


UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE




3 1761 07096940 7

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













THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

VOL. XXVII.

PUBLISHED IN

SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1849.



LONDON:

THOMAS RICHARDSON AND SON,

172, FLEET STREET; 9, CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN; AND DERBY.
JOHN BOYLE, EDINBURGH—HUGH MARGEY, GLASGOW.
NEW YORK: EDWARD DUNIGAN AND BROTHER, 151, FULTON STREET.
A PARIS: 9, RUE DU COQ, NEAR THE LOUVRE, STASSIN AND XAVIER.

1849.

EX LIBRIS

— BACH'S SCHOLASTICATE

CONTENTS OF NO. LIII.

ART.	PAGE
I.—Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England. By S. R. MAITLAND, D.D. 8vo. London, Rivingtons, 1849.	1
II.—Grönlands Historiske Mindesmærker, &c. Kjøbenhavn, 1838 — 1845. Historical Memorials of Greenland. Edited by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, 3 vols. 8vo. With Plates, Maps, and Plans. Copenhagen, 1838—1845. ...	35
III.—Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers, and other Poems. By WILLIAM EDMONDSTOUNE AYTOUN, Professor of Rhetoric in the University of Edinburgh. 8vo. Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons, 1849.	74
IV.—1. L'Univers. Journal Quotidien. Paris, 1849. 2. L'Union. Journal Quotidien. Paris, 1849. 3. La Revue des Deux Mondes. Paris, 1849. ...	91
V.—The Island of Cuba: its Resources, Progress, and Prospects, considered in relation especially to the influence of its prosperity on the British and West India Colonies, by R.R. MADDEN, M.R.I.A. London: Charles Gilpin; Dublin, James B. Gilpin, 1849.	123
VI.—A Catholic History of England. By WILLIAM BERNARD MAC CABE. Part I. England: Its Rulers, Clergy, and Poor, before the Reformation, as described by the Monkish Historians. Vol. II. London: Newby, 1849.	128
VII.—The Supplement to the Times.	146
VIII.—Jesus and Mary; or, Catholic Hymns, By FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London: Burns, 1849.	163
IX.—The four Gospels, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek text, being a revision of the Rhenish Translation, with notes critical and explanatory. By F. P. KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. 8vo. New York, 1849.	181
Notices of Books.	227

CONTENTS OF NO. LIV.

ART.	PAGE.
I.—The Rambler, for June, July, August, and October, 1849. London: Burns.	267
II.—The Four Gospels, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek text, being a revision of the Rhenish translation, with notes critical and explanatory. By F. P. KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. 8vo. New York: Dunigan, 1849.	291
III.—1. First, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Reports from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to enquire into the operation of the Irish Poor Law, and the expediency of making any amendment in its enactments, and to report thereon to the House. Together with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, March—July, 1849.	
2. First, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th Reports from the Select Committee on Poor Laws, (Ireland.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, March—June, 1849.	
3. Report from the Select Committee on the Fisheries of Ireland, together with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 20 July, 1849.	
4. First Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to enquire into the expediency of a Legislative Enactment being introduced, to enable possessors of Entailed Estates, to charge such Estates with a sum to be limited, for the purpose of Draining and otherwise permanently improving the same, and to report thereon to the House, together with the Minutes of Evidence. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 6 June, 1849.	

5. First and Second Reports from the Select Committee on Receivers, Courts of Chancery and Exchequer, (Ireland), together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 29 June, and 11 July, 1849.
6. 12 Vict. c. 5. An Act to authorize an advance of Money for the relief of certain distressed Poor Law Unions in Ireland.
7. 12 Vict. c. 23. An Act to authorize further advances of Money for the improvement of Landed Property, and the extension and promotion of Drainage and other works of public utility in Ireland.
8. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 59. An Act to amend an Act of the tenth year of her Majesty, for facilitating the improvement of Landed Property in Ireland.
9. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 62. An Act to authorize the advance of Money out of the Consolidated Fund, to the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company.
10. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 95. An Act to amend the law concerning Judgments in Ireland.
11. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 100. An Act to promote the advance of private Money for Drainage of Lands in Great Britain and Ireland.
12. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 104. An Act to amend the Acts for the more effectual relief of the Destitute Poor in Ireland.
13. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 105. An Act to convert the renewable Leasehold tenure of Lands in Ireland, into a tenure in Fee.
14. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 77. An Act further to facilitate the sale and transfer of Encumbered Estates in Ireland.
15. 12 and 13 Vict. c. 86. An Act to provide additional funds for loans by the Public Works Loan Commissioners, for building Workhouses in Ireland, 345

IV.—“Presbytery Examined.” An Essay, Critical and Historical, on the Ecclesiastical History of Scot-

ART.	PAGE.
land since the Reformation. By the DUKE OF ARGYLL. 8vo. London: Moxon, 1849. 431
V.—1. A Letter to Lord John Russell, suggesting a Plan for the adjustment of the relation between Landlord and Tenant in Ireland. By SIR A. W. HILLARY, Bart. London: Wilson.	
2. A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Roden, by ISAAC BUTT, Esq., Q. C. Dublin: McGlashan, 1849.	
3. How to reconstruct the Industrial Condition of Ireland. By JAMES WARD, Esq. London: Smith, Elder and Co.	
4. The Irish Relief Measures, Past and Future. By G. POULETT SCROPE, Esq., M.P. London: Ridgway, 1848. And Mr. Scrope's Letters after a tour through Ireland in 1849.	
5. Thoughts on the Poor-Relief Bill for Ireland, together with reflections on her miseries, their causes and remedies. By JOHN, EARL OF SHREWSBURY. London: Dolman.	
6. Two Speeches of Sir Robert Peel on the Plantation of Connaught, delivered in the House of Commons on the 5th and 30th of March, 1849.	
7. Mr. Bright's Speech at the Manchester Financial and Parliamentary Reform Association, October 25th, 1849.	
8. Crown and Government Security Bill, and Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland, 1848-9.	
9. Massacre and Burning at Dolly's Brae, in the County of Down, by the armed Orangemen and Police, on the 12th of July, 1849.	
10. Report on the Dolly's Brae Massacre, presented to the Lord Lieutenant by the Government Commissioner, Mr. Berwick, Q. C., Sept. 22nd, 1849, and consequent dismissal of Lord Roden and the Messrs. Beers from the Magistracy.	
11. B Orange Meetings convened in Dundrum, (co. Down,) C lelfast, the Rotunda, Dublin, to denounce Lord C arendon, and to present Addresses of Condolence and Sympathy to Lord Roden and the Messrs. Beers. Nov. 1849.	

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE.
12. Report of the Grand (Orange) Lodge on the alleged arming of the Orangemen by Lord Clarendon, and on the Dolly's Brae Massacre. <i>Warder (Dublin) Newspaper</i> on the 1st and 8th of December, 1849.	468
VI.—The History of St. Cuthbert ; or, an Account of his Life, Decease, and Miracles ; of the Wanderings with his Body at Intervals during one hundred and twenty-four years ; of the State of his Body from his Decease until A. D. 1542 ; and of the Various Monuments erected to his Memory. By the Very Rev. MONSIGNOR C. EYRE. London : James Burns, 1849.	512
VII.—1. Report on Quarantine, Presented to both Houses of Parliament. London, 1849.	
2. Report of the General Board of Health, on the Measures adopted for the execution of the Nuisances Removal, and Diseases Prevention Act, and the Public Health Act, up to July, 1849. London, 1849,	528
Notices of Books.	

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

SEPTEMBER, 1849.

ART. I.—*Essays on Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England.* By S. R. MAITLAND, D.D. 8vo. London, Rivingtons, 1849.

FATHER Feyjoo, in his *Teatro Critico*, has preserved a quaint old Spanish proverb about people who “steal a sheep, and give away the trotters for God’s sake.” There is a class of writers, who, in their dealings with Popery, often remind us of this amusing proverb; who consider a very small grain of praise an equivalent for whole pages of abuse and invective; and, after coolly making away with the fair fame of the entire popish system, imagine that they have satisfied every obligation of justice, by throwing us back a few minor points, as not utterly and hopelessly unredeemed. The learned author of the “*Essays on the Reformation in England*,” stands in honourable contrast with this unamiable class of writers. Few men of our time have done more to break up the mass of prejudice in which the history of Europe before the Reformation had been industriously involved, and to secure for the historical student the means of a calm and dispassionate investigation of the religious and social character of that important period. And yet, while he does not fail to make profession, upon every suitable occasion, of his own convictions, and to disclaim all sympathy with the peculiar tenets of the Roman Church, he never parades his hostility in offensive or acrimonious terms; he never, like many of his predecessors in the task, like Hallam, Guizot, Michelet, and Thierry,

indulges in the still more insulting ostentation of patronage and protection; much less does he seek to avail himself of his position as a reputed patron and apologist, in order to give additional effect to the seemingly extorted and unwilling admissions, injurious to the cause, which he professes to yield to the force of truth alone. If he has at times filched a little from us, like the rest, he has at all events reversed the Spanish proverb; he has only stolen the trotters, and has left us the carcase for ourselves. Indeed, we have often been tempted to wonder at the calmness and impartiality of the tone with which, in a period of so much polemical bitterness, he has contrived to discuss questions which were calculated to provoke the very extreme of acrimony; and, throughout the heat of the contest between the Romanizers and the anti-Romanists of his party, to maintain his consistency as an orthodox high-churchman, without at the same time falling into the angry and excited ranks, which, especially for the last three years, the numerous and important defections from Anglicanism, have arrayed in undisguised hostility to Rome. Perhaps the secret of this success may be found in the circumstance, that he has confined himself almost entirely to historical questions and matters of fact, and has scrupulously avoided all dogmatical discussions, even those which were naturally connected with the facts which came under his consideration.

How well Dr. Maitland has maintained this impartiality in his celebrated "Essays on the Dark Ages," our readers are already sufficiently aware. A topic which, before him, had been the battle field of almost every controversialist who took up his pen against the Church of Rome, in Dr. Maitland's hands was found, to the astonishment of those who recollected the olden controversy, to have become a purely literary and historical subject, to be discussed upon exclusively historical and critical grounds. He had the good sense to discover, after three centuries of bitterness, that, for the good name of the Reformation, it was not absolutely essential to demonstrate that all religion, all science, all enlightenment, had disappeared from the world in the ages which preceded it. He had the courage to approach the historical enquiry into the actual state of society in those ages, without a positive predisposition to ignore every evidence of civilisation and virtue, which could clash with this preconceived theory. And the result of this honest

determination was a success almost without a parallel in the annals of historical controversy; for it may well be doubted, whether, in the entire range of critical literature, there is to be found a more searching, more complete, or more crushing exposure of ignorance and bad faith, than in the admirable *Essay on the Dark Ages*.

The subject of the *Essays* now before us, will appear, at first sight, to involve even greater difficulty. To criticise with perfect freedom the history and circumstances of the English Reformation; to discuss its merits in its several stages; and to canvass the motives and character of the agents by whom it was accomplished, requires no small degree of boldness on the part of one who is a member of a church already committed to one side of the question. Much more, to enter upon the examination with the avowed purpose of sifting to the bottom the mass of popular impressions and popular prejudices with which the facts have been so long and so deeply overlaid; and to lay bare the truth fearlessly and without favour, no matter what may be its bearing upon the interests of party, and the traditionary character of the men and events with which party has become identified. The difficulty, however, is not so great as might at first sight be imagined; and indeed, it might almost be said, that Dr. Maitland, or a member of Dr. Maitland's school, comes to the task of investigating the early history of the Reformation in England, with even a smaller amount of professional prejudice than he brought to the consideration of the state of Europe during the Dark Ages. There is one of its phases, at least, with which his school stands in avowed and hereditary antagonism; and there are few orthodox high-churchmen of later days, who will not turn to the study of the history of the Reformed Anglican Church, with a preconceived desire to disconnect the Church, as such, as far as may be possible, from the Puritan or Calvinistic element, which entered so largely into its constitution under its first founders, Edward and Elizabeth.

If any one open Dr. Maitland's *Essays*, however, in the hope of discovering new lights upon this topic and the many similar ones involved in the history of the period, he will be grievously disappointed. Dr. Maitland has cautiously abstained from these and all other purely doctrinal discussions. He has not entered upon any of the popular controversies of the day, regarding the Anglican Reforma-

tion. There is not a word about the Prayer-book, or the Articles, or the various modifications which both underwent as a different spirit came over the rulers of the church; nothing upon the interesting and important discussion, how far each may be considered as representing the real views and doctrines of the English Church, or whether both are but parts of a crude and ill-considered system, obtruded upon her by extrinsic causes, for which she holds no responsibility; nothing upon the still more momentous question, whether the Reformation in England is to be regarded as, in any sense of the terms, the work of the Church herself, and not rather an unwilling and enforced submission to secular influence, or rather secular tyranny. Gladly as we should welcome any contribution from Dr. Maitland's acute and manly pen towards the elucidation of these obscure and most important controversies, we cannot but admit that he has acted more in accordance with what seems to be his especial vocation in eschewing them all. It is clear from all his earlier writings, that the tone and tendency of his mind are far better adapted to historical than to dogmatical, discussion; and he is evidently much more at ease with his reader, as well as on much better terms with himself, in dissecting a dubious authority, or hunting up a false quotation, than in settling the preliminaries of a disputed theological question, or marking out the boundaries beyond which orthodoxy may not safely venture to speculate.

At the same time, his work makes no pretension to the title of a regular history. It is a series of independent, and, in great part, unconnected, Essays,* all more or less historical, but without any fixed chronological order, or any strictly systematic plan. They are rather offered as contributions to the history of the time, or as helps towards a critical examination of the popular historians, than as regularly digested views of the characters and events which they describe. And the leading points of the enquiry towards which all, if they can be said to have any common

* The greater number of the Essays originally appeared in the British Magazine, which has been for many years Dr. Maitland's favourite medium of communication with the public. The longest of them all, however, those on Bishop Bonner, had never before been published, and the rest have undergone considerable alteration and enlargement.

aim, appear, at least indirectly, to tend, are;—first, the general propriety of implicitly adopting the statements of the received authorities, especially where the interests of their party are involved; and secondly, how far the history of the time can be said to confirm or justify the received notions of Protestants regarding certain particular points, as for example, the persecutions of the early reformers in England, and particularly those under Mary, or the character and conduct of the most remarkable of the persecutors.

The readers of the “Dark Ages” will not require to be informed that the most remarkable characteristic of the Essays on the Reformation is the profound and curious learning which they display in every page. There is hardly a writer of those times, however insignificant, hardly a publication, however trifling or obscure, hardly a source of information, printed or manuscript, with which Dr. Maitland does not seem to be familiar. And indeed the great value of his book lies not more in the novelty and boldness of its views than in the abundance and variety of contemporaneous historical evidence by which they are enforced. Its weight is almost irresistible. Where even the least sceptical might turn with suspicion from an unsupported assertion of Dr. Maitland himself, the most inveterate worshipper of traditionary prejudices may be shaken in his dogged faith by the authority of Bale, or Ponet, or Traheron, or Bradford, or Goodman.

And before we proceed to examine the Essays in detail, we may observe that, in looking over this mass of quaint and curious learning which Dr. Maitland has brought to bear upon his subject, we could not help being struck by the remarkable similarity of the results which the writers ascribe to the Reformation in England, and those detailed by Döllinger in the words of the German and Swiss Reformers as having followed the movement in their respective countries;—the same impiety; the same blasphemous extravagances; the same demoralizing heresies; the same corruption of morals; the same disregard of God and holy things. Thus Strype, speaking of the year 1556, avows that there had arisen “abundance of sects and dangerous doctrines, whose maintainers shrouded themselves under the professors of the gospel. *Some denied the Godhead of Christ; some denied his manhood; others denied the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, original sin, the doctrine of*

predestination and free election, the descent of Christ into hell, the baptism of infants. Some condemned the use of all indifferent things in religion; others held free-will, man's righteousness and justification by works—doctrines which the protestants in the times of King Edward for the most part disowned. By these opinions, a scandal was raised against the true professors." Others, again, had "imbibed principles of *Pelagianism, Arianism, and Anabaptism,*" and not only "in private assemblies did they swarm to pervert the right ways of the Lord, but also in divers prisons of London, where they scattered their heretical doctrines." (pp. 29, 30.) To meet the evil thus forcibly described, Traheron, the divinity lecturer at Oxford, was compelled to direct his lectures professedly "*against the Arians, who began much to increase in these times.*" (p. 76.) He himself, on the other hand, was accused of "using irreverent speech, and saying that it was in God's will and ordinance that Adam should sin, making God the author of sin." (77.) Even John Knox is "ashamed to rehearse *the universal contempt of all godly admonitions*; the hatred of those that rebuked these vices, and the authorising of such as could invent most villany against the preachers of God" (p. 87); and an equally zealous writer avows that the *change of religion has produced no change in life*, "the gentlemen protestant, for the most part differing from the others *in knowledge only, and not in life*, in words and not in works; the like covetousness, the like malice and envy, the like craftiness, the like cowardice and unfaithfulness in defending their country, the like flattery, the like lechery, the like fleshly pleasures, the like lying being found in both sorts." (187.)

We could easily extend these and other similar testimonies—the more important because reluctant and full of shame and regret—to the unhappy fruits of the new opinions. But we do not mean to enter upon this topic. It does not form any part of Dr. Maitland's plan; and the passages which we have cited are merely casual and incidental allusions, which occur by chance in the course of the extracts introduced by him in illustrating the topics to which he addresses himself professedly.

The Essays are twenty in number, and embrace a great variety of topics; the claims of the Puritan writers to the character of veracity; the singular coarseness, ferocity and virulence of their style; the irreverence and

ribaldry of their language and all their dealings with Catholics and the Catholic religion; their social and political principles; their title to be considered good subjects of a Catholic sovereign; and the trustworthiness of their accounts of the character and conduct of particular individuals among their antagonists, especially Bishops Gardiner and Bonner. It will easily be understood that in so vast a variety of subjects we cannot hope to venture upon more than a few specimens of the manner in which the author deals with them all.

The Essays upon Puritan veracity, with which the series commences, will remind the reader of some of the best passages in the masterly Essay on the Dark Ages. The author thus briefly explains his views of the question:

“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 any thing in their notions respecting *truth*, which ought to throw suspicion on any of their statements.

“The question is one which does not require much research or argument. 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, and for the benefit of those who were fellow-helpers in it. The case is not merely that the charitable partisan looked with compassion on the weak brother who denied his faith under the dread of cruel torments, or stood by with pitying and loving connivance while he told a lie as to some matter of fact, to save his own life, or lives dearer than his own. It is, that they did not hesitate, without any such urgent temptation, and with great deliberation and solemnity, to state 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.”—pp. 1, 2.

He proceeds to illustrate this statement by examples, selecting four different individuals, all men of approved character for piety and virtue among their party, and whose conduct even in the instances on which he comments, is recorded by their biographers and partisans, not only without censure, but even in some cases with directly

laudatory remarks. We shall briefly condense the particulars.

The first case is that of George Joye, a fellow of Peter House in Cambridge, and still known as one of the most active controversialists of the time, and as connected with Tyndale's translation of the New Testament. This Joye was cited, along with some others, before a commission assembled at Westminster, Nov. 27th, 1527, at the instance of cardinal Wolsey and several bishops, to be examined as to their "having preached or taught the opinions of Luther, or any others condemned by the church." The account which we have of the transaction is from Joye's own pen. He tells of his citation, of his arrival in Westminster, of the examination of his friends and partisans in misfortune, and of the means by which he himself eventually avoided the same disagreeable consummation. The most important circumstance is the following.

"Then came I to the byshopes place agayne at my houre, and shewed my selfe to M. Chaunceler. And there daunsed I a colde attendance tyll all most nyght; and yet my lord was not come. Then I went to M. Chaunceler wyth whom was Watson the scribe, desyryng him that I mought departe; for I though[t] my lord wold not come home that nyght, sayng that I had farre to my lodging, and I loued not to walke late. Lothe they were, I perceyued, and especially the scribe, that I shulde go: but they wolde nether byd me to supper, nor promyse me lodgyng; and I made haste, sayng that I wold come agayne on the morow to se and my lord were come home. Then sayd the scribe, 'Where is your lodging?' And here I was so bold to make the scribe a lye for hys asking; telling hym that I laye at the grene drogon towards Bishopsgate, when I laye a myle of, euen a contrary waye; for I neuer trusted scribes nor pharisais, and I perceyued he asked me not for any good. Here I bad them bothe good nyght.'"—pp. 9, 10.

On this frank and characteristic avowal Dr. Maitland very appositely observes:

"The reader will bear in mind that we are not discussing the question, whether George Joye had a right to deceive his persecutors; or, indeed, how far what he did was morally right or wrong. That is, no doubt, a very important question; but it is not the one now under consideration. We are at present only inquiring how far he, or any member of the sect of which he was a leader, may be relied on as an authority in matters relating to that sect. He tells us, without any appearance of hesitation or compunction, that he said what was false to others. May he not be doing the same to

us? May we, for instance, believe that the prior's letter is genuine? I should think so; but, I must say, rather from internal evidence than on his authority; and perhaps, without entering upon technical reasons for the opinion, I may say, that I believe the date from Strasburgh to be merely a blind, and that the book was printed in London. With regard to deception of that kind, it is notorious that the puritan party had no scruple."—pp. 11, 12.

The case of Anthony Delaber, a scholar of Alban's Hall, Oxford, is still more remarkable, with this difference, that the lie which he devised was intended not merely, as in Joye's case, to screen himself, but also to save another sufferer in the same good cause. Thomas Garret, another propagator of the new opinions, at Oxford, had fallen under suspicion of the authorities, and orders had been issued for his arrest. Delaber, who was known as one of his associates, and had himself been involved in suspicion, was arrested and examined touching his knowledge of the movements of his friend. He himself relates, not only without the smallest evidence of compunction, but on the contrary with the utmost seeming self-gratification, the ingenious falsehoods by which, *even upon his oath*, he eluded the enquiries of the examiner.

“‘He asked me,’ says Delabar, ‘if Master Garret were with me yesterday? I told him Yea. Then he would know where he was, and wherefore he came unto me. I told him, I knew not where he was, except he were at Woodstock. For so (said I) he had showed me that he would go thither, because one of the keepers there, his friend, had promised him a piece of venison to make merry withal the Shrovetide; and that he would have borrowed a hat and a pair of high shoes of me, but I had none indeed to lend him. *This tale I thought meetest, though it were nothing so.*’

“After some further discourse the chief beadle came to summon Dalaber to attend the Commissary, whom he found with the dean of Cardinal's College, and the warden of New College, at the altar of Lincoln College chapel. After they had asked him a good many questions, chiefly respecting himself.

“‘One came,’ he says, ‘unto them who was sent for, with pen, ink, and paper. I trow it was the clerk of the University. As soon as he was come, there was a board and tressels, with a form for him to sit on, set between the doctors and me, and a great mass-book laid before me; and I was commanded to lay my right hand on it, and to swear that I should truly answer unto such articles and interrogatories as I should be by them examined upon. I made danger of it awhile at first, but afterwards being persuaded by them, partly by fair words, and partly by great threats, I pro-

mised to do as they would have me; *but in my heart nothing so meant to do.* So I laid my hand on the book, and one of them gave me my oath, and that done commanded me to kiss the book.'

"On being afterwards examined by Dr. London, he repeated the fabrication about Woodstock and the venison, and to that, notwithstanding their threats and promises, he adhered. 'Then,' he adds, 'was he that brought Master Garret unto my chamber brought before me, and caused to declare what Master Garret said unto me at his coming to my chamber; but I said plainly, *I heard him say no such thing*; for I thought my *no* to be as good as his *yea*, seeing it was to rid and deliver my godly brother out of trouble and peril of his life.'"—pp. 17, 18.

In these two cases the individuals themselves are their own historians. But Dr. Maitland adds two others, equally striking, in which the falsehood is recorded by the great martyrologist Fox, and recorded in terms of apology and approval.

Thomas Greene, a printer's apprentice, arrested on the suspicion of putting into circulation a seditious and inflammatory book, entitled "*Antichrist*," persists, through a long series of examinations, in a fabricated story of his having gotten the book from a Frenchman whom he professes himself unable to discover or identify. Examined day after day, he perseveres in his original assertion, reiterating that "*he had told the truth*," and that "*he could tell no other truth*." At last, while he lay in prison, the woman who brought over the books, (which, like most similar productions of the time, were of foreign origin), was taken prisoner, together with a quantity of the books, and

"'Was put in the Clink in Southwark, by Hussey, one of the Arches; and I, Thomas Greene, testify before God, now, that I neither descryed the man nor the woman the which I had the books of.'

"This Hussey sent for him; but could get nothing but what he had told Dr. Story before. 'Then he was very angry, and said, "*I love thee well, and therefore I sent for thee*;" and looked for a further truth, but I would tell him no other; whereupon he sent me again to Lollard's Tower. At my going away, he called me back again, and said that Dixon gave me the books, being an old man dwelling in Birchin-lane; and I said, he knew the matter better than I. So he sent me away to the Lollard's Tower, where I remained seven days and more. Then Master Hussey sent for me again, and required of me to tell him the truth. I told him *I could tell him no other truth than what I had told Dr. Story before*. Then he began to tell me of Dixon, of whom I had the books, the which

had made the matter manifest afore; and he told me of all things touching Dixon and the books, more than I could myself; inso-much that he told me how many I had, and that he had a sackfull of the books in his house, and knew where the woman lay better than I myself. *Then I saw the matter so open and manifest before my face, that it profited not me to stand in the matter.*'

"The reader might perhaps imagine that Greene was now going to tell the truth. But no such thing; it was only that the old lie being found unprofitable, a new one must be substituted.

"He asked me where I had done the books; and I told him *I had but one*, and that Dr. Story had. He said I lied, for I had three at one time, and he required me to tell him of one. Then I told him of one that John Beane had of me, being prentice with Master Tottle.'

"Now, if after all this, and a good deal more, obstinate perseverance in lying, when the information which they wanted to get from Thomas Greene had been obtained from other sources, and the treasonable business in which he had been a petty agent had come to be fully known—if, after all this, his blood-thirsty persecutors, instead of putting him in the hands of the hangman, turned him over to the beadle, it seems to me that he got off rather better than he might have expected; and that he might think himself very lucky that his notable 'simplicitie' had led him into no worse scrape, and that he was able to say, 'when they had done whipping of me, they bade me pay my fees, and go my ways.'

"But much as we may admire the simplicity of Thomas Greene, it is surely somewhat strange to find this account of it in 'The story of certain scourged for *religion*,'—a story after which Fox observes: 'Besides these above-named divers others also suffered the like scourgings and whippings in their bodies, for their *faithful standing in the truth*; of which it may be said, as it is written of the Apostles in the Acts, "Which departed from the council rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer for the name of Jesus."' The distinction which Fox must have made in his own mind, and expected to be made by his readers, between *truth* and *the truth*, must be kept in mind during this inquiry; and it may be feared that it was not peculiar to him, or to his times, but that it characterized the party to which he belonged, and survived the age in which he lived."—pp. 26-8.

For this pertinacious mendacity the martyrologist can find no harder name than "*notable simplicity*."

Still more extraordinary is the example of John Careless, by far the most distinguished personage of them all. He is described by Strype as an "*eminent martyr*;" his letters were published by Fox and Coverdale; and have been recently republished as the letters of that "*faithful man of God*;" and as part of "a precious relic of the foun-

ders of the Established Church." Yet it is not reputed inconsistent with the sanctity of this "eminent martyr" and "faithful man of God," that, in his examination, we find no less than four avowed falsehoods, and that he himself, as well as his biographers and historians, appears utterly unconscious of moral wrong in the fabrication. (1.) On being shown the handwriting of Henry Hart, "whose hand and name he knew as soon as he had seen it," he stedfastly denied that "*he knew whose hand it was.*" (2.) On being asked if "he knew one Henry Hart, or had heard of him," he replied that "*he knew not any such, nor had heard of him that he wot of,*" and yet he unblushingly adds, that in this "he lied falsely, for he knew him indeed, and his qualities too well." (3.) On being asked "what was the cause of the contention between him and the other prisoners in the King's Bench for religion," he answered, "Surely we have no contention there, nor ever had;" and he ingeniously avows that "*he spake this to make the best of the matter, for he was sorry that the papists should hear of their variance.*" (4.) With the view of exaggerating the cruelties practised towards him, he deposed that "for almost three years he had not lain in a bed, but upon a poor couch of straw;" and this he avowed that he "*said for a good consideration, though indeed it was otherwise.*"

It is certainly not too much to say, that the statements of a historian whose ideas of the morality of truth are so conveniently loose and elastic, as to enable him to approve, or at least to pardon, such manifest violations of veracity, may well deserve to be regarded with suspicion wherever he may himself appear to "have a good consideration" for departing from the truth; as for example, when to state it broadly might bring his friends into difficulty or disrepute, or where it was desirable to overreach the "Scribes and Pharisees," or where there was danger that "the Papists should hear" some unpalatable facts which the interest or credit of the "friends of the Gospel" suggested should be concealed. Well may Dr. Maitland conclude from these examples—

"But, setting this aside for the present, let me recall the reader's attention to the four cases which I have mentioned. It seems to me to be quite time to ask him whether they prove anything? If not, perhaps no multiplication of such stories would avail to throw

any light on the puritan doctrine respecting veracity. Let me, however, remind him of one thing—namely, that I am not charging Joye, and Dalaber, and Greene, and Careless with falsehood, or attempting to show that they were guilty of it, but merely bringing forward their own statements, respecting their own conduct, made for their own pleasure, and, without the least mark of regret or compunction, addressed to their own friends, and in three cases out of the four, set forth and published by those friends without the least hint of disapprobation. If he duly considers this point, he will, I think, acquit me of any want of justice or charity towards either the individuals or their sect; and will not wonder or blame me if I proceed to inquire what effect the doctrine thus developed had on some of those writers who, whether formally or not, are in fact the Historians of the Reformation.”—pp. 40, 41.

But the most curious of all the Essays are those upon the Puritan Style. Considered in a purely literary point of view, they are exceedingly amusing, and will perhaps prove the most attractive chapters of Dr. Maitland's book. But there is a higher consideration of their bearing and tendency, which in a serious review of the history of such a movement cannot with propriety be overlooked. It is impossible in investigating the origin, the causes, and the progress of the Reformation, to avoid taking into account the motives and character of the agents by whom it was accomplished. Those who are accustomed to regard it as the great moral and religious regeneration of a corrupt and degraded church, have a right (especially if they act upon the principles of private judgment) to look for evidence, in its progress, of the ordinary signs which should accompany and characterise such a revolution; they are entitled to expect, if not clear indications of that calm and solemn deliberation which is seldom observed in a period of excitement, at least a semblance of the coolness and sobriety which must ever mark the proceedings of rational, not to say religious-minded men. They have a right to look for some indications, if not of the visible working of the spirit of God, at least of the presence and control of reason in its counsels; some sign that it was a movement of reflection and deliberation, not of blind impulse; that it had its origin in the consideration, not of men and of the interests of men, but of principles and measures; and that whatever of violence, of impiety, of pride, of revenge, of human passion, may have marked its progress, was the result of incidental causes, over which the real authors and directors had no

control, and with which neither they nor the cause itself are justly chargeable.

To require so much at least, one would say, is to set up a very low standard indeed, by which to test the moral merits of the Reformation, as a religious, social, and intellectual movement in which so many interests and of so momentous a character are involved. And although, in applying this test, it may be necessary to take into account various other and more important considerations connected with the character and conduct of the Reformers, it is plain that much light may be obtained upon both points from an examination of their writings, and a scrutiny of the tone and temper of mind and thought which they habitually indulged. Now we fear that—even with every fair deduction for “the coarseness of the age,” the “excitement of the period,” and the “rough vigour of earnest and impetuous minds,”—the specimens of the writings of the English Reformers which Dr. Maitland has collected, will not add to the character, weight, and dignity of the English Reformation as a movement of rational and religious men, conscious of the grave responsibilities of the step which they were meditating, and acting honestly under that solemn and awful consciousness. On the contrary, we fear that the men who were among its leading instruments, and who are still looked up to and venerated as its fathers, its confessors, and its martyrs, whatever may have been their real sentiments, will be found to have had the misfortune to write and think like men devoid of every higher and holier impulse; as if their hearts were full of uncharitableness, rancour, pride, and bitterness; as if they opposed the views of their antagonists and clung to their own, upon purely, or principally, personal motives; and above all, as if the habitual temper of their minds was such as seemingly to exclude the possibility of calmness or impartiality in their judgments of men, of motives, or of things.

What reliance, for example, could be placed, in any matter into which reason should enter, upon the judgment of a man, who, in a book upon a grave and solemn subject, habitually and in every page, addresses his antagonist as a “bellye beaste;” a “theefe and soul murtherer;” “blasphemous and beastlye;” an “antichrist, a theefe, a beastly blind bussard;” “as wise as Maister Harry my Lord Mayre’s foole;” a “deceitfull juggelar” [juggler;] a “brockish bore of Babylon, a swilbol, a block-

head, a bellygod;" a *beastli and unlearned bastard* ;" a "*porkishe papist*;" a "*beastlye bellye-God, and dampnable dongehill*;" [damnable dunghill,] a "*wilde brockishe bore*;" a "*filthy swineherd*," "*the very draf of antichrist and dregges of the devil*," a "*foule mouthed mastiffe*," a "*three headed Cerberus, bred and long fed in the pope's kennel*;" a "*bussard, a beast, a bluddering papist*," the "*great devil and cut-throte of England*;" a "*bottomless sea of most filthie stincking vices*?"

Now be it remembered that Strype, in his *Life of Cranmer*, is so sensitive about the language used regarding him by the papists, as to complain bitterly that Feckenham gave him the unhandsome name of "*Dolt*," and Bonner dared to say of him "that he would recant so he could have his living;" and that he makes it a grievous crime in Bonner himself to have called a tailor who came before his court by the ignominious name of "*pricklouse*." And yet the phrases strung together above are but a scanty selection from the almost inexhaustible repertory of scurrility and invective which even the few extracts from the writings of Bale, Ponet, Traheron, Whittingham, and their contemporaries, introduced by Dr. Maitland in the third and fourth Essays, will be found to present. Every sentence and every line breathes of anger, uncharitableness, violence, and pride. The lowest and most disgusting images are among their favourite sources of invective. To strip their adversary "*starke naked, and shew his scabbes to the world*" (p. 80); to "*rub his gauled backe*;" to "*bare his scabbes of iniquitie*" (81); to "*launch his boils*" (82); to make "*an anatomie of his foule inwarde partes*" (80); are the familiar threats in which they seem to delight and to make a glory; and the profane and irreverent use to which the most awful subjects are applied—the revolting allusions to the devil, and hell, and judgment—the light and mocking parodies of received catholic formularies—the blasphemous and disgusting prayers to Saint Cuckold (55), Saint Quintine (58), and other scoffingly so-called saints—bespeak an insensibility to the true spirit in which religion and all that appertains to it should be discussed, which it is hard to reconcile with the character of those agents whom Providence might be supposed to select for the great task of reforming a fallen Church. It is difficult to read any portion of these coarse and irreverent writings, without feeling that Dr. Maitland is right, when he professes him-

self indisposed to hold their authors and the other leaders of the party acquitted from the responsibility of the more outrageous blasphemies perpetrated by the less prominent actors. The men who stigmatized the Mass as an idolatrous, "sorcerous witchcraft" (68); and scoffed at "the lowsye Latine service" (64); could hardly be severe in denouncing the mockery and parody of the mass service, (294), snatching the Host from the officiating priest and trampling the Host under foot (248), stealing the holy elements and making a jest of the sacrilegious theft (242), insulting the cross and the sacred images in the public church (243), and even "putting the Holy Bread into the throat of a bitch" (276), or hanging a cat upon a gallows apparelled like a priest ready to say mass, with a shaven crown, her fore feet tied over her head, and a round paper like a wafer-cake placed between them (242). For horrors like these the historians of the times found no harder epithet than "ludicrous," and "laughable;" and for the actors, no severer description than a "pleasant knave," or a "merry fellow." The whole passage is worth transcribing.

"There is, however, a clear issue. We are not here disputing about any matter of feeling or opinion. Burnet admits that ribaldry and mocking, filthiness, and foolish talking, and jesting such as was not convenient, were made great use of, and encouraged in every possible way by the 'political men of that party,' but he states that these courses were 'disliked and condemned' by the 'grave and learned sort of reformers.' Here is a plain matter of fact. Who were the grave and learned reformers who opposed these courses? What did they do to put a stop to them? Where is their dislike and condemnation recorded? There may be protests and condemnations in the writings of some of the reformers; but I know not of them. God forbid that I should suppress them if I did. It has seemed to me that too many whom Burnet would have placed among 'the grave and learned sort of reformers,' were so far from expressing dislike and condemnation, as that, if they did not give direct encouragement and praise, they could stand by and laugh in their sleeves, while others were doing what it might not have beseemed the 'grave and learned sort' to do themselves. To say the truth, I cannot but think that any one who observes how Burnet himself, when not particularly engaged in performing the sincere historian, relates the profane and irreverent pranks which some of 'the party' indulged, will doubt whether, if he had lived at the time, he would have been very forward or very fierce in trying to stop or to punish 'these courses.' For instance, he relates an incident which occurred shortly after the accession of Queen Mary, in a tone which reminds me very much of the 'mix-

ture of glee and compunction' with which Edie Ochiltree dwelt on the exploits of his youth. The passage, not only for this, but for the historical fact itself, is much to our purpose, and quite worth quoting :—

“ ‘There were many *ludicrous* things everywhere done in derision of the old forms and of the Images: many Poems were printed, with other ridiculous representations of the Latin service, and the pageantry of their worship. But none occasioned more *laughter*, than what fell out at Pauls the Easter before; the custom being to lay the Sacrament into the Sepulchre at Even-song on Good Friday, and to take it out by break of day on Easter morning: At the time of the taking of it out, the Quire sung these words, ‘Surrexit, non est hic, He is risen, he is not here:’ But then the priest looking for the host, found it was not there indeed, for one had stolen it out; which put them all in no small disorder, but another was presently brought in its stead. Upon this a *ballad* followed, That their God was stolen and lost, but a new one was made in his room. This Raillery was so salt, that it provoked the clergy much. They offered large rewards to discover him that had stolen the host, or had made the ballad, but could not come to the knowledge of it.’ (vol. ii. p. 270.)

“I do not know where Burnet got this story, because, as in too many other cases, he gives no authority. Fox relates the same thing as happening on the same day at St. Pancras in Cheap, and perhaps it is the same story;* and in the next paragraph Fox tells us a story that should not be separated from the other, and which Bishop Burnet might have considered equally ‘*ludicrous*:’—

“ ‘The 8th of April there was a cat hanged upon a gallows at the Cross in Cheap, apparelled like a priest ready to say mass, with a shaven crown. Her two fore-feet were tied over head, with a round paper like a wafer-cake put between them: whereon arose great evil-will against the City of London; for the Queen and the Bishops were very angry withal. And therefore the same afternoon there was a proclamation, that whosoever could bring forth the party that did hang up the cat, should have twenty nobles, which reward was afterwards increased to twenty marks; but none could or would earn it.’ (vol. vi. p. 548.)

“It is needless to say that the story is told by Fox without any mark of dislike or condemnation, for he has given ample proof that he enjoyed such things amazingly. Indeed, it seems probable that his troubles first began, while he was yet at college, from the indulgence of that jeering, mocking spirit which so strongly characterizes his martyrlogy. Take a specimen that occurs only ten pages

* “If Burnet took the story from Fox, one would like to know what led him to omit one point which is stated by the martyrlogist—namely, that ‘the *crucifix*’ as well as ‘the *pix*’ was stolen.”

after the story of the cat, and which he introduces by saying, 'But one thing, by the way, I cannot let pass, touching the young flourishing rood newly set up against this present time to welcome King Philip into Paul's Church;' and having described the ceremony of its being set up, he proceeds:—

"'Not long after this, a merry fellow came into Pauls, and spied the rood with Mary and John new set up; whereto (among a great sort of people) he made a low courtesy, and said: Sir, your mastership is welcome to town. I had thought to have talked further with your mastership, but that ye be here clothed in the Queens colours. I hope ye be but a summer's bird in that ye be dressed in white and green, &c.'

"Another brief specimen may be found in a story of 'a mayor of Lancaster, who was a very meet man for such a purpose, and an old favourer of the gospel,' who had to decide a dispute between the parishioners of Cockram and a workman whom they had employed to make a rood for their church. They refused to pay him because, as they averred, he had made an ill-favoured figure, gaping and grinning in such a manner that their children were afraid to look at it. The 'old favourer of the gospel,' who seems to have been much amused by such a representation of his Saviour being set up in the church, recommended them to go and take another look at it, adding, "'and if it will not serve for a god, make no more ado, but clap a pair of horns on his head, and so he will make an excellent devil.'" This the parishioners took well in worth; the poor man had his money; and divers laughed well thereat—but so did not the Babylonish priests.' Strange that the priests did not join in the fun; and stranger still that those blind papists did not seize on the skirts of the 'old favourer of the gospel,' and say, 'We will go with you, for we see that God is with you.'"—pp. 239-44.

It is time, however, to come to the most important part of Dr. Maitland's subject, the true nature and origin of the severities exercised towards the Reformers during the reign of Mary. He himself thus proposes the question.

"What kindled and fanned the fires of Smithfield? What raised and kept alive the popish persecution in the days of Queen Mary? Was it her own sanguinary disposition? or was she the slave of her husband's cruel superstition? or were both the tools of foreigners, who certainly hated the English because they were heretics, but more deadly hated the heretics because they were Englishmen? Was it 'wily Winchester,' or was it 'bloody Bonner,' or was it something in the spirit of the church of which both were zealous members?

"Whatever may be said on any or on all of these points, there was undoubtedly one other cause; which, if it be too much to say that it has been studiously concealed or disguised, has certainly

never occupied that prominent place to which it is entitled in such an inquiry. I mean, the bitter and provoking spirit of some of those who were very active and forward in promoting the progress of the Reformation—the political opinions which they held, and the language in which they disseminated them—the fierce personal attacks which they made on those whom they considered as enemies—and, to say the least, the little care which was taken by those who were really actuated by religious motives, and seeking a true reformation of the church, to shake off a lewd, ungodly, profane rabble, who joined the cause of protestantism, thinking it in their depraved imaginations, or hoping to make it by their wicked devices, the cause of liberty against law, of the poor against the rich, of the laity against the clergy, of the people against their rulers.”—pp. 41, 42.

Of the principles against which the government of Mary had to contend, we can only find space for a few specimens. But they shall be trenchant ones. Witness the following from Knox's “Blast on the Regiment of Women.”

“For that woman reigneth aboue man, she hath obtained it *by treason and conspiracie* committed against God. Howe can it be then, that she being criminall and giltie of treason against God committed, can apointe any officer pleasing in his sight? It is a thing impossible. Wherefore *let men that receiue of women authoritie, honor, or office*, be most assuredly persuaded, that in so mainteining that vsurped power, they declare themselues enemies to God. If any thinke, that because the realme and estates therof, haue geuen their consentes to a woman, and haue established her, and her authoritie: that therefore it is lafull and acceptable before God: let the same men remember what I haue said before, to wit, that God can not approve the doing nor consent of any multitude, concluding any thing against his worde and ordinance, and therefore they must haue a more assured defense against the wrath of God, then the approbation and consent of a blinded multitude, or elles they shall not be able to stand in the presence of the consuming fier: that is, *they must acknowledge that the regiment of a woman is a thing most odious in the presence of God. They must refuse to be her officers, because she is a traioresse and rebell against God.* And finallie they must studie to repress her inordinate pride and tyrannie to the uttermost of their power.

“The same is the dutie of *the nobilitie and estates*, by whose blindnes a woman is promoted. First in so farre, as they haue most haynously offended against God, placing in authoritie suche as God by his worde hath remoued from the same, vnfeinedly they ought to call for mercie, and being admonished of their error and damnable fact, in signe and token of true repentance, with common consent they ought to retreat that, which vnadvisedlie and by igno-

rance they haue pronounced, and *ought without further delay to remoue from authoritie all such persones, as by vsurpation, violence, or tyrannie do possesse the same.*

“‘For so did Israel and Iuda after they reuolted from Dauid, and Iuda alone in the dayes of Athalia. For after that she by murdering her sonnes children, had obtained the empire ouer the land, and had most vnhappellie reigned in Iuda six years, Iehoiada the high priest called together the capitaines and chief rulers of the people, and shewing to them the kinges sonne Ioas, did binde them by an othe to *depose that wicked woman*, and to promote the king to his royall seat, whiche they faithfullie did, *killinge* at his commandment not onlie *that cruel and mischeuous woman*, but also the people did destroye the temple of Baal, break his altars and images, and kill Mathan Baales high priest before his altars.

“‘The same is the dutie as well of the estates, as of the people that hath bene blinded.

“‘First they ought to remoue frome honor and authoritie, that monstre in nature (so call I a woman clad in the habit of man, yea a woman against nature reigning aboue man).

“‘Secondarilie if any presume to defende that impietie, they ought not to feare, first to pronounce, and then after to execute against them the sentence of death. *If any man be affraid to violat the oth of obedience, which they haue made to suche monstres, let them be most assuredly persuaded, that as the beginning of their othes, proceeding from ignorance was sinne, so is the obstinate purpose to keepe the same, nothinge but plaine rebellion against God.* But of this mater in the second blast, God willing, we shall speake more at large.’—p. 52.

“‘Cursed Iesabel of England, with the pestilent and detestable generation of papistes, make no litle bragge and boast, that they haue triumphed not only against Wyet, but also against all such as haue entreprised any thing against them or their procedinges. But let her and them consider, that yet they haue not preuailed against God, his throne is more high, then that the length of their hornes be able to reache. And let them further consider, that in the beginning of this their bloodie reigne, the haruest of their iniquitie was not comen to full maturitie and ripenes. No, it was so grene, so secret I meane, so couered, and so hid with hypocrisie, that some men (euen the seruantes of God) thought it not impossible, but that wolues might be changed in to lambes, and also that the vipere might remoue her natural venom. But God, who doth reuele in his time apointed, the secretes of hartes, and that will haue his iudgemetes iustified euen by the verie wicked, hath now geuen open testimonie of her and their beastlie crueltie. For man and woman, learned and vnlearned, nobles and men of baser sorte, aged fathers and tendre damiselles, and finallie the bones of the dead, as well women as men haue tasted of their tyrannie, so that now not onlie the blood of father Latimer, of the milde man of God the bishop of Cantorburie, of learned and discrete Ridley, of inno-

cent ladie Iane Dudley, and many godly and worthie preachers, that cannot be forgotten, such as fier hath consumed, and the sworde of tyrannie most vniustlie hath shed, doth call for vengeance in the eares of the Lord God of hostes: but also the sobbes and teares of the poore oppressed, the groninges of the angeles, the watchmen of the Lord, yea and euerie earthlie creature abused by their tyrannie *do continuallie crie and call for the hastie execution of the same. I feare not to say, that the day of vengeance, whiche shall apprehend that horrible monstre Iesabel of England, and suche as main-tein her monstrous crueltie, is alredie apointed in the counsel of the Eternall: and I verelie beleue that it is so nigh, that she shall not reigne so long in tyrannie, as hitherto she hath done, when God shall declare himselfe to be her ennemie, when he shall poure furth contempt vpon her, according to her crueltie, and shal kindle the hartes of such, as somtimes did fauor her with deadly hatred against her, that they may execute his iudgements. And therefore let such as assist her, take hede what they do.' "* (p. 55.)—pp. 133–6.

Precisely the same is the tenor of Goodman's book "On the Regiment of Women."

"If your IESABELL, thoghe she be an *vnlawfull Gouvernesse, and ought not by Gods word and your owne lawes to rule*, would seke your peace and protection as did Nabuchadnezer to his captiues the Iewes: then might you haue some pretence to follow Ieremies counselle: *that is, to be quiete, and praye for her liffe*, if she would confesse the onelie God of the Christians, and not compell you to idolatrie no more than did Nabuchadnezer: who acknowledged the God of the Iewes to be the true and euerlasting God, and gaue the same commandement throughout all his dominions, That what soeuer people or nation spake euill of the God of Israell shuld be rent in pieces, and his howse counted detestable. For (saith he) Ther is no other true God that so coulde deliuer his seruantes, as he did Sidrach Misach and Abdenago.

"But because her doinges tend all to the contrarie, that is to blaspheme God, and also compell all others to do the like, what cloke haue you here to *permitte this wickednesse?*

"To be shorte, if she at the burninge of three hundreth Martyrs at the leste, could haue bene satisfied and vnfaignedly moued to confesse the true Christe and Messias, and repented her former rebellion in geuing contrarie commandement to all her dominions, charging them to receaue agayne the true religion and to expell all blasphemous idolatrie of the pestilent papistes: and that none shulde speake any euill agaynst Christe and his Religion (as did Nabuchadnezer by the example of three persons onely, whom the fire by the power of God coulde not touche) then were she more to be borne with, and reuerenced as a Ruler (*if it were lawfull for a woman to rule at all*) then were there also some probabilitie in the

reasons of the aduersaries of this doctrine. Otherwise as you now see, it maketh nothing at all for their purpose.' (*Goodman*, p. 130.)"—p. 140.

The same directly regicidal doctrines are urged by Ponet, and with even greater vigour.

“‘That wicked woman, *whom you vntruly make your Quene*, hath (saye ye) so commanded. O vayne and miserable men. To what vilenesse are you broght, and yet as men blynd, see not? Because you would not haue God to raigne ouer you, and his worde to be a light vnto your footestepps, beholde, he hath not geuen an hypocrite onely to raigne ouer you (as he promised) but an Idolatresse also: *not a man accordinge to his appoyntment, but a woman, whiche his Lawe forbiddeth, and nature abhorreth: whose reigne was neuer counted lawfull by the worde of God, but an expresse signe of Gods wrathe, and notable plague for the synnes of the people. As was the raygne of cruell Iesabel, and vngodlie Athalia, especiall instrumentes of Satan, and whipps to his people of Israel.*

“‘This you see not, blynded with ignorance: yea, whiche is more shame, where as *the word of God freethe you from the obedience of anie Prince*, be he neuer so mightie, wise, or politike commanding anye thinge whiche God forbiddeth, and herein geueth you auctoritie to withstand the same as you haue harde: Yet are you willingly become as it were bondemen to the lustes of *a most impotent and unbrydled woman; a woman begotten in adulterie, a bastard by birth, contrarie to the worde of God and your owne lawes.* And therefore condemned as a bastard by the iudgement of all vniuersities in Englande, France, and Italy: as well of the Ciuilians, as Diuines. For now are we freedde from that Iewishe yoke to rayse vp seede to our brethern departing without issue, by the comynge of our Sauour Iesus Christe, who hathe destroyed the walle and distance betwixt the Iewes and Gentiles, and hathe no more respecte to anie tribes (for conseruation wherof this was permitted) but all are made one in him with out distinction, which acknowledge him vnfaynedly to be the Sonne of God and Sauour of the worlde. For in Christe Iesus there is nether Iewe nor Gentile, Grecian or Barbarous, bonde nor free, &c. And therefore it must nedes followe, that kinge Henrie the eight, in marying with his brothers wife, did vtterly contemne the free grace of our Sauour Iesus Christe, which longe before had deliuered vs from the seruitude of that lawe: and also committed adulterous incest contrary to the worde of God, when he begate *this vngodlie serpent Marie, the chief instrument of all this present miserie in Englande.*

“‘And if any would saie, it was of a zeale to fulfill the lawe which then was abrogated, he must confesse also that the kinge did not marie of carnall luste, but to rayse vp seede to his brother: when the contrarie is well knowne to all men. Let no man therefore be offended, that I call her by her propre name, a bastarde,

and vnlawfully begotten: seing the worde of God, which cannot lye, doth geue witnesse vpon my parte. And moreouer, that suche as are bastardes shulde be *deprived of all honor*: in so muche as by the Lawe of Moyses they were prohibited to haue entrance in to the Congregation or assembly of the Lorde to the tenth generation. Consider then your vngodlie proceadings in *defrawding your contrie of a lawfull kinge*: and *preferringe a bastarde to the lawful begotten dawghter*, and exaltinge her whiche is, and will be a common plague and euersion of altogether: for as much as she is a traytor to God, and promis breaker to her dearest frindes, who helpinge her to their power to her vnlawfull reigne, were promised to inioye that religion which was preached vnder kinge Edwarde: which not withstanding in a shorte space after, she most falsely ouerthrewe and abolished. So that now both by Gods Lawes and mans, *she ought to be punished with death*, as an open idolatres in the sight of God, and a cruel murderer of his Saints before men, and *merciles traytoresse to her owne natiue countrie.*' (*Ponet, p. 96.*)—p. 138-40.

It would be tedious to pursue the enquiry further. Dr. Maitland, in the Essays on "Puritan Politics," has collected a mass of evidence which it is impossible to resist. The Reformers under Queen Mary were rebels and revolutionists, far more than they were preachers of the Gospel; and the political principles of the most prominent among them, as well as the political disrepute in which the violence of the leaders involved all the rest, were the true motives of the persecution under which they suffered. Dr. Maitland has done much to sustain this view. He has drawn attention to sources of information of which little was hitherto known; and although it was impossible within the compass of a few essays to combat in detail all the popular impressions regarding this interesting period, yet he has supplied most valuable materials for what we hope to see one day undertaken, a full and impartial investigation of the history of this most important, but hitherto most misrepresented, reign.

One of the most curious and amusing essays in the book is the tenth, which is entitled "The Puritan Palinodia," and which details the effort made by the party to unsay with regard to Elizabeth, when she succeeded to the throne, those traitorous and seditious principles which they had so long put forward against the government of Mary. Under her also the "Regiment of Women" was continued. The same arguments from reason, from history, from nature, and from scripture itself, still subsisted. The female monarchy, if

it were "monstruous" in Mary, was no less "monstruous" in her sister. But the cases, though so far identical, were very different in everything else. Mary had been a Papist: Elizabeth was a zealous Protestant; and, accordingly, it became necessary, for the interests of party, not alone to recant, but to refute the traitorous principles which it had been their policy to maintain against Mary. Bishop Aylmer's "Harborough for Faithful Subjects" was the result of this party perplexity, and Dr. Maitland has most felicitously exposed the shifts, and strainings, and sophistry, by which he escapes from the parallelisms suggested by the late reign. We should most gladly transcribe a portion of this very curious tract, as an amusing illustration of the pliancy of party; but we prefer to introduce one or two examples of Dr. Maitland's most peculiar faculty, and the quality which most distinguishes his previous publications, especially "The Dark Ages;"—the ingenuity and skill with which he exposes a fraud, or a falsification, or exaggeration. We can afford room but for a few brief examples. Strype, in his account of the celebrated Commission upon the Six Articles, after enumerating the commissioners, adds, that in order "that they might be sure to do their duty, a letter was procured from the king to Bonner, the Bishop, or his commissary, to give all these their oaths for the execution of the said act; that the Bishop accordingly administered the oath to them, and when the jury were sworn, *the Bishop admonished them to spare none.*" The natural tendency (and the one evidently intended by Strype) of this admonition was, that they should spare none; that all offenders, without exception, were to be sacrificed,—men, women, children—learned and unlearned—seducers and seduced; and accordingly the phrase, "SPARE NONE," is urged, over and over again, against the memory of Bloody Bonner; and understood as Strype represents it, the fact is undoubtedly a damning one. But hear Dr. Maitland.

"It is really almost enough to put one out of conceit with all history, when one sees so good a man as Mr. Strype undoubtedly was, writing in such a way as this; and what reader goes to Fox, the only writer whom Strype quotes, to see whether he has fairly represented his authority? Fox tells us that 'When the two juries were sworn, Bonner taketh upon him to give the charge unto the juries, and began with a tale of Anacharsis, by which example he admonished the juries to spare no persons, of *what degree soever they*

were.' Now it seems to me that this most materially alters the state of the case. One can hardly doubt that the 'example,' which the bishop quoted from Anacharsis, was his well-known saying, that laws were like cobwebs, which caught flies while they were easily broken through by stronger insects. Surely there was no presumption in the Bishop of London's taking upon him to charge the juries, and the tone of the charge, even on Fox's showing, was very different from that which a reader of *Strype* would suppose. If 'bloody' *Bonner* had been a favourite, we should probably have been told, that he faithfully and conscientiously warned the jury against a pharisaical show of zeal in haling to the judgment-seat the defenceless poor, the weak, and the foolish, while they took bribes from their rich neighbours to connive at their heresy, or 'spared' them because they had the means, not only of defence, but of retaliation.

"But what if, instead of these miserable, and tiresome, and invidious explanations, one were fairly to take the bull by the horns, and ask Mr. *Strype* and all the world, whether it was the duty of a sworn jury to exercise the prerogative of 'sparing' persons, when they were simply sworn to find and present facts? What should we think of a jury who should come into court and say, 'We find that A has robbed B; we are quite sure that he is a felon—but in our discretion we spare him—and our verdict is "Not Guilty?"' Was *Bonner* requiring from the juries more than all the commissioners themselves were bound to? Their oath, as given by *Fox*, was,—

"'Ye shall swear, that ye, to your cunning, wit, and power, shall truly and indifferently execute the authority to you given by the king's commission, made for correction of heretics and other offenders mentioned in the same commission, without any favour, affection, corruption, dread, or malice, to be borne to any person or persons, as God you help, and all saints.' (vol. v. p. 264.)"—pp. 273, 274.

A similar fraud on the part of *Fox*, the Martyrologist, is no less amusingly exposed: his "Story of John Porter, cruelly martyred for reading the Bible in Paul's." The impression which any one would receive from this story, as related by *Fox*, is that the sole crime imputed to the "martyr" was the reading of the Bible, and what is worse, reading from the copies set up by authority in the churches, for the express purpose of being read.

"The reader who has got thus far in the history of John Porter, probably thinks that he has made a considerable progress towards understanding his case. He may wonder to find a man brought before Bishop *Bonner* for the simple act of reading the Bibles which Bishop *Bonner* himself had set up, and still (*Cromwell* or no *Cromwell*, it seems) kept up, in his Cathedral; and to learn that the

bishop put him to death for it. He may, however, consider that it would be mere folly to attempt to account for the cruel freaks of such a sanguinary monster; and that the only way to meet the difficulty is to say, 'Whether Bonner put the Bibles up, or put the Bibles down, his object was blood. No doubt his secret orders to the myrmidons whom he sent to spy out the proceedings of the Bible-readers in Paul's were to "SPARE NONE."' "

"But, whatever surmises may have arisen in the minds of those who have read the matter contained in the preceding pages of this essay, the unprepared and confiding reader of Fox will, by what has been hitherto said, learn absolutely nothing (one might almost say less than nothing) of the real case. It may be hard to say, particularly, and in detail, what was the charge against the prisoner; for, so far, it has been studiously suppressed in the story; and it only just crops out in the sequel sufficiently to show us, that to represent John Porter as 'cruelly martyred for reading the Bible in Pauls' is historically (and yet more verbally) as untrue as to say that John Thurtell was put to death for firing a pistol. Whatever were John Porter's offences, we may safely join issue with Fox, and deny that it was 'for reading the Bible;' and that, too, on his own showing, for he immediately goes on to say, 'Bonner then laid unto his charge that he had made *expositions* upon the text, and gathered *great multitudes* about him to *make tumults*.'

"These were the very things particularly forbidden in the 'Admonition' set over the Bibles, to regulate the behaviour of those who should see fit to use them. It directed 'that no number of people be specially congregate therefore to *make a multitude*, and that no *exposition* be made thereupon;' and these were the very things which the Bishop laid to the charge of John Porter. And he charged him, not only with these things, forbidden in themselves, but with a much more serious offence—namely, with doing these things in order to *make tumults*. We have only the *ex parte* statement given us by Fox; but does he venture to say that the charge was false? Not at all. Does he represent John Porter himself as denying it? Not at all. When Bonner made the charge, 'he answered, he trusted that should not be proved by him.' A most prudent and characteristic reply. But, having recorded this discreet answer, not a word more does Fox say of the charge, or the examination, or the defence. He seems as if he suddenly felt that he had said quite enough, or too much; and he huddles up the story, leaving his readers in a state of great ignorance, but surely not without a strong suspicion that there was a good deal more in the matter than he chose to tell. His very next words to those which I have just quoted are, 'But, in fine, Bonner sent him to Newgate, where he was miserably fettered in irons.'—'In fine,' surely his jumping to such a point, when the reader naturally supposed that he was at the beginning of a story, is very suspicious; and this instance, among many others, may very use-

fully instruct us not to receive the stories of party writers without some care and examination."—pp. 287-9.

We shall add one other, and much more important falsification of history, or, at least, a grievous exaggeration, which is chargeable, not upon one, but on several of the historians of the time. We mean, as to the extent of the persecution under the celebrated statute of the Six Articles under Henry VIII. Holinshed tells of this statute, that it was named, "*the bloodie statute, as it proved indeed to manie.*" Strype states, that Cromwell vainly endeavoured to "protect the gospellers," but could not; that "after his death *a cruel time passed*;" that "few durst protect those that refused to subscribe to the articles, so that they suffered daily." Lord Herbert in his "Life of Henry VIII." repeats the same assertion, that "*they suffered daily, whereof Fox hath many examples.*"

"Surely a reader who knows no more of the facts than what he may gather from these writers, would expect to find, as the story went on, that torrents of blood were shed, and the number of the slain incalculable. He might, indeed, consider the fact, that 'the cruel time,' (not to say *any* enforcement of the Act,) did not begin till more than a year after the 'bloody Six Articles' had passed, as indicating a strange degree of moderation, or impotence, in those who had framed it in bloodthirsty vengeance, and this might lead him to suspect exaggeration in the historians. But would he not think that he made all due allowance, if he dated the persecution from after the death of Cromwell, and finding that thenceforth 'they suffered daily,' he assumed the charitable minimum of one sufferer per day for all England, and so limited his idea of the number of martyrs to somewhat more than five-and-twenty thousand? Would he not be startled if one told him that he would have to look sharp for five-and-twenty, and might dismiss the thousands as being figures, not of arithmetic, but of speech? It may be a confession of ignorance, but I must say that I have not found so many. I have not indeed made such inquiry as would authorize my speaking positively and with precision. But precision is not wanted in such a matter. If, besides the cases which I am about to mention, twice or ten times as many others can be produced of persons undeniably put to death under the Act, it will in no degree invalidate my argument, or justify the writers whose language I have quoted."—p. 258.

He proceeds to give a list of all the martyrs whom Fox mentions for the whole time the act was in force, that is, for the last seven years of Henry the Eighth's reign, which, of course, includes those who suffered under all other

statutes of heresy. Now the fact is that the entire list contains, during the seven years, precisely twenty-eight, or an average of *four each year*, being at the rate of *one every quarter of a year* instead of *every day*, as it is represented by these enthusiastic or unscrupulous writers.

Dr. Maitland's observations on the personal feelings and opinions of Henry VIII., on the subject of religion, are solid and judicious.

"Few things have had a greater tendency to involve the history of the English Reformation in obscurity than the loose way in which the king's own personal feelings, and opinions, and his proceedings with regard to religion, have been estimated and represented. With reference to the present case, even Lord Herbert says, 'But that it may seem lesse strange why the King, who before was much disposed to favour the Reformers, did on a sudden so much vary from them, I have thought fit to set down some of the motives as I conceive them.' But it seems hardly worth while to follow him into his ideas respecting the jealousy of the foreign Reformers, and the emperor, and other remote reasons which he suggests, while it is so apparent that he is only troubling himself to solve a difficulty which never existed. Undoubtedly Henry 'was much disposed to favour the Reformers' who took his part in the divorce question—he 'was much disposed to favour the Reformers' who maintained that he was the supreme head of the church, and sided with him against the unjust usurpations of the Bishop of Rome—he 'was much disposed to favour the Reformers' who carried through the suppression of the monasteries, and thereby not only humbled the pride of those who might be more strictly called the popish clergy, but filled his exchequer, or enabled him to be profuse with an empty one. For the same reason, and because the thing was somewhat scandalous, and sometimes supported by disgraceful trickery, he thought it right to stop the lavish offerings which were heaped on the shrines of some of the more popular saints, and to turn those treasures to more useful purposes—and we cannot wonder if, with these views and feelings, he did not altogether dislike or disrelish some things having a tendency to lower the papal power in his dominions, by rendering the pope and his adherents ridiculous. All this was certainly very antipapal; and if to be antipapal was to be protestant, this was very protestant, and the king was very protestant; and it might be very protestant to give his subjects the bible in the vulgar tongue—a circumstance very curious and much to be remarked in connexion with the matter now before us; because, that it was the work of Cromwell (or perhaps we may say of Cromwell and Cranmer) admits of no doubt. But how would Henry have stared if anybody had inferred from any or all these things that he had any heretical misgivings or doubts about transubstantiation, or purgatory, or the invocation of

saints, or other doctrines which we justly consider as errors or heresies peculiarly characteristic of the Church of Rome, and which in the modern popular view of the Reformation in England are commonly mixed up with the doctrine of papal supremacy, in the general notion of 'popery.'"—pp. 266-8.

We have entered into so many of the curious topics with which this interesting book abounds, that we have little space left for the essays upon Gardiner and Bonner. To the latter he devotes by far the largest portion of his book. We must confess, that while we are satisfied of the cruel injustice which he has met at the hands of the Protestant historians, we have, nevertheless, little sympathy with his principles or his character. He was one of the most zealously compliant among the supporters of the royal supremacy, and one of the meanest of the sycophants who paid their court to the king at the sacrifice of their loyalty to the Pope. Even under Edward he sought to make his peace with the Reformers, by parading his services in overthrowing the papal usurpation; and, although his retraction under Mary was complete and unequivocal, one is always tempted to regard it as the result of the same constraint under which he had unworthily surrendered his first faith. Still it is the part of historical justice to extend to him protection, at least, from misrepresentation, and to this Dr. Maitland has applied himself with zeal and success.

We cannot hope to follow him through the various details of his investigation. He has taken up, one by one, the most striking of the statements and assertions of the hostile historians, and especially Fuller and Fox. One of these, rather a lengthy one, must suffice, as a sample of them all.

Fuller sums up the picture which he has left of Bonner's cruelty, by declaring that "no sex, quality, or age, escaped him, whose fury reached from John Fetty, a lad of eight years old, *by him scourged to death*, even unto Hugh Laverock, a cripple, sixty-eight years old, whom he caused to be burnt." We can only afford space for the criticism of the story of the boy, John Fetty, which is told in the author's most characteristic style.

"John Fetty, the father of the child in question, was a simple and godly poor man, 'dwelling in the parish of Clerkenwell, and was by vocation a taylor, of the age of twenty-four years or there-

about.' He seems to have married at an age when he could not be expected to show much discretion in choosing a partner; for this (not his only, and perhaps not his eldest) child was 'of the age of eight or nine years.' He suffered for his youthful indiscretion; for his wife, disapproving his resolution 'not to come into the church, and be partaker of their idolatry and superstition,' was so cruel, or so zealous, as to denounce him to 'one Brokenbury, a priest and parson of the same parish.' Accordingly 'through the said priest's procurement, he was apprehended by Richard Tanner, and his fellow constables there, and one Martin the headborough.' Immediately after doing this the poor woman was seized with such remorse that she became 'distract of her wits.' Even the pitiless papists were moved; the Balaamite priest and the constables, and headborough, all agreed for the sake of her, and her two children, that they would 'for that present let her husband alone, and would not carry him to prison, but yet suffered him to remain quietly in his own house; during which time, he, as it were forgetting the wicked and unkind fact of his wife, did yet so cherish and provide for her, that within the space of three weeks (through God's merciful providence) she was well amended, and had recovered again some stay of her wits and senses.'

"But strange to say, 'so soon as she had recovered some health,' her cruelty or zeal revived, and she 'did again accuse her husband.' The steps are not stated; but we may reasonably suppose them to have been the same as before. Now, however, as there was nothing to interrupt the common course of things, John Fetty was 'carried unto Sir John Mordant, Knight, one of the Queen's Commissioners, and he upon examination, sent him by Cluny the bishop's sumner, unto the Lollards' Tower.' On what charge (except so far as may be gathered from what has been already stated) Sir John sent him to prison we are not told; but there he lay for fifteen days, and probably Bonner knew no more of his being there, than he knew of Thomas Green's being twice as long in his own coal-house.

"Perhaps while her husband lay in prison, the poor woman, who may so peculiarly be termed the wife of his youth, relented, and thought herself happy that, owing to their early marriage, they had already a child of an age to traverse the streets of London, of 'a bold and quick spirit,' who would make his way in search of his father; and at the same time, 'godly brought up,' and knowing how to behave himself before his elders and betters at the bishop's palace. I own, however, that this is mere supposition, and that I find no particular ground for supposing that his mother knew that he was gone out upon what may have been only a spontaneous pilgrimage of filial piety; but, to come to facts, it is clearly stated that he 'came unto the bishop's house to see if he could get leave to speak with his father. At his coming thither one of the bishop's chaplains met with him, and asked him what he lacked, and what

he would have. The child answered, that he came to see his father. The chaplain asked again who was his father. The boy then told him, and pointing towards Lollards' Tower, showed him that his father was there in prison. "Why," quoth the priest, "thy father is a heretic." The child being of a bold quick spirit, and also godly brought up, and instructed by his father in the knowledge of God, answered and said, "My father is no heretic; for you have BALAAM'S MARK."

"By this notable speech the unhappy child has gained a place in the holy army of martyrs. At least (so far as Fox tells us) he said and did nothing else; though perhaps we may take it for granted that the precocious little polemic showed his 'bold and quick spirit,' and his godly bringing up, in some other smart sayings, and gave some other 'privy nips' to the Balaamite priest, such as Bishop Christopherson and Miles Hoggard would not have approved, before he got the whipping, which he is said to have received ere he reached his father in the Lollards' Tower. For 'the priest took the child by the hand, and led him into the bishop's house,' says Fox; and he adds, with the absurdity which so often, and so happily neutralizes his malice, 'whether to the bishop or not I know not, but *like enough he did.*' 'Like enough'—is that all? and is there the least likelihood of such a thing? especially when Fox proceeds to state that the child as soon as he had been whipped was taken to his father in the tower, and fell on his knees and told him his pitiful story, how 'a priest with Balaam's mark took him into the bishop's house, and there was he so handled;' but not a word did the child say of ever seeing the bishop. Fox himself dared not put more in his marginal note than 'The miserable tyranny of the *papists* in scourging a child.'

"The historian, however, tells us that they detained the boy (whom they probably considered as a go-between) for three days; and at the end of that time Bonner makes his first appearance in the story. And then we are introduced to him, not burning heretics, but 'basting of himself against a great fire' in his bed-room. There is nothing to show that he had ever before heard of either John Fetty or his child; but on that occasion the father (and as far as appears the father only) was brought before him. He quickly showed by his conduct and discourse that he was either a sort of half-witted person, or else that finding himself in awkward circumstances, that he wished to pass for one. In that character, whether natural or artificial, he talked some sad nonsense and impertinence to the Bishop, who having, of course, gone through the necessary preliminaries of being in a '*marvellous rage*' and a '*great fury*,' and then again being in 'fear of the law for murdering a child,' (for all at once it has come to be quite certain that the child *was* killed, and by Bonner too, and therefore he) 'discharged him.' It is remarkable that on one point, Fox says absolutely nothing,—there is not a word of the prisoner's being asked to abjure, or recant, or

submit, or amend his evil ways—no hint of his being offered, or signing, any bill (as Fox calls it), or of anything of the kind, so common on such occasions. I think, however, that every well-informed reader will suspect that so far as prudential reasons and 'fear of the law' might weigh with a 'bloody wolf,' Bonner must have known that it would have been safer for him to whip two taylor prentices to death, and hide them in his coal-house, than to discharge one prisoner committed under the warrant of Sir John Mordant without a recantation or submission, or some sort of voucher, to lay before the Council. But nothing, I repeat, is said about it.

"Our business, however, is rather with the story of the unfortunate little creature, whom, for his impertinence, Fox has made a martyr. Within fourteen days after he had been taken home by his father the child is said to have died; and Fox most characteristically adds, 'Whether through this cruel scourging, or any other infirmity, *I know not*; and therefore I refer the truth thereof unto the Lord who knoweth all secrets, and also to the discreet judgment of the wise reader;' discreet and wise historian—he gives no hint how he picked up the story, and does not venture to insinuate that the boy, or the father, or anybody else ever said that the Bishop even knew of the whipping. Such is the authority for Fuller's bold, brief, and, I suppose I may add, false statement."—pp. 415-20.

Whatever may be the impression created with regard to Bonner by the above statement, it is, at all events, conclusive against the accuracy and trustworthiness of Fuller, and the same is shown in various other instances, with regard to Fox and other similar authorities. He sums up his judgment of Bonner's character as follows:

"But let us for a while dismiss Fuller's wild beast, or forest of wild beasts, in order to introduce a very different character. When the reader of Fox has become sufficiently familiar with the 'MARVELLOUS RAGE' and 'GREAT FURY' that embellish so many of his descriptions of prelatival proceedings, to treat them as Mr. Burchell would have done,—when he calmly inquires what these tales so full of rage and fury really mean, when they mean anything—he finds the bloody wolf transformed (I will not say into a spaniel, for that might imply fawning), but into something much more like a good-tempered mastiff, who might safely be played with, and who though he might be teased into barking and growling, had no disposition to bite, and would not do it without orders. In plainer terms, setting aside *declamation*, and looking at the *details of facts* left by those who may be called, if people please, Bonner's victims, and their friends, we find, very consistently maintained, the character of a man, straightforward and hearty, familiar and humorous, sometimes rough, perhaps coarse, naturally hot-tempered, but obviously

(by the testimony of his enemies) placable and easily entreated, capable of bearing most patiently much intemperate and insolent language, much reviling and low abuse directed against himself personally, against his order, and against those peculiar doctrines and practices of his church for maintaining which, he had himself suffered the loss of all things, and borne long imprisonment. At the same time not incapable of being provoked into saying harsh and passionate things, but much more frequently meaning nothing by the threatenings and slaughter which he breathed out, than to intimidate those on whose ignorance and simplicity argument seemed to be thrown away—in short, we can scarcely read with attention any one of the cases detailed by those who were no friends of Bonner, without seeing in him a judge who (even if we grant that he was dispensing bad laws badly) was obviously desirous to save the prisoner's life. The enemies of Bonner have very inconsiderately thrust forward, and perhaps even exaggerated, this part of his character, and represented him as a fawning, flattering, coaxing person,—as one only anxious to get submissions, abjurations, and recantations which would rob the wild beast of his prey. That he did procure a considerable number of recantations, and reconciled a great many to the church of Rome, I have no doubt; some are incidently mentioned, and we may suspect that there were a great many more which are not recorded. Of course the Martyrologists are not to be blamed for this. Their business lay with those who did *not* recant. On several accounts we must not forget that a Book of Martyrs is a record of extreme cases. This is not the place to enter into details; but I do not hesitate to express my belief not only that Bonner procured the abjuration of a great number, but that this was one of the causes of that bitter hatred with which the Puritans regarded him. It was not, as I have said, the duty of their historians to record such matters; nor could it be agreeable to the party to have them published either on the mountains of Gath, or on their own hill of Zion. But certainly while the public sufferings of their stedfast brethren formed in every point of view the best subject for invective, against the papists, for example to the protestants, and for political agitation of the people, there was, among the leaders, a great fear of the Bishop's powers of persuasion; or as Fox oddly calls them, 'the *subtle snares of that bloody wolf.*'

"And while it may be proper to say that this phrase did not relate to traps set for fugitive heretics—for the person spoken of as 'then in danger of the subtle snares of that bloody wolf Bonner,' was already in captivity, and had 'been divers times before my lord in examination'—it is right to add that I do not recollect any instance in which Bonner was charged with any breach of faith, or promise, by prisoners whose lives he had saved by his old trade of persuading. I have found him reproaching some of them with broken promises; but on that point I do not recollect any retort."—pp. 422–5.

But we have written more than enough, we feel assured, to excite the reader's curiosity regarding this very remarkable book. It is, in many respects, less directly attractive than that which must always remain the author's great work, *The Dark Ages*. It has less of unity and harmony of purpose. It is less complete in some of its parts. The criticisms are less trenchant, and come less directly home. The exposure of the falsehoods and frauds of party is hardly so striking or so palpable to every mind. The defects of the author's manner, too,—his discursiveness—his over-familiarity of tone—his tendency to run off into digressions and collateral researches—are more frequently apparent, and the attention is oftener drawn away from the main point at issue to comparatively unimportant and irrelevant enquiries. But it must, nevertheless, be admitted, that it is a work of rare merit, and indeed almost unique in its kind; and, as specimens of historical criticism, many of its chapters, making due allowance for the diversity of subject, are only second to the inimitable essays of the *Dark Ages*. Few writers of our age have done so much as Dr. Maitland at once to elevate the character and the responsibilities of history, and to destroy the prestige of some of its most popular names, by exposing their disregard of these responsibilities.

We shall not undertake to predict what may be the actual influence of these essays in removing popular prejudices and promoting more just views upon the subject of the English Reformation. For our own part, we attach little importance to minor discussions of this character, as bearing upon the really practical controversies connected with religion. They are but too apt to engender a cold, cavilling, and rationalizing frame of mind, and to indispose for the higher, more enlarged, and more comprehensive views, through which alone the merits of a great question can be fully reached, or justly appreciated. Nevertheless there are minds for which these discussions are especially adapted, and which can only be approached through such a medium. Every grain of truth which is recovered may, or rather must, be a contribution towards the enlightenment of the human mind, and as such must ever be welcome. And to us, at all events, truth told as it is told by Dr. Maitland, cannot fail to be acceptable, for our sake as well as for its own.

ART. II.—*Grönlands Historiske Mindesmærker, &c.* Kjobenhavn, 1838—1845. *Historical Memorials of Greenland.* Edited by the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, 3 vols., 8vo. With Plates, Maps, and Plans. Copenhagen, 1838—1845.

A FEW pages would, by most of our readers, be perhaps deemed sufficient to contain all that is known of ancient Greenland. To some, the mere announcement of a history of that country in former days, will appear strange, though in a geographical point of view, Greenland has been by no means unnoticed in our times, from its near proximity to those seas where British enterprise is constantly exerted in the whale fishery, and where British zeal and perseverance have been so long expended in the doubtful research for the North-West Passage. The sailor, nay, even the scientific man, who may chance to view these wild and savage shores, inhabited now by wandering tribes of Esquimaux, many of whom have never seen the face of the white man, can scarcely believe that, within historical times, there dwelt here a comparatively numerous colony of the Scandinavian race, men, fellows in blood and in language and belief with the Norman who ravaged the banks of the Seine, or with the Dane who subdued half England in Anglo-Saxon times. Few will admit that in times long gone by, a christian people dwelt in the fiords and inlets of the western coast of Greenland; that of this people, contemporary records, histories, papal briefs, and grants of lands, yet exist; and that, finally, the whole colony was utterly lost to the rest of the world, and that for centuries Europe was in doubt regarding not only its fate, but actually, almost to the present day, in respect to its geographical position. To the Catholic it must be doubly interesting to learn, that here, as in his own land, the traces of his faith, of that faith which is everywhere the same, are yet distinctly to be found, that the sacred temples of our worship may still be identified; nay, that in at least one instance, the church itself, with its burial ground, its aumbries, its holy water stoup, and its tombstones, bearing the sacred emblem of the catholic belief, and the pious petitions for the prayer of the surviving faithful, still remain, to attest that here once dwelt a people who were our brethren in the church of God. It was not, as in our own land, that these

churches, these fair establishments of the true faith, were ruined by the lust and avarice of a tyrant; no change of religion marked the history of the church of Greenland, the colonies had been lost before the fearful religious calamities of the sixteenth century had been felt in Europe. How or when they were swept away we scarcely know, save from a few scattered notices in the present volumes, and from the traditions of the wandering Esquimaux, now, for the first time, carefully collected and recorded. For the heathen people that burst in upon the old colonists of Greenland, and laid desolate their sanctuaries and their homes, till not one man was left alive, was, and is to this day, a wild and savage nation, without literature, without culture of any kind, and lies still buried in the darkness of paganism.

In the year 1000 of our era, Greenland was a rising colony, having been peopled by adventurers from Iceland, who had arrived on its coasts about twenty years before. In that same year the cross was triumphantly planted on its shores, and from the cold and frozen north, the restless spirit of the Scandinavians carried them to Labrador, and far down along the American continent, even to the peninsula of Florida.

By the middle of the eleventh century, A.D. 1054, the colony had increased so much in numbers and in wealth, that the colonists sent an embassy to Bremen, in Germany, praying that a bishop and more priests might be sent out thither. In the following year Albert, or Adalbert, the first titular bishop, was ordained to the see of Gardar, in Greenland; but from various causes, it was not till sixty years more had elapsed, that the colonists saw the episcopal functions performed in the church of Gardar. No bishop seems to have arrived in Greenland prior to the year 1112, but from that date down to the year 1460, or thereabouts, the colony seems to have had a regular episcopal succession, though many an interregnum occurred, from the difficulty of communication with the mother country of Norway, and with the Metropolitan See of Drontheim. From the latter date, almost all notice, whether of the temporal or spiritual condition of the colony, disappears, though a titular Bishop of Greenland resided in Norway, or in Denmark, until after the Reformation.

The three volumes now before us, are replete with the most interesting details concerning both Pagan and Chris-

tian Greenland. They are the results of the labours of a commission, appointed by the Royal Society of Northern Literature at Copenhagen, to investigate all that related to the history and topography of Greenland, as contained in the precious Icelandic manuscripts of the middle ages, which form the chief ornament of the great Library of the Danish capital. These invaluable documents were originally collected by Arne Magnussen, an Icelander, who died in the year 1730. The collection was at one time far more extensive, but in 1728 two-thirds of the MSS. were burnt in the great fire that devastated Copenhagen. It is from these manuscripts, many of which have never yet been published, that the principal editor of these volumes, the late lamented Finn Magnussen, has drawn the chief portion of his materials. He has here presented us with a complete collection of all known records relating to the lost colonies of Greenland, while from his own unequalled information upon northern literature and history, he has added, in the form of notes and lengthened preliminary dissertations, matter sufficient to form more than one of the volumes before us.

The whole work is divided into three separate parts or sections. The first, and by far the most extensive, embraces all that is contained in the ancient Icelandic Sagas, relative to the history of old Greenland, its discovery, its colonisation, and the introduction of christianity therein. On the one page we have the old Icelandic text, on the other an accurate Danish translation, while each separate Saga has its particular introduction, wherein its historical worth is closely examined, and the various manuscripts from whence it has been edited are carefully indicated. The Sagas, with the notes and preliminary dissertations, occupy the whole of the two first volumes. The second part of the work contains the ancient geographical descriptions of Greenland, for in the old Sagas and documents, we find not merely personal histories, but topographical descriptions of the colonies, careful directions for the course of ships sailing from Iceland or Norway to these distant regions; and lastly, observations on the natural phenomena and productions of Greenland, such as we could hardly have looked for in an age so remote, or in countries so distant from the then centres of European civilisation.

To the antiquarian, and especially to the Catholic

archæologist, the third section will present matter of deep interest. It exhibits an ample summary of all that has been done by the Danish government to re-discover the lost colonies, which many, even in the present century, believed might yet be in existence, retaining their laws, their language, customs, and religion, though cut off for the last four hundred years from all intercourse with the civilized world. Truly, had such been the case, it would have been a singular and an interesting scene, the first meeting between the polished and advanced citizens of our present Europe, and the rude uncivilized Northman, retaining unchanged the habits and ideas of the fifteenth century. But this dream of certain philosophers has been now completely dispelled by the recent researches of the Danish Government, the results of which are contained in the third of the volumes before us. During the last thirty years, the coast from Cape Farewell westward along the shores of Davis Straits, has been carefully examined, the traditions of the Esquimaux regarding the "Kablunaks," or white men, have been collected and compared, and the result has been such a mass of geographical and antiquarian evidence, that the question of the ancient position of the colonies, and of their total destruction, may now be regarded as satisfactorily determined.

We shall now examine these volumes more in detail, and endeavour to select, amidst their various contents, the points which may best interest and instruct our readers. The first seventy pages of the first volume are occupied by a learned disquisition from the pen of the late Finn Magnussen, on the historical value of the ancient MSS. from whence the documents regarding Greenland have been derived. This essay does not admit of extract or of condensation; but, with the most laborious perseverance, the author clears up much that was obscure regarding the earliest writers of Icelandic history, he criticises the relative value of their productions, and having thus prepared a ground-work for his text, he proceeds to lay before us the ancient Sagas in their full integrity, omitting no portion of them wherein mention is made of the then existing colonies of Greenland. The first extract, [p. 71-135,] relates to certain islands lying on the east coast of Greenland, and which were the first portion of that country discovered by the adventurers from Iceland. If the reader examines the map of the Polar regions, he will see how

short a space intervenes between the west coast of Iceland and the eastern shores of Greenland. The old Vikings were not perhaps first-rate navigators, they seldom got out of sight of land where it was possible to avoid it, and we may therefore readily agree with Finn Magnussen, that the Gunnbjörns Skjaer, or rocks of Gunnbjorn, are probably the small islands visited by Graah in 1830, and by him named Danells islands. They lie in latitude 65° 20" north. From the old Norse directions for sailing to Greenland, we learn that the established course was nearly due west from Iceland, till they sighted one or two high mountains on the east coast of Greenland, from whence they touched at Gunnbjörns rocks, and steering afterwards south-west, rounded Cape Farewell, and arrived at the more favoured climes of the eastern colony. It is well known to all navigators of the Polar seas, that the eastern coast of Greenland, from Cape Farewell in latitude 59 N. to Scoresby Sound N. lat. 70, now presents an almost impracticable barrier of ice, so that few save Graah and Wallöe, have ever been able to land upon its shores. Perhaps, in the tenth century, the eastern coast may have been less blocked with ice, but the perusal of the ancient Sagas sufficiently shows, that this coast was always regarded as perilous in the extreme, and that the majority of the shipwrecks which occurred in the Greenland trade, took place upon this most inhospitable part of the country. Gunnbjörns rocks seem to have been not only a resting-place for those sailing to Gardar and Eriksfiord, but also to have been, for a time at least, inhabited, if we may judge from the following extract from the "Landnama Bok," or book of the possession of land in Iceland, written, or at least commenced, by Aré the Wise, about the year 1120.

"Snæbjörn Holmsteinson, surnamed Galte, owned a ship that lay in the mouth of the river Grimsaa in Borgarfjord (Iceland.) Rolf of Rödesand bought the half share of the vessel, each partner took with him a crew of ten men. With Snæbjörn, were Thorkil and Sumarlid. They went in search of Gunnbjörns rocks, and found land. Snæbjörn ordered that no one should go on shore that night; but Styrbjörn, one of the crew, secretly left the ship, and finding a purse with money in a cairn, hid it, and returned with it to the vessel. Snæbjörn struck him with an axe, so that the purse fell to the ground. The crew then built a hut for a dwelling place, and it was soon entirely covered with snow. In the month of

March, Thorkel Roed's son, looking through the window, saw water on a fork that stood outside. Then they cleared away the snow, and Snæbjorn rigged the ship, while others busied themselves with hunting. But Styrbjorn slew Thorodd, and he and Rolff slew likewise Snæbjorn, and all the others were forced to swear an oath to preserve their lives. In returning they were driven by contrary winds to Helgeland, in Norway, and from thence made their way back to Vadir, in Iceland."—p. 75.

In another copy of the *Landnama Bok*, not now in existence, but of which a fragment has been preserved by Björn Johnsen in his *Icelandic Annals*, we find this incident given more in detail, and we copy it, as it is not without interest in regard to the heathen custom of burying money with the dead.

"When they arrived at Gunnbjörns rocks, the commanders of the ship ordered that no one should go on shore, or should explore aught thereon. They put out the boat that afternoon, but all slept in the ship. During the night one of the crew arose secretly, and went on shore. Straight-ways he discovered a small cairn over a dead man, whose body seemed to have been recently interred there, after the manner of the heathens; he sought immediately if there was anything hidden beneath the shoulders of the corpse, and he found there a large and heavy purse with money, which he took back to the ship, and lay down to sleep as though nothing had occurred."—p. 105.

It is certain that at the time Björn Johnsen wrote, A.D. 1574—1600, many Icelandic MSS. of the greatest value were in existence, and which are now entirely lost. A great part of these had been gathered together in the Arne Magnean library, at Copenhagen, previous to its calamitous destruction by fire in the year 1728. The number, however, of those still existing is very great, while it is evident that these Sagas are, for the most part, prose versions of histories, originally sung in accurate measure, and often in rhyme. Many of the old verses are yet incorporated in their pages, and were probably contemporary with the heroes whose praises they record. Almost all the celebrated chiefs and adventurers were accompanied by skalds or poet laureates, whose office it was to record their patron's feats of arms, and to entertain him and his guests with their lays. We have a good illustration of this custom in an extract, or rather a condensed account, made by Björn Johnsen in the sixteenth century, from a work now totally lost, viz. the *Travels of Björn Eimarsen, of Vatnafiord, in*

Iceland, otherwise called Björn the Jerusalem Pilgrim. (Björn Jorsala farër.)

“Björn of Vatnsfiord, surnamed Jorsalafarer, on his third journey to Rome, made his way on to Jerusalem. He had much to tell of his travels, and of the perils he and his wife had passed through; but most of all on his last journey, when he was long detained by the Ice on the coast of Greenland. Björn on this occasion touched at Gunnbjörns rocks, which lie north-west out from the mouth of Isafjord, in Iceland. He ascertained that they were inhabited, but a girl warned him in a song, that he would lose his life if he accepted of the proffered hospitality of the inhabitants. In his suite, on this voyage, was Einar Fostre his skald and historian, who was bound to entertain Björn and his wife each Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday with his songs and tales, in return for his maintenance. And learned men say that Einar Fostre sang the so-called Skidarima, as part of this engagement. And at the end of this short poem we find the following verse:—

“Here my song shall cease
Till Sunday doth appear.”—p. 113.

It is curious that though Björn’s travels are now entirely lost, yet the song of the maiden who warned him of his danger yet exists in Iceland, or rather it was extant in the time of Arne Magnussen, who has fortunately preserved it.

“None may be guests On Gunnbjörns isles Who have garments rich And precious wares.	“The host shall destroy His stranger guests As the sow devours Her new born litter.”
---	---

It must be owned that these lines contain more point than poetry, but they run smoothly enough in the Icelandic verse.

Björn Einarson commenced his travels in 1378, and concluded his last voyage in 1411. He kept a daily journal of his progress through the various lands he visited, but all is now lost, though the journal itself was extant in the year 1550.

We have next an interesting account of Cross Islands (Krossaeyar) on the eastern coast of Greenland, but Finn Magnussen inclines to the belief, that they are identical with Gunnbjörns rocks. Following this, (p. 150 to 168,) we have the somewhat, if not entirely, fabulous history of Aré Marson, who is said to have become a great chief in America (Vinland), and to have been baptized there.

The Landnama Bok seems to put little faith in the story, and we only notice it because the whole tale is there said to have originally come from one Rafn, surnamed of Limerick, "because," says the Landnama, "he dwelt long in Limerick, (Hlymréki) in Ireland." Perhaps in his travels through the Emerald Isle, Rafn had kissed the stone of Blarney? We are next introduced to documents of more certain historic worth.

Aré Thorgilson, surnamed Frode, or the Wise, was almost a contemporary of the earliest colonists of Greenland. Aré was born in the year 1068, and died on the ninth of November, 1148. He was one of the earliest writers of Icelandic history. His work, written originally in the strong nervous language of his native isle, was translated into Latin, and was published at Oxford in 1716, under the title of "*Arae multiscii Schedæ de Islandia.*" The original Icelandic manuscript, in Aré's own handwriting, was extant in Iceland in the year 1651, at which time the copy now in Copenhagen was transcribed from it, under the care of the learned Brynjulf Svendson. The authenticity of the MSS. can be thus distinctly established. We may learn too, from Aré's own words, from what sources much of his information was derived.

"The land which is called Greenland, was discovered and colonized from Iceland. Erik the Red, was the man from Bredefjord, who passed thither from hence, and took possession of that portion of the country now called Eriksfjord. He gave a name to the country, and called it Greenland, 'for,' quoth he, 'if the land have a good name, it will cause many to come thither.' He first colonized the land fourteen or fifteen winters before Christianity was introduced into Iceland, as was told to Thorkel Gellerson in Greenland, by one who had himself accompanied Erik thither."—p. 170.—vol. I.

When we recollect that Thorkel Gellerson was uncle to Aré Frode, and that he was renowned in Iceland for his travels and for his memory, we may readily conceive that the historian gathered much of his materials from his kinsman. Passing over several interesting extracts from the Landnama Bok, we come next to the Saga of Erik Rauda himself, (pp. 195—281.) In confirmation of the antiquity of this special history of the first colonizer of Greenland, we may remark, that it is referred to in the famous Saga of Olaf Tryggvason, which was certainly written by the monk Gudleif Erikson, before the year

1218. Like most of the early colonists, Erik Rauda was a fugitive from his native land, on account of sundry murders which he had perpetrated. At length he was declared an outlaw at the Ting, or judicial assembly of North Iceland, and to escape the doom so justly merited, he resolved to fly to Gunnbjörns rocks. On his voyage thither, he sighted the coast of Greenland, and after exploring some of its fiords, settled in the present fiord of Igalikko, where he founded the Osterbygd, or Eastern colony. Erik was soon followed by other colonists, outlawed adventurers like himself. The western colony, further up Davis Straits, was next established, and every year they continued to receive accessions from Iceland, and Norway. But Greenland was yet heathen, the light of the christian faith had not dawned upon her shores. Old Erik the Red, who had established himself at Brattahlid, in Eriksfiord, was a confirmed pagan, though he lived to see the seeds of the true faith taking root in his rising settlement. In the second chapter of the Saga of Erik Rauda, we find the following.

“When fourteen winters were passed from the time that Erik the Red set forth to Greenland, his son Leif sailed from thence to Norway, and came thither in the autumn that king Olaf Tryggvason arrived in the north from Halgoland. Leif brought up his ship at Nidaros (Drontheim), and went straight to the king. Olaf declared unto him the true faith, as was his custom unto all heathens who came before him, and it was not hard for the king to persuade Leif thereto, and he was baptized, and with him all his crew.”

This was in the year 1000, the same year that christianity was first introduced into Iceland. But even before this date, at least one christian had arrived in Greenland. Old Erik Rauda, after his first two years' sojourn in Greenland, had returned to Iceland, and the report he gave of the excellencies of the new found land, seems to have induced many restless spirits to follow him thither. The Landnama Bok tells us that, in 986, no fewer than twenty-five ships sailed from the Borgarfiord and the Bredefiord, in Iceland, bearing colonists for Erik's new kingdom. Amongst the leaders of this fleet was one Herjulf, on board of whose ship it is expressly stated there was a christian man, a stranger, for he was from the Hebrides (Sudreyar,) which at that time were constantly visited by the Northmen. Perhaps not all of our readers

are aware that the old Norse name of the Hebrides is yet perpetuated amongst us, in the title of the Bishop of SODOR. Of the twenty-five ships that sailed, as above mentioned, only fourteen arrived in Greenland. Most of the others were wrecked on the inhospitable east coast of that country, and Herjulf's own ship got entangled among the breakers. Then rose up that christian man from the Hebrides, and he sang the song "Hafgerdingadrapa," or the chaunt of the breaking waves. Truly must the burden of this his song have sounded strange in the ears of the pagan Norsemen.

"I pray to him that is without sin,
The Lord that rules the halls of heaven,
That arch over this our earth,
I pray that he would hold his strong hand over me."

And the prayer of that one christian man saved the ship, they escaped the perils of the sea, and landed safely in Greenland.

Old Erik's colony flourished and increased, while the restless spirit of the Norse adventurers carried them still further into lands, which for centuries after were unknown to the rest of Europe. The greater part of the Saga of Erik the Red, is occupied by details of the various voyages undertaken by the Greenland colonists to the coasts of the United States of America. This land they named "*Vinland hin goda*," for there they found a good soil, whereon wheat and grapes grew wild. For nearly three hundred years, or even for a longer time, the coasts of America seem to have been frequented by the Greenland colonists, and it is possible that settlements were even made thereon, though of these there are few or no traces. Still the geographical descriptions of the coasts, of the tides, the headlands, and of the natural productions of the soil, are so close and accurate, that the course of the Northmen can be traced with certainty to the shores of Massachusetts, where Leif, the son of Erik Rauda, took up his residence for more than one winter, in a bay called "the Hope." How far this spot can be recognized at the present day is a doubtful question, but immediately above the inlet indicated by the Saga, we find an elevation bearing the *Indian* name of Monthaup; and at a short distance from thence is the celebrated Assonet Rock, whereon the Danish and American antiquaries believe that they can decipher an

inscription in Runes, relating to the expedition of Thorfinn Karlsefne. We will not enter here on this disputed point, suffice it to say, that there is the strongest possible resemblance between some of the figures outlined on this rock, and various others that occur on rocks in Iceland, Sweden, and Norway, and which are of undoubted Scandinavian origin. It is questionable, however, whether any part of America was ever colonized by the Northmen as a permanent establishment, though we read that Bishop Eric of Greenland sailed to Vinland to convert the heathen, but he was never more heard of.

We must now pass over, for brevity's sake, not less than a hundred pages, which are occupied by Finn Magnussen's learned notes on Erik Rauda's Saga, and by a still more interesting essay on the art of poetry among the Northerns. The Saga that follows is that of Thorfinn Karlsefne, (pp. 281—494,) which is thought by the editor to have been written about the commencement of the thirteenth century. It has never before been published, yet, as a document of history, and as connected with the discoveries of the Northmen in America, it is of the highest value. In the first chapter of this Saga we find mention made of Ireland.

“Olaf was a Viking, who harried (plundered) on the Western lands, and conquered Dublin and Dublinshire, in Ireland, where he became king. He married Aude the Thoughtful (deep minded). Olaf fell in Ireland (in battle), and Aude and her son Thorstein then sailed to the Hebrides. Thorstein and Sigurd Jarl the Powerful, conquered Caithness, and Sutherland, and Ross, and Moray, (Katanes ok Sudrland Ros ok Mærevi), and nigh half of Scotland; and Thorstein then was king until he was beaten by the Scots, and slain in fight. Aude his mother, was in Caithness, when she heard of her son's death, and she fled to the Orkneys in a ship she had caused secretly to be built in the woods. Hereafter, Aude sailed from the Islands to seek for Iceland; she had twenty free men on board of the ship with her. Aude arrived in Iceland, and abode the first winter with her brother Björn. And she had a place for prayer on the Cross Hill, whereon she caused to be upraised a cross, for she had been baptized, and was strong in the faith.”

The second chapter of this curious Saga relates to the discovery of Greenland by Erik Rauda, and adds much geographical information to the details given in the Saga of that chieftain. In the third chapter we have the history of Thorbjörn, a chief who once dwelt in Iceland, but who subsequently migrated with all his family to

Greenland. After a perilous voyage, Thorbjörn landed at Herjulfssness in Greenland, where he was received hospitably by Thorkel, the owner of that promontory, and took up his abode with him for the winter. There follows next a description of a heathen incantation, such as the mind of the author of *Waverley* and of the *Pirate* would have revelled in. We venture to extract it entire, as, besides its interest as a picture of heathen manners, it likewise shows some of the difficulties and doubts which here, as in more polished lands, beset the new converts to christianity.

“At that time there was sore scarcity in Greenland, the men who had gone out to the chase returned almost empty handed, and some indeed had never come back again. Now there dwelt in the colony a woman named Thorbjörg, she was a spæwife (spækona), and was called the lesser Vala. She had had nine sisters, and all were spæwives, but she alone survived. It was her custom in winter, to travel round to the different Gilds, and in particular was she welcomed by those who wished to know something of their fate, or of the prospects of the year. And as Thorkel was the chief man of the colony, so seemed it meet that he should learn when the scarcity that now pressed on them would be lightened. Thorkel invited the spæwife to his house; she came, and was well received, as was the custom when these sort of women were guests. A high seat was prepared for her, and a cushion (stuffed) with hens' feathers was laid thereon. But when she came, after mid-day, conducted by the man who had been sent to meet her, she was clad after the following fashion. Her upper garment was blue, and set with jewels down to her girdle, and she had glass pearls around her neck, and on her head a hat of black lamb's skin, lined with the skin of white cats. And she bore in her hand a staff, whereon there was a knob, ornamented with metal, and set all around with stones. Round her waist was a girdle fashioned of old and dry wood, (hnioskulinda) and thereat hung a heavy purse of leather, wherein she carried her materials of incantation. On her feet were heavy calf-skin sandals, attached by long cords (or ties), each terminated by large tags of tin. On her hands she wore gloves of cat's skin, which within were white and shaggy. And as she entered the house, all men thought it their duty to greet her with honourable words, and Thorbjörg received each salutation graciously. Then Thorkel took her hand and led her to the seat that was prepared for her, and besought her to cast a favourable eye over his house and flocks. But she answered briefly to all that was said. Then was the table decked for the feast, and it behoves us to note what was prepared for the witch's meal. There was a porridge of goat's milk, and a dish of the hearts of all the animals that could be procured. Thorbjörg had a knife case of metal, and a knife of

copper, which was fastened in a shaft of walrus tooth, with two rings, but the point was broken off. When the feast was done, Thorkel addressed the spæwife, and besought her to inform him and his guests of that which each most desired to know. Thorbjörg answered that she could say nothing until the next morning, till she had slept one night in the house. The next day, after noon, all was made ready for the incantation. And now the witch commanded that they should cause to approach the women who could sing the magic song, and the song was called Vardlokkur, or the invocation of the protecting spirits. But in the house were no such women found, and they sought for them elsewhere. Then said Gudrid, (Thorbjörn's wife,) 'Though I know not magic, and am no spæwife, yet did my foster mother Halldis, in Iceland, teach me a song which she called Vardlokkur.'—'Thou art lucky Gudrid, with thy knowledge,' quoth Thorkel. But she answered, 'It is a song such as I do not hope for help from, for I am a christian woman.' Then said Thorbjörg the witch, 'It may be that you may do the guests much good thereby, and yet be yourself not less esteemed than you were before.' Thorkel now pressed Gudrid till she answered that she would sing. The women formed a circle around the magic mound, but Thorbjörg sate thereon, and Gudrid sang the song so clearly and so well, that all thought they had never heard a voice so sweet. The spæwife thanked her for the song, and said, 'Now are many of the spirits come to us, and find great joy in the sweetly chaunted song, who before would have kept themselves aloof, and would not have aided us, and now are many things clear to me, which before were concealed. But I tell you Thorkel, that the scarcity that now prevails, will last only through the winter, and when the spring comes there will be plenty,' &c., &c.—p. 373.

We will not trouble our readers with the rest of the rather common-place prophecies of the witch, but it is curious to remark that the description of the actual materials and ceremonies used in the incantations is omitted, for no doubt the worthy chronicler, who was probably a priest or monk, did not dare to name them. The song Vardlokkur is still preserved in the elder Edda. It seems, too, that Gudrid's husband was a better christian than his wife, for after the witch had left, a message was sent to Thorbjörn to return, for he had gone out, as he would not be present at such unholy doings.

Chapter the fourth of the Saga contains the history of Leif, son of Erik the Red. The conversion of Leif by King Olaf of Norway, which we have before referred to, is given here at much greater length, and that most Christian, but somewhat impetuous monarch, seems on this occasion to have employed soft words instead of his

more usual argument of the sword. Leif, on his voyage back to Greenland, was driven to the American coast, but at length he arrived at his father's house at Brattahlid, and was well received.

“Leif straightways began to declare the universal faith throughout the land; and he laid before the people the message of king Olaf Tryggvason, and detailed unto them how much grandeur and great nobleness there was attached to the new belief. Erik was slow to determine to leave his ancient faith, but Thjodhilda, his wife, was quickly persuaded thereto, and she built a kirk nigh into Brattahlid, which was called Thjodhilda's kirk. And from the time that she received the faith, she separated from Erik her husband, which did sorely grieve him.”—*p.* 389.

Chapter the fifth is occupied almost entirely by a ghost story of no mean power and terror. Were it not for its great length, we would gladly have extracted it, for the admirable illustration it affords to us of old northern superstitions. The conclusion of this chapter is remarkable, as illustrating the ceremonies used in Greenland at the burial of the dead. Thorstein Erikson, the second husband of Gudrid, died of a sore sickness. Many of the household had been previously carried off by the same malady, and the ghost of each corpse joined its fellows in tormenting and terrifying the survivors. The night after Thorstein's death, his corpse rose up in the bed, and called for Gudrid his wife. With reluctance and terror the widow approached the body of her husband.

“Now when Gudrid arose, and went to Thorstein, it seemed to her as though he wept. And he whispered some words to her, which none could hear, but these other words he spoke in a loud voice, so that all were aware thereof. ‘They that keep the truth shall be saved, but many here in Greenland hold badly to this command. For it is no Christian way, as here is practised, since the universal faith was brought to Greenland, to lay a corpse in unblest earth, and to sing but little over it. And I will that my body, and the bodies of those of this household that have died before me, shall be carried to the church, all save the body of Gardar, (he died first, and was probably a heathen,) but Gardar's body ye shall burn upon a pile, for it is he that has caused all the apparitions that have troubled you this winter.’ Then Thorstein foretold to Gudrid her future lot, and that her fate should be a renowned one, but warned her not to wed any man in Greenland. He prayed her to give their goods, partly to the church and partly to the poor, and then fell back a second time in death. It had

been the custom in Greenland, after Christianity was brought in, that the dead should be buried on the lands where they died, and that a stake should be placed in the ground, over the breast of the corpse, that when the priest should afterwards come, the stake might be pulled up, and holy water poured into the hole, and then they sung over the body, even though it had been a long time interred. And the bodies of Thorstein and of all the others, save Gardar, were conveyed into the church at Eriksfiord, and there the Priests sang over them."—*p.* 401.

The remainder of this most curious Saga is devoted to Thorfinn Karlsefne's voyage to America, from the consideration of which we must reluctantly abstain. Like most of the other prose Sagas, this one has evidently been altered from a poetic original, for many consecutive sentences may yet be found in the true Icelandic alliterative verse.

The succeeding pages, from *p.* 494 to the end of this first volume, are occupied by copious extracts from the Eyrbyggja Saga, an abstract of which most singular history has been given by Sir Walter Scott, and has been reprinted by Mr. Blackwell in his excellent edition of Mallet's Northern Antiquities. The Eyrbyggja Saga is one of the freshest and most interesting of the Icelandic histories, and is supposed to have been written about the middle of the thirteenth century, though Finn Magnussen would assign to it a considerably earlier date.

The second volume commences with a portion of a Saga hitherto unpublished. The manuscript of the Floamanna Saga is in the Arne Magnean collection, and was made use of by Torfæus in preparing his *Groenlandia Antiqua*, though the brief abstract given in this work is very far from being satisfactory or complete. This Saga is indeed well worthy of an English translation, for it contains some of the most important notices we have yet seen regarding the manners, customs, and superstitions, of the old Norsemen. It is ascertained to have been written about the middle of the thirteenth century; but the original versified history had probably existed at a much earlier period. There are strong grounds for believing that it was reduced to its present form by Styrmer the Wise, the friend and companion of the great Icelandic historian, Snorro Sturleson. The Saga is chiefly devoted to the life and adventures of Thorgil Orrabeinsfostre, the son of Thord Stjornusteinar, in Iceland. Thorgil spent his early youth

on the seas, and then settled quietly down on his father's lands in Iceland. Here he married for his second wife Thorey of Odda. This seems to have been about the year 990, for Thorgil had been an old sea-comrade of Erik the Red, who in 997 sent to him a pressing message to come and settle in Greenland. Thorgil had by this time become a christian, for many were baptized in Iceland by Thangbrand and his followers, some years before christianity was formally adopted as the established religion of the country. Thorgil accordingly set sail for Greenland in 998, with his wife Thorey, and a considerable crew. They were shipwrecked on the eastern coast of Greenland, where his wife Thorey was murdered by her slaves, and Thorgil's crew died one by one of hunger, till only he, and a few others, were left alive. For two winters Thorgil managed to eke out a scanty subsistence on this inhospitable shore, and from his time down to Graah's adventurous journey in 1829-30, but few Europeans have survived the fearful climate, and the other dangers of this dreaded coast. Thus, one of the chief points of interest in this well-written Saga is, that it gives us a picture, bearing every stamp of truth, of the fearful dangers and privations that beset the mariner on the eastern coast of Greenland. This coast is here described as being of very great extent, and almost uninhabited, indented by many Firths and bays, and rendered inaccessible, or nearly so, by fearful icebergs and icefields. Hither Thorgil was driven by storms in the month of October, 998. His ship was embayed in the ice, and he wintered on this inhospitable shore; but while he and the greater part of his freed men were out among the hills, the ten or twelve slaves whom he had brought with him, conspired together, murdered his wife Thorey, and sailed away with his ship and all their provisions. The deserted Thorgil now constructed a boat of skins, and got out through a channel in the icefield, after eighteen months of bitter privation and anxiety. He carried with him, and tenderly nursed the little infant that Thorey had borne him shortly before her death. During that summer, they only made their way to a tongue of flat land, whereon they found great store of seals. They wintered there, and left the spot in the month of April. After fourteen days of toil and peril among the icefields, they came to a small island, whereon they found some eggs of the Svartbakkur, (the great black-backed gull), which, to the famished men,

proved an unexpected and delicious feast. Shortly after they reached another landing place, where they were so fortunate as to kill a white bear, which they found in a cleft of the ice, almost starved, and with its fore leg broken. From hence they continued their toilsome voyage, till in the autumn they landed on a point where they saw a house, evidently built after the Norse fashion. It was inhabited by a Norseman called Rolf, who had fled from Erik's colony on account of a murder which he had committed there. Rolf received them kindly, and they wintered in his house, and this was the fourth winter from the time they sailed from Iceland. The next summer they rounded Cape Farewell, and entering a large Fiord, they espied a ship steering up the inlet. They soon learned that the vessel came from Norway, and that it was commanded by Thorgil's friend, Thorstein the White. The two friends arrived at Erik's colony in the Eystribygd. After so long an abstract, we can scarcely venture to transcribe any passages from the Saga itself, save that which is descriptive of the murder of Thorey. Sickness had come upon the crew while they were detained on the inhospitable coast, where they passed the first winter. The followers of Thorgil's brother commander Jostein, died one after the other. Their spirits walked again, and sorely disturbed the survivors, for it seems from the context that many of the crew were yet heathens. Thorgil himself was a Christian; but to still the evil spirits he burnt the bodies of the deceased on a funeral pyre, and their ghosts then walked no more. In the mean time Thorey, his wife, brought forth a son.

“One day Thorey told to Thorgil a dream which she had had. ‘I thought,’ quoth she, ‘that I saw fair fields, and men shining all clothed in white, and from thence do I conclude that ere long we shall be released from these fearful straits.’ Thorgil answered: ‘Thy dream is good, and yet it may be that it foretells another world, and that good awaits thee there, and that holy men shall there help thee for thy good life, and for thy many hardships’ sake.’ Thorey now besought her husband to use his best endeavours to escape from the desert land they were detained upon. Thorgil answered, that as yet he saw not the mode of getting away. Thorey for the most part now kept her bed. One day when the weather was good, Thorgil said that he would go up to the hills, to see if the ice were yet breaking off from the shore. Thorey said that she was loth to let him go; but he answered that he would proceed but a little way. The slaves were ordered to row out to

fish, and the steward, Thorar, was afterwards to help them to draw the boat up on to the shore, and then he was to return to Thorey. Thorleif, Kol, and Starkad, offered to go with Thorgil, but he bid them stay, for in that case there would be none left to defend the house, and he could not trust to the slaves. Nevertheless, they all went together up to the hills. Thorgil had a battle-axe in his hand, and the sword he took from the cave by his side. It was about three hours after mid-day that they returned, and the weather had now become stormy. Thorgil led the party, for he well knew the way. They came to the hut, and saw not the boat; then they went within, and all the chests and the men were gone. Then said Thorgil, 'Some evil deed has been done.' But as they entered the hut, they heard a rattling noise from Thorey's bed; and when they went up to it they saw that she was dead, and the infant was sucking at the dead mother's breast. There was a small wound under one arm, which had been done with the point of a small knife, and all around was soaked in her blood. This sight caused to Thorgil the deepest heart-grief he had ever felt, of all that he had seen. The provisions were all carried off. At night, Thorgil said that he would take care of the infant, though he said he saw not the way in which its life might be preserved. 'Yet shall it go hard with me,' quoth he, 'if I do not something for its life; I will cut into the nipple of my own breast, and will give the child suck thereat.' And this was done; and first there came forth only blood, and then came a fluid like whey, and last of all there flowed real milk, and the child was well nourished therewith."—*p.* 108, *vol.* ii.

The latter part of this tale may seem to many a gross fabrication; but we have the testimony of Humboldt, of Astley Cooper, and of others, that under similar circumstances milk has been secreted from the breast of the male, even in our own days.

We cannot afford much more space to the fortunes of Thorgil, or to those of his child, thus wondrously preserved. Thorgil, as we have shown in the abstract, arrived at length, after sore hardships, at Brattahlid in Eriksfiord.

"It happened in winter, that a bear attacked the herds of the colonists, and did great damage. One day, people came to Thorgil to trade with him, and many men were assembled together with him in an outhouse, where the goods were laid up. Thorfiun (Thorgil and Thorey's son) was likewise there. He said to Thorgil, 'See, father, there is a large and fine dog outside.' Thorgil answered, 'Do not mind it, and go not out.' But the child slipped out, and went to the bear; and the beast threw him down, and stood over him, while the child screamed out loudly. Thorgil sprang out of the store with his drawn sword. The beast was yet

playing with the child. Thorgil struck the bear between the ears, and clove its head asunder, so that the beast fell dead on the spot, but the child was scarcely harmed."

Though thus twice marvellously rescued from death, the son of Thorgil was not destined to re-visit Iceland. On their return thither, the ship encountered terrible storms; a heavy sea struck the vessel, and dashed Thorfinn overboard out of his father's lap where he was sitting.

"'Now,' cried Thorgil, 'hath the sea struck us that we need not seek to bale out.' But the next wave threw the child again into the ship; he was yet alive, and he said: 'The waves are heavy indeed, my father.' 'Now,' cried Thorgil, 'bale ye all that can.' And they did so, and the ship was cleared of the water. But on the same day the child was seized with a vomiting of blood, and died two days after. And Thorgil, for four days, neither eat nor slept; and he said, that while he lived, he would not blame women again for thinking more of the child they themselves had suckled, than of others."

Interspersed through this Saga we find much of interest regarding the early Christians among the Northmen. That occasionally we should meet with marvellous tales of apparitions in these old histories, is no more than might be expected in such remote times, when the powers of witchcraft were fully credited, and when it would indeed seem, that the spirits of darkness had more visible influence on earth, than in these our days. At the present time, Satan can guide his adherents by luxury, avarice, and pride, and needs not the aid of supernatural appearances to maintain his rule. Thorgil, after he became a Christian, is related to have had fearful combats with the heathen god, Thor, whom the author of the Saga evidently looks upon as the personification of Satan. The story of his deadly strife with Thor, strongly reminds us of the long wrestling of the Scottish covenanters with the enemy of mankind in person. Next follow some extracts from the famous Saga of Olaf Tryggvason; but they are chiefly repetitions of what has been already noticed. These are succeeded by a relation of Thorar Nefjulfson's attempt to reach Greenland, taken from the Saga of St. Olaf of Norway. We next, at page 250, meet with the Saga of the foster brothers (*Fost-brædra Saga*), of which the principal features are, the murder of Thorgeir Havarson, and the mode in which his assassination was revenged by

Thormod Kolbruneskald in Greenland. One of the principal, if not the chief resident in Greenland, Thorgrim Trolle, arrived in Iceland on a trading voyage, and there became a party to the murder of Thorgeir Havarson, an officer (*Hirdmandr*) of King Olaf Haraldson. This was about the year 1023. Thormod, the foster-brother of the slain Thorgeir, left his native land, sailed to Norway, saw King Olaf, and from thence, apparently with that monarch's permission, proceeded to Greenland to avenge his foster-brother's death. Thormod took up his residence, on his arrival in Greenland, with Thorleif Erikson, the grandson of old Erik the Red. Their friendship, however, was soon interrupted by a murder committed by Thormod in revenge for an insult, unpardonable in those times, which had been offered to him. Though obliged, in consequence of this, to fly from Brattahlid, Thormod seems never to have forgotten his original design of taking the life of Thorgrim Trolle. By the most marvellous boldness and dexterity, he succeeded at length in slaying not only this chieftain, but also four of his nephews, and many of his followers, so that scarcely a single man of importance survived of Trolle's race. Pursued by the surviving friends, often wounded, yet never falling into their hands, Thormod was at length concealed by some of his friends, and, in fine, returned to Norway to relate his revenge to king Olaf, who ever after held him in high honour and esteem, till they both fell in the fight of Stiklestad.

We scarcely know where to select a passage for illustration, amid the stirring events of this well-told Saga. Perhaps the struggle of the wounded Thormod for his life, with Falgeir, is as choice a specimen as can be selected from this tale of murder and revenge.

"Skuf and Biarne carried Thormod with them to Eriksfiord, and conducted him to a cave in the cliffs, now called Thormod's cave, which lies close to the sea shore, opposite to Stokkanes. Above the cave there rose steep cliffs, and below it was alike steep, so that the cave was right difficult of access. Before the mouth of the cavern was a plot of grass, but he was an active man who could descend the cliffs above, and land safely on this grass plot."

Thormod soon tired of his lonely residence here, and one day left his retreat, and succeeded by stratagem in slaying Thorkel, one of Thorgrim Trolle's relatives, as he was landing from a boat. His comrades, Thord and

Falgeir, who were in the boat along with Thorkel, pursued the murderer.

“Thormod set off in a run, and cast away the cloak he wore as a disguise. Thord and Falgeir followed him close, and he used all his strength to escape them, till he came to the edge of the cliff above the cave, and cast himself quickly down from thence upon the grass plot. Thord sprang after him, but the height of the fall caused Thord to bend his knees when he alighted on the grass, and at the same moment Thormod struck him so heavily with an axe, that the weapon sank between his shoulders to the very shaft. Before Thormod could pull the axe out from the wound, Falgeir sprang down upon the turf, and struck straight at Thormod. And the blow of his axe fell between Thormod’s shoulders, and caused a grievous wound; but Thormod ran straight at Falgeir, and seized him below the arms, for Thormod had now no weapon. Soon Thormod felt that he had not strength to strive with Falgeir, and small was the hope now for his life, a wounded and weaponless man. Then Thormod turned his thoughts to king Olaf, and prayed his help in his mind, for he deemed his aid would not be wanting. Then fell Falgeir’s axe out of his hand, down into the sea, and Thormod felt better hope, for now both were weaponless. Thereafter, struggling, they both fell over the cliffs into the sea below, and swam there, each seeking to drown the other by pressing his head under the water. Thormod felt his strength fast ebbing from his wound and from the loss of blood; but death was not yet for him; for Falgeir’s belt burst asunder, so that Thormod dragged his enemy’s nether garments (*braeksnar*) down about his feet. Then Falgeir could no longer swim as before, and was sore beset; he sank often, and swallowed much sea water; and at length he rose from the water to his middle for the last time, to give up the ghost; and then his eyes and mouth were open, and his look was that of a man who grins fiercely at an object before him. Thus Falgeir died; but Thormod, in great weariness, swam to a low rock, and crept up thereon, and lay down waiting for death, for he was sore wounded, and the rock was far from land, and he thought he should surely there leave his life. His friends, Skuf and Bjarne, took a boat secretly that night, and rowed down the fiord. And as they came near to the cave, they saw something alive upon the rock, and they disputed if it was a seal or some other animal. Then they rowed to the rock, and landed thereon, and saw a man lying there whom they knew to be Thormod.”

The murderer survived his wounds, and was carefully tended in secret by an old couple, Gamle and Grima, at the upper end of Eriksfiord. These people seem to have been but half reclaimed from heathenism; for Gamle owned a chair or settle, on the back of which the image of

Thor was deftly cut in wood. The friends of the murdered parties came to the house with a large body of men; but Thormod was so well concealed, that they could not discover him. When they saw the above-named chair in the day chamber, with Thor's image thereon, Thordis, one of the party said to Grima:

“‘There is still somewhat remaining of thy heathendom, Grima, for Thor's image is cut on the back of thy chair.’ Grima answered, ‘I get but seldom to the church to hear the words of learned clerks, for it is a long journey thereto, and few folk are left at home. Now does it rather seem to me, when I look on Thor's image thus carved in wood, which I can break and burn when I will, how much greater is He that hath made heaven and earth, with all visible and invisible things, and who giveth life unto all creatures, but cannot be conquered by man.’”

Truly was Grima an astute old woman, but, we fear, an indifferent Christian withal. After many more hair-breadth escapes from his enemies, Thormod at length arrived in Norway, and recited in verse his many deeds of murder before King Olaf. The king said:

“‘Thou hast done more, Thormod, with thy revenge in Greenland, than even the fisherman thinketh fair in his fishery, for he sayeth he hath taken enough when he hath got one fish for himself, a second for the boat, a third for the line, and a fourth for the hook. Now thou hast exceeded this measure, wherefore hast thou slain so many men?’”

Thormod excused himself by relating the insults offered to him in Greenland; but the king does not seem to have been really angry. Had he, however, but known of Thormod's evil vow, which was unquestionably an offering to Odin, he would hardly have treated him so well; for Olaf, with all the faults and savage ferocity of the age, was yet a zealous Christian. The vow of Thormod is not noticed in his Saga, but it is to be found in the *Flateybok*:

“Thormod Kolbruneskald now remembered the vow he had made in Greenland, before he slew Thorgrim Trolle: to fast nine Sundays, but for nine Fridays to eat flesh-meat. And he now willed to fulfil that vow. Wherefore he went down to the king's (Olaf's) kitchen, and taking up a meat-pudding, or sausage, he bit it in two, and eat the half thereof, and this was on a Friday. Then said the cook: ‘Art thou one of the king's men?’ Thormod answered, ‘It is so.’ The cook rejoined, ‘The king hath with him many strange folk, and it would fare ill with thee if that he knew

what thou hast done.' Thormod answered: 'We often do otherwise than what the king willeth, and sometimes he heareth thereof, and sometimes not.' 'Thou canst not conceal it from Christ,' replied the cook. 'True,' quoth Thormod, 'but between Christ and me there will be small quarrel about the half of a meat pudding!'"—p. 418, vol. ii.

Could we expect obedience to the laws of the Church from one who had imbrued his hands so deeply in the blood of men?

The Iceland ballad of Skjald Helge succeeds the Fostbrædra Saga, and occupies, with its appended notes, no small portion of the volume, viz. from p. 419 to p. 576. There is much that is curious in this ballad, but in reality it is only a paraphrase in rhyme of the ancient Saga bearing the same title, and which, though extant in the year 1600, is now entirely lost. The manuscript from which this ballad is now printed is in the Arne Magnean Collection at Copenhagen, and it is evidently of an earlier date than the Reformation; for in the margin of one of the parchment leaves, there occur invocations to the Blessed Virgin and to St. Leodegarius. That to Our Lady runs sweetly in the Icelandic, "MARIA MIN, EK THARF NU THIN,"—"Mary mine, I call on thee for help." Finn Magnussen suspects that the composer of this ballad has omitted much of the historical detail of the original Saga, and has occupied himself mainly with the more stirring scenes of the loves of Helge and of Thorkatla, and with the fearful diablerie and witchcraft practised by Thorun the witch of Herjulfssness in Greenland. As an ancient ballad, and as illustrative of the manners and superstitions of the north, the rhymes of Skjald Helge are indeed of great value; but as regards their historic worth, we may set them aside, while so much remains of more importance.

The extract from Gisle Surson's Saga, p. 576 to p. 608, are only of interest in so far as the manuscript in which the Saga is contained, relates a curious circumstance in reference to the esteem in which Christianity was held by the Pagan Northmen.

"At that time (about 962) Christianity had been introduced into Denmark, and Gisle Surson and his brother in arms were received in Viborg as Catechumens, (Letu primsignaz), for this was a frequent custom among those men, when out on trading voyages, and thereby they participated in all fellowship with Christian men."—p. 586.

Perhaps, indeed, there was more of worldly wisdom than of true piety, in thus getting admitted among the catechumens, for the true Christians avoided all intercourse for trade or otherwise with the heathen.

Gisle Surson's Saga relates but very little of Greenland, and the same may be said of the succeeding Saga, that of Thronð of the Uplands, though this last supplies an omission in the Great History of Snorre Sturleson, regarding the causes of the dissensions between King Magnus the Good and King Harald Haardraade.

The succeeding history of Audun of Westfirth, p. 630 to 653, is curious, as it illustrates the high value that, in these early times, was placed upon the productions of Greenland. Audun had sailed to Greenland about the year 1050, and arrived in Eriksfiord, where all the richer men of the colony seem to have resided. From thence he passed on to the western colony. A hunter there, by name Erik, had taken alive a fine Polar bear, which he had probably captured in one of the huge bear-traps, still existing in Greenland as memorials of the old Norsemen. Audun purchased the bear, and gave for it all that he possessed. He then sailed to Norway with his prize, and at a feast there met with King Harald.

"It was told then to the king that Audun had with him a white bear, which is a thing marvellous to be seen; and the king said: 'Hast thou ought, Audun, that is a great wonder?' And he answered, 'It is true that I have brought with me a white bear from Greenland.' 'Wilt thou sell it?' quoth the king, 'for the price thou gavest for it?' 'I will not,' replied Audun. Then said the king: 'Rightly answered, for it was not a just offer on my part, but wilt thou give the beast for double the sum it cost thee, and that is surely fair if thou hast given for it thine all?' Audun still refused. 'Wilt thou then give me the bear?' quoth the king. Audun would not do so, and he openly told Harald, that he intended to carry the bear to the court of king Svend of Denmark, with whom Harald was then at war. 'Thou art indeed a simple man,' said the king, to talk thus to me; but go on thy way, and when thou returnest, let me hear how thou hast fared with king Svend."

Audun encountered bad weather on his voyage to Denmark, so that when he arrived there, his money was all expended, and he could buy no meat for himself or for his bear. Aage, King Svend's steward, offered to advance him money on condition of his having a half share in the highly prized animal. But when Audun came before King

Svend, and related his hard bargain with Aage, the unjust steward was disgraced, and Audun was received into high favour. The history of Audun was almost certainly written about the year 1150.

The succeeding extracts are of considerable importance, as they refer not only to the history of Greenland, but likewise to individuals who enacted no inconsiderable part in our own island. Unfortunately the original Sagas are now lost, and we have only the brief abstract of them in Björn Johnsen's annals. A complete Saga seems to have existed in this writer's time (about 1560) relating the deeds of Tostig, the well-known brother of King Harald Godwinson of England. This Saga was named *Tosta Thattr*, or the deeds of Tosta, but it is now entirely lost. It was in the year 1066, that King Harald Sigurdson of Norway undertook his unfortunate expedition to wrest the crown of England from Harald Godwinson. The Norwegian monarch fell in the battle of Stanford-brig, so energetically described in the glowing pages of Snorro Sturleson. The Greenlander, Lig Lodin (Lika Lothin), to whom the present extracts relate, seems to have followed Harald's fleet, and probably assisted, according to his promise, in conveying the king's body back to Norway.

“FROM BJORN JOHNSEN'S COMPENDIUM.

“In this ice from the Northern Oceans, the greatest number of ships have ever been lost, as is much spoken of in the Saga of Tosta's deeds, for Lig Lodin took his bye-name from this cause, that in the summer he sailed to the Northern uninhabited parts (of Greenland,) and brought back with him to the Church, for Christian burial, the corpses of the wrecked men, which he found in caves, to which they had fled from the icefloes, and after shipwreck. And near unto the bodies there were often Runes engraved, telling of their misfortunes and of their sufferings.

“And as king Harald lay at the Solan isles, on the coast of Norway, Lig Lodin came from Greenland, and taking a boat he rowed to king Harald's ships. Lodin saluted the king, who asked how long he had been at sea. Lodin answered, ‘seven days.’ ‘Didst thou see ought remarkable on thy voyage?’ demanded the king. ‘Not much that *now* seems wonderful to me,’ replied Lodin; and when he said this, his crew whirled the boat rapidly round. The king said, ‘thy men appear to think that thou tellest not the truth, nevertheless relate what thou hast seen.’ Lodin answered, ‘When we had sailed two nights from the coast, we saw a burning fire on the ocean, so wide that we perceived not the termination

thereof, and though we had the best north wind, we could not sail past it, wherefore I determined to drive through it with my ship, where the flames were lowest. And the sails as we did so were burnt with the fire, and the bodies that we carried, wrapped in new wadmal, of Greenland make, were likewise singed. And when we had sailed for a space further, a thick cloud came over our ship, and therewith so great a darkness, that a man could not see his own hand. Then we heard a fearful noise, and as I looked up to the sky, the black cloud was split asunder, and from either side of the cleft, blood dropped in a heavy shower on our ship, and even yet canst thou see it stiffened on the deck, but it was warm and wet when it fell. And when we had sailed three days further, we heard much noise again, and looking out we saw many sea-fowl flying in a great flock, and the largest of the fowls flew at the head of the flock. And their flight over us lasted for three whole hours, and so many were they, that the sun was hid thereby, yet none turned back again, but all flew towards England. Thereafter we sailed for two days, till yesternight we came to land, and then we saw the same fowls flying from the south-west towards Norway, but all the large birds were gone, and the rest flew silent and sorrowful; and when they reached the land, all dispersed, and sat down here and there. Now have I no more to tell thee.' The king answered: 'And couldst thou have concealed all this from me, and saidst thou that thou hadst seen nothing wonderful on thy voyage?' Lodin replied: 'I spoke thus because all that I have seen was no longer a marvel to me, since I knew that thou hadst determined upon this expedition.' 'What meanest thou?' asked Harald? 'Because,' replied Lodin, 'thou wilt not return hither; and it may be that such omens foretell the death of great men.' The king said: 'Wilt thou go with me?' Lodin answered: 'That dependeth upon thee; but I come to take away the bodies of thy warriors who fall.' Then the king said: 'Dost thou, Tostig, regard these as true omens?' Tostig replied, 'If a trustworthy man had related them, I would have done so indeed.' Lodin answered: 'It would be worth much money, Tostig, if thou didst not bear more falsehoods between lands than I have done.'—*p.* 658.

The wonders seen by Lodin are in reality more within the scope of probability than many which are related in the northern annals. Frequent volcanic outbursts, accompanied with flames, have occurred even of late years in the Iceland seas, as off the south-western coast of that island, in 1783. The rain of blood may have been the volcanic ash and cinders, at times of a carmine red colour, which were driven, by the huge escapes of steam, upwards from the submarine volcanoes, into the higher and colder regions of the atmosphere. There the steam condensing

into rain, mingled with the red volcanic ash, and poured down like a shower of blood upon the ships below. The mighty flock of birds may be witnessed, even at the present day, by the traveller who visits the western coast of Norway, or even the Shetland islands, where it is more probable that King Harald was lying with his fleet at the time that the Greenlander joined him.

The history of Einar Sokkeson, which follows that of Lig Lodin, is as yet unknown to the English reader, save in the translation given in the *Memoires des Antiquaires du Nord*, a work which probably very few have ever seen or heard of. Perhaps of all the ancient records of the early Norsemen in Greenland, this history exhibits details of the most surpassing interest. Finn Magnussen believes the Saga to have been written early in the thirteenth, or at the close of the twelfth century. The Catholic may study herein the history of the establishment of the first Bishop's see in Greenland, and he will mark too, the difficulties that the Bishop there encountered, from the passions and animosities of his wild and scattered flock. That Bishop was Arnald, who arrived in Greenland about the year 1126. Arnald may justly be considered as the first recorded Bishop of that country, though a Bishop Erik is once or twice mentioned in the Sagas as having preceded him.

In the year 1123, Sokke Thorerson lived at Brattahlid in Greenland. One day old Sokke called together his neighbours of the colony, over whom he seems to have had much authority, and represented to them how necessary it was that this flourishing colony should now have a Bishop's See established therein. To this all the colonists agreed, and they promised that they would support the Bishop in his authority. Sokke's son Einar was deputed to Norway to obtain the wished for boon.

“Einar took with him in his ship many walrus teeth, and costly skins, to gain the good will of the Norway court. They came to Norway, and then was Sigurd Jorsalafarer king of that country. Einar sought the king, and was well received by him, and he detailed to him his errand, and besought the king's powerful aid, for that of which the land he had left sorely was in need. The king deemed that it would greatly benefit the land, and he called unto him a man named Arnald, a learned clerk, and one well versed in the history of the people. The king besought Arnald to undertake this heavy task, for God's sake and for his (the king's) own sake, and I shall send thee, quoth he, to Archbishop Ossur, in Lund,

with my sealed letters. Arnald answered, that he had little wish to accept the proffered task, for various reasons ; and first on his own account, for that he was ill fitted thereunto ; and secondly, that he must leave behind him all his friends and relatives for ever ; and lastly, that he would have a wild and savage people to govern. The king replied, that the greater the evils he endured from men, the more glorious would be his reward in heaven. Arnald answered, that he would not refuse the king's prayer, 'but,' quoth he, 'I insist on this, that Einar shall swear to me an oath, to defend all the rights and privileges of the future Bishop's see.' And to this Einar agreed. Therefore, Arnald proceeded to Archbishop Ossur, and told him his errand, and showed to him the king's letters. The Archbishop received him well, and examined closely his spiritual and moral character, and being convinced that this man was well fitted for so high a dignity, he consecrated him Bishop."

On his voyage to Greenland, Bishop Arnald was forced, by stress of weather, to land in Iceland, where he passed the winter at Oddé with Sæmund the learned.

"It is told that as the Bishop and his men rode up to Oddé from the ship, they stopped to rest their horses at a bonder's house at Landey, and they themselves sat before the door. An old woman came out of the house with a card for teasing wool, and going up to one of the strangers, she said : 'Wilt thou, my brother, fasten this tooth in my card?' And the stranger readily agreed to do so, and taking a hammer out of his havresac, he fastened the tooth in the card, so that the old woman was well pleased therewith. And the stranger was Bishop Arnald himself, who was skilful in such handiwork, and the story was told thereafter as an instance of his humility."

In the course of the next summer, A.D. 1126, Bishop Arnald and his companions arrived in Greenland, and he occupied his see at Gardar in the Eriksfiord.

A Norwegian named Arnbjörn, had accompanied the Bishop in another ship from Norway, but they had parted company in a storm, and when Arnald arrived the next summer in Greenland, Arnbjörn had not been heard of, and it was thought that he had met his death by shipwreck. Four years more elapsed, and no tidings came of the missing ship or of her crew, when a Greenlander, named Sigurd Nialson, set out on a fishing voyage to Cape Farewell. They had but little success, so he agreed with his crew to penetrate further into the unknown fiords of the east coast. Steering into one of these inlets, they saw a ship stranded there at the mouth of a river, and a small

bark lay near it. The ship was a large one, well fitted for sea voyages. Then they went on shore and saw a large hut, and a tent at a short distance from it. The next morning they went again on shore, and found a piece of timber with an axe sticking in it, and close beside it lay the dead body of a man. Sigurd remarked that this man had no doubt been engaged in hewing the timber, but had sunk down from hunger. Then they went up to the hut, and saw near it another dead body. Sigurd observed that this man had no doubt travelled as far as he could, and these two, added he, must have been the slaves of those who are in the hut. He then cautioned them against entering the hut by the door, but advised them to take off the roof first, that the noxious vapours which might have arisen from the dead bodies, might escape. They did so, and then they saw within the hut several bodies, and great store of goods. Sigurd then said: "It seemeth best to me that you should lay the bodies in the kettles that belonged to the dead, with boiling water, that the flesh may be separated from the bones, which it will then be easy for us to transport to the church. I believe, too, that the beautiful ship, now lying on the shore, belonged to Arnbjörn, who must have landed here, for I have heard that he owned such a ship." The ship was a large one, with carved figures, and all painted. With this ship they sailed to Gardar. When they arrived at the colony, they sought the Bishop in his residence, and told him the news, and of the goods they had found. "Now," quoth Sigurd, "it seemeth best to me, that the goods which have been found, shall go with the bones of the dead, and if my counsel may prevail, such shall be the case." The Bishop said that Sigurd had done wisely, and much treasure came to the church with the bones of Arnbjörn and his men. The Bishop observed, that the great ship Sigurd had brought in, was indeed a vessel of wondrous beauty. Sigurd answered, "It is best that it should be presented to the church for the souls of the dead." The rest of the goods they divided amongst themselves, according to the laws of Greenland. The sequel of this history by no means redounds to Bishop Arnald's praise. This prelate seems to have been not only grasping and avaricious, but even to have been a consenting party to a foul murder committed by his friend Einar. The relatives of Arnbjörn, in Norway, hearing that his ship had at length been found, and

that his fate had been ascertained, came to Greenland in the following year, 1131, and laid claim to the ship and to all the goods it had contained. The Bishop refused their requests. The goods, he said, had been fairly disposed of, according to the custom of the country, and besides, they were the property of Arnbjörn, and could not be better employed than for the benefit of the souls of the late owners. Ossur, the chief of Arnbjörn's relatives, left the Bishop's presence with threats of revenge. So stood matters through the winter, but in spring Ossur having failed in obtaining a hearing of his cause at the Althing or justice court, revenged himself by cutting two planks out of the disputed vessel's side. Thereat Bishop Arnald was greatly enraged, and sending for Einar, reminded him of his oath of good service in Norway; observing that Ossur had forfeited his life by the injury he had done to the ship, and that he would hold Einar as perjured if nought was now done.

“Thereafter the people collected to the feast of the consecration of a church, and to a banquet at Langenæs. The Bishop and Einar were there, and many others, and the Bishop himself sang mass. Thither likewise had Ossur come, and he stood against the south wall of the church, conversing with a man called Brand Thordarson, who dwelt with the Bishop. Brand besought Ossur to yield to the prelate; but Ossur replied, that he could not bend himself thereto, so ill had he been treated. And they were deep in converse together, as the Bishop left the church, and Einar was with him, and they both moved towards the house. When they came to the entrance of the great chamber, Einar turned suddenly back from the crowd, and returning alone to the church-yard, took an axe from the hand of a man who had come to attend mass, and proceeded to the south side of the building. Ossur stood there, leaning upon his axe. Einar struck him straightways a fatal blow, and then went back to the house, where the feast was ready, and he went up to the table opposite to the Bishop, but spoke no words. Then came in Brand Thordarson, and went up to the Bishop and said, ‘Hast thou heard ought new, my Lord?’ The Bishop replied, ‘I have heard nothing, but hast thou?’ ‘There is one who has fallen outside, and needs thy blessing,’ quoth Brand. ‘Who hath done this?’ cried the bishop, ‘and to whom?’ Brand answered, that they were near him who could tell all. ‘Hast thou, Einar, caused the death of Ossur?’ demanded Arnald. He answered, ‘Truly I did so.’ The Bishop observed, “Such deeds are indeed evil, but this one may be excused.’ Brand then besought that the body might be washed, and might have Christian burial, but the Bishop said there was time enough for that. They still continued

at table, and heeded little more of the matter, nor would the Bishop give orders for singing over the dead body, till Einar himself begged that it might be done. Then the Bishop said, 'It were but just that Ossur's body should not be buried near the church, but for thy prayer, Einar, he shall be buried near unto this church of Langenæs, for it has no priest attached to it.'—vol. ii., p. 702.

The ruins of the church of Langenæs, near the head of the present fiord of Igalikko, have not as yet been carefully cleared. Well might the curse of God fall upon the colony of Greenland, when such fearful assassinations were countenanced by the unworthy prelate Arnald. Let us not, however, judge too hastily of this man, for it is possible that the history of Einar Sokkeson may have been written by one of the opposite party, who, of course, would spare no efforts to blacken the memory of the Bishop. Einar Sokkeson was subsequently murdered by Ossur's friends, and a long and bloody feud continued for some time between the parties. Bishop Arnald, after twenty years' residence in Greenland, returned to Norway, where he died.

The concluding pages of this volume, from p. 725 to 791, are occupied by shorter extracts from various Sagas, wherein mention is made of Greenland. In one of these we find a notice that Marcus of Roedesand, and Ingebjörg, his wife, on their return from a pilgrimage to Rome, bought good and fine bells in England for the church they intended to construct in Iceland.

In the Saga of Gudmund Areson, we have a glimpse of what was the fate of too many of the adventurous Northmen on their voyage to Greenland. In the year 1188, the priest Ingemund, who had arrived the year before in Norway from England, sailed for Eriksfiord in Greenland. No word came of his arrival on those distant shores, but fourteen years after their ship was discovered in an uninhabited part of the country, most probably on the east coast. It lay in the cleft of a rock, and beside it lay the corpses of seven men.

"Among these was the priest Ingemund, his body was whole and entire, but the skeletons of the six men lay around him. Wax was also at his side, (probably a waxen tablet), and Runes thereon, telling of their hard fate and approaching death. But it seemed to men a great sign that God had been so well contented with the priest Ingemund's life and conversation, that his body should have so long lain uncorrupted."—p. 755.

Again, in Bishop Paul's Saga, we find mention made of two holy prelates meeting in the far north to consecrate the holy oils, A.D. 1186.

"In Bishop Paul's days came Bishop John from Greenland, and he staid for the winter in the Eastford in Iceland. But in the time of the long fast (Lent) he travelled to Skalholt, there to meet with Bishop Paul, and he arrived there on Maunday Thursday, and the two Bishops consecrated on that day much holy chrism, and had together many learned and confidential conversations."—p. 765.

The third volume of the work we are now considering, begins with extracts from the ancient Icelandic annals of all that concerns Greenland. These annals seem to have been commenced by Are Frode at a very early period, and they were continued by different hands for several centuries. Their testimony is of great value, as fixing the precise epochs of the discovery of Greenland, and of the various events that took place in that colony. The latest mention of the Greenland colonies in these annals is of the date 1411, and the circumstance to which it refers is curious, as shewing the little intercourse that then existed between Iceland and Greenland. Snorre Torfesön and some companions sailed from Norway to Iceland, in 1406, but were driven to Greenland, where they remained for four years. In 1408, Snorre Torfesön's wife, who was then in Iceland, doffed her widow's weeds, and married Gisle Andreason, for having heard nothing of her husband Snorre for two years, she concluded him to be dead. But in 1411, Snorre was wrecked on the coast of Iceland in a small vessel which had brought him from Greenland. His wife hearing of his arrival, rode over to see him, and he received her kindly, and they lived together as before, until his death, when the widow again married her second husband Gisle.

It is in these annals, under the date of A.D. 1379, that we find the first notice of the encroachments of the Esquimaux tribes on the colonies of Greenland.

"The Skrellings attacked the Greenlanders, slew 18 men, and took two boys prisoners, whom they carried away as slaves."—vol. iii., p. 33.

But it was not merely the hostile inroads of the Esquimaux which pressed so heavily on these distant colonies. That fearful pestilence, the black death, which ravaged Europe at the end of the fourteenth century, did not spare the rugged mountains of Norway, but raged there with

such fury, that only one Bishop was left alive from the North Cape to the Naze, and no ship sailed to Iceland for the space of two whole years. Later on, the malady spread to Iceland, and though we have no record of the prevalence of the black death in Greenland, we may fairly conclude that it sooner or later arrived there, or, at all events, that by its prevalence in other lands, these colonies were deprived of their constant and necessary intercourse with the rest of Europe. So much had the commerce of Norway declined, and so limited had become the intercourse with Greenland, that, in 1383, we find the following curious entry in the Icelandic annals:—

“A ship came from Greenland to Norway, which had lain in the former country for two whole years; and certain men returned by this vessel who had escaped from the wreck of Thorlak’s ship. These men brought the news of Bishop Alf’s death from Greenland, which had taken place there six years before.”—p. 35, vol. iii.

In 1389, Bishop Henry was appointed to the see of Gardar in Greenland, and this prelate was certainly residing there in 1391. A still more fatal blow was now struck at the prosperity of the Greenland colonies, by the absurd commercial policy pursued by the mother country of Norway. Previous to the union of Calmar, Queen Margaret had made the trade between Iceland, Greenland, and the Feroe Islands, a royal monopoly, only to be carried on in vessels belonging to, or licensed by, the sovereign, and this absurd restriction pressed with peculiar severity on those colonies which were dependant for almost the necessities of life upon the mother country.

The notices of Greenland from this time become more and more scanty, till at length they entirely cease. An original document, however, still exists at Bergen, relative to a marriage that took place in Greenland in 1408, and this is signed by a priest, and by the chief man of the colony, and is dated from Gardar in Greenland.

From the Icelandic annals we pass to another series of documents, certainly not less interesting,—the various diplomas, letters, and papal briefs still extant, and referring to Greenland, pp. 66 to 208. These documents have been found in the chancery of Bergen, in the libraries of Copenhagen and of Stockholm, and lastly, through the industry of Monsr. Mallet, some have been obtained from the great library of the Vatican at Rome. The length to which

this article has already extended, prevents us from noticing more than one of these, but it is a document of great value, and only a small portion of it has hitherto appeared in print. It is a letter of Pope Nicholas V., dated the 20th of September, 1448, and is addressed to the Bishops of Skalholt and Holum, in Iceland. In this brief, the holy father speaks in sorrowing tones of the miseries endured by the Greenland colonists, concerning which most grievous complaints had recently been laid before him. The numerous churches of that distant land had, it is said, been so devastated thirty years before by the irruption of pagan tribes, that only nine of the sacred edifices remained standing in the whole country, while for the last thirty years, the colonists had been almost wholly deprived of episcopal and sacerdotal superintendance. From this time, the history of Catholic Greenland is a blank, for even the Icelandic literature, after the fearful pestilence of the beginning of the fifteenth century, had nearly ceased, and there is therefore small cause for wonder that the more distant Greenland was forgotten. Still it is consoling to find that the two last efforts in favour of the sinking colonies, were made by the Catholic church, by that ever vigilant church which watches over the interests of her adherents in every quarter of the world. The former effort we have already referred to, as having been made by Pope Nicholas V., in 1448, and in the year 1520, the famous Erik Walkendorf, Archbishop of Trondhjem, in Norway, is said to have exerted all diligence to collect information regarding Greenland, with a view to re-establishing the intercourse between the see of Gardar and his own metropolitan see of Drontheim. But the benevolent views of Erik were frustrated by the dire catastrophe of the reformation, which forced the unbending Archbishop from his see, to die an exile at Rome. For fifty years after this time, the fearful calamities, spiritual and temporal, which overwhelmed Europe, drew off all attention from Greenland. What was the fate of the unfortunate colonists? Were they extirpated by the increasing numbers and repeated hostile inroads of the Esquimaux, or did they amalgamate with these pagan tribes, and do their descendants yet roam as heathens and savages along the once cultivated shores of Greenland? For nearly three hundred years the fate of the Norse colonists of Greenland was a mystery to the rest of Europe. From time

to time chance rumours reached the civilized world, that the sailors which had ventured near those desolate shores, had seen flocks of sheep and cattle feeding on headlands they could not approach, and that more than once they had heard, tolling amidst these icy solitudes, the bells of the churches, summoning the christian colonists to prayer. How long the colonies survived after they were totally lost to the rest of Europe, we have no data to tell, but that the colonists were to a man destroyed by their foes, is now rendered more than probable by the traditions that have been recovered from the wandering Esquimaux, around the present Danish colonies of Greenland. The pastor Jørgensen, of Julianehaab, has carefully collected several of these traditions, and has transmitted them to the Royal Society at Copenhagen. From these it is evident that the Norse colonists were gradually extirpated, and it is probable that they never mingled with the Esquimaux. We know, from the invaluable description of old Greenland, written about the year 1350, or somewhat later, by Iver Bardson, that when this priest visited the western colony at that period, not a christian inhabitant remained; all had been driven away by the Esquimaux, and had either been killed or had retired for safety to the Eystrybygd. In 1379, the Esquimaux attacked the eastern colony, as we have before noticed. It is probable the Norsemen made a bold stand for their churches and dwellings around the Bishop's see of Gardar, at the head of the Igalikko fiord, one of the richest inlets of west Greenland. Here the recent investigations conducted by the Royal Society of northern antiquaries have discovered the ruins of several churches, and by a careful comparison of the geographical accounts in the old Sagas, they have satisfactorily, we think, identified most of the localities named by the ancient annalists. The site of the old metropolitan church of Gardar could not easily be mistaken, so accurate are the directions to it given by the old geographers. Here, about two hundred paces from the shore of the Igalikko fiord, the pastor Jørgensen, in 1838, found numerous ruins, partly overgrown with willow and birch bushes, and of a style of masonry that evidently was that of the old Norse colonists. The church can yet plainly be traced, an oblong building seventy or eighty feet long, by thirty or thirty-five feet broad. Like all the ruins of churches yet made out in Greenland, this building is

correct in its orientation. The north wall of the church is yet fourteen or fifteen feet high, and about seven feet thick. The church-yard wall can be distinctly traced, and outside of this last lie innumerable ruins, amongst which, no doubt, are the remains of the dwellings of the Bishops of Gardar, and of their priests. As yet this church-yard has not been excavated, nor have accurate plans and drawings of the ruins been made. In the vicinity of almost all the Greenland churches, there is found a singular round building, with walls of great thickness, and which the northern antiquaries believe to have been a baptistery. At Igalikko, on the opposite side of the fiord, are the ruins of another church, surrounded by the remains of many houses. The Esquimaux name of Igalikko means "the deserted homestead," and truly does this now deserted fiord merit that appellation; for, in ancient times, to judge from the ruins that are so thickly strewn along its shores, it must have rejoiced in a comparatively dense population. In the fiord immediately to the west of Igalikko, now called Tunnudluarblik fiord, the ruins of a much larger church have been discovered. It differs from all the other sacred edifices of Greenland, in being a cross church, with small transepts north and south. Here, close to the east wall of the south transept, was found the fine Runic stone which has already been noticed in a former number of this Review. It bears the following truly Catholic inscription: "Vigdis, the daughter of M—, lies here; God rejoice her soul." In the church-yard, at the depth of three Danish ells, the skeletons of the old Norse colonists were found lying closely side by side, and along with them fragments of pine wood coffins, and several well preserved pieces of shrouds of coarse brown cloth. The Esquimaux of the present day bury their dead in a species of raised grave above the surface of the ground; they use no coffins, and are unacquainted with the art of weaving woollen cloth, even if they possessed flocks of sheep or of goats. The form of the skulls, too, many of which have been sent from hence, and from other church-yards, to Copenhagen, is an evident proof of the identity of their dead with the old Norsemen. In some of the graves at Ikigeit, (the ancient Herjulfssness,) wooden crosses have been found, which had probably been laid on the breasts of the dead. In this last named church-yard, several small stones were discovered, which are all care-

fully figured in the present volume. They bear crosses of a shape closely resembling some figured by Mr. Petrie in his work on the Round Towers of Ireland, or those discovered lately at Hartlepool in England, while the fragments of inscriptions are in the Lombardic letters, and not in Runes.

But we should exhaust the patience of our readers, were we to attempt the task of analysing the geographical and antiquarian lore contained in this third volume; we will, therefore, as a conclusion, confine ourselves to the description of the most perfect church yet remaining in Greenland, with the traditions attached to it by the Esquimaux, that here the Norse colonists made their last hopeless stand against their foes.

This church is situated in the fiord of Kakortok, a few miles north of the present Danish settlement of Julianehaab. It is built in a plain on the banks of the fiord, at the foot of a high hill, from which evidently the stones have been quarried for the construction of the edifice. The stones of the walls are carefully put together, some of them having been evidently hewn over, and the intervening spaces are filled sparingly up with lime. The church stands nearly due east and west. The south side, looking to the sea, has four windows and two doors, the most eastern of the latter is evidently the priest's door, and is nearly eighteen inches lower than the western entrance. On the north side there is only one window, but as the wall on this side is a good deal broken down, there may have been more. The principal entrance has been in the western wall, and over it is a large window, while at the same elevation in the eastern wall, is another window very skilfully arched. The east wall is still nearly twenty feet in height. In the interior of the church there are several small niches, about five feet from the ground, which probably were intended to hold images of the saints. There are three such niches in the north wall, and four in the south wall. The length of the building is fifty-two feet, its breadth twenty-six feet. The northern and southern walls are about four feet thick, the east and west walls nearly five. The arched window at the east end is, externally, three feet ten inches high, and two feet two inches broad; internally it is five feet six inches high, and four feet five inches broad. Around the whole building, at the distance of from twenty-one to twenty-nine feet, has

been a wall or fence, (the church-yard wall,) which is now in part destroyed. The whole of the interior of this church, and part of the church-yard, have been excavated to some depth, but little or nothing has been found save a few skeletons evidently of the Scandinavian race.

It has been supposed that this church of Kakortok was one of the last that was erected by the old colonists, and the fact of no inscription or grave-stones, and but few skeletons having been found here, appear to corroborate this opinion. Still more is this however confirmed by the traditions of the Esquimaux of the neighbourhood. The closing scene of the old Norse colonies of Greenland will form no unapt termination to our notice of these most interesting volumes. The old Kablunaks (white men), say the Esquimaux, had been long since rooted out of all their other settlements in Greenland, but still held their own in the Kakortok fiord, where the church in particular served them as a place of refuge. Here dwelt the leader of the little band, to whom some give the name of Ungertok, others that of Olavik, the latter name undoubtedly is the Scandinavian Olaf.

Though not exactly on the best possible footing, the two hostile parties lived for a considerable time near each other without quarrel or open deeds of violence. It chanced, however, one day, that an Esquimaux from the neighbouring island of Akpeitevik, rowed out towards the church of Kakortok, to try some new arrows which he had made. As he passed a small point not far from the present ruins, a young boy of the Norse colony sat there, and ridiculed the Esquimaux for his want of skill in the use of his weapons. The boy, sitting on the shore, began to imitate the cry of the auk, and to dare the savage to hit him with his arrows. The wrath of the Esquimaux was moved, and in an instant the Norse youth lay pierced fatally with an arrow. Shortly after another of the Norsemen fell in like manner. The ire of Ungertok was now roused, and he resolved to take signal vengeance on his Esquimaux neighbours. In a moonlight night he climbed the high and steep hill behind Kakortok, and rushing down on the Esquimaux settlement, hoped to massacre all in their sleep. As they passed however by the side of a lake near the huts, a young Esquimaux girl, who had gone out to fetch water, saw their long shadows reflected on the still surface of the lake, and gave the alarm. The men, rush-

ing from the huts escaped with their lives ; but the women and children were all mercilessly massacred, save a little boy, who hid himself amid the tumult in a cleft of the rock, which the Esquimaux point out to this day. Ungertok's vengeance was appeased, but his foes thirsted for revenge. During the winter they prepared great store of bows and arrows, while the women dressed a large quantity of white seal skins, wherewith to cover their boats. When spring was come, and the wind blew from the west into the fiord, the Esquimaux rowed from Marksak round the shore on which now stands the colony of Julianshope. As soon, however, as they came to the entrance of the Kakortok fiord, they laid in their oars and let the boats drive before the wind down upon the dwellings of the white men. These, coming out of their houses, ranged themselves on the shore, and placing their open hands above their eyes, looked out on to the Fiord. Deceived, however, by the white seal skins that covered the Kayaks, they mistook the advancing boats for pieces of drift ice, and returned unsuspectingly indoors. At nightfall the Esquimaux landed in a bight a few bow-shots from the church, where the shore is still thickly covered with dwarf wood. Hence they proceeded to the Norse settlement, and stealing up to the doors, fastened them securely, and then fired the buildings. Amid the burning ruins all the white men met their death, all save Ungertok, who, with his infant son under his arm, sprang through one of the windows of the blazing church, and fled to the eastward, pursued closely at first, but at length all but one or two gave up the chase. Ungertok had now reached the east end of the high hill above the church, the Esquimaux following him so closely that he ran round a small lake to escape their arrows. Still they pressed him more nearly than ever, and the exhausted father, as a last resource, cast his infant son into the lake, and thus lightened of his burden, escaped to Igalikko. From thence ever pursued by his foes, he wandered towards the south, perhaps hoping that a chance ship from his old fatherland might yet appear to save him, but at length he was discovered and set upon by his enemies. They dared not however advance too closely upon him, for Ungertok was a man of immense strength, and defended himself desperately with his axe. At last an Esquimaux slew him with a charmed arrow, formed of the terminating process of the back-bone of a barren woman.

Thus fell the last of the Kablunaks, like too many of his forefathers, in fight. When this event took place we know not, the Esquimaux has little knowledge of dates or periods, but they say it was long, long ago, and in all probability not one hundred years after the last faint cry of the suffering Greenlanders had reached the halls of the Vatican.

We would gladly have done more justice to the many interesting subjects contained in this third volume, but the great length to which this article has already extended must be our excuse. It is seldom that we have to record the total extinction of the Christian faith in a land where once it flourished, and where no new doctrine replaced the belief of the Catholic Church. The flocks and herds, the ships and dwellings of the old colonists have passed away, but the churches yet remain, ruined indeed, but still not totally destroyed; and it may yet be in the designs of Providence that, on these now thinly-peopled shores, the Catholic religion may again flourish, and a Christian people return, like the Jews of old, to repair and rebuild the ancient temples of their faith.

ART. III.—*Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers, and other Poems.* By WILLIAM EDMONDSTOUNE AYTOUN, Professor of Rhetoric in the University of Edinburgh. 8vo. Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons, 1849.

PROFESSOR AYTOUN'S volume is a lingering echo of a voice which we had hardly thought to hear again in this utilitarian age. The poetry, however, of the Cavalier cause seems destined to a long immortality in Scotland; and it is a curious illustration of the inconsistencies of life, that, even in a practical country like Scotland, at the very moment when the cities are erecting triumphal arches in joyous welcome of the Royal Descendant of "the hated Hanoverian crew," and the Highland glens are pouring out enthusiastic multitudes to hail her approach, there should be found, nevertheless, among her poets, learned and accomplished men, to sing the memory of the rival dynasty, with the same ardour and devotedness which

were displayed by their forefathers at Culloden or Killiecrankie.

The "Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers" are a series of historical ballads, for the most part illustrative of the Cavalier cause in Scotland, especially since the Revolution. The theme, even still, is eminently attractive; and if enthusiastic love of the subject be an element of poetical success, Mr. Aytoun's title to popularity can hardly be called in question. He is a thorough worshipper of his heroes and their cause; his poetry is an evident emanation of genuine enthusiasm, and whatever may be its other defects, every line bears an impress of life and reality which it is impossible to mistake.

Although Mr. Aytoun has entitled his poems, "Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers," there are some of them to which the designation is scarcely applicable. This title, it is true, conveys a sufficient notion of the general character of the collection; but they will be found to include several other subjects from the romantic history of Scotland; and the finest of them all—"the Heart of the Bruce," and "Edinburgh after Flodden"—possess no association which can be considered, in any sense of the word, more peculiarly the inheritance of the Cavalier than of any other lover of Scottish nationality.

The Ballad, or Lay, may be said to be the distinctive fashion of this age of poetry. A place in popular estimation to which a poet of the past generation could only dream of aspiring through the medium of a regular "Romance in Five Cantos," or an "Epic in Twelve or Twenty-four Books," may now be claimed as the prize of a few stirring and successful pieces, which the olden poet would, perhaps, have deemed it beneath his dignity to indite; and a form of composition which used to be regarded as almost exclusively characteristic of the first rude stages of poetry, is now considered a not unworthy medium for the exercise of the very highest efforts of the poetic art. Of the Historical Ballad, too, this is especially true. While it releases the writer from the conventional rules of ordinary poetry, it places at his disposal everything that most tends to give vigour and energy to verse. Tenderness, simplicity, pathos, wildness, are, even in its rudest and most primitive forms, the staple material of this singularly interesting species of composition; and the modern historical ballad, in the master hands into which it has fallen, while it

preserves all these distinctive characters of the simple original, has not failed to extend and improve the advantages which they present. Excluding almost everything of history except its romance, it affords an opportunity for the display of passion, tenderness, enthusiasm, and indeed all the best and most effective elements of poetry, which it would be idle to seek under almost any other of its forms.

Nor is there any department of history which has furnished material for so many ballads, as that which Mr. Aytoun has chosen as the subject of the greater number of his Lays. The Lays, however, are of a very different character from the olden Cavalier Ballads. The author has not sought in them so much to imitate the Cavalier or Jacobite Ballads of the existing collections, as to embody in a modern form the spirit which they all in common breathe; and, though we are far from imputing to him the character of a servile copyist, we trust it is no disparagement of his labours to say, that he has evidently taken Mr. Macaulay as his model of style, manner, and versification.

We must not be expected to enter into the historical bearings of Mr. Aytoun's work. The actual justice or injustice of those portions of it to which we have been alluding, has little to do with the real question of its merits. A Cavalier ballad, in order to be true to its character, must, as a matter of necessity, be one-sided; nor can a modern imitator, if he desire to preserve the spirit of his model, aspire to any other office than that of a zealous partisan, the exponent of the feelings of his party, and the chronicler of their histories and traditions. It is a matter of little importance, therefore, who were the real authors of the massacre of Glencoe, or whether the characters of Montrose and Argyle, of Dundee or Forbes, be historically true or not. There is little opportunity in ballad poetry for the delineation of the nicer shades of character. The main outlines of the present subject are long and irrevocably fixed in the public mind; and Mr. Aytoun has discharged all his obligations, by depicting the characters and events which he introduces, strongly, vividly, and distinctly, according to the notions of them which the history and traditions of the party have preserved.

The literary merits of Professor Aytoun's book present

considerably more difficulty. Twenty years since, it could hardly have failed to place him high among the poets of the age. But, in these days of progress, the art of ballad-writing, like the more practical arts of every-day life, has become more difficult by competition. From Lockhart's Spanish Ballads, down to Mr. Macaulay's inimitable Roman Lays, there is hardly a poet of any eminence who has not tried his hand upon this peculiarly attractive theme; and the union of ancient simplicity and modern refinement has carried it almost to the extreme limits of perfection of which it is susceptible.

Mr. Aytoun, in many respects, is fully equal to any of his predecessors; and there are passages in his Lays to which it would be difficult to find anything superior in the very best of our modern ballads. His versification is singularly smooth and flowing; his poetical vocabulary is remarkably select; his imagery is chaste, copious, and appropriate. The narrative, too, where narrative is introduced, is clear, vigorous, and well-sustained. And yet we fear it will be impossible, even for the most uncritical and inobservant, not to feel a certain want in reading these polished pieces. The flowing verses soon pall upon the ear; the images lose their charm; and the narrative often requires all the attraction of the brilliant style in which it is told, in order to sustain its interest. Mr. Aytoun has over-refined his subject; and his Lays, though occasionally exhibiting very great poetical powers, and reaching at times to the very highest point of dramatic interest, are, as a whole, too plainly artificial to be thoroughly effective. He has too frequently lost sight of what forms the great charm of the olden ballad, and carries off, even in the rudest of them, the numberless vices and defects of their structure;—he has substituted sentiment for action. He can seldom resist the temptation of a fine thought; and, instead of showing in the ballad what his heroes feel and think, by exhibiting it in their own persons, he allows the effect to evaporate by himself becoming its exponent. The result is something very polished and beautiful, which it is impossible not to admire, but which is deficient in the first and most attractive characteristic of ballad poetry.

It is not a little remarkable, too, that this defect is most observable, precisely where we might least expect it, in the purely Jacobite ballads of the collection. It would be difficult to find a more appropriate subject for a vigorous

and impassioned outburst than "The Widow of Glencoe," or a more touching and tender, as well as inspiring, theme, than "Charles Edward at Versailles." And yet neither of these, although they both abound in poetical beauty, can make any pretension to be regarded as a ballad. While, on the contrary, "Edinburgh after Flodden," "The Heart of the Bruce," and "The Execution of Montrose," are not unworthy, in some respects, to take their place beside the very best of our modern historical ballads. We should add, however, that there is one remarkable exception to what we have said of the Jacobite Lays—"The Burial March of Dundee"—which, indeed, is, in every way, the best of the purely Jacobite pieces.

The subject of the first Lay—"Edinburgh after Flodden"—is the alarm into which that city was thrown by the news of the fatal battle of Flodden-field, on the 9th of September, 1513. The reader may recollect Sir David Lindsay's prophetic anticipations of this disastrous result in Sir Walter Scott's "Marmion:"

"Nor less," he said, "I moan
To think what woe mischance may bring,
And how these merry bells may ring
The death-dirge of our gallant king;
Or, with the larum, call
The burghers forth to watch and ward,
'Gainst southern sack and fires to guard
Dun-Edin's leaguered wall."

We know not whether these lines may have suggested the idea of Mr. Aytoun's ballad. But the subject is one of the most poetical which can well be imagined; and this piece is certainly the most successful in the entire volume, and not inferior in energy to Mr. Macaulay's celebrated ballad of the Armada, to which it bears a striking similarity in its general conception. The opening is highly poetical:

"News of battle!—news of battle!
Hark! 'tis ringing down the street:
And the archways and the pavement
Bear the clang of hurrying feet.
News of battle? Who hath brought it?
News of triumph? Who should bring
Tidings from our noble army,
Greetings from our gallant King?"

All last night we watched the beacons
 Blazing on the hills afar,
 Each one bearing, as it kindled,
 Message of the opened war.
 All night long the northern streamers
 Shot across the trembling sky :
 Fearful lights, that never beckon
 Save when kings or heroes die.

“ News of battle ! Who hath brought it ?
 All are thronging to the gate ;
 ‘ Warder—warder ! open quickly !
 Man—is this a time to wait ? ’
 And the heavy gates are opened :
 Then a murmur long and loud,
 And a cry of fear and wonder
 Bursts from out the bending crowd.
 For they see in battered harness
 Only one hard-stricken man,
 And his weary steed is wounded,
 And his cheek is pale and wan.
 Spearless hangs a bloody banner
 In his weak and drooping hand—
 God ! can that be Randolph Murray,
 Captain of the city band ?

“ Round him crush the people, crying,
 ‘ Tell us all—oh, tell us true !
 Where are they who went to battle,
 Randolph Murray, sworn to you ?
 Where are they, our brothers—children ?
 Have they met the English foe ?
 Why art thou alone, unfollowed ?
 Is it weal, or is it woe ? ’
 Like a corpse the grisly warrior
 Looks from out his helm of steel ;
 But no word he speaks in answer,
 Only with his armèd heel
 Chides his weary steed, and onward
 Up the city streets they ride ;
 Fathers, sisters, mothers, children,
 Shrieking, praying by his side.
 ‘ By the God that made thee, Randolph !
 Tell us what mischance hath come ; ’
 Then he lifts his riven banner,
 And the asker’s voice is dumb.”—pp. 9-11.

The messenger tells his tale of sorrow—a sad one for Scotland, which, besides her chivalrous king, James IV.,

had lost, upon the field, an archbishop, two bishops, the king's secretary, thirteen earls, fifteen lords and sheriffs, two abbots, five eldest sons of peers, and numberless gentlemen;—a tale of double sorrow for the city of Edinburgh itself, which had sent all its magistrates and able-bodied citizens, in the train of their king, to Flodden, never to return.

“ Woe, woe, and lamentation !
 What a piteous cry was there !
 Widows, maidens, mothers, children,
 Shrieking, sobbing in despair !
 Through the streets the death-word rushes,
 Spreading terror, sweeping on—
 ‘ Jesu Christ ! our King has fallen—
 O great God, King James is gone !
 Holy Mother Mary, shield us,
 Thou who erst didst lose thy Son !
 O the blackest day for Scotland
 That she ever knew before !
 O our King—the good, the noble,
 Shall we see him never more ?
 Woe to us and woe to Scotland !
 O our sons, our sons and men !
 Surely some have ‘scaped the Southron,
 Surely some will come again !’
 Till the oak that fell last winter
 Shall uprear its shattered stem—
 Wives and mothers of Dunedin—
 Ye may look in vain for them !

“ But within the Council Chamber
 All was silent as the grave,
 Whilst the tempest of their sorrow
 Shook the bosoms of the brave.
 Well indeed might they be shaken
 With the weight of such a blow :
 He was gone—their prince, their idol,
 Whom they loved and worshipped so !
 Like a knell of death and judgment
 Rung from heaven by angel hand,
 Fell the words of desolation
 On the elders of the land.
 Hoary heads were bowed and trembling,
 Withered hands were clasped and wrung :
 God had left the old and feeble,
 He had ta'en away the young.”—pp. 16, 17.

Murray tells them how bravely each and all had borne them in the fight, and how bravely and well they had supported their gallant king in his last battle.

“ ‘No one failed him ! He is keeping
 Royal state and semblance still ;
 Knight and noble lie around him,
 Cold on Flodden's fatal hill.
 Of the brave and gallant-hearted,
 Whom he sent with prayers away,
 Not a single man departed
 From his monarch yesterday.
 Had you seen them, O my masters !
 When the night began to fall,
 And the English spearmen gathered
 Round a grim and ghastly wall !
 As the wolves in winter circle
 Round the leaguer on the heath,
 So the greedy foe glared upward,
 Panting still for blood and death.
 But a rampart rose before them,
 Which the boldest dared not scale ;
 Every stone a Scottish body,
 Every step a corpse in mail !
 And behind it lay our monarch
 Clenching still his shivered sword :
 By his side Montrose and Athole,
 At his feet a southern lord.
 All so thick they lay together,
 When the stars lit up the sky,
 That I knew not who were stricken,
 Or who yet remained to die.
 Few there were when Surrey halted,
 And his wearied host withdrew ;
 None but dying men around me,
 When the English trumpet blew.
 Then I stooped, and took the banner,
 As ye see it, from his breast,
 And I closed our hero's eyelids,
 And I left him to his rest.
 In the mountains growled the thunder,
 As I leaped the woeful wall,
 And the heavy clouds were settling
 Over Flodden, like a pall.’

“ So he ended. And the others
 Cared not any answer then ;
 Sitting silent, dumb with sorrow,
 Sitting anguish-struck, like men

Who have seen the roaring torrent
 Sweep their happy homes away,
 And yet linger by the margin,
 Staring idly on the spray.
 But, without, the maddening tumult
 Waxes ever more and more,
 And the crowd of wailing women
 Gather round the Council door.
 Every dusky spire is ringing
 With a dull and hollow knell,
 And the Miserere's singing
 To the tolling of the bell.
 Through the streets the burghers hurry,
 Spreading terror as they go ;
 And the rampart's thronged with watchers
 For the coming of the foe.
 From each mountain-top a pillar
 Streams into the torpid air,
 Bearing token from the Border
 That the English host is there.
 All without is flight and terror,
 All within is woe and fear —
 God protect thee, Maiden City,
 For thy latest hour is near !"—pp. 19-21.

The rallying call of the "brave old provost" is very spirited, though perhaps it has a little too much of the oration for a genuine ballad. One extract from it must suffice.

"Let them cease that dismal knelling !
 It is time enough to ring,
 When the fortress-strength of Scotland
 Stoops to ruin like its King.
 Let the bells be kept for warning,
 Not for terror or alarm ;
 When they next are heard to thunder,
 Let each man and stripling arm.
 Bid the women leave their wailing,—
 Do they think that woeful strain,
 From the bloody heaps of Flodden
 Can redeem their dearest slain ?
 Bid them cease,—or rather hasten
 To the churches, every one ;
 There to pray to Mary Mother,
 And to her anointed Son,
 That the thunderbolt above us
 May not fall in ruin yet ;

That in fire, and blood, and rapine,
Scotland's glory may not set.
Let them pray,—for never women
Stood in need of such a prayer !
England's yeomen shall not find them
Clinging to the altars there.
No ! if we are doomed to perish,
Man and maiden, let us fall ;
And a common gulf of ruin
Open wide to whelm us all !"—pp. 24, 25.

“The Heart of the Bruce” is founded upon the well-known story of the pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre, undertaken by Sir James Douglas for the purpose of depositing in that sacred resting-place his “beloved master, King Robertis hart.” Although the popular tradition reports him to have successfully discharged this commission, all the best authorities concur in stating that he failed to accomplish his pilgrimage; and that the relic entrusted to his care was brought back to Scotland, and deposited in the celebrated monastery of Melrose. During the course of his pious mission, tidings reached him of the holy war, in which Alonzo, king of Leon and Castile, was engaged with the Moorish conquerors of Spain, and his chivalrous and romantic spirit impelled him to take a part in the enterprise. His resolution proved fatal, not only to the mission with which he was charged, but to his own life. He fell in his first battle. The details of his death are strikingly characteristic of the man and of the time. The Moorish cavalry were defeated in the engagement; but Douglas, with his companions, pursuing them with imprudent ardour, had the misfortune to be surrounded by the Moors in a successfully executed manœuvre, and separated from the main body of the army. They performed prodigies of valour in their attempt to cut their way back through the Infidels. But Douglas's friend, Sir William Saint Clair of Roslin, having unfortunately become entangled in a thick crowd of the enemy, Douglas turned to his relief, and thus himself became even more hopelessly involved. In the moment of extreme peril, he took from his neck the casket which contained the Heart of Bruce, and cast it before him with the memorable words, “Pass thou on, as thou wert wont, and Douglas will follow thee or die!” These words were his last. He was overpowered by numbers, and fell with a crowd of his followers. The

next day the casket, covered by his dead body, was found upon the field. We can only find room for this single scene.

“ The trumpets blew, the cross-bolts flew,
The arrows flashed like flame,
As spur in side, and spear in rest,
Against the foe we came.

“ And many a bearded Saracen
Went down, both horse and man ;
For through their ranks we rode like corn,
So furiously we ran !

“ But in behind our path they closed,
Though fain to let us through,
For they were forty thousand men,
And we were wondrous few.

“ We might not see a lance's length,
So dense was their array,
But the long fell sweep of the Scottish blade
Still held them hard at bay.

“ ‘ Make in ! make in ! ’ Lord Douglas cried,
‘ Make in, my brethren dear !
Sir William of St. Clair is down ;
We may not leave him here ! ’

“ But thicker, thicker, grew the swarm,
And sharper shot the rain,
And the horses reared amid the press,
But they would not charge again.

“ ‘ Now Jesu help thee, ’ said Lord James,
‘ Thou kind and true St. Clair !
An' if I may not bring thee off,
I'll die beside thee there ! ’

“ Then in his stirrups up he stood,
So lionlike and bold,
And held the precious heart aloft
All in its case of gold.

“ He flung it from him, far ahead,
And never spake he more,
But—‘ Pass thee first, thou dauntless heart,
As thou wert wont of yore ! ’

“ The roar of fight rose fiercer yet,
And heavier still the stour,
Till the spears of Spain came shivering in,
And swept away the Moor.

- “ ‘ Now praised be God, the day is won !
They fly o'er flood and fell—
Why dost thou draw the rein so hard,
Good knight, that fought so well ? ’ ”
- “ ‘ Oh, ride ye on, Lord King ! ’ he said,
‘ And leave the dead to me,
For I must keep the dreariest watch
That ever I shall dree ! ’ ”
- “ ‘ There lies, beside his master's heart,
The Douglas, stark and grim ;
And woe is me I should be here,
Not side by side with him ! ’ ”
- “ ‘ The world grows cold, my arm is old,
And thin my lyart hair,
And all that I loved best on earth
Is stretch'd before me there. ’ ”—pp. 62-65.

The close is very simple and touching.

- “ The King he lighted from his horse,
He flung his brand away,
And took the Douglas by the hand,
So stately as he lay. ”
- “ ‘ God give thee rest, thou valiant soul,
That fought so well for Spain ;
I'd rather half my land were gone,
So thou wert here again ! ’ ”
- “ We bore the good Lord James away,
And the priceless heart he bore,
And heavily we steered our ship
Towards the Scottish shore. ”
- “ No welcome greeted our return,
Nor clang of martial tread,
But all were dumb and hushed as death
Before the mighty dead. ”
- “ We laid our chief in Douglas Kirk,
The heart in fair Melrose ;
And woeful men were we that day—
God grant their souls repose ! ”—pp. 66, 67.

We cannot refrain from giving a few stanzas of the
“ Execution of Montrose. ”

- “ The morning dawned full darkly,
The rain came flashing down,
And the jagged streak of the levin-bolt
Lit up the gloomy town : ”

The heavens were thundering out their wrath,
 The fatal hour was come ;
 Yet ever sounded sullenly
 The trumpet and the drum.
 There was madness on the earth below,
 And anger in the sky,
 And young and old, and rich and poor,
 Came forth to see him die.

“ Ah, God ! that ghastly gibbet !
 How dismal 'tis to see
 The great tall spectral skeleton,
 The ladder, and the tree !
 Hark ! hark ! it is the clash of arms—
 The bells begin to toll—
 He is coming ! he is coming !
 God's mercy on his soul !
 One last long peal of thunder—
 The clouds are cleared away,
 And the glorious sun once more looks down
 Amidst the dazzling day.

“ He is coming ! he is coming !
 Like the bridegroom from his room,
 Came the hero from his prison
 To the scaffold and the doom.
 There was glory on his forehead,
 There was lustre in his eye,
 And he never walked to battle
 More proudly than to die,
 There was colour in his visage,
 Though the cheeks of all were wan,
 And they marvelled as they saw him pass,
 That great and goodly man !

“ He mounted up the scaffold,
 And he turned him to the crowd ;
 But they dared not trust the people,
 So he might not speak aloud.
 But he looked upon the heavens,
 And they were clear and blue,
 And in the liquid ether
 The eye of God shone through :
 Yet a black and murky battlement
 Lay resting on the hill,
 As though the thunder slept within—
 All else was calm and still.”—pp. 40, 42.

It is hardly necessary to explain the subject of the Lay

of "The Widow of Glencoe." It is founded on the inhuman massacre of the Macdonalds of Glencoe, which was perpetrated in the beginning of 1692, and the memory of which was one of the bitterest sources of the lasting hatred with which the revolution continued, even to a recent period, to be regarded in the Highlands of Scotland. Professor Aytoun has condensed into a short prefatory notice, the circumstances of the atrocious massacre. But we must content ourselves with reminding the reader of the main outlines of the story. By a treaty concluded soon after the battle of the Boyne, and expressly sanctioned by William, a full and unreserved indemnity and pardon were secured to all the Highlanders who had appeared in arms, on condition of their taking the oath of allegiance to William and Mary before the first of January, 1692, in presence of the Privy Council of Scotland, or of the sheriff or sheriff-deputies of their respective shires. Many circumstances tend to shew that, notwithstanding this solemn treaty, a general massacre of the Highlanders was contemplated. "In the course of the investigation before the Scots Parliament," says Mr. Aytoun, "letters were produced from Sir John Dalrymple, then Master of Stair, one of the secretaries of state in attendance upon the court, which too clearly indicate the intentions of William. In one of these, dated 1st December, 1694,—a *month*, be it observed, before the amnesty expired—and addressed to Lieutenant-Colonel Hamilton, there are the following words:—'The winter is the only season in which we are sure the Highlanders cannot escape us, *nor carry their wives, bairns, and cattle to the mountains.*' And in another letter, written only two days afterwards, he says,—'It is the only time they cannot escape you, for human constitution cannot endure to be long out of houses. *This is the proper season to maule them in the cold long nights.*' And in January thereafter, he informed Sir Thomas Livingston that the design was 'to destroy entirely the country of Lochaber, Locheill's lands, Keppoch's, Glengarry's, Appin, and Glencoe. I assure you,' he continues, 'your power shall be full enough, *and I hope the soldiers will not trouble the Government with prisoners.*'"—p. 105.

One of the stipulations of the treaty, which also was expressly sanctioned by William, was, that the chiefs should have leave to communicate with king James at St. Germain's, for the purpose of obtaining his permission and

warrant for the contemplated act of submission to the new government. The proclamation was issued on the 29th of August, leaving but a space of four months for the preparation. A special messenger was dispatched to France; but it was not till December 12th, that the warrant was issued from St. Germain; it did not reach Dunkeld till eleven days later, and thus it was impossible to circulate it in the Highlands within the appointed time. One chief, Locheil, received his copy thirty hours before the expiration of the time, and appeared before the sheriff at Inverara on the very last day of the allotted term. A supplication was presented to the council, praying an extension of the time. They declined to do so on their own authority, and ordered the letter to be transmitted to the court.

“In reply of William of Orange was a letter, countersigned by Dalrymple, in which, upon the recital that ‘several of the chieftains and many of their clans have not taken the benefit of our gracious indemnity,’ he gave orders for a general massacre. ‘To that end, we have given Sir Thomas Livingston orders to employ our troops (which we have conveniently posted) to cut off these obstinate rebels *by all manner of hostility*; and we do require you to give him your assistance and concurrence in all other things that may conduce to that service; and because these rebels, to avoid our forces, may draw themselves, *their families*, goods, or cattle, to lurk or be concealed among their neighbours: therefore, we require and authorise you to emit a proclamation to be published at the market-crosses of these or the adjacent shires where the rebels reside, discharging upon the highest penalties the law allows, any reset, correspondence, or intercommuning with these rebels.’ This monstrous mandate, which was in fact the death-warrant of many thousand innocent people, no distinction being made of age or sex, would, in all human probability, have been put into execution, but for the remonstrance of one high-minded nobleman. Lord Carmarthen, afterwards Duke of Leeds, accidentally became aware of the proposed massacre, and personally remonstrated with the monarch against a measure which he denounced as at once cruel and impolitic. After much discussion, William, influenced rather by an apprehension that so savage and sweeping an act might prove fatal to his new authority, than by any compunction or impulse of humanity, agreed to recall the general order, and to limit himself, in the first instance, to a single deed of butchery, by way of testing the temper of the nation. Some difficulty seems to have arisen in the selection of the fittest victim. Both Keppoch and Glencoe were named, but the personal rancour of Secretary Dalrymple decided the doom of the latter. The secretary wrote thus:— ‘Argyle tells me that Glencoe hath not taken the oath, at which I

rejoice. It is a great work of charity to be exact in rooting out that damnable set.' The final instructions regarding Glencoe, which were issued on the 16th January, 1692, are as follows :—

“ ‘ WILLIAM R.—As for M' Ian of Glencoe and that tribe, if they can be well distinguished from the rest of the Highlanders, it will be proper for public justice to extirpate that set of thieves.

‘ W. R. ’

“ This letter is remarkable as being signed and countersigned by William alone, contrary to the usual practice. The Secretary was no doubt desirous to screen himself from after responsibility, and was further aware that the royal signature would insure a rigorous execution of the sentence.”—pp. 107-109.

The chief of this doomed clan had all but literally complied with the terms of the proclamation. Failing, from the excessive severity of the winter weather, and the difficulty of the mountain passes, to reach the residence of the sheriff on the day appointed, he repaired to the military governor of Inverlochy, (now Fort-William,) and tendered his signature to him. This officer, not being authorized to receive his submission, could only give him a certificate of the appearance and tender. However, on new-year's day, 1692, (one day after the allotted time,) he succeeded, with great difficulty, in reaching Inverara, where the sheriff, seeing the certificate of the governor of Fort William, the best evidence of the bearer's intentions, received his submission and administered the oath.

But it was in vain. The rest of the history is but too well known. The lament of the “ Widow of Glencoe ” is an attempt to embody the popular feeling on the subject. It is a vigorous and powerful piece; but it is hardly all that we should conceive to be the expression of the feeling which such an event should naturally call forth. Still there is deep feeling, as well as poetry, in the following.

“ Oh, the horror of the tempest,
 As the flashing drift was blown,
 Crimsoned with the conflagration,
 And the roofs went thundering down !
 Oh, the prayers—the prayers and curses
 That together winged their flight
 From the maddened hearts of many
 Through that long and woeful night !
 Till the fires began to dwindle,
 And the shots grew faint and few,
 And we heard the foeman's challenge
 Only in a far halloo :

Till the silence once more settled
 O'er the gorges of the glen,
 Broken only by the Cona
 Plunging through its naked den.
 Slowly from the mountain-summit
 Was the drifting veil withdrawn;
 And the ghastly valley glimmered
 In the gray December dawn.
 Better had the morning never
 Dawned upon our dark despair !
 Black amidst the common whiteness
 Rose the spectral ruins there :
 But the sight of these was nothing
 More than wrings the wild-dove's breast,
 When she searches for her offspring
 Round the relics of her nest.
 For in many a spot the tartan
 Peered above the wintry heap,
 Marking where a dead Macdonald
 Lay within his frozen sleep.
 Tremblingly we scooped the covering
 From each kindred victim's head.

* * * * *

But I will not waste my sorrow,
 Lest the Campbell women say
 That the daughters of Clanranald
 Are as weak and frail as they.
 I had wept thee, hadst thou fallen,
 Like our fathers, on thy shield,
 When a host of English foemen
 Camped upon a Scottish field—
 I had mourned thee, hadst thou perished
 With the foremost of his name,
 When the valiant and the noble
 Died around the dauntless Græme !
 But I will not wrong thee, husband !
 With my unavailing cries,
 Whilst thy cold and mangled body,
 Stricken by the traitor, lies ;
 Whilst he counts the gold and glory
 That this hideous night has won,
 And his heart is big with triumph
 At the murder he has done.
 Other eyes than mine shall glisten,
 Other hearts be rent in twain,
 Ere the heathbells on thy hillock
 Wither in the autumn rain.

Then I'll seek thee where thou sleepest,
 And I'll veil my weary head,
 Praying for a place beside thee,
 Dearer than my bridal-bed :
 And I'll give thee tears, my husband !
 If the tears remain to me,
 When the widows of the foemen
 Cry the coronach for thee !"—pp. 117-121.

These extracts must suffice as a specimen of Professor Aytoun's "Lays." The fault of the book is too great diffuseness; and we should not be surprised if the short fragments which we have selected, may convey an idea of the book, somewhat higher than will be produced by reading the several poems in their complete form. But, nevertheless, even as a whole, it will well repay the trouble of perusal; and we can hardly doubt its eventual popularity, especially in Scotland.

-
- ART. IV.—1. *L'Univers. Journal Quotidien.* Paris, 1849.
 2. *L'Union. Journal Quotidien.* Paris, 1849.
 3. *La Revue des Deux Mondes.* Paris, 1849.

THERE are some who pretend that the monarchical form of government is adapted only to the infancy of society, and that the democratic republic is alone suited to the manhood of nations. They add, that the course of events in Europe, as well as the temper of the public mind, warrant such a conclusion. Let us examine this assertion by the light of history, as well as by the evidences of reason.

As monarchy is the most natural and ancient form of government, so will it prove in all probability the most enduring. We never meet with the republic in the origin of nations; it was unknown in all the great civilized countries of the east, (possessed as many of them were of very free municipal institutions,) and in like manner it is wanting among the greater part of the western and northern nations. The republic in its origin is nothing more than a *dismembered municipality*; that is to say, a small community severed by rebellion, war, or a thousand other

accidents, from a monarchy, under whose shadow it had sprung up and thriven. When confined within such narrow limits, the republic is the fitting, and even natural, form of government for petty commercial communities. But when it is stretched beyond the confines of the city, it soon falls into utter disorganization. Observe, our remarks apply to the democratic republic, where the aristocracy has little or no weight. In heathen antiquity, where the great bulk of the population were slaves, devoid of all participation in political rights, and possessing not even a civil existence, the democratic form of government was far more practicable. But even those democracies so restricted, which were, relatively speaking, *oligarchies*, and were besides ever counterbalanced by aristocracies more or less powerful, never proved equal to the exigencies of a great empire. When, in ancient Rome, power passed from the hands of the great families into those of the plebeians, though the great mass of the people still remained excluded from all, even the remotest, co-operation in affairs of state, still anarchy, with its long train of evils, failed not to ensue; and the iron grasp of despotism could alone hold together the incohesive elements of discordant empire.

But under the christian dispensation, which has emancipated the masses, where slavery is unknown, democracy, even in a small state, is a government scarcely practicable. We may appeal to the history of the Florentine democracy in support of this assertion. What endless agitations and commotions, what alternate tyranny and license, do the annals of that petty republic exhibit! God forbid we should be exclusive! Under certain circumstances, and in certain conditions of society—as, for instance, in the little pastoral and catholic communities of Switzerland—democracy for ages insured to its inhabitants substantial freedom and happiness.

But it may be objected, that the United States of America have for sixty years presented to the world the glorious spectacle of a mighty empire resting on the broadest basis of popular government. There are many circumstances which render the American republic radically and essentially distinct from those sickly abortions that since 1789 have, in the different European countries, come forth from the womb of revolution.

In the first place, the United States form not a single

republic, but a confederation of republics; and in this federal system, elements of stability as well as freedom exist, which are not to be found in the *unitary* scheme whereof the European revolutionists are so deeply enamoured. Secondly, the founders of the American republic retained the laws and municipal institutions of the mother-country, and made but partial changes in their local legislatures and systems of administration. Universal suffrage, now prevalent in almost all the states, has been only by degrees introduced; and the institution of a senate in the several legislatures, as well as in the Imperial Congress of Washington, is, in the estimation of revolutionary democrats, an outrage on the principle of equality. Thirdly, British America, originally settled by Puritans and Independents during our civil wars, was characterized from the first by a republican spirit, republican manners, doctrines, and institutions. In such remote dependencies, too, the spirit of loyalty is ever weaker than in the parent country; and, moreover, the absence in America of a titled, wealthy, and powerful aristocracy, (though in that country at the revolution a gentry existed, and even still exists,) was one obstacle less to the establishment of a pure democratic regime. Fourthly, slavery, which to a considerable extent exists in the southern states of America, (and in a more repulsive form, too, than was ever witnessed among christian nations,) has the effect of rendering, as in heathen antiquity, the republican form of government more easy and practicable. Fifthly, there is no dense population in America—the inhabitants are scattered over an immense tract of country—employment is easily procured, and abundantly repaid—and, with few exceptions, there is as yet, in the strict sense of the word, no *populace* in the American cities. Consequently, many of those elements of democratic agitation, so common in Europe, are unknown to the United States. Sixthly, the terrorism of clubs has never been there tolerated; and the monstrous theories of Communism have as yet found no echo in those countries. It is needless to add, that whereas the men who within the last sixty years have attempted to establish in France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Germany, a wild democracy on the ruins of monarchical government, were with few exceptions notorious for their irreligion; the founders of the American republic were many of them conspicuous for pure virtue, and sincere

attachment to religion; that, notwithstanding the wide spread of unbelief as well as political fanaticism in America, there is still much earnest religious feeling in a portion of the Protestant population, while the Catholic Church, blessed with a freedom of which she had long been bereaved in Europe, has of late years made wonderful progress in that country. Lastly, in despite of all these peculiar advantages, which position and circumstances, no less than the wisdom and honesty of her rulers, have insured to the American republic, the discerning eye will not fail to discover in her infancy all the marks of premature decay. Already has a mere question of tariff threatened to bring about a rupture between the northern and the southern states of the Union. A question of pounds, shillings, and pence could to-morrow shiver the American republic into a thousand fragments. But look to Austria! See, amid the conflicts of faction, the shocks of war and revolution, how much the magical name of Hapsburg has done to hold together nations the most dissimilar in race, language, manners, and in part religion, in the common bonds of dutiful allegiance! This leads us to point out another excellence in the monarchical form, namely, the gratification which it affords to the feelings and the imagination.

II. The splendour of a court, by enkindling the imagination, imparts a wondrous stimulus to national exertion and to the spirit of enterprise. What in a commonwealth are the scattered rays of patrician lustre, when royalty is not there to combine and concentrate them in one focus? In the person of the monarch the traditions of the past—the glorious recollections of a nation—are concentrated, embodied, and rendered continually present. And as those recollections ever constitute one of the most potent excitements to national energy, it follows that the splendour of a court answers not merely the purpose of vain ornament, but by acting on a most powerful faculty in man—the creative imagination—is often the spring of national greatness and glory.

But, in the next place, the feelings and affections of men find peculiar gratification under monarchical government. It is in human nature to feel more attachment to persons than to things; and, consequently, in a republic the abstract state can never call forth the same feeling of love as the person of the prince in the kingly government.

The affection of a people for their sovereign is not a blind predilection for his person, whatever his defects; nor does it consist in a mere homage rendered to the abstract principle of royalty; *but it is an attachment to an institution, embodied and set forth in a person.* Thus the abstract and the concrete—the universal and the special—a principle and a sentiment are combined in loyalty. Hence the tenacious energy of that sentiment; hence the deeds of self-devotedness—the heroic sacrifices, which it has given birth to in every age. The love of liberty is doubtless a mighty lever in the history of nations; it has been the spring of great and glorious actions: but this sentiment, if not sanctified by religion on the one hand, and blended with loyalty on the other, will degenerate by degrees into a narrow, selfish instinct, that will soon succumb to violence, or yield to corruption. M. Guizot, though belonging to the cold school of the Doctrinaires, where theory has ever played the principal part, has lately declared that he was not for excluding the affections from their share in politics.* A sad experience has doubtless convinced this statesman, how precarious is the fate of that government which appeals only to the interests of a people, and has no hold on its love. The facility, indeed, with which successful military chiefs often put down a turbulent democracy, has its ground not only in the love of social quiet, which that form of government, except in certain rare cases, fails to satisfy, but also in that utter void which it leaves in the affections of men. But as it is only a shallow rationalistic philosophy which could pretend that the feelings and the imagination were with the advances of civilisation to be cast aside, it follows that that form of polity, which best corresponds to these faculties, will not be superseded, but rather developed and consolidated, in the social progress of mankind. And we are the more warranted in drawing this conclusion, as reason recognises in monarchy—the temperate monarchy—the form of government which best satisfies its just claims, as it gratifies the other powers of the human mind.

These preliminary reflections will, we trust, not be deemed out of place in an article devoted to the consideration of France since her last revolution. They may serve to explain some events now passing in that country. For

* See his able pamphlet, "Democracy in France."

how else can we account for the fact, that a return to order is there accompanied with a revival of affection for monarchy; and that the friends of order are, with few exceptions, the friends of royalty? Why else does the people in its agony turn to this form of government as the only one capable of furnishing it with a clue out of the labyrinth of its political difficulties and errors? The people instinctively feel the truth which the force of evidence wrung from one of the fathers of Jacobinism, Robespierre, when he said, "France is a land too large for a republic." The Church most of them know to be the sheet-anchor of their country; but the Church alone cannot suffice for all the temporal wants of a nation.

We shall now address ourselves to the subject before us.

The monarchy of July, amid all its external splendour—its successful diplomacy abroad, and its vigorous repression of faction at home—contained within itself the germs of precocious decay. 1. It was the child of rebellion; it was founded in the anarchic principle of popular sovereignty, and therefore depended for its very existence on the caprice of the majority of the people, or rather of the factions that usurp and abuse the name of that majority. It wanted the sanctity of hereditary right; it wanted the "divinity that hedges in the rightful king;"* and thus was unable to command feelings of ardent affection and self-devoting loyalty even from its own partisans. Hence the Orleanists, though perhaps superior to the Legitimists in wealth and numbers, were, from the cause adverted to, unequal to them in that true moral strength, which no motives of self-interest, but high enthusiastic love can alone insure.

2. But the royalty of July might have atoned in some measure for the sin of its origin, had it honestly fulfilled its solemn engagements to the Church. The freedom of the Church, and freedom of education, were guaranteed by the Charter of 1830. Had this promise been redeemed, not only would the Legitimist opposition have been neutralized, and a large and growing number of French Catholics from all ranks of society have for ever rallied

* This the revolutionists seemed to feel; for though they hated the elder line of Bourbons more intensely than the younger, still they made much fewer attempts on the lives of the former than on those of Louis Philippe and his sons.

round the new dynasty ; but the foundations of the social edifice would have been strengthened, and the blessing of heaven called down on the new order of things. If under the critical circumstances in which France was placed, the Orleans monarchy, raised up as it had been by the revolutionary party, found it difficult to show favour to the Church, still nothing could prevent it from according to her the boon of liberty.

3. This policy of the new government naturally invigorated the Legitimist opposition. And how formidable was this opposition we may infer from the fact, that the Legitimist party includes in its ranks the largest landed proprietors—the remnant of the old French aristocracy—as well as the peasantry and lower orders of the western provinces, and a considerable portion of the southern population ; and that, moreover, powerful as it is in wealth and numbers, it derives additional strength from its devotion to the Church, and from its constituting, in the provinces especially, the nucleus of the Catholic party. But the policy pursued by the Orleans government towards the Church, forced this party—by every motive human and divine—by a sense of religious duty, as well as of political interest and affection, to unfurl the banner of opposition.

4. But if this government failed to satisfy the just claims of the Catholic and the Legitimist parties, it had to encounter the fiercest resistance on the part of the Republicans. The revolutionary origin of the monarchy of July, as well as its recognition of the principle of popular sovereignty, gave to the Republicans, in despite of their inferiority of numbers, and their anarchic doctrines, a decided advantage in the struggle. In their conflicts with that monarchy, they had less the bearing of rebels resisting lawful authority, than of rivals who deemed themselves dispossessed of their rightful heritage. Hence under the Orleans government this faction attained to an organization, and displayed an audacity and violence, such as it had never exhibited during the restoration. Plot succeeded plot, one attempt at regicide followed upon another, till at last, in a sudden revolt, the royalty of July was submerged, and the anarchic party, borne on the waves of popular tumult, grasped the helm of power.

5. But with such numerous and various enemies to contend with, what resources could the new royalty reckon on? Its chief supporters were among the middle classes,

including a vast number of all ranks wearied of change, and hostile to anarchy. But these adherents, as we said above, were animated either by motives of self-interest, or by a sense of political expediency, rather than inspired with those feelings of devoted enthusiastic loyalty, which form the true enduring strength of monarchies. A royalty thus void of deep roots in the affections of any class, backed by no great historical recollections, unsustained by personal glory, was guarded by no hereditary peerage against the encroachments of democracy. The upper house, without the rights of hereditary descent, composed in great part of government officials, bereft of the heads of the noblest families in France, who either voluntarily or by compulsion had quitted it, was calculated rather to irritate than check the republican party. Nor was this defect supplied by a close union with the Church, which, robbed of her just liberties, regarded the government, and was regarded by it in turn, with jealousy and distrust. The Church had no direct political power; she enjoyed no honours, possessed no landed property; and though the moral influence, which in despite of restrictive laws she still retained, was considerable, yet was that influence chiefly confined to the portion of the population least favourably affected to the monarchy of July.

The chamber of deputies, though in its great majority ever attached to the government of 1830, would perhaps have proved a more efficient support to that monarchy, had the elective constituency been of a broader construction. In this constituency the middle classes had the decided preponderance; the classes, to wit, which are precisely the most importunate and clamorous in their demands for places and pensions, and that consequently render the governments dependant on them almost perforce corrupt. As these classes contain some of the most profligate men in France, and as their attachment to the monarchy of July was grounded in great measure on motives of self-interest only, the government of Louis Philippe was compelled to purchase their services by pensions and dignities. And this fact, as well as the conduct of these functionaries, often brought dishonour on their employers. Even M. Guizot, though himself a man of stainless honour, as well as of consummate talent, went latterly, we are told, on the wrong principle of selecting officials more from their character of worldly shrewdness,

and even cunning, than from a reputation for integrity. Of Louis Philippe we must in justice say, that his position was one of extreme difficulty; that though in the later years of his reign especially, he might, we think, have redeemed the pledge of 1830 in regard to the Church and to education, still we must not forget the formidable obstacles he had to encounter; and that where his hands were freer, as, for instance, in the matter of ecclesiastical patronage and episcopal nomination, he displayed not only considerable judgment, but great rectitude of purpose.

But if such were the outward political state of society during this monarch's reign, what was its inward moral condition? During those memorable eighteen years which it lasted, the Church, as we showed on a former occasion,* had been slowly gathering up her strength, as if in anticipation of the coming storm. The clergy, equally exemplary for its virtues as under the restoration, now multiplied its institutions, and added to its stores of sacred and profane science. The old nobility, that since the bloody expiation they had gone through in the first great revolution, had evinced the most sincere attachment for the Church, now removed from court, devoted their exclusive energies to the cultivation of religious and political literature, or to the increase and improvement of their family estates, and to the cherishing of friendly relations with their neighbours and tenantry. Numbers from the middle classes, and the liberal professions and learned bodies now rallied round the Church; and many political liberals, once so hostile to religion, renounced their prejudices, and sometimes even became its devoted adherents.

In this reign, however, public education in all departments, whether high or low, became still more corrupt, and the lower orders sank even deeper in vice and impiety. It is worthy of remark, that in France in the last century, where the schools were generally religious and the literature anti-christian, youths were brought up in sentiments of religion, but corrupted in later life; whereas, in the present age, the youth is generally perverted in the school, but the man, in consequence of the more religious tone in the upper ranks, and the sounder character of a large portion of the literature, is not unfrequently brought back to the fold of Christ.

* See the Article, "Religious and Social State of France," January, 1844.

If, as we said, in the reign of Louis Philippe, the Church, in despite of her stern bondage, made considerable progress, irreligion also made fearful advances. The old atheism of the eighteenth century was entirely worn out, and a pantheism, more or less gross, was substituted in its stead. As the purely negative atheism of 1793 had overturned religion without attempting to establish anything in its room, the new pantheism sought on the ruins of all moral and social order to realize its own extravagant theories. From the year 1830, when the monarchy of July sprang into being, down to that of 1848, when it was overturned, we see this fanatical sect busily at work. The theories of the Saint Simonians, of the Fourierists, Pierre Leroux, and Considérant, were successive applications of the doctrines of Pantheism to social order. Hence arose the hideous sects of Socialism.

As in the Church of Christ every dogma and institution must be successively assailed by heresy, in order that their divine truth may be tested and rendered more manifest unto men, so it is in society. The bloody atheism of 1792, after having overthrown the altars of religion, massacred her ministers, and sought to erase even her very name from the hearts of men, turned its rage against a royalty of fourteen hundred years, and all its thousand traditions, recollections, and affections; and against the aristocracy, which was bound up with the Church and the throne, and whose roots were intertwined with the nation's history. But before the work of social havoc could be consummated, it was arrested by the arm of an energetic soldier. The anarchic phantasy of Babœuf remained unrealized, and amid the moral convulsion, the family,—that last pillar of the social edifice,—together with its pediment, property, was still seen standing.

The time was now come when those parts of the moral and social edifice that had escaped the first revolutionary storm, were now to encounter the rage of angry elements, and thereby to evince their divine strength and endurance. The great enemy of mankind,—“that murderer from the beginning,”—who is ever lying in ambush for his prey, seeing that his efforts against the Church of Christ were unavailing, turned his assaults against the foundation whereon that Church and all human society depends. If some sects of Socialists openly professed pantheism, and with it the annihilation of all religion, others put forward

a more modest deism, and proffered full toleration to the Catholic Church. They flattered themselves, that under this specious disguise of tolerance, they would better achieve their nefarious purpose of introducing universal anarchy by the destruction of property, and universal demoralization by the dissolution of the nuptial tie, and the establishment of promiscuous concubinage.

There were other Jacobin writers, unconnected with the Socialists, (like a once illustrious, but now fallen ecclesiastic,) whose later writings have tended to mislead the minds, and embitter the feelings of the lower classes against their superiors in station.

Such was the condition of French society when the storm of February burst over it. That storm had, indeed, been anticipated, and even foretold by not a few, who knew that righteousness was the only sure foundation of thrones. But how it came unawares on all those selfish voluptuaries, who imagined that society was framed only to minister to their own sensual indulgences! How it took by surprise all those arrogant speculatists who thought they could build the city up without God! How must the citizen monarch at that dread hour have felt himself in more "than the solitude of kings!" How could he fall back upon the Church, whose most equitable rights he had helped to withhold; or on the ancient nobility, with whom he had so long warred; or on the lower orders, who had been taught by the constitution that they were virtually the sovereigns, as all power emanated, according to that document, from the people; or even on the middle classes, that had raised him to the throne, and were bound to him by no other link than the fragile tie of temporary expediency?

Our readers are too well acquainted with this recent and too memorable history, to require from us a detail of facts. Abuses and corruptions there undoubtedly were under the late government, but such only as were the natural, and almost necessary result of the position of Louis Philippe, as well as of the state of French society. Still less were those abuses such as to justify a revolution in order to put them aside. The cry of Parliamentary Reform had been artfully raised from one extremity of France to the other, by the Radical party; and in this cry the leaders of the Liberal Opposition, called Dynastic, more perhaps from ambition than conviction, had joined.

The Opposition insisted on holding political banquets in despite of the government; the latter called forth a large array of military force; many of the National Guards on service allowed themselves to be carried away by the cry for Reform; and even common workmen, disguised in the uniform of National Guardsmen, stole into their ranks. The Dynastic Liberals, after having by the most inflammatory speeches in Parliament, enkindled a popular conflagration, sneaked away in the moment of danger, and withdrew from all participation in the political banquets. But the Radical party could not let an opportunity so favourable to their designs pass by, and turned this popular agitation to account. A formidable insurrection was organized throughout France; many of the National Guards, believing the movement was for Reform, and not for Revolution, were foolish enough to be led away by it; the popular exasperation was artfully fomented by the carrying about of dead bodies of men and women, slain by the soldiers in self-defence; a portion of the National Guards wavered in their fidelity; and the troops of the line at last yielded to the bad example set them by the civic force. The result is known. In despite of two successive changes of administration, and his own abdication in favour of his grandson, Louis Philippe was unable to preserve the monarchy. The right of the young Count of Paris to the throne was, notwithstanding the courageous conduct of his mother, set aside by the legislature, shorn of the greater part of its members, and bearded and coerced by the Republican faction, and its armed satellites. The Republic was formally proclaimed, and the royal family expelled from its palace under circumstances of unexampled ignominy.

The writers of the journal "Le National," were chiefly instrumental in bringing about this revolution of February; but their very success surprised and embarrassed them. They found formidable allies, on whose co-operation they had not reckoned; and so in the very infancy of this republic, we see opposite and conflicting elements and tendencies. Lamartine, Ledru Rollin, and Louis Blanc, were the leaders of three opposite parties, that divided the young republic. Of Lamartine, we confess, we find it difficult to speak with patience. When we consider the great gifts, spiritual and temporal, which this man had received, the high religious tone of his youthful poetry,—

when we bear in mind that he had enjoyed the friendship of illustrious Christian philosophers, like a De Bonald and a Count Maistre, and then see how, in his maturer years, he has prostituted all those great gifts, and cast all the fruit of those glorious opportunities away,—how the once loyal, chivalrous, and religious bard has proved false to his God, to his king, and to society, and all this so much from overweening vanity and love of notoriety, we are inclined to feel more indignation than sorrow. The deep-feeling poet, whose soft-stringed lyre once so well responded to the divine harmonies of religion, has now condescended to retail a vapid, puling pantheism.* The loyalist, who erst sang the misfortunes of dethroned royalty, is become a political incendiary, joining with the meanest and most reprobate of men in the work of social destruction. We deny not to Lamartine the possession of good qualities of heart, but it is precisely those qualities which render us more impatient with him than with such a thorough-going Jacobin as Ledru Rollin.

It was Lamartine who first talked of tearing up the map of Europe; who, in his history of the "Girondins" had, with a sophistical eloquence, first palliated the crimes of Robespierre, and the monstrous aberrations of 1793, and had the effrontery to throw ridicule on the martyr-king himself. It is true that, when raised to power, he afterwards endeavoured to allay the storm which he had helped to raise; but he would have done well to remember the words of a great writer: "Woe to those who trifle with the passions of the people; it is like playing with the hidden powers of nature."

If the nobler and more generous qualities of Lamartine prevented him from realizing those destructive theories, which, in a spirit of wanton speculation, he had thrown out, his colleague, Ledru Rollin, was under the control of no such feelings. What this violent reckless demagogue is capable of, the reader who remembers his atrocious and convention-like circulars of last year, as well as the profligate commissaries whom he sent out into the provinces, to corrupt and intimidate the electors, cannot fail to discern. He headed the Jacobin portion of the Provisional Govern-

* Whenever Lamartine attempts to speak of religion and politics, he utters the most arrant nonsense that it is possible to conceive. He perpetually mistakes a metaphor for a syllogism.

ment; intrigued incessantly against his more moderate colleagues; was in secret understanding with the most atrocious leaders of the clubs; and even, contrary to the solemn pledges of the government, and the wishes of the majority of its members, secretly abetted a revolutionary expedition against a neighbouring state.* His subsequent conduct has revealed his character and principles in their true light. Though no believer in the follies of Socialism, he has joined the party from motives of ambition, and declaims with violence against what he is pleased to call "the infamy of capital." After having for a year convulsed France by his revolutionary harangues in parliament and in public meetings, he has at last dragged his party into open rebellion, and fortunately, defeated in his designs, has been compelled to flee a country which he had brought to the very verge of destruction.

The third of this triumvirate, Louis Blanc, was in many respects the most dangerous of all; for he aimed not only at the subversion of government, but at the overthrow of all society. He had previously indulged in violent declamations against property, and in invectives against the bourgeoisie, and now demeaned himself as if he conceived he were a prophet deputed by Heaven for the deliverance of the Fourth Estate. In the meetings of the Luxembourg, the minds of the workmen were perverted, and their passions heated by the wildest and most culpable theories. The national workshops, founded either at the suggestion of Louis Blanc, or of his friends, by enticing artisans away with the lure of higher wages and shorter work, had the effect of ruining many establishments of private industry, already shaken to their foundations by the shock of a violent revolution, as well as by the spread of Communistic doctrines. In these workshops, where the artisans learned to know their numbers and discipline their forces, was formed the nucleus of that insurgent army, which in the disastrous days of June filled Paris with desolation and bloodshed.

These were the leaders of the three parties represented in the Provisional Government. But though M. de Lamartine and the more moderate of the Republicans had for a time the upper hand, yet was it easy to foresee that they could not dam up the revolutionary torrent which

* The expedition of "Risquons-tout" against the Belgian government.

they had let loose ; and that their more violent, but more consistent colleagues could not fail, for a time at least, to carry their designs through.

It is needless to recount to the reader the sad tale of 1848. He knows that, in the first outbreak of the February revolution, there were comparatively few popular excesses ; the fire glowed only with intenser heat beneath the embers. Soon were the most subversive doctrines proclaimed in the press, and from the tribune, and indirectly supported by a portion of the government ; soon did the clubs exercise their terrorism over the capital and the provinces ; soon did atrocious proclamations, worthy of 1792, spread dismay through France ; soon was class arrayed against class ; soon did Socialism rear its hideous crest, striving to pluck up the three main pillars of human society,—religion, marriage, and property ; till at last France, with a sunken revenue, an almost annihilated commerce, a famished population, a degraded army, a divided government, presented the awful spectacle of divine chastisement reserved for a people, that had for a hundred years turned its back upon its God, and for sixty years trampled under foot the eternal laws of social order.

If in 1791 the aristocracy of France, from the example of irreligion and licentiousness set by many of its members, from the neglect of their tenantry and forgetfulness of their duties towards God and man, received so severe a retribution from Divine Justice, so now, (as the prescient genius of Count Maistre had foretold thirty years ago,) the day of reckoning had come for that selfish, arrogant, godless portion of the middle class, which had so long revelled on the spoils of nobility. The nobles had been overthrown and proscribed by the bourgeoisie, whom, either by doctrine or example, they had helped to debauch. Now, in its turn, was that bourgeoisie to be trampled down by a lawless populace, from whose minds they had sedulously striven, for sixty years, to efface every vestige of religion, and every sentiment of loyalty. A permanent ascendancy this new Fourth Estate could at no time, and under no circumstances maintain, still less at the present time, when it strove to realize the impracticable theories of Communism. The elevation of these proletarii would be the certain prelude to their downfall ; for their triumph would be the very destruction of human society. Thus was the great revolution of 1789 destined by Divine Provi-

dence to convulse and disarrange successively every stratum of human society; till each class, humbled one by the other, should bow down before the common Chastener, repent its transgressions, acknowledge God alone to be great and unchangeable, God alone mighty enough to refix society on its true foundations.

The parliament, gathered together in a hurry, amid the general panic of a revolution, and under the terrorism of Ledru Rollin's commissaries, was composed in great part of new, untried men; the Red Republicans, or Jacobins and Socialists, mustered in a strong minority; the more moderate Republicans formed indeed the majority, but were disunited; the real Conservatives were not strong in numbers; and a tolerable number of waverers, giving their votes alternately to the cause of order or of anarchy, lent an unsteady, vacillating character to the proceedings of the whole assembly. This assembly, however, such as it was, was too conservative to satisfy the men of destruction. The clubs determined on bringing about the dissolution of the legislature; and hence the half-tragic, half-comic occurrence of the 15th of May, last year, which must be too fresh in the reader's mind to require any detailed notice here. This audacious outrage on the National Assembly, which was the result of an understanding between the leading clubbists and many of the agents of public authority, evinced, perhaps more than anything else, the state of utter weakness and distraction in the French government. In the first French revolution, there was a tragic grandeur of crime that inspired a certain amazement, mixed with horror; but in this abortion of February, there is something indescribably mean, ludicrous, and contemptible in the pretentious, ignorant, fanatical, and often reprobate creatures, "drest up in a little brief authority," that strutted and fretted for a moment on the stage. We seem to dream when we remember that the most important affairs of the most influential country in Europe were intrusted to shallow incapables like a Bastide and a Volabelle; to arrogant and fanatical charlatans, like a Louis Blanc and an Albert; or to men of low vulgar cunning, like a Sobrier and Caussidière.

The leaders in the criminal attempt of the 15th of May, were, indeed, apprehended and confined; and it is only just to say, that on this occasion M. de Lamartine displayed considerable courage and resolution; but the

wretched, rickety, and disjointed thing, misnamed the government, was incapable of sustaining for a week the cause of social order. At length the long pent-up torrent of revolution burst through its flood-gates, and threatened to sweep down for a time all the dams and bulwarks of civilised life. For four days was the affrighted capital in a state of anguish; the legions of destruction, which had inscribed on their red banners "Rape and Pillage," intrenched themselves behind formidable barricades; blood flowed in torrents; five general officers were killed or severely wounded; the most insolent proposals were made to the legislature; and the triumph of order seemed still uncertain, till the prayers and the blood of an illustrious Archbishop appeased the wrath of Heaven against the guilty city. The triumph of General Cavaignac over the rebels of June, was one of the most signal graces ever vouchsafed to France, and to Europe. For had those insurgents obtained but a momentary triumph, what direful scenes of havoc and desolation would have occurred, not only at Paris, Lyons, and other chief cities of France, but at Vienna, Berlin, Dresden, perhaps even at Milan and Naples, at a time when the German and Italian governments were in a state of utter disorganization! This victory of General Cavaignac's was the first blow given to the February revolution,—the revolution of the proletarii, and one from which it has never since rallied. Its effects were felt in every corner of Europe; for it dispelled the fatal illusion of popular omnipotence, before which the statesmen and sovereigns of Europe were quailing. The members of the Provisional Government, from the coxcombical Lamartine down to the desperate, tyrannical Ledru Rollin, who had all more or less winked at, or pandered to anarchy, were cast aside by aroused and indignant France; and the National Guards, who from all points had flown to the succour of the capital, declared, on returning to their homes, that they felt only one regret, namely, that they should still leave the republic behind them.

But while the conspirators against human society were, by violent harangues and popular tumults, by secret plots and open insurrections, labouring to accomplish their nefarious designs, what was the course pursued by the friends of order? Soon after the revolution of February, when all the pillars of the social edifice seemed tottering to their

base, men of the most opposite political parties, rushed by a spontaneous instinct to sustain its quaking walls. The four leading parties in the late reign that were so often marshalled against each other in fierce conflict,—the Legitimists, the Free-Church party, the Conservative Orleanists, the Dynastic or Orleanist Liberals, severally represented by the distinguished names of Berryer, Montalembert, Molé, and Thiers, were now (O happy omen!) joined together in a common league for defending the most sacred interests of humanity. Under the auspices of these statesmen, the association of the Rue de Poitiers, composed of the parliamentary members of the above-named political parties, was formed, and has ever since exerted a no less decided than happy influence on the course of public events. Not only in defence of the mighty interests of religion, property, and the family, are these parties united against the Socialists, but on the more debateable questions of freedom of the Church, and freedom of education; the parties once most hostile to religion are disposed to make the most equitable terms. What a great change has come over the mind of M. Thiers we had occasion to notice in a former article. His public declarations show that he is prepared to make the most liberal concessions to the demands of the Church of France; and we believe we may assert with confidence that he will go the full length in carrying out the views of Count Montalembert, in respect to ecclesiastical and educational freedom. There is no reason to suppose that his followers, over whom he exercises so much influence, will be more backward in their advocacy of these great measures, since some of them are members, and all supporters of an administration pledged to carry them through. The altered tone, too, in the organs of the old Liberal Opposition, such as the *Constitutionnel*, the *Courrier Francois*, and the able periodical, the *Révue des deux Mondes*, in all that relates to religion and her ministers, is not one of the least remarkable results of the February revolution.*

But besides these momentous questions of freedom of the Church and freedom of education, whose imperious necessity has pressed itself on the minds of men, hitherto

* The *Revue des Deux Mondes* has, in its recent numbers, frequently enforced the necessity of a freer and more religious system of education in France.

the most hostile or indifferent to religion, there was another topic, second only in importance to these, which warmly agitated the provinces. This was the question of their emancipation from the administrative despotism of the capital, that bound down and fettered all their movements, kept them in a state of perpetual insecurity, as well as bondage, and ever and anon drew them down into the vortex of its periodical but ruinous revolutions. Soon after the February revolution, there were in the different departments public meetings held, numerous attended, and presided over by large land-owners, and eminent political characters. In these, amid general applause, the boldest language was uttered against the centralizing domination of the metropolis, and the most energetic resolutions for bringing about the administrative enfranchisement of the provinces were agreed to. Shortly after, the editors of all the Legitimist journals in Paris, as well as in the provinces, had a public conference, in which they came to the determination of strenuously insisting on freedom for the Church, freedom for education, freedom for religious association, freedom for the press, and lastly, the decentralization of the provinces, or full liberty secured to the commune and the municipality for the administration of their own local concerns.*

On the immense advantages which would result to religion and to society from the adoption of these measures, it is surely unnecessary to enlarge. First, as to the liberty of the Church. If, in the age of Louis XIV., when the court and parliaments, as well as the people, were still so deeply impressed with the truth of the Catholic religion, the restrictions then imposed on ecclesiastical liberty, proved so hurtful to the best interests of religion, what calamitous consequences in the altered condition of France, must not ensue from the servitude of her Church! When the government is often so hostile, almost always indifferent, to religion, when impiety and licentiousness are so widely spread through all ranks, when irreligion, by means of the press and of secret societies, has such for-

* We are glad to see that the *Revue des Deux Mondes* gives its powerful support to the advocates for provincial enfranchisement. The *Journal des Debats*, on the other hand, the old organ of the Bureaucracy, unconverted by the direful events of 1848, still doubts the expediency of the measure!

midable instruments for propagating its tenets, it is more than ever necessary for the Catholic Church to have free, unimpeded intercourse with its Head; for the Bishops to confer together in synods, and to possess the power of condemning in council doctrinal errors, framing disciplinary regulations, and founding or encouraging such institutions of devotion or charity, as the wants and circumstances of the time may require.

It is surely needless, too, to point out the blessing of freedom of education to the Church in a country, where for forty years impiety has enjoyed a perfect monopoly of teaching. Liberty of education once established, the Catholic schools, founded by the secular and regular clergy, would multiply on every side; most of the bad schools would be abandoned, for even parents indifferent to religion would not send their children to such institutions. More especially at the present time, when, partly from conviction, partly from interest, such a salutary religious reaction has occurred among the middle classes, we should see such sound educational establishments patronized even by those who were formerly their most bitter opponents. The same remark will apply to the religious orders of men; these doubtless, so soon as they shall obtain from the legislature the promised boon of liberty, will spread with the same rapidity, and be productive of the same abundant blessings, as the long tolerated communities of women.

But if on these points there can be no difference of opinion among well-thinking Catholics, there is another matter needing more careful examination in its moral and political bearings: we mean the subject of provincial de-centralization,—the emancipation of the commune and the municipality from the control of the metropolis.

First, as to its political bearings. What can be conceived more adverse to freedom than a system which excludes the province, the city, and the commune, from the management of their own affairs; which will not permit a hospital to be built, a bridge to be constructed, or a by-road to be cut, without the sanction of a board sitting at the distance of many hundred leagues? How under such a system can the practical skill and judgment of the citizen be called forth and developed? And how, without the useful training furnished by the administration of provincial and municipal concerns, can he be qualified for the

exercise of political rights? Must not the elector, so unpractised, so inexperienced in affairs, become too often a mere passive tool of the government functionaries for the time being; or on the other hand, of the emissaries of revolutionary societies? All the local influences, so necessary for the guidance of political opinion—the advice and the example of the clergyman and the magistrate, the nobleman and the landed proprietor—are enfeebled by this system; it cramps the activity of the will, as it arrests the exercise of the mental faculties. In peaceful and ordinary times, it is calculated to engender a spirit of passive acquiescence in all acts of government; and in periods of political commotion, a sort of helpless, inert, imbecility.

On commerce and industry, literature and science, the system of centralization exerts an influence equally pernicious. How many plans of local improvement may be carried out—how many institutions for the encouragement of agriculture, trade, and manufacture may be set on foot, or promoted by provincial and municipal authorities, and even by private enterprise, which are utterly beyond the scope and capability of a central Government, overburdened with occupation, and distracted by such various cares.

The arts and sciences, too, require local encouragement, local establishments, local patrons, unless we wish to see, as in France since the Revolution of 1789, intellectual languor and inertness in the Provinces, and an overweening literary excitement in the Capital.

It may be objected, that within the last sixty years France has made considerable progress in husbandry and manufactures, arts and letters. In answer to this objection we must observe, that the partition of landed property which occurred in the great Revolution, by creating a new race of proprietors, gave no doubt for a time a strong impulse to agriculture. But how fatal such a partition of property, by annihilating the class of large landowners, is not only to the political stability of a state, but to its material prosperity also, inasmuch as it prevents the accumulation of capital so necessary for the promotion of agriculture, trade, and manufactures, the experience of the last sixty years in France may suffice to show. The progress which that country has made in some branches of industry, is owing to the rivalry of other nations, and the general spirit of the age; but her ancient manufactures have not been surpassed in solidity or brilliancy. Her maritime

commerce was greater in the eighteenth century, than at the present day. The trade carried on formerly between Marseilles and the Levant, and between Bordeaux and the West India Colonies, exceeded, in the magnitude of its operations, the commercial transactions of France since her first Revolution.

Science and literature in that country have, doubtless, felt the mighty concussion, which the great catastrophe of 1789 gave to the European mind. Accordingly in Theology and Philosophy, the Belles Lettres, and the Natural Sciences, we see a certain number of eminent spirits far superior to any that France can exhibit in the last century. She had then no philosophers and theologians to compare with Count Maistre, M. de Bonald, the Abbé de la Mennais (before his fall,) the Pères Lacordaire and Ravignan—no writers like Chateaubriand and Montalembert—no philologists like Sylvestre de Sacy, and Abel Rémusat—no savans like Cuvier, and Cauchy. But although the eighteenth century was one of intellectual decline when compared with the preceding age, still the clergy, nobility, and magistracy of that period, were, as bodies, better educated than their successors at the present day.

It was acknowledged by M. Salvandy, the minister of Public Instruction, a few years ago, that the number of French Colleges and Institutes for affording a liberal education, was, irrespective of the population, considerably greater in the last century than in the present age. The fact is, that knowledge was then more generally diffused; and if the Capital possessed less literary excitement and activity, there was far more intellectual culture and refinement in the Provinces.*

If now we look at this system of centralization under its moral aspect, we shall find its results equally pernicious.

* We were twenty years ago in a provincial city of France, possessing a population of twenty thousand souls. There was not any large bookseller's shop in it; nothing but the most ordinary publications were on sale; and before any valuable work could be procured from Paris, many months must have elapsed. Yet this was the capital of a province, and before the revolution of 1789, it possessed not only a parliament, but states general of its own. It is quite common to hear the provincials say: "In the provinces we know nothing." Of late years, however, a spirit of intellectual activity has there shown itself.

cious. Can any thing be considered more disastrous, than that a Capital, so long a stronghold of impiety and revolutionary principles, should be allowed to exercise so great a control over the Provinces? For *political power* necessarily insures *moral influence*. When all offices of Government are centred in the metropolis,—when all Boards of Provincial administration must receive all, even the minutest, directions from that quarter, it is only to be expected that in taste, opinion, manners, and doctrine, the Capital should be found to give the tone to the country. Accordingly we see that under the Restoration, and the monarchy of July, the revolutionary party ever made Paris the centre of its operations; there its leading Journals were established; thence issued the mandates of its secret societies; and thence also, in all periods of agitation, were the watch-words of rebellion given.

Destroy this system of centralization—restore freedom to the municipality and the commune, and you restore at once the local and legitimate influences of rank, property, education, spiritual counsel, and municipal control in all political transactions. The spell of the demagogue is dissolved—the stern severe discipline of the secret society is broken up,—and the clergyman and the magistrate, the landowner and the master manufacturer, can more easily obtain a hearing on political topics from the lower orders.

Thus in every point of view, moral, intellectual, and political, is the system of administrative centralization productive of the most fatal results. It deprives the Provinces of their sense of independence, and thereby renders them more obnoxious to the evil influences of the Capital;—it facilitates the success of revolutionary propagandism; renders the citizen void of that political skill and forethought which self-government insures, and engenders by turns a spirit of servitude and of anarchy.

Let us now return to the history of events. The Government of Cavaignac was a transition from a state of anarchy to one of comparative quiet. When the insurrection of June was put down—one of the bloodiest in the long and bloody drama of the French Revolution—the state of siege, amid the loud applause of the National Guard, was proclaimed at Paris. Military tribunals were forthwith erected for judging the delinquents; those guilty of murder were reserved for the civil courts; the leaders and chief instigators of rebellion were, after sentence, transported to

the colonies, and the less guilty condemned to temporary confinement, or graced with amnesty. But the policy of the General continued weak and wavering. He would not take up his ground on the side of Conservatism, but flattered and irritated by turns the revolutionary spirit, following herein the suggestions of the Coterie of the "National," which, though it will not push its principles to an atheistic communism, still holds in their utmost latitude all the fatal doctrines of 1792. If this party does not, with the Socialists, demand the extirpation of all Religion, the spoliation of the wealthy, the promiscuous concubinage of the sexes, the uprooting of all the fences and land-marks of social life; yet it exhibits, in most of its members at least, the same enmity to the Church and her ministers, the same levelling spirit, the same attitude of aggressive hostility towards the European monarchies, in a word, the same arrogant fanatical Republicanism, which distinguished its predecessors of 1792. Whether it will or not, *moderate Jacobinism must end in Socialism*. The eyes of the lower orders have in this respect been opened, and without the prospect of a division of plunder, they will not risk their lives in the cause of Revolution. They will no longer spill their blood for the aggrandizement of a few ambitious demagogues, pettifogging attorneys, or ranting journalists. They eagerly insist on a repartition of property—on a resettlement of society, in order the better to secure their own share in the spoils of victory. Hence these *moderate Republicans*, as they style themselves, have been pushed aside by the stream of events; they have been defeated, nay, almost annihilated in the elections, and as a necessary consequence, have been driven from office, driven from the Legislature, less by their own personal incompetence, than by the utter inadequacy of their political doctrines to the crisis of affairs.* In this party there are honourable men, such as General Cavaignac himself, and M. Bastide, the latter of whom is said to be a sincere practical Catholic.

This party it was that brought into existence the new Republican Constitution:—a puny, sickly, ricketty, ill-fa-

* As a proof of the tendency of this modern Girondism to terminate in Socialism, we may observe that the organ of this party, the *National*, has, since the defeat of its friends in the elections, hoisted the red flag.

voured thing, which the parents themselves were tempted to disown. Yes, we verily doubt whether the authors of this Constitution believe in its durability. What can be expected from a Republic founded on universal suffrage, unsupported by a Senate or Upper House, unlinked with any system of Provincial confederation, recognizing no orders or corporations, proscribing not only the political rights, but the very titles of nobility, and running counter to all the manners, customs, and traditions of the nation? On the danger and absurdity of such a system it is the less necessary to enlarge, as these points were fully discussed in a former article.*

Two good articles in this constitution, those respecting the freedom of the Church, and the freedom of education, tend to redeem in some degree its other absurd and dangerous enactments. These stipulations are not, we think, destined to remain a dead letter, like the similar ones in the charter of 1830.

The election of Prince Louis Buonaparte to the Presidency on the 10th of December of last year, put an end to that sad state of suspense and anxiety which France had so long been kept in. The Prince hitherto known only as an obscure political adventurer, apparently not overburdened with discretion, shone out now on his elevation to the Presidency as a man of sound principles, clear strong sense, and straight-forward character. Never perhaps in history was there an example of such a successful popular election. This success is to be ascribed not only to the veneration in which the name of the great Napoleon is held, but still more to that thirst, that longing after social quiet felt by the great majority of Frenchmen. It is, however, not to be denied, that the notion of the Prince's enormous wealth, with which the common people were possessed, and which it was hoped would enable him to bring about a considerable reduction in the public taxes, tended to procure him not a few votes from that quarter. In his Manifesto, Prince Louis Buonaparte declared, that after the example of his great uncle, he would, if raised to the Presidency, strive to put down anarchy, and uphold order, maintain peaceful relations with the powers of Europe, defend the temporal sovereignty of the Pontiff, as necessary to his spiritual independence, and carry out the

* See Article entitled "Political State of Germany," July, 1849.

freedom of the church and freedom of education as guaranteed by the constitution. Certainly nothing can be more frank as well as equitable than this declaration; and it must be confessed, that as far as the difficult circumstances which he was placed in would allow, the President has honestly endeavoured to fulfill the pledges of the candidate.

Prince Louis Buonaparte, as we observed in a former article, has consulted and followed the suggestions of the Conservative coalition represented in the Association of the Rue de Poitiers. He has selected his ministers from every shade of conservatism; and the nomination of M. de Falloux—the most Catholic-minded minister France has possessed since Matthieu Duc de Montmorency—to the ministry of public instruction, is an act which Christian France cannot be too thankful for. The ministry had to encounter an opposition, sometimes violent, sometimes insidious, on the part of the late assembly; and they were in consequence often reduced to a negative course of action. But considering the great difficulties which surrounded them on every side, they have curbed and repressed with considerable vigour and skill the secret manœuvres and armed insurrections of the anarchic party. The last elections, indeed, have not turned out so favourable as had been expected; but the fault of the enemy has completely repaired any damage which the cause of order might have thereby sustained. The leaders of the Red Republic have, by an insane rebellion, completely thrown away all the chances of success, which a more cautious policy might have insured; and the consequence has been, that the conservative party, by the flight or imprisonment of so many members of the Mountain, as well as by the more fortunate turn of some elections subsequent to that event, has gained immensely in strength.

The ministers have introduced laws for bettering the condition of the lower classes, and promoting the interests of trade and agriculture. Measures such as these, coupled with the freer spread of religion, and the more vigorous assertion of the law, will, it is trusted, secure the people against the seductions of the socialist levellers. The new Bill on education will, we hope, satisfy the just claims of the long-oppressed Church of France, and of Christian parents. The expedition to Rome, which, whether from the difficulties of the French Cabinet's position in regard

to the late National Assembly, or from the internal conflicts of that Cabinet, bore at first a selfish, equivocal character, is now likely to terminate in the full, unqualified restoration of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope.

Order is solely maintained in France by the co-operation of the Legitimists, the Orleanists, and the moderate Buonapartists. The report recently spread that the Orleanists and Buonapartists would form a coalition in order to bring about a marriage between Prince Louis Buonaparte and the Duchess of Orleans, is perfectly absurd. For what would be royalty without legitimacy? And is it possible that the monarchists of July can have so soon forgotten the bitter lesson taught by the February Revolution? Again, any attempt on the part of the President of the Republic to re-establish by a Coup d'Etat the imperial despotism of his great uncle, would be equally fruitless. In the first place, such an attempt is likely to find few supporters out of the army; and secondly, such a despotism depends on *the personal merit and military glory* of the founder, is from its nature little compatible with a regular state of society, and consequently is not lasting.* Such a system, far from offering any guarantee to the friends of order, would shock and wound too many feelings, opinions, interests, and institutions in the country, would leave the great political problems unsolved, and after a momentary compression of anarchy, bring it back again with tenfold violence. The good sense and sound principles which Prince Louis Buonaparte, since his accession to the Presidency, has manifested, forbid us to entertain any suspicions of this kind. Equally monstrous is the opinion that the Legitimist party, or the great majority of it, (for of course we cannot answer for some

* The military despotism of Cromwell and Napoleon perished with themselves. If the first Cæsar, who subverted the constitution of his country, was followed by descendants who established for a time a dynasty, that dynasty sprang out of revolutionary principles, served to perpetuate them, and at last gave place to governments equally revolutionary. Doubtless, if France is to perish, she will be oppressed by an alternation of anarchic republics and military tyrannies. But if she is to be saved, she can be saved not only by a return to the Church, but by a return to legitimate, free, temperate, well-regulated monarchy.

hot-headed individuals), would league with the Mountain and Socialist party for the purpose of preventing an Orleanist restoration. Woe to the defenders of human society, if they become divided on questions, important indeed in themselves, but still subordinate to the other vital interests of social order! Monarchy, as we have shown, is necessary for the permanent existence of social order in France, and Legitimacy is indispensable to the consolidation of Monarchy. But unless preceded or accompanied by the perfect reconciliation of the Orleanist and Legitimist parties, the restoration of the rightful monarch would not be established on a secure and lasting basis, nor productive to France of all the promised blessings.

We doubt, however, whether this union of parties, now so auspiciously begun, be yet sufficiently matured to render a restoration at this moment expedient. It is desirable, too, that the important questions respecting the freedom of the church, freedom of education, and provincial emancipation, should be finally settled before the strife and passions necessarily enkindled by a restoration, should arise to mar such an adjustment. And this task we hope to see accomplished by the instrumentality of the parties now happily acting in friendly co-operation, and which are represented by the honoured names of Berryer, Montalembert, Molé, and Thiers. When these preliminary matters shall have been adjusted, when the reconciliation of the two leading parties throughout the country shall have been perfected, then will the acclamations of an exulting people call back from exile the descendant of their ancient kings, and restore him to the heritage of his fathers.

Thus, after sixty years aberration, France returns to the point from which she started. In 1789, notwithstanding all the delusions current at that period, the major part of the French constituency instructed their deputies to reform, but not to destroy their constitution. But those deputies, heedless of their instructions, gave their country not reform, but revolution; and we have witnessed the result. France demanded that the rights and claims of the monarch, the clergy, the nobles, and the commons, should be respectively adjusted and defined. But how were those wishes, those demands responded to, on the part of her revolutionary rulers? Their reply history gives in characters of blood. The nobility robbed of their estates, liberty,

and lives ; religion proscribed, her temples desecrated, her ministers plundered and massacred ; monarchy overthrown, a most virtuous king brought to the scaffold ; honest citizens of every rank marked out as objects of suspicion and hatred ; credit and commerce annihilated ; the bloodiest and most atrocious tyranny which history records, coercing the cowering dumb-struck population ; and famine, pestilence, and foreign war smiting down the miserable multitudes that had escaped the guillotine, or the sword of civil butchery. Nor was this all. After the political edifice had fallen to the earth with a tremendous crash, and the groans of the victims whom it crushed had been followed by a lugubrious silence, all attempts at reconstruction (and the architects have been many and various) have proved ineffectual. No seed cast in that agitated soil has ever germinated ; no plant there put in has ever brought forth fruit or blossom. Constitution after constitution, dynasty after dynasty, has been tried, but all to no purpose. And why ? Because the principles on which those reconstructions were made, were either radically false, or else too one-sided and exclusive. The best result of the February Revolution—one of the most memorable lessons, doubtless, ever given to mankind—has been to prove to all classes their mutual dependance and their necessary subordination. The priest and the magistrate, the noble and the burgess, the artisan and the peasant, now feel, and feel deeply, that they are all members of one body politic, that the destruction of one is the destruction of the other, and that their mutual concord and hearty co-operation are necessary to the well-being of society.

France returns, as we said, to the point from which she started in 1789. But she returns with all the wisdom gathered by experience, and with the altered conditions of existence which the deep memorable Revolutions she has undergone, during that long interval of time, have brought about. The mighty problems she had then to solve come back upon her, and imperiously demand solution. The Church must be rendered free—free with that freedom which her Divine Founder hath bought for her with His own most sacred blood—free in her internal economy—in her relations with her spiritual Head—in the holding of her synods—in the institution of orders and congregations—in the establishment of schools and

colleges of every kind and grade. But she must, withal, be bound in holy wedlock to the state, sanctifying the relations of the state, and receiving in return from the latter that homage which, as is ordained, all divine things must obtain on earth. Royalty, legitimate royalty, must be restored, free, powerful, resting on its own personal responsibility, hallowed by the unction of the church, invested with the halo of ages, not subjected to all the humiliating restraints of the modern representative system, but bound and attempered by a national Parliament, where the three estates are duly represented, and by Provincial and Municipal Corporations, the organs of an everywhere active, energetic body politic. The Nobility—that representative in every country of national traditions, feelings, character, and honour—the Nobility, we say, if the French monarchy is to be saved—if popular liberty is to possess a bulwark of defence, as well as a dike against its excesses—if the great interests of agriculture and trade which best flourish under the shelter of large properties,* and the accumulation of capital, insured by such properties, are to be promoted and encouraged—if refinement of manners and elegance of taste are not to be for ever banished from society—if, in fine, the nation is not to break entirely with its past—then, we say, must the French Nobility be raised from its ruins. The middle classes, that is, the literati, and the monied and commercial men, brought back, like the nobles forty years ago, to the feet of the Church, must no longer arrogate an exclusive predominance in the state, but must be content with that important position to which their wealth, knowledge, talents, and practical energy entitle them. The lower orders, by a sad experience disabused of the false doctrines which had led them astray, seeing the folly and wickedness of that chimerical equality they had sought after, *and which exists not even in heaven*, (for in heaven there is a hierarchy and subordination of intelligence, love, and felicity;) and above all, reformed in newness of mind and heart by the holy influences of religion,—the lower orders, we say, will become again

* This truth, long denied by French liberalism, begins now to be recognized. The *Revue des Deux Mondes* has in a recent article ably shown how very beneficial an influence the large landed properties in England have exercised over her foreign and internal commerce.

what they once were, the support and buttress of the social fabric. But in proportion as the spirit of religion pervades French society, the moral and material interests of those classes will be in every way protected and promoted. And with their advancement in religiousness, morality, education, and physical well-being, will their social importance and indirect political influence increase. The foot cannot direct the eye, nor the hand govern the head. It is therefore clear, that those orders of men who are doomed to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, whose subsistence is so precarious, and who have but few moments to improve on that slender stock of knowledge they acquired in youth, ought not to possess the same degree of power with their superiors in station. False, therefore, is any constitution which gives undue weight to these classes, or which practically withdraws them from the influence of those ranks of society that by birth, education, property, leisure, experience, authority, spiritual and temporal, are qualified for forming a judgment on political matters.

The mighty social regeneration whereof we speak must be the work of time; but the beginnings have already been made. The beginnings have been made, when the false doctrines that have given birth to so many political catastrophes are forsworn. The Church had long been winning multitudes back to her fold; and since the February revolution the scales have dropped from many an eye, and even those who have not yet returned to her embraces, are yet willing to concede to her the full measure of her rights. All the false idols of the political revolution must fall to the ground. The sovereignty of God must be substituted for the sovereignty of the people. The reign of might must yield to that of right. All exclusive and one-sided theories, too, must be thrown aside. For those parties who wished to set up royalty without the title of legitimacy, and those who were for excluding aristocracy from their monarchical system, and those who were for establishing democracy with a nominal kingship, and those even who demanded freedom for the Church, yet spurned her connexion with the state—all those parties are now unequal to the great crisis in which their country is involved. For the time has arrived when all the faculties and energies of the social man must be brought into play and harmonious co-operation. The Church and royalty, the aristocracy and the commons,

each preserving its own sphere of action,) must be bound together in the bonds of an indissoluble union.*

* Even the best and most intellectual men may, especially in times of great party-conflict, easily fall into mistakes. Thus the Count de Montalembert—a nobleman who may be held up to Catholics as a model of genius, learning, piety, and zeal—occasionally made, in his otherwise admirable speeches, dangerous concessions to the principles of the revolution. He sometimes used to speak of the glorious revolution of 1789, or of the free and glorious principles of 1791. The context of his speeches, as well as his known religious and political doctrines, forbade a literal interpretation of his words. He merely meant to say that the revolution of 1789 was glorious, inasmuch as it consecrated the principle of parliamentary representation, or, to speak more accurately, revived a principle of the old French constitution that had for two centuries lain dormant. Even the religious toleration, often ostentatiously claimed as a peculiar merit of the revolution, was preceded by the Edict of Nantes in 1598, and the Ordinance of Louis XVI. in 1787, restoring freedom of worship to the Protestants. But how were such loose, equivocal expressions likely to be understood by the people? How were they, in fact, understood by a large portion of Legitimists, in whom they excited suspicion and distrust, and whom they for many years kept aloof from that sacred struggle in behalf of ecclesiastical freedom, whereof the Count Montalembert was the acknowledged leader? Accordingly, it was in perfect keeping with the noble character of this statesman, that, profiting by the lessons of experience, he this year declared at the tribune, that if he repented of one thing in his public career, it was that he had not always sufficiently respected the principle of authority in political matters. In the last years of the July monarchy his language had been more guarded; but he is now all that we could wish him. May his life long be spared by Divine Providence for the defence of the Church, and the salvation of his country!

As to a small knot of French Catholics, who recently made an attempt to engraft revolutionary doctrines on Catholicism, their failure has been so signal, that the less that is said about them the better.

It gives us great pleasure to add, that, amid the storms which have recently convulsed their country, the writers of the *Univers* have not only sustained their old reputation for religious orthodoxy, as well as literary talent, but have evinced a rare political sagacity, and have defended their views with singular prudence, tact, moderation, and courage.

Among the other daily journals of France with which we are acquainted, the *Union* is also for its religious and political principles, as well as for the talent and moderation with which it defends them, deserving of the highest commendation.

ART. V.—*The Island of Cuba: its Resources, Progress, and Prospects, considered in relation especially to the influence of its prosperity on the British and West India Colonies*, by R. R. MADDEN, M.R.I.A.
London: Charles Gilpin; Dublin, James B. Gilpin, 1849.

THIS is a new work disclosing the horrors of slavery in the island of Cuba, by a man who there, as well as in every part of the world visited by him, has been unceasing in his endeavours to mitigate the miseries endured by slaves, and put an end to that which is the source of such miseries—the Slave Trade.

We have deemed it to be but justice to the author to state at once what was “the moral” of his work; but we should do him great wrong, if we did not add, that the perusal of his work will prove it to be a valuable collection of facts with respect to the past history, and the present social, statistical, and political condition of Cuba; as well as a clear exposé of the existing state of the slave trade. Regarded in this view, the work is one deserving of the attention of the politician and the philanthropist. It has been published at a moment when the Court of London and the Cabinet of Washington are trembling with the apprehension of being alike unwillingly involved in war, on account of the Island of Cuba; for the ministers of both countries are now aware, that in Cuba, as in the United States, a formidable conspiracy has been organised, having for its object the transference of Cuba from the Spanish crown to the American Republic, and this for the purpose of strengthening the slave-holding interest in both places. The fact of such a project being entertained, is only now recognized in England and America; but it was detected by the author, Dr. Madden, so long ago as the year 1836, and it was then brought by him under the attention of the Colonial Office. Dr. Madden had prepared this work for publication with the intention of demonstrating that such a plan was in contemplation; and yet, whilst the sheets are passing through the press, the American President issues a proclamation against the enrolment of an armed force to seize upon Cuba, and the *Times* sounds the alarm against its accomplishment! It rarely happens that an author when labouring to show that an evil is to be apprehended, of which others are unconscious, can issue his work at the

very moment when every day's intelligence demonstrates that his sagacity has been wisely exercised, and that his forethought is proved to be the realisation of events.

In political literature we know of nothing more curious than the following passages in Dr. Madden's book, warning his readers as to what was sure to happen; and then sending them forth to the world, at a moment when messengers, arriving from a distant quarter of the world, announce that the events so predicted are at that moment occurring.

In quoting these passages the reader will bear in mind that the words *in italics* are so marked by their author, and show the importance attached to them by himself. The world now can judge how significant they are.

“The white people of Cuba having found their commercial interests not only benefited by intimate relations with the Americans, but their slave-owning interests apparently identified with those of the planters of the United States, they encouraged the latter to settle amongst them—suffered not their national prejudices to stand in the way of those interests—nor the ancient exclusive laws and prescriptive ordinances of the country to be raked up for preventing the establishment of foreigners amongst them.

“In 1779, the Spanish Government' had so far favoured the North American merchants, exclusively, as to issue a decree authorising them to receive specie in exchange for their produce, in times of scarcity of provisions in Cuba. Of late years, the governors affected to consider this favour of 1779 as an evidence of a settled policy of the State, to give peculiar encouragement, not only to the traders, but to the settlers of the Union in Cuba.

“This indulgence to them was considered a privilege that made naturalisation in their case justifiable, and it has been accorded to them virtually, though not nominally, for many years past.

“A strange state of things arose from this connivance at the laws which forbade the establishment of foreigners in Cuba: as the latter were not supposed by the laws to exist, there were no provisions in them for subjecting strangers to those imposts to which Spanish subjects were liable. Consequently, the American settlers were exempt from a variety of taxes, personal contributions, and other imposts, which the former had to pay.

“This immunity drew great numbers of settlers to Cuba from the Southern States of America, so that some districts on the northern shores of the island, in the vicinity, especially, of Cardenas and Matanzas, have more the character of American than Spanish settlements.

The prosperity of the island has derived no small advantage

from those numerous American establishments. Improved modes of agriculture, of fabrication, of conveyance, were introduced by the Americans. Several railways have been made. In the course of ten years, no less than ten have been carried into effect. At the opening of the first, from Havana to Guines, in 1837, I was present. To American enterprise and energy solely, I have reason to know this great undertaking was indebted. The loan for it was made in England, but the projectors, the share jobbers, the engineer, and the overseers, were Americans. The expense of the Cuban railways, it is said, has not exceeded 17,000 dollars the English mile, in round numbers, £3,400 sterling, while the expense of those of Belgium and Holland is estimated at more than double that amount.

"The substitution in Cuba of the old grinding-mill, rudely constructed of wood, by steam-engine machinery, is also chiefly due to the Americans. To them, therefore, Cuba is indebted for the various improvements in the fabrication of sugar, and modes of conveyance of the produce of its plantations, which enable the proprietors to compete so successfully with those of the English colonies. Cuba, ever since I knew it, has been slowly but steadily becoming Americanised."*

"It is needless for recent political writers of Cuba to deny the existence of a strong feeling of animosity to the mother country, and a longing desire for separation. From my own intimate knowledge of these facts I speak of their existence.

"If England could have been induced, in 1837, to guarantee the island of Cuba from the intervention of any foreign power, the white inhabitants were prepared to throw off the Spanish yoke, to undertake the *bonâ fide* abolition of the slave-trade, and to have passed *some measures* for the amelioration of slavery. There was then a Spanish army, nominally of 20,000 men (Spaniards), in the island, but the actual number of native Spaniards in it did not exceed 16,000 men. The leading men of the Creoles, or Cuban white people, had then little apprehension of the result of an effort for independence. A liberal allotment of land in the island, for the soldiers who might be disposed to join the Independent party, it was expected, was a prospect which would suffice to gain over the army. The great apprehension that was entertained was of the slaves,—of their taking advantage of the revolution to get rid of all the whites, both Spaniards and Creoles. But the hope of

* "I pestered my superiors with my opinions on this subject in 1836-7-8-9. 'Liberavi animam meam' might be fairly said by me, if the star-spangled banner were floating to-morrow on the Moro-Castle, or flaunting in the breeze at St. Jago de Cuba. In the course of seven years a feeling, strongly prevalent in the colony, in favour of independence, has been changed into a desire for connection with the United States."—*Author's Note.*

obtaining any such guarantee as the one referred to was not likely to be realised, and the apprehension of a rising of the slave population gaining ground the more that time was spent in deliberation, at length all thoughts of independence were merged in considerations of interests that were thought of more immediate importance—those, namely, of life and property.

“Spain is indebted to these considerations, and to these alone, for the retention of the island of Cuba, ever since the period I have referred to.

“It is not to England, now, that the white natives of Cuba look for aid or countenance in any future effort for independence. *It is to America that they now turn their eyes, and America takes good care to respond to the wishes that are secretly expressed in those regards.*

“The American Government possibly and probably takes no direct steps—no official ones, I mean—through official agency, to hasten the flinging off the Spanish yoke, and the incorporation of that island in the Union of its States. But that the American Government contemplates this event, and looks approvingly on acts of its citizens in Cuba that are well calculated to produce this result, there can be no doubt. The opinion has been most industriously circulated by Americans in Cuba, that the interests of the planters of the Southern States of America and the white people of Cuba, who are proprietors, are identical, and that no other power but that of America can long maintain slavery in any part of the world.

“This is the feeling, I am sorry to say, which had already begun to gain ground among that intelligent educated class of Cuban Creoles in 1839, before I left the island,—among that class to which alone it was possible to look for any liberal sentiments, or just views, on the subject of slavery and the slave-trade. All the communications I have had with natives of Cuba, of the class I refer to, of late years, in other countries, and in the present year particularly, then, would lead me to imagine that the desire to link the fortunes of Cuba and the United States is now very generally and strongly felt; and that the annexation of Texas to the United States will be followed by that of Cuba to the same country, in the course of a few years, if slavery does not break down in the interim in Cuba, or England be not prepared to prevent the contemplated Texian game of conquest, and the machinations that are now pursuing for another annexation in the Gulf of Mexico. The American Consul in Cuba, Mr. Trist, does not officially stamp them with the sanction of his signature and the public seal, as he does the fraudulent papers of the Spanish slave-trade captains who sail under false colours, and with false papers, duly Americanised in his office; but he promotes them most industriously and perseveringly in his private capacity, and his Americanising policy in Cuba is progressing fast and surely.

“The annexation of Texas to the United States was an event of far greater importance to the interests of Great Britain, than was commonly supposed in the latter country. It involved the question of disturbed relations with Mexico and Cuba, and of an extended influence to American slavery in those countries, which was calculated to bear most prejudicially on our West Indian colonies.”—pp. 82-87.

The readers of this periodical are aware that Dr. Madden filled at one time the office of “Superintendent of Liberated Africans” at the Havana, with which was combined that of “Acting Judge Advocate in the Mixed Commission Court.”* It was whilst discharging the duties of those offices that he made the memoranda which form the substance of the work now published. With these he has combined the most full information respecting the changes in our West India Islands since the abolition of slavery, showing the comparative state of agriculture and commerce prior and subsequent to emancipation. These returns he has contrasted with the exports from other colonies, and especially from Cuba, where slavery exists. He has accumulated facts upon facts, for the purpose of compelling public opinion to make a “*pronunciamiento*” on the subject of the Slave Trade; and this not merely for the sake of humanity alone, but of humanity and prudence combined; for it is his deliberate conviction, that “if the present state of things in our colonies should endure for two years longer, without any effective efforts to ameliorate their condition, the cultivation of sugar must be totally abandoned in them.”

Such an opinion from such an authority, and supported by statements that cannot be controverted, will, we trust, aid in attaining the end aimed at by the author: the attention of politicians may thus be fixed upon the events that are occurring around them in connexion with this subject; and that England at last, whilst making enormous sacrifices to put an end to the Slave Trade on the coast of Africa, will also look *at home*, and mark with the public indignation, if she cannot punish them as criminals, those merchants of her own by whose means there take place annually “vast exports from Liverpool, London, and Bristol, of gunpowder, muskets, cutlasses, *shackles*, and

* See *Dublin Review*, No. xlvii. pp. 59, 60, Art. *Madden's History of the Penal Laws*.

spirits, that are sold at the slave-trading factories of Whydah, Bissaos, the Gallinas, and the Rio Pongos, exclusively for the commerce that is carried on in those places in slaves."

Dr. Madden does not now, for the first time, call attention to this anomalous iniquity too long tolerated by England, and the knowledge of which is so injurious to her abroad, and gives to her policy on this question a character for selfishness and hypocrisy, of which, in point of fact, the government and the people are alike innocent. It is well, however, that the crime should continue to be denounced, that the public should be warned respecting it; because in its increased notoriety may be found the most sure and certain means for its suppression.

ART. VI.—*A Catholic History of England.* By WILLIAM BERNARD MAC CABE. Part I. England: {Its Rulers, Clergy, and Poor, before the Reformation, as described by the Monkish Historians. Vol. ii. London: Newby, 1849.

THE "Catholic History of England," as originally projected, is a work of which these days of ephemeral literature can hardly be deemed worthy. Such a work should rather have fallen upon the times of Mabillon and Muratori, when a division of labour made the most gigantic enterprises easy; when D'Achery or Bouquet would have explored every literary storehouse in Europe for materials, and Montfaucon's ready pen would have digested and arranged them; above all, when, in the taste for solid learning which distinguished the scholars of the time, and the spirit of cordial co-operation which animated them, the work would have possessed a European interest, and have found purchasers in every city, and readers in every library, upon the continent, no less than at home. The author of the Catholic History has done all that perseverance and industry could accomplish. Two massive volumes have followed each other in rapid succession, and the third is announced for publication about the commencement of the coming year. Nevertheless, we are not surprised that, with all his industry and all his

enterprise, he has found the task in its original integrity too weighty for a single individual, especially when it only forms one of many laborious occupations; and that he has resolved to suspend his labours at the date of the Norman conquest, and confine the work to the History of England during the Anglo-Saxon period.

Indeed, the work, if completed upon the original plan, and in accordance with the scale adopted in the volumes before us, would have been voluminous enough to take its rank with the ponderous collections of the olden historians. The first volume, though it contains nearly eight hundred large octavo pages, cannot be said to comprise more than about two centuries of the history properly so called. The volume now upon our table extends over about one hundred and fifty years. The third is intended to contain about the same number; and as, from the time of the Norman conquest, the materials rapidly accumulate, and the interest in many respects may be said to increase, it will easily be believed, that at least a dozen such volumes would be required to carry down the monastic chronicles as far as the date of the Reformation.

We have already recorded our opinion as to the merits of the first volume of the Catholic History; and we do not hesitate to say that the present volume fully realizes all the anticipations then expressed. There is the same evidence of learning, research, and impartiality; the same care in the selection and arrangement of authorities; the same ease and simplicity in the style of translation; the same skill in combining the motley materials which compose the work, and in dovetailing them into each other so as to form them into one uniform narrative, or at least to make them all subordinate to one common end. And when the reader remembers the extent and variety of the sources from which the History comprised in these volumes is derived; when he considers that it is drawn not alone from the more condensed and compendious chronicles,—as the Saxon Chronicle, the Chronicle of Melrose, of Peterborough, of Durham, &c.; but that it includes every name among the ancient annalists of Britain, Asser, Ethelwerd, Ingulf, Bromton, Higden, Goscelin, Matthew Paris, Nicholas Trivet, Florence of Worcester, William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Roger de Hoveden, Roger de Wendover, William of Newbury; and is illustrated by frequent and copious references to the contem-

porary chronicles of other countries,—to the history of the Popes, to the annalists of France, to the Northern Sagas,—and by a vast variety of historical, ethnological, and even polemical learning, he will be better enabled to do justice to the labours of this most meritorious author.

The period embraced in the second volume affords from its very nature more room for historical and controversial criticism than the earlier epoch. Sharon Turner's *Anglo-Saxon History*, Laing's *Chronicle of the Kings of Norway*, Lappenberg's *Anglo-Saxon Kings*, and several other equally popular works have supplied abundant materials for stricture. That ever-watchful hostility to the Roman Church, which is the prevailing characteristic of these historians, has left many traces upon their history of the men, the events, the institutions, and the laws, as well as of the religion, of those times; and Mr. Mac Cabe, while he details the facts fearlessly and without disguise, in the words of the contemporary chronicler, has never failed to repel the unjust and illiberal inferences which are deduced from them.

The second volume comprises eleven reigns, commencing with that of King Ethelwulf, A.D. 836, and terminates with the death of King Edgar the Confessor, in 975. And an idea may be formed of the minuteness of the narrative, from the fact that the period which occupies this entire volume of nearly seven hundred pages, is dismissed by Hume in about sixty, and, even in Lingard, does not quite fill a hundred octavo pages. The history of each reign is told in a series of isolated extracts from the most interesting and authentic of the ancient historians who have treated of the period; but such are the skill and taste with which these unconnected fragments are combined together, that even the most fastidious must admit them to form, generally speaking, not alone a solid and instructive, but an orderly and agreeable narrative.

In weaving his various authorities together so as to form a connected history, the author, generally speaking, has confined himself to a single authority for each event. But the notes will be found almost always to contain a reference to several of the contemporary chroniclers; and wherever any important discrepancy occurs among the historians, or wherever a well-founded doubt has been suggested as to the credibility of the particular writer on whose evidence the fact is related, the author has seldom failed to discuss

the question fully and impartially. And thus, although in the many controversies regarding Anglo-Saxon times to which Dr. Lingard's history has given occasion, Mr. MacCabe has added little to the materials collected by the venerable father of Catholic history, yet he has himself originated several interesting discussions; and even in those which are not new, his annotations will generally be found to contain, at least, a useful *resumé* of what has previously been written upon the subject.

We do not mean to enter here into any discussion as to the merits of the plan on which the Catholic History of England is compiled. It is plain that a history not merely founded on the narratives of the original historians, but related in the very language which they employed, should, in itself, possess a larger measure of their authority, than any mere compilation derived from a digest of their collective statements. And, if the selection of original authorities be judicious and impartial; if all the really important events which they contain be fairly and fearlessly put forward; if, after due examination of the conflicting accounts which occasionally present themselves, the best and most probable be uniformly adopted, irrespectively of every bias of party or of creed, and with an utter and habitual disregard of its bearings upon these interests;—it is impossible to deny the advantages of the plan, or to underrate its value. But it cannot be doubted, on the other hand, that there are few minds sufficiently unbiassed to acquit themselves with entire impartiality of the responsibility which it imposes. Few men, under the influence of general preconceived views, (and it is hardly possible, if it were indeed desirable, to find a man without such views,) can shut their eyes to the bearing upon these views which the statements of two conflicting authors irresistibly present. With a knowledge of these bearings, it is very hard to avoid even an unconscious leaning towards that which is favourable to one's own opinions. And when the license assumed by the compiler extends to the selection of facts and events, as well as of authorities, the temptation to use it for the interests of party is proportionably increased. It is impossible, therefore, to deny the existence and the amount of the danger thus involved in the author's plan. But we think it will be found that he has successfully avoided it; and that his History presents a fair and impartial picture of the times, such as they presented themselves to the minds of

the writers upon whom his narrative is founded. We do not mean to say that it would not, perhaps, be possible to draw up from the very same writers, and that, too, in the very words which they themselves employed, an entirely different picture of the same period; to throw all its better characteristics into the shade; and, by a judicious selection of original authorities, with occasional omissions and mutilations, to represent it as a period of barbarism, irreligion, and crime, scarcely redeemed by a single countervailing quality. We will even admit that it might not, perhaps, be necessary, in order to effect all this, to falsify a single quotation, or to fabricate a single authority. Still, it is equally certain that an attempt such as this, however it might for a moment deceive the unlearned and unenquiring, would meet with speedy and signal discomfiture. It could not long bear the ordeal to which the author's full, clear, and satisfactory system of references has subjected the Catholic History. And indeed, at the worst, it is plain that the charge of liability to fraud and dishonesty on the part of the compiler of such a history, applies with equal, or, in truth, with far greater, force to the ordinary historian, who compiles his history from the very same authorities, with this additional temptation to dishonesty, that he is exempt from the obligation of producing the words of the authorities themselves.

Mr. Mac Cabe, however, seems to have used the privileges of his position with a most impartial hand. Where he has, as sometimes occurs, omitted a statement which rests upon any ancient authority, or has adopted, upon the credit of one witness, an account of an event which is contravened by some of the other writers of the time, he has not failed to state distinctly, in his notes, the grounds upon which he has ventured to take this course; and if the reader is, in this way, occasionally deprived of a pleasant story from Roger of Wendover, or an amusing piece of scandal from William of Malmesbury,* he has at all events the means of judging for himself whether this has been done upon sufficient motives; and, at the worst, can gratify his curiosity by following the ample references to the original which he will never fail to meet in the margin.

* See pp. 350, 550, 551, &c.

Upon these points, however, we shall not dwell further, and in a former notice of the Catholic History we have explained our views upon other questions which may possibly suggest themselves. It only remains, therefore, that we endeavour to give a brief account of the general tenor and contents of the present volume. Among the reigns whose history it comprises, the first which will occur as a subject of interest, will, of course, be that of the great King Alfred, which is, in every respect, the most interesting in the volume. It is told, for the most part, in the language of his biographer, Asser. His text is occasionally interspersed with passages from Roger of Wendover, William of Malmesbury, and the Saxon Chronicle. But the main body of the history is told in the words of Asser's *Life of Alfred*, and a delightful old biography it is.*

The leading facts of the life of this great christian king are sufficiently familiar, even to those who possess but a very superficial acquaintance with early English history. But we must own that to us they have a fresh charm in the simple narrative of the old historian. What can be more beautiful, for example, than the following details of the private life of Alfred?

“Meanwhile the king, although entangled in many wars, embarrassed by the ever-recurring difficulties of his position, with the invasions of Pagans to repel, the daily infirmities of his body to endure, and the entire government of a kingdom to control, to check, and to superintend, did still contrive not merely to see that all matters pertaining to the chace were attended to, but he also saw that those who had the care of his falcons, his hawks, and his hounds, performed their duty, and when occasion required, taught them how to do it—and not only did he teach them, but also his goldsmiths, and all other kinds of artisans, so that he was able to erect, and in accordance with his own plans and contrivance, edifices which far exceed those of his predecessors in design, in grandeur, and in execution. And doing these things he was unceasing in his study of Saxon works, and especially endeavoured to commit

* We may mention, for the information of our non-antiquarian readers, that Asser's *Life of Alfred* is one of the “Six Old English Chronicles” published by Bohn in his *Antiquarian Library*. The authenticity of this most interesting biography was called in question by Wright in his *Biographia Literaria Anglo-Saxonica*. But Dr. Lingard, in the recent edition of his “*Anglo-Saxon Church*,” has fully vindicated it against these objections. See Lingard, ii. 424-8.

to memory Saxon poems; whilst he enjoined upon others that as a duty, which he to the utmost of his powers performed as a task. He was too most diligent in his devotions—he daily heard mass, recited psalms and prayers, the holy hours and nocturns—and even in the night time, and without the knowledge of his attendants, was in the habit of visiting churches, in order that he might, in such places, offer up his pious aspirations. He was so bounteous in his alms-giving, that he might be considered, in his bestowal of them, as animated with an intense love for the helpless amongst his own subjects, and the destitute of all nations. He who was distinguished by a matchless affability and pleasantness in demeanour to all who came within his presence, was also a ceaseless inquirer into all matters that appeared strange, or had previously been unknown to him.

“Many Franks, Fresons, Gauls, Pagans, Welsh, Scots, and Armoricans—men of high ranks, as well as of low degree, adopted him as their sovereign lord; and all were treated by him as if they were his own countrymen; each and all according to their respective stations, were loved, honoured, enriched, exalted.

“He was untiringly attentive to the reading of the Divine Scriptures, whether that task were performed by persons of his own land, or, if it should so chance, that they were expounded to him by foreigners, and he was alike eager and solicitous to unite with them in prayer.

“His bishops, as well as all who were in holy orders; his ealdormen and his thanes; his public officers and his personal attendants he loved, with an exceeding great love. Even their children who were nurtured with the royal family, he bestowed on them as much affectionate tenderness as if they were his own offspring; for he never ceased to bestow his care in having them imbued with virtuous principles, and well instructed in letters.”—pp. 222–5.

Even the oft-told tale of Alfred's studies is placed in new light by the monkish biographer.

“Thus did he pass his time, and yet it was, as if he found no consolation in all these things; or as if no outward calamity and no inward grief could afflict him; and all this because of a single sorrow, for which he prayed to the Lord, and with respect to which he alone sighed and complained to those who were on the most affectionate terms of friendly intimacy with him. The single sorrow was this, that the Almighty God had been pleased to make him ignorant of Divine wisdom, and of the liberal arts. And in so thinking he might be likened unto the pious, most famous, and most wealthy Solomon, king of the Jews, who, despising temporal glory and riches, asked God alone for wisdom, and so asking obtained both wisdom and temporal glory, as it is written, ‘Seek ye therefore first the kingdom, and his justice, and all these things

shall be added unto you.' But God, who is the ever attentive watcher of the very innermost recesses of the mind, and of its meditations, and at the same time the Inspirer of its virtuous inclinations, nay, Who is also the bountiful Dispenser of pious desires; and Who never has instigated any one to wish for that which was good, and that it would be right and just to concede to him, Who has not bountifully bestowed it; thus also inspired the mind of Alfred, interiorly, and not by exterior circumstances, or as the Scripture expresses it, 'I will hear what the Lord God will speak in me.' That which he wanted was to have those who could aid him in carrying out the object of his pious meditation—who might assist him in gaining the wisdom he desired to possess, and in attaining the knowledge of which he longed to be the master. The course that he pursued was that of a sagacious bee, which, springing from its tiny cherished cell in the summer's earliest dawn, wings its rapid flight through the unknown pathless regions of the air, seeks out the flowers, however numerous and different they may be, whether of plant, or shrub, or tree, tries the flavour of each, and brings back to its hive that alone which is the most sweet and the most odorous. Thus did king Alfred: he cast his views abroad—he sought exteriorly, for that which he had not interiorly—that is within his own kingdom. And God was then pleased to afford some consoling assistance to the benevolent desires of the king—as if his kindly and well founded complaint were no longer to remain unattended to—for there were sent to the king those who might be esteemed as great lights of learning. For instance, Heaven sent to king Alfred, Werefrith, bishop of Worcester, a clergyman thoroughly informed in Divine learning, and who, at the desire of the king, translated for the first time from Latin into the Saxon language the books of dialogues of Pope Gregory and his disciple Peter—a work in which the sense and meaning conveyed in one language were clearly and elegantly rendered into another. The next person that came was Plegmund, the archbishop of Canterbury, by birth a Mercian, a truly venerable and wise man. The next were Athelstan and Werwulf, priests and chaplains, both Mercians and both great scholars.

"These four were invited by Alfred to come from Mercia, and all were exalted by him in the kingdom of the West Saxons to the highest honours and privileges it was in the power of a monarch to bestow—they had from him all things, and we may even include in these Plegmund's archiepiscopal and Werefreth's episcopal titles in Mercia. In their society, the desire of the king for the possession of wisdom and learning seemed as incessantly to increase, as it was constantly gratified. Day and night, whenever he could spare a moment from his other indispensable duties, he had these to read out of books for him. He was never unaccompanied by some one amongst them, and hence it came to pass that he gained a knowledge of all kinds of books, although thus unaided he could not

comprehend them, for there were some of them that he had not yet learned how to read.

“In the acquisition of learning he exhibited a right royal, most commendable, and ever grateful spirit of avarice—he sought to accumulate his knowledge by every fair and just means, and he sent, amongst other places, ambassadors to France to procure teachers. From thence it was that he invited Grimbald, the priest and monk—a person eminently entitled to veneration—a perfect master of singing—most learned in every species of ecclesiastical discipline as well as of the Holy Scriptures—a man too adorned with every virtue. There was also amongst those teachers a monk and priest named John, an individual possessing a particularly acute mind, most accomplished in all kinds of literature, and thoroughly skilled in a vast variety of arts. By means of these the wisdom of the king was increased, his knowledge enlarged, and his mind accomplished, whilst his teachers were endowed with great power, and enriched with splendid gifts.”—pp. 225–30.

So also his administration of justice.

“For the sake alike of those of noble as well as of ignoble rank, king Alfred endeavoured by a diligent study to ascertain what were the proper judgments that ought to be delivered in each particular case; because it very frequently happened that in their assemblies, the ealdormen, thanes and reeves obstinately quarrelled with each other, as to the fitting doom that should be pronounced; so much so that scarcely one amongst them could be found to concede as true and proper, that which had been adjudged to be so by the other ealdormen, and thanes and reeves. Such obstinate, such pertinacious dissensions rendered it necessary that each case should be submitted to the judgment of the king—and such judgment every party was willing to aid to its due fulfilment. The man, however, who had done wrong, who was conscious that there was injustice in his plea, was not willing that it should be submitted to the decision of a judge like Alfred, and was alone by the force and stress of law to be coerced to an appeal to a tribunal, which voluntarily he never would have approached; for he well knew that his iniquity, whatever it might have been, would speedily be laid bare, because there it never could be concealed. Nor is it to be wondered at that such should be the case; for in the enforcement of his dooms, as in everything else that he did, Alfred was a careful enquirer and a diligent watcher. He enquired with equal sagacity and anxiety into all the judgments that were delivered in his absence—he ascertained what they were—made sure whether they were just or unjust; and if he discovered any want of equity in the decrees pronounced, he summoned in a friendly spirit the judges who had delivered them before him, and either by his own personal interrogatories, or through those put by his ministers on

whose fidelity he could rely, he penetrated to the cause, or reason, why a wrongful decision had been given—whether it originated in ignorance, or was attributable to malevolence—whether it was traceable to favour for, a fear of, malice against others, or that it had sprung out of a sordid cupidity for money.

“If those who were judges admitted that they had given improper decisions, because they were incompetent to know what was right, and what equitable in the complaints that came before them, then he with wisdom, with discretion, and with moderation, rebuked them for their want of sense, or want of knowledge, addressing them in some such words as these:—‘I do, in sooth, marvel at thy presumption, in taking upon thyself an office—emanating from God, and conferred by me—that office being one which requires knowledge and wisdom; whilst at the same time thou hast neglected the study of the one, and the attainment of the other. I command thee at once to resign those privileges and territorial possessions, which by reason of that office have been conferred upon thee, or devote thyself earnestly and diligently to the acquisition of that wisdom, which must first be mastered by thyself, before thou art fitted to impart it to others.’

“Such language as this filled with terror those to whom it was addressed—such a rebuke was regarded as a severe punishment, and it acted with all the force of a penalty upon ealdormen, thanes, and reeves, who thenceforth devoted themselves with all the energies of their minds and bodies to the study of all that might aid them in the propounding of equitable decisions. It was wonderful to see men who, though holding the highest offices and rank, had been illiterate from their childhood, now commencing, in the maturity of their years, literary studies. The reason for their doing so was this, that they preferred, whatever was the cost, the toil, and the trouble, to submit to a course of discipline, which however personally disagreeable, or difficult to attain, was still less grating to their feelings than the abandonment of power they had hitherto exercised, or the resignation of offices which they had previously possessed. And if there were amongst these great men, one who either from his advanced years, or from the total disuse of his faculties in the acquirement of knowledge, felt himself to be utterly incapable of undergoing the toil of study, then he employed his own son, or if not his son, a relation, or if not a relation, a man of his own, a free man, or else *one of his slaves, whom he had because of his literary capacity previously promoted to the rank of a free man*, in order that such person, whenever he had any spare time, might read aloud books for him in the Anglo Saxon language. Often and often was such a great man heard to sigh, and express aloud his deep and heart-felt grief, that he had not in his youth devoted himself to literary studies—declaring that the young men in Alfred's reign were to be regarded as truly fortunate, because they had the opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of every liberal

science; whilst on the contrary, those like himself were to be looked upon as truly unhappy, because in their youth they had not been taught, and because in their old age, however vehement was their desire, they were incapable of learning."—pp. 250-6.

The education of his children is detailed with equal simplicity. The son, Ethelward, was educated in common with the children of the nobility, and some even of humbler rank. In the school where they were taught in common, "books in both languages, the Saxon and the Latin, were read with great assiduity." Edward and Elfrith were brought up within the precincts of the court. They "won the love of all, strangers as well as their countrymen, by their humility, affability, and meekness; and whilst they acquired those things which were indispensable for their high position, they were not permitted to pass by inattentively or idly that which might be esteemed book-learning or intellectual proficiency. Psalms, and Saxon books and Saxon poems especially, were studiously learned by them, sometimes by oral recitation, but most frequently by written works."

We cannot pass by the original of the well-known anecdote of the "burnt cakes."

"One day it happened, that the neatherd, according to his usual custom, proceeded to drive the swine of which he had charge to their usual place of pasturage, leaving the king and his wife alone in his hut. Upon this day, it chanced that the wife of the rustic had placed some cakes of bread at the fire to be baked. The king was sitting close to the fire, and preparing for use a bow, arrows, and other warlike weapons, when this unhappy woman perceiving that her cakes at the fire were getting burnt, ran in a great hurry, moved them away, rebuked the invincible king, and said to him:—'Oh! what a man thou art!

Canst set and see the bread burn thus (thou sot)
And canst not turn what thou so well lov'st hot.'

This shrewish woman little thought she thus spoke to king Alfred, who had waged so many wars against the Pagans, and had won so many victories from them."—pp. 190-1.

Our countrymen in the days of King Alfred appear to have been distinguished by the same love of enterprise as they are now. It displayed itself even in their acts of piety.

"In the year 891, three Irishmen, Dusblan, Mahbeth, and Mulinin, desirous to devote their lives to God as pilgrims, deter-

mined to abandon their native land. This project was secretly carried into execution by them, and in this manner. They supplied themselves with provisions for a week, and then having constructed for themselves a leathern boat (a corricle) which was made of two hides and a half, in this they, without oars or a sail, committed themselves to the sea, where they were tossed about for seven days, and finally were drifted upon the coast of Cornwall. From thence they proceeded to the king Alfred. By this sovereign they were graciously received, and from his court they travelled to Rome—thus imitating the example of so many other pious persons. From Rome, it was their determination to proceed on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.”—pp. 258–9.

The author dwells at considerable length upon the accounts given by the monastic historians of the long series of Danish invasions, of the numberless battles which were fought, and of the cruelties and atrocities which almost invariably accompanied the success of the stranger. Some of these narratives are exceedingly graphic and picturesque, as, for example, the following from Ingulf.

“A few young men, from Sutton and Gedency, cast away their arms, and with difficulty saved themselves in the adjoining forest. From thence they emerged on the following night, to carry to Croyland monastery intelligence of the defeat of the Christians, of the death of brother Toli, and of the destruction of all his followers. The abbot, Theodore, and his monks, were engaged in the prayers appointed for the morning vigil, when the clamorous cries and the dismal howling of the fugitives announced their arrival at the doors of the church.

“All were cast into a state of confusion by this intelligence. The abbot determined upon retaining with himself in the monastery, the aged monks, and a few of the young boys, hoping that perchance, the helplessness of both might excite the commiseration of the barbarians; but in so doing, forgetting that which has been said by the poet;

‘Nor faith, nor pity moves the heart of him
Whose home’s a camp, and who lives by war.’

“All the monks who were in the vigour of life, as well as the younger men attached to the monastery, took with them the sacred relics of the monastery; amongst these were the most blessed body of St. Guthlac, the Saint’s Discipline and Psalter, with some of the principal jewels and documents, such as the charter of its foundation by King Ethelbald, the subsequent confirmations of the charter by different kings, and some of the donations of King Wiglaf. The monks who carried these with them, were desired by the abbot to betake themselves to the adjoining marshes, and there

await the event of the war. The monks, to the great grief of their hearts, obeyed these commands. They stowed a boat with the above mentioned relics, and with the memorials of former kings. The slab of the high altar, which was covered with plates of gold, and had been presented to the monastery by King Wiglaf, ten goblets, with hand-basins, foot-baths, dishes, tankards, and other brazen vessels, were cast into the cloister well, where all were concealed, with the exception of the altar-slab, an end of which, on account of its extreme length, appearing above the surface of the water. It thus became necessary again to remove this altar-slab; but whilst extracting it from the well, the monks perceived the fires bursting out from the village of Kesteven, gradually approaching, and thereby denoting the advance of the pagans. Fearful of the instant arrival of the Danes, they were sent away by the abbots and the senior members of the monastery. The fugitives hurried off with their little vessel, and arrived at the wood of Ancarrig, which is close to the south of the island. There they remained, to the number of thirty, (ten of them being priests, and the others in minor orders), for four days with brother Toret, who passed his life in that spot as an anchorite.

“Meanwhile the abbot, with two of the old monks, carried the altar-slab outside the church, to the north of which they concealed it in the earth, but where or in what place no one has ever since been able to discover. The abbot and all the remaining monks then arrayed themselves in their vestments, and assembling together in the choir, they said the regular prayers of the Divine office, and afterwards recited the entire Psalter of David. The lord abbot next celebrated high mass, with brother Elget serving as deacon, and brother Savin as sub-deacon, whilst the acolytes were the brothers Egelred and Wlric. The mass had been finished, and the abbot, with his attendant priests, partaken of communion, when the pagans burst into the church, and at once, and by the hand of the cruel King Osketul, the venerable abbot was slain on the holy altar—a true martyr! a victim to Christ was he thus immolated! whilst all the ministering priests were beheaded by the barbarians. The young and the old men, in attempting to fly from the choir, were laid hold of, and again and again subjected to the most bitter tortures, for the purpose of compelling them to discover where the church treasures were concealed. Sir Asker, the prior, was killed in the vestry, Sir Lethvyn, the sub-prior, was cut down in the refectory. He had been followed thither by brother Tugar, who was then but a child ten years of age, and remarkable for the beauty of his face and form. When the boy saw his beloved old man thus slain, he eagerly prayed that he might die along with him, and be put to death in the same manner. But the jarl Sidroc, the younger, moved with pity for the boy, stripped him of his monk's cowl, which he replaced with a Danish hood, and then desired him to follow his footsteps whithersoever he went. Thus was

this boy, of all the old and the young that had remained in the monastery, the only one that had been spared—coming in and going out, amongst the Danes, the entire time that he stayed, as if he were one of themselves, and all this through the favour and protection of the before mentioned jarl.”—pp. 107–10.

The object, however, which the author proposed to himself in dwelling upon the history of the Danish invasion, is not merely the historical interest which attaches to these and other similar details. It is to disprove, by contemporary evidence, the assertion made by Mr. Laing in his “Chronicles of the Kings of Norway,” that the resistance which the small piratical bands of Danes and Northmen encountered in England was trifling; and that this fact is a convincing proof of “the abject state of the mass of the old christianized Anglo-Saxons;” and an evidence that, “the spirit, character, and natural vigour of the old Anglo-Saxon branch of the people had become extinct *under the influence and pressure of the Church of Rome upon the energies of the human mind.*” Mr. Laing does not hesitate to ascribe the superior enterprise and energy of the northern pagans to their having been hitherto exempt from that debasing and enervating influence of the Roman Church, under which their enemies, once as vigorous in character as themselves, had unhappily fallen; and so far is he carried by this strange and almost unaccountable prejudice, as to yield to the Northmen a decided superiority over the Anglo-Saxon Christians in literary and intellectual activity, no less than in the ruder arts of war. “It might be surmised,” he writes, “by a philosophic reader of the history of those times, that all the vigorous action and energy of mind of those barbarous Danes or Northmen, could not be showing itself only in deeds of enterprise abroad, and that some of it must be expending itself at home, and in other arts and uses than those of a predatory warfare. It will not, at least, surprise such a reader that some of this mental power was applied, at home, in attempts, however rude, at history and poetry; but he will be surprised to find that *those attempts surpass, both in quality and quantity, all that can be produced of Anglo-Saxon literature during the same ages, either in the Anglo-Saxon language or in the Latin.*” (vol. i. p. 15.) Nothing can be more complete than Mr. Mac Cabe’s refutation of this strange and unaccountable

statement. The writer whose prejudices could blind him to such an extent as this silly paradox would imply, deserves that he should be subjected to the punishment which is best suited to the lover of paradox, by being compelled to the ignominy of refuting himself. Mr. Laing is made to do this, and with the most signal effect.

“The reader will observe that the period of history at which we are now arrived is approaching the close of the ninth century; and that previous to that period there had been the Anglo-Saxon poet Cædmon—a considerable body of Anglo-Saxon literature,—that amongst the Latin poets were Aldhelm, Bede, Boniface, Leobgitha, Cena, Ethelwald, Alcuin—that amongst the historians and scholars, whose writings are still read with pleasure, were Gildas, Nennius, Aldhelm, Bede, Boniface, Eddius, Alcuin, Asser. And with these we must bear in mind, not only the mass of Saxon literature destroyed by the Danes, but that Saxon manuscripts were diligently sought after by the Normans for the purpose of being destroyed. See Preface to PETER LANGTOF'S *Chronicle*, § 8, pp. xxix, xxx.

“During all this period of time, what was the amount of literature possessed by the Northmen? Mr. Laing himself shall answer the question. ‘*Until the beginning of the 12th century,*’ he says, it was ‘*an oral not a written literature.*’ (*Chronicle of the Kings of Norway*, vol. i. p. 27.) And so far were the Northmen, as he has asserted, (vol. i. p. 15,) from being engaged in literature whilst carrying on a predatory warfare, that it is not until that horrid practice fell into disrepute, that they commenced having anything deserving of a name of literature. Mr. Laing thus proves both these points:—

“‘It is known that in the 12th century Are, Frode, Sæmund, and others began to take their sagas out of the traditionary state and fix them in writing.’ (Vol. i. p. 24.)

“‘The last piratical expeditions were about the end of the 12th century.’ (Vol. i. p. 112.)

“But as to the literature itself of these Northmen, which Mr. Laing (vol. i. p. 15,) declares surpasses ‘both in quality and quantity, all the writings of Bede, of Alcuin, Aldhelm, Boniface and Cædmon, not to mention a single author during the ninth and succeeding centuries, let us see what he himself says of *that*, which he affirms is *so superior* to ‘all that can be produced of Anglo Saxon literature!’

“The curious assertion is made by Mr. Laing; and he has, in the following passages, had the kindness to afford a most satisfactory refutation to it. This is his own description of the literature of the Northmen:—

“‘The extraordinary metaphors and mythological allusions, the epithets so long-winded and obscure, the never-ending imagery of

wolves glutted, and ravens feasted by the deeds of the warriors, arise evidently from the necessity imposed on the scald of finding alliteratives, and conforming to the other strict rules of their versification. The beauty of this artificial construction is lost even upon the best Icelandic scholars of our times; and it appears to have been the only beauty, many of these pieces of poetry ever pretended to, for the ideas so expressed are not often in any way poetical.' (Vol. i. p. 208.)

“ ‘It will not escape the observation of the English reader that in the ideas there is a very tedious monotony in the descriptions of battles and bloodshed, in the imagery of war, in the epithets applied to the warriors and kings; and in general, there is a want of sentiment or feeling. The spirit is altogether material.’ (Vol. i. p. 210.)

“ ‘Torfæus, who was himself an Icelander, and was unquestionably the first of northern antiquarians, declares that much of the scaldic poetry is so obscure, that *no meaning at all can be twisted out of it by the most intense study.*’ (Vol. i. p. 206.)

“ Thus it is that Mr. Laing refutes himself! his assertions are contradicted by his facts—and these facts are irrespective of others of which he is not aware: for when he declared, that the Icelandic scalds have produced a greater impression upon the literature of Europe, than any of the Anglo Saxon writers (vol. i. p. 64), he seems to have been utterly unconscious, that the composition of one of them, the humblest, and the poorest of all, the herdsman-monk, Cædmon, constitutes what may be regarded as the groundwork of the noblest poem in any language, Milton's ‘Paradise Lost,’ (see TURNER'S *History of the Anglo Saxons*, vol. iii. pp. 314, 324.)

“ We have dwelt at much length upon this point; but when an able writer like Mr. Laing, lends his talents to the propagation of error, he is worthy at least of refutation, *in his own words.* He attacks the ancient writers of England, because they were monks; and we have desired to shew that their fame could be vindicated, even by the admissions of their assailant, who having first disparaged the priests of Christianity, and attempted to prove that they were inferior to the pagan scalds, at last, under the pressure of an undeniable truth, is compelled to acknowledge that when the two came in contact, the scald had to give way to the superior learning, abilities, and genius of the catholic clergyman.

“ ‘Before the introduction of Christianity, and with Christianity the use of written documents, and the diffusion by the church establishment, of writing in every locality, the scald must have been among the pagan landowners what the parish priest and his written record were in the older christianized countries of Europe. * * * The scalds of the north disappeared at once when christian priests were established through the country. They were superseded in their utility by men of education, who knew the art of writing; and the country had no feudal barons to maintain such a

class for amusement only. We hear little of the scalds after the first half of the 12th century.' (Vol. i. p. 51.)

"This is a most important admission; for it shews first, that the Northmen, as pagans, had, previous to the establishment of Christianity, nothing deserving of the name of literature; secondly, that with the spread of Christianity came the first attempts at taking the sagas out of the traditional state, and fixing them in writing, (see vol. i. p. 24); and thirdly, that with the extending influence of the Roman Catholic priesthood, we can identify the decline of piracy, and the destruction of domestic slavery.

"'The last piratical expeditions were about the end of the 12th century, and in the following century, *thralldom or slavery was*, it is understood, *abolished* by law, by Magnus the law improver.' (LAING'S *Chronicle of the Kings of Norway*, vol. i. p. 112.)

"We shall add but one more observation upon the literary merits of the Anglo Saxons, as compared with the Northmen, and that observation is taken from a writer, remarkable for his anti-catholic prejudices.

"'The pen has ever triumphed over the sword, the olive over the laurel, mental culture over barbarian violence; written language always prevails over unwritten, and even the *home of the Northmen is indebted for its alphabetic writing to the Anglo Saxons.*' LAPPENBURG'S *Anglo Saxon Kings*, vol. ii. p. 15. (Translated by THORPE.)"—pp. 151-4.

We shall not weary the reader with any observations upon the manners, laws, and institutions of the period comprised in the volume before us. Dr. Lingard's profound and interesting work has made them familiar to every student of the history of ancient England. But we cannot help referring even the cursory reader to the short and simple abstracts of the laws of Alfred, (280), of Edward the Elder, (332-9), of Athelstan, (421-6,) and of Edgar, (622-8), which the monastic writers have left. They are at once an interesting monument of the manners and usages of the times, and a satisfactory evidence, that through all the simplicity, and, we may add, barbarism of the period, the saving and hallowing influence of Christianity never failed to be felt in every relation of life, public as well as private; and that, notwithstanding Mr. Laing's peremptory and unhesitating assertion, it is almost exclusively to this salutary influence of the Church that Anglo-Saxon England owes her best institutions, and the precious constitution of modern England, its happiest inheritance of rights, of privileges, and of laws.

We would gladly transcribe, as an illustration of the

manners of the times, and, at all events, as an example of the notions then entertained of what should be the leading elements of the character of a christian, the charming accounts of Oswald, of Dunstan, of Swithin, of Abbo, of Fleury, of the Chancellor Turketul, and many other eminent ecclesiastics. But we have already exceeded our proposed limits, and we shall close, in preference, with a picture which may appear strange in these degenerate times,—a Lord Chancellor retiring from the world, and closing his days in a monastery. Few modern chancellors, we fear, will be found to imitate Turketul, the chancellor of the good king Edred.

“This pious king perceived that the holy desire expressed by Turketul daily acquired strength, and fearing that opposition might destroy this pious soul;—for Edred was a monarch remarkable for a conscience which excelled in purity that of his predecessors;—he one day called Turketul into his private chamber, and there throwing himself at the feet of him, who was his own subject, he with tears supplicated and adjured the chancellor that he should not abandon his king in times of tribulation and perplexity.

“The chancellor seeing his lord and master, the king, in fact, of all England, on the earth, and at his feet, cast himself upon the ground, and kneeling, besought of his sovereign to have pity upon him. With deep sighs, with loud sobs, and with abundant tears he entreated Edred to accede to his wish, and he even besought that he would do so as he venerated St. Paul, a saint to whom the king had a special devotion. Thus praying, and thus adjuring his sovereign, he at last obtained the assent for which he had so long sought in vain.

“Both rose from the ground. They appointed a day on which they should go to Croyland together, and when the holy vow might be carried into effect, in a manner the most befitting, and the most becoming for a chancellor to make, and his sovereign to sanction.

“Only a few days had elapsed from the time that the king had given his assent to Turketul's becoming a monk, when the venerable chancellor caused a proclamation to be made by the mouth of a herald through the streets of London, that if any person considered that any thing was due to him, the chancellor was prepared on a certain day, at a certain place, to pay that person the full amount of whatever he claimed; and it was moreover declared, that if at any time he had done injury to any person, he promised to pay a compensation to treble the amount of the damage he might have done—thus acting like another Zaccheus, satisfying every exigency of justice, and indemnifying, beyond the amount which human tribunals would accord, every damage that had been inflicted.

“When all creditors and claimants had been satisfied, he bestowed upon the king his lord, his sixty manors—reserving, however, in perpetuity, every tenth manor for his Lord Jesus Christ. Of the sixty manors he possessed, he reserved six—these were the manors most closely adjoining to Croyland; viz., Wendlingborough, Elmyngton, Worthorp, Rotenham, Hokyngton, and Beby. All the rest were given by him to the king.”—pp. 479–81.

What a contrast with the retiring pension and peerage wherewith our chancellors are wont, now-a-days, to console their learned leisure! Only think of Lord Lyndhurst resigning his seat at Wimbledon Common, and his town house in George St., Hanover square, into the hands of “the king his beloved lord;” or of Lord Brougham sending a herald through the streets, to proclaim to all whom it might concern, and especially to the unlucky suitors in his Court of Chancery, that he would “pay compensation to treble the amount of the damage he had done!”

But we must have done; and, in conclusion, we cannot help expressing a hope that the purpose conveyed in the preface, of bringing the work to a close at the end of another volume, may, even yet, be abandoned. The period which would still remain, is more important, if it be not more interesting, than what has already been written; and it is a period in which the monastic historians are especially valuable as witnesses. Nevertheless, if the author should persist in his resolution, the public will, even still, have reason to be deeply grateful for what he has accomplished; and his work, though not realizing all that had been originally intended, will, notwithstanding, be a complete and independent book:—the *Monastic History of England during the Anglo-Saxon times.*

ART. VII.—*The Supplement to the Times.*

THERE is nothing, however mean and contemptible in itself, which does not become either wonderful or terrible when it appears on a gigantic scale. Drops of water make a deluge, grains of sand make moving mountains, and puffs of wind make a hurricane. And to a hurricane have those once gentle puffs come, which of old used

blandly to fan the stroller's sense as he walked the streets, or greet the traveller as he approached the British metropolis. Those were the quiet, lazy days of advertizing, when it partook of the monumental character, and a quarter-of-a-mile of park wall was only sufficient to deploy the long, sea-serpentlike announcement of one single commodity. How associated is the remembrance of those slowly-trailing words with scenes now passed away! As morning broke upon the chilled and sleepy outsides of the coach, on the great north or the Bath road, they needed not to ask if they were approaching London. It was not the long avenue of poplars, no less sleepy than themselves, as it might have been in France, nor the drawbridges and palisades of a strong place, as in Flanders, nor the long line of announcements of *Salons de 100 couverts, ici on loge à pied et à cheval, Noces et festins*, that flanks every entrance to Paris, which formed the out-posts of the mighty city. It was the alternating defiances that passed from one side of the road to the other, between "Day and Martin" of the one side, and "Warren" of the other. To a foreigner it must have seemed that the first, the only thing one had to do on reaching London, and scrambling down the side of the top-heavy vehicle, was to run to one or the other of these rival emporiums, and provide oneself with blacking. And all this is now a dream! coaches and travellers, and those huge uncial, or rather cubital letters in white upon the wall, which those that ran might read, of which, however, as yet a fragment here and there remains, over which you may sigh, as over a defaced inscription of the Pharaohs. And as the cheery tenor of the guard's bugle has *trebled* into the shrill shriek of the steam-whistle, and the stamping of the mettlesome team has changed into the iron rattle of the furious driving-wheel, and all this is but one form and kind of puff; so has the ancient quiet advertisement, which is another kind, multiplied and swelled, and surged and roared, till it threatens to take society by storm, and to invade every peaceful nook, as well as every public thoroughfare. It is creeping up the columns of our newspapers, as an encroaching sea, gradually absorbing them like those of the temple of Pozzuoli; till a supplement will soon be wanted to contain the news.

Yes, indeed, things have changed their face not a little since those quiet old times. Advertizing is no such a

calm, stagnant matter now as then. Instead of the traveller moving, and having time to spell the portentous announcement while the team went at full speed, the advertisements have acquired life, motion, activity; they come before you, they defy you to miss them, they impertinently stare you in the face, they stop you as you attempt to cross the street, they pass athwart you like Macbeth's ghosts, all looking alike, and all saying the same thing. See that huge van which stops the way. You cannot help staying and looking up. What does it say? "It tells me that to-night is Jullien's last night but fifteen. What is that to me?" But before you can cross there comes another, and another, and another, slowly, deliberately before you, impeding your path, and compelling you to read each time the same important communication. Now what does this mean? Why simply that M. Jullien is fully resolved that you, and every one who may have as little music in his soul as you, and who has no more desire than you to have the drum of his ear drummed out of his head by colossal *grandes caisses*, nor blown out by Titan ophycleids, still shall know, in spite of yourselves, that M. Jullien's concerts are going on daily *diminuendo*, and that he will honour and favour the public only fifteen times more; and he is determined, that you shall have no excuse of ignorance for not accepting the honour at his hands, and that if you are barbarian enough not to value it, at least its thought shall cross your path waking, and haunt you sleeping; for surely you will dream of those enormous vans, as in hideous nightmare they drag themselves over your chest. Some time ago a huge red hat, almost large enough for a conclave to be held in, used to parade the streets; not long since there was a sort of "revolver" on a cart, which fired off a new advertisement at you at each turn of its barrel. Tom Thumb was announced on a gigantic scale, while Signor Pancrazio Gambalunga, the Calabrian Goliah, should he come over, may never get beyond a biped placard. And even this is no joke, either for the living form that animates it, or for the wayfarer that encounters it. Sometimes the animal, or sensitive and locomotive, portion of the advertisement, is as safely ensconced in a quadrilateral, well-angularized shell, as any of the crustacea, and may walk in perfect safety through the most crowded thoroughfare, unmindful of knocks, and with all the chances of giving them on its

side. Like a hollow square at Waterloo, it presents the front and face of its offending on every side, up the street and down the street, towards the house, or towards the carriages. Next in the scale comes the genus, which, like a *Janus bifrons*, presents only two faces; the other being manifestly the *Janus quadrifrons*; the living portion, as in other bivalves, being not so well secured against aggression. Like a herald in his tabard, emblazoned before and behind with portentous representations; or like an unfortunate culprit in the east, screwed down between two boards, ready to be sawn through with them, the unhappy being parades the edge of the pavement, and, in addition to the weight, suffers the intolerable torment of hearing himself read on both sides, in the same manner, the entire day. The next is the mere *signifer*, or standard-bearer, who, armed with a huge placard on the top of a pole, seems to consider it the perfection of his avocation so to carry it poised upon his shoulder, as that one side can only be read from the garret, and the other from the gutter. But woe to the foot-passenger, should rival tea-marts or conflicting bonnet-emporiums have sent forth their skirmishers so armed, to warn every passer-by against the foe. For he must run the gauntlet of some forty on a side of these desperate decoys.

But all these modes of imparting life and action to an advertisement are at best but slow. The dashing omnibus affords an opportunity for more rapid communication. What is that strange representation on it, occupying the place of a window, and carefully excluding the light of day? It is "Child's night-light," exhibited as magnified by the hydro-oxygen microscope at the Polytechnic; or as it is made in execution of a large order just received from Brobdingnag. Such a thing would set one's house on fire, instead of being the little innocent baby of a candle, which has to stand up to its tiny black shoe-tops in water all night, in a saucer.

So much for the most approved modes of imparting information, to the most unwilling, who perambulate the English metropolis. Come we now a little to study the composition and interior structure of modern advertisements. They form a literature of their own; they have a grammar of their own, rules of construction of their own, words, phrases, parts of speech of their own. They care nothing for Lindley Murray or any other pedant, who pre-

tends that any necessary connexion exists between the parts of a period, or that every verb must have a nominative before it — or any such stuff. A good advertiser snaps his fingers at grammar. Give him a *definite article*, and he will make you a present of all the other parts of speech. Mrs. Gamp herself could not make more glorious confusion of antecedents and relatives than the more successful advertisers of the day. The following may be taken as a fair specimen of the grandiose advertising style which is now greatly in vogue.

“FIRE-INSURANCE SUPERSEDED. Every one endued with human sensibility, and which forms the brightest ornament of our nature, that thrills with exquisite delight round the heart-strings of our affections, but must have been wrung with a throb of commiseration at the wail of helpless infancy, degraded to the very height of human suffering. The RAMONEUR dispenses with these inflictions on tender years, by discharging their functions with far greater accuracy. Combining the advantages of mechanical skill with scientific construction, it grapples at once with the most tortuous architectural arrangements, and nevertheless diffuses cleanliness through the most perpendicular flue. Apply to — —, &c. Chimneys swept by contract by the year. Smoky chimneys cured. N. B. Observe the number. No connexion with any other house.”

But if our advertising style plays at ducks and drakes with the parts of speech, and sets all grammar at defiance, it is the most active contributor by far to the dictionary of our language. A Dr. Todd may yearly publish a new volume of supplement to Dr. Johnson, to keep pace with the “world of new words” which daily spring up beneath the prolific hands of tailors and barbers. For no saying of his has poor Shakspeare been more roundly rated, than for his impertinent question, “What’s in a name?” Your advertiser will tell you, “everything.” Think you the youth who daily lubricates his luxurious ringlets with incomparable oil “Macassar,” at five or seven shillings a bottle, would have any faith in its virtues, or admit it “between the wind and his gentility,” were he plainly told that it is precisely the same substance wherewith the peasants of Lucca oil *their* locks: that is the locks of their doors, when stiff? Or that the one who lays the flattering unction of bear’s grease, or *gras de lion*, to his almost bare poll, would persevere in its application, if fairly told, that he is only each day giving himself, and his thin crop, a top-dressing of honest hog’s lard, whereof two penny-

worth, with a little cheap colouring, and a few drops of any aromatic essential oil, would replenish his half-crown pomatum-pot, and leave some over? "What's in a name?" Why, all the difference between lime-water and Carrara water: the latter conveying to the drinker the charming illusion, that he is swallowing the solution of a marble chimney-piece, or refreshing himself with the infusion of an ancient classical bust. "What's in a name?" Why the very essence, life, existence of things. Why did the Adelaide Gallery go down, but because it had not a name beginning with *Pan* or *Poly*, or ending with *on* or *rama*? Its rival the *Polytechnic* has stood its ground. Call it the "Regent-Street Scientific Exhibition," and it could only last a season. The reason is clear; English names are for annuals,—exhibitions are all annuals; but exotics are perennials. Cosmorama, Panorama, Diorama, Cyclo-rama; Pantehnicon, Panopticon, (announced to be) Panklibanon, Harmonicon, Apollonicon; Pantheon and Colosseum, all stand the wear and tear of time and *ennui*, because they are bronzed over with the Corinthian brass of classical titles. We wonder at the daring of Madame Tussaud and sons, to keep her most interesting historical gallery open, without bestowing on it some prodigious fine name of four syllables, from the Greek; especially with that terrible Panklibanon under the same roof. We would suggest, for instance, most respectfully, the name of "AcrocERAUNIAN Exhibition," as displaying the summit or acme of wax-work art. The inmates of the "chamber of horrors," might be described as the *infames*, connected by Horace with that long name.

But the Panklibanon naturally reminds us of pans; from which, no doubt, half the people that enter, derive the name; its latter part being, by the decidedly pious, considered scriptural, with an epenthetic, or euphonic, K interposed. Out of the many singular illustrations there to be found of the value of a name, let us take only one. It is advertised as "the Hecla coffee-pot." Do they make good coffee in Iceland? or do the people there boil it on Hecla? or do they save the trouble, by filling their coffee-pots from the boiling fountains, which it supplies? We own we are puzzled. But Hecla having now been secured for a coffee-pot, we fully expect to see advertisements going the round of the volcanoes; we may have a Vesuvius shaving-pot, a Mongibello (better than Etna)

tea-urn, and, with a small variation of orthography, a Strong-bowl-o'-punch-kettle. The tea-pot we were going to say we would spare. We had indeed hoped, that this sacrificial vessel of English domesticity and sociality would never be profaned by any attempt to hellenise or to latinise it; we would not even allow the Chinese to meddle with it, though their rights are great in the matter of tea. But to our horror, while we are writing, we see a sacrilegious attempt to Gallicanise it; which is worse. For we read the following advertisement: "THE TEA-POT SUPERSEDED. Loysel's *Machine à Thê* comprises in one vessel, urn and tea-pot, &c." *Machine à thê* indeed! Will this be tolerated? Shall our most household words be thus scouted from our language, and all their associations be at once obliterated? We firmly trust that the "mothers and daughters of England" will rise against the attempt: and that the tea-pot, sacred to so many recollections, from the nursery to the sick-bed-side, from the cup sipped luxuriously over the newspaper, to the hearty draught, mingled with more substantial fare, after a hard day's work, will not allow itself to be superseded by a *tea-engine*, to speak plain English, analogous to a vulgar beer-engine. It is true, indeed, that the French call an urn a machine, just as we and they call anything else of which we do not know the name; but surely, after we have taught them how to make tea, how to drink tea, how to like tea, after we have taught them the very names of things connected with the mysteries of tea-making and tea-drinking, we are not going to submit to the yoke of these foreigners, in this the almost solitary department of domestic cookery, in which they have not presumed to dictate to us. We are not going to reject a most genuine, expressive, Saxon-shaped, English compound, a thorough home-word, a rapid dissyllable, for three clumsily-joined outlandish words, which will even help to vulgarise *tea* into *tay*, if the words be rightly pronounced, and into a quaker *thee*, if wrongly. And all this in deference to a people, who, a few years ago, bought their tea by the scruple at the apothecary's, and *confectioned* it, as they would say, according to a physician's formula!

But if we wish to study thoroughly the vast inundation of monstrous words with which our language is threatened, by the advertising torrent that has attacked its precincts, we must look to those departments of industry which

thrive upon human vanity; and which most perseveringly, and most loudly appeal to its weaknesses. The portentous names by which the most simple "garments" (for *clothes* seem to have gone out of fashion) are called, almost make one shudder at the thought of wearing them. The hardest names are sought out for what ought to be the softest wear. The shirt seems most particularly suggestive of uncongenial appellations. First, there was the *corazza* shirt: that is the cuirass, or hauberk, or coat-of-mail, shirt. Now we should have thought that no two articles of clothing could be more diametrically opposed to one another in weight, texture, comfort, fit, and position in relation to the rest of one's apparel, than a good shirt and a good cuirass. But this name, after all, was but an Italian name, and not learned enough by half for the *tailleurs pour chemises*, as the French call them. Nothing less than Greek would content them. Hence, 47, Cheapside, advertises regularly in the "Times" the *Zetetique prize shirts*, which may imply that good shirts, like

"The Germans in Greek
Are sadly to seek:"

as Porson sung. But then next comes 145, Strand, and cries out: "I have found them:" i. e. *Ford's Eureka Shirts*; a title which we presume was given in reference to Archimedes's extreme and shocking forgetfulness of the *article*, on the occasion when he uttered that emphatic word. Immediately following, in the column before us, comes "*The Sans-p^{li} Shirt*," which is described as a "garment made entirely without gathers." This name rather contents us, as containing security against every possible contingency of mistake. For should it turn out that, upon being worn, it makes itself into just as many *gathers*, and crumples, and puckers, as an ordinary *garment*, and the unlucky vendee, (the man sold,) should apply to the vendor, (the man selling,) and make complaint thereof, the latter might indignantly ask: "Pray, Sir, what did you intend to buy?" Answer, "Why, a *sans-p^{li}* shirt to be sure." The young man's retort courteous: "Well, Sir, and you have it:—a *cent-plis* shirt." Certes, he has got a *hundred-folds'* worth more than he bargained for! Finally, to close this list of white-boy raiment, besides a *new yoke shirt*, we see just announced the *Porizo shirt*; the peculiar excellences of which we have yet to learn.

This last name reminds us of a marked peculiarity in the literature of advertisements. The manner in which these learned names are bestowed is easily ascertained. It will be observed that a considerable number of them consist of verbs in the first person singular, present tense, active voice; or of substantives or adjectives, in the nominative case singular; should both of these parts of speech occur, it is a mercy if they happen to agree in gender. Now there is an unlucky want of accordance in Latin Dictionaries and Greek Lexicons, between the English and the classical verb, in tense. The English is in the infinitive, and the Latin or Greek verb in the first person, as above. The searcher after a learned name looks out for the word he wants on the English side: e. g. having invented a new brace, of a *compressing* character, he looks out for the word in Latin, and finds *comprimo*, "I compress." Hence comes forth the hideous hybrid, *the comprimo brace*. Another wants to express a new ring-brace; looks out for *new*, and for *ring*, and thinks he has achieved a marvel, when he has advertised the absurdity called a *novus annulus brace*.

This we consider too great a national disgrace to remain longer unremedied. There must be an act of parliament to put an end to it. There must be a permanent commission appointed (one more will not make a great difference) to regulate the issue of new names from the mint of the Queen's English. We have even thought there should be a regulated scale of payments for taking out certain licenses to call common things by uncommon names. There should be a heavy fine for a Greek title, and a lighter one for Latin, and so in proportion. Or perhaps a joint-stock company might make a good thing of it, by engaging to furnish new names for old things, at a proportionate remuneration. The Sanscrit might be turned to advantage, and perhaps the Chinese; and we really think, that if some Privatsdocent Schmetterzähne could be engaged to explore the early Teutonic dialects, with the help of the Grimms' researches, some most delightfully unpronounceable polysyllables might be profitably attached to very simple garments. As the case stands at present, everybody is pulling at the *paletot*, and claiming its invention; so that in a few years, "who invented the *paletot*?" will be a question involved in as

fearful an obscurity, as "who wrote *Junius*, or 'Ikon Basilike?'" or, "who was the man in the iron mask?"

Posterity too, in reading our history in our advertisements, will really wonder to what race we belonged, and whether we were Greek, Roman, or mediæval. Suppose the following description of a fashionable youth of our days to be embalmed in one of those novels of the day, which delight in miniature portraiture, and give the features and dress of each character with the minuteness of the "Hue and Cry:" and suppose that one stray copy of the book happened to be preserved, in some circulating library in Australia, or rather that this very page of it only fell into the hands of the antiquarian. The problem to be solved would be, to what period of history does the book belong, which contains a hero so described....."He rose early, and prepared himself for his journey. He first applied to his face a copious supply of *Euxesis*, and having carefully rubbed his *Plantagenet* razor upon his *Canton strop*, or *quadrilateral Chinese razor-sharpener*, he therewith smoothed his chin, and refreshed his face with the fragrant *Kalydor*. With the help of *rhyphophagon* and *amandine*, he completed his ablutions, and then adjusted to his head, his *gentleman's real head of hair*, which had the rare advantage of being *invisible*. His shirt was an *Eureka*, his stock, the *Albert*; his trowsers the *aptandum*,* a splendid *vesting* encircled his breast, over which he drew on the graceful *chlamys*. His feet he clothed in *inpilia Prince Georges*, or *pannus corium Oxonians*. Then he equipped himself for out of doors, by encasing his legs in *antigropyloi*, placing on his head an *idrotobolic* hat, and throwing over his arm his *aquascutum*. A *cheeroot* in his mouth completed his fashionable accoutrements."

Now if we knew whereabouts Dr. Johnson's ghost haunted, and could get with it a dialogue of the dead, (on one side only,) we should like to have his opinion on the above precious compound of new-fangled words. The shade of the old lexicographer would melt away in despair, at seeing his own pomposity of diction so outdone by the grandiloquence of advertisements. But his horror of

* This *singular* epithet, must mean, if any thing, that the trowsers never actually fit, but are *to be fitted on*, as well as they can. We would recommend a rival to correct the error in number and tense, and advertise *aptata* trowsers.

Jacobinism would lead him, with us, to indignation against the clear tendency of one class of artists (we believe that is the phrase) to socialism, and levelling—revolutionary demonstrations. We have observed, with pain, that your boot and shoe-maker alone invariably selects his names from among illustrious personages, as Wellington, Blucher, Albert, Prince George, and that highly respectable and Tory class of men, the Oxonians, (we think it suspicious that the Cantabs have been spared,) as though he wished these persons to be trodden under-foot, pressed in the mire, and walked over by every one. This should be looked to; it is a sign of the times.

But we must not leave our friends the advertising “finishers of men,” so lightly. They contribute more than any other class to the enrichment of our tongue and letters, by the fertility of their invention, and the ingenuity of their announcements. They suggest, in the keenness of their rivalry, problems to solve, much more puzzling, than occur in any Cambridge Examination-paper. As thus: Abraham clothes you at 25 per cent less than *any other* house in London. Benjamin sells his garments for 25 per cent also below *any other* house. *Qy.* How much cheaper than Benjamin does Abraham array you; how much cheaper than Abraham does Benjamin? But it is not merely in the scientific department that these advertisers shine. They deserve our national gratitude for having afforded the last refuge to the Muses. Like the Druids, who retired before the encroachments of Roman roads through our island, into the fastnesses of Wales, the poetry of England, scared by the railway usurpation, seems to have retreated beneath the shelter of Moses’s pacific rule. Whether his name and that of the Muses have any mutual attractions we know not; but this is certain, that while their inspirations seem to have been withdrawn from our literature, while Wordsworth appears to have hung up his harp, and Moore’s, we fear, is unstrung for ever, while Alfred Tennyson is oblivious of “the days of good Haroun El Raschid,” and has allowed “Little Lilian” to grow too big to “clap her hands any more above her head,” while even Monckton Milnes perhaps finds his muse restive amidst sewage legislation, and Magyar diplomacy; there does live a poet whose golden visions are undisturbed by public clamour, and whose haunts have not been desecrated by the crossing of the

iron-road to ruin. We should like much to see that poet, whose quarterly review of novel productions is so liberally showered into the window of every cab, issuing from certain privileged stations. He knows not the changes of nature's vesture, as do others of his craft, as a passing from winter's snowy robes, to the green of spring, the russet of summer, and the brown tints of autumn; to him it is a series of transitions from the corded tweeds of winter, to the alpaccas of spring, the sylphides of summer, and the doe-skins of autumn. The goose, and not the swan, is the symbol of his poesy—

“ — argutos inter strepit anser olores.”

He must believe all creative powers to be concentrated in the cutting-rooms of his employers. He cares not for verdant lanes wherein to roam, so long as he may freely stroll through their vast avenues of “invisible green.” He sighs not after azure-skied Italy, so long as his eye, in a fine frenzy rolling, lights upon the broad expanse of “double-milled blue Saxony.” Flowered vests strew his path, and he delights in contemplating the well-folded stock of fleecy hosiery. And thus kindling the spark of his poetic enthusiasm, he indites an elegy on an over-coat, or a sonnet on a pair of trousers. It must be to genius thus inspired that we owe the wonderful nomenclatures of various articles of raiment, which appear as novelties every season, of which we have already culled a few specimens. We see now on the list of the celebrated encyclopedists of clothing just referred to, something called the *Bulwer Pacha over-coat*. That the gentleman alluded to may deserve the title of an Effendi, we do not pretend to dispute. But we really are at a loss to divine when or how he was created a Pacha, unless he be the dignitary described by Marryat as the “Pacha of Many Tales.” As a fair specimen of advertising grammar, we may note the very title of a common announcement, headed “Waterproofing Facts.” How facts can waterproof, or what they do waterproof, might be interesting questions, if first we could ascertain from the advertisement, what facts it contains as waterproofing agents.

We should hardly know where to end this subject, were we to indulge fully the vein which it excites. There is only one sort of trade-advertisements more to which we will allude,—the kind proposals daily made to supersede

entirely the precious metals. "The only substitute for silver"—"nickel silver"—"German silver"—"albata plate"—are familiar to the attentive student of Bradshaw's Railway Guide, that labyrinth of figures without a clue. There would be a very simple way of getting rid of these absurdities; namely, by compelling the gentry who put them forth, to receive back their own base metals at the value which they set upon them. Silver, when bent, broken, or pounded, is still silver, and will fetch its worth. Let these debasers of its value be obliged to swallow their own fictions, and sweep into their tills, as payment for their trumpery wares, the fragments of them when broken, at the value of that of which their material is proclaimed a real substitute.

Upon looking over what we have written, we find we have been guilty of a great omission. Our paper should certainly have been prefaced with learned observations on the early history of advertisements. It is usual so to handle such grave subjects. No doubt the Egyptians advertised extensively. Rharnes made known, in the columns of the "Dendara Lotus," that he had discovered a new, and economical, Shillibeer-sort of, mode of conducting funerals; whereby several hundred yards of linen rollers were saved, and mummy-cases, being cut out by patent machinery, were 25 per cent. cheaper than at any other house: and Sheshonk announced, in the supplement to the "Memphis Papyrus," that gentlemen desiring to have leeks for purposes of domestic devotion, would find them more fragrant at his establishment than elsewhere; adding, that he had a bed of spring garlick in prime condition, as also a fine ichneumon and two lively young crocodiles. We do not exactly remember in what museum, or what library, the basalt stone, or funeral roll is preserved, on which these interesting advertisements are alluded to; but not less wonderful things have been discovered. And we certainly do remember a marble advertisement (though it may have been a *post mortem* one) in the portico of the temple of Minerva at Assisium, of a man who professed to be "medicus, chirurgus, oculista, dentista," all which compounded together make up "a quack"—a much briefer description—who no doubt had his *mineral succedaneum* for decayed teeth, and his *pearl dentifrice* for sound ones, and his *herbaceous eye-snuff*

(which by-the-bye cures *cholera*) for the eyes, and his ointment for all-but-wooden legs.

Roman advertisements, it is well known, still remain on the walls of Pompeii: but so poor a hand did they make of our noble art in those days, that a man who advertises a house to let, does not even tell us that it had "a dining-room and drawing-room, and four best bed-rooms, besides servants' ditto, and excellent offices," all which we suppose the "Times" keeps stereotyped, for its advertisements of semi-detached villas, at Clapham or Croydon. But how was it possible for advertisements painted on a wall, (though they yet have them in Paris,) to come up to the developments which nothing but the art of printing could have produced? And hence it must have been in reference to this, by a sort of poetical vaticination, that Horace wrote:

"Projicit ampullas, et sesquipedalia verba."

"It throws off puffs, in words a half-yard long."

For, we care not what critics may think, but we feel sure, that *ampulla* here means the glass, inflated into a huge glass-bubble, by the glass-blower's puff. But speaking of Horace, in connection with this modern branch of letters, reminds us of another felicitous allusion of his to one of our most popular places of entertainment, celebrated for bringing out every year a fresh succession of "lions," weaned from their own countries, the last of whom was "Dickens's Juba," as immense placards told us. For, to what else but Vauxhall can he allude, when he speaks of "The land of Juba,—the dry-nurse of lions?"

"Jubæ tellus—leonum
Arida nutrix."

One is certainly inclined to laugh at the crude nonsense which inundates the country, covers its walls, and fills its journals, in the shape of advertisements. But it is with the same mirth with which one catches oneself sometimes laughing at the vagaries of a drunkard. The moral sense immediately revolts, and inflicts a double reproof, on the merriment and on its cause. And so it is here. To plain, truthful, honest advertising, far from any one objecting, we have all reason to be thankful. We are by it put in possession of valuable information; we learn where we may procure that which is useful, or even necessary to us.

The fair tradesman who informs us of new works, new wares, or new improvements, confers on us a real and solid benefit. Nor can any one be opposed to that honourable rivalry, which instigates him to state his claims upon public patronage. Although the old proverb may still hold good, that "good wine needs no bush," it may really need an advertisement; for how are the lovers of such vanities to know, that Xeres and Co. have sherry twenty years in bottle, and that Oporto and Co. have crusted old port, unless they tell them so? and let them tell it, *if true*. But that mass of advertisers, who openly proclaim what they know to be a lie, who state that they extract from oriental herbs what grows in Europe, who offer as an exotic and delicate tooth powder what they have compounded from charcoal or chalk, who advertise as silk what they know to be cotton, as French what they have had made in England, as superfine what they know is coarse, and as superior what they know is vile; who invent hard and big names for the commonest trumpery, with the deliberate intent of taking people in,—that class we have no hesitation in denouncing as demoralizers of our commerce, and the underminers of its character. While they are deforming our language with their merciless importation of foreign sounds, and at the same time glutting our own and foreign markets with worthless trash, they are unhappily no less enriching our speech with a variety of terms which it would be a blessing to have it spared. We have been appalled at the number of strange words that have crept into our language, indicative of over-reaching, cheating, ruining, and being ruined. Slang words they may be; but when "to sell" has become equivalent in a language to, "to cheat," we may begin to fear that honesty is not always the regulator of our business transactions. However we trust that, after all, honesty will be found to be the best policy—a real policy of insurance, in advertisements, as well as in all other ventures. For our parts, were we reduced to the last of our last dozen of inward "garments," we could not find the face to go into a shop, and ask for one of those Greek monstrosities that are daily advertized. We should feel at once, if we did so, in the position of a dupe, of one taken in by a senseless name, coined by an ignoramus for that purpose. Our pride would revolt at asking for a

Eureka, when we wanted a shirt, * knowing that that name described neither good materials nor decent workmanship, and would be much more applicable to a screw-steamer than to the next human integument after the skin. Nay, our very Eton grammar would choke us, if we attempted to utter the solecism required for the demand; and as we stood confronted with the merchant, the thought of *As in præsentî* would effectually bar all further communication.

Here we would gladly close; but we must advert to two other classes of advertisements, the one most immoral, the other most painful. Under the first head we allude to a strange, but often-repeated, offer "to make the literary reputation" of any aspirant after fame, by composing, and allowing to be published under his name, any sort of work, from a three-volume romance to a shilling pamphlet on any imaginable subject. As much nobler as is literary eminence than mercantile success, so much baser is this sordid proposal than any excess of bragging announcement which we have hitherto selected for notice. It debases the noblest of gifts; wisdom, (if the name can here be used without desecration,) to the lowest purpose, that of making it subservient to another's passions, to produce from so unnatural a parentage, gold. It perverts the loftiest acquisition of man's soul to the basest end, that of playing with the pride and stupid ambition of any dolt with more money than brains, who has a fancy to be thought learned, if he cannot be clever; it tries to hook him by this folly, and to get him into a conspiracy to cheat the public and himself; to inveigle him to be the sleeping and sleepy partner in a swindling joint-stock. The man of education, of genius, of universal acquirements, advertises for a young gawky, to join him in a lie, and to pay him well for it! Never were intellectual advantages so prostituted, unless it was by the man who used to advertise in Church periodicals, that he made and sold to clergy manuscript sermons on all subjects; whose only motto was apparently, "bid me discourse;" and who seemed as ready to compose a high-church homily on apostolical succession, as an evangelical "improvement" against baptismal regeneration. Such advertising men are a reproach

* We take this as a *name*, not pretending to judge of the merits of the *thing*, which no doubt is worthy of a better appellation.

to the name of science, and of letters ; far more baneful to society than the sellers of gamboge pills as a universal remedy, or of mercurial compounds as purely vegetable medicines ; than the quacks who pretend to make up the recipes of old Parr or Methusalem, or who employ the names of eminent men to give credit to what, otherwise, would be a mere *drug* in the physic market.*

With very different feelings we turn to those advertisements which we have characterized as painful: towards which the eye almost instinctively glances, when we take up the "Times." There, in its second or third column, is to be found, in a few lines, more pathos than is in many a tragedy, and the suggestive sketch of a feeling romance. The widowed mother there often pursues the only son, to whom she looked to be the stay of her old age, appeals to his feelings, broken-hearted herself, promises forgiveness of all, and restoration to affection, if he will only return. What antecedents of gentle forbearance and of reckless profligacy does not the request imply ! What years of unremitting kindness, and of unfeeling sport with ever-yielding affection ! And then the foundering of every hope, the ruin of the home, the blight of the heart, which has just taken place in the unkind flight of the prodigal ! Shall we wish her success ? shall we pray for her that he may return, probably only when he has squandered what he has robbed her of, more debased, more heartless, more worthless than ever ? Or rather, shall we not leave the reckless and godless scapegrace to find his own way to Norfolk Island, and content ourselves with sincerely hoping, that a better balm than that of Gilead may be dropped into the wound of the mother's heart ?

Verily, this vast region of advertisements is one wherein the two rival philosophers of antiquity might meet, not as on neutral, but as on common, ground ; where, if one might laugh to his heart's content at the follies of mankind, the other might find cause to weep over their real miseries.

* Thus *the* Dr. Locock has no more to do with the wafers or pills that bear his name than the man in the moon. Another eminent physician, Dr. Frampton, has been made godfather to another batch of quack pills, of which he knows nothing. A recipe for cholera has just been fathered on Sir James Clark.

ART. VIII.—*Jesus and Mary ; or, Catholic Hymns.* By FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London : Burns, 1849.

AMONG the problems of which this wonderful era is rapidly forcing on the solution, the adaptation of Catholicism to our national character, circumstances, and wants, is likely to be neither the least interesting, nor the most remote. The three centuries which have elapsed since the great schism, have done comparatively little towards the elucidation of it. During the greater part of that dreary period, the Catholic Church in England has been rather struggling for existence, than putting forth her energies or calculating her resources. Truly "her life has been to her as a spoil," hastily and surreptitiously snatched from the enemy. The barest toleration has been all she craved at the hands of the world ; and, little as she asked, it was less than that little which she received. Browbeaten by politicians, and taunted by the multitude, she has withdrawn from the gaze of men, and exercised herself in secret. The scantiness of her acquisitions has relieved her from the difficulty of dealing with them ; instead of being called to deliberate about the management of her converts, she has almost been afraid of making them. The justification of these prudential courses has been found in the absolutely unparalleled anomalies of our position ; and far from condemning, or even criticising, the policy of those who have preceded us, our predominant feeling is that of gratitude for the precious heritage of the Faith, which, by whatever means, they have preserved to us.

The result, however, of the disadvantages under which the Church has laboured in England, since England ceased as a nation to be Catholic, has been an almost inevitable stiffening of her form, and curtailment in her liberty of action. She had been, as it were, bed-ridden so long, that she had all but lost the use of her limbs. While she has been suffering and meditating like one compelled to a painful restraint, the world has been actively pursuing its way on the line of advance, or at least in the process of expansion ; and now that Holy Church wakes up and walks abroad, she neither finds mankind as she left them,

nor presents to their view the appearance of commanding greatness, and the full traces of her ancient beauty. So crippled by confinement, so emaciated by suffering, what wonder if her very lovers and friends can scarce recognise her as the Church of the olden time, and if the world, which she is born to subdue, should arrogantly plume itself upon its power and intelligence, and exult, almost in the heathen poet's words, over the supposed decrepitude of its former conqueror ?

“ — te victa situ, verique effæta senectus,
O mater, curis nequidquam exercet, et arma
Regum inter falsa vatem formidine ludit.
Cura tibi, divum effigies et templa tueri :
Bella viri, pacemque gerent, queis bella gerenda.”

The time, however, has now come when the Catholic Church may doff her garb of mourning, and put on her beautiful vesture, and re-assert her dominion over the world ; that dominion which, of course, she has never relinquished, but only in appearance suspended. She has a two-fold mission, and must make the first use of the liberty which she has hardly won to carry out her great purposes. One part of her office is to rule the intellect ; another, no less important, is to gain the heart. In the execution of the former part of this trust, she will sooner or later be required to cope with the formidable hosts of evil who are now arraying themselves on the side of a material and God-denying philosophy ; and, in pursuance of the latter, she will have to draw upon those manifold resources of influence which accrue to her from her command over creation, and her knowledge of all that is in man. At one time, by cutting appropriate and heavenward channels for the current of rushing thought and onward invention ; at another, converting to her service the powerful and versatile capacities of art and literature ; now refining sense and sanctifying imagination by her august and soul-thrilling ceremonial, and now unlocking the affections with the key of her deep devotional science, she must gradually dislodge the enemy from one after another of his strongholds, and so bring every haughty “ understanding,” perverse faculty, and rebel inclination into the obedience of Christ.

Many circumstances conspire to mark out our own England as a probable arena of this great contest between

the powers of light and darkness. The very greatness of England is in some sort a token of promise in her favour. Mighty destinies appear to await her; she must greatly rise or greatly fall, and in either case may involve many in the issue. Her power abroad, and restlessness at home; her extensive commercial relations, and widely-scattered empire; her control over all that wealth can purchase or skill effect,—all these point her out with scarcely mistakeable distinctness as a mighty instrument in the propagation of good or evil; while the stirring of thoughtful and inquisitive minds within her social body, is enough to prove that her mission will not be independent of great moral and religious effects in the quarters to which it may extend. At such a crisis it is interesting to reflect upon the prayers which almost throughout Catholic Christendom are doing violence to heaven in England's behalf; of the more than pious conjectures and enthusiastic anticipations which have made her so prominent an object in the interests of holy men; but, above all, of the influence which the "Island of Saints" will never cease to vindicate to herself in the courts of the blessed by reason of the large and precious contributions which she has ere-while made to their glorious and prevailing company. It cannot be that the "child of so many prayers" should ultimately fail.

But the Church must gain England, before England can gain the world; and no one who adverts for an instant in thought to the place which the Church has occupied in England's later history, but must feel how much she has to do and to suffer before she can rightly acquit herself of her high embassy. Hitherto it has been open to statesmen to despise her, and possible for heretics to ignore her; but the time is coming on when she must make herself known and felt, and when men will have to choose between loving and hating her. There is absolutely no weapon of influence which she must not wrest from the enemy's hand, and sharpen on the anvil of the Spirit; there is no field of exertion which she must not appropriate, no avenue to men's hearts which she must not pre-occupy. Her prerogative it is, and her province it must be, to elevate literature, to theologize philosophy, to purify art, to reform, refine, and christianize all the works of human genius and all the impulses of popular thought. Yet heretofore, in the external aspect of Catholicism among us, how little

has there been to draw either the masses or the educated towards it, or to make it plain to the world at large that the Catholic Church, rather than any of the countless sects which it has associated with her august name, had a divine commission to instruct and sanctify it! Here and there, indeed, the virtues of some self-denying priest who was seen to stand in the breach which the pampered beneficiary had forsaken, might have excited the interest, and won the sympathies, of the more candid, or even led them to deeper enquiries into the nature and doctrines of that religion which had the power to make its ministers do their duty, or to supplant the world in the affections of its children. But much as there was to interest, what was there to strike and win, the English people in the external manifestations of Catholicism amongst them? A Church of which they had read as essentially aggressive, was seen by them to be stationary and unambitious; they beheld priests with the name indeed, and not rarely with the spirit, of Missionaries; yet coming into no visible contact with the masses in our crowded cities, and producing no conspicuous effect upon the religion or morals of the multitude. It must have seemed to them that the names of "field" and "street" preacher—names ugly and unpopular, indeed, but still but other names for offices which Saints and Apostles were not ashamed to fill—were almost as unwelcome to the Church of St. Augustine and St. Boniface, as to the Establishment itself. Nor did our "places of worship" present to the popular eye the distinctive marks of the Catholic faith in any sufficient prominence. They neither symbolized, on the one hand, the majesty of the Catholic religion, nor, on the other, did they conspicuously express the nature of its relation to the poor. It was not because these structures were devoid, as they were, of architectural correctness and graceful embellishment; for in truth many a building, in comparison with which some of them might have been styled magnificent, would have represented a great Catholic idea as well as the most gorgeous cathedral. But what struck the better sort of Protestants was, that our religious edifices wanted a character of their own; that they neither typified worship, nor charity; that while they were destitute of the architectural beauty of the old Catholic structures, on the one hand, they equally lacked, on the other, the free and popular air of the Meeting-House; that their

arrangements had much of the stiffness of the Establishment, without the *prestige* attaching to a church wherein Saints had worshipped; and much of the vulgarity of the sectarian chapel, without the set-off of an apparent heartiness and rough-handed English simplicity in the character of their congregations. The sad consequence of this failure in externals, was, that while Anglicanism held fast the lovers of order and the adherents of the ancient traditions, Wesleyanism took captive the more enthusiastic and unworldly spirits of our agricultural and provincial population; while London, poor London, (with the exception of the comparatively few who clung to the ancient Faith, and of those who, wherever they might be, did their duty, according to their light, in the station to which they had been called,) was made over hand and foot, as if in very hopelessness, to the ministers of Satan.

But the Catholic Church in England is rapidly assuming a new attitude, more consistent with her character and claims. She is by degrees adopting the bolder, in the place of the safer, policy; and thus extricating herself from the reproach, necessary though it were in its day, of sitting solitary, or making herself the companion of those who alternately flattered and contemned her.

While the sects are breaking up or dividing afresh, she is daily adding to her numbers and consolidating her strength. While she is attracting the educated of other bodies, she is at the same time fulfilling the still more important function of binding to her side by closer and closer ties the Poor of her own. While in every large city she can now point to one church at the least in which her soul-subduing rites are celebrated with becoming splendour, she can also rejoice in the multiplication of buildings set apart to the chief purposes of Divine worship, whose plainness of character and meagreness of decoration serve but to set in all the stronger contrast the majesty of the Presence which inhabits them. Heretofore the Church has concerned herself but little with the characteristics of Englishmen, for the plain reason that she has had but little to do with them. Conversion upon any large scale has not till recently been her effect, and scarcely even her aim. With a supply of labourers utterly inadequate to their work, she has rightly judged that her duty lay far less in the line of extending than of keeping her possessions; and

it is well known how very small a proportion of our Catholic population is exclusively English.

Moreover, the Church has not only been unpractised in dealing with the English character, but has been mainly conversant with another character almost its opposite. She has found a population ready to her hand, and one predisposed, nay eager, to be led by her. To the hearts of the Irish our holy Religion is so congenial and so dear, that the difficulty would be, not to implant, but to eradicate it. The task of gaining England is one as difficult as it is new; yet who can doubt that this conquest is the particular destiny of the English Catholic Church? Hitherto she has fulfilled a most important office in witnessing to the Faith amongst us, and in ministering to the spiritual necessities of a large population of foreigners whom necessity has forced to exchange their Catholic home for this wilderness of heresy and sin. But the work which now opens upon her is one demanding, not merely the prudence to retain, but the zeal to acquire, the wisdom to devise, and the charity to win.

Among the instruments which Divine Providence is raising up to our need at the present crisis, it will hardly be questioned that an important place must be assigned to the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. Relieved by the conditions of their institute from some of the more laborious duties of missionary life, the English sons of St. Philip have the leisure to employ in the service of the Church so dear to them, those high intellectual gifts, graceful accomplishments, and practical talents, which, by a combination as rare as it is valuable, are united in their body. They bring also to their work a thorough knowledge, and an evident love, of the English character, and an experimental acquaintance with the modes of influencing it, not the less serviceable to their present object because it was gained in a state of exile from their true Home. But if their English habits and preferences seem peculiarly to fit the sons of St. Philip for the work they have undertaken, their noble loyalty to the Holy See is a sufficient safeguard against the danger of an exaggerated nationality. It seems a paradox to say it, and yet we are convinced, that a Church is not necessarily national in proportion as it is not ultra-montane. It may conceivably be neither; loose, at once, in its attachment to the Centre of Unity, and in its hold upon the affections of its own people. It would,

we think, be far truer to say that a Church fulfils its national office in proportion as it is intimately bound by the ties of love and duty to the Roman See, than that it is apt to gain in true nationality what it loses in true Catholicity.

If the English sons of St. Philip bring many and great personal qualifications to their work, the character of their institute forms an additional ground of the hope which their establishment among us is calculated to awaken. Of its peculiar genius and primary scope, as it originated with its great founder, Father Faber says:

“St. Philip devised a changeful variety of spiritual exercises and recreations which gathered round him the art and literature as well as the piety of Rome.....Sanctity in the world, perfection at home, high attainments in common earthly callings, such was the principal end of his apostolate. He met the gloom and sourness and ungainly stiffness of the puritan element of Protestantism by cheerfulness and playful manner; which he ensured, not in any human way, but by leaving to his children the frequentation of the Sacraments, as the chief subject of their preaching, and their chief counsel in the spiritual direction of others, and he represented in the Church the principle of love.....what was mediæval and suited to the mediæval state of things, passed away; and there appeared in the Chiesa Nuova and the Gesù, the less poetical but thoroughly practical elements of modern times, the common-sense which works and wears so well in this prosaic world of ours.”—*Hymns, Preface, p. x.*

The Oratorian Institute, as we understand it, combines many of the advantages of a Religious Order, with far greater opportunities of acting upon the world in other besides directly religious ways, than is allowed by the rules and constitution of most Religious Orders properly so called. Although living in community, bound by rules, and wearing a religious habit, the Oratorians, we believe, regard themselves chiefly in the light of coadjutors to the secular clergy; they do not, at least in London, take part in visiting the sick, nor at present (and this we regret) in the education of the poor; nor does it enter into their prescribed duties, to “hunt up” sickly or dying souls from the dens of vice and the nests of squalid wretchedness. On the other hand, their freedom from all duties among the sick, leaves them at liberty to devote the more time to the Confessional, to preaching, to religious exercises with their people, and to personal intercourse with applicants out of

confession, than is ordinarily practicable on the mission. And, no doubt, in each of these most responsible relations with their congregation, they are aided to an incalculable extent, by the joint protection of rules and common-life; the one promoting habits of order and punctuality, which enable men not merely to do their work better than others, but to do more of it; the other sustaining the spirit of religious cheerfulness, and creating the habitual consciousness of sympathy in those around them. But the frequentation of the sacraments it is which sustains and poises their work in the world, while "the greater glory of God" is kept in sight as the end of all their pious inventions for gaining on mankind by them no less than by that great Society, one with them in heart and object, of which those words form the motto.

The beautiful little volume which has suggested this train of reflection is, we believe, the first original offering which its accomplished author has made to the Church of his affection, since he joined the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. Hitherto he has been chiefly known among us as the editor of the series,—which we rejoice to see quietly and steadily pursuing its way—the "Lives of the Modern Saints." In the composition of these poems he has had, as he tells us,

"A double end in view; first, to furnish some simple and original hymns for singing in Catholic churches; secondly, to provide English Catholics with a hymn-book for reading, in the simplest and least involved metres."—*Preface* vii.

The Catholic Church, in its separate national manifestations, has two great objects at heart; the one to maintain intact both the body and the spirit of the Faith; the other, to gain a hold upon the affections of the people among whom she resides, by accommodating herself in every possible way which the Faith allows, to its peculiar genius and circumstances. There is a power of expansion and a principle of elasticity within her which renders this always a practicable, though rarely an easy, work. It is precisely this pliancy and expansiveness which distinguish her from the sects which are by the very law of their being national and local. But the Church, on the contrary, can be truly national, for the very reason that she is Catholic. She is so strong that she can afford to yield. The Establishment dares not, as well as wants the

genius, to be free and flexible; the dissenting bodies, on the contrary, care not what extravagances they commit, for they have no faith to lose; it is their nature to move in eccentric orbits. The consequence is, that while the Church of England is stiff and pedantic, they are loose and vulgar; but after all, it is they and not the Church of England, or the Church of England so far only as it deviates into their track, with whom resides, (so far as it resides anywhere but in the Catholic Church,) the secret of influence in England. The Church of England has nowhere the power, as a body, which Wesleyanism exercises in Wales and Cornwall. Out of the Catholic Church then, the way to peoples' hearts seems to be gained in proportion as the dogmatic principle is waived or contradicted; but with the Catholic Church it is otherwise. The upstart lordling consults his spurious dignity by a haughty and unbending deportment; the reckless adventurer purchases popularity by lowering himself with his companions; but the Queen of the nations is affable and gracious; she can make herself as one of the people without sullyng the lustre of her ancestral rank, or compromising the majesty which awes while it wins. In fact, besides those essential and common characteristics of worship which form the bond of union between national Churches, and make the Catholic at home everywhere, there is, in the Church, an almost exhaustless store of subsidiary devotions, to supply the demand of every character, and to meet the necessities of every time. These are the golden fringes of the Church's vestment, which encircle her with so beautiful a variety; and by these it is that her national diversities are made to consist with her essential unity and uniformity.

So wise a legislator as the Catholic Church will not be apt to overlook the value of soul-moving poetry, and appropriate music, as one of the engines of influence among the people with whom she sojourns. Bound to the use of an universal language, in the fixed and more solemn portions of her august ritual, she has always been allowed to consult the predilections of particular countries in those tributary and subordinate devotions, and expressions of devotional feeling, which are in their own nature more accidental and variable. Hence, in England as on the continent, it is customary to recite the Rosary of our Blessed Lady, and even the litanies (out of solemn services) in the

vernacular; while, in country missions especially, the Latin offices are often preceded, (and sometimes even superseded,) by a series of prayers and other religious acts, in English. On the continent the same license is generally extended into the province of psalmody as well as of prayer. Those who have attended the church of our Lady of Victories at Paris, are aware of the enthusiasm which is thrown into the popular "Cantiques." In Italy, the "Laudi" are pieces of the same character, commonly sung, we believe, at the evening offices of the Church; while in Germany, the use of hymns in the vernacular, is permitted even during the Holy Sacrifice, and often, we understand, the Mass proceeds with no other musical accompaniment than that of these national religious melodies. In England, as far as we know, (certainly in London,) the introduction of hymns in the vernacular during solemn services of the Church, dates from the establishment of the London Oratory, and is at present confined to it. The experiment, if successful, is not unlikely to be tried elsewhere, always, of course, supposing the approbation of authority.

Father Faber's volume is intended in part to supply this conceived deficiency in our present Church services, by providing a sample of metrical compositions, capable of being set to music, which if well received may be followed up by a larger contribution.

The application of the word "Hymn" to compositions like those in Father Faber's volume will be new to the Catholic reader. We Catholics are accustomed to think of no "Hymns" but those of which the praises of God or the blessed Saints are the direct subject; whereas many of the pieces in the work before us, are rather meditations in verse than commemorations of mysteries, or addresses to the court of Heaven. Even in the Established Church, such a use of the term "Hymn" is, as far as we know, confined to the school called "evangelical." In the Establishment indeed, there is no collection of authorized Hymns. Lately, we are told, they have introduced (though without authority) translations of some in the Breviary; but within our own memory, the very name of a Hymn was hardly more bearable to high-church ears than that of the conventicle, with which it was associated. The Psalms of David, done into very humble verse, were (with one or two exceptions) the staple of metrical psalmo-

dy in the Established Church; and doubtless it must have been through an excessive dread of innovation, that so inadequate a substitute for Christian Hymns was able to keep its ground at all. To our Catholic ideas, there is something preposterous in descending from the original Psalms of Inspired Scripture to an indifferent translation of them, and this in the course of the very same religious service. The dissenters and "evangelicals" went into the other extreme, and, dropping or putting on one side the inspired psalms, replaced them in their affections at least, if not in act, by metrical compositions on the doctrines of Christianity, (according to their interpretation of them,) or on subjects of a mere personal nature. The most celebrated of these collections, called the "Olney Hymns," contains many beautiful pieces of the poet Cowper and his friend Newton; and represents altogether the golden age of Evangelicalism, when it expressed the struggles of pious minds feeling after a truth which they could not reach. Father Faber, who evidently retains a pleasing remembrance of the Olney Hymns, has sought in the present volume to incorporate their simple and affectionate spirit in the language of the Church.

The Oxford school, rejecting at once the palpable heresies of Evangelicalism, and the cold formality of the elder High-church party, struck out a middle course; using poetry as an outlet of devotional feeling, which, if vented through any less sacred medium, might have spent itself in empty and irreverent declamation, yet keeping clear of any attempt to innovate upon the established usage of their communion. Thus were suggested in succession, the "Christian Year," the "Lyra Apostolica," and the "Cathedral," the "Thoughts in Past Years," the "Baptistery," and other volumes of Mr. Isaac Williams. Of these publications the "Christian Year" is the most popular, but the "Lyra Apostolica" the most ascetical, and therefore the more Catholic.

In prominent distinction from all these meritorious attempts to meet the religious needs of various bodies or parties outside the Church, stand our own time-honoured treasures, the Breviary and Missal Hymns, embodying the devotion of saints and uniting in the same language of jubilant worship the past and the present, the far and the near; all who in all times and all places profess the Apostolic doctrines, and gather under the shelter of St. Peter's

See. Differing at once from the inspired psalmody and from all extra-ritual melodies, the compositions of individuals, which the Church admits as tributary to her public offices, the "Hymns" of the Breviary and Missal constitute one of the three great branches of sacred song recognized by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Ephesians. They are also themselves specifically divisible into at least the following classes. 1. Metrical prayers, such as "Veni Creator Spiritus." 2. Eulogistic or pathetic commemorations, like "Pange lingua gloriosi Lauream certaminis," or the "Stabat Mater dolorosa." 3. Metrical *creeds*, (so to call them,) such as "Lauda Sion." 4. Aspirations of love in the form of hymns, such as "Jesu dulcis memoriæ." But, varying as they do from one another, the Hymns of the Church agree in the two following characteristics; 1. in being objective; 2. in being corporate. 1. They do not detail what are called "spiritual experiences;" they are not confessions or personal exercises, but acts of the mind towards God; and 2, they express the needs, and embody the sentiments, not of this or that worshipper, but of the Church at large.

Father Faber's compositions are of so mixed a character that we could almost regret his choice of a title which sets them the more strikingly in contrast with the authorized Hymns of the Church. Many of them are evidently not constructed for use in public worship; they are the expressions of an individual, and even of a particular mind, which will find responses in many a devout heart, but which could not be introduced into a mixed congregation without danger of forcing the feelings, in some instances, into an unnatural state. Some of them represent sentiments of piety and contrition, which on the lips of the casual worshipper would be unreal; some embody particular devotions, and so are necessarily partial in their application; while all but a very few are more subjective in their character than we should fancy suitable to public worship, even as outlets of informal and auxiliary devotion. This, or some of it at least, is true of the seventeen latter hymns, which, accordingly, we infer to be those excepted in the Preface from the number intended for congregational use. After this deduction, there remain in the volume three very distinct classes of composition; the first dogmatic, such as the Hymn to the Most Holy Trinity, and several others; another historical, such as those on some of the

glorious Mysteries of the Redemption; and a third simply commemorative, such as that on "The Blessed Sacrament."

It is the hymns comprehended in these three divisions which correspond more than others with the strict ecclesiastical type; keeping sufficiently clear of personal characteristics and local devotions to present claims for adoption into an ordinary congregation. Of this number there are about eight which strike us as eminently fitted for the purpose of congregational worship; we had noted them down before making anything like a formal analysis of the contents of the volume, and we find that they come, with one exception, from the "commemorative" class, and that they include none of the "dogmatic." Our own preferences, looking to the objects of a congregational service, are drawn especially to the lines headed "Corpus Christi" (No. 12), the "Hymn to our Blessed Lady" and the "Immaculate Conception" (15, 16), "the Assumption" (19), the "Hymn to our Blessed Lady for the Souls in Purgatory" (20), two to St. Joseph (21, 22), and to "My Guardian Angel," (24.) Several of these admit of verse and chorus singing, and are therefore extremely well fitted to give vent to congregational feeling. For instance, that for Corpus Christi:—

"Jesus, my Lord, my God, my All,
How can I love Thee as I ought?
And how revere this wondrous Gift,
So far surpassing hope or thought?
Sweet Sacrament, we thee adore;
O make us love Thee more and more!"

And the latter words are repeated at the end of each stanza, like the chorus in "Adeste fideles." All experience is in favour of this form of song, as a medium of enthusiastic feeling; and if Father Faber makes another contribution of sacred poetry to the Church, we hope he will bear this fact in mind. Many of the "cantica," too, or subsidiary choral pieces actually in use, are constructed on this model. Two of these we happen to remember, of a grave character, "Adoremus in æternum," and "Rorate cœli desuper;" and we fancy something of the same character in the pieces sung at Benediction and other occasional services in the continental churches.

On the other hand, the dogmatic hymns in Father

Faber's collection, beautiful as they are, appear to us to trench too closely upon the authorized hymns of the Church, to find their proper place in a collection of popular psalmody. The province of direct doctrine is so sacred and so slippery, that we should be for leaving it exclusively to the Church herself. It must always be remembered, that those very same hymns which keep up the religious feeling in Protestant bodies, have tended for that very reason far more than books, sermons, and formularies, to insinuate and recommend doctrinal error. Jansenism, too, has prolonged its existence in some of the Hymns of the Parisian Breviary, after it has ceased to infest the Church as an external plague. And with these warnings before our eyes, we should not be surprised if the Holy See were slow to sanction the congregational use of doctrinal hymns, especially in the vernacular. The commemoration of the Divine mercies, the joyful celebration of mysteries, and the praises of our Blessed Lady and the Saints, do not appear to stand on the same shifting ground.

It is rarely indeed that the high subjects of our Faith will be entrusted to a hand at once so free and so delicate as that of Father Faber. His grasp of true doctrine seems to be so firm, that he feels himself almost at liberty to play upon it, like a skilful musician who varies his theme indefinitely without once losing the basis of the melody. From several specimens which we had marked for quotation, but which our limits preclude us from citing, we select, as to our taste a pre-eminently successful instance of the union of good theology and good poetry,—

“ THE CREATION OF THE ANGELS.

“ In pulses deep of threefold Love,
Self-hushed and self-possessed,
The mighty unbeginning God
Had lived in silent rest.

“ With His own greatness all alone
The sight of Self had been
Beauty of beauties, joy of joys,
Before His Eye serene.

“ He lay before Himself, and gazed
As ravished with the sight,
Brooding on His own attributes
With dread untold delight.

- “No ties were on His bliss, for He
Had neither end nor cause ;
For His own glory 'twas enough,
That He was What He was.
- “His glory was full grown ; His light
Had owned no dawning dim ;
His love did not outgrow Himself,
For nought could grow in Him.
- “He stirred—and yet we know not how
Nor wherefore he should move ;
In our poor human word it was
An overflow of love.
- “It was the first outspoken word
That broke that peace sublime ;
An outflow of eternal love
Into the lap of time.
- “He stirred ; and beauty all at once
Forth from His Being broke ;
Spirit and strength, and living life,
Created things, awoke.
- “Order, and multitude, and light
In beauteous showers outstreamed ;
And realms of newly-fashioned space
With radiant angels beamed.
- “How wonderful is life in Heaven
Amid the Angelic choirs,
Where uncreated Love has crowned
His first created fires.
- “But see ! new marvels gather there,
The Wisdom of the Son
With Heaven's completed wonder ends
The work so well begun ;
- “The Throne is set : the Blessed Three
Crowning their work are seen—
The Mother of Her First Born Son,
The first-born creatures' Queen.”—pp. 103-7.

We are not sure that in the whole range of sacred (uninspired) poetry we have ever met with any thing more simply sublime than the earlier stanzas of this hymn. In addition to any other reason we may have for not wishing it set to music, the impossibility of finding among known composers, any hand to do it justice, is a very practical

objection to the attempt. It would require the spirit of a Beethoven to give it expression.

With the few exceptions we have noticed, this beautiful volume appears to us far better fitted to supply food for meditation than materials for the choir. Most of the pieces strike us as far too recondite in sentiment for congregational singing. The simplest homeliest stave in honour of our Blessed Lady; a sustained "Ave," or a joyful oft-repeated "Viva," would carry hearts away (we should fancy) better than many a more finished composition. How bald, as poetry, are the national "rhymes," of which it has been said that they bind a people far more strongly than its laws; how few and rough the words of those loyal or republican airs whose influence has erewhile rallied hearts around the person of an exiled prince, or uprooted in a night the traditions of centuries! A few loving words oft repeated on a popular theme, and set to a strain buoyant and simple, are all that is wanted to arouse a nation's spirit. It is with the greatest diffidence that we offer any criticism on a work of such rare merit as that before us, and we do it only because its author modestly invites it. But we cannot help thinking that if for the future this accomplished writer would divide his great powers of metrical composition—giving us, on the one hand, something exceedingly simple for the Church, and, on the other, carrying on the work of meditative poetry, in which he so excels—he would do a service in two distinct lines, which the present volume, from the very circumstance of attempting both at once, has but partially accomplished.

As an aid to meditation and a vehicle of the soundest, most reverent, and most affectionate religious feeling, we do not think that the claims of Father Faber's volume can be easily exaggerated. In the few latter compositions especially, there is a depth and reality of devotional spirit which must commend itself to every pious heart. All will have felt what Father Faber so truthfully and so sweetly expresses; as, for instance, in the following stanzas on

“DISTRACTIONS IN PRAYER.

“ Ah, dearest Lord, I cannot pray
 My fancy is not free;
 Unmannerly distractions come
 And force my thoughts from Thee.

- “ *The world that looks so dull all day
Glows bright on me in prayer ;
And plans that ask no thought but Thee
Wake up and meet me there.*
- “ *All nature one full fountain seems
Of dreamy sight and sound,
Which, when I kneel, breaks up its deeps,
And makes a deluge round.*
- “ *Old voices murmur in my ear,
New hopes start into life,
And past and future gaily blend
In one bewitching strife.*
- “ *My very flesh has restless fits ;
My changeful limbs conspire
With all these phantoms of the mind
My inner self to fire.*
- * * * *
- “ *Had I kept stricter watch each hour
O'er tongue, and eye, and ear,
Had I but mortified all day
Each joy as it came near :—*
- “ *Had I, dear Lord, no pleasure found
But in the thought of Thee,
Prayer would have come unsought, and been
A truer liberty.*
- “ *Yet Thou art oft most present, Lord,
In weak distracted prayer ;
A sinner out of heart with self
Most often finds Thee there.*
- * * * *
- “ *The surface troubles come and go
Like rufflings of the sea ;
The deeper depth is out of reach
To all, my God, but Thee.”—pp. 150-55.*

Specimens like these seem to bring us near to the reality of a vision which we have long indulged ; of a Catholic counterpart to the “*Christian Year,*” or “*Lyra Apostolica*” of the original Oxford school. The province of religious poetry is one almost unoccupied in the Catholic Church of England, and we know of no way more likely to refine, elevate, and deepen devotion amongst us, than an attempt by some master hand to supply the deficiency. The Eng-

lish Oratory includes one at least of the contributors to the Oxford "Lyra," and by the present volume, Father Faber has established his claim to a chief place among Catholic poets. The subjects of such a collection as we could imagine press round with a multiplicity and variety which would render not invention the difficulty, but selection. The Calendar and Ritual of the Church, the Lives of the Saints, the holy Sacraments, the Religious State, all are full of poetry. Even the work of the Mission, monotonous and irksome as it may appear, is essentially poetical; indeed, all duty is so, where we have eyes to see through "this dull prosaic world of ours," into the realities beyond it.

As a specimen of Father Faber's power in a somewhat different department of poetry from any into which we have as yet followed him, we will quote, in conclusion, the magnificent and touching appeal in behalf of

"ST. PHILIP'S HOME.

"O Mary, Mother Mary! our tears are flowing fast,
For mighty Rome, St. Philip's home, is desolate and waste;
There are wild beasts in her palaces far fiercer and more bold
Than those that licked the martyrs' feet in heathen days of old.

"O Mary, Mother Mary! that dear city was thine own,
And brightly once a thousand lamps before thine altars shone;
At the corners of the streets thy Child's sweet Face and thine
Charmed evil out of many hearts, and darkness out of mine.

"By Peter's Cross and Paul's sharp Sword, dear Mother Mary,
pray!

By the dungeon deep where thy St. Luke in weary durance lay;
And by the Church thou know'st so well beside the Latin Gate,
For the love of John, dear Mother, stay the hapless city's fate.

"For the exiled Pontiff's sake, our Father and our Lord,
O Mother, bid the angel sheathe his keen avenging sword;
For the Vicar of thy Son, poor exile though he be,
Is busied with thine honour now by that sweet southern sea.

"O by the joy thou hadst in Rome, when every street and square
Burned with the fire of holy love that Philip kindled there;
And by that throbbing heart of his which thou didst keep at Rome,
Let not the spoiler waste dear Father Philip's home!

"O by the dread basilicas, the pilgrim's gates to heaven,
By all the shrines and relics God to Christian Rome hath given,

By the countless Ave-Maries that have rung from out its towers,
By Peter's threshold, Mother ! save this pilgrim land of ours !

“ By all the words of peace and power that from St. Peter's Chair
Have stilled the angry world so oft, this glorious city spare !
By the lowliness of him whose gentle-hearted sway
A thousand lands are blessing now, dear Mother Mary, pray !

“ By the pageants bright whose golden light hath flashed through
street and square,
And by the long processions that have borne thy Jesus there !
By the glories of the Saints, by the honours that were thine,
By all the worship God hath got from many a blazing shrine,—

“ By all heroic deeds of Saints that Rome hath ever seen,
By all the times her multitudes have crowned thee for their Queen,
By all the glory God hath gained from out that wondrous place,
O Mary, Mother Mary ! pray thy strongest prayer for grace !

“ O Mary, Mother Mary ! thou wilt plead for Philip's home ;
Thou wilt turn the heart of Him who turned St. Peter back to
Rome ;

O thou wilt pray thy prayer ; and the battle will be won,
And the Saviour's sinless Mother save the City of her Son.”

pp. 206—11.

ART. IX.—*The Four Gospels, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek text, being a revision of the Rhenish translation, with notes critical and explanatory.* By F. P. KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. 8vo. New York, 1849.

ANY work from the pen of Bishop Kenrick, must be received with interest and with respect by every Catholic who speaks the English language. His varied and extensive learning, his great researches, his distinguished abilities, and his sound orthodoxy, combined with his high position in the Church, must give weight to all that he publishes. The work before us is another proof of his lordship's zeal, and another monument of his learning ; and as such we sincerely welcome it. The object of this new version, with its commentary, appears to be two-fold. First, it is intended to vindicate the Catholic Vulgate, and shew its superiority to the Anglican ; secondly, it is

directed, both by modifications of the ordinary Catholic translation, and by short notes, to remove difficulties, and facilitate the reading of the gospels. It is by no means a controversial work; the notes do not undertake to meet those misrepresentations which result from erroneous doctrine; and on the whole, they will be probably much valued and read by Protestants as well as Catholics.

This work acquires, in our minds, an additional importance from another consideration. It is the first attempt to bring before the notice of ordinary Catholic readers, the critical study of the text. It is an undoubted fact, that all modern judicious critics will give great weight, and even preference, to the vulgate, or Latin version, beyond the ordinary Greek text, where the two differ. The reason is simple. On these occasions, the oldest and best manuscripts, and the most ancient versions, almost invariably agree with the vulgate; and their concurrent testimony establishes the fact, that the vulgate represents manuscripts more accurate, than have been used to form the received Greek text. When we consider the scorn cast by the reformers upon the vulgate, and their recurrence, in consequence, to the Greek, as the only accurate standard, we cannot but rejoice at the silent triumph which truth has at length gained over clamorous error. For in truth, the principal writers who have avenged the vulgate, and obtained for it its critical pre-eminence, are Protestants. But though such a judgment has long been passed by the learned, the great bulk of readers, including men of education, no doubt fancy as yet, that the Greek must always have the preference; and even Catholics may not be free from this opinion. Now Bishop Kenrick has taken the simplest mode of removing it. He shows, in few words, that where the Anglican version agrees with the Greek, but differs from the Latin, the best modern Protestant critics give the preference to the latter.

We have no doubt that this exposure will do much good. At the same time it suggests to us the fear, and shall we add, the shame, that we are not altogether prepared for these critical remarks. We do not believe that Catholics are worse off than their neighbours, who profess to draw all their faith from scripture. But as it is not our place to think for these, we naturally confine our remarks to our own body; and we regret to say, that we have not an English Catholic elementary book of biblical introduc-

tion. Little or no study is made in our schools of the preliminary matter requisite for reading the Bible, although we are sure that the subject could be made as interesting as it is important. Upon this topic we would willingly dilate, did we not view it in connection with deeper considerations, and a wider range of defects than we can at present dwell on. But whoever has paid attention to biblical critical studies, and knows the niceties of the questions in which they get involved, and has tried to unravel the perplexities of *recensions*, and their theories, and has experienced how difficult it is to fix the date of a manuscript or a version, or to weigh conflicting evidence about any text, will fear, we think, with us, that very few indeed of such readers as Dr. Kenrick will secure, will be able to appreciate the critical portion of his notes, or to understand their drift. Nor can we hope that the very brief "Explanations" at the beginning of the volume, containing necessarily so many hard names, and allusions to matters with which ordinary readers are not familiar, will very effectually assist them. If Dr. Kenrick, or any other sound theological scholar, who could sift the chaff from the wheat in modern scriptural writers, would supply the want to which we have alluded, he would confer a lasting advantage on our body.

The second object proposed in the learned Bishop's notes is, we think, of greater practical utility: and we do not hesitate to say that many readers will derive great benefit from their perusal. They will find many terms and phrases explained which they have possibly often read without attaching any very definite idea to them; they will see apparent discrepancies very simply reconciled, and obscure passages briefly but ably illustrated. It will in many cases dispense with the necessity of consulting larger commentaries.

And again on this subject we will express a hope, that this work will lead to others in scriptural learning, and those not merely introductory, but deep, earnest, and solid. For we are fully convinced that the field belongs exclusively to Catholics, and that they alone can properly occupy it. After all the boasted researches of the moderns, what has been done? What are the commentaries of Kuinoel, Rosenmüller, Campbell, or Bloomfield? Sapless, heartless, devotionless, merely critical and philological notes, which help one not a step to taste and relish the

sweetness of the divine narrative, or to learn its true lessons. There is in them neither breadth of view nor depth of penetration; they walk you over the surface, and, if anything, deaden the perception of those inner and hidden treasures, those rich mines which lie beneath the letter. And this must be the case with all Protestant scripture learning. The tender mysteries of our Saviour's nativity and holy childhood, associated at every moment with His Blessed Mother; His kindness towards sinners, and his familiarity with the poor; the sorrowful scenes of His passion, in their details, as meditated upon by Catholic Saints;* all these it is impossible for a Protestant mind to view or dwell on with the intensity and affectionateness that a Catholic heart requires. Then what can a Protestant do with the evangelical counsels, poverty and chastity, and renouncing of all possessions; with the apostles, sent without scrip or staff to preach to heathens; with celibacy and virginity; with fasting and watching; with the forgiveness of sins, and the eating of Christ's Body; with miracles and wonders to be wrought in the Church? He must try to show that some of these things are figurative, and that others only applied to the apostolic times; and that, in fact, they are nothing to us. Only the Catholic can fully and lovingly enter into the heart of God's word, and feel its whole truth and perfect reality. The others must be ever reasoning, while we are content to receive impressions.

We feel, therefore, deeply convinced, that if we would only take full possession of scripture, and place it before those who love, or affect to love, it, in its true and catholic light, and draw from it its practical, yet most moving lessons, in the catholic spirit, we should easily convince our adversaries that ours is the only religion of Scripture, and our inheritance its interpretation. But perhaps we shall best explain our meaning, by endeavouring to exemplify what we have said. Let us take, for instance, one characteristic point of our Saviour's teaching, and endeavour to

* A curious enquiry to pursue, but not here, would be the following: How far has the rejection and condemnation, by Protestantism, of pictures and sculptures conduced to the suppression of meditation, which is a mental representation? We believe much. To take one instance—could a person who has never seen a crucifix possibly realise to his mind the crucifixion?

develop in it, and through it, the principle which we have laid down: that it requires a catholic view of it, to do it full justice, while yet this does not exclude those modes of illustration which may be deemed the common property of every scholar, though they require the chastening hand of orthodox Religion safely to apply them.

Were any one asked, what is the peculiar feature of Our Saviour's teaching, as preserved for us in the Gospels, he would naturally answer, that it consists in His constant use of parables and similitudes. The answer would no doubt be correct, so far as comparison with other known methods of instruction can lead us. Not only the Fathers and later teachers in the Church pursue a system that may seem the very opposite, but even the Apostles, who naturally imbibed the Spirit of their holy Master, and sought to be like Him, disclose no traces of this mode of delivering doctrine. Nor can this be the result of want of genius or of imagination, or of any other faculty. For they wrote under the influence of Divine inspiration, and the Holy Spirit who breathed in, and through them, and who guided their pens, could have suggested to them parables and illustrations, as easily as simple dogmatic teaching. If He did not so, if in this respect they were guided to depart from the model of their Lord and Teacher, there must have been reasons why that mode should remain sacredly His, and not be considered suitable to them. Again, this could not be, because the Apostles had to address, in their writings, a different class of disciples. Several of their epistles are directed to the same Jewish people, whether still living in their own country, or dispersed in distant lands. In every respect these compositions bear the Jewish stamp, in style, in reasoning, in quotations, in allusions, in illustration, in figures of speech, in cast of thought. The strongest internal evidence of their genuineness results from this decisive mark of origin, combined with the novelty of their doctrine, and their connection with the Gospel system. If therefore our Saviour chose the mode of instruction by parables to gratify a Jewish taste, or to gain the Jewish mind, we might naturally expect, that after His justification of such a course, it would have been pursued by His first followers. And if we say, on the other hand, that the Apostles wrote rather for the Church in after times, we shall surely belie our best thoughts and feelings, if we do not consider that every

word which our blessed Lord spoke was as completely addressed to His spouse, as to any unbelieving Jew.

We cannot be surprised that this peculiar choice by our Redeemer, of His method of instruction, should have engaged the attention of religious minds and ecclesiastical writers. Good and solid reasons have been given for His preference; the beauties of His different parables have been unfolded by many an eloquent pen; and the lessons which each contains have been expounded, illustrated, and inculcated, with an almost endless variety of explanation. Each may be likened to a simple theme in music, upon which many composers will elaborate many variations, through all which the original strain will be heard, though one may seem to droop in mournful key, and languid measure, and another to sparkle in all the brilliancy of the wildest caprice. Every parable has been preached upon, commented upon, meditated on, written on; chapters, essays, volumes almost, have been devoted to several of them; their literal, their allegorical, their spiritual, their doctrinal, their ascetic sense has been fully drawn out, sometimes into a very wire of extenuated detail, sometimes into beautiful "chains of gold inlaid with silver,"* the chaste delicacy of the commentary enhancing the rich brilliancy of the text. In so well reaped a field, what can *we* hope to glean? Can we, for a moment, flatter ourselves, that we can add another thought, or even another fancy, to the luxuriance of past illustrators; or that we can throw any additional light upon the method itself of parabolic teaching, after all that has been written concerning it?

We would not put such questions into our reader's thoughts, did we feel ourselves compelled to answer them directly; were it necessary either to give a presumptuous affirmative reply, and so forfeit his confidence; or, at once, by a self-condemning negative, cut off our right to pen another line on the subject. We will do neither; but will rather trust ourselves to his indulgence and generosity, to take it for granted that we would not willingly waste the pages of our Review, nor trifle with his patience; and that, therefore, if merely taking our suggestion from the volume before us, we venture to lead him on so beaten a road, it is not without the hope, that we may draw his attention to

* Cant. i. 10.

something which he may have passed by before. There is no great merit in this. It may be that we have travelled it over more frequently than he, because our business and duty led us regularly that way; it may be that we have had more leisure than he in going along it, and so have sauntered, and loitered, and looked about us more; it may be that we have walked on it in the company of the wiser than ourselves, who, in oriental phrase, may have dropped the pearls of their sage words upon it, and we may remember where, and pick them up, as we go on; or it may be that we have held in our hands, as we journeyed, some quaint old volumes, that collected its histories, its traditions, its associations, and hidden sources of interest. If so, there can be but small pretension in embodying the results of such slender and such pleasant industry, and offering them to others. And having got thus far, let us conclude these introductory remarks, by boldly stating, that we think there are some views of this method of teaching, which have not received their full elucidation, and which yet present a strong attraction, that the system, both in its principles and in its details, bears powerfully upon the evidences both of christianity in general, and of catholicity more particularly; and that, moreover, many of the aids to appreciating the full beauty of our Lord's method of instruction, are locked up in works too much out of ordinary readers' way to be familiar to them, or are derived from sources not likely to reach them; which yet are not sufficiently brought forward, as they might be, to enhance the interest, or deepen the impressions, of these sacred lessons.

If we take any portion of our Saviour's discourses in the three first gospels, we are struck at once with the richness of its texture. It is like a beautiful piece of tessellated work, composed of rich designs of imagery, each of which is beautiful in itself, but runs into the next, while, perhaps, in the midst, to continue our image, comes a fuller and more finished picture, set as in a rich border. There is hardly a sentence that descends to what we should call prose; every thought is conveyed in a sententious, proverbial, and easily remembered form; or it is a beautiful and perfect simile, or comparison with natural objects, or ordinary usages, such as conveys the lesson familiarly, and gives it a hold on the mind and memory; or it is a more formal and complete allegory, corresponding point by point with

a more solemn lesson. Now, to every one of these forms of speech, the term PARABLE is applied. For we may observe that the terms *proverb* and *parable* are almost convertible in scripture language. In the three first Gospels, the figurative instructions of our Lord are called Παραβολη: in St. John this word does not occur once, but the word Παροιμια is always used instead.* It is true the latter means a similitude as well as the former; but it is the title given by the Septuagint, to what we call the *Proverbs* of Solomon; and these again are called in the text Παραβολαι,† though they exactly correspond to what we should call proverbs. Besides the philological reasons for this commutation of terms,‡ we may assign a very natural one. It is that what we call a *proverb*, a similitude, and a parable, is only a more or less condensed form of the same species of speech. A proverb or sententious saying, containing in it deep meaning and practical truth, may be easily considered as the moral of a fable or parable, and its frequently figurative form would very often give, at once, the clue to such an illustration. This building of stories upon proverbs has been so often done, that it would be almost childish to dwell upon it. Franklin's story of "paying dear for one's whistle," will suffice as an instance. Again, to return to our subject, when our Lord thus addresses his fellow-townsmen: "Doubtless you will say to me this similitude, (παραβολήν): physician,

* We may likewise here remark, that *only* in St. Luke is the word παραβολη rendered by *similitudo* in the Vulgate, seven or eight times. In St. Matthew and St. Mark this is never found.

† Prov. i. 1; xxv. 1.

‡ The Hebrew word whereby the Proverbs of Solomon are called, מָשָׁל *mashal*, corresponds to the Arabic مَثَل *methel*, *like*. It is curious to observe what an influence on all modern European languages the corresponding word in Latin has exercised. From *fabula*, a fable, comes *fabulari*, to converse; hence the old Spanish *fablar*, (now, by an ordinary conversion, *hablar*.) Portuguese *fallar*, Italian *parlare*, French *parler*, and hence our *parlour* and our *parliament*! This proves that wherever the Latin language was vernacular, the ordinary word in conversation for *to speak* was this. And hence we may trace back to the oldest period of the language, the familiar use of apologues and fictitious narratives. In fact, Livy calls Memmius's apologue on the Mons Sacer, the *priscum et horridum dicendi genus*.

heal thyself.”* It is plain that this expression corresponds exactly to what we should call a proverb, yet who does not see in it, at once, a full parable, which scarcely requires development? A physician loudly proclaims his skill in curing every, or some particular, complaint: a patient sends for him, and sees at once that he is as sick as himself, and that his boasted method of cure has not answered in his own case. He very naturally rejects him as an empiric, and bids him first cure himself with his nostrums, before he tries them on others. “Physician,” he exclaims, “heal thyself.” It matters not whether the phrase arose out of an apologue, or leads to it; whether it be the fruit or the seed, is all one.

If, therefore, among the Jews, a proverb, a similitude, and a parable, were considered as but different degrees of the same form of expression, and if our Lord’s discourses were almost entirely made up of the three, we can easily see how literally those words of the sacred text meant to apply; “all these things Jesus spoke in parables to the multitude, and without parables he did not speak to them.”†

It is manifest that a marked difference may be expected, as to novelty, between those shorter proverbial phrases, and those poetical comparisons by which our Saviour conveys simpler moral and dogmatic truths, and those longer parables which contain in them a complete system of doctrines. No one, however wise, when conversing with ordinary men, will always employ original phrases, nor even deliver original ideas. He must be understood, and to keep up the interest of an audience, say many things which have been said before. Proverbs, which carry in them the thoughts and experience of the good and the wise, have become a public property; they will be used by the very best and wisest; but they will be used aptly, happily, more strikingly than by others; and what is still more important, they will receive new strength and higher meaning, and be made to contain some new and great truth. In examining the shorter parables of our blessed Lord, there is danger of two extremes; of considering every thing as new, and so rejecting all illustration from other sources, on the one hand, and of trusting too much to the light which

* Luc. iv. 23.

† Matt. xiii. 34.

these may throw upon them, on the other. The latter was the crime of that wretched school of biblical literature, which rose in Germany in the course of the last century, matured to avowed rationalism in this, not so much poisoned, as withered up, the last fibres of faith which protestantism yet held by, tainted this country with a venom which has not yet fully developed; and then seems to have gone out, like a noxious vapour, kindled for a time by an infernal flame. In its insidious beginnings, this was one of its worst deceits: that overlooking or rejecting ecclesiastical teaching and tradition, it sought, with preverted erudition, for all its illustrations of God's word, out of it, and of the natural channel of interpretation. But on the other hand, to reject totally the aid of such secondary sources of illustration, is, in truth, not merely to reject such light as they can cast on the sacred text, but to exclude what helps much to raise the character of our Lord Himself to its true dignity. Let us examine a few instances.

Our Saviour makes use of a most appropriate illustration in the following passage:—"How sayest thou to thy brother: let me cast the mote out of thine eye, and behold a beam in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thy own eye, and then thou shalt see to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye?"* Now we can hardly doubt that this was a proverbial expression among the Jews, for we find it quoted as such in the Rabbins, but with very different effect. "It is written, that in the time of the judges, if any one said, 'cast out the mote (stalk) from thy eye;' the other would answer: 'cast out the beam from thine.'"† "Rabbi Tarphon said: 'I wonder if in this age there be any one who will receive correction: for if any one says to another, cast out the mote from thine eye, he would answer him, cast the beam out of thine.'"‡ Similar passages occur elsewhere. As here used, the expression was clearly one of retort, and he who used it is evidently blamed. The haughty pharisee, the unbelieving Sadducee, the scandalous priest, was no doubt generally the reprover of others' failings, (for *they* were not "as the rest of men,") and to them was the retort frequently and justly addressed. Now our Lord exactly takes part with those who make it, but He goes

* Matt. vii. 4, 5.

† Bava Bathra f. 10. 2.

‡ Erachin f. 16. 2.

further still, and takes it in God's name, and brands with the terrible name of "hypocrite," him who dares to incur the injustice of correcting others, while he is guilty of even greater sins. His treatment of the accusers of the woman taken in adultery,* is the best illustration of this meaning. But Christ's application of the familiar proverb rises higher; it goes to teach, what Jewish doctor never thought of, mutual forbearance, gentleness in dealing with others' defects, strict scrutiny into our own failings rather than into theirs, and self-correction before we undertake the delicate office of directing others. And thus, as in that same sermon on the mount, He took the texts of the old law, and amended them for the new, in all that regarded charity, so did He no less those familiar and traditional phrases current among the teachers of the people.

Let us take another example, which has given rise to much strange discussion. "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven." † Even in ancient times, as appears, from marginal notes on manuscripts, there was a disposition to modify the apparent harshness of this text. A camel passing through the eye of a needle seemed almost incongruous; and hence by changing *κάμηλος* into *κάμιλος*, a "camel" into a "cable" a more natural connection was sought to be given between the two terms employed: "a cable passing through the eye of a needle." Drusius warmly espoused this reading; ‡ and others followed him. But no sensible commentator would now adopt so useless an attempt at emendation. There can be little doubt that the expression was a proverbial one, to imply an impossibility. For with the exception of the animal mentioned, we find the same proverb in use in central and eastern Asia. In those countries the largest beast of burthen was the elephant, and the image in the comparison was naturally drawn from it. In the *Bava Metsia*, one of the Talmudic treatises, a person thus addresses another who dealt in wonders: "Perhaps you are from the city of Pumbeditha, where they make an elephant pass through the eye of a needle." § And in another work it is written:

* Jo. viii.

† Matt. xix. 24.

‡ In loc. and in his Treatise on Heb. proverbs in Crit. sac. tom. v.

§ Fol. 38. 2.

“They do not show a golden palm, nor an elephant going through the eye of a needle.”* Dr. Frank has given a similar proverb as Indian: “as if an elephant were to try to pass through a small opening.”† What the elephant was to the oriental Asiatic, the camel was to the western: the proverb would naturally present this substitution of animals, yet be substantially the same. Hence, the Arabs have the proverb, with the camel, as in the gospel.‡ But what an awful severity, what a definitely acute edge does not this vague and general expression, more of incredulity than of impossibility, receive, when applied, as by our Lord, to the difficulty, for the rich, of entering His kingdom. And how increased is the strength of the figure, by the appeal, which follows it, to God’s omnipotence, as the sole power that can reverse or modify the sentence. “With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible,”§ and therefore this. So firmly welded and rivetted have the two parts of the sentence become, in our Saviour’s mouth, that no power will ever again separate them; it would be profane to reduce again to a general expression of difficulty, or human impossibility, that which has been definitely appropriated by Him, to declare the most terrible moral truth of His divine Religion.

We can easily conceive how this familiarity with the proverbial forms of speech in use among the Rabbins and learned men of His nation, this apt and elegant use of their favourite expressions, and this power of giving them new and peculiar beauties gained Him at once the respect and confidence of the people, associated Him, of right, with their admitted teachers, shut the jealous mouths of these men, and delighted and charmed all, till they would remain whole days, regardless of food, in His society. Hence even in that very place where He was no prophet, the people “all gave testimony to Him: and they wonder-

* *Beracoth*, fol. 55. 2.

† 50th. Continuation of the Accounts of the E. I. Missionaries, Halle, 1742.

‡ It occurs in the Koran, Sur. vii. 38. “They who charge our signs with falsehood, and reject them, the gates of heaven shall be closed against them, and they shall not enter Paradise, till a camel pass through the eye of a needle.”

§ Matt. xix. 26.

ed at the words of grace that proceeded from His mouth, and they said, Is not this the son of Joseph?"* But what doubtless added still further to enhance the beauty and gracefulness of His discourse, was the readiness with which His illustrations and comparisons seemed to spring from the objects around, or from the most homely subjects. How important this consideration is, when we study our Saviour's more formal parables, we shall see later: but in the shorter images, the *fabelle breviores*, as Quintilian calls them, this obvious facility of taking them up must have rendered them much more striking and interesting. The whitening corn-fields suggest the thought of the spiritual harvest ripe for the sickle; † the fig-tree putting forth its fruit furnishes a lesson on the coming of God's Kingdom. "See the fig-tree, and all the trees, when they now shoot forth their fruit." † When discoursing on the mount, how beautifully the birds flitting about furnish a beautiful image: "Behold the birds of the air:" and the lilies which spring up, as travellers inform us, on that very ground, give rise to that still more graceful similitude, "Consider the lilies of the field how they grow: they labour not, neither do they spin. But I say to you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed as one of these." § Then every action and operation of the household, and of ordinary life—the grinding at the mill; || the leavening of the dough; ¶ the good housewife's hoard; ** the governing of the house; †† the cultivation of the vineyard, from its planting †† to its yielding fruit; §§ the tillage

* Luc. iv. 22.

† Jo. iv. 35.

‡ Luc. xxi. 29.

§ Mat. vi. 26, 28. Solomon is the Cræsus of oriental poetry. The prince of Persian poets, Hafez, has a similar figure:—

چو گل سوار شود بر هوا سلیمان وار

"When the rose rides on the air like Solomon."

(Rosseau's Flowers of Pers. Liter. p. 165.) The rose is in Persian, what the lily is in Hebrew, poetry.

|| Mat. xxiv. 41.

¶ Lu. xiii. 21.

** Lu. xv. 8.

†† Lu. xii. 35.

‡‡ Mat. xx. 1, xxi. 33. Mar. xii. 1. Lu. xx. 9.

§§ Jo. xv. 1—6. "Every branch that beareth fruit, he (the husbandman) will purge it, that it may bring forth more fruit." (v. 2.)

of the field* and of the garden; † the pastoral life in its smallest details, ‡ each furnishes him with most appropriate imagery, and most pertinent illustration. At the same time even the more refined and luxurious life of the higher classes is no less fertile in His hand; the management of the estate; § the distribution of confidential duties to servants; || the sumptuous feast; ¶ the bridal procession; **

This same figure is beautifully applied, almost in the same words, by the Persian poet Saadi :

زکوة مال بدر کن کة فضله رزرا
چو باغبان ببرد بیشتر دهد انگور

“Distribute in alms the tithe of thy wealth; for the more the gardener cuts away the redundancy of the vine, the more fruit it gives.”—Gulistan, chap. ii. Tale xlix.

* Mat. xiii. 3, 24. Mar. iv. 3, 26. Lu. viii. 4.

† Lu. xiii. 6. ‡ Mat. xviii. 12. Lu. xv. 4. Jo. x. 1.

§ Lu. xvi. 1. || Mat. xxv. 1. Lu. xix. 12.

¶ Mat. xxii. 12. Lu. xiv. 16. We are tempted to introduce another oriental illustration of an important feature of this parable. (M. v. 11.) The guests called in on a sudden are all found clothed in a wedding, or feasting garment, (for *γαμος* expresses the feast) corresponding to the Roman *cœnatorium*. There is only one exception. As he is severely reprimanded and punished for not having one, and yet he and all his fellow-guests were poor, we must suppose that rich garments were given to them, and that gross neglect, or some worse fault was imputable to the unrobed guest. Now Fakr-Eddin Razi informs us how Jaffar the son of Yaya, in the days of the great Egyptian Khalif, Haroun Al Rashid used to have in his palace secret banquets, and that the guests all put on garments of various colours, red, yellow, or green, and the forbidden cup circulated freely among them. One day he had assembled in his apartments all his boon-companions except one, whose name was Abd-al-melik, and he left orders with his porter to admit none but him. It happened, however, that there was at court another of that name, a man of austere morals, whom Jaffar had in vain endeavoured to draw to his jovial parties. He happening to come to speak on business, gave his name, and was admitted by the unsuspecting porter. The guests were surprised and confounded at his appearance: but he, without embarrassment, joined the party, and said: “bring me also one of those rich garments;” and only after he had been thus clothed, asked for a cup of wine. Sacy’s Chrestom. Arabe. pp. 35, 36 of text.

** Mat. xxv. 1.

the processes of law;* even political events of recent occurrence, † serve for Him as groundwork of most expressive and beautiful lessons. And there is every reason to suppose, that even such detailed and pointed parables as that of the rich man and Lazarus had a basis of fact, and alluded to characters and incidents well known.

When we consider, in addition, that in almost every case these parables could not have been prepared, but were introduced in discourses arising from casual events, or spoken in answer to sudden questions, we shall not be surprised at the delight which they gave his audience, and how they found his words truly full of elegance and grace. What we have said will enable us to explain the beautiful description which our Lord Himself gives us of His own mode of teaching. After the remarkable series of parables in the thirteenth chapter of St. Matthew, in which the Church is symbolised as a field, a treasure, a pearl, and a net, our Saviour, having explained them to His disciples, thus addresses them: "Have you understood all these things? They say to Him, Yes. He said unto them, Therefore is every scribe" (or Doctor) "instructed in the kingdom of heaven, like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure" (that is, his store) "new things and old." (51, 52.) Our Lord, having made use of different parables, some from common life, as the sowing of a field, or a draught of fishes, others from more extraordinary occurrences, such as the finding of a treasure, or of an invaluable pearl, asks His apostles if they understood all these illustrations. They answer Him affirmatively. *Therefore*, He replies, that is because you find these different images so clear, you see herein the skill of the experienced religious teacher. He is like an economical householder, who has carefully stored up objects of every kind, some old, some new, and knows where always to find just the thing that he requires. So the good teacher, who has treasured up in his mind a rich collection of varied learning, will be ready always to cull out just what is wanted, old things or new: the old, by adapting to his doctrine ancient maxims, proverbs, and wise sayings, as well as historical events; and the new, by seizing the

* *Ib.* v. 25.† *Lu.* xix. 14.

occurrences of the moment, or objects that are present, and turning them to the profit of his scholars.

We have seen how admirably and how perfectly Christ did this. But His hearers not only found His words full of grace, but they marked a difference between His teaching and that of their usual instructors, which they described in this phrase: that "He was teaching them as one having power, and not as the scribes and Pharisees."* Besides the remarkable and most important meaning which we hope later to draw from these words, we may easily explain what the Jews meant, by reference to the corresponding teaching of the pharisees and scribes. For we may here assume that their teaching is fairly represented to us by the lessons recorded in the Jewish writings, of the parables and sayings of the older Rabbins. We have not leisure or space to prove this; but it would not be difficult. We could show that St. Jerome refers to, and even, in his version, follows traditional Jewish interpretations to be found in Talmudic writings; and if any one desires to test this assertion within a very limited compass, we would refer him to his commentary on Osee. In like manner St. Ephrem has some peculiar comments which are manifestly traditional, agreeing most curiously with the Koran, † which certainly drew its accounts from the Jews. And St. James of Edessa, quoting one of these histories, about Melchisedec, informs us that it came from Jewish traditions. ‡ St. James of Sarug does the same. § If therefore we are justified in considering the Jewish histories, recorded in later writers, as traditions of far earlier periods, we shall be warranted in comparing the teaching of our Saviour with that there recorded; and the result will be what the people describe, in the text just cited. The teaching of the Jewish doctors and expounders of the law was frivolous, trivial, and childish, and related to every manner of petty distinction and dispute, respecting the

* Mat. vii, 29.

† As that Jacob knew the story brought him by his sons, of Joseph's death, to be untrue (in loc.); which is asserted in the Koran. (Sur. *Jusuphu.*) Again, that the rock struck by Moses produced twelve fountains, (Op. tom. i. p. 263,) which again is found in the Koran. (Sur. ii.)

‡ Op. S. Ephrem, tom. i. p. 273.

§ Ib. p. 274.

law, ceremonial and moral. We do not recollect a single instance in which a masterly grasp of great principles is exhibited, in which anything like a broad, generous, exalted, view is taken of the whole law, or of a single precept. The character of this teaching could not possibly have been given in stronger and juster terms than it is by our Lord, when he reproaches them with measuring out their tithe of mint and cummin, and letting alone the weightier things of the law, judgment, and mercy, and faith, straining out at a gnat, and swallowing a camel.* Compared with this, how healthy, vigorous, noble, and enlarged must the teaching of our Lord have justly appeared. There the spirit of the law had been clearly caught and defined, and the new and higher law that was engrafted on it, in the Sermon on the mount, to which the Jews referred, was manifestly its rightful sequence, and natural maturing to perfection. And every illustration introduced, instead of serving to perplex, and bind still further, as in the rabbinical teaching, simplified and explained His meaning most happily, and supported generous and exalted views of duty.

What we have written will guide us at least one step towards answering the question with which we started; why did our Lord choose to teach in parables, and why did not the apostles? Because it was necessary for Him to claim and secure the title of a Master in Israel, a public teacher; and so to drive from the field the false teachers who held it, and had so thoroughly perverted the old law, that it was necessary to sweep away from it their corruptions, before the new could be fastened on it. This, which may be called the aggressive part of our Saviour's ministry, was not to be accomplished without great command, great vigour, and almost violence. And to it belong those strong and magnificent declamations, in which He thoroughly unmasks their hypocrisy, uncharitableness, and hidden vice. How was this work of power to succeed, save by Christ's showing Himself fully equal to those rivals in all which their dupes, and the whole people considered wisdom, and even assert successfully superiority over them in their own modes of teaching? And effectually we see, that though not brought up in their schools, nor associating with any of their sects, nor holding fami-

* Mat. xxiii. 23. seq.

liarity with any of them, and consequently having a coalition of Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, priests, and doctors arrayed against Him, though cordially hating each other, He obtained the title which they most coveted,* that of Master,† Teacher,‡ and Rabbi.§ But though this was necessary for Him, it was not so for His followers. On the contrary, as they were to have “only one Master, Christ,” they were forbidden to assume or to aspire to this title. ||

But in addition to the position thus required by our Lord, for founding the Christian religion on the groundwork of the former revelation, there was another reason why He might be considered almost compelled to adopt the system of teaching by parables. It was, that it was associated throughout the East with the idea of wisdom. Solomon, the very type of wisdom, was the great parable, or proverb, writer of the Jews.¶ When the Queen of Saba came to him, it was expressly to try his wisdom by enigmas or riddles,** which in those times were like parables.†† And the following is the description of a wise man: “The wise man will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients.....he will keep the sayings of renowned men, and will enter withal into the subtleties of parables. He will search out the hidden meanings of proverbs, and will be conversant in the secrets of parables.”‡‡ Jeremias celebrates the wisdom of the inhabitants of Theman, the capital of the Idumeans.§§ And Baruch tells us in what that

* Mat. xxiii. 7.

† Mat. viii. 19 ; xii. 38. Lu. ix. 38 ; xx. 21, 28, 39. Jo. viii. 4. *et al pass.*

‡ Lu. v. 5 ; viii. 24, 45, *et al pass.* This word *ἐπιστάτης* is peculiar to St. Luke in the New Testament.

§ Mat. xxvi. 25, 49. Mar. ix. 4. Jo. i. 38 ; iii. 2, 26, *et al.*

|| Mat. xxiii. 8, 10.

¶ 3 Reg. iv. 32.

** 3 Reg. x. 1. Menander and Dios, the historians of Tyre, whose fragments are preserved by Eusebius, inform us that the friendship of Solomon and Hiram was kept up by their sending one another enigmas to solve.

†† As Jud. xiv. 14.

‡‡ Ecclus. xxxix. 1, 3.

§§ Jer. xlix. 7.

wisdom consisted, when he speaks of "The children of Agar also, that search after the wisdom that is of the earth, the merchants of Merrha and Theman, and *the tellers of fables, and searchers of prudence and understanding.*"* We might add many examples more. But it was so throughout the East. The story of Œdipus proves it for Egypt. Esop is the impersonation of that oriental wisdom, as it appeared in early Greece; and his fables may be traced through the Arabic of Lokman (surnamed as their writer, "the Wise") and the Persian of Bidpai, (known more popularly as Pilpay,) to the Hipotadesa of India; a genealogy as clear as that of our numerals through Araby to India. The Armenians fall into the chain, through the fables of Vartbran. The Gulistan, or Rose-garden of Saadi, one of the most beautiful oriental poems, to which we have referred in a former note, consists entirely of a classified series of short parables or tales, sometimes containing only the saying of some sage, each followed by an often exquisite strophe, containing the moral or application. And not to multiply instances, suffice it to say, that so much authority is granted to this form of teaching among Mussulmen, that the prohibition to drink wine, now so important a feature in their religious code, rests entirely, not on the Koran, but on the teaching of a parable, in the Taalim, their second religious book. So long, then, as in the country and age in which our Saviour lived, the idea of wisdom was so completely involved in that of teaching by similitudes and parables, and this not rashly, but in accordance with the definitions of the sacred writings, and the character of acknowledged sages, it became Him so far to adapt Himself to these habitual and deeply-rooted views, as to ensure the deepest and most reverential attention, as a sage. Nay, it was absolutely necessary that He should cope with Solomon himself in his own peculiar form of wisdom, that so He might confidently and boldly tell the Jews, "behold more than Solomon is here!" † The meaning of these words is indeed very deep and solemn. For as the gift of wisdom to that king was given in terms that excluded rivalry from man, ‡ to assert,

* Bar. iii. 23.

† Lu. xi. 31.

‡ I "have given thee a wise and understanding heart, in so much that there hath been no one like thee, before thee, *nor shall arise after thee.*" 3 Reg. iii. 12.

so decidedly and so boldly, superiority to him, and that in One in whom humility was first shown to be a main part of wisdom, was equal to a declaration of His superior and Divine nature. For no one but the Giver of wisdom to Solomon could possess more wisdom than he.

These motives for teaching in the manner which alone would commend itself to the Jews, and secure their esteem, will in part explain those awful passages, in which our Lord seems to intimate that He taught them in parables, on purpose that they might not understand.* For we see that this necessity was one of their own making: and that the deafness and the blindness which followed from it, were the fruit of their obstinate adherence to so imperfect a method of teaching.

But the meaning of such passages will become perhaps more intelligible, from our next consideration, which leads us into the main scope of our dissertation. If we accurately examine the whole system of teaching by parables adopted by our Lord, we shall see that it corresponds to prophecy in the Old Law; that, in fact, in them is to be found the germ of the whole Christian system, as the history of Israel and Juda, and of Christ and His reign, is to be found in the prophets. As in the latter we have seldom anywhere one continued context on these subjects, but have to construct the web out of fragments and separate pieces, not without study and research; so likewise in the parables we have a variety of apparently detached lessons, which, considered individually, give but partial results, but which compared and joined together, throw marvellous light upon the whole theory of religion and the Church. In like manner, therefore, as the prophecies read or heard, when first uttered were generally most obscure, often unintelligible, and served even to irritate those who heard them, † and even made them harder than they were before; so were the parables, which, alluded to a system not yet fully established, necessarily unintelligible, except in so far as, like prophecies of imminent fulfilment, they alluded to the commencement of the system. And as that beginning involved the destruction of the existing state and its upholders, it naturally irritate

* Mat. xiii. 13. seq.

† Jer. xxxvii., xxxviii.

ted, provoked, and, through their obstinate perversity, even hardened those unhappy men. At the same time it might happen, and it did happen, that a parable spoken in answer to a question, while beautifully pertinent, and sufficient for its present purpose, contained in it treasures of wisdom for the future Church, which could not possibly catch the eye of the first superficial observer. Let us illustrate our meaning by an example.

In the thirteenth chapter of St. Matthew, there is a series of parables relating to the "kingdom of heaven," that is, the Church. These need not necessarily have been spoken all at the same time. The first of them, the parable of the sower, occurs in the three first gospels, and all the evangelists remark, that it was addressed to a vast multitude.* And in truth it may be well considered as the preliminary, or introductory, parable to the whole series of the parables. For it lays down the necessary dispositions for receiving, with profit, the words of Christ, and particularly describes His ministry. But the other parables may be taken in the following order. 1. The seed then sown by Christ in this field of the world, that portion of it even which fell upon well prepared ground, was soon to be disturbed by the enemy. A spurious seed would soon be scattered among it, and it would spring up, side by side with the blade of genuine grain; that is, even in the Church itself, and among the faithful, there would arise corruptions, vices, and scandals; the parable of the cockle.† 2. The sowing of this seed has evidently two distinct operations, one on the individual, the other on the Church or world in general. The heart, the dispositions, of those to whom doctrine is addressed, are essential for its cultivation in the first instance: when many have received it within, these uniting would form the Church. To each one then, this seed of true doctrine is of immense importance and value; it is the treasure, the pearl of immense price, which must be purchased by sacrifice of all else.‡ When once hidden in the heart, it is as a leaven which will communicate its qualities on every side, and make the whole of society ferment with its spirit.§ 3. That

* Matt. xiii. 3. Mar. iii. 3. Lu. viii. 4.

† Matt. xiii. 24.

‡ Ib. 44, 45.

§ Ib. 33.

seed which will at first be so small, hidden and confined, will now spring up about the earth; the grain long buried, will become a great and glorious tree.* A portion only of all this belonged to the Jews; the duty of receiving Christ's doctrine, laying it to heart, and being ready to surrender all to possess it. The rest is prophetic, belongs to the future, and neither friend nor foe could understand it then. It required fulfilment, and, as no one but our Lord himself knew what His kingdom, or Church, was to be, so no one till the time came could fully see the beauty of the applications. The time did come at length: and we shall see how admirable the wisdom which this teaching laid up in store for us.

There has never been any founder of a false sect, whether deceived himself by fanaticism, or deceiving others in malice, who has not promised, and pretended to make, a perfect system. The world, if it receives their doctrine, is to be regenerated, the elect alone have to reign, or even to exist: vice and evil are to disappear before their doctrines and systems. Mohammed taught this, and used the sword of extermination to realise it. It formed the ground work of the so-called reformation, beginning with the mischievous tenets of Wycliffe and Huss, that sin put an end to all rights, down to the murderous ravings of the German Anabaptists, the fanatical brutishness of the Cromwellian Puritans, and the wild dreams of Mormonites or Agapomenites. Certainly the beginning of the Church might easily have seduced men into the same dream; and the sight of the one-hearted church of Jerusalem, or of the love-bound community of Alexandria, might have made sanguine believers hope, that a state of unmixed virtue was beginning to prevail on earth. But jealousy and contest soon came in to dispel the vision. It was not however till many years after, that this false principle assumed the form of a specific heresy. It is essentially in every heresy; it lurked in the early sects, it appeared palpably in Novatianism, and Montanism, but it incarnated itself in Donatism. The basis of that heresy and schism, was, that the Church could only consist of incorrupt members, and that every portion of it which tolerated, or forgave those guilty of a grievous crime, had forfeited its claims. Protestantism is essentially Dona-

* *Ib.* 31.

tist, whether in its high-church theory of branch separation from the trunk, or in its lowest evangelical idea of an invisible elect church. Where was the confutation of this dangerous theory to be found? In the parables which we have arranged, with one more which follows them, and is but a confirmation of a preceding one; the likening of the kingdom of heaven to a net gathering all sorts of fishes, which are separated only on the shore.* This, our Saviour, by mentioning the angels as the sorters of good and bad, clearly refers to the explanation given by Himself, of the parable of the cockle. To judge of the importance of these parables, on the point referred to, let the reader only open, at random, any of St. Augustine's works against the Donatists. He will hardly open a page, in which he does not find these two parables quoted or alluded to, together with the similar image of the Baptist, that on the barn floor the wheat and the chaff lie mixed, till the winnowing-time comes, in the end.† “*Novit Dominus triticum suum, novit et paleam,*” is almost a proverbial expression with that Father. He is never afraid of wearying by repeating the same arguments: these images are again and again quoted, are turned on every side, are by turns arguments fully developed, and illustrations to elucidate his own reasonings; but it is clear that in them lies the whole gist of the question, and that our Lord had carefully buried in them, a seed of doctrine which would not reach its maturity, till they who heard it had long passed away.

And now let us take another instance of parables seemingly spoken for a passing illustration; which yet have acquired a most sacred importance in the Church. One of the dangers to our Lord's disciples was, from the facility with which they would take up the tone of false zeal common in their time, and considered a characteristic of great virtue. For it is difficult for men, especially if untutored, to get clear of national characteristics. Symptoms of this soon appeared. There were little pharisaical contests for the first place, among those young children of the Gospel:‡ they soon got to wish for judgment upon those who resisted their master:§ and they rebuked little ones who would approach Him, as they thought, over familiarly.|| The

* *Ib.* 47. † *Ib.* iii. 12. *Lu.* iii. 17.

‡ *Luke*, xxii. 24. § *Ib.* ix. 54. || *Matt.* xix. 13. *Luke*, xviii. 15.

Pharisees, it need not be added, only included our Saviour among those whom they despised, the sinners and publicans, because of His charity towards them. To each of these two classes, to His Apostles and to the proud Pharisees, He separately, as it would appear, proposed the same parable; that of the man who, having a hundred sheep, and losing one of them, leaves the ninety-nine in what we call the desert, that is, to use a corresponding English phrase, on the *Downs*, or an unenclosed range of hilly pasture land, and goes to seek the lost one. In St. Matthew, this parable is given to show the value of the soul of the least child before God, in answer to one of the uneasy questions alluded to, put by the disciples. "At that hour the disciples came to Jesus, saying: who thinkest Thou is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven? And Jesus calling unto him a little child," &c. And so from the sin of scandalizing, or causing the loss of, such an one, He proceeds to the earnest desire which God has of his salvation. Then comes the parable of the lost sheep, with this conclusion: "Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in Heaven, that one of those little ones should perish."* In St. Luke, publicans and sinners have gathered round our Saviour, and the pharisees murmur, saying: "This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." He replies by the same parable, with a different inference: "Even so there shall be joy in Heaven upon one sinner that doth penance."† The parable, therefore, is immediately spoken to illustrate two points of immediate use: 1st, that His disciples, instead of striving for pre-eminence, and despising children, must take them as a model, as being the special favourites of Heaven, for whose safety God is as careful as a shepherd is of that of a stray sheep: and 2dly, that as a lost sheep recovered is dearer to the shepherd than what are safe at home, so is a converted sinner more a cause of joy to heaven, than many just souls. But no sooner has our blessed Lord elsewhere said, "I am the Good Shepherd,"‡ and in a different parable assumed all the characteristics of one, than these words touch with a ray of new light, this parable, and present it to us in a far more tender and consoling form. We no longer look at the immediate application, or con-

* Matt. xviii. 1—14. † Luke, xv. 1—7. ‡ Jo. x. 11.

sider it as an illustration : it becomes a description of Himself, in His dealings with the Jews, and with each individual soul, with Magdalen, with Peter, with Saul, with every other penitent, down to the writer or reader of these lines. But how could proud Pharisee, or dull disciple, nay, or bright angel, unless foreknowledge be part of his light, have possibly understood the whole beauty, reality, and pathos of this parable, till the pursuit of the lost sheep had been made from Olivet to Sion, and from Sion to Calvary, and the stray one had been seen borne up the toiling ascent, upon shoulders bruised beneath the cross's load? As long as the world shall last, that brief parable, which sounded at first but as a most apt figure of speech, will prove the consolation of many an aching breast, and the light of many a darkened spirit, and the inspirer of many a grateful thought.

But let us look at both these classes of parables, and we hesitate not to say, that only a Catholic can thoroughly realise them, or apply them. A Protestant may see in them just as much as the Jew did. He will understand, in the first class, how the christian religion was a treasure or a pearl worth every sacrifice. But if he stands to his Homilies, or to the popular belief of his church, he must teach, not that the enemy sowed cockle or tares among Christ's wheat, but that the whole crop came to nothing, that much of the seed rotted from the beginning and brought up spurious plants, and that what sprung up, soon cankered, turned sickly, and died down to the root, so that the field showed little better than the high-road or the rock. For such would be the parable, to correspond with the theory that all christendom was for hundreds of years involved in idolatry. Then, if to get *some* Protestant church-theory out of the parable, it is supposed that the bad seed signifies error in doctrine as well as scandals in morals ; so that the Church has to be a sort of confederation of all manner of sects ; or, like Anglicanism, may permit peaceful existence in her of any amount of denominations or shades ; then, indeed, we go counter to historical realisation of it. For the Church has ever repelled into antagonism every other system, and has refused any to coexist with her in the same field. Then we have the image of the tree springing up from one seed, which at once overthrows this theory. The idea of one tree from one root, with living coherence of all its branches with the trunk,

is incapable of application, upon any other system than that of Catholic unity. It is easy then to see how the parables of our Lord, which describe the future Church, or any of its great characteristics, can only have their true meaning in Catholic hands, and only receive verification in our Church. And in the beautiful parable of the lost sheep, painful as it may be to say it, still we must not hesitate to assert it, only a Catholic can fully feel its application. Others no doubt sin, and repent, and feel the sense (if their religious opinions guide them that way) of a forgiveness. Or a few, who mimic Catholic institutions, may seek forgiveness in a sham confession and hollow absolution, both uttered under the very shadow of an episcopal reproof; but a system of grace which, from first to last, by a certain working, brings home to the penitent sinner the lively assurance and sense, that he has been mercifully followed through his wanderings, by a kind and steady friend, that he has been won back by gentleness, that there has been a delicate raising up of his heavy load, a caressing of his sickened heart, a mild soothing of his sorrows; that the thorns which had wound themselves around him as he wandered are not plucked, but picked from him with a dainty hand, and every wound and every bruise searchingly and minutely probed, but only to be cleansed and closed and skilfully dressed; and that then he has been borne in arms like a babe back to his home; a system, or rather a power of grace, which makes him know the day and the hour, and the very moment in which he is again God's child, that is to be found nowhere, yes nowhere, save only in the one true fold of God's Catholic Church. And do we want one short, convincing proof? Nowhere else is the banquet ever ready, at which the Angels are invited to rejoice for the lost sheep found. Nowhere else is communion considered or given as the pledge of repentance. His heart may be full of contrition and sorrow, but he may wait many months before his minister shall think that this is a ground for an extra communion day in the parish: but in the Catholic Church, he bounds, at once, full of love to the banquet, from Magdalen's place at the feet, to John's on the bosom, of Jesus.

If this fulfilment be the result of a dispensation in the Church, this parable creates a not less perfect counterpart by its moral application. How the early Christians loved this image! How they sculptured it on their tombs, paint-

ed it in their catacomb oratories, enamelled it on their glass! The type of (their Lord as the Good Shepherd, with the wayward sheep upon His shoulders, oh! how it spoke to their hearts of the mercies of their conversion! How tender a handling of the sinner, to represent him as the sheep, the very kin of the Lamb of God! Then how natural that an institution founded for reclaiming and saving souls, that have gone the most fearfully astray, should take the same emblem and the same name. It keeps ever before the thoughts of those holy religious who adopt it, the charity with which their duties are to be practised, and the gentleness with which those bruised souls are to be handled. In other instances and ways do the parables, so easy of adaptation in the Catholic mind, influence the institutions and the language of the Church. To call the duties of the ministry the "labours or the cultivation of the vineyard," to speak of the clergy as "husbandmen" simply *operarii*, and above all to give familiarly the name of shepherd or pastor to the bishop, more perhaps in other countries than in ours, are modes of speech most common among Catholics, but scarcely so, we believe, among even Anglicans. This trifling circumstance shows, how the parables fit into our system, as we have before observed.

And as we have alluded to the application made by our Lord to Himself of the image of the Good Shepherd, we will observe, that as He is the model of pastors, the characteristics which He so justly assumes to Himself, must be considered as those at which inferior shepherds of souls should aim. Now this again is practical to a Catholic mind, even in that hard duty of being ready to lay down life for the sheep. Protestantism has had its pretended martyrs; the church of England numbers bishops amongst them, Cranmer and Ridley for example. But can it be for a moment pretended, that they, or any of their fellows, laid down their lives for their flocks—threw themselves generously between their people and iniquity, and became a willing sacrifice? But our own St. Thomas, and the late Archbishop of Paris, and St. Stanislaus, and St. John Nepomucen, (though not a bishop,) and many others fulfilled this to the letter. And the number is still greater of those who have shown themselves ready to make the sacrifice.

It will be seen, by what we have written, that we consider the parable-teaching of our Lord as mainly embody-

ing doctrines or precepts, belonging to the Church about to be established. This is in fact our idea; and we think it susceptible of being pursued still further. Speaking, of course, not so much of the passing, short, proverbial illustrations, or of such comparisons as are merely explanatory, with both which every discourse of our Lord is enriched, as of set and formal parables, there is a striking difference to be traced in the different gospels, between the selections made by each. It will be seen, we think, that St. Matthew, who writes for the Jews, and whose main drift is to show them how Christianity had to supersede their religion, has recorded almost exclusively parables that illustrate this point. His parables relate to the rejection of the Jews, in order to make way for Christianity. In addition to the series of parables in his thirteenth chapter, which we have already quoted, and which all go to inculcate the importance of embracing the new religion, the following are the principal ones; indeed, all which occur in him, as spoken to the Jews. 1. The labourers in the vineyard, of whom those called at the end of the day were made equal to those who had been there all day; that is, the Gentiles were put on a level with the Jews.* 2. The two sons sent to work, one of whom pretended to go and did not—the Jews again—the other demurred, but went, that is, publicans and sinners who should go before them into the Church.† 3. The vineyard let out to husbandmen who gave no return, but persecuted their master's messengers and servants, and slew his son; for which the vineyard was to be given to other husbandmen,—a parable so plain in its application, that “when the chief priests and pharisees had heard His parables,” (this and the preceding,) “they understood that He spake of them.”‡ 4. The marriage feast, the first invited guests to which were rejected in favour of the poor from the way-sides, no bad image of the despised Gentiles.§ The parables of ten virgins, five of whom were rejected, and of the ten talents, were addressed to the disciples privately, though the latter in particular will apply to the purpose above intimated, the rejection of those who had neglected profitably to use the talents committed to them.|| It can hardly be doubted

* xx. 1.

† xxi. 28.

‡ Ib. 45.

§ xxii. 2.

|| xxv. 1, 14.

that these parables were purposely selected out of the many which Christ spake, to prove St. Matthew's particular point; the parables become, as it were, the key to his whole gospel; and when we look also at the very discourse with the disciples in which the two parables last referred to occur, and see that its whole subject is the destruction of Jerusalem, and when further we compare the detail with which the Evangelist gives our Lord's noble and vehement declamation against the hypocrisy of the scribes and pharisees, in his twenty-third chapter, and his full record of the sermon on the mount, in which the Jewish moral law is superseded, and the modern deformations of it are swept away, like cobwebs, from the sanctuary, we find that St. Matthew's Gospel bears intrinsic evidence of having been written, with the view of proclaiming to his countrymen the overthrow of Judaism.

But while this scope may be discovered in the special parables which he has preserved for us, these no less belong, in many of their features, to the Church, and, in those parts, could not have been fully understood by the Jews. To take one example: the parable of the marriage-feast clearly enough told the pharisees, that they had refused the invitation to God's banquet, and that those whom they heartily despised and hated, had been called in their place. But what follows after is not for them. The man of the second class, who appears unrobed for the feast, and is cast forth, represents one already a Christian, unworthy of his profession, who is to be no less punished than they. How could they see the force of this declaration? It is for us. But then, in the eyes of the Christian, the whole scene changes. The parable represents to him not the Church or kingdom of God, in its wider and external aspect, but in that which belongs to the children alone of the kingdom. The Jewish view can only reach the outer wall which shuts it out. The Church within shews to us, not a system of dry faith and precepts, but a banqueting-hall, full of domestic joy and peace, and wherein God hath spread out a table ever furnished. Interior unity, the being one house, one family, one body symbolizes itself in this form. The kingdom of God is to us a feast—nay, *the* feast; and we can no more realise the thought of practical warm religion, in disconnection with the eucharistic banquet and sacrifice, than we can think of home without a hearth, or of a family without a common

table. The Church is not merely a teaching, but a feasting place: not a lecture, but a banqueting-hall. And which Church exclusively is this? Enter the Catholic church, (the type of the Church in the abstract,) and you find not only always a table, but, if one may speak in so homely a way, a table with the cloth spread, which tells you that to-day there has been already a feast, and to-morrow there will be another, and the day after, as there was yesterday. If a Catholic found it otherwise, if he saw the altar uncovered and naked, and its furniture removed, and its tabernacle, in which the feast lies ever prepared, open and empty, he would conclude at once that the place was not in use; that, in fact, it is not actually used as a *Church*: he cannot dissociate the two—the Church and the feast. Where else is this to be found? In the meeting-house, we trow, the pulpit reminds one not of feasts. And in an establishment-church, though the piscina may have been restored, and two new oak carved chairs may be beside the communion table, this is but as a piece of furniture covered up when the family is from home. Nor can we believe, that in the mind of an average churchman, there is any obvious and natural connection between his religion and the communion table, nor that, by any instinctive association, does he think of the latter, when he speaks of “going to church.” No one, we again repeat, can fully realise this parable but a Catholic. For as our Saviour spake it to the Jews, of His kingdom, consequently of the Church, it is to this it must be applied. But when applied as by a Catholic heart it necessarily is, every part is coherent, the figure is perfect, and the details full of beauty and instruction. It associates two ideas, those of the Church and of the Eucharist, which, in Him alone, are almost correlative. And thus only is the problem solved, how wonderfully a parable spoken of the one can so beautifully apply to the other.

St. Mark agrees with St. Matthew in this, as in other respects, and therefore does not call for any particular remark here. But when we come to study St. Luke, we find, through his parables, a different purpose and scope in his gospel. He is not engaged with the Jews, nor endeavouring to root out their prejudices, and prove to the converts from them, that their religion and state have passed away. He writes for the Greek or the Hellenist converts, for those who have less difficulty on that point; and there-

fore, his object is, to place before them the high standard morality of Christ, and exhibit the beauty of His religion, by its influence on the character and nature of man. With St. Matthew, he has parables in common, as the sower, the hundred sheep, the vineyard and husbandmen, and the marriage feast. The parables of the mustard-seed, and leaven also he has, but not as in a series relating to the Church. * But the following beautiful parables are exclusively his: 1, The good Samaritan, † 2, the Prodigal child, † 3, the unjust Steward, § 4, Dives and Lazarus, || 5, the Pharisee and the Publican, ¶ 6, and that short, but most sweet of parables, of the two servants forgiven by their master, and proportioning their love to his kindness, His pleading for Mary Magdalen to the pharisee. ** And it must be observed, that many of these are not spoken in answer to questions, but are direct and spontaneous emanations of the divine wisdom in Jesus Christ; consequently, must be considered as intended to convey great and complete lessons. In fact, if we attentively consider them, in the order in which we have enumerated them, we shall find them to contain the whole theory of the following practical points: 1, active fraternal charity in its perfection; 2, the whole history of the sinner's fall, return, and forgiveness; 3, the duty of alms-deeds, and its motives; 4, the vital and fundamental principle of man's end, and of the use and worth of creatures; and the consequences of rightly or wrongly acting on that principle: †† 5, the complete doctrine of prayer; †† and, 6, the true character and motives of repentance, and the right principle of forgiveness and justification.

Before we enter into any details on any of these points, we must observe that still these parables refer to the visible and practical duties and morality, in the Church. They represent courses of action, principles embodied in practice: they include the inward animating motives, or impulses of grace that guide them, as descriptions of the

* Lu. xiii. † Ib. x. 30. ‡ Ib. xv. 11. § Ib. xvi.

|| Ib. 19. ¶ Ib. xviii. 10. ** Ib. vii. 40.

†† The entire principle of St. Ignatius's *Exercises* is to be found in this parable.

‡‡ With the parable immediately preceding it, of the unjust judge, overcome by the widow's importunity. (v. 2.)

actions of the body suppose corresponding wishes, or thoughts of the soul within. To another Evangelist belongs the higher office of describing the direct and invisible influences of grace. But these parables, in general, contain new principles of action, and describe a course of proceeding, which could not be understood fully in the old dispensation, and have reference to what was to be developed in the new. And although some of them, as referring to moral duties, may appear as applicable in one form of Christianity as in another, yet it is not so. There is hardly one of them which does not contain an idea incompatible with Protestantism. For example, the publican standing "afar off" in his prayer in the temple: from what is he far off? The Catholic says at once, "from the altar of course, at the very bottom of the Church," and if better instructed he will add, "and where in accordance with this feeling the early Church put penitents, and penitential pilgrims would now kneel." The protestant would say, "the parable has reference to the temple, and not to a Christian Church." Then which *realises* the parable? But if he thinks it may be applied to our times so materially, being a high-churchman; we ask: *do* penitents in his church stand, through reverence, far away from the altar on a common day? Is that natural to them? It is to us. And why? Because the Catholic has, more than in the temple, a Holy of Holies on his altar, in the B. Eucharist: while the protestant communion table, when it has reached its highest aim, bears only a cross and a pair of candlesticks; the emblems at most, one of a possible image, the others of a suppressed or prevented light. Again, the parable of the unjust steward contains the idea of intercession by those in heaven: evade it, and you destroy its completeness. The parable in favour of Mary Magdalen is expressly directed to prove, that love, and not mere faith, is the groundwork of contrition; and it shows the merit and value of outward acts exhibiting sorrow, and the wish for pardon, tears, penance, satisfaction, all approved of; as well as an outward declaration of pardon.

The parable of the prodigal would require more space than we can give it: but we do not hesitate to say that its beauties cannot be fully seen, except by a Catholic eye. Who but a Catholic can trace the exact parallel between the father's house, and the religious child's home in the Church? Who, but one familiar with the tale of many

sinners, opening their hearts to him, can track every step of others' wanderings; can thus tell to many a startled hearer his own sad history, or rather tell the prodigal's, so as that it shall be a mirror before him, and make him taste his own heart as bitter as the acorn? And if we have thus roused him to return towards his early home, where, out of the Church, is to be found the warm embrace, the self accusation made indeed, but almost stifled in the caress of forgiveness? Where the robe of grace, the ring of filial adoption, the shoes of strengthening encouragement? Where, above all, the feast of joy, not merely of refreshment, prepared to welcome him? Is all this minute, and most natural, and most cheering detail, but superfluous dressing out of a most simple idea, that by an inward act, there was sudden conviction of sin, and a sense of forgiveness? Or does it signify that, still inwardly, a man repented him of his ways, and perhaps shed silent tears over the past, and resolved amendment: or perhaps even applied to himself the general absolution in the morning service: or if he went to his rector and told him what he felt, and had determined, was told "he was glad to hear it, and hoped there would now be less poaching in the neighbourhood?" But trifling apart, there is not a parish-priest, nor a missionary, nor a spiritual director, who could not give twenty cases of conversion in which the parallel with the prodigal's history is most complete: and there is not a penitent in the Church, who could not say, that from his first departure from virtue to the communion that crowned his conversion, he had seen and felt, in acts, and sensible ministrations, and their effects, all that is so minutely described by our Lord.

But while we have thus claimed for the Catholic Church alone the power fully to appreciate our divine Lord's parables, by entirely realising them, we have, we trust, prepared the ground for another conclusion. It may be observed, that truth presents us ever with two classes of evidence. The first consists of the great and direct proofs on which it rests; the second, of those innumerable and unprepared convergences of argument that meet in it from various points. The former will bring us to the truth; but the latter often more sensibly secure our conviction. The one is as the trunk of the plant, the other as the suckers and tendrils which lay hold on every side of various and effectual support, and will often prevent the

plant from being overthrown by a sudden gust. Now we think that even so slight and superficial a view, as we have here had an opportunity of presenting, of the parables, may contribute somewhat towards these minor evidences, in favour of our faith.

For surely, it must afford our minds considerable satisfaction, to find how, in our own religion, and in no other, this part of our Saviour's teaching is fully carried out. It has been by other means that we have been brought to a clear conception and belief of dogma: by the clear texts of the old and new Testaments, by the teaching of our Redeemer, and that of His apostles: by the concurring testimony of antiquity, and the living voice of the Church. When from all these a system has resulted, of the Church, its government, its characters, its duties, its sacraments, its connection with the world and with time, boldly clear, and definite; and when, taking this more obscure part of our Lord's instructions, and analysing it, we find it fit this view exclusively and in every part, we must conclude that they were made for one another, this Church and the series of parables, and that both come from one hand. It is like experiments in magnetism coming to corroborate the Newtonian theory.

But there is a higher thought to which these our poor enquiries have led us: and we trust it will not be deemed presumptuous. Our blessed Lord speaks His parables off-hand, if we may use the word, with reference often to passing demands on His instruction. Even they who have impiously pretended that the whole gospel was an after-thought, and the composition of disciples in early ages, must admit at least, that the record of these parables is far anterior to the age when Catholicity (according to them) took its present development. How then account for the coincidence of the two in every part? Let us observe that the marvellous structure of Christianity was from its foundations without a formal plan: its laws were embodied in no stiff code; its government was not defined in one formal decree; its doctrines were not compressed into a symbol; and its precepts and maxims were not extended into a treatise. Nor were men chosen to raise the edifice, who, from scattered materials, were likely to compile a beautiful and perfect whole. Yet this was the result. Stone joined itself to stone, as if by instinct, or mutual attraction; the whole building stood, as if by magic, weather-tight, mas-

sive, solid, yet regular, rich, and magnificent. Government, law, faith, morals, discipline, all were found to have been provided for; and as it grew, and extended on every side, ample provision appeared to have been made for its increase, in regard both of plan and of materials. And so it expanded still, not until some thought that it had outgrown its measure, and original design. In all this, who does not see proof of a divine wisdom that designed and superintended the work? But let us suppose even, that our Lord left, as some would say, the details of the system to natural causes and the working of time; that he merely put together the main lines, and allowed them to be filled up; or that even, upon a protestant theory, the corruptions and superstitions of ages have shaped the Catholic Church as it now is—still, in every hypothesis, the fact is the same, and will go far to overthrow the erroneous supposition. Whatever led to the Church's present organisation and development, it is plain that Christ's parables, that have reference to it, or its workings, fit exactly to it, as it is. Call confession an abuse, a mistake, or what you like, there is nothing else on earth that will make the close of the prodigal's history look like a lesson or a home-truth. Then our Saviour foresaw all this and provided for it its rules and principles; and He who could cast into the world but the rudimental forms of a religion, and yet throw out in a mysterious form what would describe its state, and regulate its institutions, after a thousand years and more of vicissitudes, could be only what He claimed to be, the Lawgiver himself, the supreme Author of the new Law, the incarnate Word of God. And that system with which His prophetic teaching so approvingly accords, can be no delusion or corruption of men.

Still further to bring out this argument, let us remark the immensely superior position which He takes, compared on the one side with the prophets, and, on the other, with the apostles. The prophet who deals most largely in parables, partly spoken, and partly acted, is undoubtedly Ezekiel. But he, like all the other prophets, never presumes to deliver one as from himself. It is always a command from God, both parable and application. On the other hand, the apostles in their writings constantly appeal to their having been taught, having received their doctrine. They also make use of phrases of exhortation; and give advice. Now our Redeemer always speaks the

parable as His own, and gives us His own, and no other authority. Yet these parables contain modifications of the old law, declare the rejection of the Jews, or rather pronounce sentence of it, give the terms of forgiveness from God, define the duties of the new religion, promulgate the new law; and often, as if to contrast with the prophetic declaration of dependance, "thus saith the Lord," these definitive declarations are supported by "Amen, I say to you." Considering that the *nearer* one comes to God, and the greater consequently perfection, the stronger will be the sense of dependance, and the humble consciousness of the honour of such service, as Raphael with Tobias,* Gabriel with Mary,† the angel with St. John,‡ more explicitly even than the prophets, declared themselves only messengers of God, we cannot admit even one step of separation between the Divinity and Him who "thought it not robbery to be equal to God."§ And as to the second comparison, it must certainly be considered remarkable, that not once throughout the gospels is the word "exhort" used, except once in St. Luke, of the preaching of John.|| And this is to be the more noticed, as it is a word of frequent use by the same evangelist, in his Acts of the Apostles. Our Lord always commands, and leaves no alternative but obedience. He gives not advice, which supposes only partial knowledge; but He enjoins one, and only one, course. And this it was which really constituted, as we before hinted, our Lord's teaching "with power;" that is, as having dominion over the law itself, as possessed of inherent and rightful jurisdiction.

We fear we shall be considered to have indulged in a long digression, and, in truth, we must beg our reader to carry his memory back to where we enumerated, and commented briefly on, the parables in St. Luke. We there did not make any remarks upon undoubtedly the most perfect in structure, and the most beautiful in substance of all the parables, unless that of the prodigal may dispute equality. We allude to that of the good Samaritan. We then purposely omitted any remarks on it, because we reserved it for this place. It will better illus-

* Tob xii. 18. † Luke i. 28. ‡ Apoc. xix. 10,—xxii. 9.

§ Philip. ii. 6.

|| Luke iii. 18.

trate all that we wish to convey, respecting the application of parables, than any observations of ours can do it. If we have not already exhausted our reader's patience, we will request him to follow us into some detail.

1. Let him read the parable as in St. Luke's tenth chapter; and that will save him and us the task of a narration. But we may be allowed, in a few words, to point out some circumstances which, to the hearers, must have invested it with additional interest. Our Lord lays the scene of it between Jerusalem and Jericho. Now the latter name does not signify the moon, as some tell us, but alludes to the sweet odour of the balsam plant, there chiefly cultivated. The Arabic name, at this day, *Rihha*, confirms this derivation. Considerable intercourse existed in consequence, between it and the capital, distant a day's journey. But our Saviour placed the scene of the parable on the road between them, because it was notorious for being infested with robbers. It is as if one, writing in the last century, had put it on Hounslow-heath. The robbers of Palestine have always been the same; armed bands of desperate men, or tribes of Bedouins,* who are prepared for any violence, even where there is no resistance. One who heard our Lord deliver His parable, and who knew the road, would have the spot, at once, before his mind's eye. It was just between seven and eight miles from Jerusalem. It is the critical spot now as it was then, for the East changes but little. In St. Jerome's time it was the same; and the very name which the place bore indicated its character. It was called, he tells us, *Maledommim*,† that is, the assault or rising up of the Idumeans, to which nation possibly many of these marauders belonged. Where the mode of travelling does not change, the length of a day's journey, and the distances for repose remain

* St. Jerome, on Jer. iii. 2, observes, that by the robbers in the wilderness there mentioned, "may be understood the Arabs, which nation, given to marauding, yet infests the boundaries of Palestine, and besets the roads leading from Jerusalem to Jericho."

† מעלה אדומים St. Jerome, after Eusebius, translates it by *ἀνάβασις πυρρῶν*, understanding by the second word, men red with blood, *De situ et nom. loc. Heb.* At a later period a station of soldiers was placed near, to protect travellers. See also on the insecurity of this neighbourhood, Buckingham's *Travels among the Arab Tribes*, p. 5.

almost unvaried. Hence inns will be found for whole centuries on the same spot. In Italy this is certainly the case, as it was in old times in England. And in the East, where changes are so much less than in Europe, it will be still more so. The pace of the ass or the camel has not varied, and they are still the beasts of travel. At the present time there is, or there was not many years ago, a khan or inn, not far from the spot thus indicated in the parable. And so faithful has tradition been, and so deeply has our Saviour's beautiful lesson impressed itself on the very ground, that this hostelry is known by the name of the khan of the good Samaritan.* But there are two more reasons for the choice of this place. The first is, that Jericho, after Jerusalem, was the great station of the priests and levites, who came in turns to Jerusalem to serve the temple. The body of the priests, the Jewish writers tell us, was divided into twenty-four classes, twelve of which were stationed at Jericho. Each class comprehended levites.† It would, therefore, be most natural, that men of this profession, not usually great travellers, should be found on the road. And on the day when a priest had to pass from one city to the other, it is most probable that a levite likewise entered on, or left duty, and travelled at a respectful distance from his superior, but near enough to have the protection of his escort or retinue. Hence the priest passes first, and then the levite, contrary to the order in which, to show their inefficiency, we might have expected them to come on the stage. The second reason for the choice made of place is, that Jericho is on the way from Samaria to Jerusalem, not straight across, but according to the line of public roads. Business, therefore, may have brought a Samaritan on that road, perhaps the only one in all Judea.

We can easily imagine how graphic and vivid the parable, *improvised* so completely in answer to a petulant question, "who is my neighbour?" must have sounded to persons, who at once caught the propriety and nice fit of every minute circumstance in its recital. But every other detail is the same. A traveller on horseback and alone,

* Mariti, *Viaggi per l'isola di Cipro, e per la Soria, e Palestina*, Vol. iii. cap. 6.

† Talm. H. Taanith. fol. 27.

would not be likely, amongst us, to have among his scanty baggage, salves and medicines; but fortunately in the east, what was provision for food, was considered the best dressing for wounds and bruises. The inns of Asia furnish nothing but shelter; the traveller must take care to bring his own provisions. Two of the most indispensable were oil for condiment, and wine for drink. The Samaritan came from the country where both were of the best quality, in the land of Samaria the one,* and on the sea coast, from Carmel to Saron, the other. He was likely, therefore, to have brought his flask of each, for his own use. Now wine and oil were a common medicament with the Jews. We will quote their words, because they will show how justly, on other occasions, our Saviour declaimed against their absurd splitting of hairs, and sabbatarian uncharitableness. "An old tradition hath, it is not lawful, for the sake of a sick man, to mingle oil and wine together on the sabbath day." Again, "They spread a plaister for a sick man on the sabbath. When? when they mix it up with wine and oil on the eve of the sabbath. But if they did not mix it on the eve, it is forbidden."† What wonder, that the men who thought it better to let a sick man die, than prepare his medicine on a sabbath, should easily have found excuses for not taking one up on the road side? The circumstance, therefore, of the Samaritan's dressing the poor traveller's wounds, is quite natural, and the ingredients of his application are necessarily with him.

The last point to which we will advert, is one which often spoils the recital of the parable. The Samaritan is said, upon delivering his charge to the host, "to take out twopence," and give them with these words: "take care of him, and whatsoever thou shalt spend over and above, I at my return will repay thee." (v. 35.) This seems to us but a paltry sum, and certainly if one made such an offer as this sounds to us, at the Star and Garter, or even a small road-side inn, it would be looked at with amazement. But the fault lies in the translation. Unfortunately a *denarius* has got translated *penny*: but without going into any learned discussion on its value, it is sufficient for us to say

* "Oleum.....pretisissimum missum est ab Ephraim, cujus terra Samaria olei feracissima est." S. Hieron. in *Os.* xii. 1.

† *Shabbat*, fol. 134. *Berachoth*. fol. 3. ap. Wetst. in *loc.*

that it was a man's good wages for a day's work at that time. For, the labourers in the vineyard were satisfied with it for the whole day, till they saw that the same was given to those that entered at the eleventh hour.* The sum given was therefore enough to keep the patient two days, and when we consider that the Samaritan was only seven miles from Jerusalem, to which he was going,† and might be returning in the course of next day, we shall not be surprised at the amount of the advance.

2. This parable, then, in its *materiality* is perfect; every part is most exact. And what a variety of important lessons it contains. First it effectually answers the impertinent question proposed, "who is my neighbour?" Secondly, it contains a most mild, but tremendous, rebuke to the proud interrogator: for it tells him that a Samaritan knew better the meaning of a precept of law, than a Jewish doctor. Thirdly, it gives a lesson of practical charity, without reference to creed or nation; a doctrine totally at variance with that principle, which dispenses charity to the perishing by hunger and disease, only on condition of their renouncing their faith.

3. But who has ever read this parable, and not recog-

* Mat. xx. 13. In the Apocalypse famine prices are thus given: "Two pounds of wheat for a penny, (a *denarius*), and thrice two pounds of barley for a penny." (vi. 6.) We may remark that the difference of price between wheat and barley, as here given, is as one to three: whereas in the famine in Samaria the proportions were one to two. (4 Reg. vii. 1.) It is difficult to adjust the proportions of measures and values at different times, because coins and measures vary. The following varieties appear incredible, but we give them to show, how much could be done at times, for a *penny*. In the Chronicle of Josue Stylites we learn, that at Edessa, in 495, thirty bushels of wheat, and fifty of barley could be purchased for a *denarius*. (Assem. Bib. Or. tom. i. p. 261.) Later the prices were four of wheat and six of barley, (p. 271,) and immediately after prices fell again, and were, twelve measures of wheat and twenty-two of barley for a *denarius*.—p. 272.

† This appears from the difference of the expressions; the priest and Levite were going "the same way" as the traveller, (v. 30, 31,) while the Samaritan is "on his journey," (v. 33.) and speaks of returning, which intimates going *from* home, consequently towards Jerusalem. The image is thus most happy; the priest is one who walks in the same direction as the wounded man, of the same country and religion; the Samaritan is one who goes opposite to them.

nized in it the history of the world, and understood that Jesus Christ was the Good Samaritan described in it? Now this is in fact the grand aspect of this splendid composition. It would be impossible in fewer words to make a sketch of the whole history of man from his fall, to his complete regeneration, and preservation. It is masterly in every way, the strokes few, the masses simple and grand, and yet detailed so as to give them definiteness and character. Could man's fall be more accurately pictured than by a traveller (the homo viator of the schools) assailed by an enemy, robbed of every thing, wounded all over, naked, half dead, helpless, unable to move? And now comes the priest, the type of every system of previous religion, of Noah's, Melchisedec's; nay, of Egypt's, India's, Greece's false worship. They all recognized in man, the bruised and fallen type of a better state: but they neither cured nor raised him. Then follows the Levite, a title which specifies what before was generic; the law and priesthood of the old Testament, still better informed of man's history, but as unable to succour him. At length comes the Samaritan, the stranger to man's race. Thus far an intelligent Jew might follow: but beyond this he would be at fault. Recognizing in Christ this character, he would ask, how does *He* intend to bind those wounds? What oil and wine has He that will staunch the bleeding gashes of humanity? How will He bear the burthen on His shoulders, of that prostrate frame of a whole gasping race? Was it possible for the most learned to solve this problem? Not till fulfilment had taken place of those awful realities, which were to give as truthful a counterpart of this portion of the parable, as existed in the other parts; and not even then till the full system of the atonement was preached to him, and he understood that by His wounds ours were healed, and that He verily bore the iniquities of us all. And thus much further, though not completely, can the protestant pursue the parable, but not beyond this. We say not completely, for the sacramental nature of the remedies escapes him. The wine he will know; but what is the oil, which has ceased to have all meaning in the protestant system? It anoints him not, regenerated, into part with a kingly priesthood, nor a stripling descending into the lists, to do battle with unearthly foes, nor a priest into an inviolable consecration, nor a worn-out pilgrim for his last wrestling with the giant despair. With him it has no symbol-

ism ; it represents not to him the light of God's sanctuary, nor the *unction* of His word, nor the balmy softness (the *oleum effusum*) of two Names most sweet in Catholic mouths. It rises not to his mind with the thought of virginity, anointed with the oil of gladness above its fellow-orders of holiness. It lingers not, as a holy seal, upon the stones of his altar, after ages of desecration in the wall of the old Church, to tell whose once it was. It has vanished from his system, and together with it all uplifting of the priestly hand to bless. Consecration of man or thing he has lost, and knows no more. But oil, the emblem of all consecration, and of sacramental grace, and wine, the purest symbol of the saving stream of life, and of its sacramental impouring into man, form to the catholic mind, the most apt imaginable representation of the communication to his wounded nature of new health, new vigour, new life.

But as we before observed, but one step beyond the Jew's apprehension of this parable, protestantism stops. Man, rescued from total death, is, according to strict protestant doctrine, left to himself, and to his own judgment, to make the best of his way home. The good Samaritan leaves no vicarious authority on earth, to whom He fully and unreservedly commits the charge of him, and who has to carry out his work. The cure was complete when he had touched, and there was no one to bind up anew the sores should they re-open, or to supply refreshment if the patient should faint. But the Catholic sees here to the end, every part fulfilled. The Good Samaritan has gone on in His journey and is not yet returned: we await His coming at the end of ages. And man, though the death-wound is healed, and life secured, remains still but a weak and sickly creature, and has no food of his own, and no remedy, but what that compassionate stranger has left behind. But he has left it and him in good and faithful hands. Still requiring support, still in the pupilage of an impaired mind, still with the plague of recrudescing wounds, he feels with thankfulness that till his best friend comes again to lead him home, he has been committed to those that have received the strictest charge to give a good account of him, and have been amply provided with present means, and secured by ampler promises for any outlay. A hostelry indeed it is—that stately Church of Christ—that Khan of the Good Samaritan—for there is no lasting dwelling, no home for any one, on this way to

Jerusalem. Only pilgrims travel it. But how just a type: a house which is not our home, where we are only wayfarers seeking an enduring city, yet where we find rest, food, comfort, medicine, strength, at the sole charge of Him who has snatched us from destruction and healed our wounds. Not from some one chance inmate of the house, who is but a servant there for a time, but from *the house* itself; always the same, whoever rules it; always the same, and the same to all. Surely no Church but the Catholic inspires her children with the feeling, that they are under this particular and certain care. It is the very contradictory of the theory of private judgment.

4. And now let us see where the practical lesson of the parable is understood, and followed. Is it in poor-law relief, or in charitable associations, and mendicity societies, or in tract-distributing, domiciliary visits? Surely not. We have heard of a charitable society in London, called a "Samaritan society," which, a short time ago, busied itself very laudably with furnishing the dwellings of the poor, with Arnold's ventilators. Very properly, certainly, but not very appropriately for their name. Noah's opening the window at the top of the ark, when the deluge was over, would have been a fitter symbol for this peculiar operation of charity. But go to the *Caridad* at Seville, and see that painting by Murillo, of one, not tricked out in ideal beauty, but humble, earnest, and busy with his toil—the bearing of a sinking helpless body to the hospital: with an angel at his side, that seems as if he felt honoured in supporting him. That is a Catholic Samaritan—St. John of God. Or see him at Grenada, amidst the blazing hospital, lifting and carrying into safety, one by one, its numerous patients. Go to the frozen wilderness of Mount St. Bernard, and visit those men who have chosen it for their dreary abode, solely that they may be able to rescue the perishing traveller, from the snow-wreath, or the precipice, and bear him to their house for Christ's sake, and warm, and restore him. Aye, and they have even, in the ingenuity of their charity, engrafted their Samaritan spirit, upon canine instincts; and have taught their mute, faithful allies, to wander forth in the dark night and listen, amidst the howling blast, for the wail of the lost traveller; and having found him, warm him with their breath, and refresh him with their ready store, and lead, or even if young, bear him, with wagging tail and

glistening eye, as a prize beyond the hare or the partridge. Go to every quarter of the globe, and see the sister of charity, serving the sick and the wounded with her own hands, and hushing the old veteran that moans in his pain, as though he were an infant, and soothing more suffering by the gentle speech of her lips, or the crucifix in her hand, than surgeon's skill or apothecary's ointment can ever do. These are the copies of the good Samaritan, which the Catholic Church exhibits, without going back to those ages, when charity itself imbibed the knightly spirit, and the hospitaller of St. John was not more ready to strike home for Christ's sepulchre, than to bear his vanquished foe to the ready ward, and there nurse him like a brother; and without recurring to that more recent exhibition of the same spirit, when the ransom, with our Lord's cross upon his breast, gave himself in pledge, or in exchange for the captive slave in Barbary.

5. And now it is time to ask, what manner of wisdom that was, which indited so perfect, so grand, and so sweet a lesson? The most practised philosopher could not have struck off, in a moment, a more complete summary of the moral history of the human race, or a truer picture of man's fallen condition. Nor can we imagine any man, however gifted, presuming to speculate on the effects of his own death upon the whole world, and to put himself forward as destined to regenerate it by ignominious suffering. And still less could any man have darted his eye so deeply into futurity, as to sketch out accurately a system resulting from that event, as it would remain after hundreds of years, for carrying out and applying the fruits of his sacrifice. In the few lines which record this parable, we have a strong and remarkable proof of our Lord's Divine character.

We must, however, hasten to a conclusion. We have endeavoured to show that St. Matthew's parables are chosen in accordance with his natural purpose in writing for the Jews, that of showing them that the old law had given place, or had been absorbed in the new: and that St. Luke's are addressed more towards forming the moral character of the Church already established. Both direct their records towards the outward mould of the Church, and her exterior offices: towards the Church, that is, as symbolizing our Lord's sacred Humanity. The Gospel of St. John presents a different character. The Church is

now fully formed, and the walls have been built all round her, which separate God's vineyard from profane ground. The first sprouting of error makes its appearance among the chosen plants. A Gospel is wanted for the interior of the house, for those to whom Jesus would not speak in parables.

This difference between St. John's Gospel and the other three, may not have struck every reader. But it is remarkable that in St. John there are only three passages approaching to parables,* which yet essentially differ from those of the other Gospels. For the three instances are those in which our Lord compares Himself to a door, and a vine; † and where He describes Himself as the Good Shepherd. ‡ In no other parable is He one term of the comparison: and we may say, without danger of error, that these three comparisons of Himself to other objects ought hardly to be called parables. At any rate they form a separate class. Now what makes this peculiarity of St. John more striking is, that he clearly intimates to us that our Saviour's habitual teaching was in parables. After His last supper He says to His apostles, "These things I have spoken to you in proverbs. The hour cometh when I will no more speak to you in proverbs." § And the apostles soon after reply to Him, "Behold now Thou speakest plainly, and speakest no proverb." || These passages express that our Lord's habitual teaching had been proverbial, or in parables, and yet had St. John's Gospel alone been written, we should not have discovered this. They prove to us, therefore, that St. John supposed, or knew, other records to be in the hands of his readers, from which the nature and truth of this allusion would be manifest. These texts refer more to the other Gospels than to his own: and they form one of those delicate connecting links which associate the four Gospels as forming one record.

* Unless we reckon the passage in iv. 35, pointing out the fields as white for the harvest, which is rather an illustration than a parable.

† Jo. x. 1; xv. 1. In the first of these our Lord first makes a parable, but immediately applies it to Himself. The second was addressed to the apostles alone.

‡ x. 11.

§ Jo. xvi. 25.

|| Ib. 29.

We may naturally ask, why did St. John select those discourses of Christ, which were free from parables? If we might venture to answer without presumption, it is because our Saviour Himself divided His teaching into two portions. So long as He treated of the Church, its duties and its vicissitudes, in other words, so long as He spoke of what was to be external, and one day historical, but when he spoke had only existence in prophecy, He employed what we have seen to compose the prophetic element of the new Testament, parabolic teaching. But when He spoke of what already *was*, HIMSELF, His own existence previous even to Abraham, His coequality with the Father, His own Divinity, He shunned all parable and spoke plainly and distinctly. St. John's office was to treasure up this second series of instructions, for the confutation of nascent errors, and the orthodox teaching of the whole Church.

Hence, wherever he touches upon a matter already treated in the other Gospels, we shall find that, while they record for us what relates to its external forms or administration, that is, its body, St. John only preserves the discourse which describes its interior and more spiritual functions, that is, its soul. For instance, St. Matthew had fully preserved for us the institution of Baptism, and its form: St. John manifests to us, in the conversation with Nicodemus, the invisible agency of the Holy Spirit, and the inward regeneration by the outward action.* Again, the three first evangelists had carefully described the institution of the B. Eucharist; St. John passes over this, but has secured to us that invaluable discourse in his sixth chapter, in which the union with Christ, the immortality, and the inward life bestowed by that holiest of sacraments, are so consolingly described. St. John's office, then, seems to be, to manifest to us what our Redeemer taught, respecting that mysterious action which in His Divine nature He exercises upon the inward life of the Church, and on the soul of the believer, but still ever in the Church, and through the Church.

But this has led us beyond the region of parables, and though we would gladly dilate on it, we must pause. It was our desire to add some remarks upon our Saviour's

* Mat. xxviii. 19 ; Jo. iii.

miracles, as illustrative of His teaching, and of Catholic doctrine; but we have already exceeded reasonable limits. We may therefore reserve our thoughts for another occasion, when we will not tax our reader's patience so severely. For we must own, that we can only compare ourselves to a poor beast of burthen, which, driven day by day on a long dusty road, cannot resist the temptation of turning into a green field, that lies open on the side, and there rioting somewhat on the dainty food around it, and striving to recal the thoughts and feelings of other days, and live them over again. We have heard that some find a joy in seeing wealth in heaps around them; we have seen the satisfaction of the man of taste when luxuriating amidst objects of art; we have felt the delight of living among the records of wisdom of past ages or distant lands; but far, far brighter and happier are hours spent in this treasure-house of knowledge, this rich collection of peerless gems, this library of heaven-fetched eternal wisdom—the speakings of God to man. If we have ventured in, and may seem to have presumptuously ransacked it, it has only been because encouraged to look in this storehouse of the wise Householder for old things and new; the first to be discovered by earnest study, the latter only by humble and sincere meditation.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

- I. — *The Beauties of the Boyne and its Tributary the Blackwater.* With numerous Illustrations. By WILLIAM R. WILDE. 8vo. Dublin: McGlashan, 1849.

“THE Boyne and the Blackwater” is, in every sense of the words, so important a contribution to our scanty stock of Irish topography, that, although it has only come into our hands upon the very eve of publication, we cannot refrain from devoting to it a few pages of the space which still remains at our disposal.

In the series of papers now appearing in the *Dublin University Magazine*, under the title of “Irish Rivers,” the Sketches of the River Boyne attracted so much notice,

as to suggest to the enterprising proprietor of that periodical the idea of a separate publication on a more complete and comprehensive plan. He proposed, accordingly, to Mr. Wilde, the author of these sketches, to arrange, in the form of a descriptive hand-book, the numberless topics of interest suggested by the scenery, the antiquities, and the religious or historical associations of the Boyne, and its tributary, the Blackwater. Mr. Wilde's work, therefore, belongs, as far as technical form can impart a character, to the class of Guide-books; but it will be a grievous injustice to rank it with the publications ordinarily known under that designation. There is not a detail of the subject that could interest the scholar or the antiquarian, which does not receive its full measure of attention; and although the work enters minutely into all the ordinary sources of attraction for the tourist, there is an air of scholarship and of taste about the manner in which all these topics are discussed, which, while it bespeaks the refinement and cultivation of the author, converts for the reader the driest and dullest minutiae, even of a strictly topographical study, into an agreeable and attractive literary exercise. It is, indeed, a work of very rare merit, and reminds us, in many respects, of Ford's incomparable Hand-book of Spain;* the author being equally at home in discussing the scenery, the objects of art, the poetry, the legendary lore, the topography, the ethnology, and even the economical and industrial topics which successively present themselves. It is not merely that there is not a single scene from the source of the Boyne to its mouth—from Trinity-well to the sea—which is not minutely and accurately described; not an object of interest, from Castle-Carbury to the Maiden-Tower, which is not passed in review; not a tradition, or history, or legend connected with any of them which is not critically canvassed. This would be, in itself, no ordinary merit; but it forms only a small item in Mr. Wilde's claim to the gratitude of the lovers of Irish literature. He has contrived to employ the opportunities which his vocation as a descriptive tourist afforded, in such a way as to render his book a complete

* We must be understood only to speak of Ford's book considered in its literary relations. For, in all that regards religion, the author is unfortunately bigoted and illiberal to a most painful extreme.

grammar of Irish antiquities; a grammar, too, which teaches in the most pleasing and effective way, by examples and illustrations rather than by didactic rules. There is hardly a subject connected with our natural antiquities, whether Pagan or Christian, for the illustration of which the varied scenery of "the Boyne's ill-fated river" does not afford abundant opportunities; and the tourist under Mr. Wilde's guidance may learn upon each topic, in the compass of a few pleasant and scholar-like pages, the sum of all that the laborious antiquarians of the past as well as of the present generation have expended volumes in investigating and explaining.

We wish that our limits would permit us to extract a few of the more learned and elaborate notices of the antiquities of Ireland with which this most interesting volume abounds. But we must be content with a single passage illustrating a very curious ancient usage, the scene of which lies upon the Blackwater, the principal tributary of the Boyne.

"The first notice which the Annals record of Tailtean (the name of which is still preserved in the modern Teltown) is, that in the year of the world 3370, in the reign of Lugh Lamhfhada, 'The fair of Tailtean was established in commemoration and in remembrance of his foster-mother *Tailte*, the daughter of Maghmor, King of Spain, and the wife of Eochaidh, son of Erc, the last king of the Firbolgs.' This fair continued down to the time of Roderick O'Conor, the last monarch of Ireland, and was held annually upon the first of August, which month derives its name in the Irish language from this very circumstance, being still called *Lugh-nasadh*, or Lugh's fair,—the Lammas day,—to which several superstitious rites and ancient ceremonies still attach throughout the country generally. Upon these occasions various sports and pastimes, a description of Olympic Games, were celebrated, consisting of feats of strength and agility in wrestling, boxing, running, and such like manly sports, as well as horse races and chariot races. Besides these the people were entertained with shows and rude theatrical exhibitions. Among these latter are enumerated sham battles and also aquatic fights, which it is said were exhibited upon the artificial lakes, the sites of which are still pointed out. Tradition assigns the site of the fair to that portion of the great rath still existing upon the northern side of the road, and about a quarter of a mile to the north-east of the great fort, or Rath Dubh; and here it is said the most remarkable of the Teltown ceremonies took place—the marriages or betrothals. Upon one side of this great embankment were ranged, it is said, 'the boys,' and on the other

'the girls;' the former ogling, the latter blushing; for human nature is, we suppose, the same at all times and in all places, among our forefathers and mothers at Teltown upwards of a thousand years ago, or in a modern drawing-room, or at a flower-show or review. They then, having had a good view of each other, passed down a little to the south, where there is a deep hollow in the land, evidently formed artificially, probably the ditch of one of the ancient forts, and called *Lug-an-Eany*, where they became separated by a high wall, which prevented their seeing each other. In this wall, say the local traditions, there was a door with a small hole in it, through which each young lady passed her middle finger, which the men upon the other side looked at, and if any of them admired the finger he laid hold of it, and the lass to whom it belonged forthwith became his bride; so that we find a fair and pretty hand, a delicate and taper finger, with its snowy skin and delicately formed nail, were even more captivating among the Irish lads and lasses some twelve hundred years ago than they are at the present day. He took her for better for worse, but the key-hole or wooden ring was not as binding as the modern one of gold; for, by the laws of Tailtean, the marriage only held good for a year and a day. If the couple disagreed during that time they returned to Tailtean, walked into the centre of Rath Dubh, stood back to back, one facing the north, and the other the south, and walked out of the fort, a divorced couple, free to try their luck again at Lug-an-Eany. What a pity there is no Teltown or Black Fort marriage in the present day! What numbers would take advantage of it!"—pp. 150-1.

We are tempted to add a short poem on the Holy Wells of Ireland, which Mr. Wilde has introduced into his notice of this curious and interesting topic.

“ ‘Thou chosen spring of sacred gift!—
 By prayer and penance blest!—
 Here, on thy knee-worn margin, let
 My wand'rings find a rest.
 I would not pass thee heedlessly,
 Or deem, with scoffing thought,
 That God hath, thro' thy hallow'd drops,
 No healing wonders wrought.
 With solemn pause I gaze upon
 Thy surface calm and pure,
 Recalling days when simple souls
 In faith found simplest cure!

“ ‘Who knows thou art unsanctified,
 And hast no salving pow'r?
 Let me, at least, revere thee now,
 In thy deserted hour.

Perchance, when angry justice frown'd
 On sinning sons of earth,
 The Virgin's interposing tears
 First gave thee heav'nly birth?
 Or were thy waters angel-stirred,
 For humble suff'ers' weal?
 Be blessed still!—and may I too
 In thee my sorrows heal!"—p. 50.

It is gratifying to add, that the kindly spirit which breathes through these interesting lines pervades, with scarcely a drawback, the whole tenor of Mr. Wilde's observations even upon topics which might seem calculated to draw forth some manifestations of political or religious animosity. There is not a single one among the "Rivers of Ireland" so fertile in these unhappy recollections as the Boyne. But it is due to Mr. Wilde to say, that he has thrown them aside honestly and without reservation; and has realized the idea which Moore's lines had left unaccomplished:

"'Lie hid,' she cried, 'ye venom'd darts
 Where mortal eye may shun you—'"

He has buried the arrows of discord in the pleasant waters of the Boyne.

II—1. *Popular Christianity: its Transition State, and Probable Development.* By FREDERICK J. FOXTON, A.B., Perpetual Curate of Stoke Prior and Docklow, Herefordshire. London: John Chapman, 1849.

2.—*Ideas; or, Outlines of a New System of Philosophy.* By ANTOINE CLAUDE GABRIEL JOBERT. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1849.

The former of the two works named above is one of a series, the title of which may easily mislead the student. It is called "*The Catholic Series;*" but, far from being what this designation ordinarily indicates, its object and tendency are to overthrow not alone the Catholic religion, but even the Christian Revelation itself, except in the very widest and loosest sense of the word. The series includes several of the works of Fichte and Schelling, Ullmann's "Essence of Christianity," Gervinus's "Mission of the German Catholics," Blanco White's "Letters on Rationalism," and many other works of a similar character.

There is much material for solemn and anxious thought

in the fact that a clergyman, and, as far as we know, an officiating clergyman, of the Church of England, puts his hand to the work for the promotion of which this series is intended. What that work is, will be but too fearfully evident in the opening, as well as in the closing, paragraphs of his book :

“The time has, I believe, arrived, when the popular religion throughout the Christian world is about to undergo a purification similar to that effected for natural science by the genius of Bacon. The dogmas of religion and those of unreformed philosophy had, alike, their origin in the scholastic perversions of dialectical science; and when such an admission is candidly made by a Protestant bishop, we may fairly expect, at least, a considerable relaxation of the doctrinal system of the Church. The precise and dogmatical Christianity, that now avails only to embitter the controversies of the learned, and to mystify and puzzle the laity, will be superseded, and the vital elements of Christian philosophy will be presented to the people, in a rational and intelligible form. The ‘Church of the future’ will be the reflection of the spiritual condition of the world of *to-day*, and not the lifeless image of a by-gone age. Christians will not, much longer, dispute whether they shall adopt the language of the Nicene age, or of that of the Protestant Reformation—of the Tractarian or Tridentine theology, in their confessions or liturgies. The mind of the 19th century has a growing tendency to a reliance rather upon ‘*insight*’ than upon ‘*tradition*,’ and the memories of the past, and will have its own appropriate expression in religious faith, as well as in philosophy and science. It is as little disposed to borrow its theology from Athanasius, or from Cranmer, as it is to adopt the philosophy of Aristotle, or the science of Archimedes, in exclusion of the higher insight of Bacon or of Locke—of Newton—of Humboldt—of Leverrier, or of Berzelius. The revelations of God to man will not be looked for, alone, in the plains of Palestine—in the valley of the Jordan, or in the land of Goshen; nor will they, any longer, be considered as exclusively confined to the writings of Jewish prophets, or Christian evangelists. It has been said, that to seek our divinity in books is ‘to seek the living amongst the dead,’ and to confine the spiritual bounty of God to primitive and barbarous ages, is virtually to deny those attributes of perpetual and omnipresent justice and mercy with which every rational creed has hitherto invested Him.”—pp. 1-3.

“The transition from a belief in Christ as God, to a belief in him as (in the simple language of Scripture) ‘his only begotten son,’ his ‘well-beloved’—the most inspired of our race—the most sacred vehicle of that ‘Holy Spirit’ that ‘God giveth to *all* men liberally,’ is not so violent as may at first sight appear to those

whose minds have been emasculated by the refinements of scholasticism. The '*inspiration of the Scriptures*,' in the popular sense of the words, is even now a declining doctrine in the Church herself, mystified by various and conflicting opinion, and giving 'an uncertain sound' to the popular ear. A belief in *miracle and prophecy* is becoming daily less and less necessary as the means of inculcating a faith in the invisible things of God, in proportion as the inner miracles of the human heart and intellect are being made known by the diffusion of spiritual knowledge. *Credo's and confessions* are almost imperceptibly, but surely, losing their authority over the minds of men under the expanding influence of intelligence and toleration."—p. 226.

On the subject of the divinity of Christ, the author speaks even more plainly :

"The character, then, in which Christ must and will be regarded, sooner or later, by the future intelligence of mankind, is simply that of the 'foremost man in all the world,' soaring far above all 'principalities and powers'—above all philosophies hitherto known—above all creeds hitherto propagated in his name. He saw with the eye of Faith far deeper into the Divine law of the world than the eye of man had yet seen in his age, than the ear of man had yet heard, or his heart conceived ; and man is even yet far from apprehending the expansive power of his religion. He stood between the world of sense, and the 'life of God,' and thus was he the 'Mediator between God and Man.' And yet he must be strictly regarded as the restorer and not the creator of God's law. He came 'not to destroy but to fulfil.' He came to restore the down-trodden faith of man in the boundless possibilities of the human soul—to present in his life an enduring example of the 'beauty of holiness,' and to set his seal on the still struggling doctrine of immortality. There is not a sect of Christians in the world which does not recognise in these simple principles the *vital* elements of their creed. The minor differences (and these are what commonly produce the fierce wrangling of sectarianism) are to be sought for in the fine-drawn distinctions of speculative believers, and in the arrogant dogmatising of churches."—pp. 148-9.

There is little of novelty in the writer's views, except their boldness, for which, happily, our public is as yet but ill prepared. If we have referred to the work at all, it is chiefly for the purpose of directing attention to the movement of which its publication may be taken as an index. It is another evidence that the battle-field of controversy may be expected in England, as elsewhere, to be changed before long ; and to us it should be a warning, that we may not suffer ourselves to be found unprepared. As yet, there

is little reason, we would hope, for serious apprehension. The author of "Popular Christianity" himself avows, that "he has no hope of producing any immediate or sensible effect on the Church herself." The most he hopes or desires is, "to influence a few earnest minds, who may help to diffuse the leaven which is already at work from without." How long it may be so, Heaven only can foresee. But it is our duty to prepare, lest the time of struggle find us without arms.

We have coupled with Mr. Foxton's book a smaller work of a very different character, but one which may also serve as an indication of the temper of the times. It is a little book directed against some of the most popular theories, which, in the modern schools of philosophy, have taken the place of the old Christianity which it is Mr. Foxton's object to explode. The subject of Mr. Jobert's essays will, to most of our readers, be sufficiently unfamiliar; being addressed against theories, which, however popular in Germany and modern France, were hardly believed as yet to have effected an entrance into England, except among the followers of one particular school. A few years since, whatever might be said of books on professedly philosophical subjects, we should scarcely have seen a popular treatise, written in popular language, and published in a popular form, the avowed object of which is to combat the systems of Spiritualism and Transcendentalism.

We shall probably take occasion, on some early opportunity, to refer more in detail to this important subject, and to the interests which are involved in its consideration; nor does our space permit us to enter into any formal notice of the little book before us, though we are far from agreeing in many of its opinions. As a specimen of its general manner, the following criticism of Fichte's system may suffice:

"The doctrine of Fichte may be considered as in many points corresponding to that of Berkeley. This doctrine is summed up in the following passage:—

"The mind itself is the absolute principle of everything; by its original and spontaneous movement it constructs for itself the notion (equivalent to the reality) of an external world; and again, by its reflective movement, it comes back to the perception of its own personal creation put forth in the whole process..... Thus, at length, the great fundamental question of philosophy—that which

seeks to determine the relation of thought and existence—is settled, because *all existence* is shown to be synonymous with thought; and the union of the two notions is found in the spontaneous movement of the mind itself.

“For the truth of these views it would require not only that the world, instead of being a fixed reality, should exist exclusively in thought, but that it should be created and unfolded again and again, as an expansion of the perceptive power of every new-born individual, not only of the human race, but of every being endowed with organs, since there is no possibility of tracing a distinction between the phenomenon of perception in man and in other sense-organized animals. It would require also that the universe should be limited to that which can possibly fall within organic perception; since perception, in this system, is the absolute measure either of the depth of immensity, or of the limits of divisibility of the atomic essence.

“However poetical it may be to consider the mind of man as occupied in building his own bodily frame and objective universe, very much in the same way as the caterpillar constructs its own silky envelope, the ludicrous side of this philosophy can hardly fail to offer itself to an unsophisticated mind. Only imagine every organized being creating out of its consciousness the very conditions of its own existence! The eagle inwardly fabricating the hare, or the partridge destined to become its prey! The individual propensities of a number of wild hounds clustering to contribute each its own share to the creation of the deer which is to satisfy their common hunger! Even picture to yourself a subjective mite manufacturing in the depth of its instinct its own objective cheese! The new-born infant originating in the recesses of its nascent consciousness the anxious cares and tender affections, nay, the very organic existence, of its own mother! And again, the young scion of the English aristocracy begetting out of his own youthful spirit the chivalric achievements of his ancestors, and constructing their decayed bones in the family tomb, by the *spontaneous movements of his own mind!*

Such are, however, the ludicrous consequences of that doctrine which endeavours to absorb all material existence in the pure abstraction of thought. Here we recognise the truth of this maxim of Napoleon, that from the sublime to the ridiculous there is but one step; and we are also reminded of Cicero's sarcastic *dictum*, ‘There is nothing, however absurd, that has not passed through the head of a philosopher.’

“In justice to Mr. Morell I am bound to remark that he points out Fichte's error in ‘entrenching himself so *closely* within the circle of his consciousness, that it was impossible to find any *scientific passage* from thence into the objective world.’ But at the same time we must not forget that Mr. Morell leaves the problem of the real existence of the external world undecided, and en-

trenches himself, in his turn, in a complete scepticism, which is perhaps not inconsistent with his own Idealistic system, as we shall have occasion to show."—pp. 204—208.

We should add that the volume now before us is the sequel of a similar publication of Mr. Jobert already noticed in this journal.

III.—*The Church of the Living God; the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.* By the VERY REV. FATHER J. B. PAGANI. Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby, 1849.

It is consoling to turn from the thoughts suggested by the publications referred to in the last notice, to the hopes and anticipations which Father Pagani's admirable little volume will not fail to inspire. We cannot help regarding it almost as a model of popular controversy, especially intended for the use of the unlearned. Simple, solid, interesting, and persuasive, it appears to us to have precisely hit off the requirements of the present time, and to contain exactly what is best calculated to meet them. Avoiding those multiplied and intricate controversies regarding the details of Christian doctrine, by which the enquirer is too often embarrassed and disheartened, it seeks to concentrate attention upon the great leading points upon which all else depends, and which, once settled, necessarily involve the solution of all the rest.

The topics which Dr. Pagani has selected are exclusively those which are connected with the great question of authority; and the whole object of his book is comprised in two simple propositions: (1.) That our Lord established a visible and infallible authority for the preservation of the doctrine which He taught to His apostles; (2.) That this authority still subsists and must subsist for all ages in His Church. The discussion is conducted in the form of dialogues, which have just enough of variety to stimulate attention, without ever departing into extrinsic topics of interest.

We can only afford room for one single extract on the well-known theory of the Tractarians regarding "branch churches," and their claim to have the Church of England considered a branch of the Church Catholic. The passage is long, but it will hardly bear curtailment.

"Sound reason and common sense, plainly dictate that no particular church may claim to be a branch of the Catholic Church, unless it is proved—1. That she is the *authoritative teacher* of

Catholic doctrines. 2. That she is united with the other branches of catholic communion. 3. That she is engrafted in the trunk in which all the various branches of catholicity subsist. That no Church may claim to be a branch of the Catholic Church, unless she is the authoritative *teacher* of Catholic doctrines, is so evident that it must be admitted by all who admit the necessity of a living and teaching Church. For that only can be called the distinctive and characteristic teaching of a Church, which is taught authoritatively by it. Authoritative doctrines must be expressly taught as such by the Church *as a Church*. They must be her ordinary recognized teaching, and obligatory, at least upon her clergy, otherwise the Church does not take from them her characteristic or distinguishing mark.

“ Now, can it be said that the English Church is the *authoritative teacher* of Catholic doctrines? For brevity sake, let us fix upon some points, which Puseyites themselves acknowledge to be stamped with the character of catholicity, such, for instance, as *baptismal regeneration, the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Eucharistic sacrifice, the power of the keys, or the priestly absolution*. Now, who will dare to assert that the English Church is the authoritative teacher of these doctrines? In order to prove this point, it must not only be shown that *traces* of these doctrines may be found, scattered here and there, that Anglicans are permitted to teach them, that several individuals of the church believe them, and that some great divines and bishops of the same church have taught them: but it must be proved that they form a part of the authoritative teaching of the English Church; that the English Church strictly enforces their belief upon her children, and that the faithful cannot refuse to believe them without rebelling against their mother, and being guilty of flat heresy. Now, I ask again, is this the case? Can it be said with truth that the alleged Catholic doctrines are authoritatively taught by the English Church? I do not ask whether such doctrines ought to be held by a Church or not, but my question is confined to this simple fact: are they the doctrines of the *Church of England* or not? Are they taught authoritatively by her or not? If I ask the bishops, they say, No. If I ask the clergy of any one district, parish, or diocese, I think I may safely assert that four out of five will say, No. If I ask the majority of the members of the Church, they say, No. If I ask the catholic world if such has ever been or is its impression of the Anglican Church, it says, with one voice, No. A man might have lived a hundred years in the Church of England, he might have been archbishop of York or Canterbury for sixty years of his life, and yet never once have mentioned one of these points, unless, perhaps, to protest against and denounce it as a damnable error. Millions of the members and clergy of the Church of England live and die detesting this system of doctrine as the characteristic of antichrist.

“If I am referred to the prayer book as containing the documents of the English Church, I am at a loss to find the said Catholic doctrines contained therein in any authoritative shape. I do not think that on any one point have these doctrines the documentary evidence clear in their favour, except perhaps the baptismal regeneration; and even that has to struggle with very much which is also authoritative, and which militates against it. On every other point I think it literally impossible that any person, or persons thinking as Puseyites think, could have compiled, sanctioned, or tolerated the composition of such documents as those which are contained in the prayer book. How then can it be asserted that the English Church is a branch of the Catholic Church, since the doctrines distinctive of catholicity may be taught or most positively contradicted, indifferently by any or all of her clergy, from the archbishop to the deacons? How can the English Church assert her claim to catholicity, since the distinctive points of the Catholic faith are denied by almost all her bishops, and the largest portion of the clergy?

“And here it must be observed, that this militates most forcibly against Puseyites, who profess to hold and teach their doctrines on *authority*—on the authority of the Church as *their Church*. If they have not this, all their theory falls to pieces; their doctrines are mere opinions, matters of private judgment; nay, they are condemned by their own theory, because they have asserted the necessity of a church authority, and have proclaimed the insufficiency of private judgment. The Catholic faith, and dogmatic teaching of the Catholic faith, are, on the Puseyite theory, *essentials* of a church: but that the faith, as understood by Puseyites, is taught dogmatically by the English Church, is believed only by themselves; for all the rest of the world, including the largest part of their own communion, all dissenters, and the whole Catholic world, refuse to believe it, condemn it, or ridicule it; and yet are there found men gravely declaring that Puseyism is the authoritative and distinctive teaching of the English Church. Ah! when will they open their eyes to see their delusion, and provide for their safety? When will they perceive that they have no church, no living church, no living guide to whom they can point and say, “She teaches me these doctrines; she is my witness and my authority?” They can point to individuals and to books, but not to a church; and it is a church they are required to exhibit; for it is a church they profess to believe, and such they must show forth as their support. If this foundation is knocked away, their whole theory goes into pieces, and falls to the ground. If they would be logical and consistent, they must either give up their catholic doctrines and the idea of a church, or throw themselves into the arm of their true mother the Catholic Church, which alone in her symbols embodies and enshrines all the glorious doctrines for which they look in vain in the authoritative documents of the English Church.

“Neither does it avail in the least to their cause to say “the catholic doctrines will spread—that they will become the recognized teaching of the English Church ;” for the question at issue is, not what may be the future destiny, but what is at present the authoritative teaching, of the English Church. Is the English Church the authoritative teacher of Catholic doctrines or not? And if not, how can it be called a branch of the Catholic Church?

“And, moreover, what becomes of their beautiful theory of a Church visible and present as their guide to the faith, if the English Church does not yet hold or teach Catholic doctrines? If she be destined to become the authoritative teacher of Catholic doctrines only in *some future age*? Does not this assertion show that they have no *actual church*, and that all their vision of forming a branch of catholicity falls to the ground? And if they have no actual Church, how can they continue in their false position? What prevents them from finding out the true Church, that ever living and teaching Church, which alone is the authoritative teacher of Catholic doctrines? Ah, would to God that the veil were taken from their eyes, and that they could see plainly that Church which alone realises their “ideal” of Catholic doctrines! Would to God that they could see that those doctrines, which they have so much at heart, are taught and enforced in the Roman Catholic Church as essential, vital, personal truths, that they form part of the whole system of worship, that they are woven into it, that they spread through it, taking and keeping possession of the minds of all her people, and running out naturally in their forms of speech.”—pp. 253-260.

We shall only add in conclusion, our earnest hope that this, and, we trust, many other kindred publications of Father Pagani, may meet the same success with which his ascetic writings have been blessed.

IV. — *Cambrensis Eversus, seu potius Historica Fides in Rebus Hibernicis Giraldo Cambrensi Abrogata: in quo Plerasque Justi Historici Dotes Desiderari, plerosque Nævos inesse, ostendit Gratianus Lucius, Hibernus. Impress, An. MDCLXII.* Edited, with Translation and Notes, by the Rev. MATTHEW KELLY, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. (Celtic Society,) Vol. I. Dublin, 1849.

We are unavoidably compelled to postpone our intended review of this most able and important volume. We regret the delay the more, because the work was entitled to claim an early notice at our hands, not alone for its own sake and that of the learned editor, but also as a publication of the Celtic Society, to which, during the brief period since its formation, our literature owes many obligations. We hope, however, to make amends in our next publication.

V.—*Laneton Parsonage*. A Tale for Children, on the Practical Use of a Portion of the Church Catechism. Part III. By the author of "Amy Herbert," Edited by the Rev. W. SEWELL, B.D. London: Longmans, 1849.

The authoress of "Amy Herbert" needs no introduction from us. We have already more than once expressed our high appreciation of her merits as a writer of religious fiction for youth; and though the portion of *Laneton Parsonage* now before us is inferior, in mere interest as a tale, to some of its predecessors, it is nevertheless a very pleasing and instructive story.

Like the earlier portions of the series, it is directly intended to illustrate the religious observances of the Anglican Church; but in this tale, as in the rest, there is so little, either of doctrine or of practice, which can at all be considered as trenching upon debatable ground, that we have little hesitation in pronouncing the book a safe one; and although it is far from realising the fulness of Catholic doctrine or Catholic feeling, yet, in default of a thoroughly Catholic literature of our own, it may be received as not unsuited to the use of members of our communion.

The Third Part of *Laneton Parsonage* is a continuation of the story of Alice Lennox, and it embraces the last step, according to Anglican notions, in her christian education—the Confirmation. The *Dramatis Personæ* are the same as in the earlier volume;—Lady Catherine Hyde, Alice's kind guardian and protectress; Ruth and Madeline Clifford, her young friends; their father, Mr. Clifford, the parish clergyman; their mother, a perfect specimen of that Christian mother whom the authoress so delights to draw; Florence Trevelyan, their old schoolfellow; and the young French girl, Justine Le Vergnier, whose character, in the second part, was left involved in considerable uncertainty.

We do not mean to enter into any outline of the story. It will be enough to say that the interest of this portion of the narrative is founded on a difficulty into which Alice and her friends are betrayed, by weakly yielding to the instances of Florence Trevelyan, and consenting to conceal for a time certain equivocal, and indeed downright suspicious, circumstances regarding Justine Le Vergnier, for the purpose of enabling her to obtain the situation of governess in the family of Florence's aunt, Mrs. de Lacy.

The incidents to which this gives occasion, are made the vehicle of many forcible and delicate delineations of character, and of a fund of solid instruction upon the true motives of Christian conduct. Nothing can be more interesting than the dissection of the secret impulses by which the several actors in this unlucky plot are influenced. There are many older and wiser people than Ruth Clifford, who might learn a lesson from the temptations under which she, with all her excellencies of disposition, was betrayed. There is no more common weakness among "good people" than that desire of influencing others to good, which, in Ruth's case, the clever *intriguante*, Justine, managed in the following scene, to turn to her own advantage. She is discussing with Florence Trevelyan the best means of securing Ruth's silence regarding her.

"And yet you can be indifferent whether Ruth talks about you or not," said Florence.

"Point du tout!—not at all indifferent; but you see there are always ways. We will come over Ruth."

"Not so easy as you may think," replied Florence.

"Pardon! I knew Ruth when you did."

"At school; but you saw little enough of her."

"Enough for what I wish. Ruth loves dearly to rule; she loves to put that little finger of hers into other persons' concerns; she shall put it into mine."

"Yours!" exclaimed Florence, in a tone of alarm.

Justine laughed heartily.

"Ah! to be sure! you take fright; but trust me. See what a pretty note I have written;" and she drew a folded paper from her reticule, and gave it to Florence. "You see my happiness rests on her coming to the pic-nic," said Justine, still laughing, as she quoted her own words; "I have so much confidence to give her: I want her advice. She can't help herself now—she must come."

"And she must keep quiet till she has seen you," said Florence.

"Of course; Ruth is most proper—she is full of honour; she will never speak till we have met."

"And if you do meet, what then?" inquired Florence.

"We will see—we will think," said Justine, lightly tapping her forehead. "I never was in a trouble yet, but I found my way out of it; and we will go, *mignonnie*, you and I; we will have our treat; we will be at Paris together."

"And you will show me all the best shops, and tell my aunt about everything that is fit to be seen, and do just whatever I like," said Florence.

"Oui, *assurance*! let me only be there. Once in Paris—in my country—*la belle France*, we will have our pleasure then; and

it is so bright, so gay. Ah! Florence you don't live in England; it is all as you said one day—eat, drink, sleep, and begin again.'

"'The difficulty is to manage it,' said Florence, musingly. 'You will really take a great deal of care of Agnes, won't you, Justine?' she added.

"'Surely; the greatest of all. Did I not take care of the little Darnleys? That very evening when I went out to see my friends—the evening I was so caught; I had put them all quietly to bed: they were asleep—very comfortable—no harm could happen to them.'

"'You have a charming accent,' said Florence; that is one great advantage. My aunt heard it remarked the other day, and she admires your voice extremely. If you only make Agnes sing as well, she will be quite satisfied.'"—pp. 139, 140.

The unfelt influence of this feeling upon Ruth in her after conduct is admirably described. Not even her love for her mother, and her respect for herself, are proof against it. The struggle between this hidden self-love and remorse is extremely interesting:

"In the mean time Ruth had hurried Florence forward with the intention of outstripping the rest of the party, and when they reached a sufficient distance she stopped for a moment, and exclaimed, 'Oh, Florence! this unhappy business with Justine, it has made me miserable. I have done so wrong!'

"'How? what can have happened?' asked Florence, turning pale.

"'I have deceived,' exclaimed Ruth, in a tone of bitter self-reproach; 'I have deceived mamma, wilfully. I have all but told a story. What will she think of me?'

"'Ruth, what do you mean? what can Mrs. Clifford know?'

"'I cannot tell what she has heard,' replied Ruth, 'but she must have some suspicions; not about me though; she would never suspect me, and that makes it much worse; and I never meant to deceive her; I would not do it for all the world. Florence, I am so very unhappy!'

"'Pray be quick,' exclaimed Florence, hastening on; 'we shall be overtaken in a minute, and I must understand what you are talking of.'

"'Mamma stopped me as we left the dinner table,' said Ruth. 'She looked very anxious and worried, and asked me if you had not a friend staying with you. I said, 'Yes.' Then she asked me if she was not a French girl, who was going to be governess to Agnes; and I said 'Yes' too. Then she wanted to know if I had ever seen her, and I was puzzled what to say, when Mrs. De Lacy came up to us; she had heard just the last words, and said, 'Oh! is it Mademoiselle Veray you are talking of?' Mamma turned to

me, and said, 'That was not the name of the young lady whom you knew at Mrs. Carter's, was it Ruth?'

"Of course you said No,' interrupted Florence.

"Yes, I did not know what else to say, but I was wretched directly I had done it; and mamma smiled, and said she was glad to hear that it was not the same person; and then Mrs. De Lacy went on talking about Justine, and remarked what a pleasing girl she was, and asked if I did not think so. She said that you had recommended her, and that you had a good many French acquaintances; and she seemed to think that Justine had never been in any situation as governess before; and all the time I was obliged to let everything go on as if I did not know a word about it. Florence, I cannot bear to deceive mamma, and I must tell her.'

"If you do,' said Florence, quickly, 'you will break your word, and destroy Justine's prospects for life.'

"I am very sorry for Justine,' said Ruth; 'I would help her if I possibly could, but there is nothing else to be done; and for my promise, you know that it was made only for a time. I had no idea of always keeping a secret from my mother.'

"Then you should not have given your word,' persisted Florence. 'Justine and I have depended upon you, and have made all our arrangements under the belief that you would not break it. If you betray us, Justine will be injured for life.'

"You have never told me yet how that could be,' said Ruth; 'all I have heard has been from Alice.'

"I shall wait for Justine to tell you,' replied Florence. 'Her own account will convince you of the truth, far better than anything I can say.'

"I cannot hear her account,' said Ruth.

"Go back with us this evening, and you shall; I will manage it. At any rate, do not be unjust and condemn her unheard.'

"If I had not deceived mamma!' said Ruth, speaking to herself.

"It was not intentional deceit,' replied Florence; 'but whether it was so or not, this is a case of justice. Justine wrote to you herself, I know, begging you to give her some advice. If you betray her beforehand, I must say it will be, according to my notions, very dishonourable.'

"She might trust mamma, as well as me, if it were right to keep her secret,' said Ruth.

"That is not the question. Justine knows nothing of your mamma, and she does know a great deal of you. She has the greatest respect for you, and I know would take any hints from you; even as to her management of Agnes.'

"I cannot believe that,' said Ruth.

"I do not ask you to believe it on my word. I only ask you to

wait till you have seen Justine yourself. You have no idea what she thinks of you. Ruth, you cannot be so unkind as to persist.'

"Ruth looked unhappy, and sat down to rest under the shade of a tree, but would say nothing. Florence repeated her arguments, and became more and more earnest.

"'Your mamma and my aunt are coming,' she said, on hearing voices; 'have you no pity, Ruth?'"—pp. 247-249.

We must leave the reader to fill up, in the book itself, the details of this pretty story, and to learn the unhappy end of the schemes of the unprincipled Justine, and the bitter trials, through which Alice and her friend Ruth are brought to a more suitable turn of mind. We can promise them much pleasure as well as instruction in the search.

VI.—*Man Seeking and Securing his Last End, by uniting Meditation with his Daily Employments*, by the Rev. JOHN PERRY. London: Dolman, 61, New Bond Street; Jones, 63, Paternoster Row; Burns, 17, Portman Street; Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.

This work has been perused by the Right Rev. Dr. Wareing, and he has prefixed to it his Approbation, by declaring that he considers it "excellently calculated to promote sound practical piety in those who make use of it for leisurely and devout meditation." To recommend a book that is so approved of, our praise is not required; but in order that our readers may be made aware of what are the special objects aimed at in this work, we consider it necessary to add to the Approbation of the venerated prelate an explanation respecting them. The reverend author of this book desires to promote the practice of religious meditation amongst all persons of all classes and ranks who are Catholics; and for this purpose he has composed a book, which, though advantageous to all, is more especially intended for the poor than the rich: for the working classes, if possible, still more than for those who have by their intellectual abilities to maintain themselves and their families. Any one acquainted with the state and condition of the Catholic laity in these countries is well aware, that the practice of meditation is not one that is as much attended to as it ought to be; and yet here the practice is more required than in Catholic lands; because *there* we cannot walk along the roads—we cannot pass a church-yard, or a vineyard, that the sculptured crucifixion or the simple wooden images do not recall

to our minds the fact, that we are but pilgrims in this world—that we have God to worship, an eternity to await us, and saints and angels to intercede for us. In a Protestant country like *this*, there is nothing to excite the mind to meditation, except it be upon the folly, the vanity, the vain glory, the vices, and the crimes of our fellow creatures. Thus, in Fleet Street, an image of Queen Elizabeth reminds us of the reign of a woman whose hand was red with the blood of the saints; and in Charing cross, we have the images of two monarchs—one a victim to his own insincerity, and the treason of his people; and the other, a man who to the last struggled to retain the Catholic religion in bondage, and who regarded his ministers as traitors because they compelled him to concede emancipation; and then, overtopping them, is the image of a naval hero, whose private life will not bear examining; whilst, farther on, is the image of a king whose first madness was caused by his bigoted horror at the proposal of placing Catholics upon an equality with Protestants; and then, near to him, is the image of a Royal Duke, who took an oath that if he lived to be king, he would never do justice to Catholics.

There are in London no incitements to devotion; its images are all of sinners, and there is no outward emblem to prove that the people or the nation have the slightest respect for virtue, charity, or purity. Such is the state of the capital; and the condition of the country, with few, very few and rare instances, is the same. In such a land—where there are no processions, as on the continent—nothing, absolutely nothing, to remind mortal men that God is in the midst of them every moment of their existence, what can possibly be more desirable than a book like the present, which not only excites men to meditate, but teaches them how to meditate?

It is the duty of us all to do so, and we do not remember to have seen the point put forward in a more clear, rational, and intelligible manner, than by the Reverend author in the following passages, which form a portion of the preface to his book:

“But far the greater part of mankind are obliged, by the circumstances or state of life in which providence has placed them, to spend their days in manual labour, or to be otherwise engaged in active life: and yet, during their worldly employments, they are

not to forget their God, who placed them in this world only to love and serve Him ; nor are they to be unmindful of the truths of salvation, which His Goodness has revealed to us.

“ There are, indeed, some employments, which require much mental attention from those who are engaged in them ; and yet, even these employments may and *should* be sanctified, not only by a good intention, but also by occasional momentary reflections and devout aspirations ; recalling to mind and renewing, from time to time, the affections and resolutions of that morning’s meditation, and imploring grace to reduce them to practice.

“ The greater part, however, of manual employments do not require much attention of the mind ; but leave it, in a great measure, free for reflection. These employments should also be sanctified in the manner just described ; but in a greater degree, for there is nothing to prevent the reflections and aspirations from being more frequent, and of longer duration : they may even be made, very easily, in the form of short meditations.

“ Now, it is chiefly, but not exclusively, for the assistance of those who are engaged in active life, that the following short meditations are presented to the public : but without claiming for them the merit of originality, since the labours of others have been made use of.

“ Very many persons, when they are exhorted to the practice of daily meditation, immediately exclaim : ‘ Meditate ! I am sure I cannot meditate ! I never could ! ’ They fancy, or very easily persuade themselves, that they have not the abilities or qualifications required for meditating. But this is a mere self-delusion ; and by this pernicious delusion, they excuse themselves from applying to the pious, salutary, and important exercise of daily meditation.

“ But when these same persons have some temporal affair to execute, which is likely to bring them profit, they can then do all that is necessary for meditating—they can then exercise their faculties in such a manner, and to such a degree, as would be abundantly sufficient for meditating well.

“ If, for example, a poor uneducated man has half an acre of land, or a garden, to cultivate ; and wishes to make it produce abundance of fruit for his own profit, (as he has his soul to cultivate, that it may produce for him the fruit of eternal life,) he can *reflect*, and reflect *practically*, upon all that is necessary to be done in order to arrive at the end he has in view. He can reflect, for instance, that the seeds, or good plants, which he intends to have in his garden, will not grow so as to produce fruit, unless the weeds, and whatever else is injurious, be cleared away ; and accordingly he sets to work, and perseveres, until he has effectually cleared them away. He can reflect, moreover, what seeds should be sown, what plants be set, and at what time, and how the land is to be prepared for receiving them ; and he labours accordingly in cultivating, sowing, and planting ; and he ceases not from

employing his labours about his growing crop, until he has brought it to maturity, and obtained the end which he sought.

“Now, with regard to the cultivation or sanctification of his soul, and the spiritual profits to be thereby gained; could he not reflect, in like manner, on the multitude and enormity of his sins, and on the occasions which lead to them; and consider how these evils prevent the growth of virtues in his soul? could he not thus convince himself of the absolute necessity of correcting his bad habits, and of resolving at once to do so? and could he not, by these reflections and resolutions, animate himself to fervour, and diligence, and perseverance in labouring to clear away, from the garden of his soul, all those noxious and destructive weeds? could he not, moreover, think of the virtues which he should plant in his soul, in place of those weeds; and how to prepare and dispose himself for receiving the graces which are necessary for acquiring these virtues, and for bringing them to perfection? in a word, could he not *consider* and *employ* THE MEANS of sanctifying and saving his soul? and could he not persevere in considering and employing them, until he had arrived at the object of his pursuit; namely, the perfection of virtue here, and the enjoyment of God hereafter?”

“Therefore, when people say they cannot meditate, it is *not* because they have not sufficient *abilities* for it; but because they have not got a sufficient *will*: they are not disposed to meditate—they are not willing to give to this pious exercise the time and labour which are necessary for it, because they think too much of what is earthly and temporal, and too little of what is heavenly and eternal. But this indisposition of soul, instead of being allowed to act as a hindrance, should rather spur them on to be regular and diligent in the practice of daily meditation; because it shows how very necessary this practice is for them.”—Preface, pp. 6—9.

These observations are followed by clear and distinct rules—directions for meditation—which persons of the humblest capacity can understand; and these are followed by the meditations themselves, ninety-two in number. The conclusion is “a short rule of life.”

We commend the work to the attention of every Catholic family.

VII.—*The Christian Consoled and Instructed*, from the Italian of QUADRUPANI. London: Burns.

We are very much pleased with this little book, which is the work of a celebrated religious, and speaks the sentiments of many of the saints. St. Francis de Sales especially is followed, and his gentle spirit breathes through the whole book. The object of it is to lead the soul to the

confiding and loving performance of the duties of her state of life, leaving aside the consideration of the higher practices of virtue to which souls are called by the special inspirations of God. By this careful distinguishing of what things are duties incumbent upon all, and what are not, many fancied burdens are removed from afflicted souls, and many dangerous scruples put an end to. The instructions are simple and beautiful, and many fine passages are added from Fenelon and others. The present edition is got up with more than ordinary neatness, and makes a very pretty little volume.

VIII.—*The Life and Death of Margaret Clitherow, the Martyr of York*, now first published from the Original Manuscript, and edited by WILLIAM NICHOLSON. Richardson and Son: London, Dublin, and Derby.

Dr. Challoner, in his "Missionary Priests," mentions, among the victims of the violent persecution of the Catholics which was raised by the Earl of Huntingdon, Lord President of the North, a Mrs. Margaret Clitherow, a gentlewoman of good family in Yorkshire, who "was pressed to death" in the year 1585, or 1586. The charge under which she was arraigned was that of relieving and harbouring priests. Fearing that her trial and conviction might involve others in similar trouble, she refused to plead; and persisting in her resolution, notwithstanding every effort on the part of the prosecution, she was condemned to the punishment which the law awards to such recusancy, being literally "pressed to death."

The little volume now before us contains the original MS. memoir of this heroic lady, which has been religiously preserved in her family, the Middletons of Stockeld in Yorkshire, and is now in the possession of Mr. Middleton, its present representative. The author of the memoir is stated by Dr. Challoner to have been the Reverend John Mush, who was Mrs. Clitherow's director, and who was himself a confessor and all but a martyr for the faith. The editor, Mr. Nicholson appears to have bestowed much care on its preparation for publication, and has prefixed an interesting Introduction, not only containing an account of the MS., but entering at considerable length into the question of religious persecution.

It will be seen from what we have already said, that

the punishment awarded to Mrs. Clitherow was directly the penalty not of the charge under which she was arraigned, but of her recusancy when called upon to plead to the indictment. It was the ordinary punishment of felons refusing to plead, no matter what was the indictment. Nevertheless, the charge to which she refused to plead was in itself a felony, and it was only her reluctance to involve others along with herself that induced her to refuse to put herself upon her trial, nor can we hesitate to regard her as having suffered death for the faith.

The reader may possibly recollect a description of a similar punishment in one of Mr. Harrison Ainsworth's romances. We doubt, however, whether it can be compared with the following simple, but most affecting narrative:

“About eight of the clock the sheriffs came to her, and she being ready expecting them, (having trimmed up her head with new inkle strings, which she had prepared to bind her hands,) went cheerfully to her marriage, as she called it; dealing her alms in the street, which was so full of people that she could scarce pass by them. She went barefoot and barelegged, her gown loose about her. Fawcett, the sheriff, made haste and said, ‘Come away, Mrs. Clitherow.’ The Martyr answered merrily, ‘Good master sheriff, let me deal my poor alms before I go, now my time is short.’ They all marvelled to see her joyful, smiling countenance.

“The place of execution was the tollbooths, six or seven yards distant from the prison. There were present at her Martyrdom the two sheriffs of York, Fawcett and Gibson, Frost, *the minister*, Fox, Mr. Cheek his kinsman, with other of his men, four sergeants, which had hired certain beggars to do the murder, three or four men besides, and four women.

“The Martyr coming to the place, kneeled her down, and prayed to herself. The tormentors bade her pray with them, and they would pray with her. The Martyr denied, and said, ‘I will not pray with you, nor shall you pray with me: neither will I say ‘Amen’ to your prayer, nor shall you to mine.’ Then they willed her to pray for the Queen’s majesty. The Martyr began in this order: First, in the hearing of them all, she prayed for ‘the Catholic Church, then for the Pope’s Holiness, Cardinals, and other Fathers which have charge of souls, then for the Christian princes in the world.’ At which words the torturers interrupted her, and willed not to put her majesty among that company; yet the Martyr proceeded in this order: ‘and especially for Elizabeth, queen of England, that God may turn her to the Catholic Faith, and after this mortal life she may receive the blessed joys of heaven: for I wish,’ quoth she, ‘as much joy to her majesty’s soul

as to mine own.' The sheriff, Gibson, abhorring the cruel deed, stood weeping at the door. Then said Fawcett, 'Mrs. Clitherow, you must remember and confess you die for treason.' The Martyr answered. 'No, no, Mr. Sheriff, I die for the love of my Lord Jesus ;' which last words she spoke with a very loud voice.

"Then Fawcett commanded her to put off her apparel ; 'For you must die naked,' said he, 'according as judgment was pronounced against you.'

"The Martyr with other women requested him *on their knees*, that she might die in her shift, and that for the honour of womanhood they would not see her naked ; but they would not grant it. Then she requested them that the women might unapparel her, and that they would turn their faces from her during that time.

"The women took off her clothes, and put upon her the long linen habit. Then very quietly she laid her down upon the ground, her face covered with a handkerchief, the linen habit being placed over her as far as it would reach, all the rest of her body being naked. The door was laid upon her, her hands she joined towards her face. Then the sheriff said, 'Nay, you must have your hands bound.' The Martyr put forth her hands, still joined over the door. Then two sergeants parted them, and with the inkle strings, which she had prepared for the purpose, bound them to two posts, so that her body and hands made a perfect cross †. They willed her again to ask the Queen's majesty's forgiveness, and to pray for her. The Martyr said she had prayed for her. They willed also to ask her husband forgiveness. The Martyr said, 'If ever I have offended him, but for my conscience, I ask him forgiveness.'

"After this they laid weight upon her, which, when she first felt, she said, 'Jesu ! Jesu ! Jesu ! have mercy upon me !' which were the last words she was heard to speak.

"She was in dying *about one quarter-of-an-hour*. A sharp stone, as much as a man's fist, put under her back ; upon her was laid to the quantity of *seven or eight hundred weight at the least*, which, breaking her ribs, caused them to burst forth of the skin.

"Thus most victoriously this gracious Martyr overcame all her enemies, passing from this mortal life with rare and marvellous triumph into the peaceable City of God, there to receive a worthy Crown of endless immortality and joy.

"This was at nine of the clock, and she continued in the press till three afternoon. Her hat she sent before she died to her husband, in sign of her loving duty to him as to her head. Her hose and shoes also to her eldest daughter, Agnes, about twelve years of age, signifying that she should serve God and follow her steps of virtue.

"This little girl was at first committed to ward because she would not betray her mother, and there extremely used for that she would not go to the Church ; but, *when her mother was murdered*, the heretics came to her and said, that unless she would go to the

Church and hear a sermon, her mother should be put to death. The child, thinking thereby to save her mother's life, went to a sermon. And thus they did deceive her."—pp. 190—6.

We have more than once urged upon the parties who are in possession of such manuscript historical materials as the interesting narrative now before us, the expediency of publishing them in whatever shape circumstances may point out as most convenient; either in the separate form which Mr. Nicholson has adopted, or, if the extent and character of the MS. be not such as to warrant a separate publication, in some of our literary and religious periodicals, which must always be open for such communications. We trust that Mr. Nicholson's example may be found worthy of imitation, and that before the present generation shall have passed away, but little of the materials for the Catholic history of the last three centuries, whether it be in the shape of letters, memoirs, biographies, or narratives, will be suffered to remain exposed to the chances of destruction or loss to which manuscript remains are necessarily subject.

IX.—*The Catholic School.* Nos. vii. and viii. July 1849.—London: Catholic Poor-School Committee.

We wish to recommend this periodical as one likely to be most useful to those who are interested in our schools, both by the information it affords with respect to government assistance, and by the sound practical advice which it inculcates.

X.—*Principles of Protestantism considered with a view to Unity,* by the author of "Proposals for Christian Union." Second edition. London: James Darling, 1849.

This book is the best on the subject by the author. It does much, and that in a very attractive way, to set the conduct of the reformers, and the results of their principles, in a truer light; yet, we think it is calculated to do mischief. It is based upon a principle which is as false as it is pernicious; viz., that it is possible for the Church of Christ to be divided,—that the sin of schism can belong to both parties after a division. Acting upon this idea, the author adjudicates between the parties, now attacking the abuses of Papal government and the supposed encroachments of the Papacy; and again, mildly remonstrating with the reformers for their want of deference and submis-

sion to authority. In assuming this monstrous principle, he forgets that he is falsifying his own creed, that the Church is one, and that the chair of St. Peter is its bond of unity—that he is falsifying the promise of Christ, that He will remain with His Church for ever. For is it not inconsistent with this unity and this promise to suppose that a time has come, aye, and lasted for three hundred years, in which a man may truly say, The head of the Church, the bond of Unity, has gone so wrong, has so encroached upon the rights of others, that his claims justify or prevent my paying to him any actual submission at all? Is not that to say that the bond of unity has gone? Is not that to say that Christ has left his Church? Surely this consideration might be enough to countervail the argument that there is no positive proof that the Popes have in all ages asserted such lofty claims; for assuredly there will never be positive proof of that which alone would be of weight to the contrary, that, they ever admitted them to be lower. Our argument may be perhaps illustrated by a reference to the words of the author in a former book.*

“The intention for which Christ instituted the Primacy, all the fathers agree, was nothing else than that Christ sought to avoid schisms, and to preserve unity.”

And again—

“Now from this object of the Primacy, its essence is plainly discoverable; for if Christ our Lord instituted one chief or visible head, in order to prevent schism in the mystical body of the Church, and to preserve the union of all the members, it is plain that the duty of that chief or head is not to appropriate to himself the operations of the other members, but so to influence them that each member may abide in his place, and exercise the functions proper to his office, giving to all, for the *primum mobile* the Divine Law and the Canons. We hope our readers will agree with us in thinking that the following deduction has at least as close a connection with its premise. If Christ our Lord instituted one chief or visible head, in order to prevent schisms and to preserve union, it is to be presumed that that chief or head has not been himself the first to rush into schism and to promote disunion, that he has not appropriated to himself the operation of the other members, but that while making each of them exercise the functions proper to his office, he has also known how far his own extend, and that

* Claims of the Church of Rome, &c., p. 88.

his judgment as to the primacy or secondary authority of the Canon Law, is at least as much to be relied on as the historical speculations of our author."

XI.—*Developments of Protestantism, and other Frdgments*; reprinted from the Dublin Review and Tablet. Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby, 1849.

This pamphlet presents an auto-biography, so to speak, of Protestantism, the most complete and self-condemning that we have seen. Its founders are made once more to proclaim the principles and objects of their rebellion, and its disciples, in every country and every age, tell, in their own words, the lamentable history of its progress. It is well that this should be, because there is a delusion now encouraged by those whose theories it suits, that the reformers did not so much break off the religion of the past ages, as refuse to keep pace with the pretended encroachments of the Papacy. They charge the Catholic Church with being, at least, in part, the author of a schism which they lament, and which they would gladly see put an end to, if any compromise, short of unconditional submission, were allowed them.

It is well, then, to remember that the Homilies proclaim that "the whole world had been sunk in the pit of damnable idolatry, for the space of nine hundred years and odd," and that the Anglican divines were the loudest to cry out that theirs was God's own cause, the restoration of the gospel long defiled by the pestiferous and damnable doctrines of the Beast of Babylon. They made no compromise with the unclean thing, but boldly declared that they were God's own ministers, and that their enemies were Antichrist. Such were their pretensions; they allowed no middle term; they were either the apostles of God, or the emissaries of hell. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says our Lord; and accordingly our author follows them through Germany, Switzerland, France, England, America, and other countries, to discover the fruits they have borne, and by them, to judge their mission. We cannot give the exact references that the book furnishes, but the general outlines of the pictures which are there drawn, are too striking to be omitted. "The theology of the Protestant churches of Germany," says H. J. Rose, himself a Protestant, "presented a very singular spectacle during the last half of the preceding century,

and the commencement of the present. *A very large majority of the divines of these churches, rejected, in a word, all belief in the divine origin of Christianity..... It appears that, after a time, a spirit of almost entire indifference to religion, manifested itself among all classes.*" Would our readers know the general roads that led men to this happy state? Rationalism, the offspring of decaying Lutheranism, Arianism rising from its ashes, Socinianism, and the multitude of sects which led Luther to exclaim, that there were "almost as many different opinions as individual ministers," were Satan's instruments in the change. But how was it in Switzerland? After having been from Calvin downwards, accused of Arianism, and evading the accusation, at length, in 1816, the venerable consistory of Geneva, were openly charged by M. Henri Louis Empaytaz with rejecting the divinity of our Lord, and they replied: "*Pour maintenir le principe du Protestantisme la venerable Compagnie a dû necessairement renoncer aux opinions qu'on lui fait un crime d'avoir abandonnées,*"—and the mob of Geneva raised the cry "A bas Jesus Christ." M. Vernet's Socinian Theology is now taught in the university. In France, while according to Ranke, the Protestants, in the year 1600, had seven hundred and sixty parish churches, all in good order, we are told by the Foreign Aid Society's Quarterly Report, 1841, that a few years ago "*it was hardly possible to find twenty pasteurs who confessed the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement.*" At this time, the established Protestantism of France is, *for the most part, Socinianism.*

And, be it remembered, that in the same France, while the Protestants were patronised by the revolutionists, one hundred and thirty-five Catholic bishops, and thousands of priests, suffered death or exile for the faith, and forty thousand zealous priests are now labouring to restore it. Of the Netherlands, where, as at Geneva, the chosen doctrines were fiercely defended by the prison and the sword or stake, as early as 1655, we learn, from one of Lord Somers's tracts, that "the sect of Socinianism bears great sway in the province of Holland, and is *assented to by most there,*" and Huber says of it, that "never since the Reformation has the form of religion continued the same for the space of more than thirty years together." In Sweden, in like manner, it is admitted by Protestant authorities, that there was, about 1810, a fickleness which

arrived at changing everything, that there is now an almost universal silence upon doctrines, that the doctrines of Socinianism are no longer strange, and that, as far as regards the morals of the people, the Reformation has done harm rather than good. At last we come to England, once the isle of saints; what blessing does she owe to the Reformation? She was once in a happy unity of faith and love: "now," says the bishop of Exeter, "the sin of schism is the opprobrium, and threatens to be the downfall of our country." And again: "the opposition of teaching, *as respects the sacraments*, is the great evil of our times." And indeed, the endless variety of clergymen's views is as notorious as it is absurd. The great mass of the people are either destitute of religious instruction altogether, that is, are in the condition of heathens, or else are Arian or Socinian. Hear again the Bishop of Exeter: "Absolute heathenism, and worse than heathenism—intense hatred of the Christian faith, is raging in many parts of England:"—and Dr. Pusey: "We have allowed a large nation of heathens to spring up among ourselves, unconverted, unnoticed, uncared for, and sent out nations of heathens, in part with the worst vices of the worst of heathens, to colonize the world." The Bishop of Exeter lastly says, "True it is that ours is not the only part of the Church in which these truths, (i. e. her very nature, end and office,) seem to have been forgotten. Recent occurrences *throughout England* all tend to the same point, all prove the universal need of the same instruction." Again, "This ignorance is exhibited not in the multitude only, but *in all ranks and degrees of men*, and most prominently in those whose station is most exalted." We all know how pauperism, begun by the robberies of the Reformation, has since increased and multiplied under poor-laws and gaols, till it presents a spectacle such as no other christian land has ever witnessed. And when we look to the position of the Anglican church herself, what do we see but the cup of slavery drunk to its deepest dregs, slavery to a parliament and a minister, slavery in doctrine and discipline, slavery submitted to at the Reformation, and oppressing all succeeding generations. We have not space to carry out the investigation into America, where it is perhaps more striking than elsewhere, but will simply repeat the words of Dr. Wilberforce, in his History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America: "The

great stream of the religious opinions in America, sets toward the chill decencies of Socinian error." And again, "The mass of the population has not, yet greatly felt the influence of the episcopalian body." Such are a few features of the pictures drawn in the first part of this pamphlet, mostly from the words of Protestants themselves, of the present condition of the religions founded by those men who blasphemously said that they came for the restoration of the gospel. In the second part there are most mournful pictures of the present state and prospects of Anglicanism, portrayed almost entirely in the very words of the English Churchman, as it pours forth alternately its sorrow and its indignation at the miserable condition of the people, and of the rulers of its church. At one time it asserts that an ecclesiastical revolution, in the shape of a Puritan ascendancy, is impending, if no means be taken to check its progress—or dreads as one of the "possible fates" of the establishment, "a gradual sinking into a mere Protestant sect, ending, as such a course naturally would, in rationalism and infidelity;" and at another, that "one half of the parishes of England are living in semi-heathenism," while, as to education, the *Times* declared "that the education of this country is one great quackery from beginning to end. It does not stand the test of half a year's trial on any subject, sacred or secular."

We regret that we have not space to do more than mention the subjects that are next treated of, the numerous, public, and unproved denials of Baptismal Regeneration, by clergymen of the church of England, the solemn condemnation by a bishop of all notion of a sacrifice, the all but universal rejection and repression of the practice of confession, all of which are considered, by the English Churchman, to be primary and fundamental doctrines, the decline of daily service, and the utter want of fixed doctrines and religious ideas throughout the church. But we wish especially to recommend the last portion of the pamphlet, in which many most interesting particulars are given of the Greek Church, taken chiefly from the observations of the Count de Maistre, while ambassador at St. Petersburg. The utter abjection of that church, overrun with dissenters, and without any influence over the hearts of men, and the miserable condition of its clergy, who are become a by-word of reproach, and the outcasts of society

are strongly contrasted with the grand position of the papacy, whose mighty dominion reaches to the ends of the earth, whose sublime claims are acknowledged by a long line of fathers and doctors, and by the liturgies of the Greeks themselves, and for which the providence of God has set apart, and preserved the sovereignty of Rome. Altogether, the pamphlet will be found most interesting by those who study the position of the separatist communities throughout the world.

XII.—*Devotions for Confession and Communion*; from the *Délices des Ames Pieuses*; by EDWARD CASWALL, M. A. London; Burns, 1849.

This is a useful and ample collection of devotional exercises, accompanied with instructions for the right use of the Sacraments. It contains, also, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, and a selection of some beautiful and appropriate hymns from the *Lyra Catholica*, of which we have already spoken at length. We rejoice to see our devotional literature so much enriched and diversified, and hope that this book, as it is a sign of the increasing calls of devotion, may, in its turn, do much still further to promote the piety of the faithful.

XIII.—*Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their Effects on the Civilisation of Europe*, by the REV. J. BALMEZ. Translated from the French version by C. J. Hanford and R. Kershaw. London Burns, 1849.

We have already spoken of the high merits of this work.* It is not one of an ordinary stamp, but one that by the blessing of God, will work a great change in the ideas both of Catholics and Protestants in this country. The force of long-continued calumny and short-sighted national prejudice has prevailed over ignorance of facts, and a wish to concede, as much as can be conceded, until even Catholics have been led to suppose that their divine religion has, from some unaccountable reason, had a less beneficial influence than Protestantism upon human society and civilisation; as if that which is from God could fail to be the best in all its relations with mankind. We rejoice therefore to see so able and philosophical a refutation of

* D.R. Dec. 1848,—March, 1849.

this pernicious error brought within the means of our readers by this cheap and elegant translation.

XIV.—*The History of England, for the Use of Schools and Young Persons.* By W. F. MYLIUS, Master of Manor House School, Chelsea. Sixth edition. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1849.

From the very commencement of our literary labours, there has not been a single point on which we have insisted so uniformly and with so much earnestness, as the necessity of purifying and improving the books employed in our elementary education; nor is there any department in which the necessity was so urgent and so unquestionable as that of English History. From the most purely elementary catechism of the History of England, up to the more elaborate compendiums designed for the use of advanced schools and colleges, there was not one which did not breathe in every page a spirit of hostility, if not of contempt, towards the Catholic religion.

Mr. Mylius has the merit of having applied himself early to provide for the important want thus created in our Catholic literature. His history has long been known in our schools, and where it has been known is deservedly popular. It makes no pretensions, to use the author's own modest language, to novelty or originality, but it possesses the less equivocal merit of being carefully compiled from the best and safest sources; and what it wants in brilliancy or novelty is far more than compensated by the solidity and justness of its views, and the soundness of its principles and opinions.

The edition now before us is carried down to the present time, containing a brief summary even of the events of the present reign. Nor can there well be a better and more convincing evidence of the merit of the work, than the fact of its having passed through six large impressions, each more widely circulated than its predecessor.

XV.—1. *The Rise and Fall of Papacy*; in a series of discourses. By the REV. ROBERT FLEMING, Minister of the Gospel. London: Ward and Co., Paternoster Row.

2.—*Faith and Infidelity*, Part II.—Two dissertations on the Time of the End. London: Hatchard and Son.

We have classed these two works together, not that

they have much in common, except a subject utterly beyond their power or attainments, and a hopeless blundering through the various theories they are pleased to entertain concerning it. We must confess our surprise at finding these books upon our table. We profess no gift for expounding prophecies; upon grounds so mysterious and so awful, we should not presume to follow, even the footsteps of one duly qualified by human wisdom and Divine Teaching to explain them; but that *we*, Catholics and laymen, should intrude upon these hallowed precincts at the bidding of every presumptuous intermeddler, who thought he could find therein fit exercise for his idle hobby horse, was surely not to be expected.

We have glanced over the books indeed, and found some amusement in noticing the absurdities and inconsistencies contained in them. We noticed also in the dispositions of the Authors a difference to which it is but fair to allude: Mr. Fleming is a hard headed bitter thorough protestant, who has stretched every point, and gone through every labour to prove the Pope to be Antichrist; the author of Faith and Infidelity, more charitable by nature, and influenced by the milder spirit of the age, has decided Antichrist to be *Infidelity* in its overt form. That Antichrist and Infidelity will have no very distant relation to one another, we ourselves—modest as we profess ourselves to be, in such speculations, can find no great difficulty in believing.

XVI.—*Instructions on Mental Prayer; from the French.* Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby.

These are among the best instructions on this subject that we have seen. The method of meditation, though slightly differing from those usually laid down, is fully and admirably explained, and illustrated by many examples; especially upon the mode of exercising the affections, that most important part of meditation, many striking and practical rules are given. Then follow instructions on the utility and immense importance of mental prayer, and on the difficulties to be encountered in it, which form the subject of the second part of the book, and are divided into three heads, of distractions, dryness, and temptations in prayer. The sources and the remedy of voluntary distractions, and the advantages of those that are involuntary, form most use-

ful subjects of consideration. The various ways in which dryness afflicts the soul, and the useful purposes which it serves, together with the mode of behaving under it, are next spoken of, and lastly, the various temptations with which the devil seeks to delude those who practise this holy exercise, are beautifully explained. We think that there are few who would not, in this little book, find much new and most profitable instruction.

XVII.—*The Irish Poor Law. How far has it failed? and why?* A question addressed to the common sense of his countrymen, by G. Poulett Scrope Esq. M. P.—London: J. Ridgway, 1849.

Mr. Scrope gives us a most fearful account of the condition of the Irish workhouses. It seems that vast masses of the population are being barely kept alive; some crammed together in a filthy and demoralizing state into workhouses, others giving up a portion of their scanty pittances for some miserable shelter; all, or almost all of them sinking by gradual starvation. And this terrible mass of misery is the only result of the enormous poor-rates. We know that there are objections to Mr. Scrope's plan of employing the paupers in reproductive works, and the cultivation of the ground, but at the same time it seems a tremendous responsibility to insist too much on these, unless some other means are speedily put in action for relieving the poor-rates, and putting an end to the present ruinous system.

XVIII.—1. *The Redbreast, The Forget-me-not, The Madonna*, from the German of CHRISTOPHER VON SCHMID.

2.—*The Rose of St. John*, a little piece composed and played by the Pupils of the Sacred Heart, in honour of their kind and indulgent Father, the Right Rev. Bishop of New York. New York, Edward Dunigan and Brothers, 151, Fulton Street.

All our readers who have felt the want of good English Catholic books for children, will rejoice to see the efforts making in America to supply this deficiency. We have had occasion to mention Mr. Dunigan's name repeatedly as the publisher of delightful works of this kind, as well as of others of still greater importance. He is now bringing out a new edition of Canon Schmidt's tales. The stories are published separately; they are well translated, prettily got up, and very cheap. Thus, the fund of edifying entertainment which the good Canon has provided for his own

little flock, will be extended to the children of another hemisphere; and we are not surprised at it. There is great variety of incidents in these pretty stories; and in the mode of telling them a simplicity, a sort of good faith and earnestness, which cannot but be congenial to their young readers.

The other little story has a peculiar claim to interest. It does great credit to the enlightened religious education which its happy young composers are receiving.

XIX.—*A Digest of several Reports on Sanitary Reform*, by W. Simpson.

This is a collection of the labours of some of the heroes of Sanitary Reform, Drs. Southwood, Smith, and Arnott, and Messrs. Chadwick and Walker. It gives a full account of the poisonous influence of graveyards, cesspools, &c., and suggests remedies, especially the establishment of a proper Medical Board of Health, and Medical Offices, to ascertain by personal visits, and to register the causes of death.

XX.—1. *Votes in Aid and Rates in Aid of the Bankrupt Irish Unions*.

Two Speeches delivered in the House of Commons, by C. POULETT SCROPE, Esq., M.P., on the 16th Feb. and 27th March, 1849. London: James Ridgway; Piccadilly, 1849.

2.—*The Present Circumstances of the Unions of O'ldcastle submitted to the Consideration of the Parliamentary Committees now sitting for the Re-construction of the Irish Poor Laws*, by J. L. W. NAPER, Esq., Dublin: J. McGlashan, 21, D'Olier Street, 1849.

3.—*Emigration for the Million*, by GERSHOM. London: Richardson, Cornhill, 1849.

Here are three ably written pamphlets which touch upon the moral and physical evils of Ireland. In the deluge of pamphlets which now seek to engage the attention of the public, it is desirable that the reader of such light literature should have some clue to guide him in his selection, and for this reason, rather than from any particular novelty in those now lying before us, we will endeavour to give a short summary of their contents. With the two speeches of Mr. Poulett Scrope, all those who take an interest in the proceedings of Parliament must be already acquainted; they are important, not only from their own merit, terse, vigorous, and closely reasoned as they are; but because in them is sketched out the plan which Sir

Robert Peel has so boldly and happily matured, and which we trust soon to see the law of the land; we allude to the relief both of the poor, and the poor's-rate payer, by the compulsory sale of such land as is unable to discharge this first moral and legal obligation upon all property. Firmly opposed to the Rate in Aid, Mr. Scrope considers it better that such assistance as is needful should be afforded by the Imperial Treasury;—to be repaid, however, and that not from the income of land already bankrupt, but from the proceeds of its sale. We will not follow him through reasons and statements which have already been weighed by the public; we will content ourselves with saying, that the strong practical sense, the calm earnestness, and admirable style of these two speeches, make them really agreeable reading, and that is a bold assertion, considering the subject.

In the account of the "Present Circumstances of the Union of Oldcastle," the author has plunged somewhat discursively into the statistics needful to show the probable working of the rate in aid, and to suggest improvements. Mr. Naper, himself an Irish landlord, adopts Sir Robert Peel's plan for the sale of lands, and evidently feels that it is the only ultimate means of cutting through the entanglement of Irish difficulties; but meanwhile he discusses various grievances in a tone of good sense and moderation, which entitle him to attention. Through these we will not follow him; but it gives us hope to see, that the endless frothy declamation upon Irish troubles is going somewhat out of fashion, that men of practical minds are bending their attention to practical details. Men are coming to a point, not only in their views, but in their accusations; and certainly these derive all the more force from their concentration. When Mr. Scrope upbraids the House with the helter skelter haste with which the remedial measures for Ireland have ever been carried out, and with the blunders consequent upon such hurry and external pressure; when Mr. Naper quotes Lord John Russell's own testimony to the wretched condition of the peasantry in parts of Ireland, (and especially in Ballina), long before the famine, (in the years 1834-35), during which time, he says, "we heard no complaints;" and adds, "Why, the noble lord and his political friends have been clearly passing by on the other side, as far as the people of Ballina are concerned, ever since the years 1834-35;" we cannot but feel that these charges are *true*. When again we cull even from the two

sober minded writers, we have been noticing, such a character for recklessness, cupidity, mismanagement, and oppression, as even they give to the generality of Irish landlords, we feel that they at least ought to be silenced. In truth, recriminations are useless, all parties owe a heavy debt to the suffering Irish peasant; would that it were discharged! How joyfully should we hear of this unhappy people, that they were at last in the enjoyment of abundance, of cheerfulness, of hopeful labour, and peaceful homes! that they were striking root afresh in their native land, and that with them the tide of emigration had ceased to flow!

Such is not the feeling of the author of the third pamphlet on our list. Emigration is his universal panacea for all the evils of society; the rich are to be persuaded into emigration, the poor urged to it, the unwary entrapped, the feeble encouraged, the helpless coerced into it. Emigration is to be the reward of merit, the punishment for every fault, that of vagrancy included. All things are to be made conducive to it; our ships of war are to carry emigrants instead of cannon; nay, he would adopt Sir Robert Peel's plan, sell part of our colonies to send emigrants to the remainder. For the Irish he entertains no great love, and his anxiety for their welfare is sharpened by so vehement a desire to get rid of them, that he would clearly not think this task accomplished while a single Paddy remained in his native land.

XXI.—1. *Kirwan Unmasked: a Review of Kirwan, in Six Letters*, addressed to the Rev. Nicholas Murray, D.D., of Elizabeth Town, by the Right Rev. JOHN HUGHES, D.D., Bishop of New York.

2.—*A Sermon Preached in the Hall of Representatives of the United States*, on Sunday, December 12, 1847, by the Right Rev. JOHN HUGHES, D.D., Bishop of New York. New York: Edward Dunigan and Brother, 151, Fulton Street.

The first of these little publications is a demolishing attack upon a hypocrite, and as such, highly enjoyable. Dr. Hughes had to do with a man for whom respect was out of the question, and for whom pity—at least in the shape of forbearance—would have been weakness. His position was of sufficient importance to make it worth while to expose him, and the bishop has done it with hearty good will; masking under a playful contempt, the severity with which he has laid bare the infidelity, mean-

ness, and falsehood of an ignorant and mercenary calumniator.

The sermon was preached by Doctor Hughes on a momentous occasion, when he was invited in the most honourable and courteous manner to preach before the House of Representatives at New York, they placing at his disposal their house and their time. The sermon is worthy of the scene and of the Bishop, of whom the Catholic world is so justly proud.

XXII.—1. *A Short Treatise on the Deviation of the Mariner's Compass ; with Rules for its Corrections and Diagrams*, by Sir JOHN ROSS, C. B., &c. &c., Captain in the Royal Navy. London: Pelham, Richardson, Cornhill, 1849.

2.—*Defects in the Practice of Life Assurance, and Suggestions for their Remedy ; with observations on the uses and advantages of Life Assurance, and the constitution of offices*, by ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, W. S., A. I. A. Fourth edition. London: Orr and Co., Amen Corner, &c., &c.

3.—*Lectures on the Nature and Use of Money*, delivered before the members of the "Edinburgh Philosophical Institution," during the months of February and March, 1848. By JOHN GRAY, author of "The Social System." Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. London: Longman and Co., 1848.

We cannot undertake, in such short notices as these, to analyse the contents of the scientific works, the names of which we have given; of the two first, the subject and the authorship will ensure the attention of our scientific readers; and the last-named publication has been so sedulously urged upon the notice of the public, that it ought not to require any further introduction. The author informs us that the "simultaneous appearance" of his work, in every part of Great Britain and Ireland, and in the French metropolis, has been effected by means of a gratuitous distribution, to the extent of "twelve hundred copies," and that "a copy of the work will be placed in the hands of every member of the house of commons," before it meets the eye of the reviewer; when to this we add a challenge and offer of five hundred guineas to the Times, and of one hundred guineas to the public in general, to discuss and confute his propositions, we can only say, that we respect such earnestness of conviction, such a disinterested desire to publish to the world what the author conceives to be a means of good; and willingly make it known, but we ourselves retire from the field, and

decline to consider, (still more to confute,) the problem, "How Production, now the *consequence* of Demand, may, at any time, be converted into the *Cause* of it."

XXIII.—*Healthy Skin. A Treatise on the Management of the Skin and Hair, in relation to Health.* By Erasmus Wilson, F. R. S. Third Edition. London: Churchill.

The first edition of this little work appeared opportunely, at a time when public attention was directed to the endeavours which were being made to provide the means of personal cleanliness at a cheap rate to the labouring classes. The subject was popular—and Mr. Wilson succeeded in producing a book which, while it had some pretension to be called scientific, was yet written in an easy and amusing style, well suited to the large mass of readers—who are well contented to be taught, provided they can be so at a small expense of time and trouble. This treatise has now reached a third edition—a sufficient proof that it has merit—but we can only glance at its contents.

The first five chapters are devoted to the minute anatomy and physiology of the skin and hair. The author has here been very successful in clothing a scientific and to some extent abstruse subject in a light and popular garb; but even the professional reader would find instruction. An extract from this part of the treatise will perhaps astonish the general reader, and teach him the importance of keeping himself in a sound skin. It is calculated that on an average there are 2800 pores through which the perspiration exudes in every square inch of the surface of our body. These pores are the openings of fine perspiratory tubes, about a quarter of an inch long.

"Now, the number of square inches of surface in a man of ordinary height and bulk, is 2,500: the number of pores, therefore, 7,000,000, and the number of inches of perspiratory tube 1,750,000, that is, 145,833 feet, or 48,000 yards, or nearly 28 miles."

Through these tubes are sent in the twenty-four hours about 2lbs of perspiration, which contains a large amount of animal matter no longer fit to remain in the body. The skin is in fact the largest and one of the most important glands in the body.

The next four chapters treat on diet, clothing, exercise, and ablution, as influencing the health of the skin; and then succeed eight chapters on the diseases of the skin and hair. These latter chapters are open to the censure to

which most works on popular medicine are obnoxious. The medical man learns nothing from them—the non-medical only learns enough to lead him into mistakes—and he has to go to the doctor after all. However, Mr. Wilson has given him a hint whom to consult.

The most useful part of this treatise is, perhaps, the preface; in it attention is particularly called to those admirable establishments which, within the last few years, have sprung up in London and elsewhere—the public baths and wash-houses. The first establishment of this kind was erected in Liverpool in 1843. In 1846 the first public baths were opened in London, at George Street, Hampstead Road. Since that time three or four similar establishments have been raised in different parts of London, and a company is formed for extending more widely the blessing and comfort of cleanliness amongst the poor. The extent to which this blessing has been sought after and appreciated may be seen by reference to the report on the working of the George St. establishment, from Aug. 3, 1846, to Nov. 12, 1848. Within this period the number of persons who have enjoyed the luxury of clean skins, or clean linen, or both, amounted to 674,866, that is, between 800 and 900 per diem. This, it must be remembered, was in one of the smaller establishments, and at a time when the system was little known, and its advantages not generally recognised. These advantages are to be found not merely in the new health and vigour imparted to the labourer, but in a far more important result—in the improved tone of the moral faculties and perceptions. It would be difficult to conceive that the man who has once fully tasted the enjoyment of cleanliness should be content to return to the squalid unwholesome dwelling and filthy habits which ignorance alone could render tolerable. The improvement which takes place in the whole conduct of life when once the love of cleanliness and order at home has been felt, is too generally known to require comment. Experience has proved that this is no mere speculation.

Mr. Wilson's book is addressed to a class of persons who hardly require to be taught that cleanliness is next to godliness; but it may point out to them a mode by which they may be enabled to confer an incalculable blessing on thousands of their fellow-creatures who are not so favoured as themselves.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

DECEMBER, 1849.

ART. I.—*The Rambler*, for June, July, August, and October, 1849.
London, Burns.

WE rejoice in an opportunity of bearing our humble but very sincere testimony to the value of this excellent publication. It occupies a province of its own in our periodical literature, far exceeding in depth and solidity the ordinary run of magazines, yet preferring no claim to the more sustained character of a Review. Although embracing many of the advantages of all the various classes of Periodicals, it actually clashes with none, and maintains, in a spirit of commendable moderation, a place which is ceded to it without rival pretension. We hear with pleasure, though without surprise, that the *Rambler* is hardly less popular with the more religious and intelligent among Protestants, than with the members of the Catholic community. Although never blinking the fundamental differences of principle, because of faith, which separate us from all heretics and schismatics, even those who on private judgment receive many of our doctrines, it discusses the questions at issue with a candour and largeness of allowance, which cannot fail to ensure it a favourable hearing with all except those who are unreasonable and unphilosophical enough to consider, that the ends of Christian charity are best consulted by some relaxation of doctrinal or ecclesiastical strictness. As we have now said enough in praise of the *Rambler* to prove our hearty goodwill towards it, and as it may be well to relieve our very sincere encomiums from all suspicion of favouritism, we will add one, and but one qualifying comment. The fic-

titious and facetious strikes us as the line in which our friends are the least successful; and in addition to faults of infinitely less importance, we observe an occasional tendency to sentimentality, especially to be shunned in a work which is intended, and well calculated, to produce a healthy tone among the rising generation in our ecclesiastical seminaries.

Among other subjects of great public interest, to the discussion of which the *Rambler* has lent its interesting pages, has been that of the Offertory, as one among many conceivable methods of providing for the pecuniary exigencies of the Catholic Church in England, despoiled, as it has been, of all its ancient and hereditary resources, actually disowned by the civil power, at least as a dominant establishment, and thus (it may be happily) compelled to throw itself, according to the precedent of its earliest ages, upon the faith and filial piety of its own children.

The question was opened in the *Rambler* in the form of an editorial paper on "the Offertory." This gave rise to several Letters from individual priests, communicating the results of their own experience; among which we have great pleasure in drawing attention to the interesting one of the Rev. F. Betham, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, contained in the *Rambler* for October last. Leaving the reader to form his judgment of these several arguments and testimonies, we shall proceed to offer him our own humble views of the subject, without any regular analysis of the discussion in the *Rambler*, though not without considerable drafts upon the fund of information with which that discussion supplies us.

How is provision to be made for the service of our holy religion, the maintenance of its clergy, the sustentation of its fabrics, the celebration of its offices, and the relief of its poor? This is the question to which various replies may be addressed. But all the conceivable methods of meeting the necessity in question resolve themselves ultimately into these—the compulsory, the semi-compulsory, and the purely voluntary. Under the first of these heads we reckon the actual collection of tithes and church-rates in the Establishment; under the second, that by which money is exacted as a condition of entering a church; while the offertory and its kindred modes will fall under the third.

We need hardly state, that the resources on which the *Establishment* depends are, 1, Tithes and rates, enforced

by law. 2. Dues; in which we include the customary Easter payments, (misnamed offerings,) and the fees consequent upon parochial ministrations. 3. Endowments of land, commonly annexed to the benefices, and often to the churches, as a provision for repairs, or otherwise for the maintenance of religion. 4. Church-rates, applicable exclusively to the church and its services. For the purposes of charity, as distinct from those of religion, (except in the comparatively rare cases where schools or alms-houses are endowed as appendages to the establishment,) there is, strictly speaking, no ecclesiastical provision at all; for the plain reason, that in the Protestant system the Poor are not recognized as part of the treasure of the Church as such.

In contrast to this ample allowance for the necessities of the state-religion, the ancient Church of this country, forced out of its rightful pre-eminence, is destitute of all exterior aid, and is thrown for its maintenance entirely upon its own (we need not say how inadequate) resources. With a weight of responsibility incomparably greater than is ever claimed, far less discharged, by the Establishment or any other sect in existence, the Church possesses none of those "ways and means" which we have just enumerated; neither tithes, nor rates, nor endowments, nor fees and dues, of which it can *enforce* the payment. How marvellous, verily, are its performances, when compared with these scanty appliances! Let us but for a moment contrast it in both respects with the religion of the State. First, as to its resources. The Catholic Church is entirely, or almost entirely, dependant upon *voluntary* support. Setting aside as too insignificant to bear upon the argument, those very few and very limited endowments by which, here and there, the pittance of a Missionary priest is eked out, or the income of a seminary enlarged to the extent of enabling the maintenance of one or two additional students, how entirely destitute are we of all, except occasional and purely precarious, means of carrying out the great ends of our Religion! If in some obscure parish of the Establishment, on some single occasion, the customary rate is refused, straightway "the friends," as they are called, "of the Church" are in arms, appealing to their brethren for sympathy, and resorting to the law for protection. If the Universities, those store-houses of ill-gotten and ill-spent wealth, are threatened with even so

much as a parliamentary inquiry, there is the Chancellor in one House of Parliament, and the two Burgesses in the other, to deprecate the interference; and a host of dignitaries and well-conditioned gentlemen to plead for the preservation of academical endowments in their existing integrity; the one class having been helped by them to their benefices or their bishoprics, the other looking to them as a provision for younger sons. The Catholic Church, meanwhile, has all the privations of poverty to encounter, with all the disadvantage of a reputation for wealth. She has no avenues to the powerful, no friends at court, nor patrons in parliament—the while she is supposed to thrive upon the exactions of the Confessional, and to be replenished in her need from the coffers of the Propaganda!

What a marvel is it, we repeat, that the Church does so much upon so little! First, as to her available resources. These consist (with the trifling exception lately implied) in 1. Annual seat-rents. 2. Money paid for admission at particular services. 3. Easter offerings. 4. Offerings for masses and other benefits. 5. Money put in poor or church-boxes. It must be added, that the members of the Catholic Church in our large towns are, for the most part, not above the middle, and chiefly of the poorer class; and that those of the highest order who belong to our communion, do not, (from whatever cause and with whatever great exceptions,) contribute to her necessities in proportion to their reputed means. The tales of money derived from Rome, or exacted for the administration of sacraments, we need hardly say, are pure inventions. The resources which are at the command of the Roman Court for foreign purposes, may be estimated by recent disclosures of its necessitous condition at home; and as to the Propaganda, it possesses, for the supply of missions all over the known world, about a quarter of the revenue from which the “Society for the Propagation of the Gospel” does *not* propagate the Gospel, or any thing at all like it, even within the limits of the British empire. We need hardly stop to meet the calumny about fees for the administration of sacraments. Any priest who were even to receive, and far more to demand, a payment for hearing a confession, would incur instant suspension from his office; and all *exactions* of money for the administration of Baptism, are likewise, as we shall afterwards see, prohibited.

And now out of this scanty treasury, the produce after

all of purely voluntary contributions, let us see for what the Catholic Church in England engages to provide, and what she actually effects. Let us take London, for example, and consider, that the *minimum* of work done by our Priesthood upon these straitened means, is greater than the *maximum* which is ever secured by the great wealth of the Establishment. We exclude one or two proprietary chapels of the Church of England, where, by dint of zeal worthy of a better cause, results (at least *external*) are effected more analogous to some of the fruits of our own Missions. But taking the fairer case of the parish churches in London, to which shall we point as even coming into the field of comparison, in religious and charitable results, with the less conspicuous of our own establishments? First, as to the celebration of religious services in the churches themselves. How rarely are these buildings opened for any such act of worship except once in the week; and then with what a difference from the case of Catholic churches as to the demand made upon the physical powers of the clergy! In a church, for instance, where there shall be a rector and at least two assistants, it is felt to be a sufficient, or rather a full, discharge of ministerial responsibility, if two services are given and two sermons preached on the Sunday. Till eleven o'clock in the forenoon of that day, there is absolutely nothing to encroach upon the domestic comfort of our well-paid incumbent. He may rise after the sun even in winter, enjoy his breakfast at leisure with his family, spend by the side of the vestry fire the hour during which his curates are engaged in reading the morning service, then issue forth in all the pomp of rectorial dignity to take the "north side of the communion table," and in due course ascend the pulpit, and there preach, it may be, an old sermon. Yet this shall be a specimen of a very respectable clergyman, whose performance of his duties exposes him to no episcopal animadversion and no public criticism. Compare with this amount of duty the Sunday of one of our own priests in a town mission. After having been occupied the evening before till nine or ten o'clock in hearing confessions, and possibly called up in the night to visit the dying, he may have (if in a single-handed mission) to "duplicate" in the Holy Sacrifice, or at any rate to say the late Mass; either of which contingencies presupposes that he remains fasting till one in the afternoon, with, it may be, a sermon to

preach, and confessions to hear in the interim. Then, while the church of the Establishment generally remains closed during the week, (with perhaps an occasional exception on the Wednesday and Friday,) every Catholic chapel in London is always and necessarily opened for daily mass, with the chance of confessions before and after. When from the duties of religion we pass on to those of charity, the disproportion between the two cases is still more apparent. We record it with something like indignation, that there are undoubtedly clergymen of the Establishment in London, (and they not a few,) or rather we might say the majority, who never enter the dwellings of the poor from one year's end to another's. We know as a fact, capable of demonstration, that even in parishes where some sense of ministerial responsibility prevails, the communicants among the poor do not average one in a hundred, nor is it felt a matter of reciprocal obligation between the clergy and the parishioners that the sick should be visited on their death-beds. In these thickly peopled districts, to speak generally, none seem to care for their soul's health except the Catholics and the Dissenters. The rest either know not what it is to be of a particular creed at all, or call themselves Church-people in contradistinction to "Papists and other fanatics;" not as expressing any positive belief, but rather as a negation of all distinctive religion. In times which, whatever their drawbacks and shortcomings, are characterized very remarkably by a sense of justice, we hold it to be morally impossible that an institution of which religion is the professed aim, and these the ordinary fruits, should be long allowed, upon the mere plea of vested rights, to retain a monopoly, or even a preponderating share, of funds which are either holden (if endowments) as a *trust* for great public purposes, or (if tithes) are received as a condition of reciprocal benefit.

On the other hand, let us continue to observe what the Catholic Church manages to achieve in spite of all her disadvantages. Besides keeping up the Daily Sacrifice, which is her point of distinction from all Protestant communions, and thus at the same time giving to all her children the opportunity of daily participation in the Sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist, her priests are ever ready to respond to the call of the sick and dying. Their leisure is farther invaded by the duty, peculiar to them, of hearing confessions, and occasionally also, of preparing converts.

And while they have these labours and functions in addition to such as appertain to the Protestant minister, they do not fall behind him in those duties which constitute his principal or only work. Like him, they have sermons to prepare, children to catechize, and schools to visit; with these differences, that their spiritual charge is ordinarily greater than that of individual clergymen of the Establishment, and that they are obliged, under pain of sin and censure, to do what the Protestant minister may neglect without notice, and often actually neglects without compunction. Now we have no wish to deprecate the poverty of our clergy; quite the reverse. But in days when services and wages are estimated upon the strict principle of a *quid pro quo*, we venture to ask of sensible and equitable men, not whether it be fair that our clergy should be so ill-recompensed for doing so much, (their recompense is not of this world,) but whether it be tolerable that the ministers of the Establishment should be paid as they are, for doing so little, nay, that their incomes should generally proceed in an inverse ratio with the amount of their services?

But we have not completed our enumeration of the benefits which the Catholic Church confers upon the community at large. The labours of the clergy form but an item in her great work of spiritual and corporal charity. There are at this moment in London and its immediate neighbourhood, some dozen or more institutions of mercy, whereby "the ills that flesh is heir to" are relieved in ways very obvious to the understanding, and very accessible to the cognizance of the "benevolent and humane" portion of society. There are the good sisters of Bermondsey, ministering to the comfort of the destitute. There are the Religious of Somerstown or of Norwood, supplying the place of mothers to the orphan. There are the nuns of Hammersmith, performing the office of the "Good Shepherd," by gathering the sheep from the desert into the fold from which they have strayed; and doing that work of their Divine Master on earth, the work of reclaiming the impure, which none are fitted to do but those who take the Mother of all purity for their model and their patroness. All, or most of these institutions depend for their support upon the *voluntary* liberality of the faithful. Where are the revenues which Catholics bequeathed for these and similar "pious and charitable uses?" Hear it, all ye saints of God, who mourn over the desolation of that once

favoured Isle which nurtured you! Hear it, ye martyred prelates, and ye royal Confessors; meek à Becket, and Edward, follower of the Virgin-Spouse! Those hallowed offerings, from which religion and charity were meant to rekindle their dying fires, are now the fuel of vanity and sinful profusion. It is not the widow in very deed, the watcher in the Temple, the “Anna” of the Christian Church, who is now the recipient of a founder’s bounty, but the “sole executrix” of some affluent archbishop. It is not the thousand orphans who are the gainers by the self-denying liberality of our Catholic ancestors, but the one richly dowried daughter of him who usurps the place of the celibate. It is not the meek lay-brother or holy student who prays for the soul of his benefactor, while in singleness of heart he partakes of the frugal portion which he owes to that benefactor’s munificence; no, it is the pampered lacquey who now thrives upon the plunder of the Church, while his richly beneficed master is congratulating himself with his guests upstairs upon the blessings of the Reformation, denying the doctrines to which he owes his livelihood, and slandering the Church amid whose spoils he thus thanklessly luxuriates.

We have included the convents among the institutions through which the Church works upon the people, because they, like our churches and chapels, are almost entirely dependent upon individual charity, and thus enter fairly into the scope of our present argument, the object of which is to contrast the relative resources and the relative services of the Catholic and the Established communions. But, as our concern is now with the maintenance of churches and chapels alone, we shall henceforth narrow the discussion, so as to exclude from it the case of all establishments except those which bear directly upon the work of our secular Missions, whether viewed in the point of worship or of charity. We will ask the reader to turn back a page or two to our enumeration of the several available resources of our Missions, which we shall now proceed to consider in detail, in order to adjust the question between them on the one hand, and that method of raising money on the other, by which many are sanguine enough to think that the place of several of them might be supplied—the Offertory. The question then is, which of the aforementioned “ways and means” of the Church is unobjectionable in principle, and productive in effect, and how far

may we expect that the "Offertory" (an undoubtedly religious and ecclesiastical mode of assisting the Church, (*if* experimentally proved to be adequate to her necessities,) will in course of time supersede any one or more of them?

The first expedient for supporting our missions, to which we adverted, was the letting of seats by the year. To this we can see, under actual circumstances, no material objection, if only the practice were qualified by two conditions, one of which is this: that the right to the sitting should be forfeited by the absence of the owner. In no place of public resort, that we ever heard of, except churches and chapels, are persons allowed to retain a right over the seats which they decline to occupy. In theatres, as almost every one knows, there is always a period in the performance after which the seats become public property. What obtains in places of mere amusement, ought at least to be the rule in places of Divine Worship. At any rate, let the protestants have the unenviable distinction of lock-up pews; such infringements upon Christian liberty belongs not to the free and generous spirit of our holy Religion. Moreover, there is a manifest difference between the views which we and the protestants respectively take of the nature and obligation of Divine Worship. With them, attendance at church is mostly a thing of curiosity or custom, which may be omitted once in a way without serious consequence. But every Catholic is bound to assist at one Mass on the Sunday *under pain of mortal sin*. This consideration immensely aggravates the guilt and scandal of the practice, unhappily too common even among Catholics, of objecting to the free use of their "sittings" in their absence. We do not hesitate to say, that the grave responsibility of Masses of obligation lost through this needless and vexatious exclusion, is transferred from the poor thus disappointed of their rightful inheritance, to those who keep them out of it. The only plausible excuse which we have heard assigned for this monopoly, is founded on the uncleanly habits of a large proportion of the poor. That we are not insensible to the force of this objection will presently appear; meanwhile it is evident on the very surface that a mere physical repugnance of this nature can be no sufficient reason for the neglect of so obvious a duty of spiritual charity. We have understood that at the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, in King William Street, an arrangement prevails, which shows that the reservation of

seats is not inconsistent with the accommodation of the poor. The regular attendants at the chapel are provided with free tickets of admission, a privilege to which they are fairly entitled in a chapel unfortunately too small to receive a tenth part of the Catholics who are anxious to attend it. But if the ticket-owners do not present themselves a quarter of an hour before the commencement of the service, they forfeit their claim to their seats, which are then thrown open to the public. This plan has several advantages. It not merely gives the poor the opportunity of hearing Mass to the extent to which the room is available, but it ensures timely attendance, and prevents the confusion which would result from a rush for the vacant places after the service has begun.

Another condition which we hope to see imposed upon the proprietors of seats, if such proprietors there are to be, is, that their reserved places should not necessarily, or exclusively, lie in the foremost parts of the church. The desire of precedence in the house of God, even when founded in superiority of rank, (but far more where claimed on the score of wealth,) it must be plainly said, and in the teeth of whatever offence, is one of the infallible marks of a vulgar and half-educated mind. True nobility is ever reckless of such distinctions. Great men feel their dignities a burden; little men like to draw attention to them. To great men it is a relief to find themselves where they can forget their greatness; to little men it is a pleasure to be where the notice of the world enables them to forget that they are really little. The present Queen of Belgium is commonly seen at Mass in the midst of the poorest, nowise distinguished, either by dress or following, from the subjects with whom she mingles. And we are sure that there are those among our own aristocracy who would hail the opportunity of imitating such an example. If the uncleanness of the poor be any serious difficulty, they might be accommodated in a different, provided that it were also an equally prominent, part of the church. The substitution, however, of chairs for benches would obviate all such inconvenience, and secure that air of perfect equality among ranks, which is by no means an unimportant feature in the arrangement of churches.

We come now to the next among the sources of revenue to our churches and chapels—the exaction of money at the door. There is perhaps no part of our church and chapel

system, (next to our musical arrangements,) which has given more scandal to religious Protestants, and especially to members of the Church of England well disposed to us, than the practice of levying a contribution upon the attendants at our religious ceremonies. These respectable objectors regard it as a bar upon Christian liberty; they contend that it militates against the true idea of a place of Divine Worship, converting churches into theatres, and the solemn acts of religion into mere objects of popular attraction. In how much of this objection we ourselves actually agree will presently appear; meanwhile we must ever feel that such observations come with a peculiarly bad grace from those who are in possession of the Catholic endowments, which would supersede all necessity of any such undesirable expedients for maintaining what must be maintained. The comparison between our poor unendowed missions, and the well-paid churches of the Establishment, is evidently an unfair one; as we have already observed, we Catholics have great ends, both devotional and charitable, to meet, with no one of those hereditary or legal provisions for the Church, its ministry and ordinances, which form the main-stay of the Protestant Establishment. If, on the contrary, the comparison be instituted, where alone it is even tolerably just, between our chapels, on the one hand, and the *unendowed* places of worship in the Church of England on the other, we cannot see in what way it is so disadvantageous to ourselves. The ordinary mode of meeting the expenses of the unendowed chapels in London, whether Anglican or dissenting, is by means of seat-rents; and surely there is no difference in principle, whatever there may be in idea, between getting this revenue together by means a periodical collection from house to house, or by an application for money at the door of the church. The difference between our mode and that which prevails in the London chapels "of the separation" is merely this: that the shilling which we exact at the entrance, is elsewhere claimed as a fee by the pew-opener. Yet we are not denying, that in appearance our system *is* the worse of the two.

So much, we think, may fairly be said in defence or extenuation of the existing practice, or, at any rate, in the way of demur to the seemliness of any objection raised against it by the members of a wealthy and prosperous Establishment. But it is quite another thing to say that

the practice is *per se* a desirable one; we protest against our observations being understood in any such sense. It is stern necessity which has led to its adoption. A sad experience has proved that many who can well afford it, and who will not hesitate to pay a given sum, to secure a convenient seat, if placed in it gratuitously, will give nothing like an equivalent as a voluntary offering. The blame of our present system lies not with the clergy, but with those who compel them to adopt a plan which none like less than they. Even, too, were the practice free from all intrinsic objection, it could never be otherwise than painful to religion in some of its almost necessary concomitants. One of these is the danger of investing with arbitrary power, the kind of persons who alone are likely to undertake the very onerous and thankless office of collectors. It would be paying too high a compliment to human nature, to expect that these officials should deal with the very promiscuous materials of an ordinary congregation in the requisite spirit of forbearance and discretion; while for every breach of propriety of which they may perchance be guilty, the Catholic Church herself has to answer in quarters where everything is construed to her disadvantage, and nothing can be heard in her defence. Our modern "ostiarrii" will be too apt to measure the qualifications for admission to the church by a very defective rule. He whom St. James the apostle calls the "man having a gold ring," will be apt to secure those smiles which the poorer must be content to forego; and that functionary will feel himself the best, not who admits the good and excludes the unworthy, but who fills, by whatever means, the exhausted coffers of the church.

It should be known by Protestants who quarrel with our practice of collecting at the doors, that here, as elsewhere, they judge us by what they see of us on those comparatively rare occasions, when they are pleased to visit our chapels. They are mistaken if they think that shillings and sixpences are taken at the doors from those who frequent our Low Masses. At some churches, (as at St. George's,*) these are for the most part quite free; and nowhere are the poor expected to give more than a penny or two-pence for the support of the church.

* We observe that a correspondent of the Rambler (No. for Nov.) supposes that at least sixpence is exacted from every person attend-

A course intermediate between free admission and ostiary exaction, is that which obtains in France and Belgium, of taking a small sum of money from all the occupiers of *seats*. This plan has the advantage, of allowing those who choose to kneel on the floor to enter without any payment at all. But it is not without its signal inconveniences. It subjects the occupier of the chair to a very unpleasant and often a very unseasonable interruption. If, as is very possible, he has no small change about him, there is the tedious process of converting the silver piece into its multitudinous equivalent of cents or centimes, wherewith the owner then becomes charged in the place of the far more portable substitute which has disappeared into the pocket of the locomotive collectress. All this involves a serious disturbance of devotion, and (according to our English notions) of ecclesiastical decorum.

The fund to which we next alluded, was that of Easter and other occasional offerings. Of a method of contribution so primitive and so ecclesiastical, nothing needs to be said but in the way of explanation. This mode of liberality involves that very principle of the offertory upon which we intend to speak: the principle of ministering to the service of the altar out of the goods which the great Giver has entrusted to our stewardship. The Easter offerings, we believe, usually form part of the limited pensions of our priests, and are often redistributed by them in the very quarter from which they are derived in acts of charity and munificence. Other offerings are made in acknowledgment and consideration (not, as is often erroneously supposed, recompense,) of special favours received at the hands of the Church, whether the administration of what may be called the domestic sacraments or sacramentals, holy baptism, holy matrimony, and the benediction after child-birth; or, again, the benefit of Masses specially offered for the intentions of the contributors. Current prejudice, aided, we fear, by popular forms of expression, is apt to attribute the practice of these oblations to the mere spirit of bargain; an account of them which we need not say is alike inconsistent with facts, and at variance

ing High Mass or Vespers at St. George's. This is not the case. The poor are admitted at a much lower charge. On some occasions the offertory alone has been tried; we are not able to say with what effect.

with the intentions, as well as with the ritual prescriptions, of the Church. “*Illud diligenter caveat,*” are the words in which our English Ritual reminds each priest of his duty upon this head; “*ne in sacramentorum administratione aliquid quâvis de causâ, vel occasione, directè vel indirectè, exigat aut petat: sed ea gratis ministret, et ab omni simoniæ atque avaritiæ suspicione, nedum crimine, longissimè absit. Si quid vero,*” it is added, “*nomine eleemosynæ aut devotionis studio, peracto jam sacramento sponte a fidelibus offeratur id licitè pro consuetudine locorum accipere poterit, nisi aliter Episcopo videatur.*” It is accordingly the practice in our churches and chapels to administer all sacraments, properly so called, to all persons who claim them in proper dispositions. When the administration has ended, the faithful are accustomed to make their offering to the church, or not, and in larger or smaller measure according to their ability; but in the meantime they, or their children, have received the benefit of the sacrament without any kind of previous stipulation or exaction. To this rule, however, the sacrament of Penance always and necessarily forms an exception, no offering whatever being here permitted. The Mass, considered not as a sacrament, but as a sacrifice, stands upon a different footing. It is universally allowed, nay, it is even prescribed, that the priest shall receive a certain, and, if possible, a fixed stipend for the service rendered to individual members of his flock by the application of the special fruit of the Sacrifice to their benefit. And although the idea of an “offering” is not precluded by the regularity of this understanding, the term “retribution” is commonly used to denote a payment which is in fact rather an expression of acknowledgment to Almighty God and His Church for the personal application of a benefit, which would otherwise be shared only in common with all the faithful.

Thus end the fixed sources of revenue upon which our churches and chapels depend for their maintenance. Whatever our clergy receive for religious and charitable objects over and above the returns which accrue to them from these various means of support, is derived from the occasional liberality of the faithful, an uncertain and precarious, however valuable, resource.

Now it is the utter inadequacy of these “ways and means” to the actual and very heavy expenses of a mission which has suggested the idea of “the Offertory” as a

method, at once obvious and unobjectionable, for the supply of our missionary needs. The prejudices which formerly existed, at least in the Established Church, against what is called the "Voluntary System," have long since melted away, even among the highest and driest of "churchmen," before the pecuniary needs for which, even in the Establishment, tithes and endowments are found at times and in places, to furnish but an insufficient provision. We learn, through the *Rambler*, that both at Oxford and in London, churches and chapels have been very amply supported by the gratuitous bounty of their congregations, and this, too, without any recourse to other means of popular influence than such as are in strict keeping with the spirit of the Church.

The subject of the Offertory is part of a great question from which it is with difficulty disengaged. The problem which has to be solved is, that of adjusting some method of collection, at once ecclesiastical in its character and *profitable in its results*, with the actual exigencies of the English Catholic Church. And in offering a few remarks upon a subject in which the laity have a deep interest, although, of course, no authoritative voice, we shall hope to avoid all semblance of presumption, by prefacing our observations with a strict and dutiful reserve in favour of the *better judgment and ultimate determination of our ecclesiastical superiors*.

It must then, in the first place, be constantly borne in mind, that no financial arrangements in this matter can be feasible, which are not entirely adequate to the necessitous state of our missionary establishments. One fact, as the *Rambler* justly remarks, is incontrovertible. All existing methods of raising money for the Church have proved conspicuously unsuccessful. We are spared, therefore, the necessity of criticising these same methods in more theoretical points of view. The object of a collection is to collect, and that in sufficient amount to defray the current expenses of the church. It is true that one great end of offering, the good of the offerer, may be secured; but the actual maintenance of the establishment is another, and a very paramount one. Tried in this matter of fact way, the methods hitherto in use among Catholics have proved a signal disappointment.

It is, therefore, an antecedent objection to any proposed substitute, if it wants the recommendation of *success*.

Archæological enthusiasm must not be allowed to stand in the place of practical wisdom. The material church cannot live upon theories; she is too necessitous and too precious to be the subject of a hazardous speculation. “*Fiat experimentum in corpore vili;*” the Church Catholic is no such body. If, many persons will say, our antiquarian adventurers and mediæval empirics, our flighty “Goths” and meddling Puseyites, should land us all in the Queen’s Bench, poor comfort will it be that we have been ruined upon primitive principles, and according to the most approved methods! And while we may lament the want of poetry which is evident in such apprehensions, we must yet acknowledge the justice of the reasonings upon which they are founded.

To risk all the material interests of the Church in England upon an experiment so doubtful as the offertory, seems to us, we confess, a scarcely justifiable adventure. The result of the trial, where hitherto made, (at least in richer congregations,) has, from whatever cause, been unsatisfactory. Whether it be that the offertory has generally been attempted under disadvantageous circumstances, or that Catholics are not yet ripe for it, we are unprepared to say. Certain it is, that from no quarter is the report as favourable as many were sanguine enough to expect; at least as to the probability of the offertory taking the place, in the end, of other modes of collection more systematic and more stringent.

The attempt to superadd an offertory to a door-collection is scarcely likely, on reasonable grounds, to prosper. It labours under the disadvantage of a half-measure. The offertory has no chance of success but upon the general admission of the duty of giving to God; but it is difficult to enforce this duty with due effect in the face of a forced contribution. The alternative, therefore, seems to rest between a compulsory and a voluntary payment. Now we have yet to learn, that the Church, in any part of the world, or in any period of her history since the very earliest, has been left, for the maintenance of her ministers, her structures and her services, to depend simply upon the gratuities of the faithful. And if the purely voluntary system is without sanction in the ages of faith, and in countries where Catholicism is most flourishing, our own age and nation seem hardly the time and place to venture upon adopting it as a sole alternative.

Awaiting, then, the event (upon which it would certainly be premature to calculate,) of a restitution, or at any rate a redistribution, of the ecclesiastical revenues, we would submit with all deference to those who bear rule in the Church among us, how far it might not be practicable to make some approach to the practice of ancient times, so far at least as to levy a *fixed*, instead of an occasional and fluctuating contribution upon the members of our community? The contemplated revival of the parochial principle, as part of the hierarchical arrangements said to be maturing, might offer a suitable occasion of remodelling the whole structure of our fiscal arrangements. We feel quite sure that there are some, at least among the wealthier Catholics, who would gladly accept the invitation to dedicate a portion of their worldly substance in the cause of God and His Church; for a dedication it would still be, although made in obedience to an authoritative prescription. We Catholics want to be reminded more and more of our ancestral greatness and hereditary claims; we long to feel ourselves part and parcel of the ancient Church of England. These miserable shifts and sectarian ways, upon which we have barely thriven so long, are become abominable in our eyes; they tally not with the character of the ecclesiastical buildings which have risen or are rising on every side of us; with the churches of Nottingham, of Derby, of Birmingham, or of Southwark; they suit not the language of our professions, nor the scale of our performances. Let them expire with the leases of the conventicles to which they properly belong.

And if we are sanguine about the acquiescence of the wealthier class in some arrangement for the *regular* and *systematic* maintenance of the Church, far less can we feel any doubt of the readiness with which our noble-hearted Poor, would respond to any call upon their Christian liberality. As it is, the poor give to the church at a rate which, were it universal, would maintain her not merely in sufficiency, but in splendour. A zealous missionary and an accessible church, are all that are any where needed to secure their presence and their munificence. Now we hope to see the day when all exactions in churches will be done away, and their place supplied by a kind of local treasury for receiving the fixed contributions of the faithful, to be administered not by the superior clergy, but by officers corresponding rather with the first deacons, who were appointed to relieve

the apostles from the necessity of presiding over the ecclesiastical bank. And while upon this subject, we may say with what satisfaction we should ourselves hail the restoration of the ancient office of *almoner*, which might be suitably combined with the afore-mentioned one of treasurer. We are deeply convinced that both the dignity and efficiency of the clergy would be increased by the separation between their sacred duties and the ministration of alms, for all responsibilities of a pecuniary kind are apt to be at once burdensome, invidious, and embarrassing.

Another source of revenue to the Catholic Church, to which we look forward with a confidence justified by the character of our rising aristocracy, is that of *endowments*. We can scarcely doubt that the stream of Catholic munificence will, as time goes on, flow in this channel, as well as in that of church building and decoration. Indeed, we could hope that the period will shortly arrive, when the annexation of property *in perpetuum* to a church will be regarded as almost a necessary accompaniment to the act of raising it. Such things will come with the growth of true Christian faith among us. As we estimate more deeply the awful responsibilities of wealth and influence, as we feel that no outlay of capital can possibly be so productive to the possessor, as that which secures him the benefit of Masses when he is gone; as we more and more appreciate the claims of the poor, and the treasures of consolation which our church, duly administered, and appropriately provided, is able to diffuse throughout the land, as we consider, (where it may concern us,) how stringent an obligation of charity, at least, if not of justice, lies upon those who are any-wise the better for the *ancient Church property*, to give back in kind, at least, if not in amount, to the quarter whence they have received; surely the impoverishing of ourselves to promote the glory of Almighty God, the subtraction of riches from an earthly treasury, which are to augment the stores of our celestial inheritance, will suggest itself as not less the dictate of an enlightened prudence, than the impulse of a generous devotion.

The relief which in various ways would result from such a state of independence, as would thus be secured to the Church, is almost beyond the power of temperate expression. All those difficulties about "making both ends meet," which now disturb the peace, and cripple the usefulness of our indefatigable clergy; all those temptations, to a

kind of ecclesiastical avarice, which with some minds must be a constant subject of scruple, would thus be, once for all, precluded. Our churches and chapels would be placed upon a footing which no vicissitudes could shake, and assume an attitude which no criticism could assail. The solemn offices of religion would then every where be conducted on a scale proportionate, however inadequate, to the mysteries which they express; and heretics would no more be in danger of confounding the lineal descendant of the ancient Church of England, and the august representative of apostolic christianity, with those paltry sects of yesterday, which infest her path, usurp her titles, and counterfeit her pretensions.

Nor would the difference be less visible in the interior arrangement of our religious edifices. Instead of those evidences of pinched and almost clamorous poverty, which now meet the eyes of the most recollected, and affect the composure of the most devout, our churches and chapels would then exhibit that appearance of affluent stability, and those signs of ungrudging munificence, which distinguish the earthly heaven, the palace of the King of kings, from the wrangling exchange or the upstart meeting-house. No applicant for entrance money would then accost the casual visitant with ill-timed importunity; no gatherer of the customary seat-rent would then, as in the foreign churches, startle the worshipper at his prayers, with a demand upon the unready purse. The common land of the Church would no longer be portioned out into compartments, and intersected by fences; rich and poor would share and share alike, ranging over the unappropriated territory of the Lord's household, without fear of molestation, because without consciousness of trespass. There would the poor man forget his poverty, the rich his wealth, and the noble his dignity: there would the merchant gather goodly pearls without price, and even the worldling might learn to disconnect the uses of sense from the incentives to sin, and the objects of true beauty from the fascinations of its counterfeit. Such is the Church's own view of the character and purposes of her material fabrics.

O sorte nupta prosperâ
Dotata Patris gloriâ,
Respersa Sponsi gratiâ
Regina formosissima!

Hic margaritis emicant
 Patentque cunctis ostia ;
 Virtute namque prævia
 Mortalis illuc ducitur,
 Amore Christi percitus
 Tormenta quisquis sustinet.*

Then would a church, instead of merely receiving, at stated times, the spectators (as it were) of a set performance, (as with the Protestants,) be continually open as a kind of spiritual mart, whither the children of light might flock, each charged with his special commission, each bound on his proper errand ; his movements all directed to the object in view, his coming and going regulated not by the example of his neighbours, but by the beginning and ending of his own particular transaction. We are not, of course, attempting to preclude the idea of common worship, which has also its ample provision in the Catholic system, but only protesting against that stiff and formal notion of a church and its service, which looks merely at the object of the one particular function which happens to be going on at the time. How beautiful is the amplitude of devotion, the range for diversities of taste and peculiarities of circumstance permitted and favoured by the Catholic Church ! Her multiplied altars provide facilities to every class of worshippers, and scope for all spiritual preferences ; her unrestricted space gives freedom to all comers, and opportunity for various religious actions at once. Here you shall see the loving votary of Mary, offering her newborn infant to the charge of its heavenly Mother ; here the aged widow is telling her beads before a favourite image ; elsewhere priests are preparing for mass, or giving thanks after it ; the altar of the Sacred Heart has its visitants in another quarter, while the holy sacrifice is proceeding in behalf of all, with its company of devout assistants, and the stranger passes among the whole of the large though scattered company, without averting an eye or distracting a prayer. The striking of the church clock is a signal for the organ to peal forth its joyous notes ; a procession of priests and clerics sweeps through the aisles, and clouds of incense denote that the Adorable is approaching. They are removing the Blessed Sacrament to Its own altar

* Hymn for the Office of Dedication.

for the morning Benediction; or they are about to celebrate a High Mass, not as *the* act of the day, which is to suspend all other acts, and supersede all tributary devotion, but as a mere incident in the course of sacred offices, which falls in with the others, and interrupts none.

Such are the scenes which we hope one day to see revived in our own dear England; but they will not return till our zeal has repaired the breaches which Protestantism has opened in the walls of our august and most beautiful "city of solemnities." Such will be, at once, the products and the stimulants of a true and loyal devotion, which, feeling the Church to be the centre of all our highest joys, and the home of all our purest affections, gives not merely a public and disinterested, but a personal and most absorbing, interest in its well-being and extension. In such a state of things, the periodical appeal to liberality is superseded by the instinct of attachment, and men no more require to be reminded of the duty of offering to Almighty God, still less to be wound up to it by a machinery of excitements, than a person in health to be tempted towards the means of bodily sustenance by the provocatives of appetite which are required in disease.

At last, however, it is not in particular expedients that we shall find the remedy of our present evils, but in the wider recognition of those principles of Catholic liberality, the fruits of which are so apparent in the standing memorials of the ancient Church of England. It may be that the demands of our own time require a new application of these principles, and a new direction of this munificence; still, with the faith of our ancestors, we shall, please God, recover the effects of that faith, whereof even the whelming tide of heresy, and the withering blight of schism have been unable to obliterate the traces and destroy the power. Once let the Church re-establish herself in the hearts of our people, and with great joy they will be seen offering of their best to God and His poor. No need will there be to cut channels for a current which will be strong enough to create them; no need to prescribe modes of operation to an impulse which hardly requires check, because it hardly admits of misdirection.

Catholics we may be in name and privilege, but hardly in very deed, till we realize and act upon the duty of offering to God. It is pre-eminently a Catholic duty; it came with Christianity and departed with Protestantism. It

has its deep foundation in the sense of personal responsibility, in the estimate of the power of good works, and in the communion with the invisible world: principles of the Christian religion which were first systematically impugned by the arch-heresy of Luther. It was when Catholic faith took flight, that men began for the first time, as a body and upon principle, to defraud God of His right, and to lay up for themselves the treasure which has its proper destination in heaven. Then Exchanges took the place of Cathedrals; national prosperity was measured by national wealth; poverty became a reproach, and sacrifices for God were regarded as but the dictate of fanaticism. Men who professed a singular veneration for the Inspired Scriptures, could still forget that the man after God's heart had said, "All things are Thine, and when we give to Thee, we give but what we have received of Thy hand;"* and they who undertook to reform the Church after the Apostolic model were not the men to sell their lands and lay the produce at the Church's feet.† It was *our* undying traditions which preserved the record of these truths; it was *our* storied Calendar which illustrated the glory of these examples; it was *our* holy service-books which transmitted the history of these facts, and rescued these memorable lessons from oblivion. Year after year did Holy Church, in that magnificent office wherein she celebrates and commemorates the Dedication of her material fabrics, imprint on the hearts of her children the august idea of Herself, as the Tabernacle of the Most High among men, the earthly type of Her who held God in Her embrace, the Heavenly Jerusalem, the Virgin Spouse of Christ, the Queen of glory and of beauty. In consecration to the service of Almighty God, She taught men to discern the true use and appropriate destination of the precious minerals which enrich the womb of earth, and the beautiful things of creation which decorate her surface. In the adornment of the Temple of Solomon with all that could be collected of rich and rare from the busy marts of Tharsis, and the teeming mines of Ophir, she saw the precedent, and hailed the sanction, of that costly magnificence and elaborate embellishment which excite awe in the majestic cathedral, or express love in the tessellated basilica. For three long and dreary centuries has Holy Church thus kept up her

* 1 Paralip. xxix. 14, &c.

† Acts iv. 37.

silent witness, (as it were in the dens and caverns of the earth,) against the iniquity and selfishness which ranged abroad; her holy influences, though unknown, have not been unfelt. "Ever living, they have floated around,"* and haunting the impoisoned air, and feebly yet surely sustaining the life which is now beginning to manifest itself by more palpable tokens. In the increased zeal of our own happier time, in the aspiration after better things, in the friendly mootings of great practical questions, in the liberal acts of many and the ardent desires of more, in the mitigation of natural prejudices, in the commencement of great undertakings, in the authoritative sanction of enthusiastic aims, in acquisitions from the ranks of heresy, in the discovery of sympathy where we looked for hatred, and in the evidences of approximation where before we had felt estrangement, in these and many other encouraging signs of the day, we trace the rewards of a seemingly thankless perseverance, and the fruits of many an unknown prayer.

At the present moment the destinies of the Church in England would seem, humanly speaking, to be more than ordinarily under the control of her faithful Laity. Their earnest co-operation and ready liberality are what the Pastors of the flock principally need to give effect to their hearty wishes, and influence to their zealous acts. We want so many things, that we almost fear to enter upon the enumeration, lest it should operate to the discouragement of all attempts to supply the deficiency. We want new churches, and, even still more, the power of working the present ones. We want Houses of Refuge for the destitute, and schools for the ignorant. We want more priests, and for their due training we want more colleges, or greater accommodation in those we have. We want, in short, everything but that which money could not obtain us—the desire of improvement. There are youths burning to serve God in the ministry of the Church, who have no funds for education at their command. There are priests sighing over the necessities of their districts, which they have no means of alleviating. There are Catholics ready for the Sacraments, but no priests to respond to their call. We are compelled to see the sheep of the flock devoured by hungry wolves in the shape of zealous and unscrupulous missionaries of Protestant infidelity, who lure our unsus-

* τὰ δὲ αἰὲ ζῶντα περιποῦνται.—Sophocl. *Electra*.

pecting people by the offer of gain too attractive to a starving multitude, disseminate heresy and blasphemy in their dwellings, and pervert the ductile minds of their unhappy children. In the higher places of the Church there is the zeal to desire, and the genius to devise, and the arm to accomplish; but it is the faithful Laity, we repeat, who must second this noble enthusiasm, and strengthen that uplifted arm. Let means be forthcoming, and measures and men will not be slow to follow. Above all, let these means be accorded in a spirit of generous confidence, with as little as possible of partiality or restrictive stipulation. Of course we do not wish to preclude local preferences, and discriminative applications. Still, it has been perhaps a fault in our body, (whencesoever resulting), that what has often been given to the Church, has been given otherwise than *through* the Church. Without desiring to imply reflection on any part of our community, we may yet be permitted to select its poorer members as those who seem, by a kind of Catholic instinct, to understand the way of giving, as well as to excel in the virtue. It is a fact which redounds to the honour of our poor, and reflects light upon the peculiar attributes of our holy Religion, that in the quarters where the Catholic population is most needy, the means of the Church are the most ample. It is certain that if the same proportion of gifts to means were maintained elsewhere, the Church would not be long in securing her rightful pre-eminence over all her subjects, and by degrees also over others whom she longs to gather into her kingdom. It is not our object to enter upon statistical calculations; but in this assertion we feel that every inquiry will fully bear us out. What chance would there be for Protestantism if the Church were but fairly free and effective? for a body, weakened by endless divisions, against one strong in its unity, and firm in its coherence? for one which rests entirely on the shifting will, and variable characteristics, of the individual, against one which meets the world with the power of the Sacraments, and is supported by the prayers of the Saints? Protestantism has no stamina; it is an old and worn-out dotard, whose weary life can now be sustained by nothing but those artificial props and soothing appliances which money can command. But these *can* sustain it, and for a while it must continue to encumber the land. Meanwhile there is a giant at hand, biding his time and waiting his opportunity, who seems to

say, "Who will bring me into the strong city? will not thou, O God, go out with our armies? Heal thou the breaches, for the earth is moved; Thou hast shown Thy people hard things. Thou hast made us drink the wine of sorrow. Thou hast given a warning to them that fear Thee, that they may flee before Thy bow, that Thy beloved may be delivered."*

ART. II.—*The Four Gospels, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek text, being a revision of the Rhenish, translation, with notes critical and explanatory.* By F. P. KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. Svo. Dunigan: New York, 1849.

WE proceed, in fulfilment of a promise which closed our last number, † to unfold our thoughts on a subject which cannot fail to interest every reader of the Gospel—the Miracles of our Lord.

But before entering upon it, we beg for a few moments' grace, while we indulge in some preliminary remarks. In opening our paper on the "Parables," we briefly approved of the critical study of Scripture, and expressed regret that it was not more cultivated amongst us. In a notice of that paper, in a Catholic periodical, its writer remarked: "We do not agree in all the propositions laid down as to the value and advantages of biblical criticism ourselves." So slight a comment, so passing an observation, so modest an expression of difference of opinion, could never have elicited a word from us, unaccustomed as we are to notice reviews upon our reviews, did it not appear to us to indicate what we have seen more strongly expressed elsewhere without reference to us;—a tendency to depreciate Biblical studies, and the theological use of holy Scripture. That persons who have witnessed, during a great part of their lives, the sad and fatal abuse of God's word—who have seen it become a snare to the feet, a veil to the eyes, a cloak to hypocrisy, a seed-bed to heresies, and a very

* Ps. lx.

† P. 226.

excuse for sin:—that men who have seen havoc come to souls from its misapplication, and ruin to conscience from its distortion,—who have heard every key of the sacred instrument jangling and jarring in distracting dissonance, as at once bravely thumped by the evangelical, and timidly stolen over by the churchman: that they, in fine, who have themselves perhaps lived for a time entangled in the meshes of contradictory interpretation, and have now exclaimed, “*laqueus contritus est, et nos liberati sumus,*” should look with distrust, and some dislike, on studies which tie men apparently to the killing letter, and quench the living Spirit, is perhaps natural, and as such pardonable. But there is danger in too violent a rebound; and we are truly and deeply anxious, that any extreme views, on so important a subject, should not be encouraged.

Let us for a moment consider this very critical study of God’s word. No pursuit has been more abused: and we hope it is looking rather at the abuse than the use, that the writer alluded to tells us, that he does not agree with us, as to the value of that branch of learning. Eusebius, Origen, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, Aleuin, and many others applied sedulously to it, and their labours have been highly prized by the Church of God. The Council of Trent, in ordering a new revision, and consequently a new *recension*, of the Vulgate to be made, commanded the severe critical pursuits necessary for this purpose.

But we are looking at the matter too seriously. There are two ways in which critics can justify their disapprobation, in sweeping and general terms, of a pursuit. The one is by looking outwardly at its effects, and without taking the pains of fathoming it, making up their minds to its inutility. Even a very mild person might be led to pronounce that *conchology*, for instance, however pretty, is not a very useful science, because its influence on society, or letters, or individual character, and its results to mankind, nowhere appear. It is negatively condemned, if one may say so. But a great science pursued by many great and good men, and by them brought to bear upon theology, and upon the preservation of God’s Word, cannot be so judged; and only they, we will confidently assert, have a right to pronounce, who can say that they have gone fully and thoroughly into it, and have discovered its hollowness. Now, unhesitatingly, we declare such a result to be impossible. No one can apply himself to the

critical study of the Bible, without finding it graceful, noble, sure to enhance his appreciation of the real beauties of the divine writings, certain to bring home to him many hidden treasures, and, at the same time, solid, convincing, based upon sure principles, and superadding the elegant and protecting structure of human research and skill, to the immoveable and unshaking foundation on the rock of truth. It is like a bastion thrown out beyond an impregnable fortification; a breakwater outside the safe harbour, scooped in a craggy shore. Neither is necessary for security: but the one terrifies the assailant, and keeps him further from the walls; the other represses the unruly waves that would fain agitate the haven's calmer waters. No part of biblical science has more thoroughly disappointed the unbeliever, and answered the Catholic's hopes, than the critical study of Scripture.

But probably it will sound strange to some to hear us pronounce this to be a "graceful or noble" pursuit. Solid it may be; but what there is to captivate the mind, or win admiration, does not easily appear. We speak, then, of this study as catholicly followed; and as the great purpose of our whole paper is to prove how truly Catholics alone hold the sway of scriptural literature, we may be pardoned if we dwell a little longer on this point, and show how we have found this driest and least spiritual looking portion of biblical science, most savoury, sweet, and delightful. That the path to it is rugged, intricate, and often consequently wearisome, we will not gainsay; for the principle holds here, as elsewhere, that there is no royal road to knowledge. It requires patience to learn the technical part of the study, to become familiar with its peculiar phraseology, to unravel the intricacies of various systems, classifications, and recensions. Nor can this be attained without the further patience of learning perhaps more than one language, uncouth to the eye, rugged to the ear, and strange to the mind. Then there is a certain amount of practical skill in manipulation to be acquired, which is tedious at first, and requires perseverance. But when these preliminaries have been gone through, the science, even in itself, is interesting and delightful. When an uninitiated person gets an old biblical manuscript into his hands, "miratur pulchros apices," he turns it from end to end, admiring the regularity of the writing, or the preservation of the ink, and gives it back to the librarian, won-

dering somewhat of what real value such an old volume can be, or whether it may not possibly contain some new and strange reading, (if he have heard of such things,) which may puzzle critics or commentators. And then he remains "oculis laudator, sed mente non cognitor." Now let the practical critic take it into *his* hand, and see with what confidence and intelligence he handles it. As surely as a *connoisseur* in art examining a picture, he knows how to explore it. The very crackle of the parchment speaks to him: if thin or thick, if polished or rough, if white or yellow, it gives him a mark, a datum for calculation. The colour of the ink, the retouching of faded letters, the corrections between lines, all tell *him* a tale. Then he inspects the letters, which, like troops in a review, wear the uniform of a country or age. He pries into their junctures and divisions, their punctuation and length of ranks or lines; he scans their straightness or their flexures, their lengths and breadths. He notes the letters on the margin at given intervals, which to the other appeared random marks, and he pronounces, at once, a confident judgment of the volume's age. Now for its country. He looks into the text, darts over a few lines, detects certain errors by substitutions of letters pronounced alike in some countries but not in others, and thus gets a first simple clue. But with a few master glances, just like an expert leader at the bar, who, turning over folios of foolscap in his brief, catches with his eye just the recital which contains the pith of the bulky brief, and makes up his case, over which his junior has pored for hours, he turns familiarly to a few decisive texts, gives but one scrutinizing look, and, shutting the volume, tells you, not merely its country, but perhaps the very city or monastery in which it was written. As certainly as that picture critic will distinguish the Spanish from the Flemish school, and even tell you whether your painting came from Andalusia or Estramadura, so surely will the other tell you whether your manuscript was written in Egypt, or on Mount Athos. And of what use is this? Why, he knows, that if you were to read it carefully through, you could not find in it a single novelty; that by no possible combination of chances, could it contain a single word that could give the sceptic a new objection, any more than the discovery of any imaginable genuine sketch by Raphael, could possibly lead us to the conclusion that he was a bad draughtsman.

But at present we are rather bent on proving that this critical study of the Bible is really a pleasant and gratifying pursuit. Let us take another example. Let us suppose that we wish to amuse ourselves with the origin of some outlandish translation. We will take, for instance, the Arabic version of the Psalms, published by Gabriel Sionita at Paris a couple of hundred years ago, and most beautifully printed. Be not startled, gentle reader; we are not going to give you a single hard word, or strange looking character, as we did in our last article. We are not going to use any long technical terms. Follow us gently, and as it were tiptoe; and we will give you a little specimen of critical *clairvoyance*. Look into that cell. It is in an Eastern monastery, on the craggy side of Mount Libanus, with palm trees shooting up slender around it, and waving their graceful heads to the evening breeze. All is still and calm; the chaunting has ceased, and each pious recluse has slowly returned to his cell. Look again at the one we have chosen, rude and bare as it is. There, by the latticed windows, thrown open to the setting sun, on his little square mat sits, Arab fashion, a bearded monk, grave and furrowed with lines of thought. At his left side is his inkstand with its reed-holder, passed behind the girdle like a dirk. In his left hand he holds his page of vellum on a slight board, in his right his ready cane-pen: for he leans not his body nor his book on anything when he writes. He lives at a time when the sacred language of his country, the Syriac, is becoming less known even in religious houses, and an Arabic or vernacular version is required of the Psalms. He being well skilled in languages, and a holy man, has been ordered to make it, and he is already plying his sacred task.

Now first, what is he translating from? On a low three-legged stool beside him, lies the open volume. What language is it? "How," you reply, "can I possibly see, at this distance of place and time?" Then I will tell you: it is a copy of the Septuagint, or ancient Greek version of the Bible. How do we know this? Every verse of his translation tells us so. For while that version differs very remarkably from the Hebrew in its readings, his translation throughout keeps close to the former. Well, this is a very simple discovery. But we see that our good monk is not *very* strong in his Greek, for he keeps every now and then looking at another old volume, or rather roll

beside him. It is clearly the Hebrew original, which being more akin to his own language, he can better master. He uses it, therefore, as another would a lexicon. Hence through his translation, when a hard and puzzling word comes in the Greek, we find him putting the very Hebrew word into his text, making quite a jumble of it. This tells us that he did not help himself out of another version already made from the Hebrew, but dealt freely with the original. But we have very curious proofs of this. We are now watching him translate Ps. lxxvii. v. 74. (69 Heb. and Gr.) He has hit upon two curious deviations from both the Greek and the Hebrew. And yet we can very easily account for them, but only one way. If in two small words together, we imagine him to have mistaken, in one a *beth* for a *caph*, in the other a *caph* for a *beth*, (the two *Hebrew* letters being very much alike,) we get just his reading. And the same verse contains another certain proof, but too complex for our present purpose.

See him now fairly nonplussed. He has got to Ps. xxxix. (Heb.) v. 9. (in lxx. v. 6,) and there he finds the two texts irreconcilably different. You may behold him, with his hands dropped before him on his knees, waving his body backwards and forwards, and gently stroking his beard, as Orientals do when they wish to convey electricity to their brains. And now a bright thought has struck him. He knows not which reading to prefer, so he will put them both in; and consequently he combines them, and gives us in his translation a double version, from the Greek and from the Hebrew. Having discovered this notable expedient, he has recourse to it again in similar difficulties: for example in Psalm xlv. (Heb.) verses 13, 14, where he once more treats us to both texts. But this Psalm seems to have greatly perplexed him; for sometimes, as in a fit of desperation, he fairly takes his departure altogether from both his originals, and hazards a most unaccountable paraphrase of his own. He however finds another remedy in his difficulties. There he gets up, and takes down from his small library, or rather out of his book-chest, another volume. How shall we make that out? Very easily: we can see it from here, as we peep over his shoulder. It is the Syriac *Peschito* version. He is engaged on Ps. xevi. (Heb.) and at every verse he looks into this translation, and does not hesitate to be guided by it. Coincidences so curious occur as to leave us no doubt of this.

The good old translator may have pretended what he liked to his less learned brethren, and may have made them suppose that he was very fluent in Greek, and read it off like an Athenian: but he cannot trick us, and we can make out, as plain as if we saw him, every book that he used. Nay, we can even decide to what country his copy of the Greek text belonged, that it had the text, as corrected by Lucian: and probably that it was, what is called a Hexaplar copy.

We may be further asked, why we put the author of this version on Mount Libanus, and not in Chaldea, or Egypt, for instance. Here again interior data combine to determine us: the translation from the Greek, and the knowledge of Hebrew, do not allow us so easily to attribute it to the first country, where the Greek language had long ceased to be known, and Hebrew could be but little cultivated, before this version was made: while the use of the Syriac version unknown or unused in Egypt, does not permit us to assign it to the latter. But in Syria, we have every requisite condition for explaining the character of this translation.*

But all this may show how any one who has spent perhaps years in the preliminaries of this study, and has some peculiar local opportunities of perusing it practically, may find interest and even amusement in his researches; but what influence can these have upon his higher perception or relish of God's word? Or we may even ask, do they not naturally divert his thoughts from the better study of its uses, and value of its perfection? We say, most decidedly not. An illustration strikes us, which may explain our view of the matter, better than a disquisition. Let us suppose two enthusiasts about architectural beauty to enter a noble old cathedral; and both, as is the custom with such, straightways to fall into raptures—real ones in our supposed case, about it. They vie with one another

* What is lightly and vaguely described in the context is the true history of this version. The writers of "Introductions to Scripture" have been satisfied with pronouncing it to be translated from the Septuagint. But a searching collation of a sufficient portion has convinced us, that the medley of versions enumerated above has concurred to produce a most anomalous, heterogeneous, and often unaccountable translation. We have minute data for this conclusion.

in their exclamations of delight ; they praise the harmonious whole, the exquisite proportions, the gigantic dimensions, the delicate enrichments, the airiness of its superstructures, and the solidity of its walls. Chancel and nave, aisles and transepts, pavement and vault, are accurately scanned, rated, dated, and pricelessly valued. The bewildered verger stands amazed, for they evidently know more than he does, who has been in and out of that church, as man and boy, any day these six-and-thirty years. But of the two admirers, the one has evidently some peculiar skill beyond the other. While one is still rambling on, and re-admiring the same beauties again and again, the other is standing still on one spot, and book and pencil in hand, is—sketching perhaps? No, actually calculating! In the midst of that wondrous structure, he has the heart to think of Cocker, or Bonny-castle, and to perpetrate so vile a thing as a sum! By a penetrating, as well as a comprehensive glance, he has measured the vast masses which compose the edifice, he has calculated the weight of those enormous blocks which, to his companion's eye and his own, looked so light, more like stalactites pendant from a cavern's roof than solid stone, and appeared hardly to press upon the slim and towering piers. He has estimated how nicely adjusted to the weight is the skilfully planned support, and what clever combinations were required to produce the actual effect. Moreover, he has accurately ascertained, what complicated, yet correct machinery must have been necessary, before the resources of modern mechanics were developed, to exercise the huge power requisite to raise those blocks, and place them securely on their beds high up in air. But if his friend casts on him a glance of almost scorn, as he passes by him, still engaged in his unpoetical labours, how will he regard him, when he sees him actually begin to grope and poke into every cranny of the building, and rub off the white-wash, and scrape the pavement, and scrub the tombs? And thus he discovers of what curious materials the structure is composed. This pillar is marble, from Devonshire or from Westmoreland; this canopy is stone, from Caen; this monument is alabaster, from Tutbury; this slab is granite, from Anglesey; this bit of pavement, is tessellated work from Italy; for here are serpentine and porphyry with gold *smalti*: even

the main walls are built up with sandstone from quarries at least twenty miles off, without water-carriage.

Now we ask, does this man who thus studies and comprehends the laws of the construction and preservation of the building, and its very hidden and internal substance, lose or gain in true, deep, and earnest admiration of it, and of its wonderful architect? Yet we do not hesitate to say, that in equal measure will he have advantage, who has carefully and catholicly pursued the critical study of Scripture. For what else is this but the endeavour to discover the means whereby God has framed and preserved this beautiful structure of His wisdom on earth? It is, in fact, the history of His providential dealings with His own divine Word. As we follow it, we discover the marvellous agencies which have been kept at work to preserve, through the vicissitudes of ages, the sacred text. It is translated in every variety of language, by every diversity of genius and learning; it is collated and revised from the most opposite motives, hostile or friendly, orthodox or heretical. It is transcribed in every country, by holy scribes like Bede and Alcuin, or by hasty, blundering, and mercenary transcribers. And this goes on for ages; the Jew desirous of one reading, and the Arian of another, and the Catholic striving for the truth. Only an accurate critical study can give a right notion of these various powers, some naturally appearing to tend towards involving the whole text in inextricable confusion, others to distort it positively into a wrong direction. Yet as surely as did the steam-engine and the hydraulic press, and the pontoons, and the many capstans with their many crews, lately bring the Britannia tube-bridges into their right position, and firmly plant them there; because, though to a mere by-stander they appeared pulling in various and conflicting ways, yet they were all under the direction of one master-mind; even so do the many strange powers, to all appearance discordantly at work for ages upon the texts of Old and New Testaments, appear to the devout scholar, overruled and made subservient, by a wise and unseen control, to the placing and preserving in its high and noble position in the Church, that holy and venerated record of God's mercies. The very jarrings of conflicting interests, the jealousies, the strivings of error against error as against truth, will be found to conspire to the same great purpose. And most certainly, a searching study by a

catholic mind into the very words and points of that sacred writing is a homage, of respect and love, to the wise Builder, who has employed them as His materials in this His edifice. They who of old loved God's sanctuary, loved the very stones of which it had been built, even after they had been dispersed.* And that study which directs its attention to the materials that enter into the construction of the sacred volume, makes us search for their origin, their accurate form, their rightful position; which enables us to see the treasures and curious fragments of different ages and countries, brought from afar, and made to fit in, and strengthen the work; nay, which in the rudeness or elegance of its construction, shows us equal aptness, design, and evidence of truthfulness and genuineness,—that study, surely, instead of impairing, greatly must increase our veneration and love for Him, who has condescended to speak to man in the language of man, and subject His written, as He did His living, Word to the gaze, the scrutiny, and even the inflictions of men. We would venture to say more, were it likely that we should be believed by any but the experienced. We will, therefore, draw this rambling and perhaps tiresome disquisition to a close, by referring, as an example, to only one passage, Matt. xxvii. 17, where the terrible awfulness of the proposal which it records, is inexpressibly aggravated, to one acquainted with the critical history of its text.

Most writers who have treated of our Saviour's Parables, have joined to them His Miracles. A considerable number of essays profess to speak of both: and the reason is sufficiently obvious. Our Lord's miracles may be contemplated in three distinct lights.

1. Simply as miracles or wonderful works, directed to give overwhelming authority to His teaching, and to evidence His heavenly mission and His divine nature. Hence He Himself repeatedly appeals to them, as proofs of His claim to be heard and believed.† This view of His miracles appertains to the evidences of christianity; and in that branch of theology, the character, the reality, and

* Ps. ci. 15.

† Mat. xi. 20, 24; xii. 41; Mar. iv. 40; Lu. iv. 36; vii. 16; Jo. ii. 23; v. 36; vii. 31; x. 25, 38; xii. 37; xiv. 12; xv. 24.

the testimony of these marvels, are duly considered and vindicated.

2. As works of mercy. He whom compassion for fallen man had drawn down from heaven, and who had come to rescue him from sin and death, could not but desire to alleviate those sufferings, which were the consequence of the one, and the precursors of the other. He possessed the power likewise to do so, while he chose to live in privation of the means of ordinary alms-giving. It was by the exercise of His power, therefore, that He gave us example of the discharge of charitable duties towards the poor. He could not give them money, in their illness, to buy food; but He gave them health and strength to earn it. In this way St. Peter considered the exercise of the miraculous powers deputed to him: "Silver and gold, I have none; but what I have I give thee: in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk."* Where others gave silver, he gave a cure; where others bestowed gold, he bestowed a miracle. The Jews saw our Lord's miracles under this aspect: they not only admired them as evidences of immense power, but they esteemed them as proofs of unbounded goodness. They would have feared Him, whereas they loved Him, had His miracles been only deeds of might; had the withered fig tree, or the drowned herds of the Gerasenes, alone evinced his greatness,† they never would have exclaimed: "He hath done all things well; for He hath made the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak."‡

3. It is evident that Christ's miracles, even under these two points of view, were powerful auxiliaries to His teaching. The first secured, in earnest-minded hearers of His Word, deep attention; the second won from the affectionate, a willingness to be taught. The one drove to conviction, the other led to easy persuasion. According to the principles of the Rhetorician, they respectively served "*reddere auditores attentos et benevolos.*" The third mode of considering these great works, the one of which we are about to speak, rendered them *docile*, or teachable, for we have to treat of them as important and truthful lessons.

We take it for granted that every Catholic, at least, has been instructed in this mode of reading the scripture account of our Saviour's miracles. He has again and

* Acts iii. 6.

† Mat. xxi. 19; Lu. viii. 32.

‡ Mar. vii. 37.

again read or heard them commented upon, as lessons acted rather than spoken. “*Dominus ac Redemptor noster, per Evangelium suum aliquando verbis, aliquando rebus loquitur.*”^{*} It is nothing new to say that the cleansed leper represents the forgiven sinner, and that the boat saved from the storm, by the power of Jesus present in it, signified the Church. And if the leper is sent to the priest, the Catholic sees naturally the intimation of the priestly ministry in the parallel case. We, therefore, may assume that our Lord’s miracles taught a lesson, and some important one.

In treating of the Parables we showed, not we trust unsuccessfully, that they contained a distinct body of teaching, corresponding to the prophecy of the Old Testament, and containing the principles, the history, the developments, and the action of the Church. Can we find in the Miracles of our Saviour a counterpart to this? Such is our present enquiry. If what was mysterious in His oral teaching related to things of future accomplishment, it may be fairly surmised that what was still more mysteriously taught by action, should be referable to similar objects. The analogy between a parable spoken, and one acted is evident, and a miracle which contains in it a lesson, beyond its immediate and obvious purpose, is to all intents and purpose a parable, more even than the symbolical actions of Ezechiel or Osee. For example, when Christ orders His disciples to cast their nets, and though all night they had done so in vain, they now find them filled with the miraculous draught of fishes,† we at once see how appropriately this foreshows, how they, when become “fishers of men,” † shall bring multitudes into that net, which in another spoken parable has been made the image of the Church,§ without the multitude breaking the net,|| that is destroying religious unity: and how this will be, not by human power, but in obedience to the divine command, and through the energy of grace. For till the order was given them to go and preach, they had striven in their ministry in vain. Now all this is most apt, not merely because part corresponds to part, but because it corres-

* St. Greg. Hom. 32 in Evang.

† Jo. xxi. 6.

‡ Mat. iv. 19,

§ Mat. xiii. 47.

|| Jo. xxi. 11.

ponds adequately—miracle answers to miracle, each real, and not on the one side figurative. The command of God is equally true in both: and the draught of fishes is miraculous, as is the draught of men in the apostolic net. On the other hand, the cutting and burning of Ezechiel's hair,* or his going forth from his house through a hole in the wall, † or his lying upon his right or left side, ‡ or Osee's marriages, § bear no proportion to the terrible exercise of power which they figure. They are mere human actions ennobled into representations of divine judgments; whereas, as we have observed, in the Gospel image there was as much miracle on one side as on the other. Yet it must be borne in mind, at the same time, that the one miracle was immediate, definite, and clear to sight, while the other was gradual, indistinct, and to be learnt by reasoning. For, no one doubts that the propagation of Christianity by the twelve fishermen of Galilee was a divine and supernatural work. But while it was going on, this could not appear, as it does to us, looking back on its success; nor does the Church's net cease yet to descend, and to bring its goodly freight into the bark of Peter.

From the illustration which we have given, we may draw some first principles, that will gradually bear us forward towards our object. 1. For, if the analogy between the Parables and the Miracles of the Gospel, corresponding to that between prophecy by words, and prophecy by acts in the old Law, will suggest their both having a common end and term; the instance which we have chosen will give us a further suggestion. And it is, that the miraculous lesson delivered by Christ our Lord, in action, will have a corresponding reality in what it teaches. If in the prophets, the act of man was made to represent the action of God, the order cannot be reversed, and the best be degraded, by the actions of God in the flesh, describing or symbolizing any thing less than themselves. Miracle can only foreshow, typify, or guarantee miracle. Nay, we will venture to say more. The marvel performed as a type cannot be greater than its fulfilment: the latter must be the greater. The delivery of Israel from Egypt was a divine miraculous achievement: the wonders of Aaron's rod, the opening sea, the swallowing of Pharaoh's host by the abyss, the plunder of Egypt, the great work preceded

* Ezech. v.

† xiii. 5.

‡ iv.

§ Os. i. iii.

by the mysterious pasch, and apparently dependant on it, were well worthy to be considered final and complete. Yet they were all types: and when the fulfilment came, it came with such a superiority of grandeur and sublime results, as proved how only God can surpass His own work: and *will* surpass it, however magnificent, when it has been the figure of another dispensation.

2. Further, in this second instance we have presented to us another result, which may be also drawn from the first. In both we find, that, while the fulfilment is far superior to the figure, yet the appearance of miracle is much greater in the latter. Or we may better express it thus: the fulfilment relates to the order of grace, and the figure belongs to that of nature. The deliverance of man from the broken power of Satan on Calvary, was no less real, and was a more wonderful work, than the freeing of Israel from Egypt's bondage; yet it was not seen by man's eye, nor felt by his soul, as this was. The conversion of the heathen world was a greater miracle than the catching of one hundred and fifty-three fishes: but conversion was an inward, soul-hidden act. If the miracles of our Lord teach as types, we must expect them to represent other acts in the Church, not only equally, but superiorly to themselves wonderful and miraculous: and yet these may, and probably will, be invisible and belonging to the spiritual life.

We may carry this comparison much further into details. The eating of manna represented the spiritual food in the B. Eucharist:* the drinking from the rock, the refreshment received from Christ:† the raising of the brazen serpent to cure the bite of fiery serpents, the lifting of the cross with its precious burthen to heal the angry bite of the infernal serpent:‡ Jonas in the whale and cast again on shore, our Lord's resurrection.§ The thing represented was far nobler and sublimer than the type in every instance, and intrinsically more prodigious and miraculous; yet this quality did not appear to men's eyes in the reality, as it did in the inferior figure. We must ever, therefore, bear this in mind.

The Christian revelation wonderfully opened to man a second world, the sight of which had been utterly withheld from the heathen, and only manifested in glimpses to the

* Jo. vi.

† 1 Cor. x. 4.

‡ Jo. iii. 14.

§ Mat. xii. 40.

better Jews. The new heavens and earth thus manifested showed man in a new state; a spiritual life, which has its laws, its course, its goods and evils, its beginning and progress, nay, its very food, its organic operations, its illnesses, its cures, its very death, though not destruction. The soul, that indefinite being, even in Jewish theology, is with the Christian so real an existence, that he can individualize it in mind, and separate it in thought from his very self. He can speak of his soul as weak though his body is strong, or as powerful when *he* is feeble: it may be at rest and in peace while his outward existence is passed in tempestuous troubles—the soul may sleep, with Jesus, in the very bark that is tossed on the billows. He may feed that soul, while his body is starving; clothe it, while his flesh is naked. It may fly towards heaven while the mortal frame creeps on earth, and will attain its object when this perishes. All this requires a system provided for it: the “things spiritual,” which are so familiar in the Catholic’s mouth. Grace is the sphere, the order in which this spiritual life has place: it is its principle, its breath; the soul of soul, the food, the vesture, the sustaining vigour, the means of growth, the motive power; it is the ruling, and regulating, and perfecting energy of this invisible economy. A Catholic holds and understands all this as though he saw it. But in the gospel estimate this spiritual order is infinitely higher and nobler than that which includes the body, and its natural contingencies. To cure the soul is infinitely a greater deed and a greater miracle than to cure the body, and so is to raise a soul, far more than to raise a body, from death.

There is thus established a corresponding order of existence and operations, between the seen and the unseen life; each being equally real. The Miracles then of our Saviour, if they are representatives of other actions, can find in this spiritual state their truest counterparts,—realities no less marvellous, and of a far superior character.

Yet so long as man has not been totally absorbed into the spiritual life, but still lives on earth, a compound being, it is clear that the ministrations to the spiritual life must pass through his lower state, and be connected with earth. The rain first rises from the earth, then falls on it again, and thence it rises again in bubbling spring, or sparkling fountain, or it steals quietly out a brook or river, with fertilizing energy. And so grace was first begotten on

earth, by the merits and the death of the Holy One; thence it was borne to its boundless treasure-house in heaven, whence descending into the Church's rich soil, it is redistributed in endless beautiful forms, through her various agencies and ministerial institutions. Now the *sacramental* action of Grace, as conceived and understood by the Catholic alone, will exactly answer all the conditions requisite to solve our problem. The sacrament belongs to the higher sphere of the spiritual life; it is as supernatural in its invisible efficacy, as the miracle is in its visible effect; yet it is as real: it is so perfect a counterpart as to be a sufficient fulfilment; and it is so immeasurably above it, as to be a worthy fulfilment. And such we believe to be the real teaching of the great body of our Saviour's Miracles, as preserved for us in the apostolic records. As the Parables contained the dogmatical and moral principles to be developed in the Church, so do the Miracles show forth the superhuman, and in truth miraculous, agencies of her practical ministry. The one tells us what the Church shall be and say, the other what she shall do.

It is now time that we look into the gospel itself for the groundwork of this view.

Our blessed Lord, when alone with His disciples, before His passion, said to them: "Amen, amen, I say to you, he that believeth in Me, the works that I do, he also shall do, *and greater than these shall he do.*"* That the miraculous powers alluded to in the first part of the sentence, were not bestowed on the body of the faithful indiscriminately, is clear. St. Paul gives evidence that they were at most distributively given to the first christians, † nor is there reason to suppose, that every simple faithful was a *Thaumaturgus*: it is peculiarly related of St. Stephen, that he being "full of grace and fortitude, did great signs and wonders among the multitude:" ‡ as though this gift was special. But to the Apostles and disciples, the gift of doing all miracles, even the same as Christ our Lord, was part of their commission, bestowed on all, previous to their receiving any spiritual or priestly charge. "Going, preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils." § Again, to the seventy-two the

* Jo. xiv. 12.

† 1 Cor. xii. 11.

‡ Acts vi. 8.

§ Mat. x. 8; Lu. ix. 1.

same power was granted: "Heal the sick,... and say to them: The kingdom of God hath come nigh unto you."* To the first of these commissions, it seems impossible to add. The four classes of miraculous benefits enumerated, include all that our Saviour ever performed, even to the raising of the dead. And beyond this exercise of miraculous power, how was it possible to go? What greater works than Jesus did, as miracles, remained to be performed, in virtue of this promise? Was it possible to go beyond the raising of Lazarus? The words cannot be so understood. Then we can only reasonably explain them in this sense, that works of equal power but belonging to a higher order, would be performed by the faithful followers, whom the Apostles represent. We shall be more ready to admit this interpretation, when we see similar language employed elsewhere. For instance: "Every one who hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall possess life everlasting."† It is clear, that the hundred-fold of earthly goods, signifies not the reward of the future life, from which it is expressly distinguished: but a recompense in this world. But it means corresponding spiritual gifts, greater because belonging to a higher order, affecting the soul and not the body. For no one has ever imagined that the promise related to the real increase of the very things renounced, except perhaps some sensual millenarians. Yet no doubt the greater things promised, are not so striking to sense, so appreciable by the animal man, in his debased nature and with his limited faculties, as are the grosser and more material, though lesser, ones. In like manner, therefore, we may reasonably conclude the greater things than Christ's visible miracles, which the faithful had to perform, to refer to those works of power, which the ministry of the Church effects in the spiritual class of her operations: and this gives us at once, her sacramental energy.

Upon this theory, the Catholic at once explains the selection made out of the countless miracles wrought by our Saviour. When St John, shutting up the Gospel records, twice takes care to inform us, that "many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of His disciples, which

* Lu. x. 9.

† Mat. xix. 29.

are not written in this book,"* and that "the world itself would not be able to contain the books that should be written," to relate all the things which He did: † we must conclude that the miracles recorded are selected from that vast unrecorded multitude, because these were particularly important for us to know. Hence St. John tells us, what was one main principle in his selection, and it accords exactly with what we concluded respecting his gospel, when treating of the parables. After the first of these two texts, he continues: "But these" (signs) "are written that you may believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." † In other words, St. John selected his miracles, with a view to establish our Saviour's Divinity, against the rising heresies of the early Church. Accordingly, as we find him give fewer Parables, so we find him relate fewer miracles. But those which he does record, he describes with a minuteness of detail and a drawing out of proof, which are not only highly interesting, but clearly show his purpose. The most remarkable instance is, the cure of the blind man, in his ninth chapter. Every perusal of this beautiful narrative, inspires us with fresh admiration. The sifting of the evidence, and the cross-examination of the witnesses, are masterpieces of almost forensic investigation. The resurrection of Lazarus, is another similar instance of detailed narration, § directed to show how fully the miracle was tested by adverse parties, and how easy would have been its refutation or its gainsaying, had there been a flaw in its decisiveness. Another of St. John's miracles is remarkable, as bearing, like this, upon a point, towards which our Lord seems to have directed more especial miracles than towards any other; the confuting of the Jewish superstitions respecting the sabbath. St. John relates another cure wrought on the sabbath for this purpose, on which our Redeemer reasoned against the Pharisees, respecting it. This was the cure of the cripple at the pool of Bethesda, in the fifth chapter, referred to and defended in the eleventh. || When we consider that the right claimed by our Lord, over the divine institution of the sabbath, as the Jews considered it, was a strong proof of His assumption of a Divine power, we can easily understand how St. John, as well as the other evangelists, should have selected miracles in which the legislative pre-

* Jo. xx. 30. † xxi. 25. ‡ xx. 31. § xi. || vv. 21—23.

rogative was exercised. And as we are on this subject, we may close it by remarking, that a similar selection of miracles is to be found in the other evangelists, not only perhaps to establish the important truth, in the abstract, that the "Son of Man is the Lord of the Sabbath;"* but, as He transferred all His authority to His Apostles, and sent them, as His Father had sent Him, to show how they were authorised to exercise this lordship, by the transfer of its obligations to another day. The miracles recorded to prove this truth are the cure of a withered hand in the very synagogue,† that of a woman bowed down,‡ and of a dropsical man.§ It may be worthy of remark, that these three miracles, (the two last exclusively), are related by St. Luke, whose gospel we saw, in our former paper, seemed clearly directed to the forming of the Church, already established beyond the want of mere evidence against the Jews, (the scope of St. Matthew,) in practical virtue and religion. The rules of Christian sabbath observance, as well as the Church's right to appoint the Christian sabbath, are thus laid down by him.

But to return to St. John's gospel, from which we have somewhat digressed, it may be worthy of notice, that besides the miracles which we have mentioned, the histories of Lazarus, the blind man, and the helpless patient of Bethsaida, there are only two others recorded by him, before the Resurrection, which, while they signally proclaim the divine power of Jesus, are most important for establishing the view which we are taking of His miracles.

While St. John made his selection of signs from the boundless riches of our Saviour's works, the other evangelists did the same. They all concur in assuring us that He healed every sort of disease;|| and yet it is evident, that they ever dwell upon some in particular, and such does our Lord himself ever select. And these we shall find, both in their own nature, and in the circumstances accompanying them, the liveliest image possible of the sacramental institutions in the Church. We will rapidly glance at each:—

I. *Baptism.*—The most striking effect of conversion in

* Mat. xii. 8; Mar. ii. 28.

† Mar. iii. 2; Lu. vi. 6.

‡ Lu. xiii. 11.

§ Lu. xiv. 4.

|| Mat iv. 23; xv. 30; Mar. i. 32; Lu. vii. 21.

the early Church, would be the admission to a new and wonderful knowledge of religious truth. The cleansing from original sin would be known as the direct grace of the Sacrament; but the obvious effect, and the fruit of the grace, would be the initiation into the beauties of the christian mysteries, and the participation thence resulting in the vast range of sublime religious thought. What a flash of intellectual illumination would dart upon the soul of a right-minded heathen, who had been groping in the gloom of complete ignorance, or in the twilight of a striving philosophy, when, for the first time, the Christian doctrine of man's origin, destiny, fall, and reparation, was unfolded to him! What a steady, calm, and cheering brightness would seem to overspread the moral firmament, when the principles of love of God and man, and the splendid system of christian virtues, were completely communicated to him! If to men of study, of thought, and of superior mind, such as Brownson or Stolberg, the passage from a false christianity to the true has appeared as the transition from light to darkness;—if their previous wisdom has seemed to them as mere childish perception compared with the clearness and brilliancy of the spiritual light which has shone on them, and played from its vivid centre on all other objects of knowledge, and kindled them up in its own warm ray;—what must the beam have been that flashed on a Dionysius, from the lips of St. Paul, when his noble doctrines threw into the shade all the wisdom of the Athenian council? Surely to say, that “their eyes had been opened;—that they had passed from darkness to light;—that now indeed they saw;”—would be the most natural expressions they could use to describe the intellectual change which they experienced in themselves. What would a moral pagan thinker, who was drawn towards christianity, most naturally ask, but *Domine ut videam?*—“Lord, that I may see?”* Hence, any one conversant with the New Testament will at once remember, that “darkness” in it signifies the state of men before Christ's coming, and “light” the condition of those who followed Him.

But the spiritual condition of man was not merely one of darkness and blindness: it resembled rather a state of total helplessness. Even when his feeble ray of moral light showed him the right way, he had no strength to follow it.

* Lu. xviii. 35 ; Mat. xx. 33 ; Mar. x. 51.

—“*Video meliora, proboque
Deteriora sequor,*”

was a true picture of man's mind, in regard to moral good. There was no vigour nor energy in the will; there was no stimulant to the choice of good; and worse than all, there was no consciousness nor hope of any infusion of a super-human grace. But when the christian found himself suddenly, not only able to fulfil the law of nature, but to “run in the way” of most arduous commandments; nay, when he felt himself ready and eager for suffering and death for Christ, and saw his tender daughter joyfully weaving for her own head, the lily and the rose, into a double crown of virginity and martyrdom; to what would he liken himself better, than to one who had lain grovelling till then in impotent lameness, a cripple in every limb, till set free; and new strength and buoyancy had been marvellously bestowed upon his spiritual frame?

Every other sense, even the most inferior, has its parallel in the spiritual life. The soul hears in christianity by that docility of learning, and that readiness of obedience, which belong exclusively to the believer. “The Lord hath opened my ear, and I do not resist,”* exclaims Isaias in the person of Christ. And frequently those who refuse to hear the word of God, through him, are styled by him deaf,† as they are by the other prophets.‡ In the New Testament a similar use occurs.§ To open the mouth or the lips, expresses similarly the power worthily to praise God, and to speak His truths.|| Again, therefore, we may easily imagine how a christian, once fully imbued with the truths of his religion, one to whom the wonderful mystery of the blessed Trinity had been taught, with its no less sublime sequel, the Incarnation, able now to address God as He is,¶ and to speak worthily of His nature, would feel as though the enjoyment of a new sense had been given

* Is. l. 5.

† vi. 10; xliii. 8; xlvi. 8; lxiv. 4.

‡ Jer. v. 21; vi. 10; xi. 8; xxxiv. 14; Ezech. xii. 12; xl. 4; Mic. vii. 6; Zac. vii. 11. § Mar. viii. 18; Act. xxviii. 26; Rom. xii. 8.

|| Ps. l. 17; Prov. viii. 6; Is. vi. 8; l. 4; Jer. i. 9; Ezech. iii. 27.

¶ “In confessione veræ Fidei, æternæ Trinitatis gloriam agnoscere, et in potentia majestatis adorare unitatem.” Collect for Trinity Sunday.

him, and his tongue had been loosened, like Zachary's,* to proclaim the mercies of God.

There are some other circumstances worthy of consideration in this matter.

1st. The afflictions which we have enumerated, are almost always congenital, or date from birth. The blind, the deaf and dumb, and the crippled, are almost always born so; the cases that arise from accident are the exceptions. And in the New Testament this circumstance is particularly recorded. St. John expressly tells us, that the blind man cured by Jesus, had been so from birth: † and two cripples cured by St. Peter and St. Paul, are especially described, as such from their mother's wombs. ‡ The state, therefore, was one of privation, rather than of loss; it came with birth, and was a natural condition. This class of visitation represents, in consequence, the state of man not brought to Grace, better than those sicknesses or infirmities which have afterwards grown upon him, or have resulted from personal misfortunes. When the disciples asked our Lord, if the blind man had been so afflicted for his parents' sins, § they gave us no bad clue to the discovery of the cause of man's spiritual blindness.

2nd. In those whom our Saviour cured, by restoring to them lost senses or power of limbs, poverty seems generally to have been an additional affliction. That He was equally willing to heal the rich as the poor, we cannot doubt. But the Evangelists have recorded for us comparatively few instances of His going into the houses of the wealthy, for such a purpose. It was the multitude that flocked around him in the street, the beggars on the road side, and at the gates of towns, || who chiefly applied to him for relief. He went to sup with Simon the leper, ¶ but we do not read that He healed him. Perhaps the proud Pharisee, who despised Magdalene, was above asking for it, or recognizing our Lord's miraculous power. This further enhances the parallel between man in his fallen state, and the healed by Christ. He was spiritually poor, as well as blind, lame, deaf and dumb.

3rd. These particular ailments are especially connected, as consequences, with demoniacal possession. We have

* Lu. i. 64.

† Jo. ix. 1.

‡ Acts iii. 12; xiv. 7.

§ Jo. ix. 2.

|| Mat. xx. 30; Mar. x. 52; Lu. xviii. 43.

¶ Mar. xiv. 3.

three remarkable cases recorded of this. The first is related by St. Matthew and St. Luke, of a dumb demoniac.* The second is of one possessed, who was deaf and dumb, mentioned by St. Mark and St. Luke.† The third unites with possession, the triple loss of sense; the energumen being blind and deaf, consequently dumb, as described by St. Matthew alone.‡ Now, here again is a most striking similitude between the spiritual condition of man, and the physical state of those whom Jesus Christ mostly cured on earth, so far at least, as it has been thought, for our instruction, right to record. Man's soul was blind, deaf and dumb, through the fearful possession of the evil one, who had usurped God's dominions over the mind and heart of man. He was in the bondage of the devil, as well as in darkness and gloom. Hence the two are joined in enumerating the objects of Christ's mission. "To preach deliverance to the captives, and sight to the blind," had been foretold by Isaias, and is quoted by St. Luke,§ as descriptive of His glorious work. And speaking of this satanic mastery over man's body, we may as well remark, how fearfully, yet how strikingly it was meant to represent a similar tyranny over his soul, in one other Gospel description of it. It was a legion of devils that had invaded him, their influence had brutalized him to the level of the most unclean of animals, and then pushed him headlong into a gulf in which he must perish. ||

We have not thought it necessary to strengthen what we have written by reference to authorities. There is not a point which we could not corroborate from the holy Fathers: who again and again represent the blind, the deaf and dumb, and the demoniacs as representing man in his fallen state. We will, therefore, proceed at once to the application of what we have said.

The rite by which, in ancient as in modern times, the Church acts upon that state of man, touches him with the healing power of Christ, frees him from Satan's gripe, changes his condition, opens his eyes, his ears, his mouth, and makes him rightly see, hear, and speak, and gives him strength to walk in God's commandments, is holy Bap-

* Mat. ix 33; Lu. xi. 14.

† Mar. ix. 16, 24. ("Deaf and dumb spirit.") Lu. ix. 38.

‡ Mat. xii. 22.

§ Is. lxi. 1; Lu. iv 19.

|| Mat. xviii. 24.

tism. So natural was this idea, that her whole ritual of baptism is based upon it.

First, the exorcisms which occupy its first part, show that the unbaptized are placed by her in the class, spiritually, of those under the grasp and control of the evil one. He is rebuked, cursed, and disdainfully adjured, and violently thrust out; and this is done with an energy and rudeness of language, exactly suited to the object, and like to what our Saviour used with His demoniacs. Dr. Pusey, in his well remembered Tract on Baptism, has proved that every liturgy, but the Anglican, contains these exorcisms, and consequently this idea.

Secondly, the senses are treated as requiring restoration, and the very rites are copied, which our Lord condescended to employ, for the purpose of restoring them. When "they bring to Him one deaf and dumb, and besought Him that He would lay His hand upon him:" he would not consent to exercise His power, by that ordinary mode; but "taking him from the multitude apart, He put His fingers into his ears, and spitting, He touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven, He groaned and said to him; Ephpheta, which is, be thou opened."* Now this ceremony, the Church has, from the beginning, adopted into her ritual for baptism: where the priest, touching the ears of the catechumen, pronounces the same word, touching similarly with spittle, as in imitation of the divine action, the nostrils. And then into the mouth is put the salt, "the sacramentum salis," still further symbolizing the opening of the mouth, to speak heavenly wisdom, of which salt is the emblem.

Thirdly, in the rite for the baptism of an adult, there is a striking ceremony, which expresses strongly the Church's thought on this resemblance. The officiating bishop or priest signs with the cross the various senses, with appropriate words. "I sign thy forehead † that thou mayest receive the Cross of Christ. I sign thine ears † that thou mayest hear the divine precepts. I sign thine eyes † that thou mayest see the brightness of God. I sign thy nostrils † that thou mayest feel the sweet odour of Christ. I sign thy mouth, † that thou mayest speak words of life. I sign thy breast, † that thou mayest believe in God. I sign thy shoulders † that thou mayest receive the yoke of His

* Mar. vii. 33.

service. I sign thee all †" (not touching) "in the name of the Father, † and of the Son, † and of the Holy † Ghost, that thou mayest have life everlasting, and mayest live for ever and ever. Amen." Again, when the bishop in the porch of the church, truly to the Catholic, "the beautiful gate" of God's house, stretches out his hand to the catechumen there kneeling, and raises him up, and saying to him, "Enter into the Church of God," leads him, holding by his stole, for the first time into the temple; how much the resemblance must strike us, with what was done by Peter, the first Bishop after Christ, when, in the name of Jesus, he bid the lame man, at the temple-gate, to rise; "and taking him by the right hand, lifted him up; and the man "walked, and went with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God:" and he on his part, "held Peter and John,"* no doubt, by their garments, as affectionately clinging to them.

Fourthly; but the great blessing of baptism or bringing to the faith, was that which St. Peter so beautifully expresses when addressing his new christians, in the words adopted from him by St. Augustine, in speaking to the newly baptized, calling them, "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that you may declare," he adds, "His virtues, who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light." † While the miracles that regard other bodily organs and powers may be considered as accessories, this bestowing of the grace of Faith, the foundation of all other virtues, must be considered as of the very essence of baptismal regeneration, and is truly the bringing of blind nature to the "marvellous light of God." Hence in the baptismal service of the Church it is frequently alluded to, under this image. In the very opening prayer, with his hand placed on the child's or catechumen's head, the priest thus speaks: "all blindness of heart drive from him, break the bonds of Satan in which he hath been bound." And again, more solemnly, and with the same important action, he prays as follows: "I entreat Thy eternal and most just pity, holy Lord, Father almighty, eternal God, author of light and truth, on behalf of this thy servant N. that Thou wilt vouchsafe to enlighten him with Thine intellectual light." And this in the baptism of adults, is preceded by an abjuration of Satan,

* Acts iii. 1—11.

† 1 Pet. ii. 9.

in these words: "For He commandeth thee, accursed one for ever lost! who opened the eyes of the man born blind." Finally, in the same service we have the following prayer: "I beseech Thee, holy Lord, Father almighty, eternal God, that to this Thy servant N. who wanders uncertain and doubtful in the night of this world, Thou wilt command the way of Thy truth, and of knowledge of Thee to be shown; that the eyes of his heart being opened, he may know Thee, one God, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, with the Holy Ghost," * &c.

These passages will prove sufficiently, how strong the analogy is in the mind of the Church, between the giving of sight to the bodily blind, and of faith to the unbaptized. Among the rites familiar to our Saviour as a means of cure, was that of laying His hands upon the patient, a ceremony which may be said to have become especially sacramental. This was employed by him in curing the blind; and in one instance remarkably. "And taking the blind man by the hand, He led him out of the town; and spitting upon his eyes, laying His hand upon him, He asked him if he saw anything. And looking up, he said: I see men, as it were trees walking. After that, again He laid his hands upon his eyes, and he began to see, and was restored, so that he saw all things clearly." † Now we have seen how just twice, in the administration of baptism, the priest places his hand upon the child, with a prayer for the removal of blindness at the first, and for the granting of light at the second time.

But another instance is more remarkable. When Saul is overtaken by the merciful judgment of God, on the road to Damascus, he is struck blind. Was this merely to humble and subdue his haughty spirit, to tame him, like a blinded eagle, plucked down in his first flight for prey? Or is there not also in this, a deeper symbolic meaning, to show him how the power of the Church's ministry, while it cured his corporal blindness, gave his soul also intellectual light? For Ananias coming in to baptize him, "laying his hands upon him," said: "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus hath sent me... that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately

* We can only refer to the Roman Ritual or Pontifical, where the two baptismal services are given, for these various extracts.

† Mar. viii. 22—26.

there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight; and rising up he was baptized.”* Now here we have the very miracle of blindness cured, connected with the baptismal rite: nay, more, to all appearance, blindness inflicted, on purpose to show the close analogy between the two, and to bring the visible miracle in confirmation of the invisible.

Our Lord Himself, however, has directly given us the most interesting example of this relation. We have before referred to the detailed account preserved by St. John, of the cure of a blind man. In this instance our blessed Saviour first made use of the mysterious ceremony described by St. Mark. For, “He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and spread the clay upon his eyes.” This, one might have supposed, would have sufficed to complete the cure. And so it would have done, had He so willed it. But, undoubtedly to teach a lesson, of which we ought to learn the import, He “said to him: Go wash (bathe) in the pool of Siloe, which is interpreted, Sent. He went therefore, and washed, and he came seeing.”† If Jesus desired to symbolize the miraculous action of baptism as we have described it, as giving the divine light of Faith supernaturally to the soul, He could not have done it more completely than in this, the most minutely recounted of all His cures wrought on the blind. The anointing of the eyes, for so the text describes it, † was only made a preliminary ceremony, like the unction with the oil of catechumens in our baptism; but the cure was completed by the waters—not of the Jordan, the waters of John, but of the bathing-pool of Siloe, the waters of the Messiah. And even this choice is most expressive, when we take into account the Jewish belief concerning it, that it was the most efficacious bath for purification from legal defilement. § Not even Cæsar’s celebrated report,

* Acts, ix. 18.

† Jo. ix. 6, 7.

‡ Ἐπέχρισε, v. 6. The act here described, like that before quoted from St. Mark, viii. 23, will appear in no ways strange to those who are aware how much a similar practice was in use among the Jews, and other nations of antiquity. See Wetstein in loc.

§ “Even if he should wash himself in the waters of Siloam, ... he would not obtain complete cleanness.” *Talm. Hieros.* Ibid. where see also, on v. 6. the Jewish denunciation against anointing the eyes, or rubbing them with saliva on the sabbath. Compare v. 13.

“veni, vidi, vici,” expressed more emphatically the rapidity of his conquest, than does the blind man’s narrative, the instantaneousness of his cure. “That man that is called Jesus made clay, and anointed my eyes, and said to me: Go to the pool of Siloe, and wash. *And I went, I washed, and I see.*” No wonder that the ancient Christians should have applied to the baptistery, the very word used in this passage, calling it among other names, the *κολυμβήθρα* or swimming bath: doubtless from this very passage.

All that we have said will receive confirmation from a beautiful passage in Isaias, and will, in return, throw light upon it. It is the following:—“God Himself will come, and will save you. Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as the hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall be free. *For waters are broken out in the desert, and streams in the wilderness.....* And a path and a way shall be there, and it shall be called the holy way; the unclean shall not pass over it; and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein,... they shall walk there that shall be delivered.”* It is to spiritual ailments alone that this allusion can be made.

It may well appear superfluous to add, that only in catholic baptism is a counterpart discoverable, to the class of miracles which we have classified together, as they generally are in the gospels. The exorcisms and other prayers, which we have quoted, have disappeared from the protestant liturgy; all intimation of belief in effects parallel to those miracles of our Lord will be sought there in vain. But not only in the formularies, but in the opinions of the Anglican system, there is a total absence of the doctrine necessary to establish such a parallelism as we have traced. We are sure that Faith is there neither spoken of, nor considered, as a gift of God, an infused virtue, actually and instantly communicated to the soul in baptism—into the soul even of an infant. Faith with protestants is a profession of a mode of thought; thought being an act of the individual. Hence in Confirmation, the Anglican system looks to personal profession of what had been professed by proxy, in baptism. But there is no actual belief (unless it be in the ideal church which lurks

* Is. xxxv. 4—9.

in the closets of Oxford theologians) that the child had, from baptism, possessed an inherent, true, and orthodox faith. Hence the first question in the Catholic Ritual, put to the catechumen is, "N: what dost thou ask of the Church of God?" and the answer is, "Faith." That the Anglican theory, even when elevated to the highest stage of High-churchism, has no perception of this most important point of the doctrine of baptism, will appear from this; that none more than Oxford theorists try to deter ladies and young men from becoming Catholics, by telling them that thereby they will be renouncing "the Church of their Baptism." For such phrase can only signify, that in baptism they were incorporated into the English establishment, as a body distinct from the *orbis terrarum* Church, or the Catholic Church in communion with Rome. For if Anglicanism be a part of the one universal Church, such an expression is as unmeaning and as absurd, as if one were to say to a man, "Do not become a British subject, lest you cease to be a citizen of London:" or to a soldier, "Do not join the body of the army, lest, thereby, you renounce your regiment." The phrase, therefore, means, that Anglicanism is so distinct from Catholicity, as that the baptism of the one is not that of the other. Now for this to be, either the baptized child receives no faith, or it receives faith according to the holding of Anglicanism, as distinct from that of the Catholic Church; and that is clearly no faith at all. The only sense to be attached to such a now "cant phrase" is: "In baptism you made *profession* of Anglicanism, and it is sinful in you to depart from that *profession*." And this meaning is rendered more evident by the fact, that they who use it *profess* Anglicanism, but make no scruple of *believing* Catholicity. The expression is another Protestant novelty: we are only surprised that it had not been forestalled by the Donatists. It makes the Church more like the corporation of a close borough, than the empire of God over the whole world.

The catholic Church, on the other hand, considering Baptism as the *Janua Ecclesie*, "the gate of the Church," considers every one validly (even though unlawfully) baptized, as a member of the true Church, a Catholic, possessing sound faith, as well as other infused virtues, and as continuing so until some contradictory act destroys the virtue, and transfers the unhappy victim to the dominion of error, schism or heresy. Look well to this, ye high church

teachers; every one of you, if duly baptized, has once, in the estimation of the Catholic, Universal, One Church, been a member of it. Each of you has left it by an act of apostacy! and your children, whom you have with your own hands baptized, that the sacred rite might not be made void by the profane carelessness of its daily administration around you, these yet innocent prattling little ones, are still ours, in communion with the holy Church of God throughout the world. When the day comes, that you, more in doubt than is consistent with safety, about your own position, shall pour into their docile ears, the poison of a heresy which you regret, shall make them believe that Jesus Christ has left no one united Church on earth, or that he commanded not communion with Peter, or that the titular of your diocese is a descendant of the Apostles, or that Mary should not be invoked, or that baptism made them Anglican, or that there is no real corporeal presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, or that priestly absolution is not of necessity for pardon of sins; or should the day come, (for strange things do now happen,) when you will teach exactly the contrary, and tell your children that your Church (as you call it) holds every one of the opposite doctrines, just as Catholics do, and so cheat them verily into a heretical profession of orthodox doctrine, when that day comes, know ye, that you will be guilty of a parricidal act, you will pluck from off your children's body that white garment of innocence, (for heresy is sin,) which in every real baptism is spiritually placed upon the neophyte, you will snatch the burning lamp of orthodox faith from their hands, you will tear off the garland of joyful adoption which true Baptism placed upon their heads. You will do worse; you will reverse the wonders of Baptism; you will undo its miracle. You will blind the eyes that have been once opened, seal up the ears again that have been unstopped, tie up the tongue that has been loosened, and cripple the limbs that have been made whole. Oh! think of this, before it becomes too late. You, whose own minds are tempest-tossed, uncertain of your faith, who, perhaps flatter yourselves with the hope that unity may yet be restored, and you may be carried safely by the gulf-stream into the haven of catholic rest; you who will not venture to say that no occurrence may happen that will unmoor you from your present position, and drive you into our Church; you, above all, who say, that while you believe it to be

your duty to remain where God has placed you, you would rejoice had His Providence from the beginning rooted you in the catholic Church, who "would give anything" to have been always catholic—spare your own pains, your own stings, your own tortures, to those you love; forego the delusion that you can educate your children catholics in an Anglican church, or an Anglican parsonage; frankly and generously give them up to the only mother that will train them holily; make them pledges of your love, which you give not to your own system; send your treasures where you profess your heart to be, that the two be together, and you give not the lie to Truth. Yes, we boldly repeat it, there are many now in Anglicanism, who cannot, without fearful sin, allow their children to be brought up in it, for they have not the excuse of a false conscience. Their only escape is, to let them continue safe in the Church of their baptism, the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

II. *Penance.*—It will not be necessary to delay the reader long upon the other Sacraments. The application of our Lord's miracles to them will be less complicated. If those afflictions, which disable man for work, which afflict him from his birth, which visit him rather as negations or privations of good, than as a positive withdrawal of what has been held, and which were in Christ's time united often with demoniacal possession, seem most aptly to apply, as figures, to unregenerated man; those ailments and diseases which befall him in his course of life, and often end in death, may be taken to symbolize those spiritual distempers which he brings upon his soul by sin. Indeed, so accurately could the resemblance be traced, that particular complaints might be easily compared to particular sins or vices. Even the heathen poet could read the parallel between the avaricious mind and him who

"Crescit indulgens sibi dirus hydrops."

Anger is a fever of the mind, anxious care its gnawing canker, jealousy its jaundice, pride its plethory, sloth its atrophy.

But we will confine ourselves to three of the lashes of that scourge, which fell upon man when first he sinned.

1. The first of these is palsy. It is not unfrequently the consequence of excess, and it reduces the man to a helpless condition: it deprives him often of utterance, it inca-

pacitates him for work. It makes him, as far as possible, what we have before described, as symbolizing the state of fallen man. What more exact image of what man does to his own soul by sin? He makes it a palsy-stricken, prostrate, trembling, helpless, useless, wretched thing. The cure recorded by the three first evangelists,* of a paralytic man, is especially interesting for this, that it is evidently recorded to establish the Catholic doctrine on forgiveness of sins. The patient is brought before our Saviour, by being let down through the roof; and instead of at once healing him, He addresses him in these words: "Man, thy sins are forgiven thee." Now this mode of acting no doubt proceeded from the charity and goodness of Jesus, who, like a skilful physician, would not deal with a lesser malady, while there was a greater in possession. But the words were, most assuredly, designedly spoken. They were intended to provoke a grave objection, and to afford an occasion to answer it: and that answer was to be of solemn and dear importance to us. They indicate, moreover, how the sight of the man's corporal affliction brought to His mind his spiritual and unseen state. For else, wherefore, did He not address the same words to any of the bystanders, who may have needed, as no doubt most did, this timely pardon? But this poor wretch's prostrate frame and quivering limbs, were to Him but the lively image of a soul overthrown, and disabled by sin. Some Protestant commentators have considered this expression equivalent to a declaration of cure; but it is clear that the effect of restoration to bodily health did not ensue. We must, therefore, conclude, that true remission of sins was here granted; and the more, because the very same words are used as were on occasion of Magdalene's forgiveness.† The Jews, inwardly think, that our Lord blasphemes by arrogating a power which belongs exclusively to God. "Who is this that speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone?" Had He merely cured the poor man, they would not have raised the objection. They had seen Him cure plenty of such: but evidently, they considered the power of healing spiritual maladies so much higher and greater, that they could not allow the one necessarily to involve the other. He, therefore, meets their thoughts, and answers: "Which is

* Mat. ix. 6; Mar. ii. 10; Lu. v. 24.

† Lu. vii. 48.

easier to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk? But that you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (He saith to the sick of the palsy,) I say to thee arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house.* Our Lord Himself may be said here, to draw the resemblance; first, between the two ailments, the body's and the soul's; and secondly, between the cure of the one and that of the other, between the healing of a grievous malady, and the forgiveness of sin. He, moreover, establishes the adequacy of the resemblance, comparing them as acts of power, and showing how one was of the same nature as the other, each a miracle. If then, to the Apostles He gave this very power; "heal the sick:"† and if afterwards, as though almost alluding to this very passage, and using the same words, He repeats the assertion of His own power on earth, and communicates it to them, to the extent of doing that which He cured the palsied man to claim—the right of forgiving sins: † we may surely conclude that this prerogative was received by them in a sense, which perfectly made it correspond with the miraculous gifts conferred on them. And who doubts that of the two, the spiritual healing was a much greater boon from Christ our Lord, than the visible and corporal? Who doubts that, "thy sins are forgiven thee," though to men as easy to say, was a far greater mercy than, "arise take up thy bed?" Had the latter alone been spoken, it might have been the prolongation only of a life of sin, and an accumulation of condemnation, that would have ensued. Had the former only, they would have secured to the sick man, at least, an everlasting life. And as the boon, so was the power from which it flowed.

Here then, we have the parallel exactly established between a visible act of supernatural power, and an invisible exercise of an equal, or greater, power. When the Apostles raised a paralytic, all the multitude would applaud, as they no doubt did when St. Peter, almost in

* Lu. v. 23, 24.

† Mat. x. 8.

‡ Compare "the Son of Man hath *power on earth to forgive sins*" with "*all power is given to me in heaven and on earth*," (Mat. xxviii. 18.) and "as the Father sent me" (*on earth*) "so do I send you. Whose *sins* you shall *forgive* they are *forgiven* them." (Jo. xx. 21, 23.) The words in italics are the same, in the different passages, in the original.

the same words as his divine Master, said to Eneas, "who was ill of the palsy," "Arise, and make thy bed;" and immediately he arose.* But they did much more, and no one saw it, when, in virtue of their higher commission, they forgave a man his sins. This parallel leads us to the following conclusion. 1stly, The commission to forgive sins was, in regard to the soul, what the charge to heal the sick, here fulfilled by St. Peter, was with respect to the body. 2ndly, It was to be exercised by a specific act, as was the raising of the paralytic. 3rdly, It was to be not declaratory but efficacious. 4thly, It was to be followed by instantaneous effect. The sinner was to be as truly forgiven, on the words being pronounced, as the sick man was well, when he had heard the command to arise. Surely it is only in the Catholic Church that all this has reality; or even that any one believes, that there exists, vested in the successors of the Apostles, a power which permits of such a comparison with the cure performed by our blessed Redeemer.

2. It would be wasting our reader's time, to endeavour to prove that the leprosy was a fitting emblem of sin. This fitness arises from the character of the disease; it is an uncleanness as well as a malady. It commenced generally by a small spot: if not checked, it increased and spread; it eat into the live flesh, it separated the limbs at the joints, and it finally caused death. It was, moreover, deemed infectious, and thus further resembled sin. But in addition, it was not left to be treated by the physician, but it was placed especially under the jurisdiction of the priests. To them the person conscious of the disease, had to present, and to denounce himself. They had the minutest rules to guide them, in forming their judgment, and pronouncing on the complaint. If they did not declare the patient clean, they put off his case for some days longer, and he again submitted to sacerdotal judgment. Even if he were now declared free, he had to perform certain acts, as washing his garments, before he rejoined his people. But when the defilement was certain, and the disease manifest, he was separated from the people; he wore a

* Acts, ix. 38. While this miracle presents a resemblance to the healing of the palsied man in the Gospel, the account which immediately follows it, (the raising of Tabitha,) has no less resemblance to the raising of the daughter of Jairus. (Mat. ix. 23.)

peculiar garb, he lived without the camp or city, and he cried out to every passer-by that he was unclean. Then, if at last restored to health, many mysterious rites had to be performed: the principal or final one, of which was, that he should "take a lamb and offer it up as a trespass offering," and "immolate the lamb where the victim for sin is wont to be immolated, and the holocaust, that is, in the holy place."* All this was done after the leper had been allowed to return to the communion of his fellow-citizens.

We cannot be surprised that the ancient Church should universally have considered this malady, as the most natural type of sin in the individual, as the privations of sense in our former classification were, of the sin of the whole race. Leprosy and sin are almost synonymous in ecclesiastical language, even where the bodily affection itself was unknown. But to see fully the accuracy of the resemblance, we should view it as demonstrated in the discipline of the ancient Church. There the sinner, as now, when conscious of transgression, presented himself to the priest of God. But in those days of fervour, this minister of justice, as of mercy, took into deliberate consideration the offence committed, and while he admitted to forgiveness, and slighter works of purification, the lesser offender, sentenced the more guilty to public separation from the faithful, and severe expiation of his crime. His leprosy was revealed to all by his penitential garb; and how strikingly resembling the treatment of the leper must his case have appeared, as he stood at the gate of the Church, telling all that entered in, that he was a sinner, unworthy to join them in communion of sacred offices. Then when the time came for pardon, the priest once more spoke, and pronounced him clean; and what was his first act? Surely, as it is now, with every penitent in the Catholic Church, to hasten to the holy place, to assist at the immolation of the Lamb slain for sin, and there partake of the sacred victim. And although that outward separation from the faithful, which served to make the parallel so perfect, has now ceased in the discipline of the Church, yet all that is essential has remained; so that to this day, "to distinguish between leprosy and leprosy," is a familiar expression in writers instructing the priest, how to discern, and deal with, sin.

* Levit. xiii. & xiv.

It will not be surprising that our Saviour should have dealt with this distemper, as distinct from other ailments. The cleansing of lepers is distinguished from other works of power, both in the narrations of the Evangelists, and in His own enumeration of such acts.* In his commission to His apostles, this is mentioned as one of the powers committed to them. But He was pleased to show how He did not allow even the exercise of His miraculous power to supersede the provisions of His law. Accordingly we find, that in every instance distinctly recorded of His healing this complaint, He sends the patients to the priest to receive from him, ratification as it were, of the cure which He had performed. Whether he first completed it, or left the recovery to appear after, He gave them the same command.† Now if leprosy represented sin, and the miraculous healing of it showed forth the pardon of sin in the Church, this peculiar attention to the law which over Him had no force, most aptly serves to complete the resemblance; by showing how, if even in the figure He would have the interposition of the priestly ministry, so much more does He require it, in the fulfilment, which He has made one of the very highest duties and prerogatives of the sacerdotal office.

In describing the treatment of sin in the Church, compared with the treatment of leprosy in the old law, we have shown how exactly the type finds its accomplishment in the former. And we see how the inward cleansing from sin, by the word of the priest, corresponds exactly with the action of Christ, when, in commanding phrase, he simply says: "I will: be made clean." But if it is exclusively a Catholic practice and doctrine, thus to make forgiveness of sin dependant on the exercise of an act of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; if it be solely with us that the leper must come before him who has to heal him, and declare himself unclean, as such did with our Lord; how boldly Catholic is that further analogy with what He practised, which consists in compelling even those whom God Himself has pardoned, to show themselves to His priests, make known even forgiven transgression, and hear his sentence, though in this case anticipated, rather than ratified, in heaven. For while no one, even in the Anglican system, dares to

* Mat. x. 8; xi. 5; Lu. vii. 22.

† Mat. viii. 4; Mar. i. 44; Lu. v. 14; xvii. 12.

make confession compulsory, in even extreme cases, but some admit it as one mode of obtaining pardon, the Catholic Church admits of no exception. Let the sinner, pierced, not by lightning of God's judgment, but by the very arrows of His love; plunged, not into an abyss of despair, but into an ocean of sweetest confidence, burst his very heart in penitent sorrow; let it be full and deep as that of David, when Nathan pronounced his forgiveness:* tender and gushing as that of Magdalene, when Jesus spoke her pardon: let it be that perfect contrition which bespeaks instant remission; yet he hears a voice, as he rises from the outpouring of his grief, which tells him: "Go show thyself to the priest." He knows it has been a condition of his forgiveness, (if he can presume to hope it has been already granted,) that he should submit to the keys of the Church, manifest his past frailty, and receive the only assurance of reconciliation and restored grace, in this life—the absolution of Christ's minister. In fact, so perfectly does the Church Catholic act to this example of her Lord, and believe in the lesson which He gave for curing the leprosy, that she admits no contrition to be perfect, which does not contain confession *in voto*, in desire and intention. Most faithfully, then, does she copy His practice, in exercising the marvellous power confided to her, of healing the leprosy of the soul.

3. It would seem to us even more superfluous than in our last illustration of sacramental penance, to trace the resemblance between its exercise, and the raising, by our Lord, of the dead to life. A few brief remarks will suffice to sketch it, as peculiarly belonging to us.

One of the offices of the Holy Spirit in the Church, is to "convince the world of sin,"† that is, among other effects, to give a right understanding of its nature. In the Old Law it was merely considered as a transgression, a violation of a precept, for which anger and punishment were to be expected from God. The inward havoc of sin in the soul, is not to be found described or alluded to, even in the fervent outpourings of sorrow, which David first manifested. The spiritual life, as we have before observed, was but obscurely and imperfectly understood. If we may use so strong an expression, sin, once committed, was external to the sinner, it was a reckoning which he had to

* 2 Reg. xii. 13.

† Jo. xvi. 8, 9.

make with God. It lay at his door,* it would be a lion on his path,† but it was not the inward domestic enemy; it was not disease, canker, blight and ruin. With the doctrine of Grace, which christianity first revealed, came the knowledge that the soul has a life by that gift, the loss of which involves spiritual death. And Grace is forfeited by deadly sin. This is a language familiar to a catholic child, taught in every catechism; hence to the eye of faith a soul in such guilt, is as truly dead as is a corpse to that of the body: and the contemplation of it moving amidst the occupations and affections of life, presents as hideous a spectacle as would a body with unmoving features, sunless eyes, blanched lips, and icy limbs, gliding silent through the merry dance. There is a reality attached to this thought of spiritual death, in a catholic mind, which shows itself in many ways. For example, a mother like St. Monica does not express “her regret that her dear son should be so wild, but hopes he will become steadier,” as many a modern parent would speak of the *vices* of a son, and think she had paid a tribute to virtue; but she weeps bitter tears, and follows him from land to land, and fasts and prays, and pines in grief, and why? Her son expresses it to the life: “me multos annos fleverat, ut oculis suis viverem.”‡ She believed, nay she knew him to be spiritually dead: and she wept over him as a widow does over her dead only child. Hence, the Church most becomingly appropriates to her festival, (May 4th,) the history of Christ’s raising the son of the widow of Naim,§ as beautifully symbolical of the conversion of her son; and further reads his own commentary upon it, in the office, applying the narrative to the restoration of the soul to life. And what else is the secret of penitent grief, such as St. John Climacus describes among the solitaries of Egypt, such as every Charter-house, or Cistercian abbey could exhibit, and yet does, where men, who have every reason to hope that pardon has been vouchsafed them, will continue, for long years, to mourn and do penance; but that deep earnest conviction of sin and its detestable enormity, which makes them loath its defilement, abhor its impiety, and dread its deadly stroke? which from very love of God,

* Gen. iv. 3.

† Ecclus. xxvii. 11, 31; xxviii. 27.

‡ Confess, lib. ix. c. 12.

§ Lu. vii. 11

makes the estrangement from Him which it causes, the deadly cold obstruction which it opposes to his life-giving graces, a state as fearful as that of bodily dissolution and corruption?

This sentiment is not to be found in protestantism; it is contrary to its very first principles. First, such effects as we have described, are not witnessed nor approved there. To weep, to mourn, to afflict the body, to fast, are *works*, and are familiarly considered as opposed to justification by faith. Hence there is no provision for them; no religious solitudes, no penitential communities are to be found, where protestantism prevails. As things to be plundered, stripped and beaten down, it knows of them; but not as things to be admired and upheld. Hence, secondly, it is astonishing how easily a load of sins is supposed, in the protestant, and consequently in the Anglican, system to be got rid of. Suppose a man, a noble one for example, to have been notorious through years, for open and scandalous vice, addicted to shameless immoralities before the world: well, if growing gray, he begins to go about the neighbourhood in his phaeton, leaving bibles at every cottage, and giving tracts to every village dame, and fits up the family pew, and becomes president of the county auxiliary bible society, and presides at May meetings in the season, the scarlet of his youthful sins becomes at once white as his locks of snow; and no one, any more than himself, thinks of sorrow and tears, as having been necessary to make him—a Saint. But, thirdly, we find a marked abhorrence in protestant writers, of the distinction between mortal and venial sin. They reject the very idea of there being such a thing: they hold the Stoic maxim that “all sins are equal.”* What is the necessary consequence? That there is no apprehension of any deadly character in *any* sin. For who can bring himself to imagine, that a passing thought of anger, or a hurried word of impatience, or a trifling act of unkindness, kills the soul and robs it of grace? Then, how can the more grievous act of deliberate crime do so, seeing that it is no greater sin? There is only one escape, that such failings as we have mentioned are not sins at all; and hence comes a dullness of conscience, and a heaviness of perception, respecting sin, which soon extends to more heinous trans-

* Cicero, *Paradoxa*.

gressions. For the greatest security against mortal, is the dread of venial, offences.

The view, then, of sin which makes death its most perfect symbol, even in this life, is distinctively catholic. And thus the raising of the dead is most eminently representative, with us, of the ministerial power to forgive the sinner. Hence, in the three instances of resurrection recorded in the Gospel, there is scarcely a circumstance related, which does not strike the catholic's mind, as containing an analogy with what he sees in the sacrament of penance. And they whose ministry is employed in it, will, more than others, feel the resemblances. We will rapidly enumerate them.

1. There are three dead raised, each of whom represents a different class of sinners. The first is just dead—the beginning of sin: the second is being carried to the grave—the commencing of habitual transgression: the third is buried and lying in corruption—the obstinate and forgetful sinner. With each of these the priest has to deal; and he finds in each a practical lesson.

2. The first is indeed a corpse, but the minstrel and the multitude are still around it—the world and its vanities ministering to the dead spirit! When he that would raise it to life approaches it, and speaks of his wish, they laugh him to scorn. They must be put away; silence and quiet are necessary to raise the soul. Peter is there with his keys, James with his earnest zeal, and John with his gentle charity. A kindly hand is stretched out, and in the power of that hand, the dead one rises. And what shall be done next with her, that is, with the soul? He who has raised her, “bids them give her to eat.”* As there was a banquet when the prodigal returned, as there was feasting and rejoicing when the stray sheep was brought back, so surely must there be a rich and dainty repast, to refresh the dear daughter of the house, brought back to life. Did the mother spare, that day, her sweetest stores? Did the ruler of the synagogue stint of his richest cellarage, to warm his child's frame, or to make his congratulating guests rejoice? And shall the Church, to whose motherly care the revived soul is committed, be less parent-like than they? Will not she have her banquet too, ready? and for the hour, is not she the dearest to her,

* Mat. ix. 23; Lu. viii. 55. Compare the two accounts.

who has been the most cruelly severed from her, of her children? and is not the feast for her especially? Surely so, as it was for the prodigal. And how strange, but how beautiful, that, as if intending to show us the identity of the two lessons, in the parable and the miracle, our Lord should have made the prodigal's father say: "Let us eat and make merry; because *this my son was dead, and is come to life again*, was lost and is found."* The dead raised, and the prodigal returned, are one and the same: and both must be refreshed. This is, indeed, what the Catholic Church alone understands.

3. The second has left home, the house of the weeping mother: strong ones are bearing him to the grave. A stronger hand must arrest them in this cruel errand. At its touch, they that carry must needs stand still: a more powerful command is uttered, and the dead youth rises from his bier. What shall be done with *him*? What the Samaritan did with the poor wounded man, after he had dressed his wounds. He gave him in charge to the inn-keeper, to provide for all his wants. And here there is one by, the one by whose tears Jesus was moved to exert His power, far better than the inn-keeper—for she is his mother. "And He gave him to his mother."† There is something inexpressibly sweet in this expression. Was he not her's before? Had death broken the filial tie, and did it need to be renewed? No, but a new and tenderer relation was established: by birth she had rights over him; but the second life which Jesus bestowed was His: and His rights He resigned to her. He was to be doubly her child, because he was a second time given to her by Him: and he had from henceforward, to pay to her the gratitude, the obedience, and the filial love, which He might have claimed for Himself. Yes, truly; He has given repentant sinners to His Church, as the tenderest part of her charge. And to the ear of loving children, there is an undersound in this phrase, mystically soothing and consoling. "And He gave him to His Mother," sounds so like a prelude to the sweetest words ever uttered on Calvary. For how else could He *give* a son to his mother, but by saying: "Woman, behold thy son?"†

4. Finally, Lazarus has been four days in the grave:

* Lu. xv. 24.

† Ib. vii 15.

† Jo. xix. 26.

“Quatriduanus est, jam foetet,” say his own sisters, who are not likely to exaggerate the foulness of his condition. And here groans and supplications are necessary, and the uplifting of heavy obstructions, and the drawing forth from corruption of the dead thing, that once was a living man, by a strong command; and then comes the loosing him from his bands, as he starts to life. How distinctly allusive to the power to bind and to loose are these words: “And presently he that had been dead came forth, *bound* feet and hands with winding-bands, and his face was *bound* about with a napkin. Jesus said to them: *Loose him*, and let him go.”* He did not do so Himself, but He commissioned others. *They* have to loose for Him those bound in the *laquei mortis*, “the toils of death.” And where do we next meet Lazarus? Precisely where we might expect. At Bethania “they made Jesus a supper, and Martha served, but *Lazarus was one of them that was at table with Him.*”† It is always the same—the banquet for the recovered dear one. But here it is quite defined: he who a few days before was dead, was lying reeking in corruption, even he is at table with Jesus. O holy, sweet, loving Church of God! How we recognise thee at every step, in the workings of love divine among men! Unchanged as Himself, thy Spouse and Master, forgetting not one of His examples, dropping not one of His blessed words, how dost thou renew, day by day, the beauty of His character reflected in thee, and the splendour of His institutions, ever fresh in thy right hand!

It is an invidious, and we sincerely believe, a hopeless task, to examine the claims of others to similar coincidences. They may say that all these minute comparisons are fanciful and arbitrary. There is an easy test. Show that they can be made in some other system, and we will own it. If not, whence comes it that the catholic system alone, yea, the corrupt, the superstitious, the silly, the unspiritual system of Popery should furnish throughout, not a faint resemblance, but a minute, distinct, and lively counterpart, to what our Saviour did in His greatest works on earth?

III. *Extreme Unction.* It is worthy of note, that St. Mark, who generally is considered to follow closely St. Matthew, should alone have preserved for us three instan-

* Jo. xi. 44.

† Ib. xii. 2.

ces of cures by external rites. Two we have already seen, in the restoring to health of a blind, and of a deaf and dumb, man.* The third remains; and to Catholics is most interesting. It is the following. The apostles "cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them."† This calls to mind the well-known text of St. James: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."‡ The resemblance of this text of St. Mark's narrative, suggests at once to the Catholic the type of Extreme Unction in these first apostolic miracles. A few remarks will here suffice.

1. We do not find recorded any where, directions from our Saviour to His apostles, to use this means of cure. Yet though three evangelists (including St. Mark) give us in detail His instructions, and this practice of anointing is not mentioned by any, we cannot hesitate for a moment, to believe that it was prescribed by Himself. This will show us how His institution must be assumed in other cases, where we find practised by His disciples what we do not read to have been commanded. When, therefore, St. James enjoins, unhesitatingly, the anointing by the priest, as to be followed by remission of sins; as we must suppose the miraculous cures wrought by the unction, to be proof of divine appointment, so we may well conclude, that the more wonderful effect of forgiveness of sins could not have been attributed to the same act, unless an equally supreme sanction and promise had been attached to it. It was, therefore, a sacramental action, and as such permanent.

2. We may consider this an established principle, that what was instituted for men's souls was to remain; what for their temporal benefits was temporary. We have an example in the appointment of deacons. On the face of the institution, it was to serve a merely casual and secular purpose, "to serve tables," or distribute alms.§ But it becomes evident from St. Paul's description of the diaconal character,|| that they were invested with an ecclesiasti-

* vii. 34, viii. 23.

† Mar. vi. 13.

‡ James v. 14.

§ Acts vi. 2.

|| 1 Tim. iii. 8.

cal dignity; and they were ordained by imposition of the apostles' hands.* The Anglican establishment has reasoned wisely in this case, that, though the temporal functions of the deacons have ceased, it does not follow that the institution itself ended with them, even though they were the immediate cause of the appointment. What was temporal was temporary, and no longer continues; but the spiritual gifts and duties subsist to the end. In like manner it has reasoned rightly, (though it has sadly failed in application of its reasoning,) that what was *purely* miraculous in divine commission, was a personal gift to the apostles; what was of spiritual benefit to the Church, was to descend to their successors. But it could not see in St. James's text the same distinction, and separate the spiritual benefits of forgiveness of sins, from the raising up of the sick man; and consider the one as enduring, the other as, *perhaps*, temporary. Yet a clear analogy would have led any one of sense, unblinded by puritanical hatred of forms, so to conclude.

3. But the Catholic Church has no need of such explanations. She takes the text as it is; as the fulfilment of the whole of Christ's promise. The Apostles are to do His works, and greater than His visible works. And in the catholic doctrine of Extreme Unction, this is believed by us to be done. That bodily health is frequently restored by it, no experienced priest doubts from his own observation, independently of the Church's teaching. This is the work equal to Christ's. That sins are forgiven by the sacrament, no catholic is allowed to doubt. This is the work greater than men saw Him do on earth. It was the same when St. James wrote. The miraculous, the visible, the striking effect was allowed to continue the more marked and attractive. But who that judges, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual,"† will for a moment imagine, that in St. James's mind, the raising to health could have been considered a primary effect of any institution or rite, which at the same time gave pardon of sin? Or that this, when certain of effect, and consequently most salutary to man, could ever have been held secondary to the healing of the body? Those who have seen that beautiful spectacle, the sudden kindling up of St. Peter's in Rome at Easter night's illumination, will remember

* Acts vi. 6.

† 1 Cor. ii. 13.

how in each lamp was a heap of light inflammable materials, which, touched by the torch, instantly blazed brilliantly forth, but quickly faded. This was not the lamp destined to burn through the night, but was only meant to light this up. For when the first flash had subsided, the steady light which succeeded it, though far less dazzling, fed upon unfailling nourishment, and in spite of wind or rain, burnt unflinching to the end. Such was this, such were other institutions. Two lights were kindled at the same moment; but one obscured, or over-shone the other. The first was the brilliant, miraculous gift: that of tongues in Confirmation, that of healing in Extreme Unction. These gifts were made for a time, and proved the reality of that constant, perpetual grace, which was for the while obscured by them. And when they were withdrawn, they left that other undying flame burning as brightly as at the beginning; for its invisible, unfailling oil, is the unction of the Anointed.

IV. *The Blessed Eucharist.* It would indeed have been strange, if miracles had been wanting to foreshow the miracle of spiritual miracles. But there are such, and most splendid, most perfect, and most beautifully illustrative of the Catholic doctrine. We will dwell upon these, though not at the length which the importance of the subject deserves.

1. Our blessed Lord Himself has furnished us with a clue to the connection between the first and His own institution. He who did nothing without a design, intended to communicate His doctrine respecting this food of life: and by way of preliminary, He led the people into the wilderness like Moses, and there miraculously fed them. Five thousand men, besides women and children, were fully satisfied with five loaves and two fishes. Nor was the feast exhausted. Twelve baskets of fragments of bread remained: and who doubts that these would have sufficed, as well as the original loaves, to feed as many more? The people saw the analogy between this feast, and that of manna in the desert; and through it, our Saviour led them to His heavenly discourse on the B. Eucharist. The other three Evangelists record this miracle, but not the doctrinal teaching which resulted from it.* Two of them relate a similar miracle, where

* Mat. xiv. 15; Mar. vi. 42; Lu. ix. 16; Jo. vi. 11.

four thousand were similarly fed.* The repetition of a miracle, of such magnitude, seems intended, as it is calculated, to fix our thoughts upon it.

First, we must be struck with the motive of the miracle—it was compassion:—"I have compassion on the multitude." Who but the Catholic familiarly calls the Eucharist the "Sacrament of love?" It is to others a commemorative rite, intended to revive the memory of Christ's passion. But as an outpouring of divine affection, as the communication of God's love to man, it is only by us that it is regarded. We consider it instituted out of compassionate love for man, as medicine, as food, as support, as riches, as a dainty, to strengthen and cheer him in the desert of this barren life.

Secondly, this miracle was not an individual one, not a prerogative or favour. It required no particular state, beyond appetite or desire, to receive it. Food was given to the strong man as to the feeble, to the healthy as to the sickly, to the young as to the old, to the rich as to the poor. One relished it keenly, another barely took it as sustenance: one enjoyed its flavour, another seemed scarcely to taste it. One expressed himself warmly in gratitude, another appeared barely thankful. But there it was for all, for the mere asking; and when it was over, it was hardly a thing to talk about: one would hardly boast of having partaken of that bread, as one would of having been restored to sight by Jesus; and men would not have gone to a distance to see a person who had eaten of that miraculous food, as they went to Bethania to see Lazarus, raised from the dead.† And this, because the miracle left no visible evidence after it: because it was for the benefit of so many, (which only made it the greater,) and because it bore such a homely aspect. Such also is the feeling with regard to the blessed Eucharist. Its wonderful mysterious effects do not strike, nor unhappily excite the gratitude and admiration it deserves. But, like the bread of the desert, it is the food for all—"sumit unus, sumunt mille:" and it is partaken of by all manner of characters, the fervent and the lukewarm, the strong in grace and the feeble in desire, the rich in virtue and the poor.

Thirdly, in this miracle, our Saviour does not act,

* Mat. xv. 32; Mar. viii. 6.

† Jo. xii. 9.

beyond, by His blessing, multiplying the bread. Its distribution He leaves to His apostles. They arrange the throng, they carry round the food, they give to each his share, they satisfy all, they treasure up the fragments; and lo! wonder of wonders! they reserve as much as they began with, the self-same food comes for the next comers, and they may come in thousands, and it shall suffice.

Fourthly, the miracle thus meets one of the most popular objections against the catholic doctrine concerning this Sacrament, that many partake of the same food at the same time; "*nec sumptus consumitur.*" For it is not said that our Lord created new bread, nor diluted what there was, so to speak. From beginning to end of the banquet, they were the same five loaves and two fishes, which were eaten by this hungry crowd, and the fragments left would have made up the same loaves and fishes again. Any other theory alters the character of the miracle. It would not be that our Lord fed 5000 people *with five loaves*, but that having *but* five loaves, he created, say 4995 more, to give each person one. In that case, there being five loaves at the beginning had nothing to do with the miracle; this consists in the creating of the others. Then, according to the Gospel narrative, more than five thousand persons were actually eating the same food, and each one had enough, and it was not consumed. How was this? The catholic answer is plain and simple; in the same manner, as it happens every day in the blessed Eucharist. One miracle is a counterpart to the other.

2. Another great objection to the Catholic doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist, is directed against Transubstantiation. The change of one substance into another, seems opposed to all our notions. And yet we believe modern chemistry is fast approaching to conclusions which will greatly modify that old pretended contradiction of science. Such a change is no doubt miraculous; and against this perpetuation of miracles protestantism protests. But that is of its essence. Our dear Lord, therefore, was pleased to make the evidencing of such a transubstantiation His very first miracle.* We will make but a few remarks upon it.

First, it was at a feast that He was first pleased to

* Jo. ii. 9.

manifest himself to the world. It was by a feast, that He closed His ministerial career. At that first feast at Cana, He emerged from His first state, His hidden life; at the second, He passed again into its last stage, its sorrowful and afflicted close. The first was a marriage feast: and what was the last? let loving Spouses, like St. Catharine, or St. Rose, or St. Juliana answer. What must that feast be, at which, for the first time, is poured forth the "vinum germinans virgines?" How like are these two feasts!

Secondly, at the first feast the wine fails. Of water there is abundance; but the nobler beverage is wanting. How is the desire of the guests to be satisfied? By changing the ignoble into the noble, the water into wine. Here is the first stage of change, the first exercise of the transmuting power. What must the next naturally be? Wine was the richest, most generous, most invigorating of nature's productions. Earth could yield nothing more excellent than the vine and its fruit. The water, which filtering through the earth, is caught by its roots, elaborated into its sap, distilled into its grape, and there sweetened by the sun, is raised in nature and qualities, in the estimation of men. Our blessed Lord, by one simple action, gave it that higher existence. Then *it* must now be changed again at the second feast. And for whom? For *us* who want—not wine, not earthly growth, of any sort. Man was surfeited of that, and called for better refreshment. If the first transubstantiation was so great and so worthy of the power that made it, what shall we find, into which the wine itself shall be changed? There is but one stream, a draught from which would refresh, renew, revive our fainting race: but who shall dare to ask it? It was of "the water out of the cistern that is in Bethlehem," (the house of bread,) that David longed to drink, but he shuddered to partake, saying: "The Lord be merciful to me, that I may not do this: shall I drink the blood of these men?"* And it is from the well-spring of Bethlehem that we too thirst to drink; but we must not shrink from the awful draught—the priceless *Blood* of Him that opens it. No, there is only one change more that can be made; the wine must become a living flow from His divine Heart. Only thus shall the second feast surpass the first.

* 2 Reg. xxiii. 17.

Thirdly. But it will be said: "in the first miracle the change was visible, was tested by the senses: in the second, as catholics believe it, this evidence is wanting. Here your parallel fails." Quite the contrary. Hereby is shown the superiority of the second miracle. That which is worthy of a miracle to be its type, is proved thereby of a higher nature. If in the Eucharist the transubstantiation were sensible, there would have needed none to precede it at Cana. The latter would have been so far useless. But it is a much greater and higher miracle to have a change made and yet concealed, than to have a visible and patent mutation. The latter could not be an object of faith, and objects of sense belong to the inferior order. The change was once made visibly, that God's power should be manifested, for whenever He should please to make it invisibly. They who gainsay it in the latter case, say to Him: "Let it be as it was at Cana and we will believe Thee: but in our theory they only are blessed who believe because they see."*

3. The Eucharist, according to Catholic doctrine, perpetuates the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ on earth. He is in it God and Man, in the fulness of His perfections. One remarkable quality of His sacred Person, when He lived a visible man, was, that virtue ever went from Him, and healed all. † This unceasing flow of miraculous energy, this atmosphere of life which invested Him, as with a robe of majesty, the Church verifies, and may be said daily to feel. It is indeed hard to make this understood, for it belongs to the hidden influences of religion, more to be felt than to be expressed. But devout souls will know our meaning: they will have experienced the fervour, the peace, the confidence, the love which the mere presence of the B. Sacrament inspires, in prayer, and meditation; the soothing and tranquilizing influence which It has on their troubled and agitated or anxious minds. What religious community would stand the privation of

* Of *Matrimony* we will content ourselves with saying that the Catholic rite is singularly and beautifully interwoven with the Mass or Eucharistic sacrifice, only similarly interrupted for the hallowing of the sacramental oils; as though to copy our Lord's example, of uniting the marriage-feast with the foreshadowing of the Sacrament of the altar.

† Mat. ix. 20; xiv. 36; Mar. iii. 10; v. 30; Lu. viii. 46.

this society? On what would the chaste love of the Spouses of Jesus live, if they had not Him near them, and if after the Martha-like duties of their charity towards men, they could not often take the place of Mary at His feet, and there, in silent contemplation of His mercy and graciousness, and loveliness, repair the slight distractions of the day, and refill their lamps with that love of God, which burns outwardly as charity for man?

That this influence of this adorable mystery is real and not imaginary, is proved by its effects on those who know nothing of it. We could mention several cases of conversion from it: we will content ourselves with two, because we received them both from the mouths of those whom they regard.

The first is that of the late worthy and pious priest, the Rev. Mr. Mason. He had been a Wesleyan preacher for some years, and we heard him declare in a public sermon, to a large congregation, that his conversion was due mainly to this; that whenever he entered a catholic church or chapel, he felt himself awed, hushed to silence, and compelled to kneel in adoration, though no worship was going on; whereas, in his own meeting house, he never experienced any such feelings. Yet he was totally unconscious of the cause; and when he learnt the Catholic belief and practice, in regard to the B. Eucharist, he was so convinced of the adequacy of the cause of his emotions, that he hesitated not to yield to their evidence, and became a Catholic.

The second is that of the Baroness K—, well known to many for her abilities, her piety, and her many good works. She was a German Protestant, strongly imbued with prejudices against the Catholic religion. Coming to Rome, she entered the church of the perpetual adoration, where the B. Sacrament is exposed to worship the whole day. She saw many people, in silent prayer, bowed down, or gazing intently towards the altar. Ignorant of the object which engaged their attention, observing only a multitude of lights upon the altar, but as yet without sense of His presence, “who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks,”* she exclaimed: “Good God! surely these people are not adoring those tapers!” But she found herself, in spite of herself, gently forced upon her knees, and compelled to worship—she knew not what.

* Apoc. ii. 1.

She returned again and again, marvellously attracted, and ever with the same effect. It was a year before she discovered the truth, and became aware Who was there; and with gushing tears did she deplore to us, that year, as she called it, of grace resisted, and of time lost.

To some, perhaps to many, of our readers, these things will sound foolish and fanatical. But there is a phrase that accounts for this. When Nathanael would not believe that the Messiah could come from Nazareth, "Philip saith to him, *Come and see.*"* And to this there is a corresponding one in the Old Testament: "Taste and see how sweet is the Lord."† We have known a convert whom God soon transferred from her life of suffering, but of joy, here below, to one of unclouded bliss above, whom conversion at once changed from a pleasure-seeking worldling, into a devout and cheerful servant of God; who when debarred, herself, from approaching to holy communion, would gently draw close to those who came from receiving it, and feel a glow of comfort and a ray of happiness shed into her own heart; the virtue going forth from the sacred Humanity of Jesus, even though lodged in a frail tabernacle of clay.

"Expertus potest credere
Quid sit Jesum diligere."

But if this experience of the children of the household, be scarcely intelligible to those without, what shall we say of another experience, most awful to think of, that of fear of this latent virtue? It will be hardly credited, but we know it on the best authority, that persons wavering in the Anglican establishment, and leaning strongly towards catholicity, are forbidden, by what they call, their directors, ever to enter into any chapel in which the B. Sacrament is kept! In other words, they fear lest Jesus Christ Himself, in whose presence they profess to believe, should entice them by His sweetness, from a system which has lost Him. They dare not trust one of their flock to *His* guidance!

But, drawing now our remarks to a close, we will observe, that in the catholic Church all is true, real, and consistent. Not a promise of our Lord's there falls through. If he gave the power of miracles to His Apostles,

* Jo. ii. 40.

† Ps. xxxiii. 9.

it was coupled with the greater power of working spiritual wonders: and while that first faculty is not withdrawn but reserved for occasions that require it, the other is permanent and of daily use. The catholic mind becomes as familiar with this, as we all do with the wonders of nature. "My Father worketh until now; and I work,"* says our divine Redeemer. Their work is one, but its operations are divided. What the Father doth in the order of nature, the Son performs in the order of grace. To us, each is equally real, as equally invisible. The One speaks to the waters of the deep, and they teem with life, and send forth the birds, and the creeping things of the earth; the other breathes upon them, and they give to grace a new progeny, a regenerated humanity. The One commands the winds, and they pass over the earth, rough or gentle at will, but always cleansing, renewing and recreating; the Other sends His Spirit upon the soul: and He breathing where and how He willeth, purges, and frees from corruption the spiritual being, and renovates its fading life. The One, with kindly look lights up the heavens with gladness, and feeds the sun's unfailing radiance; the Other casts his fire upon the earth, and straightways it is enkindled: it sparkles, through the soul, like a vivid electric dart in the youth, as he kneels to receive the Holy Ghost; it is strongly but steadily lighted in the sacerdotal breast, for a beacon, set on high to guide frail barks to a safe haven, as a furnace in which every passion has to be consumed and every virtue annealed, as a cheering domestic glow, round which the child and the old man will gladly gather for warmth. The One diffuses life through all nature; sends His seasons and their various energies to earth; distributes its shower and its dew, vivifies the corrupting grain, and makes it shoot forth bread for man, and sends through the plant its nourishing juices, to come out first fair in blossom, and then salubrious in fruit: the other sows on earth a corn and a wine that gladden the heart of man; scatters His harvest and His vintage over His Church, and with their unfailing succulency, feeds, sustains, cheers and refreshes the unseen world of the spirit, the immortal part and being of man.

We can see nothing to disbelieve in the one, more than in the other series of marvellous operations,—God is in

* Jo. v. 17.

both; the same power, the same wisdom, and the same love. This is the Catholic's simple thought; he believes the order of grace to be as real as that of nature; holds the existence of a spiritual, as much as of a physical, life. He believes that Jesus Christ has promised to be *with* His Church *all days* to the end of the world:* and he cannot understand this in any other sense, than in one becoming Him, as promising, not a distant superintendance, nor an occasional assistance, but a close and intimate association, and a daily by-standing, † to borrow an expressive word. *Ego operor*, "I work," is His invaluable word; and this accounts for any amount of superhuman agency in the Church. "Peter baptizes," says St. Augustine;—"it is Christ that baptizes: Judas baptizes;—it is Christ that baptizes." And so it is in all other sacramental mysteries. The hand that blesses is Christ's; the hand that consecrates is Christ's; the hand that anoints is Christ's; the hand that absolves is Christ's; the same hand that touched the eyes and they saw, that was laid on the sick and they arose, that took hold of the dead and he lived. This realization in fact of our divine Lord's presence in His Church, as an active, daily, and hourly truth, forms the difference between Catholic and Protestant belief on the Church. Thus protestants can imagine the Church disunited—the note of unity in abeyance, as was lately said—then Christ is not there. For He cannot be disunited. His presence must be conceived to be a mere theoretical one, not an incorporation of Himself with the Church. They can believe her, even in general councils, to err. Then Christ is not really there *with* her: He is not truly in the midst of the more than two or three gathered together in His name. They can believe in no inherent virtue in the B. Eucharist, and repudiate its adoration: then He is not truly there present. In fine, they have no confidence in their own sacerdotal functions: they *dare* not ask for absolution from *any* clergyman, but only from certain initiated men, like those admitted to the mysteries of old: then Christ is not in the ministerial act, but comes into it through the godliness of the minister. But, to the Catholic, this assistance is actual on our Lord's part; it is not a theory, but a fact; and he believes in it as naturally as he does in God's providence, of which it is only a

* Mat. xxviii. 20.

† *Beistand* Germ. assistance.

specific operation. Hence these wonderful effects of the Church's ministrations cease to be in his eyes miracles; they are only dispensations of grace.

And in truth, if further we consider what is a miracle, we shall find that it bears a twofold aspect,—the Jewish and the Christian. The perversity of the Jews consisted in a call for signs that could be *seen*. “Unless you *see* signs and wonders you believe not,”* was our Saviour's reproach to them. “Master,” they ask, “we wish to *see* a sign from you.”† This was the lowest stage of belief: and could only lead to knowledge of that inferior class of wonders, which meets the senses. To this alone protestantism is able to reach; and even in that it stands on so slippery a downward descent, that it easily falls over into the gulf of rationalism and infidelity. It calls ever out for the testimony of its eyes, just like the Jews. But the christian rule of faith is very different. “Faith comes from *hearing*,”‡ and not from seeing; and this is the Catholic evidence. By this alone the true wonders of God can be found; by this only are the real miracles of revelation discovered. The Jewish shepherd looked at the manger in Bethlehem, and contemplated its miracles with awe. The heavens had opened to him, and its radiant host had sung for him a wonderful hymn of jubilee; a brilliant star had glided from the east athwart the firmament, and had drawn after it the kings of earth. But to the christian eye, the real miracle is, that the child in that manger, between an ox and an ass, is “true God of true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made.” Before this knowledge, which the sight reveals not, all seen marvels sink into insignificance.

When Jesus was brought before Herod, he wished to *see* Him perform a miracle, § and Jesus refused to gratify his insolent curiosity. What fitting miracle could He have wrought under such circumstances? He might most justly have struck the profligate idiot with blindness, as St. Paul did Elymas: || and it would have been a just punishment, as well as a true sign. Yet a sign was wrought before him, and a wonder that made angels weep with amaze-

* Jo. iv. 47.

† Mat. xii. 38.

‡ Rom x. 17.

§ Luc. xxiii. 8.

|| Acts xiii. 8.

ment; and we see it, but that worthless infidel did not. It was the eternal Wisdom clad in a fool's coat, and the Son of God, mocked by a stupid rabble of courtiers,—and no fire came down from heaven on them.

When, finally, the cross is raised on Calvary, and the sun is darkened, and the earth quakes, and the mountains are rent, and the veil of the temple is torn, and the dead arise: here surely are miracles and signs enough to satisfy even a Jew's gaping curiosity. But the christian heeds them not: the greatest of miracles is on that cross. The eclipsing of that Sun of justice;—the quivering of His frame;—the breaking of His heart;—the rending of His humanity;—the death of a God;—absorb all other thoughts and feelings, and make Redemption, the marvel of marvels, alone attended to.

In perfect consistency with this principle, is the Catholic view of the Miracles of the New Testament: they are the noble, and the most perfect counterpart of the unseen wonders of the Christian dispensation.

- ART. III.—1. *First, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Reports from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to enquire into the operation of the Irish Poor Law, and the expediency of making any amendment in its enactments, and to report thereon to the House. Together with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, March—July, 1849.*
- 2.—*First, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th, Reports from the Select Committee on Poor Laws, (Ireland.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, March—June, 1849.*
- 3.—*Report from the Select Committee, on the Fisheries of Ireland, together with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence and Appendix. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 20 July, 1849.*
- 4.—*First Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to enquire into the expediency of a Legislative Enactment being introduced, to enable possessors of Entailed Estates,*

to charge such Estates with a sum to be limited, for the purpose of Draining and otherwise permanently improving the same, and to report thereon to the House, together with the Minutes of Evidence. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 6 June, 1849.

- 5.—*First and second Reports from the Select Committee on Receivers, Courts of Chancery and Exchequer, (Ireland,) together with the Minutes of Evidence, Appendix, and Index. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 29 June, and 11 July, 1849.*
- 6.—*12 Vict. c. 5. An Act to authorize an advance of Money for the relief of certain distressed Poor Law Unions in Ireland.*
- 7.—*12 Vict. c. 23. An Act to authorize further advances of Money for the improvement of Landed Property, and the extension and promotion of Drainage and other works of public utility in Ireland.*
- 8.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 59. An Act to amend an Act of the tenth year of her Majesty, for facilitating the improvement of Landed Property in Ireland.*
- 9.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 62. An Act to authorize the advance of Money out of the Consolidated Fund, to the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland Company.*
- 10.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 95. An Act to amend the law concerning Judgments in Ireland.*
- 11.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 100. An Act to promote the advance of private Money for Drainage of Lands in Great Britain and Ireland.*
- 12.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 104. An Act to amend the Acts for the more effectual relief of the Destitute Poor in Ireland.*
- 13.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 105. An Act to convert the renewable Leasehold tenure of Lands in Ireland, into a tenure in Fee.*
- 14.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 77. An Act further to facilitate the sale and transfer of Encumbered Estates in Ireland.*
- 15.—*12 and 13 Vict. c. 86. An Act to provide additional funds for loans by the Public Works Loan Commissioners, for building Workhouses in Ireland.*

AT the commencement of last year, we expressed our despair of obtaining any effective measures for the relief of the country from a Parliament of Landlords. Many of our readers probably thought that we were not justified in expressing such unqualified distrust, but the records of the past Session place beyond a doubt the correctness of our anticipations. We have this additional conclusive evidence—the confession of one of those who

are to carry out the panacea of the Session. Dr. Longfield was examined on the 17th May, before the select Committee of the House of Commons, on the Poor Laws. He was then acquainted with the measures which the Government proposed to carry. He had examined the encumbered Estates Bill, and thought it would "be perfectly efficient," (Q. 9310,) and possibly had some notion that he would be one of the Commissioners. Yet notwithstanding all this, to the question, "Do you conceive that any measures which have already been submitted to Parliament, as far as you have seen them, have a tendency to prevent the recurrence of the evils which are now complained of?" his answer was, "None whatever;" and to its repetition in another form, "Can you see a prospect of the country being restored from the condition in which it is now placed by those evils?" his answer again was, "No, no prospect whatever, except that arising from a hope and wish that the country may amend." (Q. 9353, 9355.)

A glance at the titles of the Acts passed should satisfy any reasonable person of the character of the legislation from which, forsooth, we were to expect relief. It is obviously the legislation of a club of landlords. No one should be surprised at that circumstance,—it was impossible that the result could be otherwise. The question of our weal or woe is a landlord and tenant question; and while the landlords retain the solution of it in their own hands exclusively, it cannot be determined in a manner satisfactory to the rest of the community. Who expects from a congress of princes measures for the abolition or restraint of royal prerogatives, and the establishment and promotion of popular rights? Did our negroes ever derive any benefit from the deliberations of a colonial assembly of slave-drivers?

We feel strongly, too, that while the taxpayers of these realms allow the legislature to waste their hard earned money in subsidizing the landlords in their crusade against the people of this island, and in covering their crimes and blunders with a mantle of charity, bedizened with "gifts," "grants," "loans," and "advances," we must continue miserable. The course now pursued towards the landlords and their victims, is precisely analogous with that pursued for the last century and a half, towards the dynasties of the continent. There are the loans of money to maintain their credit and stimulate them to exertion,

and supplies of troops to collect their revenues and protect them from the natural consequences of a prolonged system of intolerable wrong. The people of England now see the folly of that policy with regard to the continent; and until they see the folly of it with regard to this country, we must be the victims of a system of government that sets at defiance the dictates of common sense, and all the elemental recognised principles of political science.

The annual cost of these Subsidies is not undeserving of consideration; we think that it equals the Income tax. We may be wrong, but these are the grounds of our opinion. Let the reader bear in mind, that we do not profess to be profound financiers, or accountants, or even to understand the mysteries of the financial relations of the two islands, or to dare to look farther back than 1817, when the two Exchequers were consolidated. We merely cast up from returns of our annual income and expenditure furnished to Parliament last year on the motion of M. M'Gregor, the following figures.

It appears that from 1817 to 1848, both inclusive, our total income—that is to say, “the total payments into the Exchequer on account of revenue, and on account of repayments of advances for public works, employment of the poor, distress, &c.,” amounted to £129,424,200, “the total annual charge for Ireland,” to £243,258,340, and the “amount provided from the British Exchequer to make good the total annual charge for Ireland,” to £113,834,140, and further, that the sums so advanced from the British Exchequer in the three last years of the account, amounted to £15,843,391. The matter does not rest there—we further learn that “the loans of £8,000,000, (10 Vict. c. 9, 1847,) and £2,000,000, (11 and 12 Vict. c. 125, 1848,) although virtually raised for the service of Ireland, do not appear in the public accounts under that head,” and that “the figures above, under Army ordnance, &c., only show the amount issued out of the Exchequer in Ireland for these services, and not the whole expense under these heads; the larger portion of which was defrayed from the English Exchequer, but the amount cannot be stated, nor can any statement be given of the naval expenditure of Ireland.” The minor portion of the charge for the army alone, is stated, for the 32 years at £34,180,927.

But it will be said, the payments here do not give a fair representation of our payments to the Exchequer, as we

bring tea and other foreign articles from England, on which the duty is paid there, and our quit rents and other land revenues, appear only in the general accounts of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, and we consequently get no credit for them. In a return made last session, on the motion of Sir Robert Ferguson, of the accounts of our revenue and expenditure for the last three years, there is the following:—

“ Abstract of the Net Produce of the Revenue of Ireland, paid into the Exchequer in the Years ended the 5th January, 1847, 1848, and 1849.

	1847.	1848.	1849.
	£.	£.	£.
Customs	2,258,043	2,009,133	2,069,773
Excise	1,467,060	1,152,932	1,321,915
Stamps	573,767	567,996	532,924
Post Office	29,000	59,000	39,000
Miscellaneous, including Repayment of Advances	364,592	536,783	311,863
£.	4,692,462	4,325,844	4,275,375”

And from a note it appears that the amount received from quit-rents and other sources of Land Revenue in Ireland in the last five years, is as follows:—

		£.	s.	d.
“ 1844 ending 31 March 1845		61,538	7	2
1845 ” 1846		55,920	6	11
1846 ” 1847		50,107	2	1
1847 ” 1848		54,178	6	6
1848 ” 1849		51,618	18	4”

And the following is a statement showing the annual average quantities of the principal foreign articles retained for home consumption, in each of the years ended the 5th day of January, 1847, 1848, and 1849, respectively; viz.—

Wine of all sorts.	Foreign Spirits of all sorts.	Cotton Wool.	Silk, raw and thrown.	Tobacco.	Tea.
Gallons.	Gallons.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
633,945	43,044	604,300	329	5,949,691	6,975,959
512,319	210,205	77,894	3	5,101,139	6,513,853
549,755	209,665	1,038,016	11,621	5,138,314	6,713,272
Coffee.	Timber not sawn or split.	Timber sawn or Split.	Sugar, raw and Foreign refined.	Flax Seed.	
Lbs.	Loads.	Loads.	Cwt.	Bushels.	
1,516,330	111,107	116,562	568,767	256,250	
1,739,046	78,827	60,048	597,101	113,011	
1,313,951	92,515	82,109	510,867	184,239	

In addition to the above articles, we retained in the three years collectively, 122 great hundreds of battens and deals, 23 tons of unwrought iron, and 10 pounds of cotton yarn.

No one, with these figures before him, can fancy that we pay, at the very utmost, more than a fourth of our entire revenue in England; and even this, we conceive, is more than counterbalanced by the sums supplied from England, to be spent by the army, ordnance, navy, &c., here, beyond the amount of which returns are supplied, and which must be, at the very least, upwards of a million and a half per annum. We have no doubt whatever, that the extra cost of our management to the people of Great Britain is equal to the Income tax. What we cost them last year we do not yet know; but the chances are, that our "pull at the Exchequer" was not below the average. We might form some estimate of the "advances" made to us from the acts whose titles are at the head of this paper, but we do not think it necessary to go more fully into the subject, as it does not concern us. To this circumstance only would we direct attention—the extreme readiness of a Parliament of landlords and capitalists to subsidize their own class, and the impossibility of extracting from them a penny in furtherance of any scheme to save or elevate any other class. In this respect their deliberations are characterised by a unity of object and uniformity of proceeding, which should satisfy the most fastidious of critics. In this light, that item of our expenditure which appears under the head, "Advances out of the Consolidated fund for public works, employment, distress, &c." deserves special notice. In those 32 years there were granted under this head, £19,307,881, in 1846 and 1847 alone, there were £7,040,547 granted, and of this last sum the repayment of £2,331,077 has been already abandoned pursuant to the 10 & 11 Vict. c. 87, in other words, the landlords have been made a present of that sum. In connection with this item, we may notice the Board of Works. This costs the people of Great Britain £39,562 annually, (that is the grant for this year, besides a grant of £24,232 for works connected with it.) Sir Charles Trevelyan, in his evidence before the Committee on the miscellaneous Estimates, stated that its duties are such as are performed in England and Scotland, by private gentlemen in their respective localities. They most commonly are, deepening the beds of rivers and so draining the adjoining lands, making roads through

mountainous districts, &c., &c. If these operations were undertaken for the public benefit, the course would be first to buy up the lands to be improved by the drainage or the roads, and when improved to sell them off again, so that the taxpayers should not lose by the transaction. But this is not thought of; the landlords have the benefit exclusively of these operations. It is clear, that if we had not a legislature of landlords, we should not be obliged to supply them with civil engineers and labourers to improve their estates. Why not supply them with butlers, valets, and house-keepers? In fact, we believe that the people of England will never understand "the Irish difficulty," till some minister, a little bolder than his predecessors, shall propose to place the landlords, their heirs, and assigns for ever on the Pension List.

At the present moment, when retrenchment is the universal subject of consideration in England, and the public creditor is threatened with a diminution of his income, or something worse, our condition becomes one of very great importance to the tax-payers and fund-holders of that country. Whatever they may, at their leisure, think on the subject, it is one of pressing and immediate importance to us. We are now in such a state that it is the duty of every man, who means to remain two years more in the country without being a landlord, fund-holder, placeman, or pauper, to consider seriously its position and his own. Our condition is the most wretched that any people were ever yet reduced to without the intervention of a war devastating their plains and cities. A third of our population is living on charity: nine-tenths of our country gentlemen are reduced to beggary—our farmers are ruined or gone—entire baronies are depopulated. Some of the richest of our counties are burthened to the extent of nearly one pound per acre for poor-rates, labour-rates, and county-cess, without the remotest prospect of relief for the next ten years at the least; and in general, throughout the country, the charges upon the land are so high, and the prices of agricultural produce so low, and there is such a certainty with the present system of government, that the former will continue high and the latter low, that it is quite idle for any farmer to hope to maintain an independence. The landlords, whose welfare depended on the solvency of their tenants, cannot get their rents, are overwhelmed with rates, and are unable to

meet their engagements to their creditors; and thus, at once, bring down to the common vortex, the Protestant clergy, who relied upon their punctual payment of the tithe rent-charge; the country shop-keepers who gave them credit for the necessaries of life; and those numerous respectable families who lived upon the interest of loans and mortgages, and the various other modifications of annuities payable out of the soil. The stagnation of trade and commerce is so great, that our monetary circulation is reduced to nearly half what it was three years ago.* Professional men suffer with the rest of the community; lawyers alone seemed to enjoy an immunity from the universal desolation, and, indeed, to profit by it; but means are now provided to level them too. All these are matters which it concerns every man, no matter what his present rank, station, or property may be, to consider gravely. The ruin of all classes has been steadily progressing for the last four years. Every one of the measures successively enacted for staying it, has had unfortunately the contrary effect. And why? We think because the class, in whose hands the power of legislation was vested, legislated with a view to their own interests only.

Let us now proceed to the proof of this position. At the commencement of last Session, the ruin of all classes was notoriously progressing, and various excellent measures were suggested from every quarter of the country. At that time it was known that thousands of farmers, cottiers, and labourers, had, in the preceding winter, died of cold and hunger, and that the same fate awaited many more, unless it could be averted by the measures to be adopted for their relief. It was known, too, that not one landlord had so suffered, and it was not pretended that any were likely to do so. Yet the deliberations of the two houses of Parliament were confined to the condition of the landlords, and the means of improving it, and the witnesses were selected exclusively with reference to that object. The committee of the house of lords were particularly select in the class of witnesses whom they thought it desirable to consult; to wit, the first, the late and the present chief poor-law commissioners—ten poor-law inspectors—two commissioners of the board of works—a boundary com-

* See this proved in an excellent article in the September number of the Dublin University Magazine.

missioner—the chairman of the emigration commission—six large landed proprietors, (four being chairmen of unions)—the manager of one of the largest estates in Erris—a land agent—the surveyor—and the assistant barrister of the Co. of Mayo—a count (Strzelecki,) who had been resident only twenty months here, administering relief—a lieutenant-colonel (Archer,) who had been for a short time on a visit to a friend near Galway—Joseph Bewley, Esq., the secretary to the Dublin Relief committee of the Society of Friends, and Mr. John Holden, a guardian of the Belfast Union, who went before them expressly to rebut some misrepresentations by a preceding witness respecting the board of that union. The committee of the house of commons were not quite so exclusive. In addition to the late and present chief poor-law commissioners, four poor-law inspectors—one clerk of a union—two commissioners of the board of works—a boundary commissioner—the assistant barrister of Mayo—nine large landed proprietors—two solicitors and a physician, who were guardians respectively of the Skibbereen, Galway, and South Dublin unions, (certainly models for all creation,) they examined four parish priests and the four gentlemen who have filled the chair of political economy in Trinity College. All these witnesses we have catalogued according to their own descriptions of themselves. We at first, fancying that the inquiry was into the condition of the poor, thought it strange that not one farmer, or person who had avowed opinions in favour of farmers and labourers, was examined, and consequently that it was just as if physicians, at the bed-side of a patient, were to ask every one but himself what had happened to him, how he felt, and what would be likely to agree with him; but on reconsideration we discovered our mistake, and saw that all was right and regular, as the comparison should have been with a consultation amongst the crew of a slaver, pursued by an enemy, at which, of course, the victims in the hold would not be called on to assist. The select committee of the house of commons, “to inquire into the state of the law, as respects the appointment of receivers of the Courts of Chancery, and Equity Exchequer in Ireland, and the effect of the present laws and regulations of the said courts, in the management of estates under their controul,” examined “the late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Sir Edward Sugden, the present Master of the

Rolls, one of the Masters of the Court of Chancery, the Second Remembrancer of the Court of Exchequer, together with a member of the Irish bar, and an Irish solicitor ;” and their evidence, we are told, “appeared to your committee to be so full and comprehensive, that it would be unprofitable, at this late period of the Session, to prolong the investigation: nor could your committee expect to obtain any additional information from witnesses of higher authority.” It apparently never occurred to the committee, that anything coming from witnesses of lower authority, could be of the slightest value. By looking to the catalogue of the witnesses, the reader may at once determine what were their views of the causes of our distress, and the remedies for it. We never before, in any public investigation, saw such a thorough illustration of the moral of the story of the besieged town, landlords and officials, being unanimous that there was “nothing like” more power and money to themselves. The committee of the house of lords have published a carefully digested index to the evidence taken before them, and under the head “Distress,” (to “its progressive increase,” 21 witnesses are indexed as bearing testimony,) there is the following enumeration of its causes and remedies:

“Its *causes*:—(1) The famine, or potato failure; (2) subdivision and subletting; (3) noncultivation of the land; (4) conacre; (5) the poor-law; (6) size of electoral divisions; (7) excess of population; (8) amount of rates; (9) depreciation of agricultural produce; (10) want of employment and circulation of capital; (11) want of industrious habits on the part of the people; (12) out door relief. Its *Remedies*:—(1) Emigration by government; (2) individualising of responsibility; (3) introduction of capital; (4) a law of settlement; (5) reduction of the size of electoral divisions; (6) creation of a class of labourers; (7) sale of estates for arrears of rates; (8) undertaking of arterial drainages, &c.; (9) granting of greater powers to landlords; (10) power of exchange of estates as in England; (11) fixing of a high maximum; (12) destruction of the dependance upon the potato and improvement in agriculture; (13) annihilation of small holdings; (14) law of relief similar to the English.”

From the views of the witnesses it is easy to divine those of the Committee. The latter are all, with the exception of the Resolutions against a rate in aid, which were adopted at an early stage of the enquiry, set forth in the 6th. Report. They recommend indoor relief, the erection

of additional workhouses, a rearrangement of electoral divisions, and a uniform revaluation; a reduction of the amount of poor rate which a tenant should be allowed to deduct from his rent, and additional powers to the landlord to recover it by distress or ejection; that the responsibility for arrears of rate, "should be limited to the person or persons originally liable, and to the land upon which such arrears have occurred," that the Quarter-acre clause should be revised and made more effective, that the emigration of the indigent classes should be promoted "on some organized system," and conclude with a flourish about the benevolent contributions of all countries, and the exertions of the Society of Friends, "the assistance wisely given to railroads,"—"the progress of education," and "agricultural instruction,"—and a confession "that much remains to be done," &c., &c.

The Committee of the House of Commons, though not so very exclusive in the class of witnesses whom they selected, were exclusive enough as to the characters of their known opinions, and the subjects of examination. When we recollect what an effort was made by the landlord party to exclude Mr. Poulett Scrope from the Committee, we need not be surprised to find from their reports, that fixity of tenure, location of the poor on the waste lands, the comparative amount of employment afforded by lands in tillage and lands in pasture, the means of creating a numerous and independent yeomanry, seemed to have been forbidden subjects. A witness was allowed to give hearsay evidence of the views of Mill on small farms, and of Blacker's supposed conversion from his errors on that subject. Why not summon these gentlemen to explain their own views? So all the members of the Committee could not have been ignorant of Thornton's suggestions on the subject of peasant properties, small farms and labourers' allotments, or of Dr. Gray's admirable suggestion for imposing different rates on tillage and pasture lands, in consequence of the difference in the amount of employment they respectively afforded. Why were not they examined? There were many others not examined who had acquired some reputation for their views on the subject which the Committee had met to consider, and who would beyond all doubt have been examined by a Committee really bent on ascertaining the truth. We are inclined to think that this Committee would have selected their wit-

nesses as exclusively as the Committee of the House of Lords, from officials and landlords, did they not feel that by examining a few clergymen, they would give an air of candour and impartiality to the enquiry, and believe that political economists were still what they were in the time of Mr. Michael Sadleir, who, describing a "clearance," says, "one such act suffices to make a human monster, a multitude of them a political economist," and that the four from T. C. D. would more than neutralise whatever good sense and charity might fall from the divines. In this latter anticipation they were disappointed. The received cant of political economists was repudiated by these gentlemen, and Mr. Butt even declared his belief, "that to profess to speak as a political economist is generally a mere pretext for perverting common sense." (Q. 10499.) Nothing, however, could prevent the Committee from adopting their foregone conclusions and concurring on all material points (excepting the Rate in Aid question) with the Committee of the House of Lords. The united views of both houses were embodied in the 12 and 13 Vict. c. 104, which contains little more than a formal enactment of most of the resolutions of the Lords' Committee.

It is obvious to any one acquainted with the country, that such paltry alterations of the former law can do no good whatever. The legislature seems to be doggedly persevering in the course which has brought such ruin upon us. Let us take the principal modifications separately; and first, the clauses allowing guardians to spend any amount of rates, or to borrow from the Exchequer Bill Loan Commissioners, (the taxpayers of Great Britain,) any amount not to exceed 11s. 8d. in the pound of the clear yearly value of the property in the district, for the purpose of facilitating the emigration of indigent persons. We are not disposed to discuss the emigration question once a year, but we must observe that the intense selfishness of the landlords blinds them to the change caused by the repeal of the Corn Laws, with regard to the wisdom of emigration so far as they personally are concerned. In order to enable them to understand the question, it is necessary to go to first principles. The political economy of a government of landlords is essentially different from that of all other governments, as its cardinal principle is to have the highest possible rent-roll; whereas, that of other

governments is to have as numerous and independent a population as possible; the greatness of empires being vulgarly, but no doubt erroneously supposed to depend mainly on the numbers of citizens able and willing to defend them. Prior to the repeal of the Corn Laws, that first principle was thus carried into practice. As the owners of the reclaimed arable parts of these islands formed the great majority of our landlord legislators, they had precisely the same interest in preventing the cultivation of the waste lands, as in excluding the produce of other countries. To them it was the same, whether the corn which it was sought to bring into the market in competition with theirs, was the produce of a reclaimed Home, Foreign, or Colonial waste; and for this reason amongst others, the 'wisdom of our ancestors' protected our bogs from the defilement of a spade or shovel, under the pretence of watching them jealously, as fosses round the fortress of our 'Protestant constitution.' And thus the strange circumstance is explained, that though the laws that actually protected them have been repealed;* yet the legislature never has responded to the public cry for their reclamation. The entire area of the island is 18,885,565 statute acres, † and of these 6,290,000 acres are waste—out of which 3,755,000 acres are acknowledged to be worth the cost of reclamation, and the rest, 2,535,000 are said not to be worth it. ‡ Prior to the repeal of the Corn Laws, the landlords of the reclaimed parts were quite right in not encouraging the reclamation of the wastes, as they would be thereby diminishing the value of their own property by a third. Their great object was to have no more acres come into competition with theirs, and to have no more hands on these acres than would produce the highest rental, and whenever the numbers of their vassals should, by any unforeseen misfortune, increase beyond the summum bonum point, to ship off to some country where their industry would be harmless, the surplus, that is to say, all who would be likely to produce more grain and vegetables than they would consume, and so create a larger supply of these articles in the market. Work as the outcasts might on foreign soils, they

* See No. for January last.

† Evidence before the Lords' Committee, Appen. B.

‡ Thornton's Plea for Peasant Proprietors, page 220.

could not interfere with the supply at home, and therefore it was sound policy to remove them; but since the repeal of the Corn Laws it is so no longer. The landlords, however, like hounds on a false scent, still run on with the old cry of emigration. Let them for a moment stop, take breath, and consider the effect of emigration now. Corn is frequently brought to England as ballast from America, and therefore for nothing. An ordinary charge for it is 6d. a bushel. This is less than the cost of conveyance by sea to England, from any of the western ports of this island, or than by land carriage at home for 20 miles. In short, American, and all other foreign produce, may be said to come into competition on equal terms with ours, so far as carriage is concerned. Compare then the effect of labour at home and abroad. In Mill's *Political Economy*, the question is considered whether it is more profitable for a man having an unlimited supply of land, to scrape the surface of all of it, and so raise a crop off all, or to till a few acres well; and he finds that the former course is deemed the more profitable. It is obvious to any one who has had any experience in agriculture, that one man with a plough and a pair of horses, scraping the surface of the rich virgin moulds of America, the Cape, or Australia, will, in the course of a year, raise fifty times more grain than he could in the worn-out loams, or dry crags, or shaking bogs of this country. And therefore his labour there must supersede the labour of twenty men at the least here; and consequently, each labourer sent out renders necessary the emigration of twenty more. And so the process must go on till it becomes as dear and as difficult to raise a crop there as here. This is what has happened already—and this is what will continue to happen till this country is desolated of farmers and labourers, and the landlords or their creditors, (which is much more likely,) have it all to themselves—and not another rate can be levied for the relief or removal of any body.

The reader will forgive us for adding a few words as to the effect of emigration on the permanent greatness of the realm. The numerous body of yeomen and small farmers, that were the strength, pride, and glory of England, while she was struggling for the sovereignty of France, and while she was distracted with the wars of the Roses, were upon the cessation of foreign and internal danger, exterminated by the landlords, in order to make room for large

farmers, that is, men occupying farms ranging from ninety to a hundred acres; and now the successors of these large farmers, who thus participated in the guilt of destroying so many happy homesteads, are themselves, in turn, looked upon as small squatters, and are being "cleared" to make room for renters of four hundred, five hundred, or a thousand acres; and, in fact, it is said, by gentlemen who have studied the subject deeply, understand it well, and believe the ancient small farm system to have been right, that the hundred acre farmers cannot hold on side by side with their more extensive competitors. The effect of that extermination in England was that at a critical period of her history the presence of a few thousand Dutchmen was not without effect in changing her destinies, and that generally she has since relied, to a great extent, on foreign, Scotch, or Irish troops, to fight her battles. At the close of the last war, such was the effect of the extermination system among the Highlanders, that most of the Highland regiments were obliged to recruit here. The Connaught Rangers, who, during that war, were remarkable for, amongst other peculiarities, such breadth of shoulder, that drawn up on parade they occupied more ground, man for man, than any other regiment in the service, were all Mayo men; and Mayo is now a desolate waste, and is to be a pasture-field. If Harry the Fifth, Dundee, and Picton, were to learn that the troops on whom they relied, could be had no more, as they had been "cleared" to make way for Southdowns and Herefords, what would be their opinion of that policy? Does it ever enter into the imagination of the exterminators of the poor in England, Scotland, and here, and their aiders and abettors, that troops may be again wanted for such a long war as the last, or even to drive a foreign enemy from our shores? and if it do, do they fancy that knife-grinders, pin-pointers, and devils'-dustmen, will answer the purpose? Need we again remind them that the Roman empire was ruined by the fifty years' peace, which enabled and encouraged the landlords to "clear" and "consolidate?" Odd and strange as it may at first sight seem, we think it would be the greatest possible blessing to this empire, if an invading army were to land in England, and hold possession of part of it for a few months, as it would teach landlords and capitalists the value of men, and that droves of bullocks, and heaps of tissue paper, are not the only tests

or safeguards of national greatness. We shall mention one other view of the question. Our national debt, and other public liabilities, are now so great, that with our present numbers, we can scarcely meet them. As our numbers diminish, the burthen on each remaining member of society increases. If by the process of famine and emigration, we should be again reduced to a million, could that million pay their public debts and live?

Next take the subject of the restriction of out-door relief, and extension of workhouse accommodation. The poor-law commissioners also echoing the views of the legislature, look to this as the ground on which they mainly rest their hope of contending successfully with the difficulties before them. (Report 4th July, 1849, paragraph 40.) It is absurd to suppose that any such measure can prevent the spread of pauperism. If there were a doubt as to the reality of destitution, the workhouse test might be necessary; but when there is no doubt, how can it be so? It is this test that has ruined the country. If, instead of driving the entire labouring and cottier population into the workhouse, measures had been taken, during the past four years, to give occasional out door relief to families really in want of it, we should not be in our present frightful condition. The consequence of the system is, that if chance drive a man to ask for relief once, he cannot get it without being a pauper for life. How much better would it have been to encourage that feeling of proud independence which, according to the confession of the commissioners in the above report, made many small farmers and cottiers, in the spring of 1848, rather than part with their land, "expose their families to intense privation, and not unfrequently to fatal consequences," that is to say, in unofficial English, to starve and die. The whole scheme is a bad copy of the worst part of a bad model—the English new poor law. In England that law is not giving satisfaction. The rapid increase of poor-rates is a constant subject of complaint there. Even if it were not, England, as Dr. Longfield has well expressed it, "can bear a greater burden of bad legislation." (Q. 9620.) It is clear that we cannot afford to keep all our paupers in prison. Let those of us who are not now paupers, work as we will, we cannot keep the present number of paupers in idleness, in or out of a workhouse. Take the instance of Clare Island union as a fair specimen of the system throughout the entire country. In

that union, persons receiving relief, were bound to idleness, and actually prohibited from tilling their farms, and the consequence was, that after that, the produce of the whole district, when divided amongst the population, amounted to 3s. 2d. a head.* To an order of the house of commons, requiring a return “of the number of persons in each county in Ireland, whose tenements are rated to the poor at the annual value of £8,” and so on as under, the poor-law commissioners made a return in August, 1848, from which it appears that the tenements so rated were then as follows :

£.	£.	£.	£.
Above 8	... 29,681	Above 18 & not exceed.	20... 20,081
„ 8 & not exceed.	10... 62,469	„ 20	„ 25... 30,662
„ 10	„ 12... 44,454	„ 25	„ ... 106,411
„ 12	„ 15... 46,689		
„ 15	„ 18... 33,848	Total	... 374,302

Supposing that famine and emigration have not affected the occupants of the tenements so rated in 1848, and taking them as being beyond the temptation to emigrate, or the reach of pauperism, by any sort of casualty, and as being the persons who are to support their own families, and such other families as may be reduced to pauperism, how can it be possible for them to do so? If they were all Anglo-Saxons of the finest possible conformation, and could work day and night without sleep or rest, they could not do it. The present Commissioner states, that there are 900,200 persons here dependant upon labour, and nearly 4,500,000 dependant on these—and that for the best part of 1846, only an eleventh of the former were actually employed; and in 1847 a seventh. † All the rest were consequently sustained in idleness at the expense of the rate payers. Could folly be greater? It is clear that we must renounce the luxury of keeping our paupers in custody and idleness, and adopt the suggestions of common sense, and common charity. If a man able to work comes and says he cannot get work or food, we should feed him, and then get back the value of the food from him in work; and thus the system would be made self-supporting. Guardians should at once get

* See Ev. of present Commissioner before select Committee of the House of Com. Q. 1052.

† *Ib.* Q. 1041-2-3.

the fee simple—we would have no renting—of some unprofitable waste in their district—they need nowhere turn on their heels to find it—reclaim and cultivate, and keep it in their hands, supporting the poor out of the produce; or if they should think it more profitable, sell it out, and get another piece, and so have always on hand ground enough to enable the pauper who wanted food, to fulfil the primal condition of his being, and earn it by the sweat of his brow.

The notion of keeping paupers, either idle or at unprofitable labour, arose from one of those absurd crotchets of English political economists, which have caused so much mischief, namely, that a public establishment, such as a workhouse, should not interfere with the ordinary natural order of demand and supply, by employing its inmates in producing what was produced by other labourers who did not seek relief from it, but contributed to its support: in other words, that lest a rate-paying shoemaker, farmer, or other producer, should suffer any loss from the workhouse providing itself by means of the labour of its own inmates, with the articles in which they dealt, all the other ratepayers should support the paupers in idleness. This is the protection theory reduced in application from kingdoms to unions. The right view was, that when the ratepayers of a district formed themselves into a union for the relief of the poor, they should have regarded themselves as a joint-stock company for that purpose, and looked only to their own interests, that is, the interest of the majority, and not suffer themselves to be ruined for the special benefit of the one shoemaker, who could supply brogues, and the one farmer, who could supply lumpers.

These, and the rate in aid—another of those paltry palliatives scarcely deserving of a comment—are the principal measures resulting from the deliberations of the Poor Law Committees of the two houses during the last session. The others are of a merely formal nature. To mark the character of the legislation, we should add, that there are provisions in the above act, c. 104, in favour of landlords and against tenants, repealing those of the original poor law act, as to the amount of rate which a tenant might deduct from his rent, and as to the invalidity of contracts by him to forego the right of deduction. Notwithstanding all the evidence, all the parade of resolutions, and all the legislation, the Poor Law now remains subject

to the objection which the House of Lords' Committee levelled at the rate-in-aid. Of that project they say wisely, "if it tends rather to sustain paupers than to remove the cause of pauperism, experience proves that the demands on such a fund are likely to be progressive," and that "the anticipation of its indefinite expansion cannot fail to aggravate all the existing dangers of Ireland, to render the sale of estates ruinous, the letting of lands difficult, their cultivation uncertain; thus at once preventing the investment of capital in agriculture, diminishing the effective demand for labour, and the production of human food," and "stimulate the increasing emigration of farmers, and of small capitalists, lessening the amount of wages to be paid, and the funds out of which rates can alone be payable, whilst greatly increasing destitution."—3rd Rep. p. 5. Such, we say, is the effect of the whole system; and the country knows it, and feels it; and such, we fear, it will be, while landlords only have a voice in its arrangement.

The one idea of the last session was, the condition of the landlords. To this point all enquiry, to this all legislation, was directed. The reader will not be astonished to find, that the result of all the researches was, that the landlords had brought about their own ruin, by altering, modifying, and abolishing every fundamental law that seemed to clash with their interests, and that the remedy recommended was a return to the principles of earlier legislation. We have been for years telling our readers that the ruin of the kingdom was caused by the landlords overturning, with a view to their own aggrandisement, and the destruction of every body else, all the provisions of the ancient common and statute law of the realm, that protected the rights and interests of the people, and every indubitable principle of public policy and justice, recognised by all other communities, and, in short, making "Maxims Controuled" the appropriate designation of their legislative efforts. We have long felt that our landlord rulers had contrived to distinguish us from every other people, not only by the extent of our misery, but the absurdity and wickedness of our laws, and that the day could not be distant, when these would be studied by jurists with the same interest that charts of shoals, coral reefs, and quicksands are by seamen. The day has arrived sooner than we expected. Before the Poor Law Committee of the

Commons, all (we believe) the gentlemen who had filled the chair of political economy in Trinity College, and who were also barristers, were examined as to the causes of the embarrassed condition of the landlords; and all agreed in attributing it to the statutes which the landlords themselves had made. The greater part of the blame was laid on the statutes allowing entails in their various modifications. "So absurd are these laws," said Dr. Longfield, that "a man possessing 10,000 acres, may be unable to work anything below the soil, or cut a tree, or, in many cases, alter a window in his house lawfully." (Q. 9634.) Next came the acts that made judgments a lien on land from the time of their entry; then the Registration Act of 6 Anne, which enabled landowners to accumulate incumbrance upon incumbrance, without parting with the title deeds; then the acts making judgments assignable at law; then the Penal Laws, which, by preventing Catholics from dealing directly with the land, extended mortgages, judgments, and all manner of ingenious complications; then the act allowing receivers to be appointed on mortgages; then those allowing them to be appointed on judgments; and lastly, the 4 and 5 Vic. c. 105, which allowed all a debtor's real estate to be extended under a writ of *Elegit*, and made registered judgments equivalent to a mortgage. (Q. 9262-68, 9336—9346, 9690-1-2.) The witnesses examined before the Committee on Receivers concurred in these views. No question was asked as to the effect of the statutory changes in the currency, whereby the plutocratic portion of the Legislature cheated the geocratic, by making debts paid in paper, and undertaken to be repaid in paper, repayable in gold; thus at once nearly doubling their value, and diminishing in the same proportion the ability to redeem them.

The Committee on receivers considered very fully "the subject of the abuse of remedies against the debtor's estate." They hear with delight Sir Edward Sugden say, "the truth is, some of the landed proprietors in Ireland require a little protection, they are so careless about their property, and their money,"* and that a cheap mode of encumbering by means of judgments, "though founded on a sound principle, is open to easy abuse by improvident or embarrassed men."† They hear

* Q. 433.

† Second Rep. p. v.

the Master of the Rolls, too, say “that men are tempted to be improvident by the facility of giving a cheap security,”* and denounce as oppressive to debtors applications for receivers by creditors for small amounts. One case in particular the Right Hon. Gentleman brought under the notice of the Committee: a widow had recovered a debt of £5. 8s. against a highly respectable gentleman, the apparent owner of the estate and lands of Carig Castle, in the county of Waterford, where he resided, and she caused the stock on the estate to be seized in execution, but was obliged to restore them by an order from the Court of Queen’s Bench, the brother of the debtor claiming them as his own, and swearing that the debtor had no property on the lands of Carig Castle, save the rent reserved out of the same on a lease made to claimant. She could not put him in gaol, the debt being under £10, (had she him in England, and he was only a poor struggling artisan, she could have had him committed to the county gaol, and had his hair cropped, from time to time, till her revenge was slaked, or he got the money, or died, or fled the realm,) and therefore she applied for a receiver over the rent so sworn to. The following morceau of the evidence is worth extraction.

Sir Robert Peel. “1220. Had this widow no other means of recovering her debt, except going through this process?—No other; and therefore I stated that I did not consider this particular case oppressive, though there are a number of cases of debts of small amount in which receivers are applied for, and in which there is nothing to excuse the proceeding.

“1221. Do you mean that it was not oppressive to the widow who did not get her money?—I mean oppressive to the debtor; it is oppressive generally when the debt bears a very small proportion to the costs, to have a receiver applied for.

“1222. The debtor might have paid the money?—Yes.”

Bentham has well said in irony, “It is an oppression for a man to reclaim his own money; it is none to keep it from him.”† We did not expect to find one of Sir Robert Peel’s own judges repeating the proposition in seriousness, in the presence of, and in answer to, the Right Hon. Bart. himself. The Committee too thought it was an oppression, and so it was. “While the money is hoped for, and for a short time after it has been received, he who lends it

* Second Rep. p. v.

† Defence of Usury, Lett. x.

is a friend and benefactor ; by the time the money is spent, and the evil hour of reckoning is come, the benefactor is found to have changed his nature, and put on the tyrant and the oppressor.”* In consequence of this gross instance of oppression, and of another in which a receiver was applied for over a property of £10. a-year, (the other circumstances connected with this case are not anywhere mentioned,) the Committee resolve that “ the mischievous facility afforded by the existing law, for appointing a Receiver at the suit of every judgment creditor, and over almost every species of property, and the security for the costs of the appointment, without reference to the satisfaction of the debt, have perverted what was intended to be a cheap and convenient remedy for a right, into a vexatious instrument for accumulating law costs, unproductive to the creditor, injurious to the debtor, and prejudicial to the public,” and that it is “ a matter of public policy, that the power of appointing receivers for small demands, or over small properties, should not be suffered to continue,” † adding naively, “ The general lien of a judgment hovering over all the property of a debtor, *produces manifest inconvenience, especially when the judgment is likely to remain unsatisfied.*” We should not wonder. But to whom is it inconvenient?

Upon these facts and views, the Legislature, which seems to require half a century at least for the due preparation of “ a comprehensive measure” for the protection of tenants, passes off-hand an act for the protection of landlords, the 12 and 13 Vict. c. 95, by which, with regard to all judgments, they repeal the acts of the 9th. and 25th. Geo. 2, which made them assignable at law, and the 5 and 6 W. 4. c. 55, and 3 and 4 Vict. c. 105, which allowed receivers to be at once appointed or extended on judgments being entered up, and they expressly give the landlord debtor a year’s grace ; and with regard to judgments for sums not exceeding £150, (such sums as poor and humble people, not great landlords or merchants, may be expected to deal in,) they repeal every act that stood in their way, from Ed. 1. to Victoria, including the practice under the 13 Ed. 1. c. 18 and c. 45, for 500 years, sections 10 and 12 of the Statute of Frauds, the Receiver sections of the 5 and 6 W. 4. c. 55, and those of the 3 and 4 Vict. c.

* Defence of Usury, Let. x.

† Second Report, iv. v.

105, the abolition of arrest on Mesne Process Act, with respect to the effect of an Elegit, so as, in short, on such judgments to prevent the appointment or extension of receivers, to prevent the creditor from extending under an Elegit, more than half the real estate, and to place executions against the real property on the same footing on which executions against the personal property stand by the Statute of Frauds, that is, that they shall affect such property only as belongs to the debtor, when the writ is delivered to the Sheriff.

We quarrel not with these alterations ; we wish only to point out their source and direction, and to let the public see how little difficulty there is in the way of repealing statutes that are found to produce manifest inconvenience to country gentlemen, who do not wish to pay their debts, or part with their estates. In fact, we hail these provisions with pleasure, as we hail every return to the principles of the common law. They restrict credit, and every thing that does that is a benefit to the humble honest man, who pays in hard cash for whatever he wants, and who too often has the prices of commodities raised to an unnatural excess against him by the competition of more pretentious folks, who pay only in promises, and who consequently can and must bid higher. It is therefore a retrograde movement in the right direction, but it will not effect the object of its framers. Instead of protecting the landlords, it will hasten their ruin. So far as it prevents them from giving real security for any debt under £150, it deprives them of the means of getting anything on credit under that amount. How are they now to get credit from those from whom they most want it, the dealers in the ordinary necessaries of life, bakers, butchers, grocers, drapers, &c.?

This compulsory return to common sense reminds us further of the remarkable coincidence between the views of the ancient professors of the common law, and those of our modern professors of political economy. These think, that the "great principle is, that the owner of a real estate should exercise the largest possible power over it while he lives to enjoy it."* This was actually the condition of all estates of inheritance prior to "*the Statute of Great Men*," as the Statute De Donis, 13 Ed. 1. c. 1, has been

* See Dr. Longfield's evidence, Q. 9436.

termed,* which was passed, as Coke tells us, in order “to preserve the inheritance in the blood of them to whom the gift was made, notwithstanding any attainder for felony or treason.”† However much the peculiar circumstances of the period in which it was passed might excuse its enactment, it was denounced so early as the reign of Edward III., by a grave Chief Justice of the Common Pleas as, “shaking a main pillar of the common law that made all estates of inheritance fee simple, and producing mischiefs such and so many as no wisdom could foresee.”‡ Coke repeatedly denounces it, citing it as an illustration of the danger of removing “an ancient pillar of the common law.” “The wisdom of the common law,” he says, “was, that all estates of inheritance should be fee simple, so as one man might safely alien, demise, and contract, to and with another; but the Statute of Westminster, 2. cap. 1, created an estate tail, and made a perpetuity by act of Parliament, restraining tenant in tail from aliening or demising, but only for the life of the tenant in tail, which in process of time brought in such troubles and inconveniences, that after two hundred years necessity found out a way by law for tenant in tail to alien.”§ Amongst the inconveniences arising from it, he mentions: “purchasers defrauded, leases evicted, other estates and grants made upon just and good consideration avoided, creditors cheated of their debts, offenders emboldened to commit capital offences.”|| This and other novel restraints on alienation, he denounces as “against trade and traffic, and bargaining and contracting between man and man,”—and a fundamental maxim of the common law which he quotes as thus variously expressed: “*iniquum est ingenuis hominibus non esse liberam rerum suarum alienationem*, and *Rerum Suarum quilibet est moderator et arbiter*; and again, *Regulariter non valet pactum de re mea non alienanda*.”¶ The happy condition of all parties before this innovation, he thus alludes to:—“When all estates were fee simple, then were purchasers sure of their purchases, farmers of their leases, creditors of their debts,” &c., “and what contentions and mischiefs have

* See Barrington on the Statutes, 83. † Co. Litt. s. 13. and 392, b.

‡ Pref. 9 Rep. xiii.

§ Pref. 3 Rep. xvii.

|| Pref. 4 Rep. vi.

¶ Co. Litt. 223. a.

crept into the quiet of the law by these fettered inheritances, daily experience teacheth us." * The evil effects of this statute, were described in the last century by Barrington, nearly in the same language as they are now by our professors of political economy. After quoting the detail given by Godefoy of the inconveniences produced in France by a somewhat similar innovation, upon a similar fundamental principle of the Civil Law, and observing that it was probably these inconveniences which led the French nobility, in 1560, "to oppose substitutions beyond three lives," a sort of Thelluson act, † and citing Chaucer's character of the man of Law: "all was fee simple to him in effect," he points out as amongst the evils arising from this statute, "the intricacy and perplexities of the law," "the stagnation of landed property," "the perpetual disagreements between the father and the son," the "most unnatural treatment of younger children," which "seems to approach nearly to the barbarity" practised among the Greeks, Romans, and Chinese, of exposing them; and adds, that he had never heard but one objection to its repeal, namely, "that certain officers and patentees should lose the fees which they are entitled to upon common recoveries." ‡ Parliaments of landlords, however, thought their own interests required them to maintain the struggle against common sense and first principles, and they have maintained it till even their own advisers—their legists and economists, tell them it is impossible to maintain it longer; and thus is another illustration afforded of the correctness of Lord Coke's observation: "Out of all these books and reports of the common law, I have observed that albeit sometimes by acts of Parliament, and sometimes by invention and wit of man, some points of the ancient common law have been altered, or diverted from its due course; yet in revolution of time, the same (as a most safe and faithful supporter of the commonwealth) have been, with great applause, for avoiding of many inconveniences, restored again." §

* Co. Litt. 19. b.

† See 39 & 40 Geo. 3. c. 98, & Thelluson v. Woodward, 4 Ves. 227, and 11 Ves. 112.

‡ On the Statutes, p. 84.

§ Pref. 3 Rep. xvi.

Incidentally to the inquiry before the committee on receivers, respecting the abuse of remedies against the property of landowners, some inquiry arose as to the effect of the system on the tenants and the community. It appears that under the Equity Courts, there are about 1,100,000 of us, and of the entire rental which we pay, and which was estimated, according to the old valuation, at £20,000,000, and according to the poor-law valuation of 1835 at only £13,000,000, ten thereof being agricultural, there are at least £2,000,000 under the courts; and such is the rapidity with which properties are coming in, that the number has been trebled within three years; and none go out except when minors come of age.* And now for the system of management. The letting is by auction, at Dublin, (where it is frequently postponed,) to the highest bidder, for seven years pending the suit, and therefore liable to be suddenly determined with the suit. When the auction is over, the highest bidder has to submit to various charges, well designated by Sir James Graham as "a tax on the sterility of the soil," (Ques. 163,) and is then "compelled to pay close up by a receiver, who receives a per centage upon the collection of the rent, and upon prompt payment," (Q. 87.) and who has no "inducement whatever to look to the estate with a view to improve it," and whose only "object is to collect as much and as quickly as possible, and to account as slowly as possible." (Q. 644.) "There is nothing more common now," says the Second Remembrancer of the Court of Exchequer, "than for the Receiver the moment his accounts are passed to rush to the tenantry, and take every possible means to collect the rent, in order to use the rent till the thirteen months, or a longer period, if he is not called upon to account, has elapsed; so that, in that way, the form of accounting acts to harass the tenantry." (Q. 1815.) "He always appears to the tenantry in the light of a person demanding money? Yes, he is a receiver, in the strictest sense of the word." (Q. 1416.) "I do not know," says that gentleman, "any class of individuals more to be pitied than the tenantry under the courts." (Q. 1382.) But we may, in passing, observe, that bad as their condition is, such is the condition of tenants not under the courts, that, according to one of the

* See evidence of Master Brooke, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hickey, and Mr. M'Cay, and especially Ques. 5, 917, 1274, 1284, 1533.

witnesses, Mr. Roe of Tipperary, was murdered, in order that his tenantry might take refuge in the courts during the minority of his children. (Q. 930.) The effect of the system on the tenant, who suffers first and most, may be judged of by its effect on the landlord, who suffers last and least. The committee report that "under the present system it seems to be generally assumed, that the appointment of a receiver seals the fate of the debtor and his property." The Master of the Rolls says: "It is notorious that property under the court, on an average, does not yield more than two-thirds, frequently one-half, of what it paid when in the owner's hands." "When you see a property, houses or land, neglected, desolate, and in ruins, if you are told that that property is in the hands of the Court of Chancery, no further inquiry for the cause of such results is deemed necessary."* The committee themselves tell us that the prominent evils of the system are so generally admitted, "that the witnesses are unanimous in its condemnation," and that it is "ruinous to private rights, and discreditable to the administration of justice," and is "attended with equal detriment to the agriculture of the country, and the condition of the tenantry." The effect on the landlords, and the tenantry being thus satisfactorily established, we next inquire, what is its effect on the country generally? "The evils," said Sir Edward Sugden, "are so great, that no country can prosper under them. I cannot conceive any greater evils." (Q. 457.) The Master of the Rolls is asked whether he concurred in that opinion.

"Sir Edward Sugden said it was impossible for any country to prosper with any system existing such as the present system in Ireland, with so much property under the management of the Court; is that your opinion?" and he replied, "I entertain the strongest opinion that it is one of the greatest calamities of Ireland to have such a state of things existing." (Q. 1246.)

Add to all this, that against the oppressions of receivers, the tenantry have practically no redress. The Second Remembrancer, Mr. Hamilton, proves this:

"1461. You have stated a variety of cases of oppression upon the tenantry; if the tenants consider themselves aggrieved or oppressed, what mode have they of obtaining relief or redress?—They must apply to the Court.

* Appendix, No. 1.

“1462. At whose expense?—At their own expense.

“1463. Have you many such applications?—I cannot say that they are very numerous, because the expense is an absolute bar to it.

“1464. You think that the expense is such as to prevent a man, however aggrieved, from applying to the Court?—Clearly, when he is a poor man.”

Can the reader, who thus learns from the best possible authority, that oppressed tenants have no redress for wrong except by an application to a court of equity, wonder at that spirit of violence and outrage which characterise so many of them, that “*animorum habitus ut pessimum facinus auderent pauci, vellent plures, omnes patenterur?*”

What are the remedies recommended by the Committee for the tenant victims of this system?—Mind, those remedies are still only recommendations, while the remedies suggested for the condition of the landlords are already law.—They are, that the courts should be empowered to grant leases for fourteen years, and to allow “a moderate outlay for repairs,” and an abatement of rent “according to a responsible discretion:”—that attorneys should not be appointed receivers;—that the costs of leases should be diminished;—that the present mode of letting by auction should be discontinued;—that covenants for good cultivation and against subdivision should be introduced into leases;—and that the Courts “should be aided by whatever legislation is proper to enable them to arrange and execute such a code of rules as would be likely to encourage (if not secure) the selection of a competent person as receiver, wherever the appointment must be made.” The committee felt that these paltry alterations were no adequate remedy, and therefore they add:

“Although your Committee have felt it to be their duty to suggest the foregoing amendments in the existing system of management of estates under the Courts of Equity, they do not express any opinion whether the evils now so justly complained of, will be sufficiently remedied by any such alterations. Nor are they to be understood as expressing their opinion that the substitution of a totally new system is not demanded by the exigencies of the case. The late period of the session at which your committee was appointed has prevented them from taking evidence sufficient to enable them to decide on the merits of the plans which have been submitted for consideration. In the appendix will be found the draft of a bill prepared under the sanction of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland,

proposing an official plan of receiverships ; another plan has been presented by Mr. Hamilton, in his private capacity ; and a third, prepared by Mr. M'Cay, is also to be found in the appendix, and referred to in the evidence."

The "totally new system" thus hinted at is the appointment of a government *Board or Commission of Receivers*, with almost absolute power over the estates and the tenantry, sitting in Dublin and assisted by district inspectors, local agents, &c. &c., at the cost of about £75,000 a-year (Q. 1626-36), which would be a great saving upon the present cost of management, which is computed at £200,000 a-year, (Q. 1538). All the witnesses, with the exception of Sir Edward Sugden, were in favour of some such plan, and indeed, it was only by a majority of 5 to 3, that the Committee did not embody in their report Mr. M'Cay's plan as the panacea. Let the reader, who does not expect a place under the new regime, conceive such a thing as a government Board (Board of Control was the title in one of the plans) for the management of encumbered estates. We remember to have seen in the newspapers a letter from the Duke of Wellington to a tradesman, who had requested him to make some member of his family pay his debts, in nearly these words : " F.M. the Duke of Wellington informs Mr. Thompson, that he does not collect tradesmen's debts." Is the government to turn farmer, bailiff, receiver, and steward, as well as civil engineer to the landlords? What next? Will it undertake to suckle their babies, prepare their meals, arrange their clothes, comb their heads, wash their faces, and if not, why not?

The first objection to such a proposition is, that it is opposed to the maxim, that every man should mind his own business. Its absurdity strikes us as so outrageous, that we cannot understand how it could be entertained seriously by any rational animals, except a club of landlords and placemen. Yet it will combine the more homogeneously with the rest of the system. Observe, the only hope of the Committee for improving our condition is founded on the chance of selecting good receivers, inspectors, and agents, to guide and drive us. The idea of holding out a motive for action to us, by giving a permanent interest in the soil, never occurred to them. Even the moral of the fable of the donkey race is unsuited to us. We are below that class of animal. Our organization is

not so perfect. We are never to be led by motives, but to be always driven by the whip.

Can there be a doubt that fixity of tenure, as we proposed it, would be as unobjectionable, so far as what are called the rights of property are concerned, and immeasurably better for the landlord? We made that proposition, in a spirit of fairness and justice, and without the remotest wish to deprive the landlords of anything to which they are justly entitled. We would not trick the meanest thing that breathes, and thinks itself a landlord, of a farthing. All that the people want is such a permanent interest in the soil, that they may know when working morning, noon, and night, they are working for themselves. We can conceive no proposition fairer than a corn rent on the principle of the tithe commutation act, to be assessed by a jury on the present value of the land; and if impartial juries could not be had here, we should bring them from England, believing that a few thousand pounds would be far more wisely spent on them, than on commissions for the sale or the management of encumbered estates. Let it not be forgotten, that the present annual cost of managing such estates is £200,000, and the proposed cost about £75,000, and the cost of the commission for the sale of them £10,000, and that if the people had fixity of tenure, all these costs would be saved. We will not however press this subject further now, but proceed to point out the sources of the present evils, and a simple suitable, and as we believe, unobjectionable remedy.

Sir E. Sugden thinks that

“ Estates ought not to remain in the Court longer than is absolutely necessary. The great thing is, as quickly as possible to ascertain who is the owner, and give him the care of his own property.”—(Q. 602.) “ The Court of Chancery is not the place, and never can be made the place, for the management of the property of the country.”—(Q. 467.) “ On no encumbered estate which does not, in fact, properly belong to anybody, can permanent improvement be made: it is not in the nature of things.”—(Q. 470.) “ When an estate is in Chancery it is impossible to manage it in a way beneficial to the community at large, consistently with the rights of parties; where there is a conflict the Court ought not to continue to have the management of the property longer than is absolutely necessary; the great point is to get the parties paid off as quickly as possible by the sale of the estate.”—(Q. 567.)

Supposing these views to be, as we believe them, the true

ones, let us see how the landlords, by departing from them, brought about the present state of confusion. Take the question of mortgages first. A mortgage is a mode of conveyance, whereby A. B., in consideration of the receipt of a sum of money from C. D., conveys all his estate to him for years, or for ever, in the most absolute and unqualified manner that legal phraseology allows, subject to a proviso for redemption upon repayment of the principal and interest by a day named. In early times, if the money were not repaid by that day, the estate became vested absolutely in the mortgagee; and this continued the practice till the seventeenth century, when the Court of Chancery, under pretence of equity, interfered, and allowed the mortgagor to redeem almost at any time on repaying the principal, interest, and costs; and drove the mortgagee into a suit in equity, in order to get that benefit from his contract which he had in earlier times enjoyed, as the simple and natural consequence of the execution of the instrument, without delay, litigation, or expense. And all this upsetting of contracts in favour of landlords was perpetrated by judges, who, as the cant phrase is, were reducing equity and good conscience to a science, and would not grant the slightest relief to an unfortunate tenant who should have happened to bind himself to the payment of a penal rent of £50 an acre for ever, for every acre which he should once neglect to sow with red clover seeds, after a certain course of husbandry.* However bad and unjustifiable this interference with mortgage contracts was in England, it became worse here; for here the mortgagee could, under no circumstances, get the benefit of his contract; as the court, in order to protect the landowner, would not decree a simple foreclosure, but a sale, at which the mortgagee could not even be a bidder, leaving him to get his money, or some part thereof, out of the proceeds, it apparently never having occurred to the superhuman Anglo-Saxon intellects who presided over that incomparable tribunal, that the land might be well worth the sum lent on it, without being worth, also, the cost of a suit and sale in chancery. This, too, was designed for the benefit of the landlords; but it has been

* See a recent instance of this in England, *Bowers v. Nixon*, 13 Jur. 334.

the main source of completely effectuating their ruin, if they once happen to get into equity. The result is thus described by Sir Edward Sugden:

“I think there is one practice in Ireland that leads to great expense, and to estates remaining for a long period under the care of the Court, and that might probably be corrected. An Incumbrancer in this country, a mortgagee or a creditor, files a bill for what is called redemption or foreclosure, that is, to compel the debtor to redeem, or if he will not redeem, to give up the property, and the Court makes a decree accordingly, and the claim is paid off to the incumbrancer, or he becomes the owner of the estate, and he can sell it to whom he pleases without any difficulty. In Ireland matters assume a different form, for in such a case there is not only a decree for the redemption of the property, but it is followed up by a decree for sale, and the consequence of that, which at first sight might not appear to be very important, is this, as in Ireland every single person who would be a necessary party to the conveyance is a party to the suit, it is inevitable that there should be a great many parties to every suit of an incumbrancer, and that leads not only to very great expense, but to very great delay; the estate may be half eaten up with costs.”—(Q. 941.)

As an instance of the enormous costs caused by this practice, in the first preliminary to an equity suit, namely, ascertaining the proper parties to be made defendants, Sir Edward mentions the case of an English gentleman, who, as administrator to a lady that was entitled to a rent-charge upon several estates here, came over to recover it: “there were only three years’ arrears of rent-charge to collect, and the charge for searches preparatory to filing the bill in order to ascertain the proper parties to the suit was £ 720.” (Q. 448.) If such be the effect of this particular rule in the first step to a suit, what must be its effect upon the suit itself? The consequence of it is, that the plaintiff “must bring before the Court, in one way or other, every party having an interest in the estate,” (Q. 10251,) and so numerous are these parties, that Dr. Longfield says, they frequently amount to 50 or 60; the Master of the Rolls says, he in one case, which came before himself, counted 160 defendants, 70 of whom only were required by the new rules to put in answers; and Mr. Butt has seen since those rules 150 answering defendants. (Q. 10258.)

“There is,” says the Master of the Rolls, “another inevitable consequence, that from the number of parties the suit will abate several times, for you cannot possibly keep seventy people alive; and

children are born who are obliged to be brought before the Court, and parties become bankrupt and insolvent, and you are obliged to bring the assignees into the suit, and you have supplemental bills and bills of revivor without number, for you cannot bring a cause to a hearing till you have it in a perfect state, and nobody can calculate when it will be in a perfect state; but supposing that it has gone through all these proceedings of abatement and bills of revivor, it comes at last for decision before the Lord Chancellor.”—(Q. 1067-9.)

The further results of it the Right Hon. Gentleman thus details:—

“1070. When the plaintiff’s counsel appears upon the hearing before the Lord Chancellor, he has the original bill briefed to him, and he has every supplemental bill and bill of revivor briefed to him; if there were 70 answering defendants you would have 70 answers, and the brief would be so large that it would be very difficult for any one to lift it. The case is opened by the leading counsel for the plaintiff; it does not take him 10 minutes or a quarter of an hour; the counsel for every defendant starts up from every part of the court, and says, ‘My Lord, I open the answer of so and so,’ and that is all he says; he has briefed to him his own answer and the bill, and the whole terminates in what is termed a decree to account. A stronger abuse than that scarcely ever occurred in any country; because you have all the enormous costs incurred for that hearing without the slightest benefit to any human being, and you have the unfortunate owner, if he was not ruined before, sure to be ruined by the enormous expense.

“1071. Then the inference we may draw from your evidence is, that an estate may go tolerably well into Chancery, but it is sure to come out worse than it went in?—Yes; the owner might have a surplus before he went into the Court of Chancery, but by the present system it is altogether swallowed up.

“1072. Sir *J. Graham*.] Sir Edward Sugden described the proceeding as ‘a bombardment of the Chancellor?’—I saw the working of the system when I was at the Bar; I have not seen it since, as the decree to account is made by the Lord Chancellor, but from what I then saw of it, I should say that Sir Edward Sugden’s description of it was not an exaggeration.

“1080. I have spoken merely of the first hearing, at which every counsel appears simply to open the answer.

“1081. To bombard the Court?—Yes. As soon as the Master has made his report, the case comes back to the Lord Chancellor to be heard upon the report. In the first place, by having an enormous number of defendants, you have the cause continually abated and affected by deaths, bankruptcies, insolvencies, and marriages; and all this may happen before you get the Master’s report; but

when you have the Master's report, the cause is set down for further directions, and every one of the counsel re-appears who had opened the answer, and asks for their costs ; they do what is called pray their costs ; and this bombardment of the Court takes place again.

"1082. What is called a bombardment of the Court is undermining and blowing up the estate?—Exactly ; it is most destructive of the estate.

"1083. It is not the Court, but it is the estate which pays all the expense?—Yes it is the estate which pays all the expense."

These, and all the other horrors of a chancery suit, are experienced in the case of every mortgage, "in which there is no ground for litigation whatever," "the existence of which, and the sum due upon it, are not matter of doubt at all," in which "the evidence in the cause is merely to prove a deed which no one doubts, the hearing, costing frequently £400, does not occupy one minute," and the decree is a matter of form."* (Q. 9290.) It is after the final decree for sale, which is also a matter of form, and equally costly, that "the real work begins," (Q. 9291,) and that real work is the litigation about the title. The mortgagee, before he lent his money, saw the title, and was content with it, and is willing to take to it, with all its defects ; but the Court of Chancery will not let him, but compels him to sell it, prove it a good one, and fight out the point with the purchaser ; and this new litigation is frequently as costly and tedious as the suit for the sale, and occupies, on the average, according to Dr. Longfield, about three years, (Q. 9351.) How unexceptionable must a title be to pass through this ordeal, when even a member of the house of lords, in his anxiety to get out of a purchase of land in Ulster, made before the recent depreciation, relied, in last Trinity term, on objections to covenants in the original grant respecting muskets, pikes, English tenants, and "mere Irish?" † Clonnina, the estate of the late Col. McMahon, who died in 1815, leaving a few debts and family charges, "comparatively small in amount," was placed, in 1813, under a receiver to raise these charges, "was sold under a decree of the court, in 1838 or 1839, after most tedious proceedings and great costs ;" and the purchaser, after five years' litigation, having been freed from the contract, on account of a

* See the evidence of Dr. Longfield and Mr. Butt generally on this subject.

† Evidence of the Master of the Rolls, Q. 1049.

technical defect in the title, was again sold in 1843, "under an amended decree to obviate this defect." Another party being "led to believe, from the previous proceedings, that no delay or difficulty could arise with regard to the title, and that from the previous investigation and amended decree, *he* should, in a short time, be put into possession," became the purchaser, and deposited the purchase money; but so far from getting possession was he, that he has not got it yet, and does not expect it for at least two years more: he was five years in litigation about the title; and, finally, had a decision against him, binding him to the contract, against which he was advised to appeal to the house of lords, but was "deterred by the fearful costs already incurred: in the meantime, he received neither rent nor interest, the property had been squatted on by refugees from neighbouring "clearances," the Colonel's youngest son and widow had died, the latter "of a broken heart, and without the common necessities of life:" "on her death fresh proceedings had to be taken, new bills filed, and new decrees pronounced;" and it is now necessary to look for her heir in America.*

However, this was not enough for the landlords; and in order that mortgagees might not be prompted to press for a sale, an act was passed, the 11 and 12 G. iii. c. 10, which empowered the Courts of Equity, without the cost and formality of a bill, on a short affidavit and petition, alleging that a year and a half's interest was in arrear, to appoint a receiver over so much of the rents of the mortgaged premises, as should be sufficient to pay the arrears, and also the accruing interest from time to time, until the whole should be discharged, together with fees, costs, &c., &c. This was the origin of the receiver system, under which, the Master of the Rolls tells us, "a clever solicitor and a facile receiver can easily manage that the produce of the estate can be expended in the costs of its management;" † and under which, consequently, if once an estate is put into chancery, it must for ever remain there. As if, however, it did not thus do mischief enough, it was extended, in 1835 and 1840, to judgments over freehold and

* See evidence of J. V. Stewart, Esq. Q. 5388.

† Appendix, No. 1.

over chattel interests, which last could have been sold at common law by a writ of *feri facias*; and thus, debtors' real estates are now never sold, but are kept always in chancery.

The reader will best understand the effect of all these arrangements, by being informed of the state of the law before their introduction.

At the common law, a creditor who recovered judgment could not touch the debtor's freehold estate, (except, if it may be called an exception, in the case of an owner of a fee simple estate, who gave a bond, binding his heirs in whose hands the estate was liable as assets,) and was limited to redress, by a writ of *feri facias de bonis et catallis*, under which his goods and chattels could be seized and sold, and a writ of *levari facias de terris et catallis*, by which the annual profits of his lands as they arose, as corn or grass growing thereon, and rents payable thereout, were made available for liquidation of the demand.* Under the former writ, however, an estate for any term of years—even 10,000—might be sold as goods and chattels, such an estate being considered a chattel interest. So the law stood till 1283, when the Statute of Acton Burnel was passed, by which, and the subsequent extension and amendment of it in 1285, called the Statute of Merchants, it was provided for the encouragement of foreign merchants, that if any merchant acknowledged a debt in any of the forms therein prescribed, and failed to pay at the day appointed, execution should at once issue against his goods chattels and person; and if he did not sell off his real property within three months after being arrested, and pay the debt, he should be detained in custody, and all his lands extended till it was paid off.† This sweeping innovation applied only to cases of debts acknowledged by persons who were or who chose to confess themselves merchants. In the same parliament, also, the freehold estate of ordinary debtors was made liable to their judgment debts by the 13 Ed. i. c. 18, which enacted as follows:

“When debt is recovered, or knowledged in the King's Court, or damages awarded, it shall be from henceforth in the election of

* See Bac. Ab. tit. Execution A. & C.

† See 13 E. 1. stat 3. c. 1. and Bac. Ab. tit. Execution.

him that sueth for such debt or damages, to have a writ of *feri facias* unto the sheriff, for to levy the debt of the *lands and goods*, or that the sheriff shall deliver to him all the chattels of the debtor, (saving only his oxen and beasts of his plough,) and one half of his land, until the debt be levied upon a reasonable price or extent, and if he be put out of that tenement he shall recover by a writ of *novel disseisin*, and after, by a writ of *redisseisin* if need be.”

This statute originally offered a most effective remedy against the property of landowning debtors; but by degrees, those who were interested in the multiplication of suits, and especially in chancery, contrived to render it as bad as the remedy by mortgage. The reader may observe that it altered the writ of *feri facias* from *de bonis et catallis*, to *de terris et catallis*, thus enabling a sheriff to sell freehold estates as he had been before enabled to sell chattel interests, and all manner of goods and chattels;—and all the early collections of writs show that the practice of the courts was in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law. In *Rastell's Entries*, published in 1574, the only form of *fi fa* given is *de terris et catallis*. In the *Registrum Brevium*, the authorised collection of writs, published in 1634, the first form given, and which is marked in the margin as being framed under “W. 2, c. 18,” is *de terris et catallis*; and all the forms, except three against clergymen which could be of course only for *bona ecclesiastica*, include *de terris*; and, as if to guard against future cavil, one is, *de terris bonis et catallis*, and another, “*de bonis et catallis terris et tenementis*.”—(See 65, b.) So, in the “*Brevia Judicialia*, or an exact collection of approved forms of judicial writs,” published in 1662, all the forms, except those against clergymen and executors, are *de terris et catallis*. So in the *Officina Brevium*, published in 1679, the forms are both ways, at common law and under the statute. Even so late as the reign of William and Mary, it was the practice to sell freehold estates on writs of *fi fa*;* but soon afterwards it ceased altogether, and since then the Statutory writ has fallen into desuetude, and been superseded by the common law writ; but it appears by the latest book on English practice to be still a moot question whether a freehold estate may not be taken and sold in execution. †

* See Johnson v Streete, Comberb. 290.

† See Chitty's Archbold's Practice, vol. i. p. 578.

One of the great advantages of sales under a writ of *fi fa* was, that the purchaser acquired an absolute title to the interest of the defendant in the premises, whatever that was, so that he could not be ousted by any one claiming under the defendant, and even if the defendant succeeded in reversing the judgment, he could only recover the proceeds of the sale from the sheriff or plaintiff,—but not the interest in the premises from the vendee.*

So, too, the other part of the statute, as to the remedy of the creditor by taking half the real estate, was neutralised by the Courts. Originally it was a very good, cheap, and intelligible process. The sheriff summoned a jury who valued the land, and determined accordingly the number of years for which the creditor should hold it in satisfaction of the debt, and gave him immediate possession. Under this both debtor and creditor at once knew their rights without further litigation, and it became the interest of the *Elegit* creditor to cultivate the land to the best advantage. But unfortunately, in the course of the seventeenth century, the Court of Chancery, under pretence of equity, made the creditor account, and so threw every thing into confusion. The courts of law, also, in that century, started another abuse, which doubled the amount of litigation necessary to give the creditor the effect of his judgment. In the reign of William III., the English Court of King's Bench decided that a sheriff could not give a vendee under a writ of *fi fa* actual possession of the premises purchased, but merely legal possession, and that it was necessary for the vendee to bring an action of ejection in order to get the actual possession. † The same crotchet was extended to a writ of *elegit*. So that it was thenceforth (in direct opposition to the old practice) necessary for the *Elegit* creditor to bring an action of ejection in order to give full effect to his first writ. This notion was not disputed with regard to a writ of *fi fa*, till 1789, when it was expressly overruled;* and, with regard to a writ of *Elegit*, not till the present century, when it was first overruled so far as regarded lands in the actual possession of the defendant, § and

* See Bac. Ab. Execution. (Q. 2.)

† R. v. Deane and others. 2. Showers Rep. 88.

‡ Taylor v. Cole. 3 T. R. 295.

§ Rogers v. Pitchers. 6 Taunt, 207.

then, in 1848, so far as regarded lands in the possession of his tenants, the court on this last occasion treating the point as clear, unarguable, and beyond all controversy, on the authority of cases in the Year Books of the reign of Henry VI.—just two centuries prior in date to this costly, groundless, and unmeaning innovation. *

There was another abuse of this remedy, which has been modified by recent legislation. Soon after the passing of the Statute of Edward I. the construction prevailed, that if a creditor extended one-half of a debtor's estate, and another writ issued before the first was satisfied, the second creditor extended the remaining half. † But afterwards the notion grew up, that the second creditor should extend only the moiety of that moiety, the third creditor, the moiety of the remaining moiety, and so on by an infinitesimal system of subdivision, till the remainder became an evanescent quantity. Let the reader just conceive the receiver system engrafted on this, and he will have some notion of the swarms of official harpies which settled and fattened on an estate once caught in equity meshes. This abuse was remedied in 1840 by an act which, copying the English act, the 1 and 2 Vict. c. 110, extended the effect of an *Elegit* to the entire estate, and equally extended the remedy by a receiver;—but is restored for the benefit of the landlords, as before described, in all cases of judgments for sums not exceeding the mysterious amount of £150.

The short effective remedy for all the absurdities which we have detailed, is obviously to return to the common law and the legislation of the English Justinian. Leave sane men to arrange their own contracts. Let a mortgage be what it was before Equity meddled with it. Let terms for years be sold as at common law, and freehold estates under the act of Edward I, and if there be a doubt whether under the proper construction of this act they can be so sold, let the doubt be removed by a declaratory enactment. What the country wants is opportunities for buying up land in small portions, and establishing an independent class of petty proprietors, and not government Boards for the management of encumbered estates.

* See *Davies v. Lloyd*. 2. Excheq. Rep. 103.

† See 1 Nels. Ab. *Elegit*, 698.

Mr. Bright has suggested that the summary process of the Bankrupt laws should be applied to landowners. There can be no sound reason for confining the operation of these laws, to persons who live by buying and selling; and it is rather remarkable, that before the system commenced of moulding all our institutions to suit the convenience of landlords, the bankrupt laws then introduced, were of universal application to all debtors whatever. This fact is noticed by that eminent jurist Sir William David Evans, in his "Collection of Statutes," where he says, "notwithstanding all the commendation which may have been bestowed upon later Statutes on account of their more confined and limited operation in this respect, I cannot but think that the generality of the original statute, was more conformable to the principles of justice and utility," (V. 4. p. 307.) and also in his well known letter to Sir Samuel Romilly on the Revision of the Bankrupt laws, where he repeats his disapprobation of the principle which confines the operation of these laws, to persons engaged in commerce, adding, "I should think that the rules of equitable distribution and personal exoneration, should be as extensive as the cases of insolvency themselves; but I am quite aware, that even if I had your concurrence in this opinion, the suggestion of any such regulation would be perfectly nugatory; the reception of your proposal for subjecting lands to simple contract debts in cases of death, sufficiently evinces that a proposal going to a greater extent upon the same principle would be instantly rejected." (Ib. 449.) Is Mr. Bright aware that Sir Samuel Romilly was never able to carry that trivial measure of law reform, and that it was effected only in the last reign, and that even in the present reign a Parliament of landowners has repealed the usury laws with regard to every thing but land? We then tell him that it is perfectly nugatory to ask such a Parliament to relax their grasp of their tenants, and to subject themselves to a code heretofore appropriated to those Celts of the geocratic political economy, those inferiorly organized animals that live by buying and selling.

The encumbered estates commission is another illustration of the exclusively landlord spirit of the legislature. Lands were substantially unsaleable at any thing like what was the fair value in former times. The true cause was the want of purchasers arising from the great fall in the prices of agricultural produce, the increase of poor

rates, and the indefiniteness of their extension, the emigration of all the substantial farmers and small capitalists, and the utter uncertainty prevailing respecting the future course of legislation. All the Irish witnesses examined before the committees of both houses deposed to this. Master Brooke described all attempts at sales as utterly abortive. (Q. 5.) Dr. Longfield scouted the notion of the English conveyancers, that titles were not as certain here as in England, and said those conveyancers did not understand the matter, and were not competent to give an opinion upon it. (Q. 9321.) Mr. Butt concurred in this view, and thought that, in the present state of the country, "no contrivance that can be adopted for selling estates, will find purchasers for them." (Q. 10273—10294.) The Master of the Rolls expresses the strongest opinion to the same effect, and gives several remarkable instances to prove that difficulty of title has nothing to do with the difficulty of sale. (Q. 1049-50-54.) Every one practically acquainted with the country knows that this is the fact. The abortive attempt to sell the Martin estates shows it. Even the chief commissioner, in his inaugural address in opening the commission, does not attempt to controvert it. He says: "Indeed, I have heard it said by some, that unless we are prepared to sacrifice all property brought into our court, we shall not be able to effect sales. I do not know whether it is expected that I should enter at any length into the subject. I presume it is not; and I confess I have no disposition to prophesy one way or other on that point." It is idle to suppose that prudent men would embark money in property that might be confiscated the next day for poor rates. Let a man buy in the best circumstanced union; the next week some neighbour, by savagely exterminating a few thousand tenantry, or humanely receiving refugees, may convert it into another Clifden, and raise the rates to 45s. in the pound.* Until the statutes facilitating extermination are repealed, and the common law on that subject enforced, and the English law of settlement introduced, the purchasing of land must be nothing more or less than a gambling speculation, and so Mr. Butt properly characterised it. (Q. 10598.) The landlords think they serve themselves by retaining such powers; but they are

* See the present Chief Commissioner's evidence before the Commons committee, Q. 86.

mistaken in this as in everything else, and they will find, too late, that the eternal and universal laws of the All-just will not be abrogated for them.

Nec lex justior ulla est,
Quam artifices necis arte perire sua.

However, nothing could divert the legislature from the foregone conclusion that the landlords, who were forced to sell, would get more for their lands if they had better titles, and thereupon they pass this act for allowing three commissioners to do what they like with every encumbered estate in the country, and the claims of creditors upon it. If the difficulty of selling arose really from the defectiveness of the titles, all that a regard for justice would have allowed would have been an alteration of the practice of the courts, so as to compel them, when they decreed a sale, to publish an abstract of the title before the day of sale, and let all bidders be bound by it; and thus "the purchaser would obtain the benefit of his contract at once," which Mr. Baron Richards announces as the chief advantage of the new court, and "not be delayed, as is sometimes the case, for years, not knowing, almost to the latest moment, whether his purchase is to be off or on." But it will be said, parties ought not to be forced to disclose their titles. They ought not, if they do not force them on the attention of the country. To the community it is a matter of indifference whether any particular estate is in the hands of A or B, provided it is in the hands of the right owner; but if it is in the hands of A, and really belongs to B, and A and his creditors wish to sell it, surely the community, whose duty and interest it is *jus suum cuique tribuere* should not be made, through their courts of justice, ancillary to the fraud. It is clear, therefore, that if landlords, or their creditors, make the courts of justice the instruments for settling their respective liabilities and rights, concerning a particular piece of ground, the title to it should be made as much a matter of notoriety and record, as the merits of the dispute respecting it. If the title were thus made known before a sale, it would fetch its value at the sale, regard being had to its sufficiency and defectiveness. But that was not enough for the landlords, and, therefore, they pass this act to make bad titles good, and saddle the cost of so doing, only about £10,000 a-year on the tax-payers of the realm.

But the gross iniquity and impolicy of the measure does not stop here. If it merely gave landlords and their creditors better titles than either contracted for, there might be no gross wrong perpetrated except upon the few right owners whose claims might be barred by a Parliamentary title. But it does not stop here. It would seem as if the landlords, having spent the money that was lent them, were now the natural enemies of their creditors, just as Bentham well observes: "the children who have eat their cake, are the natural enemies of the children who have theirs," and therefore sought to confiscate their property. By this act a puisne incumbrancer may force the sale of an estate, to the utter ruin of all the preceding incumbrancers, and though he himself, and all the world may know that he cannot thereby get one farthing of his debt. Take the case of the estates of the Earl of Portarlington. They were worth, and possibly may soon again be worth, £1,100,000. They are incumbered to the extent of £800,000. A puisne incumbrancer for £200, at the very tail of the £800,000, who cannot get anything by a sale but the costs of the application, and the profits of conducting the transaction, is forcing it on in spite of the prior incumbrancers. If the land be sold now, it cannot fetch more than £400,000. All that goes to the first incumbrancers, the Law Life Insurance Office, and all the subsequent incumbrancers get not a penny. What excuse or justification can there be for this? All that Parliamentary omnipotence should have done, was to say to puisne incumbrancers, "If you will exercise the right you now have to pay off the prior charges, we will give you the property without the expense and delay of a chancery suit, and also give you what you did not contract for, and have no right to ask—a good title: but if you will not do this, we will not allow or aid you to confiscate the property of prior incumbrancers, to gratify the whims of any one; and as you lent your money, well knowing the existence of those prior charges, and therefore impliedly undertaking not to disturb them, if the owners of those charges are content to bide their time till the circumstances of the country improve, and the land recovers its former value, you must wait too." Under no circumstances should a sale be forced that was not to realise, at least, all the incumbrances. Nothing can be more iniquitous than at a moment when it is notorious, that land is not worth one-twentieth—nay,

one-fortieth, of what it was four years back, and what in four years more it again may be, to force it into the market against the will of those who lent their money upon it, and are in law and equity its true owners, to be knocked down at any price that may be *bona fide* offered for it; for that we take from Mr. Baron Richard's inaugural address, to be the intention of the Commissioners; or in other words, at any price that the Commissioners may think it advisable for the public good it should be sold at. Before any property is sold, the only persons who should be consulted as to its selling price are its owners. Why should the public sell the property of any man against his will at their own valuation? If it be for the public good that it should be sold, the public ought to buy it at its fair value, and give him at least what he gave for it. They have no right to select him out of all the community, and sacrifice him to their notions of their own advantage. If they want his property to ride their hobby-horse, "the public good," over it, they should buy it as they buy other property wanted for public purposes. Are they now to revert to the old system of selecting particular classes or individuals as special victims, or contributories to the public good, and to rob creditors upon land on the same enlightened principle on which they formerly tortured Jews and hanged vagrant paupers? In short, the matter is not arguable. Amongst the Romans, the most politic nation in the world, it was the custom on occasions of great and overwhelming calamity to proclaim a *justitium*, a stay of the process of the courts of law, in order that that which was designed for the purpose of securing peace and justice, should not be made an instrument for overturning both. But here a Parliament of landlords seize the moment of universal confusion, consternation, and depression, to speed that process beyond all former example, and thus to ruin their "natural enemies," the benefactors, who relieved their embarrassments. Can it be *pour encourager les autres*?

But it is not the mere ruin of the creditors irrespective of the fate of the landlords, that is to be the result of this measure. We have heard indignant English creditors say, that it is to be the means of enabling the landlords to clear their lands of incumbrances, and in the following simple manner: Suppose, in the case of estates similarly circumstanced to those of Lord Portarlington, the proprietor

were to go to the first incumbrancer who does not want to have his charge paid off, and to say, If this sale proceeds, and the bidding reach the amount of your charge, will you give a receipt for the purchase money, and take a fresh incumbrance under the new title from my trustee? and he were to assent, as he probably would, the affair is settled. The estate through the process of a sale is cleared of liabilities and improved in title, and the first incumbrancer resumes his former position under the new title. Or suppose the proprietor, instead of going to an incumbrancer, goes to a company of capitalists, and asks them upon sufficient security to afford the required accommodation, the same result is effected with the additional chance of cheating the first incumbrancer of part of his claim, and the others of every thing. Can anything more intolerably and outrageously iniquitous be conceived? If after this process shall have been going on for a few years, and the greater part of the landlords shall have been restored to their lands with improved titles and diminished liabilities, our landlord legislators shall then pretend for the first time to see the nature of the measures really calculated to benefit the country and enhance the value of their property, and proceed to enact them, what will the victims of the policy say?

The only excuse that could be offered or was suggested for a measure so arbitrary and iniquitous, was, that under the peculiar circumstances of the country, it was necessary in order to promote cultivation. But this object could only be effected by improving, not the titles of the landlords, but those of the tenants. The defectiveness of the landlords' titles has nothing to do with the desolation of the country. There are thousands upon thousands of acres now waste and untenanted, to which the landlords' titles are clearly unquestionable. If therefore the motive were to yield to the national necessity of promoting cultivation, the legislature, instead of robbing creditors, should have given the tenants better titles, or done something to encourage them to remain on the land for a time and till it. But what do they do? The provisions in the original Bill respecting tenants, were thus described before the Committee of the House of Commons, by Mr. Butt:

“ I find that the 20th section provides, that the Commissioners shall ascertain the tenancies of the occupying tenant, and it gives the Commissioners a power to call upon all tenants and under-ten-

ants to produce their leases and show their titles ; that is a kind of inquisitorial power ; and unless the Commissioners insert the lease in the schedule of encumbrances to which the property is to be subject, the tenant's lease is at an end ; so that it gives them a power not only of dealing with embarrassed properties, but it gives them a power of instituting an investigation into the title of every person who has a charge upon the estate, whether by lease or otherwise, and unless they hold the lease to be good the lease is at an end."

And this, he said, was a power which the Court of Chancery never possessed, and which no tribunal ought to possess. (Q. 10553.) To provisions so outrageous, so destructive of the rights of tenants, it would be natural to suppose, that when attention was thus called to them by such a witness, some of our Liberal or Repeal members would have offered a strenuous opposition, but the facts do not support the theory. Indeed, the clause as originally proposed by the government, so far from being modified for the protection of the tenant, appears to have been elaborately amended to his prejudice, as any one may see by comparing it with ss. 23 and 24 of the statute, and these are looked upon by the gentlemen who are to carry it into operation, as of such paramount importance, that they are specially noticed in the inaugural address of Mr. Baron Richards, as providing the second of the three grounds of superiority of this court above all others : "They (the purchasers) will have a clear possession, free from all claims of tenants, save those subject to which the property is expressly sold." And thus appropriately the Act for the regeneration of this country, that commences with making bad landlord titles good, robs creditors and tenants of all titles, except such as the Commissioners in their discretion may "think fit" to leave them!

One more observation we shall make on this statute. Framed to ruin creditors and tenants for the benefit of landlords, can it be used to effect a different object? If the real friends of the people were now to devote themselves to converting, through the agency of this commission, the mass of the community into absolute owners of the soil, they would do more good in one year, than can be done in a century by the devotion of all the wisdom, eloquence, and enthusiasm of four generations, to squaring political circles according to the most approved abstract theories ever yet propounded for the exercitation of schools

or nations. We, last year, pointed out the radical defects in the plan of Sir Matthew Barrington's Land Company, and foretold its failure. Its principal defect was, that it was adapted only for a comparatively wealthy class of purchasers. Dr. Gray has recently suggested the formation of a company avoiding this mistake, and to be called the Irish Peasant-Proprietor Joint Stock Association,* and has, we believe, made some considerable progress towards its completion. Though many think a land-company will not answer, we feel certain, that if any moderate number of prudent, business-like men, bent on serving themselves as well as their country, combine honestly and earnestly with the tenants and creditors of the lands to be sold under the commission, and with such, too, of the inheritors as may not have the means to enter into the arrangements above-mentioned for clearing off their puisne incumbrancers, their efforts will be crowned with a success far beyond their most sanguine anticipations. Whether one great central company, with branches in different localities, on the model of the National Bank, or independent local companies, on the model of the Freehold Land companies of England, or some new and hitherto unheard-of system be best, we pretend not to say; but we feel the force of the adage, that where there is a will there is a way, and that if the combination we suggest be adopted, men who love their country, and are not unthoughtful of their own interests, and are unwilling to see the people vanish off the surface of the island after a lingering servitude to pauperism and starvation upon it, creditors, who are unwilling to be sacrificed by the fraudulent operation of this new landlord device, poor landlords, who cannot avail themselves of it, and capitalists who wish to make money by a safe and honourable investment, would all attain their objects, and thus not simply "a public feeling," but what is much better, a numerous landed proprietary, "racy of the soil," would be created, and the fondest, and we hope prophetic, aspirations of an honest, heart-broken, peasantry, as expressed in one of their own favourite songs

Dez Cipe az an Ypallm rancé †

would be realized; and thus, too, might English tax-payers

* See the Freeman's Journal, Nov. 30th, and Dec. 5th, 1849.

† Ireland shall belong to the wandering labourer.

realize visions of financial retrenchment, being relieved to the extent of the Income tax from the cost of keeping us in misery and order; for we fancy that if we once found ourselves comfortable, and enjoying the luxury of a seat under our own fruit-trees, freed from the plague of landlords, we should be as quiet and orderly as other comfortable people; and English statesmen, extricated from the "Irish difficulty," might have leisure to consider whether the adoption of some similar system might not be as well calculated to alleviate the sufferings of their own poor, as that super-sublime one which now keeps them, especially in the purely agricultural and large-farm districts, Dorsetshire, Devonshire, Wiltshire, Somersetshire, &c., &c., oscillating between the jail and the workhouse.

Sir Robert Peel's plantation Scheme is so closely connected with this Statute, that we may appropriately notice it here. That project, we confess with regret, confirms us more than fifty acts of Parliament in our view of the hopelessness of obtaining any really remedial measures from the present legislature. He was the first English minister who denounced the extermination system, and we therefore cherished a hope that he would look to the interests of the people, but we have been disappointed. His scheme embraces Connaught only, and suggests nothing for the benefit of the people of that province, but merely removing them, both landlords and tenants, off, and substituting a new race of Anglo-Saxon landlords. We may well pardon him for his views respecting us, but we wonder at his ignorance respecting his own countrymen. The Corporation of London was to buy up Connaught. Where were they to get the money? The Right Hon. Gentleman, dazzled by the barbaric magnificence of the Lord Mayor's entertainments, and well knowing that the peculiar characteristic of his Anglo-Saxon countrymen, and especially those collected in the focus of civilisation, was that of all highly organized races, for instance, the ancient Greeks, the Arabians and Caucasians, an instinctive antipathy to excess in eating and drinking, a love of plain and simple diet, bread, fruit, vegetables, and water, and a philosophic contentment with a very little of these, and seeing in their thin, spare, and healthy figures the practical proof of the received ethnological theory, was naturally led to fancy that a corporation, which fared so sumptuously, must have a large surplus revenue. But there is not a corporation in

the kingdom, with less money to spare for any purpose except eating and drinking. Their chief source of income is the coal tax. If they could raise any money by a mortgage of that, their first duty would be to expend it in clearing, scouring, and deodorising their own city. But they cannot. In fact, they are driven to shifts for money to which no other corporation would descend. Not to multiply details, fancy their condition, when they are obliged to make £200 or £300 a-year, by charging for admission to the galleries of the Old Bailey, the prices varying with the interest of the scene, from sixpence to a guinea, and thus converting their courts of justice into criminal show-rooms, into chambers of horror, *a la* Madame Tussaud. Just conceive the net profits of the exhibition of Manning and wife going towards the purchase of the ancient fief of the O'Connors.

Again, the Right Hon. Gentleman was mistaken, we believe, in supposing that English gentlemen and farmers would come to colonise Connaught. We think we know something of the feelings of English farmers, and we are satisfied that if they once leave their present homes to seek for new ones in another country, they will not stop on this side of the Atlantic. If they can release themselves from the sympathies which bind them to their native soil, all the world is alike to them, and why should they stop here? In America they can buy out and out for ever 200 acres, for less than one acre would cost here, in fact, for a sum per acre less than one year's poor rate assessment here, and hold it free from quit rents, crown rents, tithes, labour-rates, poor-rates, and all our other local and public burdens. A few dupes will be always found in England to embark in any speculation, however absurd; but neither Sir Robert, nor any other statesman, will ever be able to persuade fifty sensible farmers, who have anything to lose by the change, to abandon their homes and settle here. It would afford us great pleasure to see English farmers colonising our wastes, as they would soon teach our farmers not to suffer themselves to be ground to powder: but under the present circumstances of the country, no prudent solvent men can be expected to come, and with any others we can well dispense.

Another indication of the landlord spirit is the pretended facility for selling lands for arrears of poor rate, afforded by the new Poor Law Act. We, last year, pointed

out the fearful evils arising from the inability of the Poor Law authorities to recover the rates from landlords, and especially the rates of such lands as were cleared of inhabitants and left waste, and showed that the system was leading directly to universal ruin, by throwing great numbers of paupers who had been ratepayers on the rates, and then evading the payment of the rates due of the lands, off which they had been so "cleared," and thus causing rates to be multiplied indefinitely on the humane and honest folks who lived in the country, cultivated their lands, gave employment, and had stock and materials which could not escape the gripe of the collectors: and we recommended, that in this island a remedy should be adopted that was known elsewhere—namely, that the land should be sold under a summary process for nonpayment of the rates, a conveyance under the seal of the Poor Law Commissioners to be a title against the world. This suggestion was well received by all the honest rate-paying portion of the public, and in the course of the last session was much canvassed. The remedy against the land being before practically a fiction of law, the Committees of the Lords and Commons examined several witnesses as to whether the *corpus* of an estate should be made really liable for arrears of rate; and the former, to their surprise, found it suggested as one of the remedies for the distress of the country, by the Hon. Mr. Twisleton, the late Chief Commissioner of Poor Laws, Mr. Bourke, an assistant Commissioner, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, who as Assistant Barrister for Mayo, had opportunities of observing the operation of the law, Mr. Brett, the County Surveyor of Mayo, and two landlords, Mr. Leader, and Mr. Hamilton. (Q. 4206, 4416, 4512, 5161, 6951, 8087, 8136.) Before the Committee of the House of Commons, the present Chief Commissioner, Mr. Power, expressed the most decided opinion in favour of some measure, saying, that "rather than excuse the rates, he would prefer a power to take and sell the lands for the arrears," and would "at all risks, rather see that carried out fully by every means necessary to be provided by law, than adopt the practice of excusing the rate upon one property to the detriment of another." (Q. 134, 803, 951-4, 1193.) Mr. Butt, and several other witnesses, whose opinions were of great value, expressed themselves in favour of it. Mr. Napier, who was a member of the committee, assumed the character of a witness, for the purpose

of giving, in writing, “ a summary of the law, with some general suggestions.” In this valuable document he says, that where the land is deserted by tenants, “ the land is the real debtor, and there should be some direct remedy against the land ;” and as, “ under the existing law, the arrear should be paid by the first party who occupies as a primary charge on the rents and profits, I see no injustice in giving a summary remedy in the first instance, on notice to all parties. Whatever arrear remains after a tenancy is ended, must, in the end, be paid, (if at all,) either directly or circuitously by the owner of the rents and profits. There is great public mischief in allowing an arrear to continue unpaid, because it affects the rights and liabilities of many others. I see, therefore, no reason why an arrear should be allowed to remain as an undischarged incumbrance on property, if, by any summary and sufficient remedy, the property can be made responsible for the claim.” (Q. 2804.) We give, in some detail, the evidence of Dr. Longfield, as being conclusive on the subject. After saying that he thought the measure “ a proper and useful one,” and necessary here, though not in England, the examination proceeds thus :

“ 9451. Is it not going one step further in a poorer country, to say that not the product of the land, but the corpus land shall be liable ? —It is, but it is going a necessary step further. I think that when a tax is imposed on the owner of any property, the most merciful thing to him is at once to deprive him of all hope of evading the payment of that tax.

“ 9452, Am I to understand you, that where land is thrown out of cultivation, the tenant flying, and constructively the owner becoming the occupier, you would, if he failed to pay the arrear of rate, proceed to sell the land itself?—Yes; at present he must pay the arrear of rate ; if he occupies himself he can be distrained on for that arrear of rate ; if another tenant comes in, that other tenant can be compelled to pay the whole arrear, and may deduct that entire arrear from the landlord, so that practically the burden is thrown on the landlord.

“ 9453. There is a step further ; the land is not cultivated, and the owner does not occupy ; would you then constructively hold him to be in occupation, and proceed to levy as against him, and failing payment by him to sell the land ?—To sell that particular land I would, because if that process is to continue for ever, it is better to have the land sold than for it to remain always unoccupied, and whenever it is occupied the first occupier takes it with all the arrears, which are thrown again upon the landlord.

“ 9454. That has been termed a law of confiscation; would you so regard it, the law being as it now is in Ireland, the usufruct of the land being in the first instance liable to the payment of an arrear, and constructively the landlord liable for arrears?—If I were opposing the law I might call it confiscation, but I do not think it confiscation.

“ 9455. With your views of law and of equity, regarding it as a question of law and of equity, would you consider it a measure justifiable upon those principles?—I think it a measure that necessarily follows from the principles, and that it is absurd to stop short of it.

“ 9456. If it would be justifiable upon principles of law and equity, looking to the condition of the most distressed part of Connaught, as a matter of policy, would those forced sales for arrear of poor-rate operate in a manner conducive to the public good, by forcing sales of small portions of land?—I think it would operate in a manner most conducive to the public good, and I would say that it is not a question between the landlord and the other interests of the country, but between the non-paying and the paying landlord, because the rate must be collected; if my neighbour does not pay I must; that is all.

“ 9478. With reference to the power of selling for arrears of rate, does it not press somewhat hardly upon the landlord that he should bear the whole burthen of the poor-rate for tenements under £4., his tenant having no interest in keeping down the charge, but probably an opposite interest, with the hope of getting some relief himself, to accumulate the charge?—It does; I have mentioned that it is contrary to principle, but that I think in the present state of society it is necessary, because the landlord would otherwise assist, in many instances, his tenant in evading the law. If the landlord gets any rent from his tenant while the poor-rate is unpaid, he is in fact getting money that ought in the first instance to have gone to pay the poor-rate collector.

“ 9520. Mr. Napier.] In cases where there are arrears of poor-rate, and the land is encumbered with mortgages on it, supposing that the mortgagor stood in the relation of the landlord, how would you deal with that case?—In the same manner. I would sell it still, precisely as if it were unencumbered; the poor-rate at present takes precedence of all encumbrances.

“ 9521. *Quoad* the profits?—*Quoad* the profits, and thereby *quoad* the corpus, because the corpus is only valuable as you are able to enjoy the profits.

“ 9522. Would you sell the inheritance notwithstanding those encumbrances?—Certainly.

“ 9523. Would not that be affecting mortgages by poor-rate?—Of course it would be affecting the mortgages in this respect, that the estate is rendered less valuable.

“ 9524. Mr. Bright.] And their security less?—Yes.

“ 9525. Mr. Napier.] Then, supposing an arrear of poor-rate had accrued in the way you mention, and you were going to sell the property, would you sell it discharged of those encumbrances?—Certainly.”

In short, the expression of opinion in favour of some measure for selling the land for the arrears of rate was so unanimous and decided on the part of all the witnesses who were examined upon it, that the legislature thought themselves bound to appear to comply, and they accordingly adopt a few clauses, which are forthwith heralded through the realm, as providing the means of effectuating the wishes of all the honest rate-paying portion of the community, but which, in reality, leave the matter practically where they found it. These provisions are contained in the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th sections of the new Poor Law Act, 12 and 13 Vict. c. 104. The two first provide for short forms of declarations in actions in the Superior Courts by guardians; the 3rd provides for the filing and registration of the decrees of the assistant Barristers' Courts, as judgments of the Superior Courts, (this could have been done before, according to Mr. Napier, Q. 810-4); and the last makes judgments, and decrees a charge on the defendant's real estate, situate within the union, where the arrears occurred, and gives them priority (and this is the only substantial novelty in the measure) over all other charges and incumbrances, except crown and quit-rents, tithe rent charge, and charges, if any already existing, under the drainage and land improvement acts. The effect of all this is merely to place guardians, who have got a judgment or decree against a landowner, or supposed landowner, in the same position with regard to his interest in the land, as if he had executed a mortgage of it under his hand and seal, that is to say, they may file a bill in equity praying for a sale of his interest.

A Chancery suit for the recovery of arrears of rate!!! Is not the offer of such a remedy an insult to the common sense of all the rate-paying portion of the community? The guardians had the same remedy before by suing in the superior courts, with the exception of the priority now expressly given; but they never enforced it. (Q. 132-3, 810-11-14.) Fancy a ten years' Chancery suit for a half year's arrear of rate against a gentleman who, on his title being examined into adversely may, at the end of three years' more litigation on that point, prove possibly to be

little better than a bailiff, probably only tenant for life, and almost certainly not owner of the fee simple; and fancy at the end of all that an ejectment on the title, occupying, at least, another year, against the paupers who most probably would have squatted on the wastes, and were not “parties to the suit,”—and then the guardians, sending the Sheriff a writ of *habere facias possessionem*, and going with him and the *posse comitatus* to level their cabins, and take them into the workhouse, and deliver possession to the purchaser; and after deducting from the purchase money the arrears of crown rents, quit rents, tithe rent-charges, drainage and land improvement loans, and the costs of the first action and of the suit for the sale, and the suit respecting the title, and of the action of ejectment,—applying the balance, if any, towards the payment of the six months’ rate struck some fifteen years before. But do not stop here. Pursue the argument ad absurdum. How are the rates to be recovered that are or ought to be imposed in the interval between the commencement of the first action and the time of depositing the purchase money? (The purchaser will be liable for all the subsequent rates.) The owner, involved in a Chancery suit, may become desperate, and *bona fide* assign his title to some pauper, and renounce the occupation. Are they to sue the pauper? Are they to have two Chancery suits on hand at the same time? Suppose they sue, and he in terror flies the country, having first taken care to assign his estate and interest to some other but undiscoverable pauper, what are they to do? Are the lands to remain exempt from rates because the guardians cannot discover the heirs and assigns of the fugitive? and suppose they should be discovered, are they to be made parties to the pending suits by supplemental bills, or how otherwise? And if they should then in due form of law renounce all title to the land, and it should become, in fact, and to all intents and purposes, abandoned, derelict, disowned, and repudiated—how are the rates to be recovered? Are the lands to be unrated because they are unowned? If the Legislature meant to make the land really liable for the rate, would they have interposed a Chancery suit? The avowed object of all their other legislation is to take property out of that Court. The Committee on Receivers over and over again repeat their conviction of the necessity of saving property from that jurisdiction. One of the principal grounds for the

appointment of the Encumbered Estates Commission was said to be to protect property from the ruinous costs and delays of equity suits. Why not then bring these decrees and judgments within the jurisdiction of this commission? Why take special care to keep them out of it? Why, if they are to be made equivalent to a mortgage, not allow the guardians at once to enter on possession; or, if it be refused them, bring an action of ejectment for it? Why not sell on a decree or judgment without further delay or litigation, adopting the writ of execution under the Act of Edward I., as by this the Sheriff could at once dispose of the defendant's interest, and give the purchaser immediate possession? If, after ten or more years' litigation in Chancery, he must be introduced to wind up the proceedings, surely he may be as well introduced in the first instance.

But even any of these courses would be attended with more expense, delay, difficulty, and uncertainty, than ought to attend any process for the recovery of rates on which the existence of so many people, and the security of all property depend; and moreover, they do not at all reach the case of lands for which an owner cannot be discovered,—a circumstance of frequent occurrence since the commencement of the wholesale exterminations, and the consequent fearful increase of poor-rates. The only objection that can be reasonably urged to our suggestion is, that it dispenses with all litigation. But this, we apprehend, is not of much weight. The evil of unnecessarily incurring great costs in litigation where there is no doubt as to the facts, has attracted the attention of all parties. The Committee on Receivers point out the evils arising from a "facility of litigation where facts are not doubted," and say, "where the question is whether so much rent is in arrear, the fact is capable of being ascertained without vexatious litigation;" and suggest, consequently, "that the recovery of rent should generally be enforced by summary process on the certificate of the master, adjudicating on the amount of rent due." (2nd Rep. p. ix.) So the Lord Chancellor suggests, that the court should be empowered, in case one half year's rent should be in arrear for three months, "to make a summary order, unless cause shown to the contrary, to determine the lease or tenancy of any tenant holding under a Receiver or the

Court, and put the tenant out of possession.”* Read for rent, rate, and the principle applies to our suggestion. So a late Lord Chancellor observes:

“The grievance, which is peculiar to England, of being obliged to bring an action and prove a debt, established by the judgment of a court of law, before enforcing payment of it where there is not the smallest doubt of the validity of the instrument by which it is constituted, has always been a reproach to the administration of justice in this country. To mitigate the evil, the statute of Acton Burnel enacts, that where a debt has been acknowledged before the mayor of a town, immediately after default of payment, there shall be execution upon it, and that by an application to the Chancellor, the creditor may obtain satisfaction by sale of the debtor’s goods and alienable lands in any part of England.”

This his Lordship calls a “most admirable statute,”—says it shows “that the subject was as well understood in the time of Chancellor Burnel as in the time of Chancellor Eldon, or Chancellor Lyndhurst;” and adds the climax to his eulogy, by stating that he himself had “repeatedly but ineffectually attempted to extend the principle of this measure to modern securities, bonds, and bills of exchange, and to assimilate our law in this respect to that of Scotland, France, and every other civilised country.”† But an authority still more in point is that of Mr. Napier, as we may take him to be the legal representative of the landlord interest in the House of Commons. He objects even to the litigation about rates before the petty sessions, saying, in that document to which we have before referred, that the effect of the recent decision of the Queen’s Bench, allowing the landlord, when summoned before magistrates, to contest the fact of his filling that character, “converts that which ought to be a cheap and summary remedy for a specific demand into a vexatious and expensive search for the party who ought to be charged with the rate.”—“I may conclude my observations on this head by observing, that the remedy for poor rate should, as I conceive, merely involve the question of payment;—the rate book should conclusively show the party liable, and the amount due;—and the final adjudication made should be invested with all the efficacy of a judgment of a

* First Rep. App. 147.

† Lord Campbell’s *Lives of the Chancellors*, V. i. p. 167.

superior court of record, which should be enforced with all diligence against every species of available property of the party liable." We might cite authorities without number in favour, and examples from the Colonies, the United States, and other countries, of the course we suggest; but as we have the identical practice, which we would introduce, in force for upwards of two centuries in England on property belonging to the Bedford family, and established too under the auspices of one of the most eminent of the ancestors of the Premier, we think we need do no more than state what it is.

On that tract of country lying on the eastern shore of England, and called the Bedford Level, a low-lying district saved from the sea by high embankments, and consequently liable to sudden inundations, it was found necessary to devise a cheap, speedy, and certain mode of collecting the taxes, and the following is the mode devised:* The register of the corporation keeps a register or lot book, in which the ownership of each lot or parcel of land is recorded. The tax is laid on at the April meeting, and ordered for payment, part in June, and the rest in November. After that meeting the register prepares what is called the "annual tax roll, comprising particulars of the quantity of land, and the amount of tax of each owner, and transmits the same to the receiver." In this tax roll, the name of a new owner cannot be entered, except his title is first registered at the Fen Office; and if he neglect to register, "the receiver cannot divide the tax charged in the tax-roll: he is therefore required to receive the whole amount, or none of it." The tax ought to be paid at the receiver's office at Ely; but he now generally attends at certain other towns in the months of June and November, to receive it—and he is "directed to forward to the auditor in the first weeks of July and December, a correct list of all persons in arrear, in order that the auditor may be enabled to charge them with the penalties upon the taxes so in arrear."† These penalties are not to exceed a

* We take this account of it from "The History of the Drainage of the Great Level of the Fens, called the Bedford Level, with the Constitutions and Laws of the Bedford Level Corporation. By Samuel Wells, Esq., Register of the Corporation." London, 1830.

† V. i. 558-9-60, 628, 629, 630.

third of the tax; and the receiver can “not in any case whatever take any tax without penalty after the day the same is incurred.” Annually, on the first of February, the receiver furnishes the register with a fair engrossed roll or schedule on parchment, containing an account of all arrears of taxes and penalties then unpaid, which, after being examined by the latter, is certified under his hand and the seal of the corporation, and returned by him to the receiver, in order that the same may be publicly affixed to the door of the Shire hall, according to Act of Parliament. The receiver places the said schedule, (usually denominated the arrear roll), and which contains the description and quantities of the land in arrear, the names of the owners, and the amount of the tax and penalty, on the doors of the Shire hall at Ely, on three several market days, (Thursdays), immediately preceding the public meeting in April, to notify to the defaulters that their lands will be forfeited and sold at such meeting, unless the taxes and penalties be sooner paid. “The extreme though necessary severity of the law in this respect has induced the board to take every precaution consistent with the due discharge of their important duties, to prevent oppression, not only by directing that the arrear roll shall be advertised in the provincial papers two weeks previous to the April meeting, and that letters shall be written by the register to the several persons in arrear, but also by framing the conditions of sale so as to enable the Board to interfere in cases of mere accident or particular hardship.” “The mode of proceeding to sale is rather curious. The register reads from the roll the full particulars of each lot, and then demands what quantity any one will take for the amount of the tax and penalty; and should any one, for instance, say he will take the tenth, the register then enquires if any one will take less than that quantity, until he has at length obtained the amount of the tax and penalty for the smallest possible quantity.” The party to whom the sale is made becomes thereby “lawful purchaser and assignee of so much as shall be sold to all intents and purposes whatsoever,”* and the Sergeant at mace of the Corporation, by a precept under their seal, “in nature of a writ of *Habere facias possessionem* at common law,”† delivers possession. † As

* 15 Car. 2, c. 17, s. 10. Ib. Vol. ii. Appendix, 395.

† V. i. 622.

the Court of Chancery determined in 1678, that it "could not interfere with any sale on pretence of equity,"* the title thus secured is so free from doubt that, we are told, "in order to relieve titles from difficulties, lands have been sometimes put up to sale as forfeited lands, with a view of obtaining a bargain and sale under the corporate seal. Such a bargain and sale will confer an unexceptionable title. But of course this is a dangerous experiment, as any individual may bid, and thus deprive the owner of part of the estate." † Lest the reader may suppose that these powers of sale were exercised only in "the dark ages," we may quote Mr. Wells once more, who says: "The quantity on the arrear roll has varied from time to time. Sometimes upwards of 20,000 acres became forfeited for nonpayment of taxes. For several years not one acre has been forfeited, otherwise than through a mistake, and for want of money to pay the tax." † Still not a year passes that advertisements for the sale of lands forfeited for these taxes do not appear in the Cambridge and other local papers. Here, then, is a system in successful operation for upwards of 200 years, which may at once be substituted for the expensive, dilatory, and inoperative contrivances of our speculative landlord legislators. Its great advantages, and they cannot be too often mentioned, are, that the rates are collected with unerring certainty, and the least possible expense; the enforcement of the payment is by the surest, cheapest, and justest process the wit of man can devise; and the title given to the purchaser is free from all doubt, and beyond the reach of quibbles—and, above all, the quibbles of practitioners in—equity.

If any of our representatives were to take up this subject, they would find the statutes in Mr. Wells's book quite sufficient; but as they very probably may like to make provisions for the cases of persons absent, insane, under age, &c. &c., they would find these in the Acts of the United States; for instance, the Act of 9th. January, 1815, c. 21, entitled, "An Act to provide additional Revenues for defraying the expenses of Government, and maintaining the public credit by laying a direct tax upon the United States, and to provide for collecting and assessing the

* Vol. i. 568.

† *Ib.* p. 624.‡ *Ib.*

same.”* This system has worked admirably in the States, and is one of the causes of their rapid colonisation in contrast with the slow progress of our settlements. In these the colonial office mismanagers have been in the habit of making grants, to favourites or capitalists, of vast tracts of land which lie unreclaimed, the grantees looking forward for ample remuneration to the time when all the surrounding districts shall have been settled, and land shall be dear—in the meantime contributing nothing to the local or public burdens, for there is nothing seizable or sellable on the land, timber in the backwoods not being readily convertible into current coin; just exactly as our exterminators hope to manage here. In the States, however, a different rule prevails. If a party get a piece of ground, he and it are at once set down as contributories to the public burdens; and if these are not duly paid, and his goods and chattels are not forthcoming, slices of it are sold off, without much unnecessary ceremony, to persons who for their own sakes will improve and reclaim, and will not be mere nominal owners. In this way, too, we can foresee in this country a vast number of small yeomen re-peopling the districts that our humane and superhuman Anglo-Saxon masters are now converting into wastes.

In the Bedford Level Statutes there does not seem to be any provision for distraining goods and chattels for the rates. In the United States there are provisions for this purpose in the Acts regulating the taxes for the general government; but there is also a provision which one would expect to find among the enactments of a legislature whose members were selected from the ordinary classes of society, and not from the *crème de la crème* of geocracy, and some of whom would consequently be themselves, or have friends, relations, and neighbours, liable to suffer from a too harsh and unmerciful enforcement of public rights. This provision also, oddly enough, is borrowed from our law as it was when our legislature was somewhat like that of the United States, and ere yet it was exclusively composed of knights and citizens, who could declare that they respectively were worth £600 and £300 a-year, clear of encumbrance, and could consequently stand in no need of a proviso, such as we find in the 26th section of this Ame-

* See Public Statutes at Large of the United States. Boston, 1845. Vol. 3, p. 164.

rican Act:—"That it shall not be lawful to make distress of the tools or implements of a trade or profession, beasts of the plough necessary for the cultivation of improved land, arms, or household furniture, or apparel necessary for a family." The 51 H. 3, stat. 4, provided, "That no man of religion nor other, shall be distrained by his beasts that gain his land, nor by his sheep, for the king's debt, nor the debt of any other man, nor for any other cause, by the king's or other Bailiffs, but until they can find another distress, or chattels whereof they may levy the debt, or that is sufficient for the demand, (except for damage feasant) and that such distresses be reasonable after the value of the debt or demand, *and by estimation of neighbours, and not by strangers*, and not outrageous." This was re-enacted by the 28 Ed. I. stat. 3, c. 12. Lord Coke, in his commentary on this statute, quotes a similar provision of the Civil Law; and in order to show that it was part of the Common Law, cites a number of ancient authorities to the same effect, one of whom gives the sensible reason for the rule, "lest if his agriculture should be neglected, the party might be forced to run deeper in debt afterwards." Britton he cites as including within such a prohibition, in addition to beasts of the plough and sheep, beasts for the saddle, vessels, or robes, or anything within the house, or by which a livelihood is disturbed.* So a more modern writer, collecting the substance of all the authorities, says, "No man can be distrained for rent by the utensils of his trade, as the axe of a carpenter, the books of a scholar, the materials for making cloth in a weaver's shop; for these the law protects, under a presumption that without them the tenant could neither be useful to others, nor gain a livelihood for himself."† A twelve-month back we recommended that this principle should be applied to the collection of the Poor-rate, and everything we have heard or seen since confirms us in the correctness of our view. We know that the wretchedness of the country has been frightfully aggravated, and believe that two-thirds of those who within the year have become paupers, have been made so by the manner in which the collection of the rates was enforced. We cannot conceive how it could have entered

* 2. Just. 132.

† Bac. Abridg. Distress. (B)

into the minds of any men who had the slightest feeling for the people, or regard for the ultimate condition of the country, to let collectors loose upon the rate-payers the moment a rate was struck, without giving them any notice or any time to pay. The present Chief Commissioner thus coolly states the power of these myrmidons without suggesting the slightest restriction to it :

“The powers of the collectors are very summary in Ireland, more so than in England. Immediately that a rate is made, the collector can, under his own warrant, proceed on the lands rated, and take any goods, stock, or chattels that he finds there, whether they belong to the party or to any body else.” *

We may add that the collector, when he has thus made a seizure, may impound the distress where he thinks proper, sell it when and where he likes, and act himself as auctioneer. We pointed out last year, the sad consequences of plundering poor honest strugglers of the last pan, plate, and blanket. This has gone on with tenfold violence. The reader who has the happiness of not knowing anything of the country, but what he hears or reads, may take the following outline by the Reverend Mr. Hardiman, as conveying only a very faint idea of the horrors of the system.

“With regard to the levying of the rates, had the poorer classes last year any means of meeting the rates imposed upon them?—Generally speaking, I am positive they had no means.—What were the consequences of levying the rates upon a class of persons not far from starvation? The consequences were lamentable in many ways; first, it deprived those who could have existed, and still hung to the rigging, of the means of doing so, by taking away their only and sole property and possession; and, secondly, I have in many instances known that very good members of society, having a little property left, have gone, as I said a while ago, either to America or to some other quarter, and of course a greater burden of unpaid rates was thereby thrown upon the community; and in every respect, to my mind, the levying of rates, and the harshness, I will say, which was exercised in quarters where there were no means of meeting, produced consequences unutterably disastrous in every respect, both as to the deprivation to which the parties were subjected, and the fear which was infused into the wholesome parts of the community; and also I knew, in many cases, a very strange sort of procedure carried on as the collector’s part of the duty.” †

* *Ib.* of Com. Rep. Ques. 791.

† Evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons.

A common mode of proceeding has been to go at once, almost before the rate-payers could have heard that the rate was struck, to seize stock, crops and furniture, and then to sell all at less than a tenth, nay, a twentieth, of the real value, by a sort of mock auction, at which the friends and accomplices of the collectors were prepared to attend. We wonder how men could have had the patience to submit to such treatment, and believe that instances of such meekness and forbearance as they have exhibited, could be discovered in no other country in Europe.

Some remedy for this evil would be, if that we have above suggested be not adopted, to assimilate our law to that of England. The consequence would be, that the rate-payer should be first summoned before two justices: that would give time to prepare for payment. He would, before the justices, have an opportunity of proving, perhaps, that he had paid, or of explaining his circumstances, and getting a reasonable time to pay; the seizure should be sanctioned by the warrant of the justices, and the sale could not take place in less than four days from the time of the seizure, nor otherwise than according to certain forms which have been found even in England necessary for the protection of the public, against the rapacity of bailiffs. One other great advantage would be, that if it should appear to the justices, to whom application should be made for the warrant, "that the issuing thereof would be ruinous to the defendant and his family," or "that he hath no goods or chattels whereon to levy such distress," they might award imprisonment.* A further slight amendment in such case, would be to allow them to excuse him, and to charge the lessor, or the land, as the case might be, even if it were to send the guardians into chancery.

Another suggestion we would make for the protection of landed proprietors. They are now liable to process of execution against their goods and persons for arrears of rate. Nothing can be more unjust in principle or in practice, than to subject the owner (too often merely nominal) of land to such persecutions. The rate is imposed on him in respect of the profits which he is supposed to derive from the land, "the rateable hereditaments," and not in respect of any money, goods, or chattels, which he may be

* See 11 and 12 Vict. c. 43. s. 29; 12 and 13 Vict. c. 70. s. 19.

supposed to have from any other source. His name is introduced by accident only, and as a matter of description and designation of the particular hereditaments, just as the metes and bounds might be; and, therefore, the remedy should not be against him, but against the land itself. We have known instances, where gentlemen living in England, by their own personal exertion, and having only the nominal ownership of lands here, not having derived for years a penny from them, have been harassed by threats of action for rates. Again, in this country, is it not saddening to see gentlemen, who are mere nominal owners of land, who have not received rents for years from it, and in all probability never will, ruined by executions against their persons and household goods? The present deplorable circumstances of the country require that this practice should be abandoned, and that the land alone should be looked to for the rate, and that neither landlords nor tenants should be personally persecuted for it.

The Bedford Level must be our model, not only for poor-rates, but for all public taxes. The grand jury cess has now become such a fearful charge, that if the present mode of levying it be continued, it will tend to the desolation of the country almost as much as the poor-rates. The following authentic statement of its progressive increase in the county of Limerick will give an idea of its increase in other counties. It was, in 1795, £5,579; in 1805, £15,952; in 1815, £17,224; in 1825, £31,094; in 1835, £31,788; in 1845, £37,821; in 1846, £40,054; in 1847, £46,075; in 1848, £65,465; in 1849, £96,688. The following is a detailed statement of its amount per £., in 1845 and in 1849 in the several unions of that county:

	Rathkeale.			Newcastle.			Limerick.			Killmallock (part of.)			Tipperary (part of.)			Clogheen (part of.)		
1845	0	1	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	1	5 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	3 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	1	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	2	0	0	1	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
1849	0	3	9 $\frac{1}{4}$	0	4	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	3	2	0	3	0 $\frac{3}{4}$	0	3	10 $\frac{1}{2}$	0	3	4

It appears that the poor-rate and grand jury rate for that county for the year ending the 29th of September, 1849, amounted to 9s. 2d. per £. on the present valuation of the entire county; and on two of the electoral divisions of the county, to upwards of 15s. per £.; and one, Castle-town, to 20s. 1d., per £. In this last division, which consists of 9656 acres, 2397 acres are already waste. It is quite idle to expect to recover the grand jury cess off

the waste by the present process, and it is cruel and silly to lay the rest of the division waste by the process which has succeeded so admirably with these 2397 acres, namely, seizing and selling the stock and furniture of the inhabitants.

That some new course must be adopted is, we think, beyond question. The facts we have above stated respecting the county of Limerick, we have taken from a report unanimously adopted at a meeting of magistrates and grand jurors of that county, held on the 24th of Nov. last. The report states that the committee who prepared it, had been appointed to collect such facts, as might fully and impartially represent the condition of the county, and that they had done so with the co-operation of sub-committees in the several unions. These were composed chiefly of the chairmen and vice-chairmen of the boards of guardians, and counted amongst their members, Lord Clare, Lord Monteagle, Lord Clarina, Lord Muskerry, and Mr. Monsell, M. P. A report from such a body, unanimously adopted, is beyond a doubt entitled to the greatest respect and attention. Limerick too, it should be recollected, is more than an average county. It contains some of the most fertile lands in the kingdom, and has suffered, perhaps as little from bad landlords and extermination, as any other county in the island. One of the chief exterminators, we may observe *en passant*, is a Catholic nobleman. Then what do these lords, magistrates, and grand jurors report? After noticing the evidences of social progress which were visible before the potato blight, and of social ruin which has since supervened, they say: "Assuming that the events and system, which have for some years been in progress, should continue unchecked, the committee cannot but anticipate a general destruction of the ordinary bonds of society,—the annihilation of property—the cessation of all profitable demand for labour, and the absorption of all classes in one common irremediable ruin, ultimately destructive to individual happiness, and fatal to the best interests of the community;" after pointing out the progress of grand jury taxation, and the reduction in the value of property, and the extent of cultivation, they add, that the decay of the wealth of the Limerick Unions, as represented by their agricultural produce, is rapidly extending, "and the committee are enabled to state, from their own personal knowledge and obser-

vations, that *considerable and increasing tracts lie waste and uncultivated*. The number of cattle is alarmingly reduced on the pasture lands—the stacks in the homesteads have almost disappeared—many districts are left abandoned and desolate, *and the doubt of reaping the harvest indisposes many from sowing*, and even when agriculture is continued, the cultivator, in despair at the prospect of taxation indefinitely increasing, becomes hopeless, limits all his operations, and thus diminishes the demand for labour.” They then proceed to notice the increasing burthens on the resources of the county, and amongst others name the Rate-in-Aid, which, we observe, rather ominously already exceeds by £4000, the entire poor-rate for 1845, and by £1500, that for 1846. After going through all the details of the poor-rate and grand jury taxation for the county, and noticing the ruin impending over the community, and the new and extended emigration of “that middle class of industrious men which Ireland so much wants, and without which no state can be staple or prosperous,” they contemplate the arrival of “the fatal period when payment of rates shall cease by the interruption of cultivation, and the demand for labour and the power of paying wages shall likewise cease,” when “*even the extinction of all rent would be no relief to the occupier*,” and “*land would cease to be profitable into whatever hands it might fall*.” They see no escape from universal pauperism except through “the wisdom and the aid of Parliament;” and they suggest that though some may doubt whether the evils of the country are remediable by legislation, yet no one can deny “that it is a fit subject for consideration, how far recent laws have aggravated these evils, how far the reform of them is demanded, and whether the remedial measures adopted, from views undoubtedly benevolent, have neither been found adequate, nor in principle, fitted for the occasion.” *

We fear, that if every process against the goods or person for rates and taxes be not altogether superseded, and the land alone be made liable, no modification of the mode of collecting will be sufficient. We are satisfied too, that if the statutes allowing the sale of distresses for rent be not suspended or repealed, there can be no cultivation of the soil this spring. Every one acquainted with the country,

* See Limerick Chronicle, Dec. 1st, 1849.

knows that this is so. If a select conclave of Limerick landlords confess, that “the doubt of reaping the harvest indisposes many from sowing,” what would the Limerick farmers say? Let those who are startled at our proposition, reflect on the circumstances around them, and recollect that these statutes are modern landlord innovations, and in direct violation of the principles of the common law, and not dating farther back than the reign of William III. Then for the first time, landlords were allowed to sell what they could before distrain, and to distrain and sell certain articles which they could not before distrain; to wit, “sheaves or cocks of corn, loose or in the straw, or hay in any barn or granary, or on any hovel stack or rick.”—7 W. 3, c. 22, ss. 4 and 5. In the reign of Geo. IV., they proceeded further, and voted themselves the power of seizing and selling growing crops. In suggesting a revision of this legislation, we are starting no new crotchets of our own. We have no confidence in new crotchets, no matter by whom propounded. We believe with the wisest men of Greece, Italy, and England, that “the custom of making and unmaking laws is pernicious.”* We believe with Coke, and the Sage of Corinth, that old laws and new meats are best for us, and we share with the former in the spirit of the answer: “*nolumus leges Angliæ mutari quæ hactenus usitatæ sunt et approbatæ* :” as if they would have said, “we will not change the laws of England, for that they have been used and approved from time to time, by men of most singular wisdom, understanding, and experience:” and with him believe that, “as regards the principles and foundations of the common laws and customs of the realm, it is a political axiom ratified by use and experience, that the alteration of any one of them is most dangerous, for that which hath been refined and perfected by all the wisest men of past times, in a long succession of ages, and proved and approved by continual experience to be good and profitable for the commonwealth, cannot without great hazard and danger be altered.”† The landlords themselves have been already, even on this subject, forced to confess practically the truth of this “political axiom,” for the act allowing the seizure and sale of growing crops, was found to be so intolerably oppressive, that they them-

* See Pref. 4. Rep. viii. &c.

† *Ib.*

selves repealed it in 1847. The propriety of this latter measure was much canvassed last session, but not one witness (to the best of our recollection and belief) expressed an opinion unfavourable to it. Sir Edward Sugden said very decidedly, that it was "quite right." (Q. 510-13.) The master of the Rolls said :

"I am against the system of distraining growing crops; I cannot say how it (the new Law) has worked, but at times there were very oppressive uses made of that power. It was very much the custom to place keepers on properties when the crop was getting ripe, and oppressive use was made of the power of distraining; upon the whole, I am disposed to think that the law was rightly altered."—Q. 1260.

So far, therefore, this slight return to the common law meets with the approbation of these authorities. We only regret that they were not questioned respecting an entire abandonment of the new system. Master Brooke, who from his official experience, probably had a more intimate knowledge of the practical details of it than any other witness, and whose opinion therefore, was of the greatest importance, had his mind so deeply impressed with the evils of it, that on being asked whether "the shortening the period within which a distress might take place, would be in favour of the tenant," he replied: "My opinion would be to abolish distress altogether, as a remedy for rent. In Ireland it is the most vexatious and mischievous thing which it is possible to conceive." (Q. 364.) Professor Hancock was examined at some length on the subject, and his evidence is so important, that we lay it before our readers.

"10188. Have you considered, with regard to the law of distress, whether that is a power which ought to be continued to landlords?—I have not considered it so fully that I would give a decided opinion upon the subject, but so far as I have investigated it, I am inclined to think that it would be better not to give them the power of distress.

"10189. Mr. *Bright.*] Do you think that the landlord would have an adequate security for his rent?—I may mention that on well-managed estates in the north of Ireland, the practice is never to distrain; the rent is recovered entirely by proceeding against the tenant's interest in the farm, and the rents are very punctually paid without exercising the law of distress, perhaps in one out of 100 cases.

"10190. Have not the Ulster proprietors property, that is the

tenant's interest in the farm, which they can come upon when a new tenant is proposed to the farm, which landlords in other parts of Ireland where the tenant right does not prevail have not, and therefore, are not the cases so different, that you cannot draw any comparison between the two?—I think they may be fairly compared, and we find that on very well-managed properties, the rent is punctually paid without the law of distress. That law cannot be absolutely necessary.

“10191. Is it your opinion that the law of distress makes it much more difficult for the tenant to borrow money for the cultivation of his farm, than if such a law did not exist?—Certainly it does.

“10192. Is that because it gives to the proprietor the right of payment from the assets of the tenant which his other creditors do not possess?—No other creditor can take any of the tenant's property in execution without setting off a year's rent, and I think that that is an encouragement to high nominal rents, which are not really collected.

10193. Major *Blackall.*] That is to say, if the landlord puts in his claim for a year's rent?—Of course.

10194. Mr. *Bright.*] In your opinion, would it tend to make the landlord more careful as to the solvency and character of his tenant, and as to the terms upon which he entered on his farm, if the law of distress did not exist?—Yes; I would sooner give the landlords more summary power of ejecting the tenants, and less power over their chattel property in the way of recovering rent.”

Our readers must now confess that our proposition for the repeal or the suspension for a limited time of these statutes, is not so startling as they might have at first sight imagined.

As we have suggested a return to the usages of earlier times, so far as depriving landlords of the power of distress, and giving creditors a ready process for seizing and selling their lands, and as in the present state of the country they cannot be considered culpable in being unable to meet obligations contracted in a very different condition of society, we would suggest also a repeal of the statutes that allow imprisonment for debt. At the common law, no man could be imprisoned for debt at the suit of the subject. We stop not now to show that this was the true principle of public policy, but if it were right in early times, how much more so is it now, when all those who are not in the jail or the workhouse, have as much as they can do to keep on the outside of these establishments, and have not a shilling to spare for any purpose, and least of all,

for the maintenance of jails and jailors, in order to encourage reckless or fraudulent moneylenders, and when they must, if a man is imprisoned whose family depend on his labour for their bread, support that family during his incarceration? We cannot now afford to lose the services of one active and intelligent man, or to indulge in the luxury of jails, except for criminals; and those who buy not with promises, seek not their livelihood by usury, and peril not the interests of their families by improvident lendings, ought not to be taxed for the sake of those who do.

The subject of simplifying remedies against landowners, reminds us of the condition of the Protestant clergy. When we recently saw a manifesto signed by several of our representatives, suggestive of another agitation against them, we could not help thinking of the observation of that simple minded gentleman, Captain Dugald Dalgetty, respecting the conflicting war cries of the Great Rebellion: "good watchwords all—excellent watchwords—Whilk cause is best I cannot say. But sure am I, that I have fought knee deep in blood many a day, for one that was ten degrees worse than the worst of them all." Are we to be raised again by that cry, and to allow political adventurers to get rank and pay by leading us in such a senseless struggle? Till the question of self-preservation, the right to live upon our native soil, is settled, no *wise* friend will raise another watchword.* When we are being cleared off

* Since the preceding observations went to press, we have seen, with regret, that the Repeal Association, the Irish Alliance, and we may add, the English popular party through Mr. Bright, have all declared in favour of some Anti-Church movement. To these various bodies we give credit for sincerity of kind intentions towards the people; but all that they have as yet urged has led us to make no other change in what we had written, than to prefix "*wise*" to "*friend*." Can it be wise to proclaim that our physical misery cannot be alleviated except through the destruction of the Established Church, and to rouse all the dormant bigotry of England on behalf of our landlords, and identify their powers of exaction with the existence of that institution? Ought we not to attack them where and as we find them, without treating them as the champions of the Establishment, encasing them carefully in its coat-armour, placing them behind its ramparts, and in its very citadel, and summoning to their aid by sound of trumpet all the fanatics of the empire? If, at a moment when we are quiet as half-starved lambs, and our wretchedness and ruin are exciting universal pity,

our own soil as vermin, at the rate of nearly half a million a-year by our landlords, are we to divert our attention from that life and death struggle, and raise, as we are being kicked off, an outcry against a few poor clergymen and their families, who are doing us no wrong—who are not taking a shilling from us—who are merely annuitants upon our enemies; who are not distraining, evicting, exterminating us; who, on the contrary, are all, with a few inconsiderable exceptions, using every effort to prevent and mitigate our sufferings and promote our advancement, and who are at last beginning apparently to think that acts of benevolence even to us, poor benighted Celts as we are, may not be unacceptable to heaven, that they have acted too long as mere chaplains to the military owners of the soil, and that they ought to assume the position and discharge the duties of Christian clergymen and Irishmen? Are not our foes numerous, and our friends few enough already? If we were to embark and succeed in such a warfare, we should only leave the soil the more effectually cleared of all claims to our exterminators, and put into their pockets the money that now goes to the support of upwards of 2200 clergymen and their families, and throw so many more penniless strugglers upon the resources of the country. Have we not paupers enough without adding more? Would it not be a most blessed contrivance, if we could by any means cast upon the landlords the support in respectability and comfort of some 2000 more families? We hear a great deal said about no revolution being worth a drop of blood. Is blood the only invaluable liquid? How do our political moralists estimate tear-drops? Is no account to be taken of the pangs of hunger, cold, misery, and shame, consequent upon

an English Protestant audience can applaud the announcement that God has employed famine and pestilence to thin our numbers and spread the Gospel,* what may we not expect if we engage in an open warfare with that institution, declaring its overthrow a necessary preliminary to peace?

* The words of the Reverend gentleman, Dr. McNeile, were, "But God had thinned those millions. He believed that the decrease amounted since 1846, to at least 1500,000. Famine and pestilence had therefore done their work. Other causes co-operated to encourage the spread of the Gospel."—*Limerick Chronicle*, Dec. 1st, 1849.

depriving or even threatening to deprive, so many families of bread? Are his feelings to be envied who could contemplate unmoved, the cries of one starving child for bread, as the consequence of his machinations? We hope to live to see this country great, but it is not by paltry savings to be made through the infliction of unmerited wrong upon poor helpless individuals, that it can ever become so.

There is another light in which the question may be viewed. When a menagerie arrives in a town, do the inhabitants remove the keepers? The Protestant clergy are the only persons who are even supposed to have any mitigating influence over the landlords; and though their sermons are, for the most part, of the vague generalising class, that touch no man, and consequently improve no man; yet, we would rather educate than remove them, and rather put into their hands extracts from the bible, and from the sermons of the early English "Reformers," Latimer, Ridley, Jewel, Gilpin, Crowley, &c., &c., (the collection which we presented in a former number (26. art. 8.) would do for a beginning,) on the wickedness of oppressing and exterminating the poor, and wishing to live alone in the midst of the earth, than notices of ejection. It may be said that, as Catholics, we ought to be anxious for the overthrow of the Establishment. As Catholics, we may be anxious for the disappearance of error; but not for the overthrow of the Establishment, any more than of any other public institution, unless this were to effect that. A violent overthrow of that institution, instead of destroying protestantism, would give it a chance of prolonging its existence. The way to destroy it rightly is, to make the absurdity of the Establishment transparent;—to let it perish by a Euthanasia;—and to suffer no uncharitable feeling to mingle with its decadence. The present is not the time for settling the Church question. That time cannot be far distant; but whenever it comes, we hope it will be settled without bringing a tear to one eye, or a pang to one heart. For our own parts, we should settle it by a system of abolition, beginning with the poorest curacies and livings, and gradually advancing to the highest, but securing to every member of the Establishment his existing status, at the least, and promoting him regularly, according to seniority, as higher dignities and better livings became vacant, till the last survivor and only member

should be the primate. We must confess that we shall not be in a hurry to revise the theology of the landlords, till we shall have first revised their political economy, and replaced the "commonalty" of the United Kingdom in the position which they occupied before the landlords effected the *Reformation*, first of the ancient franchise, and next of the ancient faith of these islands; for we are inclined to think that they may be as wrong in their theology as in everything else; as short sighted in their innovations respecting their eternal, as in those respecting their temporal, interests: and we do not at all concur in what appears to be their theory, that no one below a 40s. freeholder has a soul to be saved, or at least is entitled to a voice in the legislation which concerns it; and we conceive, with great deference to their judgment and sagacity, that the proper course to be pursued, is the reverse of theirs; namely, first to repeal their statutes in this behalf, and restore the common law franchise to "every inhabitant householder resident,"* and then to let the people choose between the old creed of their fathers, and the new creed of their landlords, or adopt any other novelty which they may fancy, and reform it from time to time, so as to keep it always fresh and new, in harmony with "the growing intelligence of the times," and the latest discoveries in physical science and biblical philology. They are at least just as likely to be right as their landlords. It is impossible that we, as Catholics, can fear the rivalry of "a local and temporary theology." We think, with some wise man, whose name we forget, that as God in his wisdom chooses to tolerate error, so should we; and we should try to eradicate it only by the means which He, by His own example, suggested: first opening the hearts of unbelievers by works of benevolence; and then mildly, and gently, and meekly teaching them the truth. Intolerance has been always the characteristic of the weak and the ignorant. Pious court mistresses could not conscientiously refrain from exterminating with the sword the Huguenot vagaries, which had been tolerated by Mazarin, and Richelieu. Protestants here and everywhere have been always the most unrelenting of persecutors. We are not to imitate them. Instead of persecuting, we should pity those in error, and in short treat weakly consciences that

* See this question considered, Art. 1., No. 19.

reject the Faith, as physicians treat weakly stomachs that reject roast beef. Above all, in the present frightful condition of the country, we should not complicate our woes with religious distractions; we should not, as Mr. Butt has well said in his admirable address to the electors of Cork, "re-enact the miserable scenes of the raft of the Medusa, or the besieged Jerusalem, and add to the miseries of famine and the evils of oppression, the worse and more fatal horrors of internal feuds!"

One further observation we would make to those M.P.'s who suggest this movement. So far as the tithes are concerned, the Protestant clergy are virtually annuitants on Protestant landlords; and so far the payment of their tithes does not concern the community. But they have, in addition to the tithes, about 760,000 acres of the best land in the country. Will those honourable members support, in the ensuing session, a proposition for granting fixity of tenure to the terre-tenants of those lands?

The condition of the Protestant clergy generally, throughout the country, is very pitiable. The rates take away at least one-third of their incomes; and they are frequently obliged to pay those before they receive these. Indeed, in many cases, they cannot get their incomes at all; and nothing is more common than to meet a poor clergyman with an arrear of two or three years' tithe rent charge due to him. But the reader will say, he has a ready remedy, why not enforce it? The remedy is, to apply to a court of equity for a receiver over the lands of defaulters, by which process, even if the lands are occupied by tenants who pay, he cannot, before the end of three years, at the very earliest, according to the evidence before the Committee on Receivers, touch a farthing; but if they are unoccupied and waste, he never can, while they so remain, get any thing.* Such a remedy, in these fearful times, is a delusion. The proper course would be to substitute for a receiver a sale by the sheriff of the land in arrear.

This course would be preferable also, in case of the non-payment of drainage, land improvement, and other public loans to landed proprietors, to costly equity suits, and management by courts and receivers, and will, no doubt, be adopted whenever the taxpayers of the realm shall seriously insist on the recovery of these advances.

* See Mr. Lawson's evidence to this effect, ques. 9912—8.

The church establishment reminds us of another institution much more mischievous, the lord lieutenantcy. It costs the people of England about £30,699 a-year, (that is the sum voted this year,) and on that ground alone we hope they will abate the nuisance. Until it is abated there can be no hope for the country. It supplies the landlords with a court and cabinet, where they may successfully cabal against the interests of the rest of the community, and serves as a fulcrum wherewith they may apply all the powers of the state to effectuate their own objects, and prevent the application to us of the general law of the realm. It is the machinery by which the theory of Anglo-Saxon superiority is brought into practice. Through it is developed that high ethnological statesmanship, that appreciates to a shilling, the different amounts of pecuniary qualification required for Celt and Saxon parliamentary, municipal, and poor-rate electors, according to the nice shades of difference in their organisations, that discovers in the peculiarities of conformation and temperament, which are said unfortunately to distinguish us, the danger of allowing us to catch herrings with trammel nets, or salmon in the sea after sunrise, and, in short, adapts to us all those maxims reversed, those deviations from the general principles of the laws of all other countries and ages, which form the compound of "iniquitous legality" that crushes us. It is the political alembic through which "shave-beggar" secretaries distil all the good and wholesome laws and statutes of the realm, and applying the residuary dross to us, experimentalise on the strength and peculiarities of constitution necessary to resist the action of the poison. It is the means of depriving us of the protection, and refusing us the redress which would be afforded by a system of imperial government and legislation, and consigning us to the mismanagement of a faction. To it is attributable that established formula of cant, by which the vilest absurdities are perpetrated and justified, under the pretence that "the peculiar circumstances of Ireland are such, as to render inapplicable what would be right in any other country." We have not time or patience to enumerate a tithe of the evils arising from it, and will therefore proceed to address ourselves to a few of the objections which our own countrymen may urge against its abolition. It would injure Dublin. A visit from the queen once a year, would do more good to Dublin than five years vice-

royal pageantry. It would be much better for Dublin if the £30,699 annually voted for that office, were devoted directly and expressly to the encouragement of its drooping trades and manufactures, or to the encouragement of the trade of the country generally, or of the fisheries, or even to the enabling of farmers, shop-keepers, and other humble strugglers, to buy up small allotments of land on Thornton's plan. But even if Dublin were to be injured by the change; is the entire country to be ruined for Dublin? What claims has Dublin upon Ireland? From the earliest period of our annals, it has been the nest of every foreign foe. In modern times its citizens have been remarkable chiefly for supplying packed juries, to try those who loved the country "not wisely, but too well," and sending to parliament, as their representatives, the decided enemies of the mass of the community. It was not the representative of any English, Scotch, or Welsh constituency, that proposed the Gregory quarter-acre clause. Dublin has been, no doubt, the seat of divers debating societies, but it has never yet made an effort or a sacrifice for Ireland. It may suit gentlemen addressing a Dublin audience, to talk about a parliament in College-Green; but no man who has thought seriously on the subject of elevating the country from its abject misery, by repeal or revolution, can look to Dublin as the seat of government. Any amendment to be secured by either of these means, must be perpetuated by a seat of government not so conveniently situated for England. Limerick, Athlone, or some other inland place, hallowed by recollections of which men may be proud, probably crosses the visions of those who really dream about repeal and revolution; but not Dublin. This argument in favour of the Lord-Lieutenancy then fails; and what other pretence is there for it? Such a thing is not now necessary for Scotland or Wales. If an *imperium in imperio* be wrong anywhere, must it not be here? If it be absurd to restore the Heptarchy, so it must be to continue this duarchy. While there are two sets of officers, there will be two sets of principles for the government of the two countries. This has proved ruinous to us, and we cannot now stand it longer. Against it our fathers protested since the first connection of the two countries. What all the best and wisest amongst them ever sought, was a thorough amalgamation with, or entire separation from, England. No middle

course, they saw, could secure peace and prosperity to them. So all the wisest English statesmen, from Edward I. to William Pitt, aimed at thorough amalgamation, but the cliques and factions interested in the continuance of this viceregal abomination, always thwarted their efforts. Until this is abolished, it is in vain for those who wish well to the permanent peace and prosperity of the empire, to indulge the hope so well expressed by those legislators, whom the most eminent of modern statesmen is so anxious to copy, that the two countries “may grow into one nation, whereby there may be an utter oblivion and extinguishment of all past differences and discords betwixt them.”*

The Lord Lieutenancy being abolished,† and with it the Board of Works, and all the other boards that are established here for the special benefit of the landlords, we think the Home Office could do the additional work with the help of a few more junior clerks. Not one of those at the Castle would we send over, as he would be sure to perpetuate the traditions of mismanagement—nor would we dismiss one of them, as we do not think it right that the country, after it has employed a man in its service under an implied promise that the employment shall continue as long as he performs his duty, and so diverted him from some other and probably better pursuit, should suddenly cast him off. The employment we should assign them, would be to aid in the establishment and management of county registries. The Law Reformers of both countries recommend such registries as the readiest means of simplifying the transfer of land. The political economists of T.C.D. suggest the Ordnance Survey as the basis of a system of registration. † Some such system will be absolutely necessary, if our proposals for the speedy sale of land for rates, tithes, and debts, should be adopted. Experience shews that the smaller the district is to which each local register extends, the better it answers the ends of its institution. Copyhold titles are said to be the easiest of proof and transfer, from being dependant solely on the records of each manor Court. A county registry we

* 11, 12, and 13, Jac. 1. c. 5.

† See Evidence of Longfield, Lawson, and Hancock, ques. 9273-4-5, 9686-7, 9820-30, 10005.

should think sufficient here; and the present host of Castle clerks, with some slight assistance, quite sufficient to work out the system.

The length of detail into which we have been led on the preceding topics, prevents us on this occasion from dwelling on many others of great practical importance. But we cannot conclude without pointing out a grave error which our countrymen are committing in their political struggles, and that is, they are mistaking their friends for their enemies. These are their landlord rulers, and their friends are the people of England. It is a positive waste of hatred to direct it against these. They gain nothing by our misery; on the contrary, they pay dearly for it. For their own sakes they would stop it at once, if they were shown the way how to do so. But instead of seeking their aid, and pointing out specifically the practical source of our sufferings, we indulge in general declamation against them, and do all we can to alienate them from us, and to make them believe that we are dishonest, idle knaves, and dare not descend into the particulars of our wrongs. The most common notion amongst them is, that they have given us their institutions, and that these are not fitted for us. Why not point out to them that they have not given one in its entirety, but just so much of each as suits the views of our landlords? We know the people of England well; and we believe that if one millionth part of the pains taken to rouse our countrymen to a dislike and distrust of them, were expended in bringing before them, in plain and simple English, the actual sources of our sufferings, these would be soon redressed. It is positively ludicrous to charge our wrongs on them, and to fancy that we suffer because we are supposed to be Celts and they are supposed to be Saxons. These are mere pretences—mere “words by cunning caught and spread” by those who fancy they profit by class legislation, and who substitute these mysterious ethnological terms for the more homely and intelligible “landlord” and “tenant.” Who are the people of the two countries? Here Celts, Milesians, Danes, and Normans are thoroughly blended together, and form one compact mass, never thinking of their primary ethnological developments. These four races form the vast majority of the inhabitants of Great Britain. The people of Wales, Cornwall, and of parts of Somersetshire and Devonshire are purely Celtic.

The latter used to be designated by the early English Chroniclers, "the Irish of the West."* A great part of the north of England was colonised by Irish in the 6th and 7th centuries; and there, as in Cornwall, you meet to the present day families with Irish names, who have no tradition of their first arrival. The tide of immigration has been steadily pouring from this country into England for the last 300 years. The Highlanders of Scotland are comparatively near relations, and still speak our tongue so that we can understand them. Then do not these, with Danes and Normans, form the vast preponderance of the inhabitants of Great Britain? We, consequently, that is to say, Celts, Milesians, Danes, and Normans, form the majority of the population of these islands; and there is nothing in the intellectual capacity of the Anglo-Saxons, to compensate for their want of numbers. The inhabitants of the country which is supposed to have retained Saxon characteristics in their greatest purity and strength, are known to the rest of their countrymen as "Essex calves." Who have been the rulers, statesmen, orators, divines, lawyers, generals, poets, historians, and artists of England? Have they not been almost without an exception Normans, Danes, Celts, and Milesians? We have no wish to run down the Anglo-Saxon; we only want to prevent merciless landlords, and their aiders and abettors, from making the pretence of his super-Caucasian pre-eminence a means of creating discord between the inhabitants of the two countries, and thereby inducing those of Great Britain to tolerate and aid them in robbing and degrading us.

We, therefore, suffer not from the distinctions of Celt and Saxon, but from those of tenant and landlord. But we are not peculiar in our sufferings. The whole body politic of the empire has been suffering since the reign of Henry VI., from class legislation as a constitutional disease, and as this country is the weakest part, it has here developed itself with the greatest virulence, and become localized. Every one of the ills we suffer, is suffered, or has been suffered, in a greater or less degree, by the other parts of the empire. The landlords are exterminating our small farmers. So they have exterminated the small farmers of England and Scotland. Numbers of

* See Mac Cabe's History of England—passim.

our poor have been shot or transported on the most trivial pretences; so have numbers of the poor in England and Scotland. Henry VIII. hanged 72000 of his beloved subjects. Queen Elizabeth hanged them at the rate of 500 a-year; and whenever, in her time, the beggars became too numerous or importunate about the metropolis, they were hanged by hundreds, without any unnecessary ceremony. In a former number we collected several of the English enactments for imprisoning, branding, chaining, transporting, hanging, and otherwise treating paupers as felons. The last number of the quarterly exponent of Whig principles, places felons and paupers in the same category. In short, the poor of England owe as little to a parliament of landlords, as the poor of this or of any other country; and, consequently, the great cry of the humble and middle classes of England now is, that they have been sacrificed too much to the interests of the great accumulators of land and money, and that the power of legislation ought to be no longer vested exclusively in these. Our true policy, therefore, is to combine with them for the attainment of measures which would restore to both islands some portion of the prosperity which they once enjoyed; in short, to enter into an alliance, offensive and defensive, with them, against the common enemy, and try to restore the feeling of the olden time, when our fathers and theirs, the Scots and Picts, were always found under one banner. In more recent times, our fathers did not avail themselves of some fair opportunities of combining successfully with theirs. Let us not repeat those errors, but unite thoroughly and heartily with them, treating them as friends and kinsmen, and securing them as allies. It is, in fact, to them and their representatives, that we are indebted for every rational effort made for our immediate relief during these few past years. What are the names most commonly associated in men's mouths with the regeneration of our poor? Is it not those of English representatives, — Poulett Scrope, Sharman Crawford, Bright, &c., &c.? Look to the labours of our own representatives during these years. While we have been in the throes of extinction by famine, what have they done? What measure for our immediate good has one of them proposed? Have they in any way attempted to modify our landlord statutes relating to the occupation of the soil? When English political economists have been suggesting

the expenditure of some of the relief funds in the location of the poor on our wastes, have they once seconded their efforts? Have they proposed anything for the benefit of tenants? In short, have they done anything that was not worthy of them as landlord legislators, and upholders of landlord prerogatives and usurpations? What was their conduct during this last session? If they did not propound measures did they even ask questions of the witnesses examined in the several committees on the topics which interest the people? We confess, that from the manly, humane, kindly, and rational views expressed by Sir Edward Sugden, the Master of the Rolls, Master Brooke, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Hickey, the four professors of Political Economy in T. C. D., and almost every other witness whose engrossing thoughts were not those of a landlord, with regard to the laws respecting the occupation and ownership of the soil, we entertain strong hopes of soon seeing common sense acquiring some influence over our legislation. But though it was obvious that several of these witnesses might have been easily led to pronounce opinions in favour of fixity of tenure, the location of the poor on wastes, the restraint of landlord authority, &c., &c., there was no Irish member in any of the committees to put a question on these subjects. But to be still more particular, take their conduct on the Fishery Laws, passed within the last seven years, for repealing the great Charter, and every other statute that protected the rights of the people in the tidal and navigable waters in and around the island, and vesting the exclusive fishery of them in the landlords.

As it may have been thought that our denunciations of these statutes were in excess of their iniquity, let the reader hear the evidence of gentlemen whose sympathies might well be supposed to be with the aristocratic—no, that is not the word—the geocratic oppressors of the poor. The Rev. Mr. Alcock, the Protestant vicar of Ring, a fishing village in the county of Waterford, writes thus, in 1847, to the members of the Friends Auxiliary Relief Association, in Waterford. Amongst the difficulties the poor villagers have to struggle with, he says:

“The first is, the restrictions against the use of the trammel-nets. This is a mode of fishing, which has been carried on with very great success for a considerable number of years in this locality, and is of all others, the most remunerative to the fishermen.

The take of hake after the night in each boat often varying from 500 to 1,000 fish. And it is peculiarly adapted to the small boats used here, for the owners can set their nets on the fishing ground, and should the weather threaten to be unfavourable, they return to the shore, and subsequently avail themselves of the first favourable moment, when the wind abates, to repair to their nets, remove the fish therefrom, and thus supply the markets, when the larger boats are weather-bound in harbour. But by a recent enactment of the Legislature, these trammel-nets cannot be set until after sunset, and must be taken up the following morning before sun-rise. Now, when we take into account the loss of time in setting these nets and the shortness of the night in summer, you will perceive that the restriction to which I have referred, almost amounts to a total prohibition; while in winter, the darkness sets in so soon after the sun sinks below the horizon, that the difficulty of returning to the shore in open boats, particularly in rough weather, almost deters the fisherman altogether from the use of the trammel-net. If then the Board of Fisheries could be induced to sanction such a relaxation of the laws, as would allow more latitude to the class of fishermen whom I have mentioned, or would mark out a particular part of the coast at each station, between certain limits, for the use of such nets, thus doing away with monopoly, and admitting free trade in fishing as in grain, I have no doubt but they would confer a great benefit not only on the fishermen but on the community at large."

In 1848 he writes again to them:

"Is it not a strange anomaly in our Irish code of laws, that in a year of famine there should be restrictions against the free use of such nets, founded, perhaps, on a wild fancy of imagination, while they are permitted in England and Scotland? Are we protecting the fish for generations yet unborn at the expense of our famishing poor?"

In January 1849, he expresses a hope that all parties will come forward to memorial the Board of fisheries, "to do away with restrictions altogether, and leave the poor fishermen at liberty to earn a livelihood by day as well as by night." We have mentioned these restrictions to English gentlemen, liberal enlightened men, and they laughed outright at the notion of such laws being enforced, and hinted that our Celtic imaginations dwelt on ideal grievances. The Rev. Mr. Alcock says:

"Before concluding this Report, I may here mention that the nets of several of our fishermen, to whom we had advanced loans, were illegally seized in the early part of the season, and detained; the consequence has been that these poor persons have lost all the

benefit which otherwise would have been derived from them. Under these circumstances, and with the approval of your Secretary, I was induced, in some few instances, to forego my claim upon the sufferers for repayment. Some of those nets, it is true, have since been restored by an order from the Board of Fisheries, but in such a tattered condition that most of them are rendered useless. However, I am happy to say that notwithstanding such oppressive treatment, all our able-bodied fishermen continue actively employed, and contrive not only to keep themselves aloof from the workhouse, but to assist many of their less fortunate neighbours."

As a proof of the "great and progressive prosperity of the little community," he mentions the interesting fact:

"Viz., that the Ring fishermen, after supplying the wants of their families, and redeeming much of their clothing, furniture, and fishing gear, from the pawn-office, had at that moment in their houses, reserved for the spring market, from £1,500 to £2,000 worth of cured fish, which had all been caught with the trammel-net.

"Yes, gentlemen, upwards of £1,500 worth of fish in two small hamlets, where the great majority of the inhabitants, only 18 months before, were depending upon the bounty of others for the bare necessaries of life, and had neither nets nor lines, nor the means of procuring them."*

What a practical commentary upon the calumny of the political economist, who places foremost in the class of those "destitute through their own fault," "the Irish fisherman who burns his boats for firewood, and pawns his nets instead of using them to fish with!" † The Friends' Committee apply to the fishery Board, on behalf of the obnoxious net, which they say, "is cheap in construction, inexpensive in working, and takes a large quantity of fish," but "not even the slightest relaxation" is granted; and therefore, they express a hope that the perusal of their reports, "may arrest the attention of some influential member of the Legislature, and promote the speedy removal of the prejudicial and impolitic restrictions which debar the poor Irish fishermen from the free use and consequent advantages of the valuable kinds of net which are in profitable and unrestrained operation in England and elsewhere."—*Ib.* pp. 90-91.

* Appendix to Lords' Report, p. 96 to 109.

† *Edinb. Rev.* October, 1849. Article, *Unsound Social Economy*, p. 511.

We had been for several years calling attention to this and other enormities of these statutes; the country had been complaining of them, hundreds of poor men had been fined, plundered, and imprisoned, for alleged violations of them. Instead of our liberal representatives seeking a repeal or mitigation of them, successive measures were passed in these years of famine, each more restrictive than its predecessors of the public rights, until at last the landlords had the police and coast guards converted into water-bailiffs, in order to prevent any man not licensed by a landlord, from fishing in or around the island; and thus more effectually secure to them, what landlords never had before in this or any other part of creation. When we saw an order from Col. McGregor, to the police force, on the subject of these laws during the last summer, at a moment when complaints of famine were ringing in our ears from all quarters, we confess we could not but think of the irreverent gloss of the Spanish Ambassador, that when the devil tempted our blessed Redeemer with an offer of the kingdoms of the earth, he put his thumb upon Ireland in order to keep it to himself. Notwithstanding, as we were saying, the grievous oppression of these laws, especially in these years of famine, not one of our genuine Irish representatives interfered, till at last an English gentleman who represents one of our seaports, and knows the law of England and Ireland, is struck with this monstrous abuse—gets a Committee to enquire into it, calls as witnesses, men of the highest mark in the country, Lord Glengal, the Earl of Mountcashel, Sir Richard De Burgho, and several others, who denounce it as opposed to the common law and the Great Charter, and as most unjust and oppressive to the poor. Mr. Sergeant Allen, an eminent member of the Bar of England, who had several years back been through the country on a fishing tour, denounced these laws in the most indignant manner, as a fraud upon the legislature and the community, and such as no man would ever dare to propose for England. “Although,” said the learned Sergeant, “it is presumed that every man knows the law, yet no man would suppose such a law as this, having never heard of such a law in any other country.” (Q. 4914.) Sir Richard De Burgho stated, that the quantity of fish taken two years ago in all Ireland was £300,000; and that if, by the abolition of the privileges created by these enactments, the inland fisheries were made as productive

as nature intended them to be, the annual value of them would be raised to £2,000,000, besides promoting and giving a great impulse to the deep sea fisheries.* “The Act of 1842,” he says, “allows stake weirs to be erected, where they could not be erected before, with the consent of the owner of the adjoining land; and for this consent they in every instance require a rent:” and he names a number of high, and some of them titled personages, as having recently set up, or let, or consented to the setting up of, “weirs down the Shannon, in that part which was covered by the claim of the old corporation (of Limerick), down to 1841,” but which is now claimed by these gentlemen, the corporation having been unable to support its pretensions in a court of law against the rights of the public. (Q. 1579, 1588-9-90, 1811.) These laws give more rent to the landlords. That, we confess, is a great argument in their favour: yet, no man had come before the committee to defend or excuse them. The committee consisted of twenty-one members, of whom sixteen represented Irish constituencies, and ten were pledged to repeal. Mr. Anstey, the chairman, an Englishman, be it recollected, and a barrister, proposed a set of resolutions, with a view to assimilate in practice the law of this country to that of England. The first declared, “that the right of fishing in the navigable rivers of Ireland is a common right, vested in, and exercisable by, all her Majesty’s lieges, and that no several or exclusive right derogatory thereto can exist, unless created by act of Parliament, or guaranteed on prescription or charter anterior to the first year of Richard the First.” And this was negatived without a division, not a single member, not one of the nine repealers, supporting it. We should have deemed them perfectly justified if the government were opposed to the chairman’s view: but the government, on the contrary, were, and are, in its favour. The matter, then, stands thus:—These laws recently devised, take from the people their common law right of fishing in the seas, and other tidal and navigable waters of the island, and vest them in the landlords, and so enable these to increase their rentals. An Englishman obtains a committee to consider the subject and examine witnesses; and when he proposes a resolution in conformity with all the evidence

* Q. 1555, 1593, 1618.

declaratory of the undoubted, undisputed common law rights of the people against the new landlord source of exaction, and, above all, is understood to have the support of the government, not one of the other fifteen Irish members, not one of the nine repealers, supports him. On a purely landlord and people question with the government in favour of the people, not an Irishman can be found in the committee to record a vote for the Englishman's proposition in their behalf.

Seeing, then, that these are the consequences of allowing their representatives to devote themselves too exclusively to the contemplation of repeal—a subject, we admit, of great interest and attraction, as to it, no doubt, “distance lends enchantment”—the people should, as they know that that measure cannot be carried for at least another year, and that in the meantime they must live—either on the produce of their own industry, or on English alms—or die, beg of those gentlemen to abandon that all-engrossing topic for the next six months, and in the meantime to give them a foretaste of the legislation which they would pursue in College Green, untrammelled by Saxon opposition, by propounding to the Imperial Parliament the measures which they think necessary, leaving to it the discredit of their rejection, and securing for themselves a world wide and sempiternal fame; and in order to set them a good example, and stimulate them to exertion, let the people themselves begin to think and debate about their real immediate wants, and first of all, about the best and readiest mode of obtaining a repeal of those statutes, that leave them a lesser and more precarious interest in the welfare of their country than is possessed by any other people upon earth, that allow their landlords to refuse them—as an English gentleman has so well expressed it—standing room on their own soil, and to sweep them off as vermin—and that, in short, as we have so often said, place them wholly at their mercy, and prevent them from tilling the surface of their own island, searching for the minerals in its bowels, or fishing in the waters that wash its shores. When we shall see them turning their attention to questions of immediate practical utility like these, and putting their own shoulders to their own wheel, instead of praying to domestic and foreign divinities for assistance, then may we expect the realisation of the moral of the fable, and the speedy fulfilment of the prophecy that tells us, that our

wrongs shall be redressed by degrees, “ ἡλκίμ ἄν ζεκάμ ῥά ῥιόρ coil” *—then may we become enthusiastic in behalf of our wretched country—and with a great enthusiast, whose visions under somewhat similar circumstances were realised, fancy that we see “ a noble and puissant nation, rousing herself as a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks; as an eagle mewing her mighty youth, and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full mid-day beam; purging and unscaling her long abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance, while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means.”

ART. IV.—“*Presbytery Examined.*” *An Essay, Critical and Historical, on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland since the Reformation.* BY THE DUKE OF ARGYLL. 8vo. London, Moxon, 1849.

THE Scotch have always been a polemical people. Take away the theological element from the history of Scotland since the Reformation, and you deprive it of half its interest and all its significancy. There is no relation of life, public or private, into which it has not entered. There is no class with which it does not seem to have formed, ostensibly at least, a leading motive of action. No distinction of age or of sex, of class or condition, can be recognized among its votaries; nor is there any conceivable form of weapon which has not been pressed into its service, from the broad-sword and battle-axe, down to the now famous “three-legged stool” of Mistress Janet Geddes, the Palladium of Presbyterianism in Scotland.

Nevertheless, even with the knowledge of this national peculiarity, it is difficult to repress a certain amount of surprise at the appearance of such a work as that which stands at the head of these pages. An abstruse theological question could hardly be supposed to possess much attraction for a young nobleman, just entering into public

* “As you would cut down a wood.”

life, commanding, even at the commencement of his career, a prominent and important position, and evincing, both in and out of Parliament, a lively and active interest in the many political and social topics, which, of late years, have engaged so much of public attention. The Duke of Argyll, however, appears to have inherited, in their full vigour, the polemical tastes by which his ancestors have commonly been characterized. In the earlier proceedings of the Free-Church controversy, he took a warm and active part; and even before he had attained his majority, he published one of the most remarkable pamphlets which were elicited in the course of the discussion. His "*Letter to the Peers, from a Peer's son*," was a performance of no ordinary literary merit; and the vigour, the energy, and, occasionally, the brilliancy, which it displayed, were hailed by the party with whom he then acted, as an evidence that the hereditary principles of his house had descended upon him in their full integrity; and that, in conformity with the new spirit of the age, the "guid auld cause" might reckon upon as able and unflinching service from his pen, as it had ever received from the sword of his forefathers.

His Grace, however, has had an early lesson upon the instability of popular favour. The hopes which these precocious merits of the "*Letter to the Peers*" had created, have been well-nigh swamped by the "*Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*." The chosen champion of religious freedom, is now, by his late admirers, regarded as little better than a concealed Erastian; and those who were loudest in their exultation over the promised fidelity of this descendant of the olden confessors of the kirk, now openly avow their conviction that before long, in accordance with the tendency of his entire order, his Grace will be found to lapse into the Established Church of England.*

With the special controversy which still agitates the Church of Scotland, we do not mean for the present to take much concern. Our readers are already in possession of the general principles upon which it turns, and of the leading facts in the only part of its history which is really important. But the Duke of Argyll's *Essay*, although elicited by this controversy, is too important, for its own sake, to be dealt with as a purely partisan publica-

* North British Review, XX., p. 446.

tion; and we shall endeavour to treat it, in the first place, rather as an independent work, than as a controversial exposition of the author's views on the Free-Church question, or a vindication of the seemingly inconsistent course which he has himself thought fit to pursue regarding it. Of the latter points, however, we shall have to say a few words before we close.

The Essay appears to have grown out of an intended review of one of the publications of the Spottiswoode Society,—Bishop Sage's "Presbytery Examined." The Spottiswoode Society is a literary association of Scottish Episcopalians, for the purpose of illustrating the history and antiquity of the Episcopal Church of Scotland. It was an emanation of the same High Church revival, which, in England, led to the Tractarian movement with all its numberless inferior organizations; and it is well observed by the Duke of Argyll, that the name selected for the society is a sufficient indication of its spirit and its principles. It is "that of a man who was first a Presbyterian minister; who was next—a thing for which there is no name except in Scotland, where it was called—a Tulchan;* who was, thirdly, a duly consecrated Archbishop of St. Andrew's; who was, fourthly, an agent of Charles I.

* "James the Sixth's pretended bishops were, by the Scotch people, devisedly called 'Tulchan Bishops.' Did the reader ever see, or fancy in his mind, a Tulchan? Tulchan is, or rather was—for the thing is long since obsolete—a calf-skin stuffed into the rude similitude of a calf;—similar enough to deceive the imperfect perceptive organs of a cow. At milking time the Tulchan, with head duly bent, was set as if to suck; the fond cow, looking round, fancied that the calf was busy, and that all was right, and so gave her milk freely, which the cunning maid was streaming in white abundance into her pail, all the while. The Scotch milkmaid in those days cried, 'where is the Tulchan—is the Tulchan ready?' So of the Bishops. Scotch lairds were eager enough to *milk the Churchlands and titles*,—to get the rents out of them freely, which was not always easy. They were glad to construct a *Form* of Bishops to please the King, and the Church, and make the milk come without disturbance. The reader now knows what a 'Tulchan Bishop' was—a piece of mechanism constructed, not without difficulty, in Parliament and Kings' Councils among the Scotch, and torn asunder afterwards with dreadful clamour, and scattered to the four winds, so soon as the cow became awake to it."—Preface p. xiii. xiv.

in his famous follies in Scotland about a Liturgy; and who, lastly, was expelled from his native country, amidst the shouts of its people, as one of the chief of its oppressors." In his Grace's controversy with the Spottiswoode authors, we must acknowledge, that, slight as are our grounds of sympathy with Presbyterianism, he carries with him at least our sympathies, if not our judgment. Scarcely excepting our own monstrous anomaly—the Irish Established Church—we regard the Scottish Episcopal Church, both historically and theoretically, as one of the most indefensible institutions which the world has ever seen; and we cordially enter into the spirit with which his Grace makes merry over the puerile assumption by which the Spottiswoode gentlemen, in maintenance of their exclusive title to membership of the "Catholic Church" in Scotland, will never accord to their Presbyterian countrymen any higher title than that of "the Kirk," or "the form of schism established in Scotland."

The original purpose of the Essay, therefore, appears to have been a summary of the history of Episcopacy in Scotland since the Reformation, with the view of demonstrating the utter groundlessness of its modern pretensions, and the indefeasible claims of Presbyterianism upon the hearts of the Scottish people. In the progress of the work, however, the author conceived the design of rendering the same view of the history available as an exposition and vindication of the principles which he holds in relation to the late Free-Church secession. The Essay, therefore, is divided into two parts. The former of these is by far the more interesting. It is mainly historical; and although it makes no pretension to research or originality, and indeed contains no new facts which had escaped the notice of former historians, it is, nevertheless, a clear, orderly, and in many respects brilliant, sketch of the history of that great religious struggle by which the abolition of the Catholic religion in Scotland was succeeded.

We cannot help regretting the Duke's selection of a starting-point. He does not enter at all into the history of the first great change itself—the first commencements of the Reformation in Scotland. Of his own opinions regarding Rome he makes no secret. He looks upon the Romish faith as "full of great corruptions" (p. 32): the sacrifice of the Mass he considers a "manifest perversion;" the same he holds of the "Invocation of Saints,"

and the "*Adoration of the Virgin*" (p. 33); and the withholding of one element in the Communion from the laity," the "claims of the Papal court, the Papal councils, and the Papal Church," he discards as "enormous and preposterous." (ib.) But, although he gives a brief summary of the political changes, both in foreign and domestic relations, which occurred in Scotland during the second quarter of the sixteenth century, and of the new combinations of religious interests, which these changes produced, he tells nothing of the means by which the great religious revolution was effected, and the opinions which he thus reprobates were dislodged from their hold upon the people. The Reformation in Scotland, we have always thought, is one of the most extraordinary chapters in the history of the Church, and one which still remains in great part unwritten. Tytler's account is meagre and uncircumstantial, and the declamatory tirades of the Calvinistic writers cannot be said to merit the name of history at all. The materials, though far from complete, are, nevertheless, such as to deserve re-examination, and we hardly know any subject more worthy the attention of a dispassionate and philosophical enquirer.

As the immediate object of the Duke's Essay, therefore, is the struggle of the two principles of Prelacy and Presbytery, it was scarcely to be expected that he should dwell upon any preliminary enquiry. And, we must add, we cannot help applauding the candour with which, in relating the first public and authoritative abolition of Popery, his Grace freely admits the fact "which Presbyterian writers are not always inclined to mention," viz. that "the penalties prescribed against the celebration (he should have added also the hearing) of Mass, included in the last instance, the punishment of death." M'Crie, in his biography of Knox, slurs it over with the vague designation of "certain penalties;" but Tytler, with his characteristic candour, states it distinctly, and without reserve.*

* There were three acts passed in this first year of the triumph of the Reformation in Scotland. The first abolished the Papal supremacy in the kingdom: the second repealed all previous acts, in favour of Popery; the third enacted, that any person hearing or saying mass, should suffer, for the first offence, confiscation of his property; for the second, banishment; and for the third, death.—Tytler, vi. 215.

The Duke indignantly reprobates the weak and dishonest policy in which this *suppressio veri* originates. But with all his candour, he has, unhappily, fallen into an almost equally strange misstatement.

“This is weakness; we all know that the principles of religious toleration are of much later date than that at which we are now arrived. We know, that the men who took their seats in the Parliament House of Edinburgh, on the 1st of August, 1560, had, many of them, perhaps most of them, seen in their own days the most cruel persecutions not only threatened, but practised, against those who denied Henry VIII.'s supremacy in England; and only a few years before, the most eminent prelates and statesmen of that Reformed Church committing to the stake those whom they considered heretics. It is astonishing, indeed, that the Parliament of Scotland could venture on proscribing so entirely a religion of which their Sovereign was a professed adherent; but perhaps it may be safely said, that they had more excuse than those in England, to whom we have just alluded. They had themselves just escaped from a fiery trial: they had seen some of the holiest and the best among them burned alive, by men, whom, both morally and intellectually, they necessarily despised, and whose hoods and stoles did not prevent their appearing, to the Reformed, rather ministers of Satan's synagogue, than of that holy Church, which is the ‘pillar and ground of the Truth.’ Finally, their minds were filled with horror of the Mass as direct idolatry, and applied to their own times and circumstances the ancient denunciations of the prophets of Israel against those who suffered the ‘land to be defiled.’ *It is to be observed, too, that the penalty was never enforced. We are not aware of any instance in which a single individual suffered death in Scotland for the sake of his opinions.*”—pp. 23, 24.

Unfortunately his Grace is grievously mistaken in the assumption which we have marked by italics in the above extract. The penalties of this statute were over and over again enforced, and enforced in circumstances of great cruelty. Laymen, as well as priests, fell under its operation; and although, in comparison with the wholesale butcheries of England, Scottish history supplies but few examples of the enforcement of the extreme penalty, yet even the scanty records which have been preserved, sufficiently attest the zeal and perseverance with which this obnoxious enactment was put in execution. In October, 1614, Father John Ogilvie, a Jesuit priest, was arrested in Glasgow, together with several others, on the charge of celebrating mass. He was sent to Edinburgh for examination before the Supreme Council, and thence remanded

to Glasgow; where, after many cruelties, he was executed on the 10th of March, 1615.* Another member of the same Order, Father Moffat, was arrested in the archiepiscopal city of St. Andrew's about the same time; the archbishop's eldest son not thinking it beneath his dignity to head the party which arrested and escorted him to Edinburgh. He was detained for several months, repeatedly examined, threatened with the torture of the boots, and eventually sentenced to be hanged. The penalty, however, was commuted into perpetual banishment, with a provision that the sentence of death should remain in force, if, at any future period, he attempted to return to Scotland. † Three laymen, William Sinclair, advocate, Robert Wilkie, embroiderer, and Robert Cruikshanks, stabler, were arrested at the same time, upon the charge of assisting at masses, and sheltering priests. Sentence of death was pronounced upon these also; and the terror of its enforcement was kept up till the very hour fixed for their execution, when at the very gallows foot, it was, in like manner, commuted into perpetual banishment. Two secular priests, Andrew Crichton and Roger Lindsay, had been similarly dealt with a few years before, in 1610. ‡ Father John Robertson was twice imprisoned under the same statute, first in 1628, and again, after many remarkable adventures, in 1644. Father James Innes, at a later period, (1686), was twice thrown into prison, and at last sentenced to perpetual exile. Father Andrew Lesley was arrested at Aberdeen, in May, 1647, and subjected to the greatest cruelties during an entire year. His sentence, at the petition of the French ambassador, was commuted, in July, 1648, into that of perpetual banishment. A most interesting letter written by him March 27, 1648, from the prison in Edinburgh, to which he had been transferred, and detailing the wretched condition of catholics in Scotland, is preserved by Dr. Oliver. § His account is confirmed by numberless contemporary remains. Father William Lesley, in a letter dated September 1, 1630, states, that "the catholics who in the preceding July had appeared before the Council, had all, without exception,

* Oliver's Collections, p. 34.

† Ibid, p. 33.

‡ Ibid, p. 16.

§ Collections, p. 25.

women and men, been sentenced to perpetual banishment. Seven weeks were allowed them to prepare for their departure; one-third of their rents was allowed for the maintenance of their families, which third, however, was declared forfeited, should they venture to return, besides the penalty to be incurred of fine and perpetual imprisonment." In 1640, these provisions were still more stringently enforced. Father Mambrecht writes, (Dec. 17, 1640), that "several catholics had offered three-fourths of their properties, provided they might keep the remaining fourth for the maintenance of themselves and theirs, and had been refused." Orders had been issued, prohibiting "all dealing, either in buying or selling, with Catholics throughout Scotland;" and it was openly vaunted that, before the end of a year, "not a Catholic should be left in the kingdom." In the month of June, 1641, this father was the only priest left in the entire south of Scotland; and even he was in daily and hourly apprehension of being arrested.* In the August of the following year, he wrote to the same effect. "*Solus ego modo in his meridionalibus partibus relictus sum.*" So strict and so effective was the system of surveillance, that, for two whole years, as appears from a letter of his, written in 1646, he had not been able to communicate, even in writing, with his brethren in the north.† In 1652 he himself, as he had long anticipated, was arrested, thrown into prison, and condemned to death. The sentence, however, was changed to perpetual banishment.‡ His relative, John Mambrecht, father of the same society, was apprehended at Dundee by the Bishop of Brechin, in 1626. He was committed to the gaol of Edinburgh; and, after a severe examination, sentenced to be executed. The warrant received the royal signature; but, at the intercession of the Queen and the Countess of Buckingham, it was withdrawn. The account which is preserved of his imprisonment will give some idea of the cruelties to which the Catholic prisoners in those times were subjected. No friend was allowed to visit him; he was interdicted the use of pen and paper; his gloomy cell scarce afforded him light to read his Breviary; twice in the twenty-four hours

* See his Letter in Dr. Oliver's Collection, p. 29.

† Collections, p. 28.

‡ Thurloe Papers, vol. i, 588-9. Oliver's Collections, p. 30.

the turnkey brought a scanty supply of coarse food ; and the many hardships to which he was subjected brought on a tedious and dangerous illness, so that it was a long time before he had so far recovered his wasted strength, as to be able to endure the fatigue of removal from prison, much less the transportation to which he had been condemned.

Nor is it to be supposed that these cruelties were confined to the period from which the above instances have been selected. In the beginning of the next century, the Jesuit Father, James Fife, was apprehended under the statute of 1560, and sentenced to perpetual exile. John Farquarson, a member of the same order, was arrested in the act of saying mass, in 1745, and carried prisoner to Edinburgh in his sacerdotal vestments ; and Father Alexander Gordon was apprehended at Inverness for the same offence, and detained in custody till he fell a victim to the rigour of his imprisonment, in 1746. Two other priests, Mr. Grant and Mr. Gordon, were arrested, and the latter banished in 1751. Robert Maitland was tried on the same charge, and the vicar apostolic of the Highlands, who had been obliged to fly to France, no sooner ventured to return, than he was apprehended in Edinburgh, and thrown into prison.*

These examples have been selected at random from the meagre and imperfect records of a single society—the devoted order of the Jesuits, whose glory it has ever been to occupy the outposts of the faith, and to lead the forlorn hope of the Church without fee and without reward. We have not thought it necessary to enter into the history of the missionary secular priests, or of the members of the other orders in Scotland, as the Franciscans, Benedictines, or Trinitarians. What we have said will suffice to determine whether it is true that the statutes of 1560, with their provisions of confiscation, banishment, and death, were suffered to remain a dead letter ; and, perhaps, on the whole, it may well be doubted, whether it was not more prudent than the Duke would seem to admit, on the part of the “ presbyterian writers,” to keep the statute of 1560 and its penalties as much as possible in the back ground. Certainly the commentary upon that statute, which is supplied by the history of the Catholics of Scotland during the 17th and 18th centuries, though not as bloody as that of Eng-

* Butler’s Memoirs, iv. 89.

land, is far from creditable to the tolerant principles of presbytery.

Indeed, the Duke would appear to be singularly blind to the true character of Calvinism, as regards religious toleration. In his elaborate sketch of the character of Andrew Melville, alluding to his residence at Geneva, and the opportunities there afforded him of intercourse with all the eminent men of his party whom the persecutions of other countries had driven to the City of the Reformed, "secure of shelter and encouragement by the blue waters of the Lemon Lake," he gravely affirms, that "from the first moment when persecution began its work, that city had been *the refuge of the proscribed of Europe*," (p. 73); and that "in this crowded intellectual company *thought was as free as the winds which flew over them from the glaciers of Mont Blanc*." (p. 75.) As if it were not perfectly notorious that in no country had there ever existed a more sustained and despotic intellectual tyranny than in this very city of the Reformed. We have neither space nor inclination for a recital of Calvinistic intolerance; but we cannot help reminding his Grace of the cases which are familiar to every student of history; of Sebastian Castalio, who was deprived of all his employments, and banished from Geneva, because he called into question Calvin's doctrine of absolute reprobation; of Jerome Bolsec, who for a similar offence was subjected to a similar punishment; of the wretched Capuchin Ochino, whose daring innovations drew upon him the wrath of the whole church of Switzerland; of Gruet, who was cruelly tortured, and in the end beheaded at the instance of Calvin himself; of Valentine Gentili, who was banished from Geneva, and put to death at Berne, for his opinions on the Trinity; and above all, of Servetus, whose persecution and death at the hands of Calvin are marked by a degree of cold-blooded and unrelenting malice, for which it would be difficult to find a parallel in history.* From February, 1546, when he wrote to Farel, that if Servetus ever came to Geneva, he would take care that he should not leave it alive, till his execution at the stake in October, 1553, the Reformer never relaxed in his animosity, nor halted in his fixed resolve of vengeance. The details of the long series of intrigues by which he secured evidences of the obnoxious

* See the details in Audin's *Vie de Calvin*, vol. ii., pp. 185—231.

opinions of his victim ;—the cold and cruel inveteracy with which he resisted all his demands for mercy, and even for the commonest offices of humanity, down to the miserable indulgence of a change of linen, for which the wretched man appealed in terms which, at the distance of three hundred years, still move our pity, not to say our loathing ;—are given by his biographer with contemporary evidence which it is impossible to resist. And it is a painful illustration of the temper of the times, that this proceeding against Servetus called for and received the full and cordial approval, not alone of the most eminent individuals of the party, but of the collected voices of the presbyteries of Switzerland. Farel wrote to Calvin, that “he could not conceive the possibility of hesitating about putting to the death of the body the wretch who had slain the souls of so many Christians; and that he did not believe there were to be found judges so iniquitous as to spare the blood of this infamous heretic.” Beza (on whose intimate friendship with Melville his Grace dwells with special satisfaction), wrote his deliberate opinion that it was a *holy work* to shed the blood of Servetus: Bucer declared that he deserved to have his entrails torn out; even the “mild Melancthon” assured Calvin that the Church, both of these and of all other times, would owe him a debt of gratitude for such a service; and the synods of Zurich, of Schaffhausen, of Basil, and of Berne, were of one mind in expressing their approval and encouragement.*

We should be sorry to call into question his Grace’s opinions on the subject of toleration: but if he still believes that, in times like those which he describes, and in such “intellectual company” as they appear to have afforded, “thought was as free as the winds which blew over the glaciers of Mont Blanc,” we trust it may be long before our country shall be visited by such gentle zephyrs.

But we have delayed too long upon these topics, and we must proceed with the history of the religious changes in Scotland. The Duke has stated very clearly the fundamental principles by which the Reformers of Scotland are distinguished from their episcopalian brethren in England.

“The first great fundamental idea which we observe in the system of the Scotch Reformers, is to be found in their understanding

* See the passages at full length in Audin, and in Rohrbacher’s Church History, xxiii. 467.

of that much-abused term, THE CHURCH. It seems to have appeared to them as if it had been from heresy on this point that all other heresies had sprung; and of such paramount importance did they deem it that just views should be entertained in regard to this, that we find their explanations of it—not in the Book of Polity, but among the Confessions of their Faith. Under a series of heads—‘Of the Church;’ ‘Of the notes by which the true Church is discerned from the false;’ ‘Of the authority of the Scriptures;’ ‘Of General Councils—their power and authority,’—we find a number of affirmative and negative positions—the former stating what *is* to be believed—the latter what *is not*. The latter are, perhaps, the more important of the two. Affirmatively, two meanings are given to The Church; negatively, several meanings are condemned. First, there is The Church, in the largest sense—denoting that innumerable company out of all nations, and tribes, and ages, who, whether under the old dispensation or the new, have been chosen of God as his true worshippers in Christ, in spirit and in truth; to whom belong one Faith, one Lord, one Baptism—the Communion of Saints. Secondly, there is The Church, in the sense of the whole body of professing believers in the truth in each division of the earth—such as was the Church of Corinth, of Ephesus, or as that then established in Scotland. We have next, what we might expect from men who had before their eyes the incredible corruptions taught and practised by a priesthood who were in full possession of ‘Apostolical Succession’—the denial of all such positions as place the signs or ‘notes’ of the true Church either in ‘antiquity, title usurped, lineal descent, place appointed, or multitude of men approving.’ The true ‘notes’ are again affirmed to be—conformity with the revealed Word in doctrine—a right administration of the Sacraments—and the enforcement of a godly moral discipline. If controversy should arise, touching the interpretation of any passage in the Scriptures, no higher tribunal is allowed than the same Word in other parts. The Spirit of God, it is affirmed, cannot be contradictory to Himself; so that if the interpretation, determination, or sentence of any doctor, church, or council be repugnant to the plain words of God, written in other parts of Scripture, it is most certain *there* is not the true understanding and meaning of the Divine will—‘though councils, realms, and nations have approved or received the same.’”—pp. 29—31.

He may well append the following commentary :

“It is a strange and instructive passage in the history of the human mind, that the men who laid down such principles as these were the same who conjured the Parliament, by every sacred exhortation, to punish, or, in other words, to persecute the adherents of the Romish faith! What other tribunal did their own maxims leave, for the determination of true doctrine, than the ultimate authority of *private judgment*? And if neither ‘realms nor councils’

had the right to make *them* believe what was repugnant to their sense of Scripture passages compared, what better right could there be in the Parliament of Scotland to proscribe such as differed, even most widely, from that sense? We must not solve the difficulty which such a course presents, by accusing the Reformers of a want of honesty—of a conscious disregard of principles in reference to others, which they were willing to assert in favour of themselves. They were men who, whatever may have been their errors, were thoroughly, heart and soul, *in earnest*. They believed all they said, and never failed to say all that they believed. There is an explanation, we apprehend, more just to them, and more instructive for us. We see in their example how, in human controversies, the truth advances, as it were, only by small instalments. Principles are enunciated by men who have a single eye to one or more results against such prevailing errors as may have roused their special opposition. Ulterior results remain concealed; and the full fruit is only reaped by after-generations.”—pp. 31, 32.

A still more distinctive characteristic of the Scottish reform, was the doctrine which it put forward regarding the christian ministry.

“We have yet to state one other fundamental idea proceeded on by the Scotch Reformers, which, though almost entirely lost sight of in practice, under the previous system, and hardly less so by many in the present day, seems to have been with them so elementary and essential, that we know not any one passage of the times in which it was ever formally expressed. Yet on this, we think, more than on any other, depend all the great peculiarities of their system, and of the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, from that time to the present hour. We allude to the total and entire absence of anything like a priestly elevation of the clergy; and especially to the full association of the laity with all their notions of the powers and duties of the Church. The minister was, indeed, regarded as an officer of the Christian community indispensable for the due and orderly performance of such public acts as are of perpetual obligation in the services of religion, and for the instruction and exhortation of the faithful; but as possessing no authority over his brethren in doctrine, unless supported by the written Word, nor in rule or discipline except as the representative of the Church. And by this term was denoted, not the clergy, as is the corrupted sense, but the mass of the believing people.

“These were no barren speculations. We have already said that, in the abstract, they seldom or never appear as written principles. But every institution of the Reformed system bore the impress of their continual presence as fundamental truths. The Christian Church was, indeed, to be divided, like every other community, into ruled and rulers; but of the latter a large, and in many instances the larger proportion, were chosen from the laity.

That for which the late Dr. Arnold so earnestly contended, as the first step towards Church Reform—the narrowing of the space which has come to separate the great body of the Church from a class of its officers—the amalgamation of the clergy and the laity in the discharge of common duties, and in the exercise of ruling power—was fully realised by the first Scotch Reformers.

“Indeed, the very root—the essential principle—on which the priestly idea of the Christian ministry depends, was wholly wanting in their system. They recognised no invariable right of institution—no law, therefore, of perpetual succession, no principle which could constitute the clergy an order or a caste. The minister was merely the expression of an authority which ultimately lay, not in him, but around him, and above him—in the body of the Church. Popular election was the authority on which his position rested; not on the naked authority of a plurality of votes given by an un-instructed people, but on the fact of his having received public and formal commission to exercise the office of the ministry, first from his own congregation, and then from the representative authorities of the whole Church. And the special forms under which this commission was conveyed were not suffered to include anything approaching a ritual ceremony. The first Reformers rejected ordination. The miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit, which had followed the imposition of Apostles’ hands, they believed had ceased, and therefore they judged the form ‘not necessary.’”—pp. 34—36.

And upon the clearness and force with which this notion was put forward, the Duke argues for a principle on which he is directly at issue with the Free-Church divines, viz., that the first Reformers never dreamed of that distinction of Church and State, which is the essential ground-work of the modern theory.

“With these ideas rooted in their mind, the system of the Reformers wanted, we repeat, the essential principle of priesthood. And along with this want there was another want depending on it. The common idea of the distinction between Church and State is founded on a priestly idea of the nature of the ‘Church.’ It could not, therefore, find any natural place in the mind of the first Scotch Reformers. Their notions of civil government were not easily separable from their notions of the nature of the Church. Popular representation, at the root of both, left not much room for any superstitious distinction. Accordingly, there are no indications of it in the First Book of Discipline. The true idea of that distinction—that which is not dependant on any priestly notion, and which is, therefore, not the common one—even this appears in a comparatively dormant state.”—pp. 37, 38.

“It may enable us to realise more distinctly those principles of

the Scottish Reformation which we have now explained, if we attend to the constitution of the General Assemblies of the Church during the first few years of this period. It is apparent, both from the whole tenor of the proceedings, and from the names and titles of those who formed the members, that the predominant idea entertained of what that Assembly ought to be, was one of complete national representation. The only circumstance which seems to have given them any ecclesiastical character,—as that word is commonly understood,—or to have distinguished them from the nature of a Parliament, was the subject matter of their deliberations. And even here no clear distinction was maintained, (as, indeed, with their ideas, none such was possible,) between Church and State affairs. The names and designations of those who composed the first and the third General Assemblies, have been preserved in the records of the Church. In the first there were, in all, forty-one individuals. Of these only six have the title ‘minister’ attached to their names. The remaining number sat under the title of ‘commissioners’—deputies sent to represent the voices of towns and congregations. This, indeed, the ‘ministers’ were also. The constituency for which each member sat, including the ministers, is specified along with his name. This representative Assembly proceeded, we find, to designate certain individuals as qualified to fill the office of the ministry. In the third General Assembly, accordingly, we find the number of those who bear this title proportionably much greater. Only thirty-five members are named as having composed it, and of these twenty-one bear ecclesiastical designations. There is less specific mention, in this case, than before, of the representative principle; probably on account of the fact that as elected, or at least approved by his congregation, a minister was, *ex-officio*, representative for them.”—pp. 48, 49.

Our present concern, however, is rather with the history of the struggle between the two great contending principles of Prelacy and Presbyterianism. It is hardly necessary to say, that the form of Protestantism, solemnly established in 1560, was the extreme of Presbyterianism, which Knox had drawn from the rigid school of Geneva. There existed, nevertheless, from the commencement, an opposite tendency, which received, and long continued to receive, a powerful impulse from the interested designs of the nobility and great proprietors of Scotland, and of the influential advisers of the crown. In order that the reader may understand more easily the machinery called into action during the contest, we shall extract the Duke’s account of the form of church polity, partly established in 1560, and more fully developed at a later period.

“When fully developed it included four principal tribunals. First, the Parochial Court, consisting of the ministers and elders; secondly, a court in which several such parochial courts, included in a certain district, were represented, and which was called a Presbytery; thirdly, a Provincial Assembly, called Synod, which represented a proportionably larger division of the Church; and lastly, the great Council of the whole national Church, which was called the General Assembly. We need hardly say that in 1560 there were not materials for this regular series of tribunals, but from the beginning there were the first, and the last, which may be considered as primary and essential. During the first few years after the establishment of the Reformation we meet with much variety of detail; and there is one arrangement of that period which has called forth much attention and some controversy. This was the appointment of men, under the name of Superintendants, who were commissioned to plant ministers in vacant places, and to oversee the building up of the Church generally within a certain district committed to their charge. This, it has been alleged, is inconsistent with the idea of Presbyterian parity among ministers, and indicates that the first Scotch Reformers had no real objection to an Episcopal system. Now we think it quite certain,—and it has been well shown in the controversial work of Bishop Sage,—that the first Scotch Reformers did not entertain those feelings towards Episcopacy in the abstract, which we shall presently see were very soon induced by the violence and injustice of its Scotch adherents. But they indisputably held, as their own idea of a strictly scriptural system of Church government, that there was no permanent office in the Christian Church superior to that of the minister of a particular people or congregation, or parish; and to *him* they applied, as they found the New Testament doing, the Greek word *ἐπίσκοπος*. Such other offices as they considered also of permanent authority in the organisation of the Church, were regarded rather as supplementary than inferior to this—such were elders, deacons, doctors.”—pp. 51, 52.

The distinction of title thus established, formed the germ of the new scheme of episcopacy, with which Presbyterianism was destined to struggle so long and so earnestly. The contest may be dated from the year 1571. The death of Archbishop Hamilton, and of other incumbents of the ancient benefices, of which they had never been legally dispossessed, opened for discussion the important question as to the future application of these valuable revenues. The nobles had long and anxiously desired an appropriation of them, similar to that of which they had seen so many examples in England. But the reformed clergy of

Scotland were too bold and too watchful to warrant a hope that they would look tamely upon such a measure.

“How then was the desired appropriation to be effected? A most notable scheme was planned. There were already Superintendants in the Reformed Church, and why might there not be Bishops too? Every possible concession might be made to the Presbyterian character of the existing constitution of the Church—there need be little change but a change of name—it was not necessary that the new Bishops should be possessed of any spiritual power, or any authority in the government of the Church, superior to that already delegated to Superintendants or representatives of corporate authority; they might be examined and admitted according to the same forms; they might be subject, like them, to the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical court—to the control, to the censure, and finally, to the deposition of the General Assembly. All these concessions the Regent and the nobles were willing to make, and did make. What then, it may be asked, was the object of a change at all? It could not be a desire to maintain the ‘Catholicity’ of ‘the Church’—it could not be a desire to secure the blessings of Apostolic Episcopal Succession. There was no provision for this—no thought of it; it was an idea of which the Earls of Lennox, Mar, and Morton had not the remotest conception. One object, and one object only, had those men in view; one requirement, and one requirement only, was made of the presentee to a vacant bishopric—that he should not be too greedy of its revenues—that in consideration of a certain part he should pass on the greater portion into the exchequer of his patron.

“Such was the system on which the Regent and higher nobility had already begun to act, before any public sanction except their own had as yet been given to it. Bishop Keith, in his Catalogue of Scottish ‘Bishops,’ gives a quaintly honest account of this transaction, and of the first origin of his Order in the Reformed Church of Scotland. ‘After the death of Bishop Hamilton, the rents of the see (St. Andrews) were by the Regent conferred upon the Earl of Morton; and this nobleman being desirous to enjoy those rents *in some sort of legal manner*, made choice, &c.’ Accordingly, in the Parliament of August, 1571, the person who had thus honourably acquired the title of Archbishop of St. Andrews was admitted, under protest from the Reformed Church, to his seat as a member of the Spiritual Estate.”—pp. 64, 65.

This corrupt and spurious system of episcopacy, (the *Tulchan* of the popular proverb,) reached its full development under the Regency, from 1571 to 1580. Its history, however, is a series of alternations and inconsistencies. It is not to be imagined that it was unopposed by the Presbyterian party in the General Assemblies. But the

Regent, failing in the regular tribunals of the Church, succeeded in obtaining the sanction of an extraordinary convention, for this system of nominal episcopacy; the so-called bishop, however, being distinctly recognized as nothing more, in substance, than a Presbyter, and being directly subject to the authority of the Assembly.

So anomalous an institution could hardly prove long-lived. Its history is little more than a series of collisions with the Assembly; and the determined and long-sustained opposition of the celebrated Andrew Melville, at length accomplished its overthrow in the General Assembly of 1580.

The accession of James VI., however, and the active support of his first minister and favourite, Esme Stewart, Duke of Lennox, gave a new impulse to the party. Episcopacy, if the institution deserves the name, was destined to another revival. The well known Black Acts of 1584, placed it once more upon the same footing; but the opposition which it encountered, was so earnest and so universal, that, after a long struggle, the king was compelled to give way to the popular will; and under an impulse which it is not easy to explain, he abandoned the once favoured system to its fate, and embodied the whole system of Presbyterianism in a series of statutes, which form, even to the present day, the great charter of the Church of Scotland.

But whatever may have been the influence under which the change was effected, the king soon became dissatisfied with the working of the system; and from this period commences that long series of intrigue and violence which terminated, in the first instance, in the obtrusion of prelacy upon an unwilling nation, and in the second, in the downfall of the dynasty with which prelacy had been associated. The first advances were made with great caution.

“James proceeded with singular caution and address. In the first Assembly in which he began his scheme of innovation, he had to deal with, on the whole, a tolerably free representation of the Church, notwithstanding his strenuous exertions to influence the elections. He was therefore contented with a favourable reply to such demands as this—‘that it be not thought unlawful, either for the prince or any pastor, to move doubts, or crave reformation in any points of the external policy and government of the Church that are not essentially concerning salvation, or are not answered affirmative vel negative by any express part of Scripture.’ What, in

the abstract, more reasonable than this? what more insidious, when asked by one who had resolved not on partial change—but on total revolution? In the Parliament of the same year, a remarkable evidence appears of the caution of the King, and of the greatness of the power which compelled him to proceed so warily. It was enacted that such ministers of the Church as were nominated by the King to vacant sees, should have a seat in Parliament as Members of the Spiritual Estate; but all that concerned their status in the Church was expressly referred to James's dealings with the General Assemblies. In the successive meetings of that body for the years 1597—8, and 1600, we find him pursuing his design with much ability, and with a singular want of principle. Intimidation was applied to some; promises of promotion gained a few; unscrupulous falsehoods—such as solemn protestations that he meant not to introduce Bishops in the 'Anglican or Popish' meaning of the word—soothed others; and a tyrannical exercise of arbitrary power got rid of the dreaded opposition of the unappeasable Andrew Melville."—102—104.

Nevertheless, the concession thus extorted from the Assembly of 1600, amounted to no more than a recognition of the old *Tulchan* system. The prelates were not to enjoy the style and title of bishops. Their vote in parliament was to be solely in virtue of a commission from the church. They possessed no spiritual jurisdiction over their brethren, and were themselves subject, in every particular, to the jurisdiction of the tribunals of the Church.

But the death of Elizabeth in 1603, and the new influences to which James's succession to the throne of England subjected him, as well as the increase of power which it placed in his hands, soon brought about, by a more summary process, the change which he had sought to effect by those insidious proceedings. In defiance of the Statutes of 1592, and in disregard of his parting address, in which he promised to maintain the Presbyterian system inviolate in its integrity, he invaded the right of annual meetings which the law accorded to the General Assembly; he imprisoned, or otherwise set aside the leading members, whose opposition seemed most formidable, and convoked the Assembly by his own authority. The Assemblies thus convened by the Royal mandate, were soon found sufficiently compliant. The Bishops were declared to be permanent presidents of all the presbyteries within their respective dioceses. The sees were re-endowed with suitable revenues; and for the more speedy adjustment of all details,

and the more satisfactory suppression of all opposition, the Court of High Commission was established in Scotland. Under the gentle pressure of these influences, the Assemblies became still more pliant. The Assembly of 1610, held at Glasgow, conceded to the Bishops, at the King's demand, almost the full measure of Episcopal authority, with the single limitation (in those days scarcely a practical one) of subjection to the General Assembly; and three of the prelates were sent to England, to receive episcopal consecration and impart it to their brethren at home. The Assembly of Perth, in 1618, completed the work of subjugation, by introducing into Scotland, in the celebrated Five Articles of Perth, the obnoxious ceremonies, whose enforcement upon the less incongruous service, and the less uncongenial habits, of the English Church, had already encountered such resistance in England, and was destined to produce still more fatal consequences.

Charles I. inherited his father's Scottish policy, but he pursued it upon far more lofty principles. The Duke's historical summary of the events of this reign, is by many degrees the most striking portion of his Essay. The description of Charles's visit to Scotland, and of the measures which he pursued, is indeed a very brilliant passage.

“Eight years pass on from the accession of Charles I., and we find him in the midst of feasting and revelry at the ancient Palace of the House of Stuart. They had been eight eventful years for England; the antagonist principles of civil and religious despotism, and the claims and rights of freemen, had already come into ominous collision, on the floor of the House of Commons. Charles, and Laud, and Wentworth had already arrayed against them that great company of extraordinary men who cluster round the name of Hampden. This was the period when the former number had quenched by violence the opposition of the latter, and were preparing, by every species of bigotry and oppression, for their own tremendous overthrow. It was the deadly calm which precedes the hurricane; and Charles and Laud had determined on the final reduction of the Scottish people to spiritual and temporal obedience. Their Church was still deeply tainted with the leaven of Presbytery; James had known the temper of his countrymen better than did his son; the clergy had very generally refused the ceremonies imposed at Perth; and the older Scottish Bishops, with Spottiswoode at their head, had been made aware by the heaving of the ground beneath them, that they must be wary and circumspect. But Laud knew little of this; for what he did know he cared not; and there were a number

of men more recently elevated to the Episcopal Bench in Scotland, who had not risen like Spottiswoode, through Presbyteries and General Assemblies, and who were to the full as reckless as himself. In all things, Laud was resolved the Scottish service should be brought up to the level, or above it, of the English ritual. He little knew the elements he had to deal with; he met a spirit as determined as his own; he roused a bigotry almost as frantic, but having—what his had not—right and justice on its side.

“The storm, however, advanced amidst flowers and sunshine. All was joy and festival round the King at Holyrood. But amidst the lavish expenditure of the Scottish nobles, the prodigality of their feasts, and the sumptuousness of their caparisons and dress—symptoms were observed of the real condition of the people’s mind. Those, it was remarked by Charles himself, who wished to recommend themselves in Parliament, to favour out of doors, spoke in a tone of decided opposition to the Court. The persons whom he shunned, in his private intercourse, were ever, he also noticed, the nearest to his person, and the most eager to be seen in converse with him when in the public streets. The courteous manners of the high-bred gentleman, and the natural amiability of his personal character, could not repel their civility and devotion; and he saw that when a good impression was to be made on his Scottish subjects, it was needful that those from whom he was most averse should seem his nearest councillors. Poor Charles the First! Who does not deplore that the glances of that grave mild eye, which saw so much, had not seen far more! But he was a bigot, and bigots were on his right hand and on his left. That a new Liturgy, at variance with their most deeply-rooted sentiments, should be forcibly imposed on the Scottish people, was a proposition he hardly heard disputed, unless when the wary Spottiswoode recommended caution on such grounds of expediency as Charles’s nature could little sympathise with, or understand. He did indeed hear debates. The pride of the Scottish Bishops was offended by the haughtiness and temper of their English brother. They were willing to oppress others, but they could not bear to be dictated to, themselves; and a passionate dispute arose as to whether the new Liturgy should be that used by Laud, or another form to be composed by Scottish Prelates for the peculiar use of the Scottish Church. Their pretended patriotism, it seemed to Laud, was really their own pride of heart. We too are of the same opinion. Men who have trampled on the feelings and violated the constitution of their country, and who were at that moment preparing for still more aggravated oppression, can hardly be held to have redeemed their character for public spirit by rebelling against being compelled to use precisely the same form of words which the Bishop of London used. It mattered little which of them gained the day, The time was already almost come when other voices besides those of either Laud or Spottiswoode must needs be heard.

“A commission was at last granted to the Scottish Bishops to prepare a Book of Canons and a Liturgy, which, when finished, were to be sent up for revisal by Laud and other English Prelates. But all this was secret. Some public acts were however done, before Charles returned to England, which added something to the causes already in active operation. More Bishops were raised to the highest civil functions; the Court of Session and the Privy Council were crowded still more with croziers. The people had been long finally estranged; the higher nobility were now mortally offended. But for four years all was calm—so deadly still, that to the superficial eye, it seemed like rest. Some acts of gross tyranny in civil matters perpetrated by Charles, and many in ecclesiastical affairs by the now revived activity of the Court of High Commission, seemed to be submitted to in all the quietness of passive obedience. The Bishops were still concocting their Liturgy and their Canons. This was well known, and a spirit of unsubduable resistance was being infused into the ambushed ranks of Presbytery. The mysterious influences of that extraordinary time were deeply but silently at work. Notions of mere political right were being succoured by religious belief. Already was the temper of the times seeking expression in the Language of the Law and of the Prophets; and throughout the pulpits and parishes of Scotland, a patient waiting was enjoined ‘for the time when the Lord would deliver Zion.’

“No haste was manifested or felt, to begin premature resistance. It was seen, as Lord Clarendon informs us, that the temper and violence of the Bishops would soon be their own undoing; and so it was. At last, the Book of Canons was completed, and forthwith without farther communication with the clergy, or the assembling of any council, either lay or spiritual, there issued a Proclamation from the King, commanding universal and immediate obedience. This was despotic enough; but it was the appropriate introduction to a Book of Canons which laid down the principles of despotism with the noblest candour. Charles I. claimed supremacy not less ample than that which had belonged to the Kings of Israel:—he was to be King ‘after the pattern’ of David and his line. And as if to give a practical example of the powers he claimed, one of the Canons enjoined the uniform practice of a Liturgy which was yet in the workshop of the Bishops. But the crisis was now at hand. The Liturgy, too, was at last completed; and after Laud and his coadjutors had given it their final touches, and made it (where it differed) more like the Roman Missal than the English form, it was sent down to Scotland, and after some postponement and delays, the order was promulgated for its being read in all the churches on the ensuing Sunday.

“Who has not heard of the scenes which followed?—how on the memorable Sunday of the 23rd July, 1637, the two Archbishops of Glasgow and St. Andrews, with many others of their order, the

Members of the Privy Council, and Court of Session, all in their robes of office, went in solemn procession to the Cathedral Church of St. Giles in Edinburgh—how a prodigious concourse had assembled there ;—how when the book was opened, and the Dean began to read, there was first a murmur, and then a roar ;—how the excitement rose till it came to madness ;—how the Bishop commanded the Dean to proceed ;—how Janet Geddes seconded less effectual remonstrance with her three-legged stool ;—how the Archbishop interposed his dignity, but in vain ;—how the civil magistrates were then appealed to ;—and, in short, how the multitude, swaying to and fro like a drunken man, gave dreadful witness to the wickedness and folly of tyrannical dictation in matters of religion, and in forms of prayer.”—pp. 110—115.

This resistance, however, coming, as it chiefly seemed to come, from the lowest and least influential class, had not the effect of inducing the court party to give way. The Bishops, on the contrary, persisted in enforcing conformity. But a more formidable opposition soon developed itself. A considerable body of the clergy, headed by the celebrated Alexander Henderson, protested against the Service Book and the Canons, and presented a petition to the Privy Council, praying their withdrawal. Even if the King had been inclined to yield, which he was not, the still more stern temper of Laud would have maintained him in his purpose. The reply to the representations of the Privy Council was a peremptory mandate for the enforcement of conformity.

A new petition was presented, but now under very different circumstances. On the side of the “supplicants” were enlisted the whole mass of the people, by far the largest portion of the clergy, and a powerful array of the nobles and higher gentry. The Privy Council hesitated in alarm. Emboldened by their hesitation, the supplicants organized their system of resistance, and the celebrated constitution of the Four Tables, consisting of separate councils of the nobles, the shires, the burghs, and the clergy, gave a strength and solidity to their combination, to which it was mainly indebted for its subsequent success.

On the third of February, 1638, the Privy Council, in alarm, reported these formidable movements. But the king and primate were still inexorable. This resistance was denounced by proclamation as illegal and traitorous, and the use of the Service Book was still enforced with the same relentless pertinacity. The “supplicants” met this

determined step with equal determination: and now they appeared in arms. The internal divisions of the Presbyterian body, too, which the royal advisers had hoped to improve to their own advantage, were extinguished by Henderson's masterly stroke of policy in the publication of the Covenant, embracing all shades of Presbytery. The ferment became universal. Spottiswoode, and several of his brethren, fled in consternation to England; and three of the body renounced their episcopal functions, and ranged themselves with the Presbyterian party. These signs could no longer be mistaken. Charles despatched the Marquis of Hamilton as his commissioner to Scotland; and after several ineffectual efforts to temporize, was compelled to yield the claim for a General Assembly and a free Parliament, to abandon the Service Book and the Book of Canons, and to abolish the Court of High Commission.

The Assembly was fixed for November 21st, 1638. The democratic element which it threatened to exhibit in its composition, was no less an object of apprehension to Charles than was the Presbyterian; and, with the view of divesting the meeting of at least this formidable characteristic, he required that it should consist exclusively of the clergy. But the supplicants would not hear of half measures like these. They insisted on the constitution guaranteed by the Statutes of 1592; and the king, baffled at every point, was forced to prepare in secret for the armed collision with his cherished prerogatives, which he now foresaw to be inevitable. The Assembly met. It was impossible to mistake its spirit and its temper. Hamilton tried every expedient of diplomacy and of delay. When all had been fruitlessly exhausted, he declared the Assembly dissolved, and retired from the place of meeting. But the supplicants, now conscious of their strength, refused to abandon their vantage-ground. They continued their sitting without interruption; bound themselves to maintain their constitutional privileges; and, in virtue of the rights guaranteed by the Act of 1592, appointed a day of meeting for the Assembly in the following year.

This was the commencement of the war of Charles with the Scottish Covenanters. From this moment prelacy was forgotten in the strife; nor does the civil war which ensued bear directly upon the main subject of our present enquiry. It will be enough to say, that the concessions into

which the king, after various unsuccessful negotiations, was ultimately driven, came too late for the temper of Scotland. No mere constitutional recognition of the legal existence of Presbytery would satisfy the elevated pretensions of the now triumphant Covenant. The claim of Divine Right was henceforth blazoned on its banners. The offers of Charles in 1641, ample as they would have been deemed a few months before, were scornfully rejected; and a few months later, dazzled by the hope of establishing their cherished form of church polity, and enforcing their still more cherished doctrines throughout the length and breadth of England, they concluded, in 1643, the Solemn League and Covenant with the English Parliament.

We shall not enter into the minute history of this alliance. There is one peculiarity of it, however, which the Duke brings forward with great candour, however little creditable to his countrymen.

“In the establishment of this great principle,—the Liberty of Dissent,—Scottish Presbytery had not the honour of giving its assistance. Its representatives saw with horror and alarm the rise and spread of an opinion as fatal to the claims of its own Assemblies as to those of Prelatic priesthood. ‘In their sermons in the city,’ says Baillie, in a letter dated May, 1645, ‘the Independents are deviating more and more towards old and new errors, ESPECIALLY LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.’ Indeed, this period of negotiation between the Westminster Assembly of Divines and the Long Parliament is the most humiliating passage in the History of Scottish Presbytery. ‘It demanded,’ to use the quaint words of the same authority, ‘in high and peremptor, but in wise and unchangeable terms, the settling of religion, (to wit, the setting-up of Presbyterian government,) according to the advice of the Assembly, *without all toleration of any sect.*’ Yet at the very moment it was thus demanding of the Parliament to exercise its civil power in subjecting the whole people, ‘without toleration of any sect,’ to its own principles of discipline and faith, it stigmatised every attempt of the same Parliament to modify or change any of its proposed ‘Articles’ as an ‘Erastian’ interference with the government of the Church! If the Parliament consented to receive its articles *simpliciter*, and enact them, *this* was an exertion of civil power in spiritual things, which it was no more than its duty to make. But if it altered them, this was an Erastian usurpation; and if it refused them, this was the greatest crime of all,—a neglecting to ‘settle religion,’—the cause of God’s judgments, by pestilence and the sword—a violation of the Covenant!”—pp. 180, 181.

His Grace might have added, as a further illustration of

the tendency of all sects to intolerant use of power, that this very party,—the Independents—who maintained so sternly against the Puritans the principle of Liberty of Conscience and Right of Dissent, had no sooner themselves attained the ascendant, than they turned their back upon this profession. They refused to extend this liberty to Prelatists, and still less to Papists. The priests were sought out and apprehended as in the darkest days of arbitrary power. Many were sentenced to death. Father Peter Wright was actually executed in 1651. Recusancy, fines, and confiscations, were strenuously enforced. In twenty-five counties of England no less than £60,000 of Catholic rents were under sequestration in 1650, and the appeal for even the barest shadow of indulgence, not to say toleration, which the oppressed and broken-spirited Catholics made to the parliament in 1652, was contemptuously scouted from the house without even the miserable consolation of a hearing.

We are bound, however, to record, as a compensation, another event in the history of those times, in which the Scottish party figured with greater credit,—the trial and condemnation of the unhappy king with whom they had maintained so long and so deadly a struggle. There is much feeling, and, we must add, much ability, in the Duke's observations upon this subject.

“The part which Presbytery took on the occasion of this announcement is well known. The Commissioners were instantly instructed to protest, in the name of Scotland, of the Covenant and the Constitution, against an act which was deemed a violation of justice, and of all law human and divine.

“We do not sympathise with Covenanting Presbytery in all nor in most of the grounds of its difference with Cromwell. But in this we do. We look upon the execution of Charles I. as Presbytery looked upon it then, as an unwarrantable and needless crime. This, we are aware, is a most unfashionable opinion among ‘liberal’ politicians and ‘philosophical’ historians. Biographers, like Carlyle, speak of course in terms of triumphant sympathy with this, and all other deeds their idol did. Cromwell did it: he thought it necessary to be done. They therefore think it necessary too, and consequently right. With this summary conviction there is no means of reasoning. But in reference to this event, Mr. Carlyle has condescended to tell us the specific ground on which he thinks this deed was necessary, and forms a subject of congratulation to after times. It broke, he thinks,—and was needed to break,—the idolatry of Kings. It was as the unpunished insult offered by a Pagan

Queen to the volcano which her people had believed a God,—it broke enchantment, and ended servitude!

“We have seen no ‘philosophical’ explanation of any historical event which is less consistent either with reason or with facts. That violent excess on one side is productive of as violent excess upon the other, is a law of our nature which, we should have thought, had been very generally observed,—very proverbially known. The principle is of such general application that it has been admitted, we believe, to the rank of a text for copy-books. Even, therefore, if Mr. Carlyle had lived and written during the Protectorate of Cromwell, without foresight or knowledge of subsequent events, it would have been strange to anticipate the decay of king-worship from a deed against a king which was revolting to the moral sense—to the judgment and humanity of a vast majority of the British people. But that any man who lives and writes since the Restoration should ascribe such effect to the murder of Charles I.,—with full knowledge of that mad and drunk reaction which again, much more abjectly than before, placed the liberties of the nation at the feet of a despot—is the most amazing effort of historical philosophy with which we are at all acquainted. We ascribe it, however, to another idolatry, at whose shrine Mr. Carlyle is an abject worshipper—the idolatry of Genius. This, too, is an enchantment and a servitude which it would be well to break. Yet we should doubt the efficacy of an expedient such as Mr. Carlyle thinks (despite the Restoration) was so successful in respect to kings. He probably knows best whether his reverence for Cromwell would have been less if that extraordinary man had been shot or hanged. We suspect not. The noblest light which ever flashed from genius may be easily quenched in blood. But this would only exaggerate the memory of its brightness, and enshrine it as the object of still blinder admiration. And so with the right and prerogative of kings. They may be taken by assault, or cut short in violence. But this, if it be done at the expense of any sacred principle, whether of natural or political obligation, is directly calculated to induce that reaction and excess which in the present instance actually occurred with such long and deplorable effect.”—pp. 194—196.

There remains but another chapter, and that the least honourable of them all, in the history of Scottish Episcopacy. During the fierce contests of the Covenant, even the name had been almost entirely forgotten; but it was re-established in all its integrity immediately after the Restoration. Nor can any one wonder at the scanty favour which it found in the eyes of the people.

“It came under circumstances and with an aspect, if possible, still more forbidding than before:—it came under the patronage of

a profligate and irreligious Court:—it came in the train of a council of nobles rioting in every meanest vice:—it came with the same beginnings of deceit, and with ends of even greater violence:—it came with the abject and disgraceful abandonment of every constitutional security for civil and religious liberty, which had been gained during the late struggle, or which had existed before it:—it came represented by a Primate, who, like all his predecessors, was a traitor to the cause he had professed to serve, but who, in a degree much worse than any of them, was false and selfish, unscrupulous in his ambition, cruel to those below, and abject to those above him:—it came, in short, to use the words of one whose authority cannot be doubted, ‘with such cross characters of an angry Providence,’ that it seemed God was against the Bishops.”—p. 207.

There is one circumstance in the history of the Episcopal Church at this period, which the Duke records with just indignation.

“We read with especial horror, that at the very time when English Episcopacy was beginning to move in the cause of liberty—when its doctrines of passive obedience were yielding under the influence of circumstances in which it was distasteful or dangerous to practise them—when a Popish monarch became the advocate of tolerance, and the famous contest against the ‘dispensing power’ began—the two ‘governing Bishops’ in Scotland sent up an offer to James II., signed by several of the ‘spiritual’ bench, to the effect that they would offer no opposition to the removal of disabilities from those of ‘His Majesty’s religion,’ provided the enactments against the Presbyterians were maintained in force. But as it was clear that a Papal tolerance must involve also a tolerance of Presbytery, most of the Scottish Bishops ventured to record their votes against the abolition of the tests. We cannot honour them for this resistance, because it was clearly founded on the same motives which, until then, had marked their course with the basest servility recorded of any party in our history. They had aided and abetted Charles II. in every most oppressive measure of his reign; and worse, they had aided his coarsest agents in the most cruel execution of most cruel laws. Only a few years before, they had used all their influence in the imposition of those test oaths which were so odious in the principles they involved, and so doubly odious in the purposes they were intended to subserve—for ‘explaining’ which the Earl of Argyll was executed; and rather than take which, about eighty of their own clergy had resigned their livings, and left their service. With a single eye, too, to the persecution of the Presbyterian people, the same party had prostrated even principles of Episcopal authority, which it was their duty to defend.”—pp. 211—213.

It was a part of their punishment that this very circum-

stance should contribute to accelerate their fall. We shall hardly be suspected of any predilection for the antagonist principle, when we express our full sympathy in the following graphic description of the complete extinction of Scottish Episcopacy, for which the first news of the landing of the Prince of Orange gave the expected signal.

“The ‘abhorred’ invasion being soon actually made, James had to withdraw his troops from Scotland. Immediately the clergy all over the Lowlands of Scotland, where their system had earned the greatest hatred, were exposed to the attacks of fanatic mobs. They were ‘rabbed’ out of their livings. It does not appear however that any sanguinary revenge was taken. The butcheries of Claverhouse were not visited on their heads—though we fear that more impartial times will not acquit their memories of at least some measure of the guilt. As it is, we profess our inability to grieve over the hardships to which they were now exposed. They had been rabbed *into* their livings—it was natural that they should be rabbed *out*. About two hundred ministers, we are told, were ejected in this lawless manner; but not far from double this number had been ejected in 1662 by the agents of Scottish Prelacy. True—this former ejection had been made under the cover of law. But this was the master grievance. The nation’s mouth had been made to speak against itself. Priests persecuted its religion—Parliaments trod down its laws. The first took the name of God’s law,—the latter took the name of human law, in vain. And now this system of mockery was to end—the popular mouth was to be opened—its smothered voice was to resume its utterance. What wonder if its first accents were pronounced in rage? What wonder if its words were as words of cursing? The Editors of the ‘Spottiswoode’ are anxious to impress us with the injustice inflicted at the Revolution on the Episcopal clergy, by the Covenanting mobs. Doubtless they were hardly used. But the injuries they met with were as nothing to the injuries they and their agents had inflicted when they had their power.”—pp. 215, 116.

The Duke’s historical survey of the fortunes of Episcopacy in Scotland terminates with the Revolution; he cautiously abstains from identifying the existing Episcopal Church in Scotland, with the hated institution of the Stewart times. Considered as “a transplant from the Church of England, which gradually, and by legitimate means, has successfully struck root in another country;” he looks upon the former as thoroughly entitled to sincere respect. But a great portion of the second part of his Essay is devoted to a discussion of the principles of those

over jealous defenders of Episcopacy, who cling with reverence even to the shadow thereof which the Church of Scotland in the seventeenth century presented; who claim the privilege of Apostolical succession, even through all the breaks and gaps which history points out in the chain, and the false and spurious links by which the bare semblance of continuity is maintained; who still, in defiance of history, look upon themselves as "the Church" of Scotland; and—by a fiction analogous to that of our High Church party in reference to the Catholic Church in Ireland—regard their Presbyterian countrymen as in a state of schism.

With this controversy, for its own sake, we have little concern. We do not mean it as an offence to either party to say, that, looking upon truth as one and undivided, we have little interest in examining into the greater or the less degrees, of what our principles compel us to regard as errors. Nevertheless, it is difficult to imagine any such controversy in which some principle is not involved; and there is so much vigour and manliness, as well as originality, in the views of the Presbyterian principle, as contrasted with that of *Episcopacy in any Protestant community*, put forward by the Duke of Argyll, that we are inclined to devote our few remaining pages to a brief summary of them.

His theory then, is, that the idea of Presbytery formed the very essence of the Reformation: that without it the Reformation is incomplete and meaningless; and that if it be once abandoned it will be difficult to find a consistent resting place, short of the universal Episcopacy of the Papal system. And by Presbytery he means a system not only antagonist to episcopacy, but one strictly and essentially "anti-sacerdotal in its nature" (226.); rejecting all idea of "anything like a priestly elevation of the clergy" (34.), and recognizing "the full association of the laity, with all their notions of the powers and duties of the Church." This he maintains to be the true character of Scottish Presbytery. "Its government is based on the representative system. Its office-bearers are only the officers of the people. Its ministers are destitute of the character of an order; they are not above the Church, but of it; they are not lords over God's heritage, but only members of the same; they have not the power to constitute themselves into a priesthood, even if they had the will. It is forbidden by their history. For a considerable

time after the Reformation, they were not even set apart, as they now are, by the ceremony of ordination, but only by election confirmed with prayers;" (p. 226.) Now the assertion of this principle he maintains to have been the fundamental ground of the Reformation, and the leading idea of its originators.

"It is impossible not to see, that wherever a mere question as to the geographical extent of a particular Priest's authority enters principally, or even in any degree, into men's idea of the Reformation, the whole system of Protestant opinion is based on sand. We have said that the denial of the Bishop of Rome's spiritual sovereignty was a bit of truth. But the fact is, that *in itself* it can hardly be said even to amount to this. The mere fact of an universal Bishopric expressed no lie, and therefore, the denial of it expressed no truth, except when viewed in connexion with certain principles which lay behind it. In as far as the power of the Italian Priest claimed to rest on Divine authority—and thereby involve the principle of constructive interpretations of God's Will, through the medium of tradition—in so far those claims *did* express a lie, and the denial of them did express a truth. If 'Churchmen' regard it in this point of view, we should have no objection to their condemning a principle which certainly was one of those against which the Reformation entered its protest. But when it appears that the only principle which makes the denial of the Romish claims valuable, is directly involved in other claims, which those 'Churchmen' themselves advance, it becomes evident that *their* idea of the revolt from Rome forms no part whatever of the truth or the value of the Reformation.

"Except as involving the vicious principle above referred to, the spiritual jurisdiction of a central government over the visible Church was in itself no evil thing. If there is one glorious characteristic of the Christianity of the middle age, it was in that feature of wide conformity which symbolised the unity of the Spiritual Church. And this feature of conformity stood in immediate connection with the centralisation of ecclesiastical authority. It was a glorious thing to go from one end of Western Europe to another—from the harbour of Valetta, to the Fiords of Norway—from the Danube to the clustered Hebrides—and find throughout every country which lay between, one Priesthood—one Creed—one Ritual. It was a good thing to have even that faint shadow in the world, of one Lord—one Faith—one Baptism!

No mere question as to the original size of the Roman diocese, could for a moment have justified any member of this vast brotherhood in breaking its conformity. As furnishing an excuse for such a course, it was of no importance whatever whether that diocese originally comprehended the world—or only Europe—or only Italy—or only Rome—or only the gardens of the Vatican. Nothing short

of a belief that the existing conformity was a conformity of error—nothing short of an independent conviction, that what was so uniformly believed was false and wrong—could have justified any man, or any country, in disturbing the repose of the visible Church. The size of the diocese of Rome is wholly beside the question. There is no religious truth expressed in the lines of geography—in the boundaries of nations, or in the walls of towns. *Jure Divino*, of course, there was as little authority for one Priest extending his authority beyond the walls of Rome, as for another stretching it beyond the streets of Canterbury. But the reverence—the affection—the opinions, and the habits of a large part of the Christian Church, had gradually consecrated for both those Priests, a power and a position for which these were the only, and the sufficient title;—sufficient, we mean—not against those higher rights of the Christian people, for which, and from which alone, those Priests held their respective places—not against the right of any jot or tittle of Christian truth, to make itself heard in the family or in the Church—but against any frivolous or schismatic disturbance of existing order.”—pp. 239—242.

And hence he holds, that it is only in the Papal system, the sacerdotal theory can be said to find its legitimate development.

“Admit the sacerdotal theory of the nature and authority of ‘The Church,’ and we admit that from which the whole system of Romanism has been a gradual and natural development. It is possible, certainly, to maintain a successful defence against many of the specific forms of error which have belonged to the Papacy. But even this defence we have to maintain with arms, on the efficiency of which it is not safe to risk the high interests involved. Brought into ground where reason has no room to work, the fight becomes one of subtilty, doubtful in its progress, and at best but unsatisfactory in its issue. Obscure facts of history—still more obscure memories of tradition—and doubtful passages of possibly-misreported Fathers, such are the ruinous positions for which we have to keep up the most laborious contention. But are these fit defences for the citadels of doctrinal Truth? Even if some, by dint of great tenacity of purpose, succeed in maintaining them, do we not feel that others, less skilful or less determined, must infallibly be driven out? This, then, is one grand objection against the principles of Priesthood—that though despite of them, the learned and the acute may possibly maintain themselves in purity of faith, they rob the great mass of mankind of all security against the gradual but steady growth of error and corruption. If the voice of a visible government of Priests be invested with the authority of ‘The Church,’ men will accept, and ought logically to accept, that voice as it comes to them *in their own days*. They

have no time,—no opportunity,—and on those principles, no right, —to appeal from its present teaching, to its teaching fifteen or sixteen centuries ago. Divines living in the quiet courts of Oxford, may defend their Orthodoxy against ‘The Church’ of the sixteenth, by quoting ‘The Church’ of the third or fourth century. But granting that on their own theory this appeal is open to ‘Churchmen,’ it is clear that it is one which the great majority of the human race neither can nor will make; and therefore, that if the Truth is to be maintained at all, its interests must be trusted to some more open, and more sufficient plea.”—pp. 271–2.

To the secret and unfelt working of this principle also, he attributes these extraordinary conversions, which have been the wonder of this age, and which cannot fail to extend their influence to coming generations.

“We do not believe that those men who have enrolled themselves members of the Roman Church, had any intention, at first, of doing so. We believe that, though imbued with the same principles which have been accidentally associated with the Italian City, they nevertheless distinctly saw that they had no necessary connection with it. They meant to stand apart, on denials of the Pope’s supremacy, and other denials as logical, and as valueless. But when the development of those principles in their minds, opened their eyes to the identity between them and the principles which Rome had so long and so wonderfully upheld, they felt no inclination, and they had no heart to resist her charms. We do not wonder. It was hard to stand where they stood, and on a narrow point of logic, or on a false pride of nationality, to refuse to go to her. They had been led, as it were, blindfold from England, and on the Janiculum their eyes were opened! They were Englishmen; they owed no obedience to the See of Rome. But who, in such a presence, could dwell on this? They looked down on that wonderful city, which, from those heights, tells so well her history in her face. They saw her seated on a throne of ruins, but grasping in her living hand that spiritual sceptre, which has survived so many ages full of the births and deaths of nations! They saw her classic remains, her civic palaces, and her priestly domes,—the latter alone untouched by dilapidation or decay. They saw her as one mighty symbol translating their very hearts. Her power was on them—the memory of what she had been—the sense of what she is. It was needless, it was wrong, to struggle farther; they bowed their heads and their souls before her, and passed under the yoke of Rome.”—pp. 256, 257.

It is as impossible to doubt the justice and solidity of these views in point of fact, as it is to avoid being struck by the vigour, ability, and simple elegance with which they

are put forward. Early in the great movement to which the Duke refers, we ourselves, ventured to predict as the necessary consequence of the principles then maintained by the Tractarians, the very result which he ascribes to their operation; and the history of the progress of many individual minds in their advance towards the truth, fully bears out the justice of the general opinion.

We have seldom seen a more manly, and at the same time, a more complete refutation of the special claim to exemption from all taint of schism, set up by Anglicans in favour of their Church, as contra-distinguished from what they call Protestant communities, than that which is contained in the following pithy paragraph.

“Do ‘Churchmen’ wish to meet the Romanist charge against Protestants, of the sin of schism? At once they have recourse to this assertion, as having the double advantage of covering themselves, and rebuking other bodies of the Reformed. ‘We did not separate from the Church. The English Reformation maintained the authority of the Church, and employed it to shake off the corruptions which Rome had introduced. We speak only of ourselves. We cannot defend the Scotch Reformation on the same ground. John Knox, we confess, separated himself and his people wholly from the Church, setting up a system of his own. You may charge *him* with the sin of schism if you choose; but we have nothing to do with him.’ Or again, do churchmen argue against those, who faithfully interpreting their own tendencies, have lately left them, and rejoined ‘The Church?’ ‘Beware,’ they say, ‘how you leave us, and go to Rome. It is schismatical in you to do so. For it was not schismatical in us to leave Rome, and constitute ourselves as we now are. *We* are not like other Protestants. *We* referred back to the Church before Rome corrupted her. They did not do so. They rejected the authority of the Church. With *them* you really would be beyond the pale of the Church. But in leaving *us* you must be led by pride of intellect, or other deceiving passions of the mind.’ In all these forms, for these and other similar purposes, we have heard this favourite assumption repeated over and over again. It is a sort of monomania with a certain party, recurring on every occasion.

“There is, however, just one unfortunate circumstance connected with this favourite assertion, and that is that it has no foundation whatever in historical fact—in short, that it is NOT TRUE. It is not true that the Scotch Reformers, in what they rejected at the Reformation, had no respect to the authority of the Church; neither is it true that the English Reformers professed to have that authority for half that accident obliged them to retain. The English Reformers, and the Scotch Reformers, proceeded upon pre-

cisely the same idea—that they ought to revert to what the Church originally was, before its government, and its doctrine, became corrupted. And if, in the result, the two Reformations arrived at different conclusions as to what its system had been and ought to be, it was not because Presbytery refused to appeal to Apostolic history and example; but rather because—more anxious to do so than English Prelacy—it refused to form its opinion from any other source than those earliest writings, in which the Apostles themselves tell what their Master ordered, and what themselves did.”—pp. 280—282.

And the Anglican claim to the character of a self-reformed Church is dissected with equal ability.

“So far, then, the English Reformation does not seem peculiarly credible in its beginnings. And how in its later stages does it countenance the pretensions of the ‘Churchmen?’ The powers of the Priestly Episcopate,—that one essential which the Reformers are said to have preserved—how did they treat it, and what value did they give it? They threw it without reserve at the feet of a layman. The monarch made, unmade, degraded Bishops. All their authority was vice-regal. It was considered as emanating from unconsecrated hands. When Henry died, Cranmer’s spiritual authority died also; nor did he consider himself entitled to exercise it again, until his commission was renewed by the succeeding Sovereign. That mechanical efficacy, however, which is supposed to inhere in Priestly Succession was, it is believed, preserved. The lay monarch made and unmade priests; but he used other priests as the means of executing his orders. The fact of succession, therefore, continued. But there is reason to believe that even this was not estimated at the value put upon it by later ‘Churchmen.’ Many of the greatest names in the history of the English Church,—of that generation especially whose minds were enlarged by intimate intercourse with foreign Reformations, in whose vigorous theology there was no room for a petty idolising of their provincial peculiarities, and whose convictions were called to stand the test of fire,—have left abundant proof that they laid no stress whatever on the virtue of succession. It is remarkable that, though it was not till towards the end of Elizabeth’s reign that the English Protestant clergy began prominently to found high claims upon it, the same doctrines respecting the nature of ‘the Church’ had attracted the notice and the censure of some of the earlier Bishops, as Popish errors which they were desirous of eradicating. Among the Articles of Religion which Bishop Hooper distributed among the clergy of his diocese so early as 1550, we find prominent place given to one touching the true conception of the Church. The object of it is emphatically expressed in its concluding words:—‘Lest any man should be seduced, believing himself to be bound unto an ordinary

succession of Bishops and Priests, but only unto the Word of God, and the right use of his Sacraments.'”—pp. 285, 286.

We are tempted to add one or two passages illustrating the Duke's views on questions more immediately affecting our own Church. There is much grace and candour in the following admission :

“Protestants have been wont to believe that the errors of Romanism are incompatible with knowledge and enlightenment. The truth of this position has been ably combated by a great living writer, who has shown, from the loss of ground which Protestantism has sustained since its first impetuous advance, that this opinion cannot be confidently relied on. And indeed, when we consider what a separate domain from every other department of human meditation, is that of religious faith, we can see how it is that great powers and great acquirements of mind have co-existed, and do co-exist, with abject submission to corrupt dogmas. Let reason be as powerful as it may, its powers are of no value where it is not allowed to enter. Reason ought not to rebel against authority, where itself is unable to arrive at truth ; but reason *must* choose between false authorities and true ; and if in forbidding it to do the first, men forbid it also to do the second, we can understand how the greatest secular learning may co-exist with the greatest religious superstition. For these reasons, we look with alarm upon opinions which confound the Priesthood with the Church, and lay greater stress on the authority of tradition, than on logical interpretation of those writings, which are at once the earliest history, and the highest authority of the Christian Church.”—pp. 278, 279.

One extract more—an admission peculiarly valuable, as coming from one trained in the “morose simplicity” of the Calvinistic creed.

“We have no hesitation in expressing our own impression that Scottish Presbytery has left her house of worship needlessly bare of furniture. There are chords in our mental frame which it has been too much afraid to touch. It is true that when struck too strongly they have drowned the harmony of truth ; but there is a richness and depth of tone which is often lost when they are silent. There is a power, for instance, of which we are all conscious, in the reverential remembrance of the Great who have gone before us. The power of giving us personal interest in their virtues, and thereby adding to the intensity of our own feelings, is one of the best influences to which the Author of our being has made it subject. Why should we refuse assistance so powerful, and so near at hand ? Why should we silence a voice so much our own, yet so much better than ourselves ? In lower departments of human nature, who does not recognise its power ? Any association which invites us to the love of illustrious example, is valuable in promoting personal elevation

of character. The love of country is one which does so in an eminent degree. The citizen has no nobler birthright derived from country, than the personal property it gives him in the memory of its great men. It is thus that public and private character is raised, or if high, is to a great degree kept from falling. There is no reason why the same principle should not have equal value in the highest sphere of religion. There is no better way of remembering and understanding our own duty, than by keeping up loving memory of those who have well performed theirs. The narrow path has been trod before us; why should we shut our eyes on those who beckon us to follow? Yet Scottish Presbytery has shut up the Calendar of Saints. But St. Paul did not; and perhaps there is no passage in the Bible which gives us a more vivid impression of the spiritual privileges, of the Jewish people, than that in which this Hebrew of the Hebrews incites and instructs his brethren, by summing up that long catalogue of Saints which begins with Abel, and ends with Samuel and the Prophets. The history and the memory of these were in a peculiar degree their own. Christianity has made them ours also; and has added besides a great company of names, which we may recount, as St. Paul has recounted these. Why the saints of the New should be less valuable to us, than the saints of the Old Economy where to the Jews, it is impossible to see."—pp. 299, 230.

We should have been glad to enter into that part of his Grace's Essay, which is addressed to the Free-Church controversy. But our space is already exhausted. And indeed, we cannot help thinking that this is the least successful section of the book. There is a want of distinctness in the views, and a seeming consciousness of embarrassment in the reasoning, which go far to mar the effect of the argument, as a whole, however brilliant and conclusive some isolated parts must be admitted to be. The truth is, that we have looked in vain for any distinct and satisfactory exposition of the writer's present view, and any satisfactory exposition of the principles upon which his adhesion to the State Church is vindicated. In the discussion of the celebrated Auchterarder case, he held, that the Church of Scotland was legally entitled to reject the nominee of a patron, if the congregation refused to receive him: and that, at worst, the civil courts could only interfere so far as to secure to the nominee of the patron, the fruits arising from the benefice. In maintenance of these principles, the Free-Church has seceded from the establishment. The Duke, though he also still professes to maintain them, has remained within its pale. It is hard for him to

fight, embarrassed by such encumbrances; and it is impossible not to perceive that they have, in numberless instances, acted as a drag upon his pen, rapid and vigorous as it is.

However, this portion of his Grace's Essay may safely be left between himself and the numerous champions of the Free-Church. His views have already been warmly encountered in several quarters, and in some particulars with considerable success. To us, however, these are considerations of very minor importance. Where great principles are at stake, we should be sorry to see a mind so vigorous and comprehensive, wasting its energies upon matters of detail. If the Duke of Argyll shall ever turn to controversy again, there are indications in his present Essay which lead us to hope that he will turn to what he himself calls, citing the words of Burnet,—“the great controversy of the Authority of the Church.”

-
- ART. V.—1. *A Letter to Lord John Russell*, suggesting a plan for the adjustment of the relation between Landlord and Tenant in Ireland. By Sir A. W. HILLARY, Bart. London: Wilson.
- 2.—*A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Roden*, by ISAAC BUTT, Esq. Q. C. McGlashan, Dublin, 1849.
- 3.—*How to reconstruct the Industrial Condition of Ireland*. By JAMES WARD, Esq. London: Smith, Elder and Co.
- 4.—*The Irish Relief Measures, Past and Future*. By G. POULETT SCROPE, Esq. M.P. Ridgway, London, 1848. And Mr. Scrope's Letters after a tour through Ireland in 1849.
- 5.—*Thoughts on the Poor-Relief Bill for Ireland*, together with reflections on her miseries, their causes and remedies. By JOHN EARL OF SHREWSBURY. Dolman, London.
- 6.—*Two Speeches of Sir Robert Peel* on the Plantation of Connaught, delivered in the House of Commons on the 5th and 30th of March, 1849.
- 7.—*Mr. Bright's Speech* at the Manchester Financial and Parliamentary Reform Association, October 25th, 1849.
- 8.—*Crown and Government Security Bill*, and suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland, 1848-9.

- 9.—*Massacre and Burning at Dolly's Brae*, in the County of Down, by the armed Orangemen and Police, on the 12th of July, 1849.
- 10.—*Report on the Dolly's Brae Massacre*, presented to the Lord Lieutenant by the Government Commissioner, Mr. Berwick, Q. C. Sept. 22nd, 1849, and consequent dismissal of Lord Roden and the Messrs. Beers from the Magistracy.
- 11.—*Orange Meetings convened in Dundrum*, (co. Down,) Belfast, the Rotunda Dublin, to denounce Lord Clarendon, and to present Addresses of Condolence and Sympathy to Lord Roden and the Messrs. Beers, Nov. 1849.
- 12.—*Report of the Grand (Orange) Lodge*, on the alleged arming of the Orangemen, by Lord Clarendon, and on the Dolly's Brae Massacre; *Warder (Dublin) Newspaper*, on the 1st and 8th of December, 1849.

IRELAND was, at a very remote period, celebrated throughout Europe as the island of saints and the school of the world. In more modern times her children, who were driven from their country by accursed penal laws, sold their swords to the enemies of their oppressors, and placed the name of Irishman high in the records of heroic daring and romantic valour. Within the last few years Ireland has achieved a new celebrity, for she is known over the whole world as the abode of a nation of mendicants, to the subsistence of whose wretched inhabitants the very Turks and Negro slaves have contributed. The failure of the potato developed the crisis of that misery and wretchedness which had been gradually increasing and multiplying for centuries. But for this calamity, the extent of the sufferings, and the depth of the degradation of the great mass of the Irish people, would never have been known in England. So long as the Irish population received a scanty supply of potatoes, they were cruelly misrepresented as happy and almost contented. But the sudden failure of this root at once laid bare, to the whole world, such an accumulation of wretchedness as was never before known to exist in a civilized country. This misery was only intensified by the failure of the potato crop; for the various poor-law reports, and the Devon Commission, have proved that, even in the best of times, a very large proportion of the population of Connaught, and of a part of Munster, something, on the whole, approximating to two millions of human beings, were utterly destitute during two or three months in the year. Millions of poor creatures

have been uniformly devoid of clothing, with the exception of a few miserable rags, which scarcely cover their nakedness, but are no defence whatever against the inclemency of the weather. Forty-three, out of every hundred families, burrow in holes in which a well reared pig would die; the door is the only aperture to let out the smoke, and let in the light and air, so long as the roof stays on; and here these wretched creatures lie down at night, hungry and wearied, haply separated from the cold damp earth by a little wisp of straw, and with no other covering than the wet rags which they wore during the day.

Formerly this picture would have been considered too highly coloured, it would have been looked upon as the offspring of an over-heated Celtic imagination. The remote districts of Ireland were as little known to the generality of Englishmen as the interior of Africa, and they seemed to believe that they had discharged all their duties towards the inhabitants of the sister island, when they subscribed liberally to some Exeter-hall mountebank, who promised to convert the papists, or that excellent remedy failing, passed coercion bills to hang them. At length, after seven centuries of possession, the English seem but to have just discovered Ireland, and some of the most intelligent and philanthropic amongst them having visited that country, their reports of its misery, destitution, and oppression, have been listened to with as much astonishment in England, as if the two islands were separated by the Pacific ocean instead of the British Channel. It is not a little instructive as to the appalling extent of the misery which exists in Ireland, that each new tourist, who is induced to visit her shores in order to test, with his own eyes, the truth of the frightful picture of her wretchedness, which has been drawn by his predecessors, is so far from finding it too highly coloured, that he uniformly declares it to be far too tame for the reality, and that no one can conceive the utter misery of the Irish population who has not actually witnessed it.

Nor is this misery any longer confined to the labouring population. The artisan is idle, the country shopkeeper bankrupt, and the farmer starving at home or risking his life in conflicts with the military and police, to carry off as much of the crop as will enable him to place himself and his family upon the deck of some ship, "reckless what shore she bears him to," so not again to his own. No

person is more strongly attached to his native land than the Irishman ; and the almost universal desire to flee from it, as if it were the plague-spot of the earth, which is nearly as prevalent in Ulster as in Connaught, proves at once the frightful extent of Ireland's misery, and the utter hopelessness of even the most hardy and industrious of her people.

When the Irishman complains of his wretched condition, he is answered with insult and contumely. If he says that he is oppressed and persecuted by a wicked faction, he is told that he deserves it because he is a papist ; if he asks for bread for himself and his little ones, he is told that a lazy and improvident Celt deserves nothing better than starvation. In a word, he is treated as an "alien, in language, in blood, and in religion." If the Catholic asserts that he is as loyal as his protestant neighbour, he is told that he is a liar, that he is a traitor in his heart, and that neither his word nor his oath will be believed when he declares his allegiance. He is treated on all occasions as a rebel, and it is scarcely to be wondered at if he becomes one. He is deeply disaffected towards that country which uniformly takes the part of his deadliest enemies, and assists them to oppress himself and to persecute his religion, the only inheritance of which they could not, and therefore did not, rob him. The natural result is, that the great mass of the Irish population is ready to follow any demagogue who will be sufficiently unmeasured in his abuse of England ; and the degree of his popularity may be accurately measured by the virulence of his denunciation of the hated Saxon. An almost equally natural consequence is, that even those measures which England intends as healing boons, are regarded with suspicion as if it were impossible that she could grant any thing which did not contain hidden poison. *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*, is the motto of the Irish population regarding English legislation. They have seen that legislation almost uniformly exerted to enslave and oppress, and never yielding any of their just demands until they were extorted by imperious necessity. Peel, and Wellington, declared this with regard to Catholic Emancipation ; and when in 1835, Lord Normanby (Mulgrave) was sent to Ireland, and O'Connell having allied himself with the Whigs, induced his countrymen to give up the Repeal agitation in order to try the great experiment of getting justice : a no Popery cry was raised

in England, which effectually prevented the Melbourne ministry from carrying the liberal measures which they considered necessary for Ireland. The Catholic clergy were denounced as "surpliced ruffians," and the people as the slaves of a "degrading superstition," who were only fit to be trampled on and persecuted. The breath of hatred first came from England, and then it was returned in the indignant execration of the Saxon, which was uttered by the millions who assembled in the monster meetings.

The results of this state of feeling are calamitous to England and ruinous to Ireland. England knows that she only holds Ireland by the force and at the expense of forty thousand bayonets. She knows that perhaps there never was any political writer in Ireland so popular, and at the same time so openly anxious for the downfall of the "bloody old British empire" as John Mitchell. She knows that if she should unhappily be involved in war with foreign nations, Ireland would have to be even more strongly garrisoned than she is at present. And we ask any honest Englishman to put his hand to his heart, and say if this is not the natural result of his government of Ireland. Let him suppose (if his indignation at the bare hypothesis will permit him) that a church is established in his country and endowed with enormous wealth at the expense of a population, not one-seventh of which belongs to its communion; let him suppose that the only return the people receive for their money from the ministers of that Church, is to be abused and reviled on every possible occasion with forty-parson power;—let him suppose that the pious bequests and foundations which had been left to support his own religion, and that the splendid temples which the munificent piety and the enlightened taste of his ancestors had dedicated to its worship, have been forcibly taken away and given to its enemies;—let him suppose, moreover, that the property of his country has been taken from the rightful owners, and distributed amongst a set of needy adventurers, who have reduced the population to such a state of misery, that their only hope of relief seems to be in exile or in death; let him suppose that this combination of spiritual and temporal tyranny was established, and is still supported by a foreign nation; and we ask him if he would love that nation, or if he would not hate it, detest

it, ay, and if he had any reasonable hope of success, rebel against it?

And for what does England incur all this expense and peril; for what does she perpetrate all this frightful injustice, and pitiless inhumanity? To support and foster a loyal Protestant garrison in Ireland. Let her treat this garrison for one half year as she has treated the whole Irish population on account of this base faction for centuries, and where will its loyalty be found? Nay, does it not attempt to thwart by threats of rebellion, every measure of humanity, or of justice, which the legislature intends for the benefit of the Irish people? Let a sixpenny rate-in-aid be proposed to relieve the starving peasants of Connaught, and the loyal men of Down and Antrim threaten England with a revival of the ancient kingdom of Delaradia. Let a few orange magistrates be dismissed for encouraging an illegal armed procession, which ended in the burning of a whole district, and the murder not only of innocent men, but of children, old women, and idiots, and all the orangemen, from Dublin to the farthest north, headed by the well fed parsons who fatten on the plunder of the poor, to whom they are willing to give nothing in return but lead and gunpowder, suddenly feel themselves relieved from the oath of allegiance. Orange loyalty has been hitherto a very profitable speculation. Let it cease to be so, and it will be made apparent to all the world, that in Ireland, as in Canada, it is only the mask of treason.

But in consequence of the pampering of orangeism under the false appellation of loyalty, and the oppressive tyranny which its minions have ever exercised over the country, every thing emanating from a British minister, is received with such distrust, that the word of a demagogue, however mercenary, characterless, or mendacious, is enough to damn measures in the estimation of the people, which, with amendments that would most certainly be attained if they were earnestly demanded, would be very useful to the country. It is not, however, good measures, or good amendments, that the agitator wants, but grievances on which he trades with the multitude, who often do not know even the name of the matter against which he has made them vent their deepest execration.

“ His words are bonds ; his oaths are oracles :
Base man to use them to so base effect ! ”

No Catholic, whether lay or clerical, must dare to utter a word of dissent on a perfectly free question, and one which he understands much better than those who have condemned it, under pain of being denounced as a renegade who has been bribed by the Castle to betray his religion and his country. The cry of "mad dog" is raised, and every one joins in the pursuit. The people, like all other slaves, act the tyrant when they can. Nor is there any enlightened public opinion to which an honest man can appeal. A "man of independent mind" must either remain silent or expose himself to bootless martyrdom; and hence the great majority of those who take part in Irish politics, are either the dupes, the accomplices, or the slaves of faction. Can any one doubt this who will in the first place, look at those whom Ireland has sent to represent, or rather, to misrepresent, her in the Imperial parliament,—those independent nincompoops and place-hunters, who purchased their seats by a bribe of five pounds to Conciliation Hall? This was one of the lowest steps in Irish degradation, and so it is felt, even by those who sent them there, for very few of them can be induced to take the trouble of renewing their franchise. It may be said that this is because the people despair of obtaining justice from the English parliament. Be it so; but whence arises this despair? Is it not because they see how utterly powerless and contemptible their representatives are? If the Irish Liberal constituencies sent to England a united body of intelligent and patriotic men, who sought for nothing but the good of their country, and sold themselves to no English faction, they would be aided, in a short time, by such a large body of English representatives and of the English people, that no ministry could stand which would resist their reasonable demands.—Can any one doubt our statement who will, in the second place, look at by far the larger portion of the Irish press, of all shades and colours, —a press conducted for the most part without character or ability, and whose only recommendation to popular favour, is its scrupulousness in inventing or distorting facts, to serve its party or faction, and its supple slavishness in casting itself, upon the slightest intimation, like a thoroughbred spaniel, at the feet of its master, to be caressed, scolded, or kicked, according to his humour? It is totally devoid of truth and honour, and hence, however much it may despise any popular movement, and sympathise

with those who have the honesty and manliness to express their opinion about it openly, it is sure to praise what it dislikes, and to slander what it admires.

“Smiling pick-thanks and base newsmougers
Before whose tongues continual slanders rise.”

When, therefore, we find Ireland devoid of that enlightened public opinion which secures to every honest man the full and free expression of his sentiments—when we see the people striving to arrive at the objects which they desire, not by the broad, straight road, but by crooked by-paths,—when we see them so enamoured of political falsehood as to make them suspect a man of being their enemy merely because he speaks the truth, we are so far from being, like the great Dr. Doyle,* disheartened by this state of things, that we are astonished that their vices are still so few and trivial, when compared with their great and solid virtues. Of them it may be truly said, that their virtues are their own, and that their vices have been caused by others. And, however Irish agitators may contribute to foster those political vices, we shall, hereafter, show that English misrule is the original sin from which they all derive their origin.

But setting political sins aside, it does the Irish immortal honour, that, in spite of every temptation, they are still eminently distinguished for their religious and social virtues. The Earl of Carlisle (Lord Morpeth) has repeatedly borne testimony in England to the superior chastity of Irishwomen, and the more patient endurance of Irishmen; Sir Robert Peel, during the last session of parliament, spoke with admiration of the sobriety and industry of the expatriated Irish whom he saw labouring in England; and

* See his letter in Lord Cloncurry's *Personal Recollections*, p. 460. “Perhaps,” he says, “it is owing to the state of my health that my hopes of the improvement of our country are weakened; I thought there was more intelligence and virtue among the middle classes of our people, than there now appears to me to be. Their conduct at the period of the last general election, in suffering themselves to be deceived, and then bestrode by the basest tyranny that ever established itself for any length of time in these latter ages, compels me, God knows how reluctantly, to doubt whether there be sufficient soundness in the community to render it capable of profiting by any liberal system of legislation.”

Mr. Bright, in his speech at the Manchester Reform Association, speaks of them in the following terms :

“I want to know how it is that thousands and hundreds of thousands of Irishmen, who could make no progress in their own country, succeed in the United States? I want to know how it is, that men who leave Ireland with no more than that which is necessary to carry them across the Atlantic, in a few months, or a year or two, will send back a sufficient sum of money to bring their families and their relations over? If Irishmen can get on in America, why not in Ireland? I believe a change of legislation for Ireland would, within the next ten years, bring back Irishmen from America to their native country. And as to their religion, are not the people of Belgium of the same religion?—are not the people of Lombardy? Do Irishmen, when they go to the United States, repudiate the faith they held in their native country? No. And yet the belief of Christianity, as professed by Roman Catholics, is not found in these countries to be injurious to the cultivation of land and the creation of property. But there is one class in Ireland not Catholic—the landed proprietors; they are Protestants chiefly. I ask you whether they, of all persons in Ireland, if they alone have performed their duty to their country? Are they not as deeply embarrassed as it is possible for men in their circumstances to be? And are they not held up to the eye of this country and to all the world as the class of all others which has been most grossly negligent of duties which it ought to have performed? Well, then, we will dismiss this slander upon a faith which is, I believe, professed at this moment by very much the largest proportion of those who have embraced Christianity throughout the world.”

We have only room to quote one other Englishman, Sir A. Hillary. “The day is past,” says he, (p. 12.) “when men will be induced to believe that the Creator of the world denied to the Celtic race the physical organization, or mental development necessary to work out his temporal happiness, and to bring within his reach and enjoyment the bounties of nature, presented to his use in the location where providence has placed him.” And again,

“That a proprietary possessed of some of the most fertile land in Europe, favoured by climate and position, with an abundant supply of labour, which when removed from the demoralising influence of inadequate remuneration and want of encouragement at home, is found an efficient and valuable instrument of every description of industrial energy in the labour market of every other country, affords irrefragable proof that they have been worse than negligent of their own interests and welfare, even if no other evidence was presented, and suggests the inference that the blame rests with the

owners of the soil, although in this instance, as from the beginning, the fault is laid at the door of those who have the least chance of being heard in their defence: 'Quicquid delirant reges plectuntur Achivi.'

"I should not have urged this topic, but that it has been pertinaciously insisted that the misery of Ireland was exclusively to be attributed to the irreclaimable character of the natives; at one time imputed to the taint of race; at another to that of religion. The first was a convenient excuse for the oppressions of the first settlers, who had no other difference to prefer in extenuation of their injustice. The latter was received as a most orthodox explanation, at a time when religious enthusiasm assumed its worst phase, in a fanatical spirit of social and political persecution, of which the Statute Book unfortunately presents too many examples. The first I have already disposed of—the second cannot be maintained, when the Catholic population of Belgium presents so striking a contrast to the Irish at home, in industrial exertions; when the Tyrol offers so remarkable an instance of rural prosperity and happiness; when in our own colony of Lower Canada the *paysans* exhibit the characteristics of a peaceable, orderly, and moral population; and when our own countrymen of the same religion in Lancashire and other localities where they are found to exist, display no characteristic difference between them and their neighbours. If at any time we notice the misconduct of the lower classes of that religion in this country, it is found among the immigrant Irish, who still retain impressions of the Protestant teaching of their Protestant landlords at home. If the Irish peasants are what they are often stated to be—idle, improvident, reckless, ignorant of their real interests, neglectful or incapable of converting the resources of the country to profitable use, profuse in spending their gains, and devoid of foresight in husbanding present prosperity against future adversity; if they are quick in quarrel—if in resenting private wrongs, in the choice of weapons their 'ears are more Irish and less nice,'—these qualities are but the reflex of the manners and customs of their betters, and are, in fact, an obvious illustration of the force of example."—p. 18-20.

These unexceptionable testimonies prove that the Irish people possess religious and social virtues, sufficient to make Ireland a great and prosperous nation. We have said that the origin of their political vices may be traced to English misrule, and, consequently, that English justice would cure them. Our proof shall be a brief history.

The continued refusal of England to grant any thing except on compulsion, induced the great O'Connell himself to adopt a crooked policy, and to ask for one thing whilst in reality he wanted another. This he distinctly stated in his

speech at Liverpool, when announcing the abandonment of the first repeal agitation, in order to seek for justice for Ireland. He told the story of the beggar in *Gil Blas*, who pointed to his gun whilst he asked the passengers for an alms for God's sake. He said that *his* gun was the Repeal of the Union, to which he always pointed when he asked for justice; and he added, that, like his great prototype, he was the most successful beggar on the whole road. Even the last Repeal agitation, whatever hopes might have been afterwards inspired by the monster meetings, was originally entered upon as a means of keeping out the Tories, or at all events, if they did assume the reins of government, of rendering Ireland too hot for them. And after all the monster meetings, declarations, and martyrdoms, when the desertion of the protectionists on the Irish coercion Bill drove Peel from power, he declared at a meeting of liberal members which took place in Lord John Russell's house in Chesham place, that "*all* he wanted was—justice." All his family, including John, (we do not mention this by way of blame, but simply as a fact corroborative of our conjecture,) became constant visitors at the Castle; and we are convinced that, had it not been for the outcry raised against him by the young Irelanders, he would have again allied himself with the Whig ministry. From that moment the seeds of those dissensions were sown which ended in the wars of the powers, which although not quite so sanguinary, were as implacable and virulent as the wars of the roses. The death of physical force upon the plains of Ballingarry, and of moral force in the rostrum of Conciliation Hall, or upon the floor of the House of Commons, we cannot tell which did not prepare us for the resuscitation of either, at least during the failure of the potato crop. Yet each of them has been revived just such as it was when it expired weak and impotent in everything, but as the symbol of domestic strife and the rallying cry of factions. Moral force was solemnly proclaimed at the opening of Conciliation Hall, and the orators have demonstrated one thing, that though gold is very scarce, there is no lack of brass amongst them. Sir Oracle cries out, "when I speak, let no dog bark;" and every little spouter who has swollen into the dimensions of a mob orator, takes up the tone, and speaks and writes *ex cathedra* on religion and politics. In making articles of faith, they can do more in an hour than all the Councils of the Church have

been able to effect in eighteen centuries. They can, to borrow their own language, "split the craggy rocks of theological difficulty, and scale the alpine heights of canonical jurisprudence." There is nothing too high or too sacred for their patriotic *furor*. They are ready for every thing, from the A, B, C, to the Canon Law; and from pitch and toss to moral-force manslaughter.

We really hoped that the other party would have looked for some practical measures, although their old cant about *nationality* occurring in the prospectus, made us fearful of their intentions. But all our fears have been removed by their first meeting, which, like those at the rival establishment, was a decided failure; for although the name was changed—we know not why—the old confederation resolutions were again passed into laws; and although physical force was not formally proclaimed, nothing was received with such acclamations as the allusions to Ballingarry. One of their orators—their greatest orator we believe—thanked God that they had no Gorgey amongst them. And truly they had not; for in their battle they did not even wound any body, whilst that hero stormed, not a country house with a few police, but the strongest fortresses in Hungary, and measured swords not unsuccessfully with the most experienced generals and the bravest armies in Europe. To hear these orators, one would imagine that Ballingarry was the Marathon of Ireland.

Ireland is at present almost in the last stage of consumption; and the only remedy prescribed for her by both parties is *bleeding*, to be continued,—say for fifty or a hundred years. No one doubts that her cure must be speedy, in order to be efficacious; and yet, gracious Heaven! we find one set of her consulting physicians prescribing as her only remedy, a Repeal of the Union, to be obtained by moral force; and the rival party prescribing some equally unsubstantial moonshine, which, we suspect, is all the same in the Greek, but which in the vernacular of its authors is dignified by the name of nationality. Be it remembered, that we are not writing against the justice or the policy of a Repeal of the Union. Nothing could be farther from our thoughts. But we denounce its present agitation by two rival factions, the primary—we had almost said the sole—object of each of which is to put down the other. "Step in, step in, gentlemen," cry the rival showmen; "admission by the year for the small

charge of one shilling." "Here," cries the one, "is the youthful phenomenon;" "This," roars the other, "is the real original Jarley." It is the greatest insult that ever was offered to a nation writhing in the agonies of death, to tell her that she shall be cured when one of two rival clubs shall eat up the other, and then carry the Repeal of the Union—and not till then. Both the parties which are at present talking about Repeal, know that they have just about as much chance of being satisfied as the child who cried for the moon. No one can tell what changes may or may not occur in one or two centuries, or even in a much shorter period. The British Empire will one day share the fate of all its predecessors, and go to ruin; and then, when "the nations are fallen," Ireland may be found young, glorious, and independent. But whenever a Repeal of the Union, or a separation from England takes place, the present miserable penny-a-week collections will have no more to do with it than with the making of Bryan O'Linn's celebrated breeches. However, some of its abettors will say, Although it will not gain Repeal, it will get something else. This is the old miserable system of falsehood, which has so infected the people, that if a man dares to tell the truth, he is at once set down as an enemy to his country. To prove himself a patriot, he must first prove himself a liar. This mode of proceeding has been now in full operation, with the exception of some brief intervals, for the last twenty years. During this period the people have made the most tremendous sacrifices, and what have they got in return? Absolutely nothing. Had the same sacrifices been made, and the same amount of enthusiasm and of energy been exerted in seeking for the just distribution of the temporalities of the Protestant Church, and for the equitable adjustment of the relations between landlord and tenant, the concession of either of which would have been hailed by the projectors of the Repeal movement as more than realising their most sanguine expectations of its results: these and many other healing measures would be now the law of the land, and the people of Ireland would be contented and prosperous, instead of being deeply disaffected and the most miserable on the face of the earth.

But the present movements cannot even plead the miserably apology of having for their object to frighten England into justice, unless she be as easily alarmed as

the child who is afraid that his puddings will pass out through the pin-scratch upon his finger. If they were merely a farce, we would laugh at them; if they were intended only to "raise the wind," we would pass them by in silent contempt. But neither hypothesis can be entertained; for the few huxters and clerks who occupy the stage invariably commence the proceedings by informing pit, boxes, and gallery, that there, within those awful walls, are assembled the people of Ireland;—that the eyes of the nation, of Europe, of the world, are upon them;—that the future destinies of the country depend on that meeting;—that every lover of freedom will join in its ranks;—and, that whoever opposes it is the enemy of liberty. This is the language of both the rival gatherings, in each of which, we freely admit, there are honest, disinterested, and patriotic men; but in neither of which is there a single man qualified, either by genius, eloquence, or station, to combine the power of the country; whilst, for this great work, the chiefs are especially disqualified, as their chief achievements have hitherto been the success with which they have created dissensions amongst the people, paralysed their strength, and left them helplessly at the mercy of their enemies. This is what has caused those twin monsters, the Established Church and Orangeism, to cast aside the mask of moderation, and at the very time when the Irish people might ensure their overthrow by united action, to publish speeches and addresses as full of infernal intolerance as if Oliver Cromwell, and not Queen Victoria, still ruled in Ireland. The professional agitators are the best friends of Orangeism, Landlordism, and Statechurchism in Ireland; because, they oppose them in such a manner as to offend, disgust, or render apathetic a vast number of the independent, enlightened, and rational men in England as well as in Ireland. As if they were afraid that any thing should be done for the country, they invariably cry out, when any good measure is even talked of, "You may grant this if you choose; but remember, we will never be contented with any thing less than a repeal of the union. Nay, if you be so foolish as to grant this measure, we will use it as a step to reach repeal." Two results inevitably follow such a declaration; first, that scarcely any persons but repeal agitators any longer support the measure; and second, that it will never be obtained so long as such impostors are allowed to represent themselves as the expo-

nents of the popular will. It is absolutely necessary that the people of Ireland should at length manfully shake off this base thralldom: if they would save themselves, and regenerate their country, they must *cease* to be either its accomplices, its dupes, or its slaves: they must not ask what they know they will not get; but demand those practical and necessary measures which will combine in their support every truly liberal man in Ireland, and which shall be recommended to England, not only by her love of justice, (which is not very great), but by her love of mammon, which is prodigious. John Bull has at length seen the miseries of Ireland through golden spectacles, and it will certainly be a very cherished abuse for the preservation of which he will pay another eight or ten millions.

The first thing necessary for Ireland, is *perfect religious equality*. The Orange ascendancy can be tolerated no longer. The Dolly's Brae tragedy, and the yell of triumph raised by its partisans over the burning cabins of the peaceable inhabitants, and the bleeding corpses of innocent childhood, decrepit old age, and helpless idiocy, has at length opened the eyes of the people of England to the savage atrocities of Orangeism. But if the government imagine that they shall have done their duty by passing an anti-procession act, they are the shallowest politicians in the world. Party processions are but the periodical eruptions of that volcanic fire which always burns, although it is not always visible, and consumes the very heart of society in Ireland. The paramount duty of the government, is to give the people of Ireland, (what they never yet have had,) full confidence that the law will be fairly and impartially administered. Until this shall have been done, the people never will be contented, nor the country peaceable and prosperous. And can any impartial man expect that this should not be so? We do not ask him to remember the penal code, which was written in letters of blood, but we do ask him to go back as far as the 17th of March, 1849, and to reflect for a moment on the party conflicts and manifestations which have taken place within that brief period. Every one knows that there are two societies in Ireland, one of which is called the Ribbon, and the other the Orange society. The former, though composed exclusively of Catholics, is not led on by the Priests. There is not a bishop in Ireland who would not instantly suspend any priest who would either become a Ribbonman, or in any

way countenance a Ribbon procession. It is a well-known fact, that the Catholic bishops will not allow the sacraments to be administered to any member of this society, unless he shall have previously renounced all connexion with it, and that the Catholic clergy impress this fact upon their flocks, and denounce the whole system from their altar. Moreover, no Catholic above the grade of a servant boy, or a low mechanic, was ever seen in a Ribbon procession, or known to be a member of the Ribbon society. Oh! if a Catholic magistrate were discovered to be a Ribbonman, what a tempest we should have! He would be looked upon as the beast in the Apocalypse, and no government would dare to continue him for a day in the commission of the peace.

The Orange lodge, though it also embraces the rabble, is however, by no means confined to that class, for most of the gentry, landlords, and magistrates, and almost all the parsons, belong to it. The magistrates perform double duty on procession days, for they lead the Orangemen, and command Her Majesty's troops, whilst the parsons (many of whom are also magistrates) harangue the mob upon the atrocities of Popery,—tell their followers that all the evils of Ireland—the potato blight included—are to be attributed to that monster of iniquity, and finally exhort them to put their trust in God and the Bible, and to keep their powder dry. Can any man believe that these magistrates will act impartially or justly in case of a collision?

On the 17th of March last, a Ribbon mob, partially composed of armed ruffians, marched through the village of Crossgar, in the county of Down. There they were opposed by a mob of armed Orange ruffians, who refused to allow them to proceed. A police force and several magistrates were present. It never occurred to the magistrates that the Ribbonmen were a perfectly legal body, and that the Orangemen were the aggressors. On the contrary, both the police and Orangemen attacked the Ribbonmen, nor did the magistrates hesitate to grant informations against every member of that body who could be proved to have been present. Now mark the contrast.

An armed Orange mob assembled on the 12th of the following July (1849.) and marched to Tullamore park, the seat of the Earl of Roden. They had already, in the morning, marched through a Catholic district, called Mayheranayo, and over Dolly's Brae, a place over which the Catholic

population generally considered it a point of honour to prevent them from marching, on account of a murder which the Orangemen had committed there formerly. The Orangemen had had a triumph in the morning, they had another and a better road home, and Lord Roden, as well as the other Orange magistrates, were told that if they attempted to return by that road there would be a bloody party conflict. They were indeed advised by Lord Roden to conduct themselves peaceably, but neither he nor any one else said a word to prevent this armed banditti, heated with beer and exercise, from marching—under the leadership of magistrates, who have since pronounced the burning of the houses of peaceable inhabitants and the slaughter of a few papists, including even harmless idiots, to be a thing to be gloried in—directly to the place where it was known their adversaries had assembled to oppose them. This advice was like throwing out a fire and telling it not to burn, or like a famous one given to another mob, “boys, don’t break Castlereagh’s windows.” When it was perceived that if they advanced a collision was inevitable, according to the precedent furnished at Crossgar, and, indeed, according to the principles of common sense, the Orangemen should have been obliged to take the other road. It is not wonderful that this mode of proceeding did not suit the views of the Orange magistrates, but it is very strange that one of the stipendiaries, who was sent especially to prevent any violation of the peace, swore that such a wild idea as that of sending back the Orangemen never occurred to him. This is very like a story told of Sir Isaac Newton. Being one time seated so close to the fire that he was in danger of being burnt, he roared out lustily to his servants to get a mason instantly to remove the chimney further away. In his abstraction it never occurred to him that he had only to push back his chair. The Orangemen therefore, divided themselves into two parties, one of which supported the magistrates and police in their assault on the hill, whilst the other, covered by a body of dragoons, burned the houses and murdered the people in the neighbourhood. A good many Catholic prisoners were made, but of course, not one Orangeman was taken into custody; and, indeed, one of the stipendiary magistrates takes great credit to himself for having saved a girl’s life, by pushing aside the gun of a ruffian who was in the very act of pulling the trigger. Of course, it never

occurred to him to capture the murderer, or even to identify him. And yet the Catholics are expected not to be disaffected, and to have full confidence in the protection of the laws.

No comment of ours could heighten the picture of the Dolly's Brae massacre, which is conveyed in the calm and temperate report of Mr. Berwick, the government commissioner. We shall accompany our brief extract from this report by the comments of the Rev. Mr. Trench, Incumbent of Cloughjordan, because this will enable us at once to describe the massacre in Mr. Berwick's words, and at the same time to give the opinion of a Protestant clergyman, as to the conduct of those parsons of the Establishment who everywhere led the van in those meetings which assembled in a christian land to proclaim their sympathy with the Dolly's Brae murderers, and to glory in that dark and atrocious deed of blood. "You," says Mr. Trench, addressing Dean Murray, Mr. M'Ilwaine, and Dr. Drew,—the roaring megs of the Belfast meeting,—“here applaud a woman for leading the way forward—to what? To the perpetration of the deeds thus described by Mr. Berwick, the commissioner appointed to investigate the case, and whom I know to be a truly impartial judge, ‘one little boy, ten years old, was deliberately fired at, and shot, while running across a field. Mr. Fitzmaurice stopped a man in the act of firing at a girl, who was rushing from her father's house; an old woman of seventy was murdered; and the skull of an idiot was beaten in with the butts of their muskets. Another old woman was severely beaten in her house, whilst another, who was subsequently saved by the police, was much injured, and left in her house, which had been set on fire; an inoffensive man was taken out of his house, dragged to his garden, and stabbed to the death by three men with bayonets, in the sight of some of his family.’ Dear Sirs, are not these the deeds of fiends rather than men? My fullest persuasion is, that you have been instigated by Satan to do an injury to the cause of truly religious Protestantism which a century cannot repair; and what is of very inferior moment, you have helped forward the destruction of the Established Church to the heart's content of its greatest enemies.” Yet the Protestant clergy have proclaimed from the rostrum in Belfast and in Dublin, that the Established Church approved of these deeds of

blood, whilst the attempt of the three or four christians in the body, who seem so much out of place, that like flies in amber, "we don't know how the devil they got there," to get up a counter manifestation of opinion, has ended in such a complete failure; that it has proved to the whole world that the fiercest firebrand is the most faithful exponent of the sentiments of the parsons. And yet the Catholics are asked to starve contentedly, and pay these men; thus fulfilling the gospel by returning good for evil.

A few days after the massacre, a public dinner was given in Downpatrick to the Orange magisterial leader, Mr. W. Beers, who conducted himself so gallantly at Dolly's Brae. At this dinner the High Sheriff of the county Down presided; and Beers, in returning thanks when his health was proposed, called the massacre a "little blot;" but he has since published a full retraction, and declared that it is a thing to be gloried in. Several Orangemen were identified as having marched with arms in their hands in the notoriously illegal procession on the 12th of July, which ended in so much bloodshed; and sworn informations were tendered against them at the petty sessions held in Castlewellan, (the nearest town to Dolly's Brae). But the Orange magistrates, three or four of whom were parsons who do not usually attend those petty sessions, and who therefore attended specially on this occasion, in spite of the opinion of the Attorney-General and the speech of Mr. Berwick, Q. C., rejected the informations, Lord Roden himself most disinterestedly and impartially acting as chairman upon the occasion. It was indeed most unreasonable to ask the officers to call for a court martial upon the gallant troops whom they had themselves drilled, armed, fed, and led into battle. Lord Clarendon, however, after a most patient investigation, conducted by Mr. Berwick, Q. C., had the manliness and honesty to dismiss Lord Roden and the Messrs. Beers from the commission of the peace. Take care, my Lord Clarendon. Are you aware that the murderers were loyal protestants, and that they only shot a few papists? The thing is not to be borne. "Come," says that able and enlightened man—that modern Solomon—the Marquis of Downshire, "let us hold meetings, and tell his excellency a thing or two." Accordingly a meeting, composed of eight individuals, is held in Dundrum, and large gatherings take place in Belfast and in Dublin. In the Belfast meeting the noble

Marquis is in the chair, and being a profound lawyer, tells the meeting that there is *no law but statute law*. It would be a nice question to ascertain if he knows the difference between statute law and statute acres. We are delighted to find he is equal in intellectual acquirements to his gifted ancestors, for we remember that his noble father made a speech at an agricultural dinner in Dundrum, in which he recommended all farmers to get iron ploughs; "because," said he, "they will last for ever, and when they are done, you can make horse-shoes out of them."

It is, however, to the harangues of the Orange parsons that the meeting in Belfast owes its chief celebrity. We never read in our lives anything at once so ferocious, sanguinary, and indecent as the speech of the Dean of Ardagh, an old man of eighty, who is tottering on the verge of the grave. He gloried in the Dolly's Brae massacre, and told, amid great applause, a story about two young girls, one of whom snatched up the Orange flag when the men wavered, and led them on to the charge, and the other cut up her petticoat to make wadding. And this very reverend man "concluded by calling on his protestant friends to show by *their acts* the faith they professed; to go home and *read their Bible*, that safeguard and preserver of their liberties, and beg of God to give them that knowledge which would lead to *eternal salvation*." The Rev. Mr. M'Ilwaine followed in a similar strain. He declared that the sooner they had the contest for existence the better; that if the fifth of November was commemorated, he would read the prayers, and that though he desired not to handle the carnal weapon, for he was a minister of the gospel, he was nevertheless prepared to die nobly on the field of battle. Having thus duly announced what Mr. W. Beers very properly calls the blood-consecrated principles of protestantism, it only remained for the meeting to make the usual protestations of loyalty, and then to conclude with the doxology. Parson Saurin, the Archdeacon of Dromore, was the organ on this point, not only of the Belfast meeting, but, if we can believe his words, of the whole brotherhood; for he declared, that if there was a rebellion on the very confines of Ulster, the *loyal* Orangemen of that province would not stir hand or foot to oppose it. That is, the Orangemen were loyal so long as loyalty was the most profitable thing

going—so long as it gave them a license to indulge all their bad passions, by shooting, robbing, and plundering their neighbours—but the moment this license is withdrawn, they declare that their loyalty has evaporated, and that nothing would please them better than a rebellion. So writes a protestant rector, the Rev. Wm. Caulfield, from Killarney. He calls the harangues of the Dean of Ardagh, Archdeacon Saurin, and the Rev. Mr. McIlwaine, violent and uncharitable, “in which, to say the least of it, if they do not advance open rebellion, it is something very like it.”

We could almost rejoice at the Dolly’s Brae massacre, because it has been the means of revealing to the people of England, the true nature of Protestant ascendancy in Church and State as it exists in Ireland. Its lay and clerical leaders have thrown aside the mask of loyalty, under which they so long concealed their rapacity, injustice, and oppression, and have thus deprived its supporters of the only pretext which could be urged in its favour—its exclusive loyalty in the midst of a disaffected population. But since this pretence has been scouted by the parties themselves, can any government entrust the administration of justice, or the selection of juries, to men who glory in the massacre of their fellow countrymen? No man who allies himself with either the Orange, or the Ribbon factions, which have been so long the curse of the country, can hold impartially the scales of justice. We hold it therefore, to be the clear and paramount duty of the government fearlessly to dismiss from the commission of the peace, every man who associates himself with, or countenances either the Ribbonmen or the Orangemen. Moreover, the parsons have proved themselves to be as unfit for the magistracy as the priests. The language of the men whom the state has uniformly pampered and supported, has far outstripped in bigotry, truculence, and treason, the language of the men whom the state has as constantly persecuted. Indeed, the array of parsons who assembled at Castlewellan, to defeat justice and screen murder, would alone suffice to prove how unreasonable it would be to expect that the Catholics of Ireland can repose any confidence in the laws, so long as they are administered by such hands.

In party cases in the north of Ireland, the Catholics have not confidence even in trial by jury. Twelve Orange-

men are empanelled, and they acquit their brother Orangemen, which we have no doubt twelve Ribbonmen would do if they got into the jury box, (where they have as much chance of getting, as into the moon.) In the celebrated county of Down, some Orangemen, about eight or nine years ago, murdered a catholic named Mac Ardle, not far from Dolly's Brae, in the most brutal manner. They were tried at Downpatrick, and prosecuted by the Attorney General, (now Chief Justice Blackbourne.) The case was proved so clearly against them, that Lord Elliott, (now Earl of St. Germain,) who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland, declared in his place in the House of Commons, that, looking at the speech of the Attorney General, and the Judge's charge, he did not see how any one could doubt as to their guilt. Yet the jury acquitted them, and an Orange mob received them on leaving the dock, with as much triumph as the recital of the Dolly's Brae massacre called forth from the sheriff, magistrates, and persons who assembled to celebrate it in Downpatrick, Belfast, and Dublin. What confidence could any Catholic have in a jury selected by such men as Mr. Keown, the late Orange sheriff of Down, who presided at a dinner given to Mr. Wm. Beers, in which that hero described the Dolly's Brae massacre as a "little blot?" It will prove a most miserable and abortive effort to do justice to the Catholic, and to make him look for justice and protection from the laws of his country, if the government stops short by passing an anti-processions act, and still leaves him at the mercy of the Orange sheriff, the Orange magistrate, and the Orange parson. A wise and a brave government would sweep away all those nuisances at once; and although a vast quantity of treason would be spouted, we are convinced that within one year Ireland would be freed from the curse of religious hatred. If the Catholics saw that the laws were impartially administered, no large body of them could be incited by interested agitators to associate together for the purpose of perpetuating religious strife. And the Orangemen would be prudent enough not to provoke the Catholics, if they did not expect that the police and soldiers would charge on their side. The well grounded hope that they would do so made them attack Dolly's Brae on the 12th of July last, and the fear that they would have to fight their own battle, kept them peaceably at home on the fifth of November. The Catho-

lics are far the most numerous party even in Ulster, they are just as brave, and now very generally as well armed as their adversaries; and we venture to predict, if the commission of the peace be not left with parsons, or with Orangemen, to marshal the Queen's forces on the side of their friends, there will be no more party conflicts in Ireland.

But although what has been hitherto done falls far short of what we think the Catholics of Ireland have a right to demand; we can assure Lord Clarendon that the great majority of that body feel deeply grateful to him for his noble and manly conduct in dismissing the Messrs. Beers, and Lord Roden. The base and factious coalition of a portion of the press which pretends to be Catholic, with the most noted advocates of Orangeism, in their attacks upon the Lord Lieutenant for doing an act of justice to the Catholic body, betrays its treachery to the cause which it pretends to advocate. Whether its present conduct be the effect of an Orange bribe, or of Orange predilections, matters not: it is certainly playing the evening's game to the best of its ability.

The charge that the Lord Lieutenant had armed the Orangemen, was originally advanced upon the authority of Major Forrester, Captain Kennedy, and Colonel Phaire, who were said to have been his excellency's agents in the transaction. It is not a little characteristic of the system of humbug, so profitably carried on in Ireland, that at the time the charge was made, the first of the witnesses was dead, the second in India, and that the third indignantly denied that he ever knew of one penny having been advanced by the Lord Lieutenant to arm the Orangemen. The first witnesses, or such of them as could be got at, having not only refused to sustain the charge, but having, moreover, pronounced its concoctors to be guilty of deliberate falsehood; they appealed to another kind of evidence, and swore that they would prove the charge to be true, under the hand and seal of Lord Clarendon himself. The Orangemen have the documents, said they, and "haith they'll prent them." The Grand Lodge met at Tommy's Hotel, Dublin, and commenced business by voting addresses conceived in the true Cromwellian spirit to Lord Roden and the Messrs. Beers. Still it was very hard to screw out of it the Clarendon papers, and the assailants of the Lord Lieutenant discovered that it would

be useless to publish documents, no *further* evidence being required to prove that he had armed the Orangemen; the only testimony on the subject being the assertions of orange and green newspapers, which mutually quoted and re-lied on each other, and that of their own witness, Colonel Phaire, who declared the whole statement to be a deliberate falsehood. After a little Lord Clarendon was accused of having entered into a compromise with the Orangemen, to conceal documents which could do him no possible injury, as they could not make the case against him clearer than it was already. The magistrates whom he had ignominiously dismissed, were to be parties to the compromise, without even, gentle souls! exacting, as the first article of the agreement, that they should be restored to the commission of the peace.

At length, after a fortnight's hatching, the Grand Lodge brought forth its report, and certainly we are not astonished at the reluctance with which it was allowed to see the light, for it puts one thing beyond all doubt, that Orange goslings are no swans. No man of common sense could hesitate for a moment in believing, that if the Orangemen had documents that would hang Lord Clarendon, they would have at once produced them, so cordially do they detest him for not doing the very things of which he is accused; for not arming the Orangemen, and especially the yeomanry of the north; for withdrawing from the body the exclusive enjoyment of Castle favours, and for disparaging their loyalty in the eyes of the whole empire, by dismissing their leaders from the commission of the peace. The Grand Lodge has laboured might and main to prove that Lord Clarendon authorized an exclusive armament of Orangemen as such. So lame, so miserable, so paltry, so impotent an attempt to justify the magniloquent things that were promised to be brought forth when the lock should be taken off the strong box, which contains the secrets of Orangeland, was never before witnessed in the world. "The Report of the Grand Lodge," which, "like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along" in the columns of the *Warder*, proves that the persons who drew it up are alike devoid of the taste of scholars and the feelings of gentlemen. But the real value of the report consists in this, that it proves the precise amount and value of Orange loyalty, and the confidence which a

government can repose in it, in case of any future rebellion in Ireland.

When, during last spring, the contagion of the continental revolutions had infected a portion of the Irish people, the government called upon the Orangemen to come forward at this critical time, and declare that loyalty of which they were so fond of boasting. Did they come forward like men of spirit and of honour? No, but like miserable huxters, to sell their mercenary loyalty. This was the time to bring it to a good market, and they accordingly prepared an address to the Lord Lieutenant, in which they expressly demanded a recognition of Orangeism as the reward of their loyalty. The address reflected severely on the government for not having hitherto practically carried out Orange ascendancy in its conduct. They imagined that Lord Clarendon would not refuse their demands, because, in case he did, they would publicly declare that they would not assist him in case of an outbreak, and thus his government would be left without any party at all in the country. Their organs had actually threatened that they would join, in case of refusal, the ranks of the revolutionists. Yet he so bravely and resolutely refused to ally himself with Orangeism, that the Grand Lodge thought it prudent to abandon their first demand; but as they were determined not to become loyal for nothing, they insisted that they should, at all events, receive arms gratuitously from the government, and that they would "accept of 500 stand, or the means of purchasing them, by way of instalment." Yet this *ultimatum* was peremptorily rejected by Lord Clarendon. On the 22nd of April, Colonel Phaire had an interview with Lord Enniskillen, the Grand Master of the Orangemen, who stated in the presence of the Deputy Grand Secretary, "that having had a conversation with Lord Clarendon, he *had not succeeded either in procuring arms or securing such an answer to the address as the Orangemen desired.*" Thus in a *private*, we do not say confidential interview with the Grand Master of the Orangemen, in which the Lord Lieutenant would show himself as favourably disposed towards the body as possible, and in which, considering the perilous circumstances in which he was placed, he would not conceal any concessions which he was prepared to make, he distinctly and emphatically refused to recognise it, either by word or by act. Did he ever afterwards

retract this refusal? The report of the Grand Lodge distinctly proves that he never did. The report proceeds immediately after the words last quoted from it: "A resolution was then agreed to, with the view of proposing it at a meeting of the Grand Lodge of Dublin, to be held that night in case the *government* should persist in refusing to give arms." The narrative is so clumsily put together, that the parties whom it represents as having "agreed to the resolution," are Colonel Phaire, Lord Enniskillen, and the Deputy Grand Secretary of Ireland. But it matters not by whom it was originally "agreed to," as we shall see that at all events, before five o'clock in the evening, it was adopted by the United Chiefs of the Orangemen of Dublin and of Ireland. This resolution has been designedly suppressed in the Report, and the reason is, that it was of so disloyal a character that they are afraid to expose themselves to the execration of the empire by publishing it. Let them print it if they dare. It was hoped that this treasonable resolution would terrify Lord Clarendon into submission to the Orangemen, and for this purpose Colonel Phaire was desired to communicate it to him through Major Turner. On his way to the castle, Phaire met Captain Kennedy, who *requested* to be entrusted with the resolution, promising to convey it to Major Turner. It would appear that Phaire shortly afterwards saw Major Turner, for on his return to the Orangemen he stated, "that Major Turner had gone to the Lord Lieutenant, and that it had been settled that Major Turner should have an interview with Lord Enniskillen and other brethren about five o'clock that evening." Before the hour appointed, Lord Enniskillen, the Deputy Grand Secretary for Ireland, and the Grand Master of Dublin, met together at the house of the Grand Secretary of Dublin, when it was agreed amongst them, that *the* resolution should be passed at the Grand Lodge that night, unless one of the following alternatives was accepted: "that arms should be given; or that their address should receive an answer, recognising them as Orangemen. Colonel Phaire now introduced Major Turner, who was waiting outside by appointment. A meeting was then held between these six persons, but it was under an obligation not to divulge the conversation which took place. The result, however, was, that Major Turner, accompanied by Colonel Phaire, went away with the decision of the meet-

ing." All these transactions took place on the memorable 22nd of April, the day on which Lord Clarendon had told the Grand Master to his beard that he would not recognise the Orangemen, either in answering their address, or by arming them; and it is manifest that notwithstanding *the* resolution, neither Major Turner, nor Colonel Phaire, were authorised by the Lord Lieutenant to retract that answer in the conference which took place at the house of the Grand Secretary of Dublin at five o'clock; because if the Orange terms had been acceded to, the negotiations would have been at an end, whereas Turner and Phaire went away with the *decision of the meeting*. Up to this period, therefore, the Orangemen had received nothing but rebuffs from Lord Clarendon himself, and his aidecamp Major Turner. Indeed, the Orange Report does not even pretend to say that Lord Clarendon retracted the refusal which he had personally given to the Grand Master; it does not pretend that Major Turner, Colonel Phaire, or any other man retracted it in his name, but simply puts down a letter addressed to Colonel Phaire by Captain Kennedy, an officer of Engineers, who held no situation about the Lord Lieutenant's person, who had never been authorised by him to confer with the Orangemen, and whose letter is so far from insinuating that he is now acting on the part of Lord Clarendon, or that he has been authorised by that nobleman to advance six hundred pounds to arm the Orangemen, that he distinctly declares the contrary, because he states that this money is to be derived from a subscription which he has set on foot for the purpose of supplying arms to the well affected of the lower classes. Here is the letter: "Dublin, April 22, 1848. Dear Colonel, I have set on foot with others a subscription, supplying arms to the well affected amongst the lower classes, for the protection of life and property in the city of Dublin: and I take upon myself the responsibility as far as 500 stand, in case the subscription should fall short of that, of furnishing that number. I shall adopt any course which you recommend to expedite the supply of those 500 stand of arms in the shortest time. Your's faithfully, T. J. Kennedy." Two days later an order to purchase the arms was sent to the Grand Secretary, and cheques for £600 to David Stuart, the Grand Master of Dublin. Dublin having been proclaimed before the last case of arms reached Dublin, it was seized,

and the matter having been reported to Colonel Browne, the head of the police, he gave the following order for its restoration: "August 9, 1849, Lower Castle Yard. The police have directions not to interfere with Mr. David Stuart while conveying thirty stand of arms from the Queen's stores to his residence, No. 60, William Street. E. Brown, Commissioner." Now, regarding this whole transaction, it is to be observed, first, that previously to the 22nd of April, a Defensive Association, including persons of all creeds, had been formed in the city of Dublin for the protection of life and property; second, that Captain Kennedy, who was especially engaged in preparing for the defence of the city, in case of an outbreak, was an active member of this Association; third, that the Orange Report itself admits, that a subscription for the purpose of arming the well-disposed amongst the lower classes had been commenced about the 22nd of April, and that one gentleman had put down his name for £50, who was, however, never called on for the money; fourth, that the Report also admits that Captain Kennedy *alone* appears in the transaction about the arms; fifth, that all parties were arming at this period in Dublin; that the organs of insurrection advised the poor man to sell his spade and buy a pike; that the well affected were sorrowfully preparing for the worst; and that the *Grand Orangemen* only differed from their neighbours in this, that they begged their arms instead of buying them; sixth, that after Dublin had been proclaimed, a license to keep arms was not confined to the Orangemen, but was willingly given to all well-disposed persons; seventh, that Lord Clarendon, in his answers to all public addresses, distinctly opposed all exclusive armaments; that in reply to the demand for arms made by the Orangemen of Down and Antrim, the commander-in-chief, Sir E. Blakeney, informed them, that arms would be kept in the Belfast and Carrickfergus Depots, and that they would not be given out except in case of an actual outbreak; eighth, that the Lord Lieutenant, in his private interview with the Grand Master of the Orangemen, distinctly refused either to recognise or to arm that body; that he confirmed this answer by his aidecamp, Major Turner, in spite of *the* resolution; and that he never directly or indirectly retracted it by word or deed. Thus the Report of the Grand Lodge, which was drawn up for the express purpose of proving that the Lord

Lieutenant authorized an exclusive armament of the Orangemen, is so far from succeeding in its object, that no candid man can read it without completely exculpating him from that charge. But we are not obliged to rely upon indirect evidence, however clear and conclusive; for we have the positive and public declaration of Lord Clarendon himself, conveyed authoritatively through the columns of the government organs, both in Ireland and in England, that Captain Kennedy's communication to the Orangemen was made without his knowledge or concurrence; and that he never, either before the 22nd of April, 1848, or afterwards, supplied one farthing of the £600 which was advanced to buy them arms. The *Evening Post* says, he "has *authority* to state, that the £600 was neither directly nor indirectly advanced or repaid by government to Captain Kennedy, nor were the arms furnished directly nor indirectly by government." The *Times* is equally explicit: "Neither Lord Clarendon," he says, "nor the government contributed a farthing of that money, or had anything whatever to do with the offer. His Lordship did not *hear* of it till some time afterwards." The *Times* adds, that the money was most probably supplied by Sir Charles Napier. We were never in the Castle in our lives, we never spoke one word to Lord Clarendon or to any of his officials; but we have been assured by a gentleman of high station and most unimpeachable veracity, that the Lord Lieutenant declares, as emphatically to his private friends as in the public journals, his utter ignorance of the transaction between Captain Kennedy and the Orangemen until long after it had occurred. Our informant says that the £600 came from Sir Charles Napier, and that he advanced £200 more in furtherance of the objects of the Defensive Association. We do not desire to prove anything by this anonymous authority, except what every man of common understanding must admit, that Lord Clarendon would not subject himself to the utter contempt of even his meanest acquaintance, by acknowledging in private that he was guilty of that which he denied in public. We have never heard any one venture to assert that Lord Clarendon was not a man of honour, or that he would be capable of uttering a deliberate falsehood; and on a matter of which he cannot be ignorant, we do not believe that the veriest political bigot can prefer to the public and private declarations of the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland, the inuendo of an Orange lodge, or the foregone conclusions of partisan newspapers. Even Lord Clarendon's enemies must admit that he possesses a great deal of political sagacity; and yet, leaving every principle of honour aside, he must be a downright fool, if, with the example of the Orangemen before him, who, according to his accusers, were his sworn and trusted friends last April, and who are now publishing to the world every word which he whispered privately into the ear of the Grand Master, he could authorize newspapers to deny facts which could be still proved by at least two living witnesses, (Colonel Phaire and Captain Kennedy), with one of whom he could have held no communication since the Grand Lodge preferred its charge against him. If the Orangemen could have proved that Lord Clarendon had contributed the £600, it would indeed have damaged his character, not only as an honest man, but even as an able politician; but considering the way in which it was given to them, they would have still utterly failed to establish their assertion—that they had forced him into a formal recognition of their body. The money came to them, not as from the Lord Lieutenant, but as a subscription which they *knew* to have been actually commenced by Captain Kennedy, who *alone* they admit appears in the matter; and the *Grand Orange Lodge* of Ireland literally put up its loyalty to auction, and it was knocked down for the paltry sum of £600.

It is made a grievous charge against the Viceroy by some of the liberal Journals, that he held any communication with the Orangemen. Of course his accusers would not accept of their services. Why, at this very time when any intercourse with them on Lord Clarendon's part was such a heinous crime, there was not a day in which his accusers did not parade the accession of some Orange repealer, and strive to persuade the poor dupes whom they were goading into rebellion, whilst most of them took care to keep themselves safe, that the Orangemen would be their trusty allies in the hour of danger. The Lord Lieutenant would have been a traitor to his sovereign and an enemy to the people, who were so scandalously misled, if he had not attempted to enlist on the side of order every man who professed himself to be loyal. It does him great honour that, even in this perilous crisis, he never compromised himself in the least; and that, after searching all the

archives of Orangeism, the only documents at all traceable to Lord Clarendon, are answers to loyal addresses from the Orangemen of Portadown, and of a place in Tyrone, which had been published in the newspapers so long ago as March, 1848. The utter failure of this trumpety charge against him, in spite of the united efforts of Orangeism and ultra-liberalism, must convince every candid man that he faithfully followed out the instructions sent to the magistrates by Sir Thomas Redington, "to swear in as special constables all well-affected men, without any distinction of creed." It proves that he was opposed to any exclusive armament, whilst the very parties who now join the Orangemen, in assailing him, did their utmost to force him into such a measure, by representing the whole Catholic population as ripe for rebellion. The Orangemen, in the mean time, conducted themselves with great dexterity and cunning. Some of them joined the association; others the confederation; and the Dobbys entered the clubs in order to betray them. Protestant repeal associations were got up, and the Orange spouters and the Orange press talked *nationality*. Then the Saxon was to be driven from the soil by the banded millions' might,—by the glorious combination of orange and green. But the moment the Orangemen thought that they had effected their object, and that there would be a row, they immediately turned round to the Lord Lieutenant, and said, "give us arms now, and we loyal Protestants will have great pleasure in shooting those rebel papists." They were sure that the game of 1798 would be played over again in 1848; and so it would if there had been a weak or a wicked Lord Lieutenant in Ireland. But notwithstanding the difficult circumstances in which he was placed when the Orange yeomanry of Down and Antrim demanded arms, Lord Clarendon firmly and emphatically refused, as the Orange report itself states, except in case of an actual outbreak. Nothing could exceed their disappointment and indignation. They determined, however, to parade their strength on the next 12th of July; and, to show how eager they were for the conflict whenever their services should be required, they marched to Dolly's Brae and slaughtered a few papists. But heavens! who can describe their frantic rage when, instead of being rewarded, as in the good old times, their leaders were ignominiously dismissed from the commission of the peace? Their arms are turned from the papists against the Lord

Lieutenant, and this is the time that the Catholics are called upon to help them. We do not believe that they will be so insane; but if it were possible that they and their Orange allies could drive Lord Clarendon from Ireland, what would be the result? Most indubitably an Orange restoration, and the perpetuation of all those abuses in church and in state, of which Orangeism is the symbol. We cannot believe that they will follow so suicidal a policy, or that they are such slaves or such fools as to become the accomplices of their own ruin.

A game somewhat similar to that which orange and green, or what pretends to be green, is now playing against Lord Clarendon, but infinitely more excusable, was played against Lord Anglesey in 1832, and saved the temporalities of that Protestant Establishment which Mr. Macaulay has justly pronounced to be "the most utterly absurd and indefensible of all the institutions now existing in the civilized world." Out of a population which in 1835 exceeded eight millions, that church only numbered 800,000 communicants; whilst its entire revenues amounted to as many hundred thousand pounds sterling! And, in addition to this enormous revenue, since the year 1800, nine hundred and twenty thousand pounds have been voted for churches, glebes, and glebe lands in Ireland. Hence we find, from a statement prepared in 1832, that ten bishops died, leaving personal property to the amount of one million five hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds sterling, that is, one hundred and fifty-seven thousand five hundred pounds each; whilst the bishop of Clogher, who came to Ireland without a farthing, amassed in eight years four hundred thousand pounds, or at the rate of fifty thousand per annum. To this day the bigotry of England, aided by the factious madness of Irishmen, supports that Church in a land whose entire population is almost in a state of bankruptcy, where there are nearly two millions of paupers, and where disease, starvation, and emigration have, within the last few years, to make the lowest possible estimate, diminished the population by considerably more than a million.

This Church, which has been hitherto supported solely because it was considered as the citadel of loyalty in Ireland, has proclaimed itself rebel—the people of England are beginning to see the enormous iniquity of perpetuating it, and nothing but the insanity of the Catholic popula-

tion can save it from being totally abolished as a religious establishment, or from being reduced within reasonable dimensions. But it will be saved if they become the accomplices of an Orange restoration, or if its destruction be proclaimed as a mere stepping-stone to nationality or the Repeal of the Union.

In England the Established Church is the church of the majority; in Scotland the Established Church is the church of the majority: and in Ireland it surely cannot be too much to demand that the Church to which upwards of six millions three hundred thousand of the inhabitants belong, should be put on an equality with a church whose adherents do not exceed eight hundred thousand. This is the very least that the people of Ireland should demand, and that the people and government of England should be ready to concede. Yet nothing whatever has been yet done to effect this object. Stanley's Bill abolished tithes, but placed the revenues in the hands of commissioners, which was putting it into the devil's exchequer, that receives all that comes in its way, but never lets anything out again. And the commutation of tithes into a rent charge only made them more severe and oppressive, by giving the landlords a bonus of 25 per cent. for collecting them. Perfect equality might be established by abolishing all State endowments, and, after providing for the present incumbents, appropriating the entire property of the Church (including, of course, the 25 per cent. to which the landlords have no right whatever) to the support of the poor, and the education of the people. No one can doubt that seven or eight hundred thousand per annum could just now be most usefully devoted to these purposes. This plan, though most in accordance with our own views and with the feelings of the people of Ireland, is not, we fear, likely to be adopted by those, without whose support we could not hope to carry it. We are therefore content to receive the Bill recommended to the English Government in 1832 by Lord Anglesey, who was then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. This "bill went to the entire abolition of tithes, and to the resumption by the state of the church lands, and their letting or sale upon proper commercial principles, in all cases saving existing rights. It was estimated that the profit derivable from such management of the six hundred thousand acres of profitable land held by the Church, would have been suffi-

cient to have supported an establishment ample enough for the spiritual wants of Ireland, and to have left a handsome surplus available for the education and relief of the poor, or as a provision for stipends for the Roman Catholic clergy." * This plan, Lord Anglesey says, † was approved by Lord Plunket, then Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and by the Attorney-General Blackburne, now the Lord Chief Justice. We are strongly inclined to believe that the Earl of Clarendon (then Mr. George Villiers) also approved of this bill, for Lord Cloncurry tells us, (p. 332.) that he belonged to a private cabinet, to which Lord Anglesey had recourse, on all difficult occasions, for counsel and assistance. We believe that Lord Clarendon is a far abler man than Lord Anglesey, and that he is courageous enough to recommend this great and healing measure, if the people demand it in the way we have ventured to advise. And if he do recommend it, the present ministry must either carry it, or make way for Clarendon himself, or for Peel, or for some other statesman who will dare to do one great act of justice, in order to save Ireland.

That parliament considers itself competent to legislate on the relations between landlord and tenant, and that it considers some enactment on the subject necessary, is abundantly proved by the appointment of the Devon commission, and by the bills introduced upon the subject by Whig and Tory ministers. Indeed, no stranger can spend a few days in Ireland without being convinced of the imperative necessity of something being done for the rural population, in order to save the country from utter ruin. We have already had occasion to prove that the present frightful condition of Ireland, is not to be attributed to the influences either of race or of religion, but to the heartless tyranny of the landlords supported by the wicked legislation of England. The legislature, which has proved itself so powerful on the side of the landlord—which has collected his rack-rents, and executed his exterminations at the expense of the liberties and the lives of the people, can surely also do something on the side of humanity and of justice. It should not confine all its sympathy and protection to the factories, the mines, and the collieries, but

* Cloncurry's Recollections, p. 351-2.

† See his Letter, Cloncurry, p. 367.

allow some of it to reach the poor starved hinds in the country.

The adjustment of the relation between landlord and tenant, must necessarily embrace two things, the Rent, and the Tenure. Land is not in Ireland, as in England, a commodity in the market. All the Irishman's ideas of comfort and respectability for himself and his family, are derived from his possession of the "bit of land," no matter how small or how dear it may be. Until the failure of the potato crop, the landlord could not raise his land to any rent so exorbitant that he would not find numbers eager to grasp at it. The farmer and his family, even in the best times, lived upon potatoes and buttermilk, when they could get it, the whole year round. As far as all essential comforts were concerned, the small farmer fared as badly and often worse even than the wretched labourer. And yet such was the miserable state of the country, that almost all the feuds, dissensions, and murders, whether amongst the landlords and their agents, or amongst the people themselves, could be traced to the wretched competition for a few acres of land at a rack-rent, on which the occupants and their families lived only one degree removed from starvation.

Let no Englishman, or Scotchman, be deluded by the idea that good land is to be had cheaper in Ireland than in his own country. Since the commencement of the famine, the accumulation of poor rates, and the consequent impossibility of exacting the exorbitant rents which previously were paid, the landlords are content to take everything the tenant has, and then, since he is no longer profitable, to level the cabin where he and his family have lived for centuries, and cast him forth with his little ones, almost naked and utterly destitute upon the wide world. He cannot cultivate the land properly, says the landlord, because he has no capital. No indeed, he has no capital, for the landlord, who never allowed him the slightest interest in his holding, exacted his full rent, even in the bad times, so long as he had a penny; and now having stripped him naked as Job, and cast him forth upon a dunghill, he looks out for a new capitalist with whom the pressure of the times and of poor-rates, not his own inclination, may force him to act a little more reasonably. We will, however, venture thus much of a prophecy, that unless he be restrained by legal enactments, he will fleece

him, in due time, as perfectly as his unhappy predecessor. But neither the extreme lowness of prices, nor the great pressure of poor-rates, nor the failure of the potato crop, has hitherto induced any considerable number of the landlords to lower their rents, or to offer farms on such terms as will induce English, Scotch, or North of Ireland farmers to embark their capital in them. We are told that this is entirely owing to the actual and prospective magnitude of the poor-rates. Supposing this to be the case, who are to be blamed for it? The Irish landlords, not excepting Lord Lucan and his brethren in the West, who, when Lord John Russell inserted a clause in "the poor-law amendment act," to prevent the excessive pressure of taxation upon any one district, succeeded by their almost unanimous opposition in getting this clause rejected in the House of Lords. If, after all the outcry against poor-rates, government were to propose the same clause, they would most certainly have again to encounter the hostility of the Irish landlords; because their object is not to amend the Poor Law, but by representing it as an intolerable burthen, and doing all in their power to make it so, to get rid of it altogether; and thus to be able, as of old, to exterminate more freely, and to cast out the poor to die by the roadside, without contributing one halfpenny to save them from starvation. In difficult cases of this kind, the boldest course is generally not only the best, but the safest also; and we, therefore, think that instead of attempting to obviate the excessive pressure of the Poor Laws in the distressed districts, by the unpopular expedient of a general taxation throughout the entire kingdom, government should at once introduce a measure to effect this necessary object, by restoring to the first of their original purposes—the support of the poor—a portion of the surplus revenues of the Established Church.

But the truth is, that the Poor Laws, though undoubtedly in many places a grievous burthen just now, are by no means the chief cause which deters men with capital from taking farms in Ireland. Wherever the owner of the soil has heretofore let his land upon reasonable terms, we venture to affirm that the average amount of poor-rates is as low as in England. In places where land has been let at a rack-rent, and the unfortunate tenants have been evicted or obliged to fly to avoid starvation, the rates have, of course, become very heavy. Yet in those places, such

as the estates of the Earl of Lucan, where the clearance system has been most extensively resorted to, the rates vary from six shillings to seven-and-sixpence in the pound, only half of which falls upon the tenant. The vast decrease in the population occasioned by emigration, and also by starvation, has already greatly diminished the pressure on the poor-rates; and we confidently assert, that if the landlords at once reduce their rents, so as to allow the present occupiers a fair return for their labour, and to induce men of capital to undertake the reclaiming of their waste lands, the poor-rates will very soon be as low in Ireland as in England. The Irishman is not anxious to be separated from his wife, and imprisoned in a work-house; he is as able and willing to earn his bread by honest industry as any man on the face of the earth, and nothing but the most wicked laws, and the most accursed tyranny, could reduce him to his present degradation. The English, Scotch, and North of Ireland farmers were not unacquainted with the general amount of poor-rates in the West of Ireland. They went prepared to encounter that burthen, but were frightened away by the rack-rents. Indeed, Lord Lucan has published a letter in the newspapers, in which he admits that he offered to give his new tenants a guarantee that they should never be obliged to pay more than three shillings in the pound for poor-rates. This nobleman, who has come forth as the Coryphæus of the Western landlords, has taken several large tracts of land into his own hands, built upon them suitable establishments, and his anxiety to let them proves that the whole profits do not amount to the rent and poor-rates. How then does he expect that a tenant could support a family and pay him the rents he demands? He asks 18s. per statute acre for those farms of very indifferent land, (if we can believe our informant, who resides in the neighbourhood,) situate in a very remote neighbourhood, to which it is almost impossible to bring manure of any kind, and from which the produce cannot, without great expense, be conveyed to a profitable market. On this last account alone he estimates, in the letter we have just quoted, that even at the present time, a ton of corn is worth thirty shillings more in Holland than in Mayo. How, then, can he expect as high a rent? And this difference does not arise from free trade. But it is not fair to estimate the Irish landlords generally by what Lord Lucan is willing to do,

in a protracted famine. Go through the whole of the West of Ireland, almost all the South, aye, and a good part of the North, and you will not find a single farming establishment such as Lord Lucan describes, erected by the landlord for his tenant.

The only thing the landlords (with few exceptions) have done for their tenantry for the last half century, was to treble their rents, and to turn them out, without mercy, whenever any calamity rendered them unable to pay the uttermost farthing, or when they gave them any offence, or perhaps because they refused to turn Protestants a their bidding. When the wicked wars of the French revolution raised the prices of all the necessaries of life, and of all kinds of agricultural produce to a most extravagant height, the landlord raised his rent to war prices, and when the "wars were all ended," he got an iniquitous tax put upon the food of the people, in order to keep his rental up to the war standard. When those taxes were repealed, and agricultural produce fell nearly two-thirds, it would be only natural to suppose that rents should fall in a similar proportion. But not one penny of his war-rent is the landlord willing to bate, and his twofold complaint is, that he cannot coax any capitalist to give it to him, and that he must contribute something towards the support of the few of the poor wretches whom he has cast out on the world after depriving them of everything,—who have survived famine and pestilence without being able to drag their weary limbs to some foreign shore. Lord Lucan talks of land at ten or twelve shillings per statute acre; yes, such land as is to be found in Connemara, and in a great many other parts of Connaught, which might indeed be reclaimed, but which is, at present, fit to feed only snipe and crows. The surface of the cheap lands in Connaught, consists either of bog or of rocks; a small patch of it, on which potatoes or oats were grown, was usually reclaimed, beside each wretched cabin; the rest fed a goat, an ass, and sometimes a cow. The family lived for ten months on the produce, and the women and children starved for the remaining two,—literally subsisting, for the most part, on weeds and roots, whilst the men went to England to make the rent during the harvest. We appeal to every man who has travelled through Connaught, if a great portion of the land be not such as we have described it. We give Connemara as an example, because the sale of the Martin

estates in that district shows the rent that was exacted for an acre of rocks. An English farmer would think it fit for nothing in its present condition, but to be turned into a preserve for game, and yet it was let, on an average, at from five to fifteen shillings for the statute acre. Even the better soil from which the wretched tenants have been evicted, is so utterly exhausted, as to require a large outlay of capital before it would be capable of bearing good crops. Besides, there are no houses on those lands but the ruined huts of the miserable inhabitants, a great many of which are untenanted and roofless, and those which are still occupied are, for the most part, so miserable, that a respectable pig would consider himself badly lodged in them.

At all events, the plan which we propose will test the sincerity of the landlords, when they assert that they are willing to let their lands cheaper than the landlords of England, and Scotland. If they support it we will believe what they say in spite of the most evident reasons to the contrary; but if they oppose it, the hollowness of their professions will be manifest to every one. We propose that the government shall appoint three gentlemen, thoroughly skilled in the nature and capabilities of the different kinds of soil; who shall be able to estimate the expense of erecting a respectable farming establishment; who can form a correct judgment of the advantages to be derived from the facility of bringing its produce to market, obtaining manure, and in fine, who shall be capable of taking into account every thing which can enhance or diminish the produce of the land. We propose that they shall, as far as possible, be thoroughly disinterested;—that one of them shall be an Irishman, one an Englishman, and one a Scotchman;—and that they shall be sworn, not only to decide impartially to the best of their ability, but moreover, to hold no secret intercourse with either the landlord or tenant, and not even to visit or dine with either party until after they shall have concluded their official duty in the district. We propose that the occupying tenant, provided he pay his rent regularly, shall be entitled to hold his farm at the amount of their valuation for twenty-one years. We propose that the valuers shall decide what amount of capital can be usefully expended on the farm, in building, ditching, draining, &c., and that the landlord shall, in the first instance, have the option of making these improvements himself, charging the tenant a

reasonable per centage for the capital which he shall have laid out on the farm after the valuation shall have taken place. But if the landlord from any cause, shall not, within a certain fixed time make the improvements pointed out, then the tenant shall be entitled to make them; and if the tenant should be ejected, or should desire to have the farm during the twenty-one years we have mentioned, the landlord shall be entitled to take the land, upon paying the tenant (after all the arrears of rent shall have been discharged,) the full amount of his improvements, not only in building, ditching, draining, &c., but also in such superior manuring as will entitle the land to be valued at a higher rent during the unexpired portion of the twenty one years. As it would not be convenient for the government valuers to attend on every change of this kind, the matter might be very easily settled by arbitration; and if it could not be arranged in this way, let it be settled at the quarter sessions, before the assistant barrister and twelve of the quarter sessions Grand Jurors, acting as a special jury on the occasion. But if the landlord should refuse to pay the tenant for his improvements, the latter shall be at liberty to sell his interest in the farm to any solvent tenant, and he shall succeed in every thing to the rights of the out going tenant, for the unexpired portion of the twenty-one years. We propose that at the end of every twentieth year—that is, one year before the expiration of the twenty-one years after the next preceding valuation—the landlord shall be obliged to give his tenant notice, whether he intends to allow him to hold for other twenty-one years at the same rate, or to call for a new valuation, or to eject him. In the first case there will be no difficulty; in the second, the landlord shall be obliged to give the valuers notice, within a month after he shall have noticed his tenant, and one or more of the valuers shall be obliged to visit the farm, and to decide whether the rent should be raised or not. In coming to a conclusion on this matter, they must take care not to give the landlord the benefit of the tenant's capital or industry. In the third case, the landlord shall indemnify the tenant for his improvements in building, draining, ditching, &c.; and also for whatever (if any) additional value the farm has derived from the industry of the tenant. This matter also to be decided by arbitration, and in case of dispute by the assistant barrister, and a Quarter sessions special jury, as

already mentioned. If the the tenant should desire a new valuation, or determine to quit the farm at the end of the twenty-one years, he must, in the first instance, give the landlord notice at the end of the twentieth year; and within one month afterwards, notice the commissioners, who shall act precisely as if the notice proceeded from the landlord. If he should desire to give up the farm, the landlord may take it by indemnifying the tenant, as in case of ejection; but if the landlord shall refuse to do this, then the present possessor shall be at liberty to sell his interest to a solvent tenant who shall succeed to all his rights, and who can only be ejected, and whose rent can only be raised in the manner already specified.

As an auxiliary income to that which would put on a right footing the relations between landlord and tenant, we would remedy one great defect in the Encumbered Estates act. There can be no doubt but that this measure will be most beneficial in introducing a solvent proprietary. But its great object will undoubtedly be defeated, if it does not also gradually introduce a tenant proprietary. As it stands at present, it never can effect this, for no man has a right to purchase out his own farm. We, therefore, propose to insert a clause in this act, whereby, whenever any estate is to be sold by the commissioners, due notice shall be given to the tenantry when such sale is to take place, and that they shall be at liberty to become the purchasers of their own farms, whenever such purchase shall not interfere with the sale of the other parts of the estate. And upon any farmer applying to have his farm put up separately, the commissioners shall be obliged to do so. But whenever it shall be less than the half of a town-land, the sale shall not be final until the remainder of the lot shall have been disposed of.

Another auxiliary measure of vast importance, and one which would greatly contribute to create an independent proprietary, is that which has for its object the reclamation of waste lands. We shall not enter into any details on this subject, as we only wish to see the measure, which was already introduced into parliament, passed into a law. However, we cannot help observing that government is bound to carry this measure in justice to the public, because it has advanced money to complete railways through those parts of the country where the largest portion of waste lands are situated; and as these iron roads

will greatly enhance the value of the landlord's productive lands, the very least return he can make is, either to reclaim his waste lands himself, or to give them up to the public on reasonable terms.

We hope that government will aid the completion of railways by loans, and that it will give an enlightened and religious aid to the crowds of poor emigrants who are still rushing from Ireland. We shall not notice the trumpery of asking government to force manufactories into the country. The thing cannot be done. But if the measures we have mentioned were carried, factories would spring up, as if by magic, in every spot suitable to them in the kingdom.

In this article we have certainly pleased none of the extreme parties in the country, and, unlike the man in the fable, we strove to please nobody, but to speak the truth, or that which we conscientiously believe to be the truth. This is so very rare a commodity at present, that we shall very likely be abused through all the moods and tenses. But we can give a Rowland for an Oliver, and as Dick Swiveller said to Quilp, after beating him soundly and deservedly, we can promise that "there's plenty more where this came from." The patriots who are unpurchaseable, so long as there is nobody to give any thing for them, will swear that we are in the pay of the castle; some T. C., or P. L. G., or Ed., (we really do not see why the tailors should not have their T. Y. L. R.) will dub us heretic by an erratic anathema; Dean Murray and the parsons will beg a piece of her under-garment from some Protestant heroine who wears gun-cotton petticoats to blow us up; and the landlords will swear at us for daring to talk of humanity and human vermin, whilst they have their mortgages and marriage settlements to think of.

"How blest are we that are not simple men,
Yet nature might have made us as these are."

Yet we venture to ask the people to look for the measures which we have here pointed out, and not to commit the suicidal policy of yoking them at present with the question of repeal, which can only render them impracticable by driving from their advocacy the people of England, without whose assistance they cannot be carried. There is not a man of common sense in Ireland who believes in the practicability of repeal, within any given period, and

whilst the people are starving, the rival leaders have unfurled their factious standards, and called upon the country to prepare for domestic strife. We hope that instead of hearkening to these factious cries, they will learn the truth of the old Pagan maxim, *concordia parvæ res crescunt discordia maximæ dilabuntur*.

We shall not appeal to the humanity of the Landlords, but we shall appeal to their common sense, (if they have any of that commodity, which is not just so plentiful as its name would imply,) to give up the expectation that the people will ever again subsist on the potato alone, or that the masses will suffer their food to be taxed to keep up high rents, whilst communism and confiscation have shaken the greatest thrones in Europe, and are even now struggling for the mastery.

To Lord John Russell and the Whig ministry we would say, that they have not even attempted to carry any one of the liberal measures which they advocated whilst in opposition. When they came into power the cry was, Russell and Reform, Russell and liberal measures for Ireland; now the name of Russell is connected, as far as Ireland is concerned, only with coercion and corruption. No part of the filth which has been accumulating for centuries in the Augean stable of Irish corruption has as yet been swept away. Lord Palmerston has been sympathising with rebels, and tinkering up constitutions all over the continent of Europe. No animal, great or small, has escaped him, from the Russian bear to the American mosquito. Now, we tell Lord Palmerston, if all the grievances of the Italians, Sicilians, and Hungarians were united, they would not equal in magnitude any one of the three monster evils of Ireland—Orangeism, Landlordism, and the Established Church. We remember, that when the Sicilians were in rebellion, the Whigs refused to give the king of the two Sicilies his title in the speech from the throne, and would only acknowledge him as King of Naples. A parallel was attempted to be drawn in Parliament between Ireland and Sicily; but Lord John Russell at once denied it, because the King of Sicily had violated the constitution; and really this answer appeared to have silenced the Irish representatives. Violated a constitution indeed! What the devil signifies a constitution to a people who are subjected to the most grinding temporal and spiritual tyranny, and condemned by heartless landlords to starvation, exile, and

death? Would to Heaven the Irish people could exchange their constitution for the advantages which continental nations derived from what are called despotisms. Despotic kings valued the land, settled the rent upon equitable terms, and gave fixity of tenure before they granted constitutions. The Emperor of Austria is held up to us as a monster of cruelty, and yet this monster is now creating at one stroke a peasant proprietary in Hungary. If he be a tyrant

“Would that the present hour would lend
Another tyrant of the kind,
Such chains as his were sure to bind.”

To remove the oppression and redress the grievances of the Irish people, is indeed a task which would be worthy of Hercules; and which even a brave minister cannot undertake without misgivings as to the result. But the undertaking is as noble as it is difficult. It is an achievement, in the attempt to accomplish which a minister, even if he failed, would gain more glory than if he succeeded, by timeserving and trickery, in retaining office for a century. Besides, even if the present ministers could not carry these measures themselves, they could render it impossible for any other body of men who would resist them, to carry on the government of the country. Like Emancipation and the Repeal of the Corn Laws, they would be carried by the very parliament which was assembled to resist them. But if the Whigs allow their term of office to expire without attempting to carry them, they need never again pretend to call themselves the friends of justice or of Ireland. Hitherto they have exhibited themselves only as the protectors of the wildest democracy abroad, and of the most grinding aristocracy at home. In the present stricken state of her people they may despise the struggles and the writhings of Ireland. But if the Irish people see that when they remain quiescent, they have nothing to expect from the justice of England, the cry for Repeal will again justly resound from shore to shore; and it will only require some great man to arise and combine her physical might, as O'Connell in 1829 combined her moral power, in order to enable her to take advantage of the first moment of England's weakness, and to shake off her power for ever.

ART. VI.—*The History of St. Cuthbert ; or, an account of his Life, Decease, and Miracles ; of the Wanderings with his Body at Intervals during 124 years ; of the state of his Body from his decease until A. D. 1542 ; and of the Various Monuments erected to his Memory.*
 BY THE VERY REV. MONSIGNOR C. EYRE. London, James Burns, 1849.

THIS is a noble monument of learning, zeal, and piety, erected to the memory of one of the greatest saints of the Anglo-Saxon Church. It is the record of a pilgrimage made to every place which St. Cuthbert adorned by his wondrous virtues when living, or that, when dead, was rendered illustrious by his miracles, and the sojourn, even for a brief period, of his sacred remains. The spirit of a true Catholic piety is impressed upon every page, and we do not know of any more happy occupation than to associate one's mind with the author, and to accompany him, in his researches of the memorials of St. Cuthbert, in all the different and wide-spread localities where they were to be discovered.

The Very Reverend author tells us, that when he "first began to collect documents connected with the history of St. Cuthbert, they were meant solely for his own information and edification. For some time he confined his attention to such as might throw light upon the mysterious pilgrimage made with St. Cuthbert's body from the time it left Lindisfarne till it was finally entombed in Durham's Gothic shade. Afterwards, the love of the holy labour so far increased upon him, as to induce him to endeavour to compress within a small compass, the leading features of the saint's life and history." And he then adds, that "in deference to the entreaties of his friends, he has consented to lay his notes before the public."

The public may well rejoice that he has done so ; for his is the only work since the days of the hagiologists, in which the merits and the miracles of St. Cuthbert have been dwelt upon in a spirit worthy of that great saint. It is a Catholic priest, and, we believe, a Catholic priest only, that could properly appreciate the life, the toil, the virtues, and the self-sacrifices, of the monk, priest, anchorite, and bishop, St. Cuthbert ; or that could infuse into

the hearts of others that tender love, and sincere devotion towards the object of his labours, with which he is himself inspired. No vain desire for renown, no idle indulgence in curiosity, no mere amusement in antiquarian researches, have conspired together for the purpose of contributing to a publication like that which now lies before us. It has been a labour of love for one of God's saints; it is an act of piety. As such we regard it, and as such we approve of it.

Monsignor Eyre's book is an abstract of what most of the ancient hagiologists have written with regard to the life of St. Cuthbert, and of the wanderings to which his pious body was subjected; and to these are added many particulars that lay scattered about, but that are now, for the first time, placed in a connected, and continuous form, so as to make, on the whole, the most valuable and trust-worthy record respecting St. Cuthbert that has ever yet been published.

In bestowing these praises upon the book of the Very Rev. Monsignor Eyre, we do not desire to be understood as affirming that it is absolutely faultless. No first edition of any book, in which the subject required a vast amount of research, could be so. Faults and omissions can be discovered, and it is, we conceive, to the honour of the author that they are but few, and none of them of any great importance.

Before, however, we advert to them, we desire to make our readers acquainted with the contents of Monsignor Eyre's volume. It is divided by him into two parts. The first part includes "the Life, Decease, and Miracles of St. Cuthbert." The second part is divided into three sections: the first section giving an account of "the Wanderings with St. Cuthbert's body at intervals during 124 years;"—the second, the particulars respecting "the State of St. Cuthbert's body from the time of his decease, till the year 1542;"—and the third section, a description of "the different monuments erected to the honour of St. Cuthbert."

Thus, in the first part, we have an account of the birth and boyhood of St. Cuthbert; of his life as a monk at Mailros and at Ripon; of the twelve years he passed in Lindisfarne, and of the nine years that he was an anchorite in Farne island; of the two years he passed as a bishop, and finally, of his decease, his burial, and the miracles

worked by him when living, when dying, and after his decease.

This is the portion of what may be called, "the history of St. Cuthbert" that is the best known, and the materials for which are the most accessible, at least to all persons acquainted with the Latin language. In this part of his work, Monsignor Eyre has fallen into a fault which is common enough amongst good scholars: he has supposed that the knowledge so readily gained by himself was possessed by others; and hence he has presumed that the great mass of his readers must know a good deal of the miracles of St. Cuthbert, and, therefore, instead of giving them all in detail, he merely makes a passing allusion to a great many of them. In our estimation, such an omission is one much to be deplored in a work that treats of the life of any saint, but especially so of one whose marvellous humility and transcendent virtues rendered him conspicuous amongst the Anglo-Saxons, through the multitudinous miracles performed by him. In such a work as this, we should have desired to have seen all the miracles of St. Cuthbert, of which we have an authentic record, given in the most minute detail, and we should do so upon the principle so clearly and succinctly laid down by Bollandus:—

"Nam miracula (quod quidam aliquando nobis suadere conati sunt) minime prætermittenda ducimus. Valeant ea (ut alibi plenius dictum) ad augendum honorem Sanctorum, ad ingerendam mortalibus de impetranda ab illis ope fiduciam, ad deterrandum a sceleribus impios, maximeque eos qui sacrorum hominum locorumque immunitatem violare aut quoquo modo minuere niterentur."*

If ever there was a time when Catholics should not shrink from dilating upon the miracles of their saints, it is the present; for these miracles are the glory of Catholics, the shame of schismatics, the reproach of heretics, the stumbling-block to infidels: "Triumphale et gloria Christianorum miracula sunt et virtutes sanctorum, quæ quo latius propagantur, eo et boni in Domino gloriantur, et mali erubescunt et cruciantur." †

Attaching, as we do, the greatest importance to the pub-

* Act. Sanct. (Feb.) Præfat. in Vit. SS. vol. i. p. 14.

† Vit. S. Rumold, c. 1, § 1. Act. Sanct. (Julii) vol. i. p. 241.

lication of well-authenticated miracles, we regret that there has not been inserted in this splendid monument to Cuthbert's memory, every one fully as it has been described by the Venerable Bede; for mark with what scrupulous care those miracles were collected, and what caution was employed before any statement connected with them was permitted to find insertion in Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert.

"That the facts," observes Monsignor Eyre respecting Bede's Life of St. Cuthbert, "contained in his life, may be relied on, we gather from the account he gives in the preface of the evidence he had collected:"

"I have not presumed, without minute investigation, to write any of the deeds of so great a man; nor without the most accurate examination of credible witnesses, to hand over what I had written to be transcribed. * * * When my work was arranged, but still kept back from publication, I frequently submitted it, for perusal and for correction, to our reverend brother Herefrid, the priest, and others, who for a long time had well known the life and conversation of that man of God. Some faults were, at their suggestion, carefully amended; and thus, every scruple being removed, I have taken care to submit to writing *what I clearly ascertained to be the truth*, and to bring it into your presence also, my brethren, in order that, by the judgment of your authority, what I have written might be either corrected, if false, or certified to be true. Whilst, with God's assistance, I was so engaged, and my book was read during two days by the elders and teachers of your congregation, and was accurately weighed and examined in all its parts, there was nothing at all found which required to be altered, but everything which I had written was, by common consent, pronounced worthy to be read without hesitation, and to be handed over to be copied by such as by zeal for religion should be disposed to do so."

And so, too, a "zeal for religion" makes us regret that all the miracles as they were written by Bede, have not been "copied" into this volume. In point of fact, *the miracles of St. Cuthbert, as stated by Bede*, place the opponents of Catholicity in a dilemma from which they cannot escape; for they must, in defiance of his own works and all the records of history, maintain that Bede was a dolt, or an impostor in league with other impostors, promulgating, for no benefit to themselves, incredible fabrications, or they must admit his statements with respect to St. Cuthbert to be true; and if true, what becomes of the opponents to the Mass, to the Celibacy of the clergy, to the due respect and veneration to be paid to the relics of Saints?

We feel perfectly certain that it was no apprehension of encountering the reproaches of the tepid, nor of being assailed by the sneers of infidels, that influenced the Very Reverend author, when he came to the determination of not giving a full and complete translation of *all* the miracles of St. Cuthbert, as narrated by Bede. Such of the miracles as he has mentioned, prove that no such motive could influence him.

Here, for instance, is one that we have always regarded as a most charming narrative; but which we prefer as told by Bede, to the version selected by the Very Rev. Monsignor Eyre, from the Lindisfarne monk.

The following is the account given by our author. It refers to the time that St. Cuthbert was appointed to act as guest-master in the monastery of Ripon:—

“The neophyte was immediately chosen from the other brethren, to wait upon strangers coming to the house. Among the rest, one morning, during the winter season, when snow was on the ground, there appeared to him an angel of the Lord, under the appearance of a grave and grown up man, in the same manner that angels appeared, under the appearance of men, to the patriarch Abraham in the Vale of Mambre. He received him kindly, as was his custom, under the impression that he was a man, not an angel, washed his hands and feet, and wiped them with a towel, and rubbed his hands and warmed his feet on account of the cold. Whilst he was waiting for the third hour of the day to take his food, he endeavoured to overcome the reluctance of his guest, and his unwillingness to eat on account of his journey, and at last, entreating him in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, obtained his consent. When the third hour of the day came, and he had concluded his prayer, he immediately prepared the table, and put upon it the food that he had; and because it chanced that there was no bread at hand, he put on the table only the crumbs that had been collected for blessed bread. He went to the monastery to seek some bread, but not getting any, (the bread was at the time baking in the oven), returned to his guest, whom he had left eating alone; but he did not find him there, nor any trace of his footsteps, although there was snow upon the ground. In astonishment he removed the table to an inner chamber, seeing clearly that he had entertained an angel of God. As he entered, he perceived the flavour of very sweet bread, and found three hot loaves; and thanked God that in his person had been fulfilled the saying of the Lord: ‘He that receiveth you, receiveth Me; and he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me.’ (Matt. x. 40.) And again: “He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet, shall receive the reward of a prophet: and he that receiveth a just

man in the name of a just man, shall receive the reward of a just man.' (Matt. x. 41.)"—Lindisf. Monk, Bolland. 119.

The same incident is thus told by Bede, in his *Life of St. Cuthbert*:

“At the time that Cuthbert was serving as a monk in the monastery of Ripon, it became his duty to act as ‘the Master of the guests,’ or the monk who exercised, on behalf of his brethren, the rights of hospitality to all strangers. In this office, it is believed, that he was so far favoured by Heaven, as to be visited by an angel. Upon leaving his cell, in the interior of the monastery, at the commencement of a new day, he found in the place appointed for strangers, a young man sitting, who was welcomed by him with his habitual tenderness and humanity. He presented water for the hands, he himself washed the feet of the stranger, rubbed them dry with a towel, and *as they appeared to him to be chilled with the cold, he humbly rested them on his bosom, and sought by friction to restore them to their natural heat*; and he entreated his unknown guest that he would wait until the third hour of the day for some refreshment, and not travel fasting from the monastery, lest he should sink under the severity of the winter’s cold, combined with want of food. Cuthbert supposed the person he was addressing to be some man who was travelling by night, and who, exhausted by the snow-storm then raging, had turned aside from his road to the monastery at that very early hour, for the purpose of resting there a short time. The stranger refused, declaring he must presently depart, for the mansion to which he was hastening was a great way off. Cuthbert pressed his hospitable request upon the unknown man, and at last compelled him to remain, by adjuring him to do so in the name of God. The moment that the tierces had been finished, Cuthbert brought out a table, arranged it for his guest, placed food upon it, and said: ‘I beseech you, brother, to eat, whilst I go and get some hot bread for you, for I hope to find some baked by this time.’

“When Cuthbert returned, the stranger, that he thought he had left eating, was no longer visible: he looked to see what way he had departed, and although the earth was covered with the fresh fallen snow, on which the slightest footstep might be visible, it bore no trace of any one having departed from the monastery. The pious monk was astonished at this strange circumstance, when he proceeded to replace the table in the recess from which it had been withdrawn by him. Upon advancing towards it his senses were ravished by a most delicious fragrance. He looked around him, and saw on the table three small loaves of new bread, apparently still warm, of wondrous beauty and miraculous purity. He was terrified at this spectacle. ‘I see,’ he said to himself, ‘that it is an angel of God that I have received as a guest—one that has come, not to be fed, but to feed others—who has brought bread

such as this earth cannot produce, bread that excels the lilies in whiteness, the roses in perfume, and the honey in sweetness.'"—Beda, Vit. S. Cudberet, c. 7, § 12.

In contrasting these two *narratives*—that of the monk of Lindisfarne, and of the Venerable Bede—we have no desire to compare the *translations*, except merely for the purpose of submitting to the judgment of the reader this question,—which of the two he considers preferable. We incline to that given by Bede, because we conceive it to be more life-like, and because we feel a greater interest in reading the few words uttered by Cuthbert, to the pious reflections of the anonymous monk of Lindisfarne, however valuable and excellent they may be.

We dwell upon this point in the hope that the Very Reverend author, in preparing for publication the second edition of his work, will act upon our suggestion,—that he may insert in full all the miracles of St. Cuthbert as they are narrated upon what cannot but be regarded as *the unquestionable authority of Bede*. If he should do so, we would also entreat of him to rely solely upon a translation by himself,—not to make in any part of his book Dr. Giles's translation the basis of his own; for without at all questioning that reverend gentleman's *capacity* to translate Latin into English, we must observe that we have not the slightest confidence in his *capability* to be the fitting translator of an author like Bede. It is a task which should be performed by a Catholic alone—by one who can feel with his author; because, united to him in faith, his heart can fittingly respond to the earnest convictions of that truly venerable and sanctified writer. Without such a sympathy between the original author and the translator, there will be frigidity even in the closest version. It is a fault which we have had occasion to find with almost every translation by a non-Catholic of a monkish writer we have met with; for whether “done into English” by the Rev. Mr. Giles, or into French by M. Guizot, or German by Herr Gfrörer, they are not in all cases to be relied on.

In page fifty-two, Monsignor Eyre will find, upon a further examination into the facts, that he has fallen into an error with respect to Alfrid, the successor of king Egfrid, when he states that he “had devoted himself to literature in *Scotland*.” There cannot be the slightest doubt, that the place to which Prince Alfrid repaired during the reign of Egfrid for safety, as well as for study,

was Ireland, which afforded refuge about that period of time, to more than one unfortunate prince. (See Eddius, c. 27.) So well established is the fact, that it was in Ireland Alfrid was engaged in literary studies, that Mr. Stephenson, in his valuable edition of Bede, suggests, that the unjust invasion of Ireland by Egfrid in the year 684, was occasioned by the Irish having hospitably received his brother Alfrid. (See Stephenson's edition of Bede, vol. i. p. 315, and vol. ii. p. 97.)

The name of the saint, to whose truly glorious memory Monsignor Eyre devotes his book, is, he is aware, connected, at least by tradition, with the Irish—that race of men in modern times so much abused, but who were declared by William of Malmsbury, to be “genus hominum innocens, genuina simplicitate, nil unquam mala moliens.” These Irish maintain that St. Cuthbert was by birth an Irishman. This claim, on their part, has not escaped the attention of Monsignor Eyre, and our regret is that he has not fully discussed it. The writer of this article is disposed to concur with the author in the opinion, that “Cuthbert was born in Northumberland, of Saxon parentage;” but still he has not examined with sufficient diligence the Irish authorities, to subscribe to Monsignor Eyre's assertion, that the fact of Cuthbert's English parentage is so well established, that it is one of which “there can be no doubt.” We must bear in mind before we come to any such conclusion, that, independently of the statements to be found in the Irish authorities, the monks of Durham themselves “had some faith in the tradition,” that “Cuthbert was the son of an Irish king;” and we have also this fact, of which there certainly “can be no doubt,” confirmatory of the full belief in that tradition, viz., that in the year 882, those who had the care of the body of St. Cuthbert, had actually placed it on board a ship for the purpose of removing it to Ireland,—a fact that is well told by Simeon of Durham, and accurately transcribed by our author, pp. 106, 107.

As to the objection that may be made, that “it is incredible” that the son of an Irish king should be found, at eight years, of age tending sheep on the mountains, in the neighbourhood of Mailros, we may observe, that, however strange it may seem in these times, it is by no means absolutely improbable. The aggressions of the Northmen rendered such a change of fortune an occurrence by no

means extraordinary. We find in the history of their aggressions, that Astridis, a queen, was reduced to the condition of a slave,—“vili jam ac sordida veste indutam,” and in that condition brought to the slave-market in Esthonia: “publicis nudinis in foro venum exposito”—that Mirgiale, the daughter of an Irish king, was compelled to work as a slave; that the mother of the celebrated Olave Pa was the daughter of an Irish king, yet taken and sold as a slave, and on account of her beauty, sold at a high price: “venundata ab Hauskuldo tribus marcis argenteis pretio servarum trium.”* Wherever the Northmen were conquerors, there was sure to be found amongst their spoil “an immense multitude of women and male children.”† And it may therefore readily be conjectured that Cuthbert might have been (*if* the son of an Irish king) either sold as a slave in Northumbria, or he might have been carried off from his home for the purpose of being concealed there. The question of Cuthbert’s parentage is one of sufficient importance to merit a more full examination than has yet been bestowed upon it.

In pp. 62—67. Monsignor Eyre has given some very interesting and valuable accounts of the personal appearance of St. Cuthbert, as described by those who had seen him in a vision. He has, however, omitted one account of St. Cuthbert’s appearance, which is more interesting than any, because it is that for which we may consider ourselves indebted to the great king Alfred, whose narrative we may believe has been faithfully recorded in the “Decem Scriptores.”

“Lo! there shone before him (Alfred) a great light, bright and refulgent as the rays of the sun, and in the midst of this light there appeared an old black-haired man, a priest, wearing his sacerdotal robes, and bearing in his right hand a copy of the Gospels, richly adorned with gems and gold.”‡

This description is interesting on many accounts, but especially because it refers to a document still in existence—the copy of the Gospels, that was lost when the attempt was made to remove St. Cuthbert’s body to Ireland, which

* See Torfaeus Hist. Norveg. vol. ii. pp. 116, 270, 332.

† See Ingulphus. Hist. p. 20, and Depping Histoire des Expéditions Maritimes des Normands, vol. i. p. 64.

‡ Hist. de S. Cuthbert. p. 71.

copy was subsequently miraculously recovered, and to this day may be seen in the British Museum. *

We have thus dwelt at some length upon what may be regarded as the first part of the labours of Monsignor Eyre. To those who have studied the life of St. Cuthbert in the original documents, his work will be found very useful; but from the moment that we are compelled to part from the monastic historians, there is not the slightest exaggeration in affirming that Monsignor Eyre's book must be regarded as invaluable. He has seen, he has examined, and he describes every spot on which St. Cuthbert trod; and he has, in a pious pilgrimage, traced out every inch of ground over which the body of St. Cuthbert was borne by his devout disciples, when flying from the desecrating hands of the infidel Danes. And, we may add, that Monsignor Eyre affords to us very satisfactory reasons for believing that even at this moment the body of St. Cuthbert rests in its entirety,—that due care has been taken that, even up to the very hour at which we write, the last wishes of St. Cuthbert are complied with by the Catholics, when he said: "If necessity should ever compel you to choose between two unavoidable evils, I would by far prefer that you removed my remains from the tomb in which they are about to repose, and that you carried them with you to whatsoever place God should assign you a habitation, than that you would, under any pretence or condition, submit your necks to the yoke of schismatics." †

This is a subject of very great interest to all antiquarians, but especially so to Catholics; and a reference to it enables us to give a slight sketch of that portion of Monsignor Eyre's book, which we have not yet described.

The first section of the Second Part of this history of St. Cuthbert contains the most minute particulars respecting the wanderings of the disciples of the saint from Lindisfarne until his body was deposited in Chester-le-Street, where it remained for 113 years. We have then an account of the translation of the body from Chester-le-Street to

* For an account and description of this copy of the Gospels, see Monsignor Eyre's work, note to pp. 110, 111. In addition to the names of the persons by whom this copy of the Gospels has been described, and who are mentioned by Monsignor Eyre, may be added, Twysden, *Decem Scriptores*, *Praefat.* pp. 25, 26.

† *S. Dunelm. Hist. Eccles.* p. 14.

Durham, and then of its temporary removal in the year 1069.

The second section of the Second Part of the history of St. Cuthbert, is divided into four chapters, which treat of the following subjects:—"the first disinterment of St. Cuthbert's body in the year 698:"—"The translation of St. Cuthbert's body into Aldhunes Cathedral, in 999;"—"the examination and translation of St. Cuthbert's body, in 1104;"—"the opening of St. Cuthbert's coffin, and the state of his body, in 1537;"—and lastly, "the fortunes of St. Cuthbert's body after 1542, and the opening of the vault in the Feretory, in 1827."

In 1537, when the commissioners of King Henry VIII. defaced the shrine, and broke open the coffin of St. Cuthbert, "not only the body, but also the vestments in which he was robed, were perfectly entire, and free and clear of all stain and decay." And thus, as Harpsfield remarks, in his *Hist. Eccles. Ang.*, p. 105, "it is abundantly evident that the body of St. Cuthbert remained inviolate and incorrupt for 840 years." (p. 185.)

Had the body of this saint been in a state of decay, it would have been (as Monsignor Eyre suggests) treated like the relics of other saints at that time, as those of St. Thomas and St. Edmund; but being whole and entire, it was "buried in the ground under the same place where his shrine had been exalted."

A search was made, in the year 1827, for the body of St. Cuthbert. It was made not by Catholics but by Protestants. There was, to use the words of Monsignor Eyre, in making that search, "the careful exclusion of Catholics." Upon that occasion too, there were, among other things found along with the skeleton of a man, "the skull and several bones of adults, and *a skull and several bones of children!*"

Mr. Raine, and the other Protestant gentlemen, who aided in this search, maintain, that the skeleton discovered was that of St. Cuthbert. Monsignor Eyre maintains that it was not. He first points out this fact, which will be found to be one of great importance, viz., "*that the grave in which St. Cuthbert was buried, had been disturbed between the years 1542 and 1827. In 1827 an opening was found in the masonry at the end of the vault, filled up with loose stones.*" (p. 188.)

Monsignor Eyre having given the full particulars of the

examination that took place in 1827, and the discovery of a skeleton in what was supposed to be the coffin of St. Cuthbert, proceeds in the following manner. The extract is long, but it will be found well worthy of perusal.

“Was this, then, the reader will ask impatiently, the body of St. Cuthbert? If it were, there ought to have been found with it, besides the altar, and burse, and comb, a gilt fillet on the forehead, a chalice, a paten, and a pair of silver scissors, which are known to have been in the coffin when it was closed in 1104. There ought also to have been found, supposing it was St. Cuthbert’s body, the linen sheet of five ells, bought for its interment in 1542, but no remains of this sheet were discovered.

“Having given the analysis of Mr. Raine’s account of the opening of the vault, and of the things therein found, and having compared them with Reginald’s account of what was found and left in St. Cuthbert’s coffin, in 1104, it is the author’s duty to speak of a tradition that exists in reference to this subject, in order that his readers may be enabled to form an opinion as to whether the body found in the vault in 1827, was, or was not, the skeleton of the sainted Bishop of Lindisfarne.

“There has long been a tradition, that the body of St. Cuthbert was removed from the feretory to some other part of the church. *The secret of his present resting-place is confided successively to a select number of the English Benedictine monks, who have in their possession a plan of the Church, on which the exact spot is marked out.* Raine endeavours to shew that the tradition did not exist in the year 1722; but its date will be given in due course. A beautiful allusion to this tradition is made by Sir W. Scott:—

‘There, deep in Durham’s gothic shade,
His relics are in secret laid:
But none may know the place,
Save of his holiest servants three
Deep sworn to solemn secrecy,
Who share that wondrous grace.’—*Marmion.*

“The reader should bear in mind, that the existence of this tradition had been made known to the public many years before the opening of the vault in 1827. Bishop Milner, in a paper published in the *Archaeologia*, in 1809, gives the exact nature of the tradition. ‘We are informed,’ says he, ‘that some of the monks contrived to steal away the body, which they buried in a private place, yet so as to transmit the secret to some of their successors, to be communicated to others after them, as long as christianity should continue to be professed at Durham. Thus much I can say from my certain knowledge, that there are always three gentlemen of the Benedictine Order, who profess to know the identical spot at Durham where the body of St. Cuthbert rests, and who, as one of them dies, choose another to whom they impart the secret.’ ”

The illustrious historian of the Anglo-Saxon church also speaks of this tradition :

“There is a tradition to which formerly much credit was paid, that the monks, before their ejection, had substituted, by way of precaution, the body of some other person for that of St. Cuthbert, and had buried the latter in a distant part of the Church ; and the English Benedictine monks still preserve with secrecy an ancient plan of the building, in which the spot supposed to be the present resting-place of the body is distinctly marked.

“By making further inquiries into the history of this tradition, the author has ascertained from one of the Benedictines in possession of the secret : first, that it is not confined to three of the body, but is known by more ; secondly, that the traditions they possess are verbal, as well as by a plan of the Cathedral, and the two entirely coincide—the original plan on paper is in a very decayed state ; thirdly, that they do not hold this secret on oath.

“The manner in which the tradition has been handed down also deserves notice. Though the religious houses were suppressed, the English Benedictine monks still continued to exist after the Reformation. The order was kept up by Father S. Buckley, the last prior of Westminster, who effected the revival of the ancient English congregation of St. Benedict, by receiving into it, A.D. 1607, some English monks.

“This tradition, be it observed, does not state that the body of St. Cuthbert was not buried in the feretory in the year 1542, as the account of it in the *Archæologia* would seem to insinuate ; nor that the monks, before their suppression in 1540, had secreted the body ; but that, at some period after 1542, and before the time of Elizabeth, the body was taken out of the feretory and buried in another part of the Church. Hence Dr. Lingard very justly remarks : ‘If, then, any removal of the body took place, it must have been while the Catholic secular canons were in possession from that time till the reign of Elizabeth.’

“How far, then, as well as we can judge, is this tradition worthy of credit ? The author of the *Remarks* on Mr. Raine's discovery, adds the following note to page 43. ‘I have supposed that the body remained undisturbed in the grave from 1541 to 1827, because we have no proof to the contrary. But I am strongly inclined to give credit to that part of the tradition of the monks, which states that the body was taken out of the grave during the reign of Queen Mary. This will account for the opening in the masonry at the end of the vault, which opening was filled up with loose stones, a fact which proves that the grave had been opened previously to the investigation in 1827, and perhaps also for the mysterious disappearance of the linen sheet, the fragments of which Mr. Raine is sure he could have found if he had sought them.’

Another author has expressed his belief that the bones

discovered in 1827, were not the remains of St. Cuthbert. He adds, that some have thought they were the bones of the Venerable St. Bede; but to say that they were the bones of St. Cuthbert, "*assumes a fact which it is impossible to prove, and we believe to be erroneously stated.*"

"It may, perhaps, be considered presumption in the writer to give an opinion on this subject. However, *audax omnia perpeti*—he cannot refrain from penning what seems to him most probable. In the absence of sufficient positive and *a posteriori* evidence to settle the question, we may be allowed to argue *a priori*. It seems to be a question of what the then secularised monks *would* and *could* have done under the circumstances; for if they who had the safe keeping of the body of St. Cuthbert, had both wished and had it in their power to conceal his remains, we cannot doubt but that they would have done it, and handed down with jealous care the secret of their pious zeal.

"In the first place, looking at the question on its natural merits, *would* the Catholic canons have wished to preserve from violation the remains of their patron Saint? Our opinion is decidedly that they would. Their foundation charter, dated 12 May, 1541, made them members of the new Chapter; and *the same men who had been simple monks under Hugh Whitehead as Prior, became Prebendaries under the same man as Dean.* They still kept up the same reverence that had ever been entertained in their Church for St. Cuthbert. They knew well his dying wish, that his bones should never be left to fall into hostile hands; they knew that at intervals during 124 years their predecessors had journeyed over hill and dale, far and wide, to keep his body safe from the hands of the spoiler; and they had just seen his shrine violated by the Commissioners, its treasures stolen away, and the body treated with indignity. They would naturally dread a second visitation of the kind, and the signs of the times were not promising; they would doubtless wish to conceal his remains from the spoiler and the schismatic. But, in the second place, on the supposition of such having been their wish, had they the means of carrying it into execution? *Could* they have removed and concealed the body? This question is more easily answered in the affirmative than the former. Though the Prior and monks of Durham were deprived of their possessions on the 31st December, 1540, yet many of the same men were restored as members of the newly founded chapter. The foundation Charter, dated 12 May, 1541, made Hugh Whitehead, the late prior, dean; Roger Watson, the terrarius of the monastery, canon of the second stall; Thomas Sparke, the chamberlain, canon of the third stall; Stephen Marley, the sub-prior, canon of the sixth; Robert Bennet, the bursar, canon of the eleventh; and William Watson, *the feretrar, i. e., the very man who had the care of St. Cuthbert's body and shrine before the dissolution,* was made canon of the

twelfth stall. Surely, then, these men had it in their power to remove the body of St. Cuthbert to any part of the Cathedral they might wish. That this could readily have been done, must be allowed by any one at all conversant with the history of the times, which tells us how it fared with Durham Abbey in those days.

* * * * *

“The *a priori* evidence, then, may be supposed to favour the tradition, that the body of St. Cuthbert was removed from the feretory, and concealed in some other part of the church.

“In addition to this, let it be remembered that *the vault had been opened and entered* between 1542 and 1827. This is an *a posteriori* evidence in favour of the tradition of removal. ‘The upper course of masonry at the foot of the vault was composed of loose stones—a proof that an entry had already been made once at least since its construction.’ The object of this entry Lingard surmises to have been rather the wish to put something into the vault as a place of security, than to have taken anything out of it for greater security. He says: ‘But then many things were found in the coffin, which certainly were not there in 1104—such as the first skull and the bones already mentioned, a very valuable stole and two maniples, and a pectoral cross of gold, weighing 15 pennyweights and 12 grains. To me it seems probable that they were placed there by the Catholic prebendaries, who, aware of their approaching ejection in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, introduced into the tomb, as a place of security, the other relics of the Church, and the most valuable articles belonging to the feretory. The reader will recollect that the vault had already been entered, at least once, before it was opened in 1827.’

“The writer may here, with all due deference to the opinions of others, record his own opinion, viz.: that the coffin found in 1827 was the original coffin of St. Cuthbert; that *the skeleton found was not that of the Saint*; that the body of St. Cuthbert was removed by the men who had been Benedictine monks, though at the time they passed under the name of Secular Canons; that this removal took place probably during the reign of Queen Mary, (1553-58,) at any rate, between the years 1542 and 1558; that it is very possible that, at the time they removed the body, they erected the screen round the feretory, in order to disguise the removal; and that the body was removed in the linen cloth that was missing at the investigation of 1827.

“But whether the remains found in the vault, in 1827, were or were not the relics of St. Cuthbert, the question of the incorruption of the body down to 1537, is not thereby at all affected. If they

† We omit a passage in which the author proves by what occurred in Durham Abbey in 1569, how strong and universal was the attachment of the population at that time to the Catholic faith.

were his remains, and the fact ever comes to be fully substantiated, we should then venerate them no less than they were venerated when the body was whole; and we should come to the conclusion, that God, who never worked a miracle to confirm any religious belief but that of the holy Catholic Church, was unwilling that a miracle already worked should subsist, when the remains had fallen into the hands of schismatics.* If, as the writer believes, the remains of the sainted Bishop of Lindisfarne are still in safe keeping in another part of the Church, we may hope that his body is still incorrupt, and will be again, by Catholic hands, raised to a worthy shrine in the feretory. Such would be a day of joy, not only for those living on the patrimony of St. Cuthbert, but for all England, and the Catholic world. There is a tradition that this secret will be disclosed when England again becomes Catholic, and the cathedral shall again revert to Catholic hands. No doubt those that come after us will see the day when the honoured relics of the apostle of Northumbria, the British Thaumaturgus, will be brought from their hiding-place, and again raised with honour and pomp in their original shrine, before which the devout believer in the Communion of Saints will not be ashamed to kneel; and they will think of us and of the generations gone before them, and will, perhaps, make intercession for us, kneeling at that very shrine. In the meanwhile we may all pray, 'Deal favourably, O Lord, in thy good will, with Sion, that the walls of Jerusalem may be built up.' " (pp. 199-206.)

The third section of the second part of the History of St. Cuthbert, contains an account of the different monuments erected in honour of the Saint. I, Durham Cathedral: II, Lindisfarne Priory Church: III, Melrose Abbey Church: IV, other Churches built in honour of St. Cuthbert in Northumbria: V, Churches and chapels erected in his honour since the sixteenth century: VI, Sculptured monuments in honour of St. Cuthbert: VII, Pictured monuments of St. Cuthbert: VIII, Poems in honour of St. Cuthbert: IX, Personal relics of St. Cuthbert. This simple recital of the contents of this last portion of his labours, will suffice to show the zeal, the energy, and the research of the Very Reverend Author. The book is also illustrated with several maps, and regarding it as a

* Such, we may remark, is the opinion to which Bede gives expression, when narrating a miraculous circumstance in the life of St. Cuthbert: "Unde provida, ut dictum est, dispensatione supernæ pietatis, postquam fides credentium confirmata est, mox invidiæ perfidorum materia detrahendi est prorsus ablata." Vit. S. Cudberet, c. 23, § 39.

whole, we cannot but congratulate the Author and the Catholic world upon its publication. Monsignor Eyre has now, and for ever more, identified his name by his literary labours with the life and the virtues of St. Cuthbert. He has toiled as a priest and as a scholar, and in so doing, he has performed a great act of piety: "Laudes etiam divinæ attolluntur, dum ad exemplum fidelium, sanctorum merita ad memoriam revocantur."*

ART. VII.—1. *Report on Quarantine*, Presented to both Houses of Parliament. London, 1849.

2. *Report of the General Board of Health*, on the measures adopted for the execution of the Nuisances Removal, and Diseases Prevention Act, and the Public Health Act, up to July, 1849. London, 1849.

WHEN Swift, in his voyage to Laputa, described a nation of philosophers, the exaggeration was so manifest, that the real point may be said to have failed. Could he have foreseen, and described with his own matchless simplicity, what was to take place a hundred years later; the strangeness, the incredibility of what he wrote, would have been equally great, and his narrative would now read as a vision rather than a dream. Had he informed his readers that the sages of that country conversed by means of a wire at the distance of five hundred miles, with a perfect annihilation of all relations between time and space: that they dashed on at the rate of fifty (he might as well have said a hundred) miles an hour, drawn by a mechanical horse impelled by the same power as Sancho Panza's, and liable to the same little accident of blowing up: that the towns were not lighted by oil, or any adipose substance whatever, but by flames without wick, lamp or candle, coming up from under ground: that artists there made use of sunbeams, without the

* Conrad, Vit. S. Wolphem. Rolog. § 1. Act. Sanct. (April.) Vol. iii. p. 77.

necessity of bottling them, for drawing materials ; in fine, that noblemen of highest rank, and baronets of high degree, spent much time in detecting, analyzing, regulating, and utilising the perilous stuff that flows unsavoury in sewers ; we think he would have provoked more smiles of incredulity as to the possibility of such a nation's existence, than he has by any of his own excogitations.

The last half century has indeed distinguished itself, more than any other corresponding period in the world's history, by great and practical applications of science. In fact, every science may be said to have undergone a revolution within this space, and the new principles and powers which have been discovered, are becoming every day more and more the regulating, or motive agents of material existence. In Zoology, living and fossil, the researches of Cuvier, Lacepède, and Geoffroy de Saint-Hilaire ; in chemistry, organic and inorganic, the accurate observations of Liebig, Davy, and Faraday : in physiology, the *acute* experiments of Bell and Magendie ; in geology, the noble investigations of Humboldt ; in ethnography the scarcely inferior developments of his brother and the Schlegels : and in mechanics, the results of application of countless labourers, which may be said to equal the creation of a new science : these, and many other combining efforts, are justly thought to have worked a complete change in every department of scientific knowledge, and to place the first half of this our century, at the head of a new era, which (whether for the good or the evil of succeeding generations, time only will unfold) will scarcely leave any thing to the uncertainty of skill, or the chances of experiment. Every thing from henceforward, must be struck with the die, or cast in the mould, of science, must be predetermined by calculation, and created by a process.

In all this, the mechanical element, that is, the lowest of all the scientific powers, is prevailing, even to the contempt of every other. It is the constituent, dominant power of the age, its tyrant ; its restless, agitating, unsparing ruler. It embodies itself to our imagination (a faculty likely soon to be smiled out of existence amongst us, as much as in the sage island of Laputa) in the form of a huge engine, which sends its shafts along every stage of society, and its gear into every department of each, and keeps up a perpetual whirl, grating, and jarring, with a ceaseless worrit and fever in every head and mind : by its own monotonous uplifting

of its giant arms, sending every thing into every most opposite and conflicting motion; here pumping, and there draining; here lifting, and there ramming; here raising into air enormous iron tubes, that could have confined ten Titans, there drilling an eye through a needle which a microscopic insect could not creep through: here battering into a compact anchor-fluke a mass of iron which all the Cyclopes could not have lifted, and the very candescence of which would have burnt their eye out, there gently rivetting its head upon a pin; here violently twisting together the strands of an "endless" wire rope, there actually drawing through flame, without burning it, the thread scarcely thicker than the cobweb's, which has to weave the finest cambric; here voraciously lapping up the liquid mud of the streets, with its pebbles and brickbats, into a capacious stomach, there with patented mechanism uncorking the bottle of turtle-punch, to crown the civic duty of indigestion; here with the slow, deep, and monotonous burr of "the drum," producing nothing but wind, (though quite a gale of it,) there impelling the mighty ship to breast the towering billows, and face the storm in its very teeth: and then as subservient to intellect and to intelligence, here it whirls round every morning the cylinder inscribed all round like an ancient pillar, but here paradoxically with other "columns," and imparts to thousands of outspread sheets the indelible impression of the *Times*; there it sets in motion, for the comfort of one ingenious mechanic, in his humble quarters at Manchester, an escapement that lights his lamp, cooks his breakfast, awakes himself, and disturbs all his neighbours.

The scientific genius or Daimon (a letter here makes a great difference) pursues us into our domestic life, with an unwearying pertinacity. Your tailor advertises himself as "anatomical;" your shirt-maker as acting on "scientific principles;" towels are labelled in shop windows as "electrical," (we only wonder why eel-pies are not;) plasters, by a strange perversion, as "mechanical." And within doors, your foot-boy cannot any longer think of cleaning your knives, unless you procure "Kent's knife-cleaning machine," and your cook declares she cannot make your dinner without a cooking "apparatus." Every conceivable application of the lever, the spring, and hydraulic pressure has been made, to the very simple purpose of ascertaining the postage of a letter; and many a man who has

run it rather fine by clipping margins, and sparing wax, to keep his machine below the penny-stamp mark, has inflicted four-pence on his correspondent, simply because the post-office officials will stick to the old-fashioned, unscientific way, of weighing things by scales and weights, instead of by machines. Nay, we have seen the most wonderful little contrivances made, and probably "registered," if not sold, for attaining the desirable object of damping postage-stamps; whereby, having cut off your "queen's head," you place it in a box connected with a hydrostatic apparatus, which has previously to be supplied with water: then, by the application of leverage, proportioned to the operation, the apparatus aforesaid is pressed upon the gum of the stamp, and made to act upon it, affording the requisite degree of humectation: and, this accomplished, the box is opened, and the little penny bank-note is taken out ready for use; having gone through as much process as at the Bank transforms a bit of paper into £1000. Now we, not being given to mechanics, use a very unscientific mode of applying the stamp to the paper; and the contrast of the two methods powerfully reminds us of the old well-known story of the Frenchman, who sold powder for destroying insects, of the class called "industrious" among our shilling exhibitions. This was to be done by catching the delinquent, opening his mouth, and inserting the infallible poison. "Mais si je l'écrase?" asked an unscientific purchaser. "Ma foi," responded the vendor, "ça lui servirait également désagréable."

When a nation or an age gets upon a hobby, it is just in as much danger as an individual of riding it to death, or of breaking its own neck. This has happened before. The revival of classical literature in the fifteenth century, carried the age, through heathenism, into heresy. The scientific and mechanical mania of the present, may drive it into materialism, or, if one may coin a term, into *corporism*. We are not indeed going now to look at this higher moral view of the matter. But we think that a sensible observer will see that all the energy of inventive genius, so marvellously awakened in our time, is bent upon bettering the bodily condition of men, and increasing what is called their happiness, that is their comfort, their enjoyment, their complete contentment here below, to improve their animal existence, and multiply their sensations of corporeal pleasure. It is clear to any one that intellectuality, and ab-

stract truth are totally unheeded, and even contemptuously undervalued. We may truly say, that mental philosophy is almost wholly unknown and unthought of in England.

Who thinks of instructing "the people" about their souls, their minds, their ideas; their relations with another world? Who thinks of entertaining them about creation, a first cause, God, in fine? The mechanism of the body, the mode of preserving its health, the avoiding of excesses that hurt it, all this forms now the study of man; and when "mechanics' institutes," or "young mens' societies," have been well lectured on these subjects, and on sobriety, and other healthy virtues, it is thought that sound morality has been taught them. Let any one read the annual speeches which benevolent noblemen, and learned M. P.'s, and popular bishops make to such Institutes, in great manufacturing towns, and see if they aim at a higher object than that of proving that scientific pursuits will render their hearers good men: without any antidote being required for the deteriorating tendency, of all that binds men, beyond what their passions do, to earth. The bishop of Oxford, in one of these speeches to the middle classes, seemed actually to say, that the mechanical inventions of the present age stood in the place of the miracles of the early Church, as the *engine* for converting nations to christianity: that the missionary going out with the steam-engine to a savage tribe, would by it establish his intellectual superiority over its members, and consequently his right to be listened to: as though religion were only civilisation, and miracles only personal titles to human respect. And if moral and mental philosophy have ceased to be numbered among the sciences, or to be known even by name; surely the cultivation of the imagination, and the relish for poetry, are nearly as much despised and discouraged. In fact, we are in real danger of seeing the next generation brought up in the ideas of many of the present, that man is a machine, the soul is electricity, the affections magnetism; that life is a railroad, the world a share-market, and death a *terminus*.

The reason of all this is, we fear, too deep and too serious to be treated in an article, especially one so limited as it is in our power to give; and therefore we will confine ourselves to the danger that exists on all sides, of our resembling, yet more, the inhabitants of that sage philosophical country which constantly returns to our view, of

overlooking common-sense suggestions in our scientific, and certainly magnificent, designs. It is here that we think our forefathers, back to a very remote period, stand so advantageously before us : they could not do things so cleverly as we do, but they did them more completely ; their methods may have been less neat, and less according to principles of science, but they were effectual and durable. We undervalue their lessons, and make great improvements, as we think, upon them : but we certainly do not attain what they did, yet never suspect that there was wisdom in them that could compensate for their want of knowledge.

Let us take a very practical illustration. We are now deep in the preliminaries of a great sanitary movement ; one so gigantic that we have no faith in its being accomplished. It has been known for years that the quarters where the poor congregate in London, and perhaps in other large towns, were the closest, most filthy, most dilapidated, most unwholesome, most fever-haunted regions of the earth. There has been no end of visiting societies, tract-distributors, bible-readers, home-missionaries, in addition to local clergy, who have all been witnesses to this state of things. The Catholic priesthood, indeed, has been more intimately acquainted with this state of misery : but who ever thinks of consulting *them* upon any public matters, or employing them to furnish information, or suggest measures ? But now that cholera has paid us a second visit, and has not found our house swept and garnished, and therefore has quietly settled and made itself at home there, we are all in arms, and in alarms, for fear of a third call, and have loudly cried out for a change ; as though this state of things were of sudden growth, and all the cellars, courts, alleys, slums, bone and rag houses, and other unsavory dealings with offal, had suddenly sprung up, by a fungoid theory reduced to practice, and had not been long growing and strengthening, accumulating and concentrating, all their hideousness and pestilence, without the least notice or care on the part of the public. The poor had been suffering the penalties for years, and no one troubled himself : but the noxious nuisance has gone forth and assailed the rich, and the mischief has been enquired into. A complication of causes has been discovered, a terrible array of symptoms ; and remedies are being sought.

It is now discovered, as if for the first time in the world, that a great cattle market in the middle of the city is most unhealthy; that slaughter-houses are pest-houses; that cattle kept in cellars and close courts yield poison instead of milk, and carrion instead of meat; that bone-crushing, tallow-melting, fiddle-string manufacturing, hide-dressing, &c., are most ruinous trades to all but their pursuers; that church-yards swelled into embankments cannot long restrain the surging of death, which is pent up within them; that the mighty Thames is a huge ditch, and nothing better; that London is shockingly ill-drained, worse ventilated, and miserably supplied with water. These are all either simple truths or plain facts, which have been acknowledged for centuries, or known for years; but they take the public by surprise, especially because they come before it wrapped up in a haze of scientific preliminaries and deductions, which give the air of a grand discovery of the age. There are statistical details, occupying whole columns of newspapers, as to population and deaths, to establish the fact that more people die in a crowded neighbourhood near ill-buried carcasses, than in open squares; there are measurements of the mileage of sewerage existing, and calculations of the gallons or tons of materials that flow through them; there are all sorts of subterranean and subaqueous mysteries unveiled to the public in awful terms; as "noxious gases, decomposition, miasma, effluvium, subtle poison, animal substances, &c., &c.," and this is mixed up with disquisitions whether the principle of cholera be a mushroom or a fly, whether it be endemic or epidemic; till we are all delighted to think how scientific the age is, what an amount of research and knowledge is brought to bear upon an important question; at the same time that we stand aghast to find that we breathe infection, drink poison, eat corruption, and carry on our commerce through a fetid sewer, and luxuriate on white-bait taken out of a sink. Yet ages ago every continental city, in which there is a decent police, had banished unwholesome trades to a distance, especially the very ones mentioned; long ago abbatoirs were established outside the gates, with officers to inspect every joint that is for sale; and those wants which we so much deplore, were fully supplied in countries which we speak of as semi-barbarous.

To go a little more into detail; a scientific traveller will,

perhaps, sneer at the clumsy aqueducts which bring water to Constantinople; or a learned lecturer will describe the aqueducts of Rome, those stupendous monuments of ignorance of the laws of hydrostatics. "A child now knows," he would say, "that water finds its own level," (here he proves it by an inverted syphon,) "and had the conquerors of the ancient world possessed but the science of the reader of one of Pinnock's catechisms, they would have known, that they might have conducted the stream of water through pipes from the hills to Rome, and that it would have risen again to its original level, and so have been easily distributed over all the city. In this manner immense sums would have been saved. Similar evidence of ignorance will be found in the aqueducts of modern Rome, Cavesta, Cordova, &c. How great an advantage then do we possess over the greatest nations of former times in that science which is now so universally diffused, &c." Now for our parts, we should prefer to have the water universally diffused rather than the science. For it comes to this, that be the anciently known methods scientific or not, their application was at least directed by common sense. Those cities had everywhere an abundant supply of the only thing which becomes a luxury in proportion to its abundance. They had or have enough water for drinking, for washing, for baths, for irrigation, for water-power, for refreshment of the air and streets, and for waste; the poor and the rich had it equally, at home and abroad; not from pumps with padlocks, not from turncocks' daily measurement, but in ceaseless flow from jet and fountain, sparkling, and bubbling, and dancing in marble basins. The gigantic aqueduct, bestriding half a province to reach its destination, if not a scientific, was an efficient and a beneficent construction. *We* say, if *we* had to carry water twenty miles, we should do it much better; and in the mean time, we have to carry it, and we don't. Which is better, the good sense, which, seeing the importance of an abundant supply of good water, makes use of the best means which is known to obtain and convey it, or the science which scoffs at the method, boasts that it knows one a thousand times better, and yet wholly neglects to employ it? Now, if the two must be disjoined, we own that we prefer the former. But why should they be sundered? Why should not the sense of ancient times inspire and direct the science of the modern? We should not

then longer hear of the dreadful beverage of the poor in London; of water filtered through grave-yards, and tanked in impure reservoirs, fit neither for cleanliness nor for refreshment, and enough of itself to drive those doomed to it to the beer-shop or the gin-palace. Only here, where science boasts of her resources, is the supply to the metropolis of the first essential of health, at least, after fresh air, left to private speculation, and, consequently, placed beyond the reach of the poor. And even so, it has now been discovered, that even the water, which companies supply, by their scientific machinery, is insufficiently filtered, abounds with animalcules, and ought to be boiled or re-filtered at home, before being drunk. So much for the boast of what science could do, but does not; but which good sense was able to do without it.

It is only now that the scientific discovery is being made, that there ought to be in London and other great cities, a good supply of water, and that this cannot be so as to benefit the poor, so long as it costs several guineas a year per house. But this necessity we humbly, because unscientifically, think, ought to have long since shown itself another way. There is no topic become more familiar to the public of late than that of drainage. In the country it has become almost as fashionable a pursuit for gentlemen, as preserving game and shooting it. But in town, it is the anxious occupation of noble and gentle commissioners, backed by a staff of engineers and scientific men. In fact, it is become a science, and all manner of experiments, we read, are being made in it. Yet in spite of all our proficiency in the art, and of our many resources, it is acknowledged that nothing can be fouler than the sewerage of London, that through the gratings lately opened into them, in obedience to some law of science, there comes forth a most noisome and poisonous vapour, and that, melancholy to relate, five persons fell victims in one day this year, to the pestilential breath of one of these scientific receptacles. Here again is one almost deluded into fancying, that we have fallen upon quite a modern discovery, and that no one dreamt of the importance to health of this expedient, or knew how to accomplish it till modern science taught its rules. Yet scarcely had Rome been settled by the squatters from neighbouring tribes, scarcely had she begun to take the forms of a government, when the drainage of the city was known to be of primary importance,

and the *Cloaca maxima*, (the very name of which proves that it was only the main sewer into which greater and lesser drains ran), was built by royal direction, and became a monument of Roman greatness. Now we are tempted to imagine the old king who built it called, in his shade, before a Committee of either house on the subject of sewers, and drainage, and to hear, in fancy, the strange unphilosophical answers which the rude Etruscan would make. They might run thus:—

* * *

“1259. By Mr. Bore. Of what materials was your sewer constructed? Entirely of stone.

“1260. Bound no doubt by *Roman* cement? No, by no cement. I got huge stones half as long as myself. I brought them fifteen miles from the Alban hills, and I made a solid self-supporting vault, which you may see yet standing at Rome.

“1261. What engineers or scientific men directed the work? None but myself. We did not know much about such learned things in those days; we were plain people with a little common sense, and managed the matter by ourselves. I had plenty of good, strong, and willing fellows to labour under me, so we set to work and managed it very easily.

“1262. By what instruments did you take your levels, and determine your fall? I do not much understand you, but if I do, I can only say by my eye, and a careful inspection of the natural lie of the ground. You will, of course, remember that we, in our simplicity, made our drains before we built, as we had not science enough to wait till all the ground was covered with buildings, and then take levels above them, and make drains under them.

“1263. What system of trapping did you follow? I do not understand you.

“1264. What was your plan of flushing? I do not comprehend you.

“1265. What disinfecting agents did you use when your sewer had to be cleared and repaired? None.

“1266. Were not lives lost on such occasions? No: and for one good reason, it never required either. I built it large, and lofty, and solid, from the beginning. Men had not to crawl on all fours through it. Mæcenas went down it, in a boat mind you, and found it clear, savcury, and after six-hundred years, in thorough repair.

“1267. How could a boat float in the garbage and mud of a sewer? The purpose of a sewer is not to contain these things, but to carry them off. Mine was so constructed as to do this.

“1268. By Mr. Sense. How was this effected? By a plentiful supply of fresh water to the city, which, running all day and night

through fountains, and public reservoirs, and so into the drains, keep up a constant, powerful, living stream, which diluted all impurities that entered in, and carried them at once out, without suffering them to stagnate, obstruct, and ferment.

“1269. Then you think no drainage can be complete without a perpetual flow of fresh water into a town? No more than in the animal economy, the impure blood will be propelled forward without fresh blood being sent into the vessels. To think of purifying a sewer by driving through it accumulated impurities may be more scientific, but we preferred the more simple and natural mode suggested by our common sense.

“1270. Only one question more. You made the Tiber your main receptacle into which all your sewage flowed. Did this not tend to pollute and infect the stream? No: because, first, we had no tide in it, but a rapid current to the sea; and secondly, I took care to carry my sewer into Velabrum, below the inhabited bank.”

We are of opinion therefore, that we are beginning at the wrong end, in scheming how to expel without providing an expellent power. We must bring in what is wholesome, if we wish to displace what is noxious. Liquids act differently from solids. The latter must be clean removed for others to occupy their place. The former will themselves displace, if exit be allowed to what is before them. This is the principle to be followed, with water as well as with air. Introduce a current of fresh air, and under proper arrangements it will purify, not by dilution, but by expulsion. The same ought to be done in drainage, and there will be a double gain.

There is one author, who, on all occasions brings sound sense to bear on his scientific researches, and again makes science carry out the suggestions of sense. We allude to Dr. Arnott. His theories on the subject of ventilation to which we have just alluded, are simple, intelligible to any sensible person, while they will bear the test of any scientific examination. His methods too, of attaining his proposed object partake of the same advantage: their very ingenuity consists of their simplicity. A letter which he has lately published, of scarcely a column in the *Times*, contains all that is worth knowing on the subject of ventilation; and another short paper by him in one of the publications before us,* applies the principles of this subject to ships. When one considers the lavish expenditure, or rather the waste, of public money consumed in

* Report on Quarantine. p. 144.

Dr. Reid's experiments for the ventilating and warming the Houses of Parliament, when one hears of the expense gone to in trying various methods, in barracks hospitals, churches, and other public buildings, one is really tempted to exclaim, that modern science, when it comes to deal with plain and ordinary things, is little better than empiricism, not to use the more expressive term—humbug. The fact is, that such experiments and new methods proceed upon no principle whatever, and generally seek to combine conveniences or advantages that are incompatible. Science tells us most truly, that animal life is kept up at the expense of what is necessary for itself. If we did nothing but eat, and did nothing to produce food, or if nature did not take this duty into her own hands, of course we should starve. And in like manner every breath robs the air of a portion of that ingredient which is necessary for vital respiration, and surcharges it with an additional quantity of deleterious matter. It is clear, therefore, that if the process be repeated again and again upon the same bulk of atmosphere, this becomes more and more unsuited to life, and at length is perfectly a poison. Another breath of it, and it kills. When, therefore, a multitude is assembled together, as at a meeting of the Protestant Association in Exeter Hall, all breathing away at a furious rate, and all the harder Popery is hit, and the louder they shout against Maynooth, those good gentlemen little think in how many ways they are tainting the air about them, and poisoning one another. Among other modes this is one; that a number of persons are pumping oxygen out of the same portion of atmosphere, and of course the more pumps, the quicker the exhaustion. They therefore go home with a bad head-ache, and a deteriorated appetite, unable to distinguish whether these mischiefs proceed from Mr. Stowel's speeches, their own cheering, or—the *closeness* of the room. This last, and almost instinctive expression, hits at once the remedy. The room must be opened somewhere, and here begins the theory or practice of ventilation. You open a window, but the bald head of an elderly gentleman near it, tells him, and he tells the assembly, that cold air is actually raining on his pate with a copiousness and steadiness of supply, which must effectually preclude all exit to the foul air. It is like a crowd rushing into a building, and making it impossible for another to come out. The two get jammed together; and so the good air, only at most,

dilutes the bad ; but in reality it obeys a certain law of currents, plagues dozens of people, who beg to have that window shut, or they will infallibly take cold. And thus the alternative is between suffocation and rheumatism. An Englishman has an instinctive horror of draughts, that is, of air : and he insists on ventilation on the following bases. First, the foul air must be got out of the room. Secondly, no fresh air must be felt or known to come in. Thirdly, the room must not be made cold by the influx of the external air. To effect all this, has been the object of the expensive experiments alluded to : and the labour has proved vain. Dr. Arnott has put efficient methods within the reach of every one. The breathed air rises necessarily to the top of the room, and can only be got out there. By his ventilator, it has a passage into the chimney, where the natural draught being outwards, instead of inwards, as at the window, the deleterious atmosphere finds a vent. This being the case, the quantity of air that finds its way through doors and windows suffices to establish a current, the course of this being no longer entirely towards the chimney, but wherever the air in the room yields, by having an exit. And as the rarified air forms the upper stratum, this is most easily impelled by the elastic pressure from below, and is driven out.

But Dr. Arnott's simple invention does not stop here. Where many breathers are collected together, as in a church, a school, or a workshop, the ingress of fresh air will not be proportionate to the consumption, and an artificial impulse is necessary. This he has effected by means of a pump ; the more easy and simple one of two, being the swing-pump, a simple machine which may be made by any packing-case maker, at the cost of thirty shillings. A boy may work it, and draw off the foul air, for which, of course, an equal quantity of fresh air is necessarily substituted. Further, where it is advisable to keep an even temperature, as in the Brampton consumption hospital, and in barracks, where fires are inconvenient, the pump, worked by steam, propels exactly the given quantity of fresh air required by the inmates of the place, but warmed to an even temperature, by first passing between hollow copper plates, or leaves, filled with hot water. And thus, ventilation and warmth are combined, by the most simple means, and without any great expense.

This problem of comfort is a most difficult one to solve.

We wish to make the very laws of nature bend to our convenience. We insist upon every thing being made perfect; every window must be air-tight, every door must close hermetically, and perhaps be made double; a series of outposts in the shape of doors at the end of every passage, guard our apartments from the intrusion of a breath of exterior air, even if the street door open; every corner and cranny is explored, and every crevice is puttied or pasted over, through which we are sure to feel a draught, and then we complain that our chimney smokes, and that our room is excessively close. Even the abode of royalty has not been exempt from this curse of smoky chimneys, because every thing was too well made; and it was found necessary to admit draughts, in order to cure it. With all our science, or rather with too much science, we have not yet learnt a remedy for this most domestic of all plagues. Year after year you will see a model, or perhaps more than one, in the Polytechnic, of some chimney top, which infallibly prevents smoke. There is a lecture upon it; which gives a theory, no doubt most scientific, and based on sound principles, showing why every other plan has failed, and why this *must* succeed. Then comes the experiment of a baby house filled with smoke, which, by the action of the chimney, is miraculously cleared out. And yet unhappily the real nuisance remains unabated, and the beautiful theory fails utterly in practice. Now this again, to our minds, arises mainly from the same fault, of our wishing to bring nature's public arrangements to give way to our domestic ones. She has legislated on a large scale, and made the laws of currents, as yet mysterious and almost hidden, to rule the grandest and most awful phenomena of her kingdom—the storm, the hurricane, the tornado, the simoon, the trade-wind, the land-breeze, and the poetical zephyr, are all so many results and exponents of her laws, so many data by which their theory is to be constructed. But we expect them all to obey the superior law of comfort; we insist upon constructing our flues and chimneys and fire-places according to certain fashions, and rules of architecture, or in compliance with certain ideas of skill; and then we insist that dame Nature shall come into our views, and not presume to put her mandates in opposition to ours. One complains of the nasty east wind, because it always makes his chimney smoke; another cannot understand how the north wind should always drive a down-

draught, with its denigrating consequences, into his drawing-room.

Now let us consider how we set about, first defying the winds, and then trying to battle with them. One of the first things that a modern builder must take care about, is how he stacks his chimneys. Look at the gable of an unfinished row of London houses, you see it completely scored with white lines from top to bottom, making every sort of curve and meander, two always running parallel. These are the channels of all the chimneys of the next house, the courses traced out whereby the streams of smoke shall flow, till they discharge themselves into their native element, the superincumbent ocean of fog. Here is the builder's science. It does not consist in seeing how the natural laws of air in motion will act, and how under any, or every, given circumstance, the chimneys will have draught; that is not his concern. All that he has to think of is, how, by hook or by crook, he can get the whole of the flues into one wall, and get the mouth of each into the level line of chimney tops which must run fore and aft between two roofs. Or if the house be a square, detached, residence, as it is called, the owner probably insists that there shall be but one stack in the middle; and flues are sometimes carried round three sides of a room, to get them into the right channel. Ask the builder if it will not smoke. That is not his business, he has only to look to the neatness of the building; the disfiguring process which ensues does not come into his first contract. It will form a future bill. It amuses us, occasionally, to see the sort of vegetation, or growth, to which these domestic appendages are infallibly subject. One of the earliest demonstrations that one of these new terrace houses has been let, consists in seeing an additional chimney-pot on the top of two or three of the original ones. When once this first sprout has made its appearance, a rapid growth takes place. Soon, a tall pipe is seen to protrude, then this puts out horizontal arms at the top, without any head, a sort of fuliginous scare-crow turning round in the wind. Then these arms get elbows, and send forth shoots. Next comes perhaps a head with a sort of vizor, swinging about very sharply and angrily at every puff of wind, like a testy knight-errant in armour, (a figure that would make a most elegant chimney-pipe;) and then perhaps the whole, always rising in height, is crowned with a hood and feather, or arrow, or

vane, as if to put a finish to the work of modern constructive science. Any one walking the streets of London, or rather passing over them on a railway, will be amazed at the ingenious variety of these contrivances. Every imaginable bend, twist, curve, knee and joint, every conceivable head-piece, every possible position for the exit of smoke, every unnatural inclination and deviation from the perpendicular will be found in this absurd mode of remedying a systematically propagated evil: till even the old telegraph, with its mountebank motions, could not have rivalled their strange postures. Now the architect when he planned the house, and the builder when he erected it, and the tenant when he took it, were all quite assured that it must come to this: they knew that these hideous excrescences would and must necessarily spring up. But they were necessary consequences of a system, of the orthodox established mode of co-ordinating chimneys; shops and warehouses were awaiting the coming and certain crisis, full of these fanciful shapes, all ready to be exalted to the house-top. It is not an accident in house-building, that they should mount thither; it is a foreseen, and calculated, fact. It is a part of architectural science to overlook totally the real object of a chimney, which is to carry out the smoke, provided it will only carry out the design of a neat symmetrical building.

Now abroad they have not yet become so scientific, and consequently they are not plagued near as much with smoky chimneys. The old architects also, whether of the middle ages or of the *renaissance*, did not put themselves much out of the way to procure a great confluence of smokes. If two or three flues happened to be near, they grouped their tall and elegant chimneys together. But if not, they allowed them to run straight up, and each to smoke most independently. They had not need to trouble themselves in the old days, about want of draught to send the smoke up their capacious chimneys. The great hall, in which the fire blazed, often opened straight into the air, and the massive oak planks and iron hinges of its door, fastened to the stone door-posts, did not allow a very close fit. The window casements too, permitted a pretty free admission of pure air. But as the piled-up wood sparkled, and crackled, and the blaze roared up the chimney, it lit up the beaming faces of men clad in good leathern jerkins, with perhaps hooded coats, the best security against

draughts, and dames snugly wrapped in honest linsey-woolsey of home-spun solidity. They took a common sense view of these domestic arrangements; they did not pretend to have the theory of atmospheric currents, and therefore they submitted to them. They took the straightforward way about things; they sent out their smoke by the shortest road, and run their chance, much the best one, of being right; they had a brighter fire and less smoke by not being over careful to exclude air; and they protected themselves against its damaging influence by substantial clothing. They lived a cheerful race, they reached a good old age, without much influenza or much physic; and we do not believe that their discomforts were greater than ours, although they knew so little of science.

What we have just said brings before us another branch of modern science, which we fear may easily invade our personal, more than our domestic interests. We trust that the day may be very far distant, when man will be subject to a thoroughly scientific treatment. And yet we see symptoms of an approach to such a plan. There was a time when man, the animal, was supposed to be composed of certain visible substances, some solid and some liquid, which assumed certain definite forms, and performed obvious functions. Our old physiologists were content with considering his body as consisting of bone, cartilage, membrane, muscle, and so forth; and as containing blood, bile, lymph, and a variety of other fluids and juices. He lived exceedingly well under that theory, and died in his good time, dosed and doctored according to rules conformable to it. But by degrees he was more accurately studied, and science, instead of anatomising, set to analysing him; in place of examining what he might be cut up into, it was investigated what he might be boiled down to. It was discovered that this complicated body of his was only composed of three organic substances, gelatine, fibrine, and albumen. And as though he had not been yet reduced sufficiently low, he was proved to be only a collection of chemicals, and those three components are shown to be nothing more than three gases, oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen, combined with one poor solid, carbon. So true it is, that when this mortal frame of ours is dissolved, and all the gaseous portion of us melts into thin air, ashes literally alone remain—dust and ashes! These discoveries are exceedingly interesting, and very important; but we own

we dread their becoming too much the basis of "treatment" in sickness and in health. However true the theory, and none can doubt it, we should abhor almost as much as a return to the old theory of humours, to see poor humanity handled upon the basis of its constituent elements, and either its medicines or its food regulated on the principle of establishing a proper equilibrium among its simple constituents. The sense of nature would be contrary to such a science. In the first visitation of cholera, it was decided by some theorists, that the disorder arose from a deficiency in one of the ingredients of the blood, and the direct course was adopted of communicating it to the circulation. Now nature never takes up substances pure, but loves to elaborate them after her own fashion. There is iron in the blood, but no one supposes that the application of cold steel to the pores of the face each morning, or the occasional handling of the fire-irons in the day, exercises the slightest influence on the appropriation of this metal by the system. Whether in the gold regions of the west, or amidst the sands of Africa, our veins will find their colour, though the miner may not find a single vein of that metal in the entire continent. And our little "Kosmos" contrives to make its chalk formation in the joints of the gouty, out of port-wine and highly seasoned viands, without the aid of London milk: for, we believe, it is agreed by geologists, that the "London basin" contains a considerable chalk deposit. Nature thus has her own roundabout way of getting what she wants; and does not like to have it forced upon her. We must not give her the flour ready made and sifted: she would rather have the corn, and be left to grind it in her own mill, and work it up according to her own processes, into whatever she needs. While, therefore, there is a tendency in physiological and medical pursuits to deal too intimately with her powers, and endeavour to shorten her operations, we cannot but fear that this may lead to rash systems, and dangerous results. Good sense would suggest, that the great aim of all sanitary treatment, and medical investigation, should be, by the one, to endeavour to stimulate nature's own powers, and, by the other, to discover how this can be done. To second and to regulate her own efforts to retain or recover her normal condition, is the rightful, sensible, and noblest purpose of true science.

- In many points we may sincerely congratulate ourselves on the triumph of good sense over false science; and in no department more than in these pursuits. Why do we now see so few crippled and distorted limbs, so few deformed frames, compared with what used to be? No doubt, because we have abandoned all scientific ways of swathing, bandaging, and tying up children: we have learnt to let them grow up to a certain age as "noble savages," with free limbs, and copious applications of cold air and cold water to them; in other words, *mother-wit*, which is instinctive common sense, has been allowed to take the place of learned theory. Our forefathers used to consider a periodical blood-letting quite essential to health: it was most scientifically proved essential to it. Common sense has prevailed; and the lancet is scarcely known to thousands, except as the title of a newspaper, or an advertising appellation of a new razor. The same good sense has ruled us in other matters, especially as to clothing; though not as yet to the extent to which it should. However, the move is in the right direction, towards the free and easy. The arteries are becoming every year less compressed, the joints less hampered, the body less straitened, the pores less closed, the neck less strangled, and the head less bound. Even the hat and the wig are getting furnished with ventilating apparatuses; so that the two most unnatural of all outward accoutrements have become comparatively innocuous. Let us however draw our crude remarks to a close.

A strange year is this which is just closing upon us, and upon the century; leaving us but one more—its jubilee year, to finish its first half with better auguries for the next half, than we see surround us now. It appears as if the present year had been sent to humble our pride, and baffle our skill, and confound our science. It has made the high-born, and the daintily bred familiar with thoughts and sounds, and sights, from which they would have before shrunk with horror. During it, the bills of mortality were grasped, each morning, with trembling hand, and the number of yesterday's dead was counted, and scored against the preceding day's, and the catalogue of loathsome diseases was scanned and analyzed. Men then cared somewhat for how many poor died, and longed to see the ebb set in, in that tide of mortality. For the surge washed up to the very door of the rich, and thun-

dered against the dams which wealth had raised between itself and the ills of poverty. The earth seems to have yawned before us, and disclosed its unholy mysteries. We have been led by the hand through its dark alleys, and taught to mark and note each foul thing that creeps or floats through them, down slowly to the poisoned bed of the river. We have been discoursed to of the reeking pestilence that exhales from the surface of those subterraneous streams, and have been lectured on the fatal elements that compose it, till we believed we were living over a mine ready charged, and only awaiting some signal to explode, and scatter all living things in irretrievable destruction. We have seen the graves swelling and writhing with the life of corruption, as though in the throes of a new plague-birth; the black soil from the church yard's side, oozing into the dwellings of the poor, its liquid drainings trickling into their wells; its subtle vapour stealing into their windows; and grave opening into grave, the recent dead falling into the embrace of ripe and rank corruption, steaming upwards to earth, through the opened avenue. And through all this loathsome subsoil, these dregs and offscourings of earth's mortal things, there run glittering veins of liquid metal, as though escaping from the spoils of death. And what do they prove to be? Not gold from those who, with one hand, wash the sands of California's Pactolian streams, and with the other hold the ready steel; but whom a more daring hunter after gold has surprised with the rifle, not till after the metal had ingrained itself into their pores. Not silver from the spoiler of temples, or sanctuaries, whom human or divine vengeance has overtaken in the south, and who, like Achan, has perished and been consumed with his ill-gotten wealth about him. No: it is the poisonous metal from the corpses, of infants whom their mother has slain, of husbands whom their wives have coolly murdered, which even the grave in its corruption has retained; destroying all but the destroyer, consuming the victim, yet holding fast the witness to the foul deed. Such indeed has wise, philosophical England disclosed to wandering nations, this year in rank abundance. And from such a soil what has grown and flourished? The gallows-tree more laden with the fruits of vicious, irreligious times than ever before; with a heavier growth of depravity, with more desperate, fiendish crime than a generation has seen. And round its foot our

populace was dancing as at an orgy, making merry at its lessons. Surely then we have much to do, much to amend, which scientific instruction will not effect. We have moral teaching, moral training to give the people, which we are in danger of forgetting, while we are making them content with more worldly and philosophising thoughts.

May the rest of the century be as successful in this first pursuit, as the past portion has been in the second. And thus may a just balance be established; and a satisfactory arbitration be made in the great cause of Sense v. Science.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*A Christmas Gift for Thoughtful People; or Reflections suggested by the Present State of Religious Parties in England.* Burns, Portman St., 1849.

This is a most valuable pamphlet; would that its name might procure it a welcome wherever Christmas is honoured in this our dear and blinded country. This we can truly say, that whoever desires a memento for some "thoughtful" and amiable protestant society, in which he takes warm interest, may safely send them this pamphlet. It is written by a convert, one who knows Protestants well, and has addressed himself with peculiar tact to the various phases of their bigotry, indifference, and specious self-applauding delusions; and he presents to them Catholic truths in their most elevated and thoughtful aspect; Catholics themselves will not read without delight his commentary upon, and enforcement of, the beautiful fitness of the holy service of the Mass.

II.—*The Way to Heaven: a Manual of Devotion*, by the Very Rev. John Baptist Pagani. London; Burns, 17, Portman St.

The first part of this Manual consists in an exhortation to prayer, together with the most solid instructions upon the method of prayer, the advantages to be gained, and the dangers to be avoided therein; written with all the unction that might be expected from the venerable author: in the same spirit follows a treatise upon the Mass, and upon the sacraments of confession and communion; and

after these admirable instructions, the Christian is assisted by a choice collection of prayers, short litanies, and aspirations to the B. Sacrament, to the Sacred Heart, to the passion of our Lord, and to our Blessed Lady. We cannot doubt that we have said enough to give to all Catholics a high idea of the value of this prayer-book.

III.—*The Lives of Father Joseph Anchieta, of the Society of Jesus; The Ven. Alvera Von Virmundt, Religious of the Order of the Holy Sepulchre; The Ven. John Berchmans, of the Society of Jesus.* London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1849.

Two of the three great saints whose lives are recorded in this volume, are of the illustrious Society of Jesus; in almost every other respect their lives were different. The one, Father Joseph Anchieta, became early in life deformed; he was nevertheless sent to the Brazils in 1553, and there, amidst war, wretchedness, and crime beyond description, lived to a venerable age, in the arduous career of a missionary, as illustrious for his miracles as for his virtues;—the other, the Venerable John Berchmans, was a beautiful youth, who never left the walls of his college, where he died at the age of 22, the very flower and model of novices, but in whom God was pleased to show forth no wonders, except his miraculous innocence and devotion; as if to show that these were indeed a glory which none other could surpass. Most interesting it is to observe the workings of the same Spirit, in lives so otherwise contrasted. The life of the venerable nun, Alvera von Virmundt, is shorter, yet nothing seems wanting in it for edification.

IV.—*The Church's Holy-days the only Safeguard against the Desecration of the Lord's Day,* by WILLIAM GRAPEL, B.A. London: Masters, 1848.

The obvious truth set forth in the title, is clearly and well enforced in this little pamphlet: excellent *as far as it goes.*

INDEX TO VOLUME TWENTY-SEVEN.

- Advertisement*, at present locomotive, 148—
their composition, 149—of the use of foreign
languages, 154—avail themselves of poetry,
156—to supersede the precious metals, 158—
ancient advertisements, 159—literary, 161—
ior. absent relatives, 162.
- Agitation* Irish, revival of it in its different
forms, 478.
- Alcock*, Rev. Mr., his testimony to the difficul-
ties of the poor fishermen, 425.
- Alfred* King, particulars of his life, 133.
- America*, first discovered by Greenland colo-
nists, 44.
- Anglesea*, Lord, his plan for the reduction of
of the Irish Church, 501.
- Ardagh*, Dean of, his speech concerning Dolly's
Brae, 487.
- Are*, Marson, 41.
- Ate*, Thorgilson.
- Argyll*, Duke of, his letter to the Peers, 432
—his ecclesiastical history, 432—mistatement
as to the reformers, 436—commencement of
their struggle with the Episcopacy, 446—
intriguing of James VI., 448—description of
Charles's visit to Scotland, 450—his obser-
vations on the king's death, 456—his descrip-
tion of the episcopal Church of Scotland, 459
—his theory concerning the Presbytery, 460
—his view of the new converts, 463—refuted
some of the Anglican pretensions, 466—vin-
dication of the Free Church, 467.
- Arnald*, first bishop in Greenland, 62—anecdote
of ibid obtains a vessel and goods, 62—
wicked conduct, 64.
- Arne* Magnussen, Icelandic MSS., collected by
him, 37.
- Arnott*, Dr., on ventilation, 538.
- Aqueducts*, 535.
- Aude*, anecdote of, 45.
- Audun*, 58.
- Aytoun*, Professor, 74—his lays, 77—specimen
78, 84, 85, 89.
- Ballot*, the, 75.
- Baptism*, 309—Catholic compared with Protest-
ant, 318.
- Bedford* Level, 401, 408.
- Bible*, deficiency of works requisite for the
study of it, 183—inferiority of Protestant
writers on the subject, 183.
- Bible*, reasons why the critical study of it is
desirable, 292—interest of the science, 293—
conducive to a better appreciation of its
value, 297.
- Bjorn* Einarsen, his travels, 40.
- Blanc* Louis, 104.
- Bonner*, Bishop, 29-32.
- Books*, notices of, 226.
- Buonaparte*, Louis, his election, 115—his min-
istry, 116.
- Burnet*, Bishop, his account of an irreverent
transaction, 16.
- Careless*, John, his untruth, 11.
- Catholics*, persecution of them in Scotland, 437.
- Centralization*, 112.
- Charles* I., his visit to Scotland, 450—insists
upon the use of the liturgy, 453.
- Christ*, his discourses, 190—illustrations, 193—
his description of his own teaching, 195—
why he and not the apostles taught with
parables, 197—authority of his teaching, 216.
—His presence in His Church, 343.
- Church*, the, her assailants, 100—necessity for
her complete emancipation, 119.
—the, her former position in England,
163—her present prospects, 165—instruments
now at her command, 168—can afford to
yield, 170—use of national languages, 171—
images given of her in the parables, 209.
—of England in Ireland, disproportion of
her revenues and population, 499—should be
abolished, 500—nothing as yet done to that
purpose, 500.
—the, best method of providing for the
temporal necessities of, 268—her great defi-
ciencies in this respect, 270—benefits con-
ferred by the Church upon society, 273—
duty of the laity to give liberally to, 287—
diversified miracles of grace worked in the
Church, 341.
—episcopal of Scotland, 431—form of
Scotch polity, 445—its contest with the
Reformers, 453—its re-establishment after
the Restoration, 457.
—of England in Ireland, how it should
be dealt with, 416.
- Churches* ruins of, found in Greenland, 69.
- Clarendon* Lord, charge made against him by
the Orangemen, 490.
—his denial of the Orange charges
against him, 496—justified in holding com-
munication with Orangemen, 497.
- Clergy* of the Church of England, their duties,
271—compared with those of Catholic Priests,
278—Protestant clergy in Ireland, 414—their
condition much to be pitied, 418—Scotch
Episcopal, riddled out of their livings, 459.

- Cloncurry, Lord*, 475.
Corporation of London, 393.
Croyland, Monastery of, 139.
Cuba, Island of, Conspiracy now organizing there, 123.
Cuthbert St., 512—his miracles, as recorded by V. Bede, 515, 516—whether by birth an Irishman, 519—his appearance, 520—his body continuing entire, 521.
Deacons, institution of, 333.
Delabr. Anthony, his untruth, 9.
Dolly's Bæ Massacre, 484.
- Einar sent from Greenland to obtain a bishop*, 61.
Emancipation of the French Commune and municipality from the centre of the Metropolis, 110.
Emigration, effects of it in Ireland, 358.
Encumbered Estates commission, 384.
Endowments for the Church, necessity of, 284.
Erick Rauda, 43—settles in Greenland, 43.
Eucharist, the most Blessed, 335, 339—conversions effected by His divine presence, 340.
Extreme unction, 334.
Eyrbyggja Saga, 49.
Eyre, Monsignor, his work on St. Cuthbert, 512—error in it, 518.
- Fetty, John*, his history, 28.
Fisheries in Ireland, 425—at Ring, 426—restrictions upon them. 429—conduct of Irish members upon the subject, 429.
Fox, his misrepresentation, 25, 27.
France, her past and present condition compared, 111—her present state, 119.
- Glencoe, massacre of*, 87.
Grace, its sacramental action, 305.
Greene, Thomas, his untruth, 10.
Greenland, 35—its extinct colonies, 35, 38—sketch of its history, 36, 43—it name, 42.—introduction there of Christianity, 44—establishment of the first bishop, 61—blow struck at its commercial prosperity, 67—collection of Briefs, &c., relating to it, 67—fate of the colonists, 69.
Gunnbjorn's Skjaer,
- Henry VIII.*, his religious opinions, 28.
Herjulf, 43.
History, Catholic, of England, 128—merits of the plans, 131—extracts, 133.
Hymns, by F. Faber, 172.
- Ingesmund, death of the priest*, 65.
Invasion, Danish, particulars of, 139—was not passively endured by the Anglo-Saxons, 141.
Ireland, her condition, 351—effect of the poor laws there, 360—desirable that the land should be sold to pay them, 395—land daily going out of cultivation, 410—registry of land recommended, 421—who are her real enemies, 422—oppressive restrictions, 427—misery of her people, 470, 477—misgovernment of, 472—destitute of public opinion, 475.—Parliament bound to interfere on behalf of its moral population, 501.
Irish, their moral virtues, 475—history of English misgovernment of them, 477.
- James VI., King*, intrigues against the Presbyterians, 418.
Jews, their teaching, 196.
Journalists of Paris, their conference, 109.
Joye, George, his untruth, 8.
- Kakortok, church of*, 72.
- Kennedy, Captain*, his letter, 494
Kenrick, Bishop, his translation of the Vulgate, 181.
Knox, extract from his 'Blast, &c.', 19.
- Laing, Mr.*, his falsifications on the subject of Anglo-Saxon Literature, 142.
Lamartine, 102.
Land, condition and value of in Ireland, 502—in Connaught, 505.
Landlords in Ireland, their legislation, 350—their intense selfishness, 356—their interest alone the object of last Session, 363—laws passed for their benefit, 364—management of their property, 370—its enormous costs and difficulties, 374—small securities they have allowed to tenants, 372.—have prevented the sale of land for poor rates, by interposing Chancery suits, 397—are the real enemies of Ireland, 422—in England also selfish in their legislation, 424.—Irish, desire to get rid of the poor laws and the poor, 503—efforts to keep up their rents, 505—proposed plan for arbitration between them and their tenants, 506.
Law, Common, 380—Bankrupt, 384—concerning poor rates on the Bedford Level, 401—should not be changed, 411.
Lezarus, 331.
Ledru Rollin, 103.
Leif, his conversion, 47.
Leprosy an emblem of sin, 324.
Lig Lodin, extracts from his history, 59.
Literature of the Anglo-Saxons, 142.
Lodge, Grand Orange, their charge against Lord Clarendon, 491—complete refutation of it, 494.
Longford, Dr., his evidence, 395.
Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland should be abolished, 419.
Lucan, Lord, his extortionate rents, 504.
- Madden, Dr.*, extract from his work on Cuba, 124.
Maitland, S. R., his essays, I—upon the circumstances of the Reformation, 3—their learning, 5—upon Puritan veracity, 7—upon Puritan style, 13—his exposure of frauds, 24—essays upon Bonner, 29.
Manuscript of the Bible, 293.
Members of Parliament, Irish, their conduct, 425—oppose the taking off restrictions upon fisheries, 429.
Ministers of the Church of Scotland, 460.
Miracles, our Saviour's, to be considered in three points of view, 300—as important lessons, 302—forming counterparts to His parables, 302—miracles typifying greater marvels than themselves, 303—appearance of miracle greater in the type than in the fulfilment, 304, 306—upon what principle St. John selected the miracles he records, 308—miracles which typify Baptism, 309—counterparts only found in Catholic Baptism, 318—penance symbolised by miracles, 321—counterpart in Catholic Church, 326—by the raising of the dead to life, 328, 330—miracles of the three dead raised to life, 330—miracles significant of extreme unction, 332—of the B. Eucharist, 335—twofold nature of miracles, 344.
Missions, Catholic, best method of supporting them, 274.
Monarchy, most enduring form of government, 91—from attachment to the person of the monarch, 94—especially needful in France, 95—monarchy of July, 96.

Montalembert, Count de, 122.
Names of new invention, 150.

O'Connell, his policy, 477.

Offerings, Easter, 279.

Offertory considered as a means of support to the chapels, 241.

Orange party in Ireland, their loyalty, 473—contrasted with the ribbon societies, 483.

Orangemen, their loyalty, 492—traitors to both parties, 498—their rage at their leaders being dismissed from the commission, 498.

Oratory, the. Institute of, 169—its duties, 169.

Oxford, Bishop of, his speech to the middle classes, 532.

Palinodia, Puritan, 23.

Parables of our Saviour, 185—meaning of the word almost convertible with proverb, 188—different use of the two, 189—correspond with prophesy in the old law, 200—parables in the 13th chap. of St. Matthew: parable of the lost sheep, 204—only Catholics can properly apply them, 205, 212—general purpose of the parables recorded in St. Matthew, 208—different scope of those of St. Luke, 210—Analysis of that of the good Samaritan, 216—parables recorded by St. John, 225—reference of one parable to another, 331.

Peel, Sir Robert, his plantation scheme, 392, 393.

Persecution of Catholics in Scotland, 436—in Switzerland, 440.

Poor's rates, iniquitous method of collecting them in Ireland, 406.

Presbyterians oppose liberty of conscience, 455.

Property, landed, effects of its subdivision, 111.

Proverbs applied by our Lord, 190. 191—associated with the idea of wisdom, 198.

Puffing, former system of, 147.

Puritans, their mendacity, 7—their style, 13—their regicidal doctrines, 19—unsay them with regard to Elizabeth, 23.

Rambler, the, 267.

Reformation, similarity of its results in England and Germany, 5.

— in Scotland, 435.

Reformers, motive of the severities exercised towards them, 18.

— Scotch, their opinions of the Church, 442—their opinion of the Christian ministry, 443—their league and covenant with the English parliament, 455.

Repeal, its impracticability, 509.

Republic, as it exists in America, 92.

Revolution, progress of in France, 101, 105, 113—establishment of the Republican constitution, 114—election of Louis Buonaparte, 115.

Ring, fishing village in Ireland, 426.

Rome, superior drainage of, 536.

Sagas, Icelandic, 37—Saga relating to certain islands,—Ireland mentioned in them, 43.

Science, great and practical applications of during the last half century, 529—its dangerous tendency, 531—practical illustration, 533.

Scientific treatment of the human body, remarks on, 544.

St. Peter's, kindling of, at Easter, 334.

Shirt, the, 153.

Sin, as considered by the Old Law, 327—by Protestants, 329.

Six Articles, persecution under them, 27.

Skjald Helge, 57.

Socialism, 100—all parties unite against it, 103.

Soul, the, its spiritual life, 304.

Spottiswoode Society, 433—who named after, 433.

Statute de Donis, 368.

Strype, Mr., his false statements, 24.

Steam-Engine, its various applications, 529.

Subsidies, Irish, equal to the Income tax,

Tea-pot, 152.

Thorbjorn, anecdote of, 45.

Thorgil, his shipwreck on the coast of Greenland, 50—adventure there, 50—death of his son, 53—his strife with Thor, 53.

Thormud Rolbuneskald revenges his friend, 54 his conflict, 55—his vow, 56.

Thorstein Erikson, anecdote of, 48.

Transubstantiation, 337.

Turketul the Chancellor, 145.

Tulchan, 433.

Ungertok, leader of the last Greenland colonists, 72—his death, 73.

Unions, Clare Island, 360.

Univers, writers of, 122.


Vardlokur, the song, 47.

Ventilation, 540.

Vulgate, the, 182.

Wine, its transmutation, 338.


Witnesses on Irish matters selected by the House of Lords, 352.














Does Not Circulate

AP 4 .D8 SMC

The Dublin review.

vol.27.

AIP-2395 (awab)

