

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

VOL. XXX.

PUBLISHED IN

MARCH AND JUNE, 1851.



LONDON:

THOMAS RICHARDSON AND SON,

172, FLEET STREET; 9, CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN; AND DERBY.

MARSH & BEATTIE, 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.

1851.

590904

THE

DUBLIN REVIEW.

MARCH, 1851.

ART. I.—*An Earnest Appeal for the Revival of the Ancient Plain Song.* By A. WELBY PUGIN. 8vo. Dolman: 1850.

WHATEVER Mr. Pugin says or does, is like himself: and whatever is like himself must be brilliant and genuine. There are some men who rarely act or speak sincerely, at least when before the world. Mr. Pugin's difficulty, on the other hand, would be to act a part and misrepresent himself. No intelligent man could be his companion in a railway carriage, still less in a steam-boat, without guessing him to be "a genius," and but few who knew "Pugin" on paper would fail to discover the likeness between the reality and their ideal. Were we inclined, as may we never be, to break the laws of our country, a character like that of our respected author is about the last we should covet, so certain should we be to fall, the very first hour afterwards, into the hands of a police much less vigilant than our own. But of Mr. Pugin we would rather say, in illustration of our meaning, that we know of no other distinguished man alive, whose recorded words will form to posterity so exact a picture of their utterer; whose friends will possess, in the unstudied creations of his pencil and his pen, so many unmis-takeable memorials of the object of their esteem.

But it is the penalty which men so honest as Mr. Pugin must of necessity pay for the admiration and attachment which their frankness will secure, that they will occasion many misunderstandings, and not rarely do a good deal of unintentional mischief. Mr. Pugin's thoughts flow too quickly for repression, and his words, which are those thoughts on paper, stand as their natural exponents, without the checks of qualification and reserve. And thus it happens with him, as with all earnest advocates of a

cherished principle, that he loses the assent of a cautious public, while gaining the plaudits of an enthusiastic party. And while Mr. Pugin, the zealous champion of mediæval art on the one hand, and the anti-gothic revivalists in the Church on the other, are contending for their respective views with a freedom of expression which only proves to a discerning eye the sincerity of their mutual regard, because it proves what they feel themselves able to say safely—the Protestant and the Anglican, who know nothing of either, look on complacently, and chuckle with controversial glee, as though they had found out a breach in the walls of Zion, and some deadly feud were raging in our body, under the thin covering of a merely superficial uniformity. Persons habituated in the practice of differing, can ill understand how Catholics, who have a common Faith, can *afford* to disagree on matters involving neither faith nor any of its proximate subjects, and even to let those differences appear, in the spirit of a generous and confiding security, in the face of a censorious world.

In the meantime we, who come to the consideration of these differences, not as partisans, but as critics, not to advocate, but as far as we may be able, to arbitrate and adjust, are happy to feel we can throw our sympathies from time to time on either side of the question, and that too, as we trust, without either the fact of inconsistency or the risk of compromise. We fancy ourselves to be in possession of a sort of common measure by which we seem able, and that sincerely, to reconcile the apparently conflicting views of different, and in some sense rival, schools of devotional art—if we may employ a phrase, open to misconstruction, but, as we must feel, far more adequate to the intentions of the followers of each, than any which would imply that they were contending for mere hollow forms or vapid sentiments, instead of ecclesiastical and most religious realities; or which, on the other hand, would not boldly meet the fact; that, as theology is the highest of sciences, its practical application is the noblest of arts. An art it surely is, and not the less so because it is a divine art, to apply the great truths of our holy religion in such a manner as most effectually to gain upon the world which they are designed to penetrate, and by penetrating, to transform. And the difference between these schools is a difference not as to ends, but as to means; not as to whether the salvation of mankind is the first object of all

charitable efforts, and the Catholic Church the sole medium through which that object must be gained, if gained at all, but whether, and to what extent, the great institutions and principles of the Church, are either pliant or rigid, inflexible, like the dogmas of the faith, which to modify is to destroy their vitality, or, on the other hand, elastic and versatile, changing their form to external pressure without prejudice to their integrity, and indefinitely varying in their application, without corruption of their essential elements. Indeed this very word, modification, appears to be the touchstone of the controversy. If we do not mistake, with Mr. Pugin and his friends it is a word of sinister and odious import, which implies nothing less than the surrender to the world of some high and cherished truth; whereas, on the other side, it would be regarded but as the expression of the natural and necessary way of adapting variable principles to the shifting emergencies of the time. We propose, in what follows, to examine briefly these respective views, and to draw out a few of their practical results.

It appears to us, with such means and opportunities of investigation as busy men can command, that there have always been two great lines of thought and action in the Church, founded in the diversity of the great objects of that divine institution, but ultimately conspiring, though by courses occasionally somewhat divergent, to the same great ends, namely, the glory of God and the salvation of souls. The two characters of the Church Catholic which we mean, are those of Witness and Teacher. In the one it is her function to maintain throughout all time the true doctrine of God, the ever Blessed Trinity in Unity, as He is in His own divine nature and incommunicable attributes, as well as in the relation which He has vouchsafed to establish, by the Incarnation, with His creatures. In the other, the same Church is the active Teacher and Converter of the world, who, with an ever-watchful eye to her duty as also the Witness of true doctrine, is to bend as far as she can bend without breaking, and to stoop as low as she can stoop without falling, in order that "by any means she may save some" of the poor perishing souls committed to her charge. Such being the two parts of her great mission, it follows that sometimes one and sometimes the other will be uppermost in the Church's manifestation, according to the varieties of temper, and character

through which her light is reflected upon the world, or the differences of circumstance which call for the exercise of the one or the other great function. It follows also, that no perfect church-character (to use the phrase) will ever be destitute of either element, although what in one is prominent, in another will be subordinated. It would be a task of the greatest interest in its progress, and of the utmost benefit in its result, to trace the operation of these two great principles of the Church through the entire course of her history. For our present purpose it may be enough to indicate them. We are not without a very confident anticipation that those who have a deeper acquaintance with church history and biography than we claim to possess, would bear out the impression, that the exhibition of these two great departments of the Church has varied, both in individuals and in the ecclesiastical community at large, according to the crisis or necessity of the time. For instance, that in days when heretical subtlety was the most formidable antagonist of the Church, it would be found that the Church was more conspicuous for her witness to dogmatic truth than for her invention of missionary expedients; and that on the other hand, as the corruption of the masses rather than the pride of the few was given her as her object of attack, or her province of labour, men have been raised up, fitted rather to be her victorious warriors on the field of missionary enterprise, or her successful ambassadors in the quieter work of a heavenly diplomacy, than her champions in the schools, or her ascetics in the cloister. And of course to say that never has there been the period when the evil of our nature has not taken *both* forms, and so when there has not been the need of both modes of encounter, is merely to say, what we have already admitted, that the two great characters of the Church, though they are found in different degrees of prominence at different times, are never wanting to her in their sufficient combination.

Our Lord's gracious purpose of choosing instruments of various temper for carrying out the work of His Incarnation through all ages of His Church, would seem to have been shadowed out by anticipation in the characteristic differences existing between the agents whom He chose, at the beginning, to plant and propagate His divine religion. How different, for example, was St. Peter from St. Paul, and both from St. John! One seemed formed

to win, another to testify, another to govern: one was the type of all missionaries, another of theologians, and another of Popes. Nay, had not such differences a still earlier date, and a still more august exemplification? "John the Baptist," we read, "came neither eating nor drinking," and herein presented a contrast, conspicuous and avowed, to his Divine Follower, who, from adopting a less austere mode of life, received from His enemies the reproach of laxity. Each protested against the world in his own way; the one by leaving it, the Other while mingling with it; and thus they became respectively the great founders, the one by divine delegation of the contemplative, the Other by His own voluntary choice of the active, branch of the religious life. Another function of the Church remained to be fulfilled, involved indeed in those which were illustrated during the ministry of our Blessed Lord, but still requiring a fuller expansion to meet the necessities of the occasion; and for the discharge of this, the Apostolate had to be amplified by the addition of one born out of time. In the Person of Our Divine Redeemer every ecclesiastical character was essentially contained. He was the First of Missionaries, of Priests, of Religious, of Doctors; a Doctor when He taught in the Temple, a Religious when He was hidden at Nazareth, a Priest in His Oblation for sin, a Missionary when He gathered in souls in the streets of Jerusalem, or along the borders of Genesareth. Still Our Lord's Divine Commission was characteristically described in the words, "The Lord hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor." And as the Father sent Him, so He His disciples, to convert the world by direct encounter and sustained attack. He portrayed for them the character of the Missionary when He told them to be "wise as serpents and harmless as doves," and they acted on His words, so as to be "all things to all men, that by any means they might save some," and to "catch" converts by a harmless "guile," and to seem in the eyes of the world "deceivers," while "true." And then followed ages of heresy, and God raised up to deal with them, men of intellect, learning, and eloquence; but heresy spread and ramified, and required a more systematic and cogent check than controversy, which had done its work in evolving the great points at issue. Then the Church stood in need, not so much of treatises as of acts, of disputants as of theologians. And

then the holy accretions of tradition were sifted, and the thoughtful dicta of divines gathered up, and the result was in the shape of conciliary decisions, which closed open questions, disembedded latent truth, and converted well-founded opinions into the immutable dogmas of theology. The conquest or influx of heathen and barbarous nations left the Church leisure to cope with her enemies, and conquer rebels, instead of making the extension of her empire the paramount object of her efforts, though, as occasion arose, and here or there a field for missionary enterprize presented itself, her Augustines and Bonifaces were not wanting for the work.

The questions, then, which occur to the minds of Catholic churchmen, when they are called upon to choose between two very different modes of gaining over the world to the Church, are naturally such as these: What is the particular form of evil to be subdued? What the character of the times and the persons which we are called on to encounter? Are they, as to their religious aspect, heathen or heretic; as to their social, barbarous or cultivated; as to their national, gay or grave? with many others of the same kind, too obvious and too many for enumeration. To pronounce in the abstract in favour of one or the other of different roads to the heavenly life which are alike included within the wide limits of the Faith, would be, as we humbly conceive, to overlook the declaration of our Lord Himself, that the great institutions of the Faith were made for man, and not man for them; so that whatever is accidental merely in the Divine Economy, and not part of the sacred Deposit of the Truth itself, is capable of indefinite variety according to the ever changing phases of that human nature to which in the Incarnation Almighty God condescended once for all. Now, we apprehend, that on the major premiss of the syllogism, these rival schools are agreed; that there is but one opinion between them, as to the duty of preserving intact whatever is essential in the teaching of Holy Church. It is as to the minor proposition that diversities of opinion will arise; and accordingly we think that on one side of the argument, at any rate, there is a tendency to press circumstantials into the province of the Faith, as though they were its necessary adjuncts or incontrovertible corollaries. The whole tenor of the earnest pamphlet we are reviewing is assuredly such as would be warranted only upon this extreme supposition.

In one place (p. 4), the distinguished author goes so far as to confess to sympathize with an heretical liturgy, merely because it is a form of public prayer, and in portions of its matter ancient and catholic, while he rejects practices of devotion, more modern in structure, though in their substance avowedly orthodox, and such as are actually in use in many parts of the Catholic world. Now, if it be indeed true that liturgical worship is as necessarily the one devotional expression of Catholic Faith, as creeds and canons are its formal embodiments, then, no doubt, our present argument falls to the ground. Mediævalism must be forced upon our people, however reluctant to accept it, for it would in that case become a matter of faith against sight to believe that this system must ultimately prevail. But if it belong to the class of church subjects, which concern not the essence of the Faith, but merely its accidental expression, then the enquiry into the circumstances of national or temporary peculiarity, for which ecclesiastical provision has to be made, is most pertinent, or rather, necessarily antecedent, to the whole question between the two great schools of devotion with which we are at present engaged.

Under the decided impression that the latter of these is the true hypothesis, we venture to ask whether it certainly follows, that because certain modes of devotion were adapted to former times of the Church, they are necessarily suited to our own? There are some, we believe, who go so far as to say that the Reformation itself was the outburst of a set of feelings, common to all of us, for which the mediæval system made too little provision; and that the Ages of Love which then succeeded to the Ages of Faith formed the providential counteraction to the evils of that movement, and a kind of supplementary development of practical religion which till then had wanted one of its legitimate channels. It is no part of our present task to pronounce either for or against this striking opinion. But it may be said, we hope, without any danger of theorizing, that, historically speaking, such a development of the popular and affectionate side of religion did occur about the period of that disastrous convulsion which shook the Church from one end to the other, and the effects of which are so miserably felt by us even at the close of three centuries. A new class of saints arose about the era of the Reformation, as different from their immediate predecessors

in the middle age, as they again were different from the saints of an earlier time. And as it is the saints who are the true "salt of the world," not preaching, or literature—because the lives of the saints are theology in action—a manifestation so glorious, and in a certain sense so original, could not but give (if we may be permitted so to apply the words) "the age and body of the time its form and pressure." Indeed it would almost seem as if in a certain sense there needed after the Reformation a kind of revival of primitive Christianity, and the world, after that deluge of evil, had to be in a manner re-converted. The countries in which mediæval principles of art and worship had been most conspicuously illustrated, were those precisely in which the ravages of the Reformation were most felt; and the difficulty which is now found in restoring those principles is a proof how their very traces have been obliterated. Now, certainly, if evils are best cured by contraries, the deadly poison of self-will, which the triumphs of Satan in the 16th century introduced and circulated throughout the frame of European society, is best counteracted by mediæval remedies. But if, as many think, the Reformation was the attempt of a disappointed individualism to avenge itself upon its supposed oppressors, it may have been in the designs of Providence, that the very traditions of a former age should be superseded by a reconstruction of the practical system of the Church upon a more primitive basis. During the fifteen preceding centuries wonderful saints had been raised up, and wonderful works done in the Church, great orders founded, gigantic heresies crushed, the fabric of theology gradually constructed, and the power of the world successively subdued. But no movement, except Christianity itself, admits of being compared, as the work of a single corporation, internal to the Church, with that which has been accomplished in these latter days by the Society of Jesus; whether we regard the extent of its influence, the permanence of its effects, or the multiplicity of its operations. In the short space of three centuries that wonderful Institute has carried its mission into all parts of the globe, enriched all the highest departments of theology with priceless contributions, and given to the world seven glorious Saints not less remarkable for the diversity than for the greatness of the gifts by which they were distinguished; and these, as it would seem, but an instalment of the treasures of sanctity yet to be drawn

forth from the storied archives of its history, and enshrined in the calendar of Holy Church. And the secret of all this power over a reluctant and reclamatory world has been, under Divine grace, in those penetrating and transforming Exercises, which present to us the fruit of the ineffable revelations of Manresa.

But, absolutely beyond all comparison as has been the influence of this great Society upon mankind, whether we look to the abiding effects of its missionary undertakings, the inappreciable value of its theological standards, the fruits of its retreats, or last, but not least, the calm and modest witness of its homely, every-day workings—yet the Society is far from being the only great instrument employed by our Lord in later times for renewing or reinvigorating what may be called our personal relations with Him through His Church. Another body there is, of coeval date with the great Society, which, though as yet in a much narrower field, has carried some parts of the Society's popular work to a perfection which hardly admits of a parallel. Leaving to others the province of missionary labour, and the austerer forms of the religious life, the Congregations of the great St. Philip Neri have formed, wheresoever located, centres of holy light and beaming charity, wonderfully attractive to a world which sterner ways would have repelled, and diffusive, to an extent quite incommensurate with any apparent efforts, of influences as strong as they have been silent. Of the Oratorian rule love is at once the bond, the sanction, and the end. The Philippine communities are bound together not by vows but by mutual sympathy, and the superiors are not the less faithfully obeyed because they give few direct commands. Passing words, tones of voice, looks, and even gestures are calls to obedience in the eye of affectionate children. The Oratorian congregations are so many insulated but yet concordant homes, deriving strength from a real union of principle and object, but each doing its work apart with such accidental diversities as are inseparable from difference of place. The children of St. Philip are fitted for the work of love by their own mutual exercise of it. They are more strictly the servants than the friends of the world, so far as it pleases to draw towards them; they lay themselves out to win it, and therefore must, in all that is not sin, even bend to its wayward humours. They are bound to make time, where they cannot find it, for visitors, whom

they have a chance of consoling or edifying ; their privacy is rarely safe from intrusion, or their works against interruption, though their charity towards all men will prevent their ever seeming (to use a common phrase) "put out." A discipline this, which to many minds is infinitely more trying than corporal austerities, and all the more meritorious because the world accounts it not discipline but frivolity. Thus the Church has shown herself equal to her contest with the world in the very last department of influence, which would have been beforehand imagined—in the world's own peculiar province. She yields all but the Faith, and encourages all that is not sin, in order to gain a hold on the affections. St. Ignatius gave an extreme instance of this holy policy, when, in his dealings with his illustrious convert St. Francis Xavier, he began with encouraging his *forté*, and all but flattering his vanity ; and through this amount of concession, clear of sinful compliance, though approximating indefinitely near it, he ended by changing the ambitious scholar into the slave of the poor, so that the admired of Paris came to die as an outcast on the coast of China. This is what our blessed Lord calls the "wisdom of the serpent," (a strong metaphor, if it be considered,) and St. Paul "being all things to all," and the men of this generation "doing evil that good may come;" thus, as Archbishop Whately somewhere says, begging the whole question, whether what is done *be* evil.

So much of preparatory observation has seemed requisite towards analysing the grounds of the differences between the two schools of devotion which are represented severally by Mr. Pugin on the one hand, and the Jesuits and Oratorians on the other. For they are much mistaken who look upon these differences as involving mere questions of *taste*. The advocates on both sides are far too earnest and too thoughtful to risk even the semblance of disunion (for that the reality exists we emphatically deny) for anything so worthless as mere external forms. The matters in dispute are undoubtedly realities ; but realities different in kind from those about which Anglicans and Protestants disagree, inasmuch as they affect not the substance of the Faith, but, as we have already said, the mode only, in which that substance shall be set forth in the practical workings of the Church. We are not wishing to undervalue these differences, nor even to deny that they may

have a deeper spring and a more important bearing than is at once recognized; all we seek is to fortify the Catholic Church against those charges of internal division which are freely made against her by externs, in the way of what is vulgarly called a "tu quoque" rejoinder, and which we are bound to admit the language of the pamphlet under review, to those who take it for anything else than the *currente calamo* expression of a very remarkable idiosyncrasy, seems in a measure occasionally to bear out.

Mr. Pugin and his opponents appear to us to represent at their very ultimate points and in their very broadest delineations, two principles of devotional arrangement which have each their place in the Church, but which the varying circumstances with which that Church has to deal will tend at different periods to develop in very different proportions. These are what we will call the Liturgical, and the Popular: thus using terms which the opposite side will not, we hope, regard as in any way invidious, though the first expresses a fact, and the other a *view*. "Popularity," that is, adaptation to the needs, and in so far as it represents those needs to the taste, of the generality of well-intentioned people, is, we suspect, the bugbear of the one side, as much as it is the aim of the other; and so a term which one party will take as a compliment, the other would affix as a stigma. The main question seems to be, is there anything so necessary to the Faith in the full exhibition of the ritual system, as that we may not modify it, and even, at times, withdraw it, in the cause of general edification? Or, in plain language, if our people ought to like the Breviary offices, as solemnized in public, but will not do so, are we to yield to their (if so be) bad taste, or make war against it? And here two doubts arise; the one, whether we ought to change this taste if we could, the other whether we could do it if we desired? We will take the last of these queries first. Our zealous ritualists, we conclude, determine it at once in the affirmative; for we do not suppose that they would justify a priest in a hopeless crusade against the unconquerable feelings of his people, or that they would deny, in the face of the Council of Trent, that edification is an end, though a subordinate one, of ceremonial observances.

An able paper was lately put out in the "Rambler," the object of which was to argue against Vespers as an evening office suitable to the mass of the people. This

paper has attracted much notice, and has opened a great question which can hardly be determined, with our existing materials for a judgment upon it. That the Vespers, or any other choral church-office, as hitherto commonly performed, should be edifying to devout minds, could only, we should think, be explained by the fact of their having that power of abstraction from sensible objects which is said to have prevented St. Bernard from acquainting himself with the structure of the room in which he had lived for years. That persons with an ear, or a heart, should be aided (though they might not be hindered), in their devotions by psalms drawled, antiphons attenuated, versicles with variations, and responses reduced from the full-bodied roll of an animated chorus of voices, to the freezing solo or the dull duet, would imply such a love for the divine office in the abstract as some Catholics feel, but as could hardly be reckoned upon in an average congregation. And whether the same office, even when heard under great advantages, will ever be an extensive favourite with the mass of our people, is a question which there has not yet been sufficient time to clear up, though facts seem tending to settle it in the affirmative; but it must be tried under such advantages in order to be fairly determined. That the Vespers, as religiously sung, are popular with many pious Catholics, is absolutely certain; and even the poor Irish are strangely attached to the Latin offices: partly, it would seem, because they have never been used to any other, and partly because to many of that excellent people the Latin is quite as intelligible as the English, and, as they say, "more solemn." But whether by this they mean that they are devotionally affected by them (as educated people are), or whether the phrase expresses no more than a feeling of irrational awe, such as a child experiences when alone in the dark, is more than we can undertake to pronounce.

But there is a class of Catholics, and a growing one, who for some reasons demand a more careful provision than our good Irish "immigrants," as it is now the fashion to call that valuable part of our Catholic population—we mean the English Catholic poor, most of them converts of no long standing among us. In this body it is almost as hard to plant the faith as in the other to uproot it. The faith of an Irish Catholic often wants perfecting, but in the English it wants forming. To the one no food comes

amiss, but the other is dainty and eclectic. And these natural characteristics are heightened in the case of many converts, by their uncatholic experience. As Englishmen, these Catholics like to have a personal share in public worship as in other things; and whether brought up as Dissenters or as Anglicans, their early devotional preferences (if they had any) were strictly congregational. We who write have no strong sympathies with this turn of mind; but it is one of the phenomena which the Church must meet, and to which of course, as being the Church, she is equal.

The ecclesiastical arrangement which Mr. Pugin admires, were the correlatives of the "Ages of Faith." And the assumption on which he builds is, that what was right then must be right now. Instead of regarding the temper of the present times as a reason for modifying these arrangements, he takes its inaptitude to them as a clear note that it is radically bad and can only be mended by being entirely remodelled. One objection to this theory is, that life is too short to carry it out. The world is waning, and souls are perishing, and good men are few, and the devil is "many;" and after all that may be truly said for the security of slow processes and the stability of protracted works, we hold that there is another side of the question, according to which it is well that what is done for the salvation of souls should be done quickly. Abstractedly speaking, no doubt it is both nobler in idea, and higher in principle, that cathedrals should be elaborated than that chapels should be run up. In the Ages of Faith men could afford to lose time. We rejoice that we have ages to look back upon when churches were perfected by bits, and when queens took half a life to embroider a chasuble. Such facts symbolize the perpetuity, and indicate the strength, and contribute to the evidence, of the Catholic Church; but now-a-days we must be satisfied to view them as wonders rather than to use them as precedents. And the principle on which they proceed has *always* its illustration in the moral and spiritual world of the Church. With all the claims on instant attention which press around her, still she can afford, as far as human appearance goes, to lose time and waste energy; and although she cannot, at least here in England, spend centuries upon churches, or bruise diamonds to form the inimitable colour of a painted window (exquisitely beautiful as is the principle of such

sacrifices), yet even in England, with its millions of souls to be converted, men are training for the priesthood in religious houses through lengthened and unknown courses of discipline, whose term of probation our zealous impatience might long to abridge; and others have passed, or are passing, from fields ripe for the sickle of the missionary, to the deep trance of the noviciate, or the living death of the monastery. How like is all this to the dispensation of Him who can save by few as by many, in the valley as on the hills, with whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day!" But to act on this principle, where such sacred matters as vows and vocations are not at stake, seems to us like a waste of time.

The circumstances in which the Church finds herself, at least in England, oblige her to do her work of concession and edification in the shortest time in which she can do it well, and with the largest amount of relaxation which her laws and principles admit. Striking theories, lofty views, cherished prepossessions, favourite tastes, hereditary notions, *esprit de corps*, all, in short, that is not truth, must yield to the pressing emergency of a great nation perishing for lack of spiritual bread. The children are crying for food, and there is none at hand to answer. The great notes of unity and love, by which the Church was to be known, are utterly wanting to every one of the countless sects around them, and are more and more visibly monopolized by us. Hence that constant process of deep yearning and full satisfaction which is going on around us, honourable at once to the religious capabilities of the English, and indicative of the power which resides in the Catholic Church to attract by her beauty and fill by the richness of her gifts.

In this country the Church has to deal with a people eminently practical. What Englishmen cannot master, they are tempted to despise; what they cannot appropriate, they are disposed to grudge. They are the very opposite to those of whom it was said, that their ignorance was the measure of their admiration, "*ignotum pro mirifico.*" Our people are tolerant of anything rather than of mystery and theological exactitude. With great and noble susceptibilities, they have radical faults; Protestantism has deepened and given shape to the evil, and all but crushed the good. Nevertheless, Englishmen have one great redeeming quality; there is a pervading element of simple-

hearted and generous affectionateness in their character, which is, after all, the stuff Catholicism is made of—if only it can be liberated from the mass of hereditary prejudice which overlays and chokes it. The total failure of the movement to which Dr. Pusey has given his name, but not always his spirit, may be explained by reference to these points in our national character. Puseyism came directly athwart every prominent feature of the English mind; its detestation of what is commonly called “humbug” (which is the good result of what is intrinsically so irreligious, its anti-mystical element); its repugnance to subtlety (which, though a good, is connected with the untheological habits of our nation), and, generally, its thoroughly practical tone and temper, which absolutely recoiled from the absurd unreality of that most preposterous invention—we speak of it always not in its original springs, or in its accidental ramifications, but in its popular exhibition, and ultimate issues. On the other hand it may be observed, that so far as Puseyism has been really influential, its power has been owing to a certain tone of affectionate earnestness with which it has here and there been found in connexion, and which has met with a response in the English heart. Thus, while Dr. Pusey was himself, and not the party-leader, he had an influence second only to that of the illustrious man who was then his fellow-labourer; but when himself was sucked into the vortex of a party which, as a whole, is singularly the reverse of affectionate, he went down; and now, from being the one in a thousand, he is, to appearance, too much like those who surround him. And other circles of influence there once were, like that for instance of which Littlemore was the centre, the “homes of pure affection,” if ever there were such. But they have blended with a larger circle, which has not absorbed them into a merciless whirlpool, but given them play, like tributary spheres, in a majestic and well-ordered system.

Hence we conclude, that the religious exhibition which is to win the English people, (whatever else it be or be not), must at any rate be loving, as well as earnest. Dogma and mystery, the accurate exposition of the Church’s mind, and the august representation of her unearthly life; these, indeed, the English want, and that in the very first place. But this is not the need they *feel*; these are not the parts of Catholicism to which they can be attracted, except through some more immediate influ-

ence. The deep philosophy of our holy doctrine, the poetry of our glorious ritual, the graceful symbolism of our divine ceremonies, and the like, which are all that many lofty and delicate minds among us feel necessary towards linking them with the celestial world, are absolutely lost upon what are commonly, though somewhat flatteringly, called "practical" men. In this country such men are, for the most part, infidels, if indifferent, and if serious, evangelicals or dissenters. They are generally shrewd enough to know that a Christian, and especially a Christian teacher, must not be cold, secluded, and visionary. They see that, if it was love which brought our Redeemer from heaven to earth, love to God and our brethren must be the ruling spirit of His religion. Again, that the gospel which Christ taught would be unlike Himself were it afraid of encountering the world on the world's own ground; and lastly, that if the saving of the soul be matter of that difficulty and importance which preachers represent, nothing can indicate that the Church is alive to this great duty, but her appearing at the least as much concerned about it as men of the world are about riches, honours, and the other objects of their pursuit. To gain such men over to religion, nothing more is often wanted, than that the Church, as she comes before them, should seem intent, simply and directly, upon her own ends. And certainly if the Church have a machinery at her command, purposely constructed for gaining souls by countless little "inventions" of love, we can hardly doubt that she has been supplied with such an aid for some special work in which the present generation of Englishmen has a more than common interest. If she, the true Physician, neglect this labour of love, quacks will take it up.

The remarkable success which has followed upon the labours of the Oratorian Fathers, both in Birmingham and London, seems to prove that they have struck a chord which finds a ready response in the hearts of our countrymen. The attention paid to their ministrations is evidently too general and too lasting to be referred simply to the love of novelty, or to the interest felt in the past history of the more distinguished among them. Nor is it an attention which they command from any single class. Rich and poor, wise and simple, Catholics of long, and Catholics of shorter standing in the Church, are found equally to relish their cheerful devotions, and to flock to

loving ministry. Some suspect them, some fear them, one accuses them of going too far, another of not going far enough; some call them ultra-Roman, and some almost Protestants, and some (whom we fancy nearer the truth) both at once. But they are too well versed in the Lives of the Saints to wonder at these phenomena; and to take them either as a proof that they themselves are very wrong, or the Catholic Church very degenerate, or the world around them more than usually bad. Opposition and misconception, they know, even at the hands of the good, are always the fate of zealous revivals, the salutary clog on the wheel of success; and they are not likely to quarrel with a portion which they inherit from the beginning, with the author of the *Spiritual Exercises*, and the founder of the Congregation of our Holy Redeemer.

But the fact remains, that an expression of Catholicism, at once zealous and gentle, popular and refined, strict and versatile, dignified and free, like theirs, in which the capacity of receiving dogmatic truth, the appreciation of states of holiness beyond ourselves, and the readiness to bow to mysterious announcements, as the true protection against the miseries of self-love, are wrought into the mind unawares, and through processes congenial to it, appears to be the provision of all others needed at this moment by a people impatient of dictation, yet perishing, through the love of this present world, for want of that which nothing, it seems, will give them, but an authority which first wins them into its confidence, and then holds them in the sweet bonds of a willing captivity.

But we are told, that to encourage in prayer the outpourings of a rapturous and even a familiar affection, to find outlets for enthusiasm in the use of vernacular hymns, to speak of Mary our Mother, and the Saints of the great Christian family, even in formal discourses, in the language of fond, uncritical children, to prefer worshipping lovingly in a barn to coldly in a cathedral, to feel the want of no ornamental accessory in a building where Christ our Lord is present in the Blessed Sacrament, and to find no choir so musical as the untutored voices of the poor and the innocent,—is to borrow a leaf from the dissenters' books, and to substitute a set of popular, or, as some might even call them, vulgar, attractives for the approved modes of the Church. A brief consideration of these objections will land us at the end of our article.

“Influence,” in matters relating to the soul’s health, is quite enough of a gain to be reasonably an *object* with religious men. There is such a thing as morbidly declining it, as well as that which is far commoner, and far more dangerous, faultily courting it. The Saints, we believe, acknowledged it for a blessing, while they worked on steadily through the want of it. Overvalue it they could not, because they knew it for God’s gift, wholly independent of themselves, and dangerous only in proportion as this is hard to feel. St. Francis Xavier wrote to St. Ignatius on his knees, though he converted his myriads. Another St. Francis preached for three years with unabated zeal, though he could scarcely number his converts by units. But no missionary will consciously neglect any course which tends to sweeten to the world a lesson so unpalatable to it, as, “Take up thy cross and follow Me.” To win souls is his vocation; what can more fitly describe it than the name, “fisher of men?” Now a fisherman’s object is, to secure the capture of his prey. For this he will toil the day, and watch the night; for this he will spare no pains, neglect no practicable device. The apostle thought it no breach of Christian innocence to “catch” his converts “with guile,” to cast, that is, his nets, in the most dexterous way, and into the most likely parts of the deep, if haply he might inclose some stray soul in their unworldly meshes. But this holy policy, which has our Lord for its author, and heaven for its end, has nothing underhand about it. It is a recognized diplomacy, not a paltry manœuvring. It deals not so much with individuals, as with classes of character, while all its aims are declared, and all its courses above-ground. The fishermen, to whom our Lord likened His apostles, were followers of a generous craft; they cast nets into the sea; they did not angle with baited hooks in rivers and pools. It is thus that the enlarged wisdom of the Catholic Church differs from the proselytizing efforts of sects.

And if that course be serviceable without being at the same time disingenuous, one does not see why the Church should fear to adopt it, merely because it has a counterpart in the history of erroneous religions. The modern Church, and some fanatics, have derived it alike, the Church by lawful inheritance, and they by the private study of Scripture, from a source more ancient than either, the doctrine and the practice of the Apostles. Wesley and

his school were students of the New Testament in their own way, and they had the "pure and apostolic branch... established in these kingdoms," as a contrast to the Apostolic model, and therefore as a warning to themselves. They went forth into the fields and into the highways, proclaiming, as men who were in earnest, the wages of sin, and the terms of salvation; they worked upon the people by homely arguments, and familiar illustrations, and arresting anecdotes; they made them sing hymns, till, from often repeating the sentiments of piety and love, the people came to feel those sentiments their own. Without the foundation of theology and the correctives of asceticism all this labour was of course in vain; the seed sprang up, but soon withered, because it had no depth of earth. But let the preacher be a religious, with the Crucified by his side to give meaning to his exhortations, and severity to his rhetoric, and it is hard to see how such an one differs essentially from a St. Vincent of Paul, or a St. Francis Xavier.

Again, it must, as we think, be under too restricted a view of the office of the Church, that such compliances with national predilections are felt to be otherwise than strictly "ecclesiastical." Every way of winning souls which is not plainly unlawful, we are maintaining to be within the scope of the Church's mission; and to say that the ways are unlawful at which we are here glancing, is to beg the question. The Church is the temple of that One Spirit, whose operations are divers. Her antagonist is that mighty world, whose resources are all but infinite, and whose power is unmatched except by Him who said He had overcome it. That world addresses itself to every faculty, and insinuates itself through every channel; but chiefly does it act through the feelings and the imagination. If we yield it all the avenues of approach to the soul, or rather, if we yield it one, we give it a sure victory. It is the wisdom of the Church to pre-occupy the imagination with visions bright enough to throw the world's gay phantoms into the shade, and to supply the affections with objects as much more beautiful than the world's idols, as they are also more pure. To these she will invite us to pour out our souls in the language even of passion; for ever is it well to cut openings for streams which are sure to overflow their bounds. Let those who blame her indulgence account as they can for the strains, amatory, not affec-

tionate only, in which the Bride of the Canticles discourses with her Beloved.

But we must reserve to another opportunity the prosecution of this interesting subject.

Since the above was in type, we have met with an article in a contemporary periodical, which treats more or less directly of our subject. Whatever we have said which looks like a reply to the paper "on Ecclesiology and Oratorianism" in the January number of the *Christian Remembrancer*, has, at any rate, the advantage of having been written without reference to that paper, the sight of which has not led us to change a single word of our own. And having no desire to detract from this advantage by entering more directly into controversy with the reviewer, we shall confine ourselves in this appendix to the work of correcting some of the extraordinary misconceptions under which he has propounded, and that in no diffident tone, his views of ecclesiastical reform.

In the first place, we assure this reviewer that he is under a complete mistake in supposing that what he calls "Oratorianism," or the devotional development which we have attempted to characterize in these pages, is anything foreign, or even uncongenial, unhappy, to the teaching and discipline of the Catholic Church. These Puseyites cannot master the idea of a school without a party, or a movement without a faction. We assure them that we have no "isms" here. Cannot they be content with their own sections without imagining them on our side also? No Catholic, we tell them, is bound to attach himself to the Oratory or its teaching, if he does not like; we have room for all. But the Oratory has a recognized place, like other orders and communities in the Church; and when any of its fathers, in England or elsewhere, transgress its proper limits, doubtless they will be recalled to a sense of their duty by the authorities set over them. At present, we believe we are correct in saying, that the English Oratory is in the highest estimation at Rome; nay, is especially dear to the large and loving heart of our Holy Father, and in both of its local manifestations, enjoys the confidence and sympathy of the distinguished prelates who bear rule respectively in those several parts of the Lord's vineyard.

What pretence, then, is there to deal with it as an innovation or excrescence?

The other mistake which we select for notice relates to the rite of Benediction. Of this rite, its nature, meaning, history, and position in the Catholic Church, the reviewer is evidently much more ignorant than consists with the very dogmatical tone of his assertions on the subject. We learn from him, for the first time, that the "essence of Benediction is the blessing of the people by bringing the (Blessed Sacrament) into *increased proximity* with them." Whereas, in fact, the Adorable Victim occupies precisely the same place in relation to the people at Benediction, as in the Elevation at Mass, only for a longer time. Strangely enough, this writer seems to feel also that such increased proximity would savour of irreverence; as if our Blessed Lord did not approximate Himself to His people in Holy Communion so closely, that not proximity, but contact, expresses the immensity of the condescension. In processions of the Blessed Sacrament, our Lord does, it is true, approach His people more nearly than in the Mass; but these, the reviewer must know, are as old as the institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi. And, of course, that precedent gives the sanction of antiquity to the exhibition of our Lord's love in the Blessed Sacrament, in that plainness and accessibility which the reviewer seems to fancy irreverent. Has the reviewer ever considered into what proximity with sinners our Lord was brought, and that by His own condescension, during His ministry on earth? And can he not conceive what delight His lovers feel in actually contemplating, and not merely imagining, Him in the form of His adorable condescension? The reviewer implies, that he religiously eschews what he calls our "services," and we can believe it. For did he know anything of the securities for reverence which the rubric of our Benediction supplies, or had he ever been present at that sweetly magnificent function, he would have found how untrue it is, that reverence is compromised in the proportion in which love is conciliated.

With a like absence of all proof, this writer assumes, that the Oratorians are answerable for the prominence now given to the rite of Benediction. It happens, however, that the two countries of Catholic Europe in which it is in

peculiar esteem, are countries in which St. Philip has no representatives—France and Belgium.

In the Gothic cathedral of Antwerp, we will venture to affirm, that there are more Benedictions in a week, than at the chapel in King William Street in an ordinary month. Every evening in the year in that magnificent cathedral, the Blessed Sacrament is exposed for half an hour at one altar, and then carried through the church to another, and on all greater days it is exposed during the High Mass, and Benediction is given afterwards. At Liège again, as at Rome, the Forty Hours' Prayer is practised throughout the year, at the different churches in succession, involving, of course, the exposure of the Blessed Sacrament to the gaze of the people all day; and, (so far as they are present) all night. Yet here is this critic, who, for all that appears, has never (upon conscientious principles), assisted at Catholic worship in his life, undertaking to teach his readers, who in all probability are as ignorant as himself, upon matters affecting the ritual of a Church which has its place in all countries.

Nor is he more successful in his doctrinal views. The error of the Oratorians, and of those who exaggerate Benediction is, he tells us, that they disjoin the Blessed Sacrament from the Sacrifice which makes it what it is. Does he then deny that the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament is ancient and Catholic, or to say that, if our Lord vouchsafes us His abiding Presence, it is meet that it should be kept constantly shrouded from the eye of His children? and, especially, when the form under which that Presence is vouchsafed, and not merely the fact of its vouchsafement, is so especially edifying and consolatory to every loving and humble soul?

In fine, we put it to this reviewer whether he can seriously mean, that in a country like this, where hands are wanting on all sides to carry out the work of charity to the souls of the people, the Catholic Church could be expected to tie down her scanty body of missionary priests to the daily choral recitation of the Divine Office? Or that, if, in her wisdom, she thought well to do so, such fulfilment of the priestly duty could ever become an act of *popular devotion*? Let the reviewer visit some of the cathedrals in Belgium, where the canons are obliged to such recitation in choir; he will find that the attendance in the nave is limited to a few sauntering Englishmen, who

come to look at the pictures, and a few pious old women, who say their rosaries before an image, in happy unconsciousness of the presence, whether of the canons or the sight-seers. Even the Sunday Vespers at these cathedrals are often less well attended than a week-day Benediction. Here we are not arguing against the Vespers as a public office, (for it is an especial favourite with us,) but only against the views of our contemporary. And we must remind him, that the only part of Catholic Europe, as we believe, in which Vespers are extensively popular, is France, where the people take part in them—i. e., where the congregational principle is admitted in modification of the official. The actual necessities of the Church have tended to confine the Divine Office in its completeness, to the chapels of monastic, or conventual, or collegiate houses, with the exception of Vespers only, and occasionally, as on Christmas Eve, in some churches, Matins and Lauds. The secular clergy, by a most considerate, and, indeed, absolutely indispensable allowance, are permitted to fulfil their obligation of reciting the whole Divine Office where and when they find it most convenient, with, however, certain limitations, of which the reviewer does not seem aware; such as, that they may not say the Vespers of the day early in the forenoon, nor the Matins and Lauds of the next day till a certain time in the afternoon of the day preceding. On the whole, we trust that this reviewer will find a more profitable field for the exercise of his zealous labours, than the task of “adventuring rules of ritualism, to be assumed as principles for the worship of undivided Christendom” which are to take effect under the singularly hypothetical condition of “the teaching” of St. Philip Neri, being a thing “either non-existent, or external to the pale of the One Catholic Church.”

Rev. J. Oakley (Canada)

ART. II.—*The Greek Church; a Sketch*, by the Author of “Proposals for Christian Union.” London: James Darling, 1850.

MR. Appleyard has added the above to his previous sketches on kindred subjects. The Greek Church is a fitting conclusion to “The Sure Hope of Reconciliation,” “The Claims of the Church of Rome,” “The Principles of Protestantism,” and the “Eastern Churches; that is, the Nestorian, Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, and Abyssinian communities.” We are glad to see that all the former have reached a second edition: we augur the same for this concluding sketch. There is one mind running through these publications, a mind possessing many valuable qualities, with one fatal defect, which would seem to neutralise the practical operation of these qualities, so far as regards the living man. We find in the author throughout a disposition to construe very charitably the motives of others, to put himself fairly in their position, to say all that can be said for them. Luther and Calvin, Fox and Wesley, the Albigenses and Waldenses, the Nestorian and the Monophysite, the Armenian and the Anglican, find in Mr. Appleyard the very opposite of the *Advocatus Diaboli*. His amiable intention seems to be, to discover a position for each and all. Nor is there even an exception to this rule as regards Catholicism itself. The charity of most Protestant writers stops as it approaches the Pope. On the contrary, our author is even enthusiastic in setting forth the great theory of the Papacy; he acknowledges the rights of St. Peter’s chair: Catholic saints claim and receive his homage. He has ever flitting before his eyes a brilliant dream, in which the Abyssinian Abuna and the Nestorian Catholicos, Dr. John Bird Sumner, and “His Holiness Anthemius, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria,” the holy synod of Russia, and an Anglican convocation, are to find themselves united, “without,” we should imagine, “the commandment and will of princes,” (which thing Dr. Cranmer’s twenty-first article declares “may not be,”) in a new Lateran Council, at which St. Peter’s successor is to preside, the contradictions of warring creeds are to be harmonised, and “the sure hope of reconciliation” is to take effect.

Among these sketches, that of the Greek Church is not

the least interesting. Mr. Appleyard only claims "to have selected a few remarkable periods in her history." It is therefore unfair to claim from him a cohesion of parts and unity of design, which he does not affect. Still we observe a general purpose running through his first five chapters. *First*, he exhibits nationalism, the bitter spirit of eastern jealousy, as the opponent from very early times of the Pope's authority in the Greek Church. He shows this spirit continually breaking out, from the contest of the Eusebian bishops with Pope Julius in the fourth century, to the final schism under Michael Cerularius in the eleventh, and the abortive union of Florence in the fifteenth. Seven hundred years, at least, the Greek Church struggled against a supremacy which it was constrained ever and anon with fresh humiliation to recognise, until Photius in the ninth, and Michael Cerularius in the eleventh century, consummated that division, which Acacius, their worthy predecessor, attempted in the fifth, only with the result in the end of having his own name struck out of the sacred diptychs, and numbered with heretics. *Secondly*, we are shown how a cognate power comes to the relief and support of eastern jealousy of the west, and Grecian hatred of the Latins; viz., the power of the State, as set forth in the action of the imperial authority from the time of Constantine. Nowhere do we more cordially sympathise with the author than in his pitiless disclosure of the tyranny over the Church exercised by nearly all those sovereigns who succeeded to the throne, and the pretensions of the first Christian emperor. Constantius and Valens, with their Arian tools, and Zeno, with his Acacius, and Michael, the patron of Photius, and Leo the Armenian, and Constantine Copronymus, are hideous anticipations of Henry the Eighth and Cranmer: and the servility of the eastern bishops only finds its parallel in the humble submission of the Elizabethan episcopate to their mistress. If it cost an eastern emperor little to depose the blameless patriarch Ignatius, because he would not patronise the incest of a royal adulterer,—if he found bishops in multitudes who would consecrate a layman, and support him when consecrated, and rather separate the east from the west than undo their crime,—so, when Queen Elizabeth withdrew the jurisdiction she had conferred on her primate, Grindal, his suffragans are found to approach her throne with petitions for his restora-

tion, and a humble confession, that "We, whom *you* have set over the government of the Church, when we quit your majesty, have no human thing which we can hope will even for a day avert the calamity hanging over our necks and heads."—Cardwell's Annals, i. 391.

Thus the national spirit of the Greeks against the Latins, and the natural hatred of the State and the Church, are found during many centuries playing into each other's hands, and consummating at last a schism more fatal and lasting than the Anglican separation of 1534 and 1559.

Mr. Appleyard shows, with much ability, that the patriarch of Constantinople was, from the beginning, the ecclesiastical representative and expression of this double national and state hostility to the principle of unity, and divinely appointed governor of the Church, the successor of St. Peter. He thus sums up his first chapter:

"I have traced an outline of the fortunes of the ancient republic of Byzantium, and of the rapid steps by which the Church of the metropolis, its proud successor, ascended from the lowest to the highest grade of splendour and dominion. The reader will call to mind that before a single stone was laid of Constantinople, the Churches of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, were the chief members of the Christian republic, commanding the veneration of the faithful by the heroic conflicts for the faith of which they had been the scenes, for the scholars whom they sent forth from their seats of learning, in the dispensations of charity and mercy to the poor, the widow, and the orphan, of which they had been the never-failing sources; and he will judge for himself, whether the swift promotion, which, in little more than fifty years elevated the youngest member of the episcopal college over the heads of three patriarchs, and in about fifty more, placed him on a level with the fourth, *in whom by common consent in all times before a primacy was acknowledged to reside*,—whether this extraordinary rise was a legitimate development of Church principle, or the arbitrary act of imperial despotism."

The following is Mr. Appleyard's view of the Church's government at the time of the first general council; and no one, we must observe, can take such a view without having *a duty to fulfil consequent upon it*:

"At the commencement of the fourth century, the Church presented the appearance of a vast organised body, spreading her branches far and wide over the Roman empire, and interlacing with a network of her own, every order of the state, and every gradation of society. *Of this great free confederacy the Bishop of Rome was the*

acknowledged head. From Rome the large portion of the west had received the gospel; from Rome, the common interests of Christianity, through the whole extent of the Roman empire, could best be advanced. The Roman bishops, heads of the wealthiest community, were early distinguished and known in the most distant lands for their liberal benefactions to their christian brethren, and a common interest bound all the communities of the Roman empire to the Church of the great capital: in Rome was the *Ecclesia Apostolica*, to which the largest portion of the west could appeal, as to their common mother.....At this epoch, the Church, having the Bishop of Rome her virtual head, defender of the faith, and guardian of her liberties, became united to the State; the emperor, supreme in the latter, claiming the same authority in the former also."—pp. 11—12.

Within twenty years after the State had become in some sense Christian, and the emperors, accordingly, interfered in matters of faith, we have the injurious influence of nationalism on the unity of the Church thus set forth:

"The partition of the Roman world between the sons of Constantine, on the death of that great prince, and the subsequent—with occasional intervals of re-union—continued separation into the eastern and western empires, almost unavoidably upon a state theory, broke up the visible unity of the Church; subjects entered into the quarrels of their sovereigns; national distinctions grew up; intercourse was often interrupted; old grudges were studiously preserved, aggravated, and embittered. Literature, singular to say of two nations so highly polished, ceased to diffuse its humanizing influences. The Latins, on principle, learnt no Greek; and the Greeks, on principle, learnt no Latin."—p. 12.

A century later, anticipating the domineering tyranny of Justinian in spiritual matters,—

"The emperor Zeno, at the instance, as supposed, of Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 482, published the Henoticon, or Deed of Union; in which, proclaiming himself master and legislator in matters of faith, he decreed that no symbol other than that of Nice, with the additions of the council of 381, should be received. He condemned Nestorianism and Eutychianism, but made very slight mention of the council of Chalcedon. The emperor and his advisers imagined that, without prejudice to their dogmatical differences, the Catholics and Monophysites might, by this edict, be induced to renew communion with each other. The emperor Zeno died in his bed. There is some satisfaction in knowing this. In strict right, he had no business to put forth the Henoticon in that autocratic fashion at all; still the edict was good. Zeno was not torn to pieces; the Henoticon was. The

instant it appeared, the high Catholic world fell upon it tooth and nail. Those halcyon days of peace, the day dream of the imperial counsellors, vanished before the abhorrent spectacle of confusion worse confounded. In 484, Pope Felix, in a synod of seventy bishops, to give a practical refutation to the legislative pretensions of the emperor in questions of faith, passed sentence of deposition on Acacius, at whose door, whether justly or not, the merit or the demerit of the Henoticon was laid."—p. 18.

“ It is curious to mark how exactly the state instinct of an emperor of Constantinople in 482, and of an English Privy Council in 1850, coincide. And the Henoticon of this latter, proclaiming that the clergy of the same Church may believe and teach according to their private opinion that baptism regenerates or does not regenerate, seems likely to be followed by similarly happy results in the communion subject to it.

Mr. Appleyard himself suggests another parallel with English history, in the furious persecutions and confiscations of the Iconoclastic emperors :

“ In reading the doings of Constantine Copronymus, we almost feel transported to comparatively modern times. The religious houses, with their rich libraries, were either burnt or converted into barracks ; the monks were compelled to lay aside their habits, and marry, or fly to foreign lands ; his own patriarch, who had hitherto obeyed his every will, was deposed, and soon after executed ; the fury of the populace was permitted and encouraged to wreak itself, not only on the representations, but even on the relics, of the saints, which were either burnt, or cast into the sea. Nothing was allowed to be set up but the cross only. From 726 to 784, there was suspension of communion between the Greek and Latin Churches.....In 789 peace was restored. Quiet lasted twenty-nine years. In 816, Leo the Armenian, by an imperial decree, prohibited, as contrary to the law of God, all honour paid to images. A renewal of the former tumults and excesses ensued ; the sacred images were again broken in pieces and burnt ; the vessels of the church on which any figure had been formed, were destroyed. All who refused to submit were scourged ; many suffered the loss of their tongues ; banishment and confiscation of property were considered the mildest chastisements. Bishops and monks suffered torture unto death, or were frequently tied in sacks and cast into the sea. The mere possession of a religious picture, or of a book defending the use of images, the reception of an exile, or an act of mercy exercised towards a prisoner, brought with it the heaviest punishment.”—pp. 21—22.

This outburst of eastern Protestantism in the eighth century met with resistance from that same sacred power of St. Peter's see, against which the fury of western Protestantism let loose all its malignity. St. Peter's voice tore in pieces the Henoticon, and branded its devisers with the mark of heresy; rebuked emperors who meddled with that faith of which God had raised them up to be obedient sons; restored honour and veneration to the images and pictures of our Lord and His saints; maintained and re-established that whole divine sacramental system—that virtue going forth from the hem of the garment of our incarnate Lord—against which the rationalism of the eighth and the sixteenth centuries rose up in arms. And in the nineteenth century that power is living still, more than ever watchful, with the experience of a hundred contests against error, and the majesty of a hundred victories over it, ready and anxious to bless, to instruct, and to unite kings and nations, but able, too, if stern necessity so require, to protect the faith of Christ as well against the fury of a mob, as against the seduction of a court.

The author well touches on the root of that remarkable abhorrence of symbolic worship, which is one characteristic of the great anti-Christian movement in the sixteenth century.

“There exists in the minds of most Protestants a strong repugnance to the devotional use of pictures and carved representations. This repugnance springs from a most virtuous and holy source, an impression, that to put material objects to such an use is a violation of the second commandment; yet a distinguished Protestant of our own days, a man remarkable for clearness and vigour of mind, thought very differently. ‘The second commandment,’ writes the late lamented Dr. Arnold of Rugby, ‘is in the letter utterly done away with by the fact of the incarnation. To refuse, then, the benefit which we might derive from the frequent use of the crucifix, under the pretext of the second commandment, is a folly, because God has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of Himself, when He declared Himself in the person of Christ.’—*Life*, vol. i. The ignorance of the very elementary truths of the gospel existing in our population is notorious; could this have been so great had the sacred rood remained, as it ought to have done, in our churches? That most touching scene in the Saviour's passion, when from the cross He spake to the mother who bare Him, and the beloved disciple weeping at His feet, ‘Woman, behold thy Son,’

—‘Behold thy mother,’ in how many instances would not that moving history, that had riveted the eyes of the child, have been remembered by the man? a heavenly vision passing and repassing before him; soother in the hour of sorrow; quickener to the affectionate performance of filial and parental duties; inspirer of a hope that maketh not ashamed, and a faith that faileth not, by the vivid evidence of human sympathy united to divine power.”—p. 23.

We have seen Mr. Appleyard’s frank admission, that the primacy of the Roman see stands confessed at the end of those three centuries in which the Church, not being yet in union with the State, was free to act according to her inward principles. The following is his summary of the conduct of the Popes during the seven succeeding centuries, which are terminated by the Greek schism:

“In a gradual separation (between the east and west) going on through many centuries, in which so many different causes concurred, and such a variety of actors appeared and disappeared on the scenes, it is scarcely possible to determine the effect due to a distinct cause, or the share of blame justly attributed to each individual. But a succession of persons stand out from the rest, commanding our undivided attention; to judge them fairly, we must place ourselves in their position, and see with their eyes. The theory by which the conduct of the Popes was regulated was this, that they were the divinely appointed heads of the Church Catholic, the chartered guardians of her rights and liberties. What a single bishop was to his own diocese, such they deemed themselves to be to the whole Christian world. They laid to their own hearts and consciences those awful words, ‘I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing, and His kingdom, preach the word; be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine.’ I am no thick-and-thin advocate; I do not take upon myself to say, that the sovereign Pontiff never interposed unnecessarily; that the spiritual arms which they wielded were never rashly nor unjustifiably employed; but I cannot help feeling persuaded, that the reader who will examine dispassionately the line of conduct which the Popes pursued in the unhappy divisions and dissensions which so often distracted the Church, will find that they generally acted with firmness and moderation;—that they rarely resorted to extreme measures till there was no choice left them;—that the sentence of condemnation, so far from being irrevocable, was almost always mitigated, and often revoked, on the repentance and submission of the offender.”—p. 35.

The passages we have quoted supply ample proof of Mr. Appleyard's candour and liberality of judgment. We feel persuaded, that nothing would tempt him consciously to suppress or distort a fact, in order to defend a cause; and this, considering the subject on which he ventures, is very high and uncommon praise. But we have said that there was one fatal defect, which marred many excellent qualities in his writings; and we will proceed, however unwillingly, to say a word on this, first noting a weakness, which, in part, we conceive springs from it. He not only strives to be fair to all parties, but he is sometimes even tender to those on whom a judgment, which ought to be respected by all Christians, has issued an inexorable sentence of condemnation. We will not complain if he speaks of "good Archbishop Abbot," little sympathy as we can feel with that ruthless, mischievous, Puritan; but to a very discriminating character of the great heresiarch Arius, he appends the following: "I cheerfully subscribe to the opinion of a distinguished Church writer, just lost to the world, that Arius, in the first instance, *never intended to put forth any tenet contrary to Catholic doctrine. He claimed a latitude commensurate with the language of the Scriptures, and refused to be bound closer than the Bible bound him.*"—p. 63. And this is said of a man, who, from the first to the last, made the Son of God a creature! And one would think that Mr. Appleyard felt inclined to justify, which we are sure he does not, those "who claim a latitude commensurate with the language of the Scriptures, and refuse to be bound closer than the Bible bound them," for the very purpose of annihilating the true interpretation of the Bible. This has been the very chosen pretext of heresy from the beginning. No error can be found which more directly impugns the very ground-work of Christianity than Arianism; yet if it were sufficient to use the language of the Scriptures, and express belief in the "Son of God," with the reservation in one's own breast of the sense in which He is believed to be the "Son of God," it would be impossible to extirpate Arianism. Really, we can only rank this gentleness towards heretics with the mawkish compassion felt by some of the public towards murderers. The latter springs from an inadequate sense of sin in moral crime; the former from an inadequate sense of the exclusive obedience due to dogmatic truth. If Protestantism were to triumph,

it would efface both the notion of sin, and the notion of truth. It shrinks from God as the righteous Judge, nor can it bear Him as the absolute Verity. And thus, while crime is softened by it into malady, and assassins are judged to be insane, heresy becomes an act of conscience, and the worst denials of revealed truth are but the necessary workings of private judgment.

How, then, is it possible, that a man should express of the papal authority the belief we have above quoted from Mr. Appleyard, and yet remain in a system which is the direct antagonist of that authority? Is it not because in this seemingly liberal and true appreciation of the Church's history, and of the doctrines disputed in these latter ages, the writer puts himself as a judge and a standard of truth, and not as one bound to be obedient to that truth, when found, yes, to sacrifice to it, if need be, all that is dear to the natural heart? He sees, he loves, he admires, he offers the homage of praise, he seems to be with the very voice and mien of charity, "bearing all things, believing all things, hoping all things, enduring all things," in his judgment of men and things; but it is all as an eclectic, as one picking out here a fine character, and there a true doctrine, putting together his own fancy of ante-Nicene and post-Nicene times of medieval and modern Church history; but not reflecting that there is an infinite responsibility resting upon all this, infinite as the soul's eternity. He is not to be truth's master, but its servant: it is not enough to deplore the evils of separation, if one continues a separatist. If the Papacy be what he has described it, it claims his *obedience*. We may erect ourselves into judges of the Church in past ages; but in doing so, even when most extolling the truth, we put ourselves in the position of its masters: it is, as it were, a function of our own minds. Woe to us if we forget that the living Church has the claim of a parent over us, and that he cannot be a child of God who has not that living Church—the Church of to-day, which energises before his eyes—for his mother.

— *Allies.*

ART. III.—*Handbook of London, Past and Present.* BY PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A. Second edition. London: Murray, 1850.

WHEN Parliament rose last summer, a stranger might have imagined that a weariness of life had seized the fashionable denizens of the great Metropolis; or that some pestilence or war had rendered it unfit for aristocratic habitation. Men were seen turning away listlessly from the Clubs and the Operas, and dreaming of the Solent or the Highlands,—or concocting schemes for over-running Europe; while the fairer portion of creation looked as if balls and fetes were among the pleasures of memory rather than of hope. The Peer of the Realm satiated with blue books, had taken to Mr. Murray's red ones, and under their guidance had fled from politics and St. Stephen, to other pursuits and other scenes. The County member, in spite of his *vis inertiae*, had been carried off by his enterprising wife and restless daughters "up the Rhine," and was drawing from sour crout and sourer wines, strong confirmation of his faith that "there is no place like home." The merchant, to whom the city gives no rest, had encamped his wife and six children for the summer at Brighton or Hastings, and was managing, under the auspices of a return ticket, to pass his Sundays where he shines most, "au sein de sa famille." Even Themis herself had gone out of town, posting a notice on her door that she would not return till the end of October. Her black brood had followed her example; and puisne judges, nisi-prius advocates, chancery barristers, and special pleaders, might have been found far away from the scene of their toils and gains, seeking in other climes an atmosphere untainted by "pleading" or "practice." Never was London so deserted. The Park was a wilderness; Regent Street was asleep; Piccadilly was silent as the tomb. Paving Commissioners and Sewers Commissioners, Water Companies and Gas Companies, had seized and torn up the principal thoroughfares of the town,—as they are wont to do in September—and had raised up barricades and dug trenches equally obstructive of locomotion. Legions of housepainters had invaded the Clubs, and turned out the few *blasés* who were still lurking about them. Old shops were discarding their "ancient lights," and adorning themselves with modern plate glass and mahogany window-frames. Everywhere work-

men and artisans were busy, like the carpenters of a theatre between the acts, in preparing for the forthcoming scene. In every quarter the knell of the past season, and the note of preparation for the coming one, rang in our ears.

And now we are on the eve of that long expected time. The season of 1851 is at hand and already we may hear the distant sound of the multitudes who are flocking hither from every part of the world to witness the inauguration of the Temple which has been raised to Commerce, by the zeal, we had almost said by the magic arts, of its worshippers. The number of provincial and foreign visitors who are to arrive in London between the months of May and October next, has been roundly estimated at, we are afraid to say how many millions; and even if such estimates be not quite free from that exaggeration with which vivid imaginations and excited hopes have tinged most calculations connected with the Exhibition, it may be safely asserted that at no period in the history of the world, will so many human beings have congregated to one spot in an equal space of time. In the daily expectation of visitors from every part of the known world, it may not unnaturally occur to the Londoner to ask himself what lions he shall shew them when they arrive. For all visitors are, like Mr. Gordon Cumming, lion hunters; and they will certainly demand of their hosts some gratification of that universal taste. The crystal palace, to say nothing of its marvellous contents, will no doubt rank foremost on the list of places worth visiting: but the life of wonders, however great, is, after all, proverbially limited to a few days; and men who have never seen before, and never expect to see again, the chief city of our Empire and the metropolis of the commercial world, will expect to see some other memorials of the greatness, the power, the taste, or the piety of ourselves and our ancestors. While Rome and Greece, Egypt and India, preserve imperishable monuments of the early ages of the world; while almost every old town in Europe contains some specimens, if not of classic, at least of mediæval art; nothing remains in the English capital, except *names*, to mark the spot where some old building stood, or some event in history occurred.

What shall be shown to the Italian, the Frenchman, the German, and the Spaniard, in return for the glorious monuments of classic, Christian and Oriental genius,

with the sight of which their ancient towns repay our visits? This is a question which the worthy citizens of London may find more easily asked than answered. In the first place, London does not possess many palpable relics of the past. The great fire of 1666, destroyed nearly the whole of the city, properly so called. It laid waste three hundred and thirty-six acres of land, and reduced to ashes upwards of 13,000 houses, and ten millions worth of property. This frightful catastrophe swept away almost all the churches and monasteries which had been the pride and ornament of the capital of the Plantagenets; and the loss was irreparable in that debased state of art which followed the Reformation in this country, and which has been a reproach to our nation down to the present time. But although London in this respect, forms a sad contrast to Rome and Athens, enough remains within its ambit to interest and amuse. If it can afford but little interest to the artist, it can give much to all who are not destitute of that retrospective instinct which attaches man to the past. From the days of its old Saxon Hanse, or corporation, to those of its train bands; and down to George the Third's reign and Alderman Beckford's Speech, its annals form part of the national history. And it is to history alone, and not to art, that London looks for whatever means it possesses of interesting the antiquarian. The angelic being of the German story, who once in five hundred years visited a place which he found, the first time a forest, the next, a sea-coast, and the third a populous city,—was assured on each occasion by some dweller on the spot, that it had always existed in the same state as he then saw it; and undoubtedly if he should come to the Exhibition this year, he will find many to tell him that the London of today is much the same as the London of the Roses and of the Conquest. Nevertheless, hardly a spot on the face of the earth has undergone so many changes; although none possess fewer objects calculated to recall the memory of them. The history, however, of its holes and corners, the biography of its streets, and the obituary of its houses, have a charm to which few can be insensible. If the houses in which our ancestors dwelt, the churches in which they worshipped, and the walls behind which they fought, no longer exist, their names at least haunt the ground on which they stood; and every spot is hallowed by associations with the

deeds, habits, and lives of our forefathers. In short, with a well stored memory and tolerable imaginative powers, the London of our Charleses and Henrys, and even of our Edwards and Williams, may be conjured up from the grave, notwithstanding the ravages of fire, and what has been sometimes equally merciless, modern improvement.

In the next place, the inhabitants of this, like those of all other great cities, know less of the objects of interest which it contains, than the stranger who visits it for a fortnight. Crowds of them pass long lives in the densest of its smoke, and yet know less of the curiosities or antiquities which it may possess, than the bearded foreigners whom excursion trains disgorge weekly in thousands on its streets. It is true, our's is a mercantile country, and that most of our sights are only to be seen for money. Westminster Abbey costs sixpence, the Tower a shilling, and as for St. Paul's Cathedral,

“Non cuivis hominum contingit adire Corinthum.”

We are not all blessed with sufficient affluence to afford a view of that great temple of the “Poor man's Church.” And possibly the tax thus imposed on the gratification of ennobling and purifying tastes may have repressed their cultivation among a people more characterized by the practical love of the good, than by an over keen perception of the beautiful. The plodding tradesman or clerk who travels daily from a suburban cottage to his shop or counting-house in the city, cares little for the history of the streets through which he passes, or of the buildings into which duty or pleasure takes him; he cares only that the former are well paved, cleansed, and lighted, and that the latter afford a certain amount of accommodation and comfort. In the familiar objects, therefore, which daily meet his eyes, he sees nothing but unmeaning masses of stone and wood, which awaken no other emotions than such as a shop window or an advertising van can excite. Imagine him starting from Hyde Park corner to the Bank, perched on the roof of an omnibus, in company with a foreign friend or two, to whom he wishes to do the honours of the place. He will no doubt bespeak their applause for the Duke of Wellington's statue on his right hand, and the Duke of Wellington's house on his left. He will then proceed down Piccadilly without meeting any object to arrest his attention except a distant view of Westminster

Abbey, and Buckingham Palace, and the announcement of some miles of panorama at the Egyptian Hall. Should the Duke of York's column catch his eye, it may set him to calculating how many shillings in the pound the cost of its erection would have paid his Royal Highness' creditors; and its unfinished neighbour in Trafalgar Square may prove to his companions that the reign of flunkeyism is not yet ended in a country where Princes have precedence of heroes. The pigtailed monarch in Pall Mall will excite a smile, and perhaps a glance may be thrown upwards to see whether the Duke of Northumberland's copy of Michael Angelo's lion looks east or west. A little further on, as he passes Exeter Hall, he will think of the three Christian Graces, Faith, Hope, and Charity—personified, perhaps, by the three interlaced and seductive figures of Cumming, M'Neile, and Rochfort Clarke; and of whig commissions, and stamps and taxes, as his eye rests on Somerset House. He may be delayed opposite the open tower of St. Dunstan's Church, in Fleet Street, by an interminable line of waggons and omnibuses; and after winding round the expensive show-house of the metropolitan Dean and Chapter, he will at last reach the Bank. And he will reach it without having been able to point out to his companions one single object or one single spot during his journey which conjured up the memory of the ancient occupants of his home.

That his road, however, was not wholly devoid of interest, may be collected by a glance at its past history; as we now propose to shew, mainly under the auspices of Mr. Cunningham, who has collected within the limits of the moderate sized volume, whose title is prefixed to this article, a mass of amusing information upon the past as well as the present state of the metropolis.

The very corner of the Park from which our citizen started, is not without a history of its own. Here in 1642 the citizens of London, apprehensive of the approach of Charles I., erected a fort with four bastions, at which, Hudibras tells us,

“ From ladies down to oyster-wenches,
Laboured like pioneers in the trenches.”

From the scene of military preparation, it became the reward of military valour, and the retreat of military repose. Not that the Duke of Wellington is the first vete-

ran who found on that spot good quarters in the winter of his life, for

“From the middle of the reign of George II. till the erection of Apsley House in 1784,” by Henry, Earl Bathurst and Baron Apsley, who was Lord Chancellor, and afterwards President of the Council of Lord North’s administration, “the small entrance gateway was flanked on its east side by a poor tenement known as ‘Allen’s stall.’ Allen, whose wife kept a moveable apple-stall at the Park entrance, was recognized by George II. as an old soldier at the battle of Dettingen, and asked (so pleased was the king at meeting the veteran) what he could do for him? Allen, after some hesitation, asked for a piece of ground for a permanent apple-stall at Hyde Park Corner, and a grant was made to him of a piece of ground, which his children afterwards sold to Apsley”—Mr. Cunningham means “Henry”—“Lord Bathurst.”—*Hand-book*, tit. Hyde Park Corner.

Of the park itself, we are informed that it was anciently the Manor of Hyde, and the property of the Benedictines of Westminster, until Henry VIII. obtained it and the adjoining manor of Neyte, together with the advowson of Chelsea, in exchange for the priory of Henley in Berkshire. Henry did not often acquire church property by “exchange,” and this instance of his condescending to so common-place a method of acquisition is perhaps worth recording for its singularity.

How or why Piccadilly came by its name is a question which has puzzled etymologists; and no satisfactory origin of the term has yet been given. The first mention of it as a street is in the rate books of St. Martin’s parish under the year 1673, at which time it extended westward only as far as Sackville Street. In the middle of last century the part between Hyde Park Corner and Devonshire house was occupied by statuaries and stone-masons, and presented much the same appearance as the new road between Portland Place and Tottenham Court Road now does. The Coventry Club (No. 106) stands on the site of an old Inn called The Greyhound, which was bought by the Earl of Coventry in 1764. Houses in this quarter fetched good prices even then, it seems; for we are told that his Lordship paid 10,000 guineas for his purchase.

Exactly facing St. James’s Palace the great Lord Clarendon built the stately mansion which drew upon him that “gust of envy” which led to his downfall. He died in Dec.

1674; and in the following year his sons sold Clarendon House to the second Duke of Albemarle, who was soon compelled by his difficulties to part with it. Sir Thomas Bond, Comptroller of Henrietta Maria's household, became the purchaser. The house was taken down, and Albemarle and Old Bond Streets were raised on its site. Two Corinthian pilasters in the gateway of the Three Kings' Stables, Piccadilly, are supposed to have belonged to Clarendon house, and are probably the only existing remains of that edifice.

At the corner of Windmill Street and Coventry Street, one Robert Baker erected, early in the seventeenth century, Piccadilly Hall, "a fair house for entertainment and gaming;" Clarendon tells us, "with handsome gravel walks with shade, and where were an upper and lower bowling-green, whither very many of the nobility and gentry of the best quality resorted, both for exercise and conversation." The Tennis Court in James's Street, Haymarket, was attached to this once celebrated gaming house. Its last proprietor was Colonel Panton, whose name survives in a square and street adjoining Coventry Street. This Colonel Panton was a notorious gamester, in the reign of Charles II.; but, more fortunate than most of his craft, he won in one night enough money to purchase property worth £1,500 a-year; and wisely satisfied with his gain, he foreswore gambling, lived upon his estate, and from the hour of his good luck to that of his death, which occurred in 1681, never touched die or card.

The names of Arlington, Jermyn, Burlington, Dover, Berkeley, Clifford, &c., borne by streets adjoining Piccadilly, remind the passer-by of the days of Charles II.; but for further particulars respecting them, we must refer to the handbook. The first-mentioned street was inhabited, after the death of the "gay monarch," by his Duchess of Cleveland, whose name still survives in Cleveland Row; and in the following century by Sir Robert Walpole.

Mr. Cunningham informs us in his preface, that he has had access to the records of White and Brooks's clubs; and his account of those celebrated establishments tempt us to turn from Piccadilly into St. James's Street. White's, Nos. 37 and 38, is the successor of White's

* Hist. of Rebellion, i. 422, ed. 1826.

Chocolate House, which was established about A.D. 1698, five doors from the bottom of the western side of the street, and burnt down in 1733; at which time it was kept by Arthur, who founded and gave his name to the club, at No. 69.

“The incident of the fire was made use of by Hogarth in plate 6 of the *Rake's Progress*, and representing a room at White's. The total abstraction of the gamblers is well expressed by their utter inattention to the alarm of fire given by watchmen who are bursting open the doors. Plate 4 of the same pictured moral, represents a group of chimney-sweepers and shoe-blacks, gambling on the ground over against White's. To indicate the club more fully, Hogarth has inserted the name Black's.”—*Handbook, Tit. White's Club-House.*

The Chocolate house ceased to be open to the public in 1736, when it was appropriated exclusively to the chief frequenters of the place, and supported by annual subscriptions.

“It was at this time, and long after, essentially a gaming club. The most fashionable, as well as the common people, dined at an early hour, and a supper was then an indispensable meal. White's became a great supper house, where gaming, both before and after, was carried on to a late hour and heavy amounts. The least difference of opinion invariably ended in a bet, and a book for entering the particulars of all bets was always laid upon the table; one of these, with entries of a date as early as 1744, has been preserved. The marriage of a young lady of rank would occasion a bet of a hundred guineas, that she would give birth to a live child before the Countess of ———, who had been married three or even more months before her. Heavy bets were pending, that Arthur, then a widower, would be married before a member of the club of about the same age, and also a widower; that Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, would outlive the old Duchess of Cleveland; that Colley Cibber would outlive both Beau Nash, and old Mr. Swinney; and that a certain minister would cease to be in the cabinet by a certain time.”

Brook's club, on the opposite side of the street, (No 60,) appears, from its early title, to have been an offshoot of White's. It was founded in 1764, and was at one time called Almack's, from the person who first founded it; and afterwards Brook's, from a wine merchant and money-lender, who subsequently had the management of it. That it also was a gaming-club, sufficiently appears from the following rules, by which it was ordered,

“That every person playing at the new quince table do keep fifty guineas before him.

“That every person playing at the twenty guinea table do not keep less than twenty guineas before him.”

This club is more celebrated perhaps than any other for the number of distinguished, and even great, men whom it has counted among its members. The names of Fox, Selwyn, Garrick, Horace Walpole, Hume, Gibbon, Burke, Reynolds, and Sheridan, figure prominently among the members of Brook's.

St. James's Street was, we believe, “the road leading to Tyburn,” or, “the road near the house of St. James's,” where the ancient fair was kept which Edward I. granted in 1290 to the Leper Hospital of St. James's, upon the site of which the palace of that name now stands. The fair was kept for a week, from St. James's eve (24th July) every year, until suppressed by the long parliament. It was revived at the Restoration; but the days of metropolitan fairs were even then drawing to a close. It was found to attract, not the buyers and sellers for whose accommodation it had, like all other fairs, been originally instituted, but the idle, the profligate, and the dangerous classes, who, by some strange law of sequence, appear always to step into the places which the votaries of commerce vacate. St. James's fair had passed into the latter phase of its existence even before the puritans abolished it; and the excesses which were renewed upon its revival were too scandalous even for Charles, who finally put it down.

Henry VIII. became the possessor of the hospital in the same year that he became the husband of Anne Boleyn; and he quickly diverted it from its ancient “superstitious” use to that “charitable” one which begins and ends at home. He enclosed the adjoining St. James's fields, and stocked them with game; and at the Whitehall end of them built a tilt-yard—on the parade opposite the Horseguards—and a cock-pit. Thus was formed St. James's Park, which he left an expanse of grass, with a few trees and a number of small ponds scattered over its surface at irregular intervals. Charles II. threw the ponds (except Rosamond's pond, in the south-west corner of the park, “long consecrated to disastrous love and elegiac poetry,” and filled up in 1770), into one continuous sheet of water: planted the long avenues of trees, and made the strait walks which the commissioners of woods and forests have

not yet destroyed. Pall Mall, which was then included in the park and formed its northern boundary, was dedicated to the fashionable game of Pale-maille.

"A game wherein a round bowle (or ball, *palla*.) is with a mallet (*maglia*) struck through a high arch of iron standing at either end of an alley, which he that can do at the fewest blows, or at the number agreed on, wins."—Handbook, tit. Pall Mall, citing Blount's *Glossographia*.

It appears, however, that houses had then already sprung up along Pall Mall, and its exclusion from the park was one of the improvements which Charles II. effected in that locality.

George I., who had probably been taught in his native land the great ducal axiom, that a man has a right to do what he likes with his own, appears to have been but indifferently satisfied with the sense in which his half republican insular subjects understood the park to be *his own*.

"This is a strange country," he said, (in good German, probably, for his majesty did not speak English,) "the first morning after my arrival at St. James's, I looked out of the window and saw a park with walls, a canal, &c., which they told me was mine. The next day Lord Chetwynd, the ranger of *my* park, sent me a fine brace of carp out of my canal, and I was told I must give five guineas to Lord Chetwynd's servant for bringing me *my own* carp out of *my own* canal in *my own* park."—Handbook, tit. St. James's Park.

Mr. Cunningham reminds us that this is the Park which George II.'s Queen, Caroline, wished to shut up and convert into a garden for St. James's Palace. Upon inquiring of Sir Robert Walpole what might be the probable cost of carrying her plan into execution, the great Whig statesman bluntly replied: "Only three crowns." The family knot of politicians who at the present day claim the exclusive possession of the traditions and honours of Whiggery, appear, however, to believe that the obsequiousness of the courtier is better calculated to secure their hold of office than the honest vindication of a public right. They did not hesitate, therefore, with the little cunning and petty fraudulency which has made even their political supporters ashamed of them, to obtain, by the pretence of needing a simple iron railing for Buckingham Palace, the sanction of a thin and wearied House of Commons, late in the last session, to a plan for the adornment

of the palace, which not only was to be executed at the expense, but was to be carried into effect by a gross encroachment upon the property, of the public. Whatever be the merits or the fate of this "improvement," it will always be remembered as a characteristic specimen of that "jobbery" which has ever been the distinguishing vice and disgrace of the family faction. Courtiers alternately of prince and peasant; now advocates of coercion, now traders in patriotism; to-day the supporters of penal laws, to-morrow the assertors of the rights of conscience; at one moment basking in the smiles of despotism, at another toying with the terrors of anarchy; they have veered round every point of the political compass, and have kept true to but one principle, the love of place. That these unworthy successors of Walpole, however, should have, not boldly invaded, but basely filched, public property, need excite no surprise, when their chief is seen patching up a damaged popularity with the rags of No-Popery, and atoning for his past desertion of the Jews, by abetting street riots against his own Church.

At the north eastern extremity, St. James's Park abutted upon the garden and bowling green which was attached to the Palace of Whitehall. "A jet or spring of water, which sprung from the pressure of the foot, and wetted whoever was foolish or ignorant enough to tread upon it," gave its name to this garden, which was in the height of its glory in the days of the first Charles.

"There was kept in it an ordinary of six shillings a meal, (when the king's proclamation allows but two elsewhere,) continual bibbling and drinking wine all day under the trees; two or three quarrels every week."—Handbook tit. Spring Gardens, citing Strafford papers.

These and worse disorders led to the gardens being "put down" by Charles I. They were, however, again opened, probably when the civil wars were turning the attention of men to more exciting topics than police regulations; but they were closed by the Protector, and the ground was built upon shortly after the Restoration, when the entertainments were removed to a manor in Surrey, which once belonged to Fulke de Breauté, a follower of King John, and which was, after him, called Fulke's, or Fauke's, Hall, or, as we now call it, Vauxhall.

Emerging from these old Spring Gardens, through New

Street, we find ourselves in the rendezvous of the architectural and sculptural abominations of modern art. Here once stood the grandest of the nine crosses which Edward I. erected in honour of his queen, Eleanor, on the several spots where her body rested on its way from Lincoln to Westminster Abbey. Two of the nine alone now remain—at Northampton and Waltham. The Charing Cross was pulled down in 1647, by order of the Long Parliament, and the stones were used to pave the street in front of Whitehall. General Harrison, Colonel Jones, Hugh Peters, and others of the regicides, were executed in 1660, “at the railing where Charing Cross stood.”

Beyond it, and connecting it with Temple Bar, lies the Strand. In olden times, when the citizens of London left its walls, to take an evening stroll to St. Clement's well, (now in Clement's Inn,) the Strand was an open country road, along the left bank of the Thames, leading from Temple Bar to the village or hamlet of Charing. It was not paved until 1532, in which year (24 Henry VIII.) it was enacted that, “the street between Charing Cross and Strand Cross, shall be sufficiently paved, at the charge of the owners of the lands; and the pavement being made, it shall be maintained by the owners of the land adjoining to the same, upon pain of forfeiture to the king of sixpence for every yard square not paved or repaired.” A house adjoining the Duke of Northumberland's was long the official residence of the Secretary of State. Sir Harry Vane lived in it in the reign of Charles I., and Mr. Secretary Nicholas in that of Charles II.

But the Strand is memorable chiefly for having been the residence of our bishops in olden times. “Anciently,” says Selden, in his table talk, “the noblemen lay within the city for safety and security, but the bishops' houses were by the water side, because they were held sacred persons whom nobody would hurt.” “As many as nine bishops,” adds Mr. Cunningham, “possessed inns or hostels on the south, or water side of the present Strand, at the period of the Reformation.” Villiers Street, Buckingham Street, and the other streets which together are known as York Buildings, are the site of Norwich House, the ancient Inn of the Bishops of Norwich, afterwards the residence of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, Henry the Eighth's brother-in-law. It became

York House when Heath, Archbishop of York, and Queen Mary's chancellor, obtained it in exchange for Suffolk House, which had been granted to him by the queen in lieu of that other York House which Henry VIII. had taken from Cardinal Wolsey, upon his disgrace, and had converted into Whitehall. Heath's successors in the province, appear to have leased it to the Lord Keepers of the Great Seal. Here Lord Keeper Pickering, and Lord Keeper Egerton died; here died also Sir Nicholas Bacon, another Lord Keeper. The same house saw the birth and disgrace of his illustrious son. In 1672, its last owner, the second Duke of Buckingham, sold it and its gardens for £30,000. to Roger Higgs, Esq., Emery Hill, gentleman, Nicholas Eddyn, woodmonger, and John Green, brewer, who pulled it down and covered the ground with the present streets and tenements. The only vestige of it now remaining, is Inigo Jones's beautiful water gate, at the end of Buckingham Street, called York Stairs.

Durham Street points out where Thomas Hatfield, Bishop of Durham, built a town house, in 1345. It continued the property of the bishops of that see until the Reformation, when Bishop Tunstall gave it to Henry VIII. in exchange for Coldharbour House, the site of which is now occupied by Calvert's Brewery, in Upper Thames Street. Durham House was granted by Edward VI. to his sister, Elizabeth, and by her to Sir Walter Raleigh, from whom it was taken away in 1603, by James I. It subsequently passed to the Pembroke family, from whom it was purchased, in the early part of George the Third's reign, by the two Scotch architects, Robert and John Adam, who demolished it, and constructed on its site that embankment and pile of buildings which we know as the Adelphi.

Beaufort Buildings was formerly the site of the Bishop of Carlisle's town house; and not far from it stood the palace, which Peter, Earl of Savoy, and uncle of Henry the Third's wife, Eleanor, built in 1245, and afterwards bestowed on the fraternity of Mountjoy (*fratres de Monte Jovis*), and which Queen Eleanor purchased of them for her second son, the Earl of Lancaster. Since his time it has remained part and parcel of the Earldom, afterwards the Duchy, of Lancaster. It was destroyed by Wat Tyler, in 1381, and although rebuilt in 1505 by Henry VII., who endowed it as a hospital for the

relief of one hundred poor, a chapel alone now remains to mark and name the place on which it once stood. The Inns of the Bishops of Llandaff, Chester, and Worcester, were swallowed up by the palace which the Protector Somerset erected on the site of the present Somerset house. The Bishops of Bath's house passed to the Arundel family in Edward the Sixth's time, and was the repository of the Arundelian marbles, until the grandson of their collector gave them to the university of Oxford. Arundel house was pulled down in 1678, and Arundel, Surry, and Norfolk Streets were built in its place.

Essex Street, which now leads to twopenny steamers and the Chinese junk, was formerly part of the outer Temple, the very name of which is now forgotten, although its neighbours, the Middle and Inner, remind us of their incompleteness without it. It became the property of the Priests and Canons of the Holy Sepulchre upon the suppression of the Templars, in the beginning of the fourteenth century; and in the reign of Edward III. was transferred to the bishops of Exeter, who established their town quarters there. At the great era of Church plunder, the mansion of those bishops passed into lay hands, and became successively the property of Elizabeth's favourites, the celebrated Leicester, and the equally celebrated Essex. The other Essex of history, the general of the long parliament, also inhabited it; and in the reign of Charles II. it was the dwelling of one of the great lawyers of the Restoration, Sir Orlando Bridgman, the lord keeper. A portion of the old fabric was standing as late as 1777.

When we enter the city we find that some of the bishops did not disdain the security which it afforded. Thus, Salisbury Square and Peterborough Court were the sites of the London houses of the bishops of those dioceses, and the Bishops of Bangor dwelt in Shoe Lane, out of which a lane now runs which preserves their title. Chichester Rents, a narrow alley out of Chancery Lane, reminds us that Lincoln's Inn was once the property of Ralph Neville, Chancellor of Henry III. and Bishop of Chichester; and that it was the residence of his successors in the see until the reign of Henry VII. The Bishops of Winchester were lords of the manor of Southwark, and their manorial residence, built in the beginning of the twelfth century, was their town house. The Bishops of Rochester were their neighbours, but no traces of Rochester

House or of its name remain. The residence of the Bishops of Ely stood on the site of Ely Place, Holborn; but its history is best told in Mr. Cunningham's own words:

“ John de Kirkeby, Bishop of Ely, dying in 1290, bequeathed a messuage in Holborn and nine tenements adjoining, to his successors in the see. William de Luda, who succeeded him, added a further grant, ‘with condition, that his next successor should pay 1,000 marks for the finding of three chaplains in the chapel there.’ John de Hotham, another bishop, added a vineyard, kitchen-garden, and orchard. Thomas de Arundel, before he was translated to the See of York, in 1388, built ‘a gate-house or front,’ towards Holborn, and in Stow's time ‘his arms were yet to be discovered on the stone-work thereof.’ St. Ethelreda's Chapel, all that exists of the building, has a few good remains, and, as Rickman observes, ‘one fine decorated window of curious composition.’ This celebrated house (or rather, perhaps, the larger part of it) was occasionally let by the see to distinguished noblemen. In Ely Place, in 1399, died John of Gaunt, ‘time honoured Lancaster.’ From Ely Place, in Holborn, Henry Radclyff, Earl of Sussex, writes to his Countess, announcing the death of Henry VIII.; and in Ely Place, then the residence of the Earl of Warwick (afterwards Duke of Northumberland) the council met, and formed that remarkable conspiracy which ended in the execution of the Protector Somerset. A subsequent tenant was Sir Christopher Hatton (Queen Elizabeth's handsome Lord Chancellor), to whom the greater portion of the house was let in 1576, for the term of twenty-one years. The rent was a red rose, ten loads of hay, and ten pounds per annum. Bishop Cox, on whom this hard bargain was forced by the Queen, reserving to himself and his successors the right of walking in the gardens and gathering twenty bushels of roses yearly. Hatton (pleased with his acquisition) laid out £1,995 (about £6,000 of our money), in enlarging and improving the property he had leased, and was laying out more, when he petitioned Queen Elizabeth, to require the bishop to alienate to him the whole house and gardens. This, when Church lands were seized and alienated by the sovereign, was no unusual request, and the Queen wrote to the bishop, desiring him to demise the premises to her till such time as the See of Ely should reimburse Sir Christopher for the money he had laid out, and was still expending in the improvement of the property. The bishop, foreseeing the result, reminded the Queen that he ought to be a steward, not a scatterer, and that he could scarcely justify those princes who transferred things intended for pious purposes to purposes less pious. This remonstrance occasioned the following extraordinary letter to the bishop:

“ ‘Proud Prelate! I understand you are backward in complying with your agreement, but I would have you to know, that I, who

made you what you are, can unmake you ; and if you do not forthwith fulfil your engagement, by God ! I will immediately unfrock you.—Yours, as you demean yourself, Elizabeth.'

"Further remonstrances were not to be thought of, and Ely Place, vineyard, meadow, kitchen-garden, and orchard, were demised to the crown, and by the crown made over to Sir Christopher Hatton. The bishop (Cox) who made the remonstrance, dying in 1581, the see of Ely was kept vacant by the Queen for eighteen years. In Hatton House, as Ely Place was now called (hence Hatton Garden), Sir Christopher Hatton died, November 20th, 1591, indebted to the crown in the sum of £40,000."—Handbook, tit. Ely Place.

The successors of Bishop Cox for nearly two centuries endeavoured to recover Ely Place ; and it was not until 1772 that their claim was finally adjusted. The property was transferred to the crown, charged with a perpetual annuity of £200, and a house was built in Dover Street for the bishops of the diocese.

If, in coming down the Strand, we had, instead of following the bishops to their homes, turned to the north side of that street, we should have found ourselves in the garden and vineyard which supplied the table of the ancient inmates of the Benedictine Monastery of St. Peter's Westminster. With the exception, however, of Covent Garden and Vinegar Yard, which still keep alive the memory of its ancient possessors, and Maiden Lane, which reminds the passer-by of the image of the B. V. which formerly stood there, the locality derives its various names from the family which grew great on the church's plunder. Southampton Street, called after Lady Rachel Russell, daughter of the Earl of Southampton, and wife of Lord William Russell, was the site of Bedford House, the residence, till 1704, of the Earls of Bedford. Along the back of its garden wall, which stood on the south side of the present marketplace, a few temporary stalls and sheds gradually established themselves, and what the market was like, about 1698, we are told by Strype :

"The south side of Covent Garden Square lieth open to Bedford Garden, where there is a small grotto of trees, most pleasant in the summer season ; and on this side there is kept a market for fruits, herbs, roots, and flowers, every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday, which is grown to a considerable account and well served with choice goods, which makes it much resorted unto."—Handbook, tit. Covent Garden Market.

Not far from Covent Garden, on the site of the Olympic Theatre, stood Drury House, built by Sir William Drury (1589), and afterwards the property of the Earls of Craven. From this house, the upper part of the "via de Aldwych" changed its name to Drury Lane, while the rest of it preserves to this day the last syllable of its ancient appellation. Within a few steps of it rises the church of St. Mary le Strand, on the spot where formerly stood a cross, at which, says Stow, "in the year 1294 and other times, the justices itinerant sat without London." We are not informed when it was removed; but its place was occupied as early as 1634, and down to 1718, by a May-pole, which in time gave way to the present church.

"Amid that area wide they took their stand,
Where the tall May-pole once o'erlooked the Strand,
But now (so Anne and piety ordain)
A Church collects the saints of Drury Lane."

POPE.

But let us avoid Drury Lane, and steer our course eastward. In five minutes we shall emerge from narrow and squalid streets into Lincoln's Inn Fields. Mr. Cunningham rejects as apocryphal the story that Inigo Jones laid out this square, and gave the grass plot, now enclosed within rails, the precise dimensions of one of the pyramids of Gizeh. The place was infested by cripples, beggars, idle boys, wrestlers, horse-breakers, &c., down to 1735, when an act was obtained by the inhabitants to empower them to enclose and adorn the fields. Their old wooden posts and chains then made way for the present rails, and their disorderly frequenters adjourned to St. George's or Tothill fields. Here Ballard and Babington, and twelve other participators in the "Babington Conspiracy," against Elizabeth, were executed; and here, a century later, Lord William Russell was beheaded. Here also it was that Sir Joseph Jekyll,

"Odd old Whig,
Who never changed his principles or wig,"

was thrown down and ill-treated by the populace, to whom he had made himself obnoxious by his gin act, (9 Geo. 2, c. 23.) The house at the corner of Great Queen Street, now belonging to "the Society for promoting christian knowledge," was built by the Marquis of Powis,

who was outlawed at the Revolution for his adherence to James II. It was afterwards inhabited by Lord Somers and Sir Nathan Wright, the Lord Keeper; and was at a later period purchased by George the Second's celebrated minister, the Duke of Newcastle.

Lincoln's Inn was, in the reign of Edward I., the mansion of Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln. Its garden produced apples, cherries, nuts, pears, beans, onions, &c., in abundance; and, like the garden of Ely house, was famous for its roses. It became, as already mentioned, the property of the Bishops of Chichester, from whom it passed, in the reign of Henry VII. to Judge Suliard, whose descendant, in the time of Elizabeth, sold it to its present owners, the gentlemen Benchers of Lincoln's Inn. Long and brilliant is the array of those who sprang from these old walls into the arena of the world, and "achieved greatness." The peerage and red book, however, must be left to tell their histories; we have only room for the names of two great chiefs of two great republics—the bricklayer Ben Jonson, who worked with his trowel "on the garden wall next Chancery Lane," and the law student, Oliver Cromwell.

An obscure lane will lead us from Lincoln's Inn to Temple Bar. In James the First's time, it was called Rogue's Lane, and has recently assumed the title of Lower Serle's Place. But it is better known by the name which it will hold in history—Sheer, or Shire Lane, so called "because it divideth the city from the shire.* Here, at the "Trumpet," met the Tatler's Club, and here, notwithstanding its proprietor's ominous name, Christopher Katt's pastry-cook's shop acquired its reputation for mutton pies, the nucleus of the Kit Kat club. That celebrated society consisted

"Of thirty-nine distinguished noblemen and gentlemen, zealously attached to the House of Hanover; among whom were the Dukes of Somerset, Richmond, Grafton, Devonshire and Marlborough, and (after the accession of George I.) the Duke of Newcastle, the Earls of Dorset, Sunderland, Manchester, Wharton and Kingston; Lords Halifax and Somers; Sir Robert Walpole, Vanburgh, Congreve, Granville, Addison, Garth, Maynwaring, Stepney and Walsh."—(Hand-book tit Kit Kat Club.)

Temple Bar, like the bars at Holborn, Smithfield, and

* Stowe.

Whitechapel, marked the boundary of the city liberties. These bars consisted originally of posts, rails, and chains. Those adjoining the Temple were removed to make way for a wooden edifice, which in turn yielded its site to the present structure, of Christopher Wren's design.

Our ancestors had an ancient and laudable, but somewhat Dyak custom, of decorating Temple Bar with the heads of traitors; and the taste for this kind of ornament was popular enough to call into existence a class of persons who found a livelihood in letting spy-glasses at a half-penny a peep. In 1745, the heads of several of the conquered party were placed upon the Bar; but they were the last who supplied it with its horrible decorations; and it has not been found that the peace of England, or the throne of the House of Hanover has been jeopardized by a departure from this ancient way of our ancestors.

Fleet Street took its name from a small rivulet, and was the abode of Wynken de Werde, the celebrated printer, of Praise-God-Barebones, the leather seller, of Isaak Walton, and of Dr. Johnson. In this street Mr. Francis Child carried on the business of a goldsmith with "running cashes," at the sign of the Marygold, when Charles II. was king. About the same time, Richard Hoare carried on the same trade at the Golden Bottle, and Gosling at "The Three Squirrels, over against St. Dunstan's." On the site of Child's Place stood the Devil Tavern, where the society of antiquaries originated; and in Crane Court, another alley out of Fleet Street, the Royal Society met from 1710 until it obtained its present quarters in Somerset House.

But the ancient dwelling-place of the Knights Templars is unquestionably the most interesting spot in the vicinity of Fleet Street. That great order of military monks established themselves at first in Holborn, from which they removed, in 1184, to their "New Temple in Fleet Street." Shortly after the dissolution of their order in 1313, it became the property of their rivals, the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, who leased the Outer Temple, as we have already seen, to the Bishops of Exeter, and the Middle and Inner to the students of the common law. The lawyers soon appropriated the round portion of the church to the purposes of their calling. Each occupied a particular place in it, like a merchant on 'Change, and there received his clients and his fees.

The legal Templars are celebrated in Court histories for their mummeries and masks and revels; and their successors might perhaps find a place in the Court circular as well as in the law reports, if their course of education was as comprehensive as it was in the days of Fortescue.

"The students in the university of laws," says Dugdale,* citing the treatise *de laudibus leg. Ang.*, "did not onely study the laws, to serve the courts of justice and profit their country; but did further learn to dance, to sing, to play on instruments on the ferial days; and to study Divinity on the Festivals; using such exercises as they did who were brought up in the King's Court."

That great importance was attached to the first of these accomplishments, appears from the following order of one of the Inns of Court.

"That nothing might be wanting for their encouragement in this excellent study (law), they have very anciently had dancings for their recreation and delight, commonly called revels, allowed at certain seasons. . . . Nor were these exercises of dancing merely permitted, but thought to be necessary (as it seems) and much conducing to the making of gentlemen more fit for their books at other times. For by an order made 6 Feb. 7 Jac., it appears that the under barristers were by decimation put out of commons, for example's sake, because the whole bar offended by not dancing on Candlemas-day preceding, according to the ancient order of this society, when the judges were present: with this, that if the like fault were committed afterwards, they should be fined or disbarred."—Dugd. Orig. Jurid. 246.

Disbarred for refusing to dance! Fancy a contumacious junior of sixty summoned to answer before the Benchers of his Inn for demurring to the performance of a *pas seul* in Hall. Or a plethoric luminary of the Courts of Equity threatened with ruin for pleading the double plea of obesity and asthma in bar of all saltation! Or some scampish student called upon to show cause why he should not be expelled the honourable society for an indecorous execution of the polka! Not to dance before the judges! 'Twas flat burglary. It was fortunate, at all events, for a fashionable regiment which, some years ago, promulgated their incapacity or their unwillingness to dance, that they lived under the mild sway of martial law, and not under the terrible code of the Temple, else they had been infallibly tried at the drum-head and been stripped of their pelisses and

* Orig. Jurid. p. 141.

commissions. Our ungainly generation, which can only lounge through a quadrille or prance a clumsy imitation of German and Polish figures, can hardly appreciate the solicitude which our ancestors evinced about teaching their youth to dance; but when men shall again be chosen to keep the Great Seal, not for their legal lore, or their skill in debate, or their party influence, but for the gracefulness of their dancing, Terpsichore will be avenged for the neglect into which she is now fallen.

But we must not deprive the reader of Dugdale's description of the poses plastiques of the legal corps de ballet.

"Dinner being ended, they wait on the Judges and Serjeants, ushering them either into the garden or some other retiring place, until the hall be cleansed and repaired; and then they usher them again into the hall, and place them in their rooms one after another. This being done, the Ancient that hath the staff in his hand, stands at the upper end of the bar tables; and the other, with the white rod, placeth himself at the cupboard, in the middle of the hall opposite to the Judges, where, the music being begun, he calleth twice the Master of the Revels. And at the second call, the Ancient with his white staff advanceth forward and begins to lead the measure: followed first by the barristers and then the gentlemen under the bar, all according to their several antiquities: and when one measure is ended, the Reader at the cupboard calls for another, and so in order. When the last measure is dancing, the Reader at the cupboard calls to one of the gentlemen of the bar as he is walking or dancing with the rest, to give the Judges a song: who forthwith begins the first line of any Psalm as he thinks fittest, after which all the rest of the company follow and sing with him."

The students of the Temple, like the young members of the other Inns of Court, but too frequently derived their morals and manners from the contiguous Alsatia, and were less respected for their learning than feared for their disorderly conduct.

The Temple Gardens, according to Shakspeare,* supplied the first roses to the partisans of York and Lancaster; but the London smoke has long since banished the queen of flowers from the place.

Whitefriars, which lies between the Temple and Blackfriars, once belonged to the Carmelites, and possessed the privilege of sanctuary. In days when might made right, and no law was known but the will of the strong,

* Henry VI. first part, act 2, sc. 4.

the church undertook the protection of the weak. The sanctuary was then a refuge where the heavy-laden found their rest; the oasis where the defenceless and weary found refreshment and peace. But when law returned to the discharge of its duty, and again protected the life and property of man from the violence and fraud of his fellow-man, the sanctuary became the shelter, not of the victims of broken laws, but of those who broke the laws; and the ancient retreat of oppressed innocence became the receptacle of the outcasts of society. This was the fate of Whitefriars. After the dissolution of the Carmelite Monastery, the district continued for some time orderly, nay, even fashionable; as the occupation of a house there by Edward VI.'s secretary of state, Sir John Cheyne, testifies. But the inhabitants subsequently laid claim to the old Franciscan right of sanctuary; and the privilege was accorded to them by Royal Charter in 1608. A community then quickly arose of gamblers, outlaws, fraudulent debtors, and thieves, who set the law and its officers at defiance. They nicknamed the place *Alsatia*,—after the province of *Alsace*, Mr. Cunningham suggests, which then stood in much the same position towards France and its other neighbours, as Whitefriars did to the English metropolis;—and down to the reign of William III. they maintained their *imperium in imperio*. From these purlieus, and the adjoining Inns of Court and Chancery, bands of disorderly ruffians and dissipated students poured out at night, and ranging through the streets about the Strand and Covent Garden, insulted and ill-treated the citizen who found himself after nightfall in so distant and desolate a place. Did his cries attract the watch, a pitched battle followed, in which the representatives of the law were not always victorious. They were indeed themselves frequently the object of attack: and the somnolent Charley, who, in rubbing his eyes, found himself a close prisoner in his watch-box, thanked his stars if his lantern remained unsmashed, his halberd still beside him, and his skin whole. But these feats were not peculiar to the “mohocks” or “scowlers,” as they were called, of *Alsatia*. Within the last quarter of a century they were of nightly occurrence; and it is but a few years since a nobleman expiated by a long imprisonment in the Queen's Bench, an assault upon a policeman, which well-nigh proved fatal to the object of his attack. Since the establishment of the new

police, however, the species "mohock" has become extinct; for the result of a contest with the guardians of the public peace is no longer doubtful.

Miseræ cognosce præmia rixæ
Si rixa est, ubi tu pulsas, ego vapulo tantum.

Not far from the Convent of the Carmelites stood the Monastery of the black friars of St. Dominic, where Charles V. lodged when he visited this country; and where the validity of Henry VIII.'s marriage with Catherine of Arragon was argued before Cardinal Campeggio. After the Reformation, the precinct of the Dominican friars, which had, like Whitefriars, the privilege of sanctuary, received a body of players, who erected and long maintained a theatre there in spite of their puritanical neighbours, and in defiance of the edicts of the Lord Mayor, whose jurisdiction, albeit extending to the city walls, did not penetrate into the liberty in which they had established themselves.

Ludgate Street (anciently Bowyer Row) and Ludgate Hill are now separated only by an imaginary line, but until 1760 the gate of the fabulous King Lud marked distinctly enough where the one ended and the other began; as Sir Thomas Wyatt found in 1554, when after marching through London along much the same course as we have followed, he arrived at Ludgate and demanded admittance. "Avaunt, traitor," was Lord William Howard's answer from the top of the gateway, "thou shalt have no entrance here." "Wyat awhile stayed and rested him awhile upon a stall over against the Bell Savage gate; and at last seeing he could not get into the city, and being deceived of the ayde he hoped for, returned back again in array towards Charing Crosse,"* which, however, he was not destined to reach. With forty companions he fought his way back as far as Temple Bar, but he was there surrounded by the royalists, made prisoner, and carried off to the Tower.

"Gate-house" is frequently synonymous in our old books with gaol; and as early as the reign of Richard II. the Ludgate was a debtors' prison.

"Formerly debtors that were not able to satisfy their debts, put themselves into this prison of Ludgate for shelter from their credit-

* Stowe.

ors. And these were merchants and tradesmen who had been driven to want by losses at sea. When King Philip, in the month of August, 1554, came through London, these prisoners were thirty in number, and owed £10,000, but compounded for £2,000, who presented a well-penned Latin speech to that Prince to redress their miseries, and by his royal generosity to free them; 'And the rather for that place was not sceleratorum carcer, sed miserorum custodia, i. e. a gaol for villains, but a place of restraint for poor unfortunate men: and that they were put in there not by others, but themselves fled thither; and not out of fear of punishment, but in hope of better fortune.'"—Strype, cited in Haudbook, tit. Ludgate.

Not far from Ludgate, another gate "statelier built than the rest," was erected by Henry I. or Stephen, in consequence of the building of old St. Paul's, by which the highway from Aldgate through Cheap to Ludgate was "so crossed and stopped up," that passengers were forced to go round by Paternoster Row, or the old Exchange—the Cambium regis of our early Kings, which stood in old 'Change, Cheapside. This, the last built of the city gates, was called New gate, and stood across the present Newgate Street, a little east of Giltspur Street and the Old Bailey. It was destroyed by the great fire, re-built in 1672, and again burnt down by Lord George Gordon's rioters in 1780, when the present gloomy building was erected in its place. The New gate-house was used as a prison as early as the reign of John; but unlike its neighbour, the Lud gate-house, it was as much a carcer sceleratorum as a custodia miserorum, and continued the receptacle of both the wicked and the unfortunate down to 1815, when Whitecross prison was opened for the latter class. Down to 1783, Tyburn tree, a gallows which is said to have stood on the site of 49, Connaught Square, or, as Mr. Cunningham believes, in Connaught Place, had been, from the days of Henry IV., the scene of capital punishment. In December, 1783, Newgate succeeded to that "triste privilege;" and the owners of the houses in its immediate neighbourhood, reap a handsome harvest from thoughtless or depraved curiosity of thousands, every time a human being is put to death by the law.

At the north-east end of St. Paul's Church-yard stood, from the earliest times until it was pulled down by the Long Parliament, Paul's Cross. Its site can now no longer be discerned, but within the last twenty years a lofty elm stood upon it. It is supposed to have been

originally a Druidical stone. Around it, down to the 13th century, the citizens of London held their Saxon folk-mote, and elected their magistrates, tried and punished offenders, and deliberated upon their affairs. At a later period, we find it the place where proclamations and bulls were read, and where the citizens swore allegiance to their kings. It is uncertain when sermons were first preached there; but the wooden pulpit, which was on the spot in Stow's time, perched upon a flight of stone steps, covered over with a conical roof, which was surmounted by a cross, appears to have been erected by Thomas Kempe, who was Bishop of London between the years 1448 and 1489. Popular preachers were frequently invited to preach at Paul's Cross, and were "freely entertained for five days' space with sweet and convenient lodging, fire, candle, and all other necessaries,* in the Shunamite's house in Watling Street, besides receiving forty shillings.

"Before this cross Tindall's translation of the bible was publicly burnt, by order of Bishop Stokesley; the Pope's sentence on Martin Luther was pronounced from it, in a sermon preached by Fisher, Wolsey being present as the Pope's legate. Here the May-pole, from which the Church of *St. Andrew Undershaft* derives its name, was denounced as an idol by the curate of *St. Catharine Cree*, and its fate sealed. Recantations were made here; royal marriages and public victories proclaimed. The Sunday's sermon at Paul's Cross always showed the religious predilections of the Court. The Pope was denounced here in Henry the Eighth's reign, and Protestants accursed in the reign of his daughter Mary. It was used for other purposes. A certain Dr. Shaw, in a sermon preached here, sounded the feeling of the people in favour of the Duke of Gloucester, before the ambitious Richard assumed the crown; and the memory of Essex, in Elizabeth's reign, was blackened, *by command*, in a Sunday's sermon. When the Stuarts came to the Crown, the preachers at the Cross had royal listeners: King James on one occasion, to countenance a sermon on the reparation of the cathedral, and king Charles I., on the birth of his son, king Charles II."—*Hand-book tit. St. Paul's Cross.*

The church-yard was probably a burial-ground from the remotest antiquity. When Wren dug the foundations of the present cathedral, he came to Saxon stone graves, and underneath these, he found ivory and box pins, supposed to have been used by the Druids in fastening the

* Maitland, ii, 949.

winding-sheets of the dead, as also Roman lacrymatories, and lamps, and other relics of that conquering race. An obscure tradition places a temple of Diana on this site; but the earliest edifice of which any authentic account has descended to us, was erected by Ethelbert, early in the 7th century, shortly after his conversion to christianity by St. Augustine. It was burnt down in 961, and the new church, which was raised on its site, was also consumed by fire in the reign of William the Conqueror. Maurice, the bishop of London, undertook to rebuild it at his own expense; and to assist him in his pious undertaking, William gave him the stones of an old ruined tower, called the Palatine Tower, which stood near the Fleet. This was the St. Paul's which necessitated the construction of the New gate. Maurice did not live to see the completion of the cathedral to which he had devoted his worldly wealth. Although founded in 1083 it was not completed till 1240. When finished, however, it must have been a stupendous structure. It was 690 feet long and 130 broad, exceeding the present edifice by 190 feet in length and by 30 in breadth. It was also superior in height; for its spire, which was burnt down shortly after the accession of Queen Elizabeth, was 560 feet high, while the cross of the present dome stands only 404 feet above the pavement. The church-yard also, which was filled with fine old trees, was larger than the present one; its wall extending to Ave Maria Lane, Paternoster Row, Old 'Change, Carter Lane, and Creed Lane. The aisles of the old cathedral were filled with chapels to the B. Virgin, St. George, St. Dunstan, and other saints. It is believed, that prior to the Reformation, not less than two hundred priests were attached to its service, and it was renowned for its wealth, and the magnificence of its shrine.

“ Old St. Paul's was severely injured by fire in 1137, and again in 1561, when it was necessary to take the steeple down, and roof the church anew, with boards and lead. Several attempts were made to restore it, and money for the new building of the steeple, was, it is said, collected. James I. countenanced a sermon at *Paul's Cross*, in favour of so pious an undertaking, but nothing was done till 1633, when reparations commenced with some activity, and Inigo Jones built, at the expense of Charles I., a classic portico to a Gothic church.....Charles designed to have built the church anew, (of which Inigo's portico was only an instalment,) but his thoughts were soon drawn in another direction, and old St. Paul's,

under Cromwell, was made a horse quarter for soldiers. The Restoration witnessed another attempt to restore the church. A commission was appointed, and a subscription opened, but before a sufficient fund was raised, the whole structure was destroyed in the fire of London."—Handbook, tit. St. Paul's.

Like the Round Church of the Temple, the parvis or nave of St. Paul's, known by the name of Duke Humphrey's, or Paul's walk, was early converted to secular uses; and here again the lawyers attained a "bad eminence" in the work of desecration.

"There is a tradition, that in times past there was one Inne of Court at Dowgate, called Johnson's Inn; another in Fetter Lane; and another in Paternoster Row; which last they would prove because it was next to St. Paul's Church, where each lawyer and serjeant at his pillar heard his client's cause, and took notes thereof upon his knee as they do in Guildhall at this day. And that after the serjeants' feast ended they do still go to Paul's in their habits and there choose their Pillar whereat to hear their clients' cause (if any come) in memory of that old custom.'—*Dugdale's orig. Jurid.* ed. 1680. p. 142. 'The xvij day of Oct. [1552] was made vii serjants of the coyffe; and after dener they went unto Powlls and so went up the steper and so round the qwere and ther dyd they ther honage, and so [to] the north-syd of Powlles, and stod a-pone the steps until iiij old serjantes came to-gether and feytchyd iiij [new] and brought them unto certen pelers and left them, and then did feyched the residue unto the pelers.' Diary of a resident in London."—Handbook, tit. St. Paul's.

But the lawyers were not left in the exclusive enjoyment of the place; and how they managed, in the midst of the din and uproar which resounded through it all the day long, to hear their clients' cause ("if any came") must excite the wonder of the brethren of the coif, who now peacefully doze away their mornings in the silent shades of the Common Bench. As early as the time of Henry III. the nave was a thoroughfare. In the reign of Elizabeth, the Dean and Chapter complained that porters, butchers, and water-bearers, made great disorder in the Church, and that even during the performance of service people walked about in the choir, where the communion table stood, with their hats on their heads. The chantry and other chapels were completely diverted, after the Reformation, from their original purposes. Some were the receptacles of lumber: one was used as a school, another as a glazier's shop. The vaults were held by tradesmen,

or retained by the Dean and Chapter, and converted into wine cellars. Trunkmakers and carpenters established themselves under the cloisters, and the noise of their hammering echoed through the whole building. An edict of the mayor and common council, in the reign of Mary, imposed fines on all who made a thoroughfare of the place, carrying beer, bread, fruit, fish and flesh, and leading horses, mules, and other beasts. But although some of these "unreverent" practices were checked, the Cathedral continued, down to the time of its destruction, to resemble more a den of thieves than the house of God. Drunken men might be seen lying on the benches at the choir door; and pickpockets plied their calling within, upon the gallants and courtiers—the men about town of the days of Elizabeth and the Stuarts—who made it their daily rendezvous where, after their mid-day dinners, they discussed the politics or retailed the scandal of the day. Let us hasten, however, to do the fair sex justice. The "Paul's walkers" were, without exception, men. A woman was never seen among them.

Of Wren's noble structure it is superfluous to say anything. It was built at about three-fourth's of the cost of the vile rubbish which disfigures and encroaches upon the western extremity of St. James's Park. It is a copy, but not a servile one, of St. Peter's; and is not an unworthy monument of the great artist who erected it, and of the great city which it adorns. Its size, however, unsuits it to the Protestant form of worship; and, therefore, while a small portion is dedicated to the purposes of religion, the greater part of it has been converted, like Westminster Abbey, into a Pantheon, or an area for monuments to mortal greatness. The stranger who can afford to pay four shillings and four-pence to visit it, will look in vain for the majesty and pomp of a ritual in keeping with the imposing immensity of the place. He will not even find any great work of art on its bare walls; but, en revanche, he will be shown by the surly and insolent menials of the Dean and Chapter, "for fee and reward in that behalf," the clock, and the ball, and the bell, and the geometrical staircase, and the whispering gallery, and similar objects of solemn concern. To us these curiosities seem strangely misplaced in a temple, christian or heathen, devoted to the worship of the Deity; but when we find that nothing loftier than

the spirit of trade presides over their exhibition, the sight becomes so odious that we gladly pass on.

Cheapside has been from the earliest times the principal or High Street of the city. The oldest writers mention with pride and admiration the splendour of its goldsmiths', booksellers', silk-merciers', linen-drapers', haberdashers', hosiers', and milliners' shops. Ridings or tournaments used to be held in it, on which occasions a wooden scaffolding was erected across the street for the accommodation of the king, queen, and other persons of consequence; but the upper gallery, which was devoted to the ladies, having, at a great riding in 1331, broken down and precipitated Queen Philippa and her attendants upon the heads of the knights below, Edward III. erected a stone structure in lieu of it close to the Church of St. Mary-le-bow. In this stone shed or Seldam, our kings and queens sat in state to view the joustings, shows, pageants, and processions which enlivened the city; and when Wren re-built the Church, he erected for the same purpose the balcony which now overhangs the street.

And doubtless old Cheapside, on a gala day, must have presented a gay spectacle. The street was not, indeed, as now, paved with massive blocks of granite, or skirting with even flag-ways; nor did, as now, its long rows of houses stand modestly back in regular and orderly row. The roadway was, in the eleventh century, innocent of paving, and knew not Macadam. After a day's rain the horseman could with difficulty wade through its bed of soft mud—so soft indeed, that when a hurricane in 1090 blew down the roof of the new Church of St. Mary, which William the Conqueror had recently erected on arches, or "bows," some of the beams sunk, we are told, twenty feet (be the same more or less) into the earth! But even this mud was preferable to the showers which water-spouts and housemaids poured down from projecting roofs and bed-room windows into the middle of the road; showers which made "giving the wall" an act of politeness, and the wrongful "taking" of it a *casus belli*. In spite, however, of these unpleasantnesses, the poets and artists of our iron age would give the palm to old Cheapside. In days when reading was an accomplishment possessed only by the learned, gay, flaunting sign-boards, representing pictorially or symbolically the names or business of the citizens before whose houses they swung, crowded thickly in this commercial thoroughfare. The old houses turned their gable-

ends to the street; and their storeys projected over one another until the distance between their opposite garrets was only half that between their parlours. When a tournament was held, the stalls, which on ordinary days were arrayed thickly along its whole length, were cleared away; and the rude pavement which in the days of the Plantagenets covered the muddy road of the Saxons, was strewed with sand for the greater ease of horses and horsemen. And life was given to the picture by multitudes clad in costumes of every shape, form, and colour, from the glittering armour of the knight, and the more homely but still military garb of his retainer, to the cowls and hoods of monks and friars, the robes of priests, and the endless diversities of dresses which then distinguished the different ranks and conditions of men and women. It was down this old street also, and up Cornhill, as far as the Manor house of Leadenhall, and back again, that, on feasts and holidays, the Lord Mayor and aldermen of the city, issuing forth from the gothic portals of St. Paul's, accompanied by the whole of the cathedral priesthood and by the parochial clergy of the city, moved along in solemn procession. And undoubtedly, in an age keenly alive to æsthetic impressions, the splendid vestments, the tall silver crosses, the burning incense, the majestic music, and other concomitants of the ceremony, in striking the senses of the gazing multitudes, were more efficient than any appeal to abstract reason in carrying home to their minds the consolations and terrors of religion.

At last we reach the Bank, and the aspect of the respectable old lady of Threadneedle Street suffices to bring us back from the past to the present. Before the visions of by-gone times, however, melt completely away, we may, like the careworn sleeper who is roused in the middle of some dream of present happiness or early innocence, grasp at the flying shadows even while returning consciousness feels their unsubstantial nature. From this same Bank, to whatever quarter we turn, we find evidence of the monastic character of London before the Reformation. Austin Friars, now occupied by merchants, stock-brokers, and attorneys, was once the seat of an Augustinian monastery, founded by Humphrey Bohun, Earl of Hereford and Essex, in 1249. Their Church, which was surmounted by a "most fine-spired steeple, small, high, and straight," was, after the Reformation, granted by

Edward VI. to the Dutch "to be their preaching place;" and the house and ground passed to the Marquis of Winchester, whose son "sold the monuments of noblemen buried there, for one hundred pounds; made fair stabling for horses in place thereof, and sold the lead from the roofs."*

The Crutched or Crossed Friars, were settled in the locality which is still called by their name, and the Franciscans also once had an establishment where Christ's Hospital now stands, leaving their popular designation to mark their ancient precinct. Mr. Cunningham gives the following brief account of their first arrival in this country :

"Nine Grey Friars landed at Dover in the eighth year of Henry III., five settled at Canterbury and four in London. For the first fifteen days, the four who established themselves in London were lodged at the Preaching Friars in Holborn. Their next remove was to Cornhill, where they erected cells, made converts, and acquired the good-will of the mayor and citizens. John Ewin, mercer, subsequently appropriated to their use a piece of ground near St. Nicholas Shambles (whither they now removed) and became himself a lay-brother among them. A second citizen built a choir, and a third, a nave or body to their church. A fourth erected their chapter-house, a fifth their dormitory, a sixth their refectory, a seventh their infirmary, an eighth their study, and a ninth gave them their supply of water. The Queens of the first three Edwards re-built the whole fabric of their church. Robert, Lord Lisle, became a friar of their order, and the celebrated Richard Whittington erected at his own expense a noble library for their use, and enriched it with books to the further amount of £400. The library building escaped the fire, and was faced with brick as late as 1778."—Handbook, tit. Grey Friars.

The last vestige of the Monastery was swept away in 1826, by that Vandalism which falls pitilessly on unremunerative ruins, while it spares and fosters, nay, would perpetuate and increase such profitable nuisances as Smithfield Market. The Church of St. Alphage, London wall, was built on the site of the old Hospital or Priory of the B. Virgin Mary, founded "for the sustentation of one hundred blind men." The Minorities, indebted for its present celebrity, valeat quantum, to the mart and advertisements of Moses and Son, owes its name to a convent of nuns of the order of St. Clair, which was founded in 1293, by Edmund Earl of Lancaster, and brother of Edward III.

* Stow, p. 67.

Mincing Lane, the great sugar market, and head quarters of the West Indian interest, is so called from its having been once the property of the Minchuns, or Black Nuns, whose convent stood in St. Helen's Place, on the site of the present Leather-seller's Hall; and in Holywell Street, Shoreditch, once famed for its "sweet, wholesome, and clear water," stood a Benedictine nunnery, dedicated to St. John the Baptist.

Duke's Place, Aldgate, occupied ever since Oliver Cromwell's time by Jews, stands in the precinct of the Priory of the Holy Trinity, founded by Matilda, Queen of Henry I. King Edgar had granted a waste tract of land, lying beyond the "porte" or gate, called Aldgate, to thirteen soldiers or knights, "well-beloved to the king and realm" for their past services, and had created it a "soke" or guild. It was thence called indifferently the knighten guild, or the port soke. Upon the establishment of the priory, the descendants of the thirteen knights assigned their guild to the Prior, to whose office thenceforth, and down to the time of the dissolution, the dignity of Alderman of the city was attached. "These Priors," says Stow, "have sitten and ridden amongst the Aldermen of London, in livery like unto them, saving that his habit was in shape of a spiritual person, as I myself have seen in my childhood." Portsoken ward elects an alderman to this day; and if the true etymology of its name should ever be forgotten, the festive habits of our civic grandees will readily furnish another.

The Spital-fields, once a Roman burying-ground, belonged to the priory and hospital of St. Mary Spital, founded in 1197, by Walter Brune, and Rosia his wife, and dedicated to the honour of Jesus Christ and the B. Virgin Mary. In the church-yard of the priory, now Spital Square, stood a pulpit-cross, (somewhat like Paul's,) where the Spital sermons, which are now delivered every Easter, at Christ Church, Newgate St., before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, were originally preached.

The Charter house, a corruption of "Chartreuse," was called after the Carthusian monks, who established themselves on that spot in 1371; and very near them stood the great Priory and hospital of St. Bartholomew. The choir and transept of the church of this priory, now form the church of St. Bartholomew the

Great, in Smithfield, and belong, partly to the Norman, and partly to the early English and perpendicular periods. The precinct of this priory

“was for several centuries the great Cloth Fair of England. Clothiers repaired to it from the most distant parts, and had booths and stands erected for their use within the church-yard of the Priory, on the site of what is now called Cloth Fair. The gates of the precinct were closed at night for the protection of property, and a court of *Pis Poudre* erected within its verge for the necessary enforcement of the laws of the fair, of debts, and legal obligations. In this court offenders were tried the same day, and the parties punished in the stocks or at the whipping-post the minute after condemnation. At the dissolution of religious houses, the privilege of the fair was in part transferred to the Lord Mayor and Corporation, and in part to Richard Rich, Lord Rich, (A. D., 1560,) ancestor of the Earls of Warwick and Holland. It ceased, however, to be a ‘cloth fair’ of any great importance in the reign of Queen Elizabeth.....It subsequently became a fair of a very diversified character. The old amusements were wrestling and shooting, motions, puppets, operas, tight-rope dancing, and the exhibition of dwarfs, monsters, and wild beasts.”—*Handbook, Tit, Bartholomew Fair.*

Lastly, on the Surrey side of the river, below Southwark, Bermondsey, a district now inhabited chiefly by tanners, was the site of a monastery of monks of the Cluniac order, founded in 1082, by Aylwin Child, a citizen of London. Its ancient gate, Mr. Cunningham tells us, with a large arch and postern on one side, was standing within the present century. Of course, no traces of this remnant of the old house now remain. St. Thomas’s hospital was founded in 1213 by one of the Priors of Bermondsey, as an almonry, or house of alms. The fine old church of St. Saviour’s, on the Southwark side of London Bridge, was originally the church of the Priory of St. Mary Overy, and became the parish church after the dissolution of monasteries, when it received its present name.

To pass from monastic to commercial London, from the monuments which religion dedicated to God and His saints to those which modern genius has raised to Mammon, from ecclesiastical corporations to trading companies, from monasteries and churches to railways and docks, is a transition for which the reader would not be grateful. We therefore spare him the present glories of the capital; referring him for such matters to the pages of Mr. Cunningham, where he will find something said upon every subject of in-

terest, from palaces and theatres to Joe's mutton-chops, and Grange's ices. But if we pass Westminster Abbey, also, unheeded, bye, the magnitude, not the nature of the subject, is the excuse for an omission as flagrant as that of Hamlet in the play. Little assistance, it may be added, would have been afforded by the article on the Abbey in the Hand-book. The author doubtless felt, that to do the subject justice, a space disproportioned to the rest of his work was necessary. He has devoted a separate book to its "Art, Architecture, and Associations;" but in the present one has given only a meagre and uninteresting catalogue of the principal monuments, and an enumeration of the several component parts of the building.

Before leaving the "memorials" of old London, we may throw a passing glance at another class of relics, which possess a quaint interest of their own. We allude to some of the sign-boards which used, before they were removed by Act of Parliament early in the reign of George III., to swing over the doors of the shops, and to the strange names still found in different corners of the town. These, when analysed, often reveal an unexpected meaning. Thus, in Portsoken ward, just-mentioned, there is a Nightingale lane, where nightingale probably never sang, but which was no doubt named at a time when the district was known as the Knighten-guild. Blind Chapel Court, adjoining Mark Lane, is a corruption of Blanche Apleton, the name of the manor in which it is situated, as old as the reign of Richard II. Gutter Lane was once the property of a respectable Saxon, named Guthurun; and Gerard's Hall, in Basing Lane, now an hotel, possessing, Mr. Cunningham assures us, "a good coffee-room, a ball-room, good wines, beds for seventy-eight, and a Norman crypt," was called after its owner, John Gisors, who was Mayor of London in 1245.

The old signs, except where they had some immediate reference to the trades carried on under them, were generally derived from scripture or from religious history, or were the heraldic devices of royal or noble houses. The "Cock" was the bird of St. Peter, and is a well-known sign even at the present time. The "Salutation," the "Maiden Head," "Our Lady," "the Lamb," "the Three Kings," were all derived from the same source. The Saracen's Head was brought to us by the Crusaders. The White Harts, the Blue Boars, and the Black Lions

came from the same menagerie as the Griffins and Dragons. The striped pole, the golden fleece, the three balls, or purses, were dedicated exclusively to the use of the barber, the hosier, and the pawnbroker. In some cases, however, the old signs underwent metamorphoses more or less complete according to the extent of the transmutation of their names. Thus, the dishevelled figures of the "Bacchanals" were transformed into a mere bag of nails. From the pious hope or pharisaical boast of Cromwell's Independents, "God encompasseth us," sprung the Goat and Compasses. The Dutch legend of "Mercurius is der Goten Boode," gave birth to another and equally celebrated goat, to wit, the Goat in Boots. The great bull and portentous mouth, which used to distinguish one of the coach hotels of the city, was but a representation of what was, to a not over nice ear, *idem sonans* with Boulogne mouth. The Swan, in Lad Lane, acquired a second neck from his having originally borne on his beak the two nicks with which all swans on the Thames, within the jurisdiction of the Lord Mayor, are marked; and the well-known Inn in Fleet St., the "Bolt in Tun," is so called from the rebus, or hieroglyphic manner of writing the word "Bolton," the name of the last prior of St. Bartholomew's, to which religious house it belonged.

It was well observed by the great historian of the Peloponnesian war, that when the day should come for judging of the comparative greatness of Athens and Sparta by their ruins, the former would give the impression of having been a powerful state, while of the latter, little or nothing would remain to bear witness of its existence. Judged by this test, the London of the past would run the risk of sharing the fate of the military rather than of the naval republic of Greece; for it possesses, as already observed, but few monumental records of its early life. That the frail sheds which a few painted savages reared, a couple of thousand years ago, on the swampy bank of the Thames, should have vanished in the presence of a Roman fort, is not surprising; but it is a singular and a sad fatality, that little or nothing should remain of the massive erections of the Roman empire, or of the solid masonry of the Anglo-Saxons, or of the noble creations of Christian art. Few cities have been the habitation of man in so many forms and degrees of civilization,—from primitive savagedom to the highest refinement,—and yet few are so destitute

of traces of its former existence. The Tower, the Temple church, Westminster Abbey, and Westminster Hall are almost the only relics it possesses of the days of chivalry. The London stone, or so much of it as has not been chipped away by idlers and antiquarians, and some old fragments of the old Roman wall, in Cripplegate churchyard and in that of All Hallows, are the only existing representatives of the first conquerors of Britain. London bears scarcely any other marks of old age. Its growth, indeed, from the first wigwams which found a shelter among the tall oaks of the Druids, to its present colossal dimensions, has resembled rather the spontaneous development of an organized being, than the ordinary mechanical process of accretion by which inorganic matter is augmented; and, although a score of centuries have passed over it, it has not even yet attained the limit of its full size. Not only do squares, and streets, and villas, and terraces, stride out yearly, with giant steps, into the market gardens and orchards of the neighbouring hamlets; but whole lanes, and courts and alleys, in the deepest of its recesses, disappear and make way for the broad straight avenues of the most recent and approved model. Its old wooden houses gave place to brick ones; and these, not much more substantial than their predecessors, yield to such structures as present fashion or convenience requires. Hitherto, London has not been very fortunate in its architects; but the present bears the promise of a better future: and if the next generation shall surpass that which erected the Houses of Parliament and British Museum as much as the perpetrators of the National Gallery and Buckingham Palace have been surpassed by it, we may hope, that when the time shall come that London shall have to look to the past for the days of its greatness,—when, like Rome, it shall have shrunk into a corner of its former self, or, like Thebes, have ceased to be reckoned among the living cities of man—enough will remain to show that it was once the seat of one of the mightiest families of the human race.

(M. B) May well.

ART. IV.—1. *Gustav-Adolfs-Denkmal bei Lützen*; als Erinnerung an Gustav Adolph König v. Schweden, und die Schlacht bei Lützen, 1632. 8vo. Lützen, 1849.

2. *Gustav Adolph König v. Schweden, und seine Zeit.* Von Dr. Gfrörer, 8vo., Sulzbach, 1845.

AMONG the numerous and bloody wars which marked the rise and progress of Protestantism during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, there is not one that has left behind it so many vestiges as the Thirty Years' War. The traveller who wanders over the Palatinate and the lake of Constance; who visits the field of battle where Gustavus Adolphus fell, or idles along the sombre rivulet, silently gliding through the town of Egra, from whence it hurries on through a dark ridge of rocks, as if ashamed of its olden remembrances; in every region, nay, almost in every sequestered nook, is sure to meet with the demon-like phantom of that memorable struggle so steadfastly maintained by the two halves of the German nation throughout thirty long and dreary years. In an infuriate and murderous contest like this, antiquity would doubtless have seen the agency of some mysterious Being, the interference of some irritated Deity, such as pursued the Atrides, such as prompted the corpses of Eteocles and Polynices to separate from each other on the very funeral pyre on which had been laid their mortal remains.

But, indeed, no supernatural intervention is requisite to explain a feud that bears but too evidently the stamp of human passion in its most deadly consequences; and if, from the physical, you turn your eyes towards the moral world, even in those degenerate and perverse doctrines that have lately marked their career in Germany with bloodshed and ruin, you are struck with the strong resemblance they bear to that state of moral degradation, to that utter want of private and public virtue, which threatened to overthrow society itself during the celebrated conflict of the seventeenth century. Doubtless, when you stop at Heidelberg, you contemplate with astonishment the traces of Turenne's cannon balls still visible upon its time-worn fortifications; at Lindau and at Bregenz the ruined churches recall to memory the vandalism of the Swedish bands; Magdeburg still preserves the memory of its fire;

at the *Burg*, in Prague, you are shown the window from which the administrators were launched forth to a presumed death; in fine, when you penetrate into the castle of Egra, the guide never fails to lead you to a chamber now bedecked with modern trumpery, and with a grave, sedate air, he says: "Here it was that Wallenstein fell." And what a drama do those simple words alone imply! But even then the mind irresistibly reverts from the scenes of such dreadful tragedies to the passions which promoted them. And, indeed, what were the subsequent events of the eighteenth century but the direct consequences of the Thirty Years' War? The rivalry and quarrels of Frederick the Second and Maria Theresa were, in fact, but a continuation of that mortal duel between Protestantism and Catholicism. Nay more—the general insurrection of Germany against the ambition of a Napoleon had hardly been crowned with success, when the struggle was again renewed, though courteous at first and confined as it were to penmen; but ere long assuming the character of religious and political strife, it has blazed forth at last between the two contending powers of Austria and Prussia, and menaces to convulse, at no very distant period, the tranquillity of all Europe.

Who could be astonished, therefore, that an event so prolific with circumstances of high importance should have attracted the particular notice of the literary world? That the minds of men, thus hurried along out of their usual orb and evolutions by extraordinary occurrences, should have endeavoured to trace the secret motives and explain the acts of the personages who are the prime movers in the lamentable drama we are alluding to. And this was the more indispensable in the present case that Schiller was, a few years back, the only historian who appeared to have studied seriously the 'Thirty Years' War, though, God knows, with what degree of impartiality and justice. Upon the authority of the great German poet, the world was accustomed to encircle Gustavus Adolphus with a halo of sanctity and disinterestedness, which made of him the arch-type of a Protestant hero; to attribute to Tilly a proverbial reputation of ferocity, without ascertaining how far it might have been deserved; to cast over the shoulders of a Wallenstein a regal mantle, which death alone, it was said, had prevented him from assuming, as well as from selling his country to the Swedes, in order to supersede

the descendants of Rodolph of Hapsburg. Such were the current opinions of the day; and though their unsoundness was known to the learned few, the latter were pleased to promote the same erroneous views from a sense of policy, whilst the crowd of literary smatterers found it most convenient to adopt a ready hatched aphorism, which was in unison with their enmity towards the Catholic Church.

In the mean time a new generation had arisen in Germany. Ancient and modern history was studied with a new impetus; the mediæval chroniclers were sifted with a strong feeling of impartiality, and the German erudite applied to the relics of Catholic centuries the same spirit of equitable criticism which guided him so surely among the ruins of Greek and Roman institutions. It is to this spirit that we may attribute so many celebrated works, and among others the researches lately made by some Protestant historians of Teutonic origin, who have undertaken to write the biographies of Gustavus Adolphus and Wallenstein; whilst others have ventured to cope with the complicated and difficult narration of the Thirty Years' War itself. Few of these authors are known in England, though one of them at least has obtained the honours of a translation: thus we trust that some of our readers will peruse with pleasure the subject we are now to lay before them.

It was natural that the great Swedish monarch should have attracted the attention of the Germans. His prominent part between the years 1630 and 1632, his close connexion with the Elector of Brandenburg, his pretension to restore the liberty of the Germans by overthrowing the house of Austria; his no less notorious intention of usurping the Imperial Crown for himself; and last, though not least, the defeat of his designs through his ill-timed death at Lützen,—all these were motives more than sufficient to excite the curiosity of the Prussian learned. To the biography of this extraordinary man, whom Napoleon esteemed the greatest warrior of his age, M. Gfrærer, now superintendent of the Lutheran Church in Berlin, has devoted many years of his laborious life. Written in a simple yet graphic style, his *Gustavus Adolphus and his Times* has become a classical work in his own country, and well deserves its reputation. Though we shall have many strictures, as a Catholic, to lay upon several of his opinions,

still we must confess that little remains to be said concerning his hero, so thoroughly has he applied the rules of modern criticism to the numerous memoirs, correspondences, and military and political despatches, which it has been his good fortune to have access to. Differing widely from his predecessors, M. Gfrörer is by no means prone to flatter the grandson of Gustavus Wasa; throughout his whole work it is easy to discern a strong feeling of patriotic shame that his countrymen should have enlisted under the banners of a foreign usurper, who dissembled his ambitious views behind the veil of religious freedom. It is no less easy to see that the author regrets the fall of that noble fabric reared by Catholic hands and in Catholic ages—the Holy Roman Empire—more truly contributive to German unity than all the lucubrations of modern professors. And then with what burning indignation does he arraign the Protestant princes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for their selfish views of individual aggrandizement at the expense of the Church! In what vivid colours does he show their petty intrigues, their besotted jealousy of each other, their grovelling life of debauchery, their despicable meanness and baseness alternately towards the Emperor and the Swedish conqueror. Again, the man who wishes to ascertain the precise degree of religious freedom which the Protestants enjoyed under their ministers, has but to open M. Gfrörer's pages. He will there see exposed for the first time, we believe, the bigoted tyranny of the court preachers, excommunicating their rivals, imposing upon the multitude the revellings of a heated imagination, so that the people, says our author, had exchanged one single pope, who swayed his power afar and with dignity, for a set of diminutive popes, close at hand, standing high in the prince's favour, and ever ready to use the strong hand of power in order to enforce their own reckless inspirations. But it is time that we should make the reader acquainted with the writer who has put us in possession of so much precious information.

The history of Gustavus Adolphus opens, as was to be expected, with a retrospective review of the events which overthrew the Danish domination in Sweden, established in its stead a national dynasty, and consequently introduced Lutheranism as the most durable and most immediate support of the throne. We may at a future period revert to this subject, and glean many interesting particulars

from sources lately published ; at present it will suffice to affirm that M. Gfrœrer, though writing under the impulse of a strong Protestant bias, presents a most vivid picture of the ambition and cruelty which prompted Gustavus Wasa to subvert the religion of his forefathers. He repressed with the iron grasp of power the remonstrances of the same peasantry whose arm had secured him the crown. Like our own Henry VIII. he bribed the nobility with the allurements of church lands, a considerable portion of which, like him also, he appropriated to himself. Well versed in the arts of popular sophistry, and perfectly aware with what keenness men look to money matters, the new king took advantage of a fair held at Stockholm to expose before the people the wants of the public treasury. The costs of the national war, said he, amounted to no less than 980,000 marks, a large portion of which lay upon himself. The inhabitants of Lubeck had advanced 68,000 for stores and ammunition, without reckoning a loan of eight thousand marks in ready money. To balance this enormous outlay the crown had but 24,000 marks. The only resource left was to seize the lands of the Church, which formed a scandalous contrast with the poverty of the country, since two-thirds of the whole property belonged to the clergy, whilst the remaining third was divided among the king, the nobility, and the people.

It was evident that the monarch purposely omitted to state, that a great part of the church lands were appropriated to charitable distributions, which, in the able hands of the owners, contributed efficaciously to alleviate the wants of the poor, and counterbalance the effects of an inclement sky in these dreary regions of Europe. This indeed did not escape the notice of the lower classes, "who clung," says M. Gfrœrer, "with fondness to their old faith, and to the institutions founded by their forefathers." (p. 15.) But Wasa was resolved to realize his long-matured plans. Even before he ascended the throne he kept up a correspondence with Luther. He soon began to favour the propagation of the new doctrines within his realms, notwithstanding the zealous resistance of Brask, bishop of Zinkœping, and the head of the Catholic religion in Sweden. New taxes were laid upon the clergy, and every vacancy in the episcopal sees was filled with persons presumed to be subservient to the king's designs. But in this piece of policy, like many other princes, the first Wasa was

deceived; all the new chosen bishops, to a man, strenuously opposed the introduction of Protestantism. Two of them, in particular, Peter James Sunnenwæder, bishop of Westeræs, and Knut, Archbishop of Upsala, were accused of high treason, and obliged to fly to Dalmatia, from whence the peasantry addressed a letter to Gustavus, in which they declare themselves "disposed to tolerate no longer that new taxes should be laid upon the churches, monasteries, monks, and people of Sweden." M. Gfrøerer attributes this remonstrance to the intrigues of the two bishops, though he affords no proof of his affirmation; in our opinion, it is a strong evidence of what were the real feelings of the people. Wasa's tyranny forced the two prelates to seek a refuge among the mountains of Norway, but the king of that country delivered them into the hands of their persecutor, upon condition that they should receive an impartial judgment. Immediately after their arrival in Stockholm, they were impeached before the Council of State, which condemned them to death. The execution took place, notwithstanding the numerous appeals made to the monarch's clemency. Dressed out in pontifical robes, all in tatters, riding on two miserable hacknies, with their faces turned to the tails, their venerable heads covered with a straw mitre, and with a crown made of birch bark, they were led through the city of Stockholm, to meet their death, whilst a troop of buffoons shouted after them: "Here comes the Lord Peter Sunnenwæder, our new-made king!" The two martyrs suffered with constancy, evincing a courage worthy of their cause, in the month of February, 1527.

Acts like these were sufficient to strike terror throughout the land, and Wasa took advantage of it to confiscate a certain number of monasteries, allowed the secular and regular clergy to marry, appropriated to himself the spiritual jurisdiction, and deposed such priests as presumed to resist his arbitrary power. Shortly after, he assembled a diet, and required the concession of an absolute government. The clergy and nobility made some show of resistance; but the king threatening to resign, he soon gained a complete victory: all his demands were granted, and the bishops obliged to sign a paper, declaring themselves well pleased to be rich or poor according to the king's pleasure.

It would be useless to dwell any longer upon the resolu-

tions of a diet which delivered into the hands of an ambitious sovereign the faith, the liberties, and institutions of a whole nation: our own history furnishes but too many transactions of a similar nature; we must besides remember that these incidents are but the forerunners of those events which brought Wasa's grandson into the heart of Germany.

The founder of the new Swedish dynasty left four sons, Eric, John, Magnus, and Charles, of whom the two first and the last alone lived long enough to wield their father's sceptre. John had married a Polish princess, Catherine Jagellon, a zealous Catholic, and thus became an object of jealousy to the new king Eric. The Duke of Finland (for such was John's title) was imprisoned by his elder brother; but his noble hearted wife willingly shared his captivity, wherein she succeeded in converting her husband, and gave birth to her only son Sigismund. As is usually the case in such circumstances, John's sufferings made him popular with the people, so that he found no difficulty in ascending the throne on the death of Eric.

It could, however, be hardly expected that a sovereign of his character should have been chosen by God to restore the true faith, to which the peasantry, according to M. Gfroc̄erer's own admittance, still secretly adhered. John, of a fickle and headstrong character, was desirous of professing Catholicism in private, though he publicly upheld Lutheranism, and he ventured so far as to ask of the Pope that the priests might be allowed to omit the intercession of the saints and prayers for the dead in the holy sacrifice. To this piece of hypocrisy, Gregory XIII. would by no means consent, and henceforward John's zeal for our religion cooled to such a degree that he himself set up as an innovator, by imposing upon his people a spurious liturgy, strangely wrought out by a compound of Catholic and Protestant doctrines. This liturgy was enforced by the persecution of all opponents, whatever might be their own religious persuasions. King John's *red book*, as it was called, soon became the terror of the whole country, except in Sudermaunland, governed by Charles, the youngest and fourth son of Gustavus Wasa.

This prince was indeed no idle observer of passing events. Through a false policy of his father, he was next to independent in his dukedom, a circumstance which favoured to the highest degree his ambitious designs. His

demesnes became a secure asylum for all persecuted Protestants; he positively refused to use John's liturgy in his churches, allowed the Lutheran preachers to anathematize the monarch's religious enactments, and above all, zealously affected great alarm for the safety of Sweden, on seeing that Sigismund, heir-apparent to the crown, was brought up in the Catholic religion. His court soon turned out to be a rendezvous for every malcontent; he strongly opposed John's second marriage, after Catherine's death; things even went so far as to threaten Sweden with a civil war between the two brothers, an event which would certainly have taken place, had not Charles ultimately yielded to many of the monarch's wishes.

The motive of this timely concession was the discovery of a conspiracy framed by the nobility for the recovery of the power and privileges of which they had been deprived by the first Wasa. This plot contributed more than anything else to bring about a reconciliation between John and the Duke of Sudermaunland; but the death of the former in 1592 opened a new field to the hopes and daring plans of the latter.

The Duke Charles seems to have inherited, more than any of his brothers, the qualities and faults of his gifted father. Keen-sighted in his views of men and things, crafty and heartless, he was a good general, an excellent politician, and had the great merit of never abandoning his primitive purposes as long as he could entertain the slightest hopes of success. By a series of artifices and acts of treachery which are too easily glossed over by M. Gfroerer, he succeeded in wresting the throne from Sigismund, the new king, who likewise governed Poland; but whose sole crime was that of being a Catholic. And yet this Catholic sovereign merely wished to obtain in Sweden for his own religion the same toleration he granted to other religious persuasions: thus setting beforehand a high and early example of that truly christian feeling, that leaves to the grace of God and to the preaching of the gospel the conversion of human hearts and souls.

If we could give credit to M. Gfroerer's narration, the Jesuits had spun a most dark intrigue, which was supported by the most iniquitous measures, to deprive Sweden of the blessings of Protestantism: unfortunately he produces no historical proof of his assertions, and we must therefore deal with it as a mere tribute paid to the hackneyed preju-

dices of his creed. But from the whole tenor of the chapter we are now analyzing, it is evident that the Duke of Sudermaunland recoiled from no nefarious practice, in order to deprive his nephew of his legitimate inheritance, even when, as on one occasion, Charles owed to him the preservation of his very life. At last, he attained the object of his ambition, reigned for many years over Sweden, severely repressed the haughty spirit of the nobles, and left his crown to that celebrated monarch, whose future grandeur he had long foreseen. Towards the close of his life, when his courtiers were prompting him to some great undertaking, Charles IX. was accustomed to pat young Gustavus upon the head, and to exclaim, "Here is one who will do it, *ille faciet*."

If nature had done much for Gustavus Adolphus, his father certainly neglected nothing to cultivate his rising genius. At the early age of twelve years he spoke Latin fluently, four modern languages with the elegance of a native, and understood the Russian as well as the Polish idiom without any difficulty. It was indeed no extraordinary occurrence during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to see persons eminent in rank better versed in the knowledge of ancient and modern languages than many of their class can boast of in the present day. Charles IX. took great care also that his successor should be brought up in the practice of state affairs; he was but eleven years old when his attendance was required at the council; at fourteen, he undertook a journey in the southern provinces of the kingdom, to make himself acquainted with the details of local government, and only a year after we find him receiving and answering the foreign ambassadors sent to his father's court. Two men of distinguished characters were particularly entrusted with the young prince's education, John Skytte and Oxel Oxenstierna: they both remained in after times his confidential advisers and bosom friends. As for Oxenstierna, his influence over European affairs in the period which followed his master's death, is well known to all proficients in history.

The reader will not be astonished to learn that Gustavus Adolphus was an enthusiastic admirer of the art of war: to become thoroughly acquainted with its most intricate details was one of his chief objects—an object he but too soon attained for the welfare of mankind. His first and successful attempts in the military career were made

against the Danes under the direction of his father; but when the latter died Adolphus was immediately engaged in a long war against Sigismund, King of Poland, who still vindicated his rights to the crown of Sweden. The young monarch in a very short time attracted the notice of all Europe by his numerous successes in that struggle; so that when Christian IV. of Denmark volunteered to become the head of the Protestant Union in the Thirty Years' War, Gustavus was already considered as his rival for that high station, though different circumstances prevented the Protestants from accepting his offers.

Upon the eve of ushering his hero upon this great field of political and military adventure, M. Gfrörer pauses to cast a searching and impartial eye upon the state of Germany during the sixteenth century, as well as upon the principal causes which contributed to work in favour of the Reformation. This first chapter of the second book we consider as one of the most important of the whole work; for interwoven though it be with strong Lutheran prejudices, still we can trace throughout a no less strong feeling of historical candour which gives it a particular interest to Catholic readers. Never, we believe, did the despicable conduct of the German princes, nor the turbulent dispositions of the gentry and burghers appear in more glaring colours. We shall therefore offer no apology for making abundant quotations, leaving to the reader himself to animadvert upon such passages as are merely the result of insufficient information or party spirit on the part of our author.

“From the beginning of the thirteenth century,” says M. Gfrörer, “the combined strength of the Roman Church and of the German princes had lowered more and more the dignity of the Emperor.* In proportion as the supremacy of the immediate vassals rose to paramount importance, that of the Emperor dwindled into nothingness and to a mere shadow. We may consider the long and inglorious reign of Frederick III. (1440–1493) as the darkest period of this deep degradation of the imperial power. But the triumph of the high aristocracy had hardly been completed, when the victorious princes armed to attack their previous ally, the Roman Church, which had in fact usurped to herself a large portion

* Had we time and space, it would be no difficult task to prove that the Church had constantly acted in the opposite direction, and of this M. Gfrörer gives himself a memorable example in the conduct of Berthold, Archbishop of Mentz, though we do not agree in all he says of that prelate.

of the common booty. The Pope and his German agents, the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the empire, enjoyed a far larger share of power in Germany, and reaped far richer incomes from the German soil, than Frederick III. or his predecessors. Here, then, was a conquest for these ambitious lords, which promised a no less important accession of power than their victory over the imperial throne itself. And supposing that no unforeseen obstacle should interfere, it was by no means difficult to see in whose favour fortune would declare. For the aristocracy of the empire was a natural force which shot forth its roots into the deepest strata of the soil; whilst the Church, though beloved and revered during the first part of the middle ages, had now lost nearly all hold upon public opinion, in consequence of shocking abuses tenaciously upheld by the Popes, in the very face of the councils and of Christendom at large. A loss like this, in itself most lamentable, was heightened by circumstances of a still more dangerous character." P. 222-3.

Among these circumstances, one of the most conspicuous was the gradual rise and progress of the commercial interest in the towns and cities. The sober habits of this new class, their shrewd intelligence, added to the ambition which prompted them to aspire to a share in public affairs, made them generally averse to the opulent and influential prelates of the German empire. Hence the zeal with which they embraced the new doctrines, so that if the princes showed themselves the most ardent adversaries of Popedom, the citizens, (remarks M. Gfrörer,) were doubtless the most conscientious antagonists of the Roman Church. Conscience has ever, we are disposed to believe, had but little to do with the motives of the burghers; for, like their rivals in the great work of spoliation, they were not at all blind to the worldly increase of riches and political importance which they would reap from the appropriation of the lands and privileges belonging to the princes of the Church.

It must not likewise be forgotten, that the turbulent class of the liberals, so numerous in those times, was principally recruited among the sons of the burghers, and every one is well aware of the bitter enmity these men bore to the doctrines and institutions of Catholicism. If to them we add the dangerous spirit of insubordination which prevailed among the German gentry and peasantry, a spirit of which the bold insurrections directed by Franz of Sickingerr were but incidental manifestations, among many others of a no less formidable character, we shall not

be at a loss to affirm, that no element of anarchy was dormant when Luther's pretended Reformation blazed forth in all its horrors.

And yet, on the very eve of that momentous event, there was a man who endeavoured to link Germany in one common band, to rear that fabric of unity and nationality which of late has been the delusive dream of so many philosophers and politicians. That man was Berthold, archbishop of Mentz. He was born of the noble house of Hennisberg, in the year 1442, and entered at an early age the household of Frederic III., where he acquired a thorough knowledge of political and administrative affairs. In 1486, he was called to the see of Mentz. Like many bishops of his age, he was more busy with secular concerns than with the real duties of his station. However, his soaring mind soon showed him the urgent necessity of restoring to its pristine splendour the imperial dignity, and of combining the different classes of the German nation in a manner which might enable them to form a great body, somewhat similar to the British community. Thus he drew up a plan for periodical assemblies, destined to discuss the public affairs, to vote the taxes; but, at the same time, he confined within too narrow limits the authority of the crown; and, therefore, we can hardly be astonished that both Frederic III. and Maximilian I. rejected his ideas. But the wretched state of society in Germany, and the egotistical tendencies of its unruly princes, formed the principal obstacle to the patriotic designs of Berthold. He died in 1504, "the last great bishop," observes M. Gfroerer, "at least, in the old sense of the word, of the German empire, which now rushed on irresistibly towards its dissolution." After his death, the memory of his efforts was preserved among his friends, and among the people; from time to time many an abortive attempt was made to establish what had been the goal of his wishes, "but it was too late. An ill-omened star prevented the execution of plans formed with great energy, for the establishment of German unity. Providence would not ordain the realization of this grand conception." (p. 239.)

In these lines it is hardly possible not to perceive the prepossessions of the modern German politician, prepossessions which have so lately thrown his country into all but inextricable confusion. We shall have hereafter to

offer some observations on this subject, and this obliges us to be the more sparing of them at present.

The audacious revolt of Francis von Sickingen, and of the German peasantry, in 1525, has been generally attributed to the extension of Lutheran doctrines. There is doubtless some reason for this. However, our author proves, from a series of incontrovertible facts, that these insurrections were but the continuation of several others, which may be traced up to the last years of the fifteenth century. The distracted state of Germany under its feeble emperors, and no less unruly nobles, goaded the lower classes to a state of madness, which required only the slightest occasion to cause a general disruption of all the social ties. In the midst of their misery, the deluded peasants imagined that any change would bring them better days, and thus were ever ready to listen to a popular leader. Another circumstance greatly contributed to render still more formidable, and still more frequent, the recurrence of these insurrections. Since the revolution wrought by the discovery of gunpowder in the art of war, the importance of infantry was becoming greater and greater in the composition of European armies. Thus, in the course of a few years, there was hardly a labourer's family in which one of its members had not served a long time under some of the numberless *condottieri* who sought for fame and fortune by selling their services to the potentates of Europe. These restless spirits were not likely to submit tamely to the taunts and insults of the petty lords under whom they lived, on retiring to their native villages. They became the natural ringleaders of the infuriated mob. But the deep prudence with which they often combined their plans, evinced but too evidently how well they remembered the lessons of their military career. In fine, we must recollect, that a population once accustomed to the use of arms, will soon learn to conquer such rights as the policy of their governments is disposed to refuse them. Of the truth of this assertion the experience of the past and present times offers too many proofs to require any further demonstration.

Such was the condition of Germany, and we might even say of Christendom at large, when Luther made his appearance. The princes, observes M. Gfrœrer, favoured his ideas of christian liberty as far as they contributed to

extend their own privileges; but were by no means disposed to confer the same boon upon their subjects. Many of the new converts spoke out most forcibly their opinion upon this subject. The famous Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, declared, that, far from having favoured the outbreak of the peasantry, Luther's doctrine prescribed implicit obedience to the sovereign. Others issued forth proclamations destined to enforce upon the convictions of their tenants, that in the word *liberty*, religious liberty alone was concerned; whilst in this world below, all earthly duties were to remain upon the same footing as before. It was a hard lesson for the Germans to learn; but their tutors succeeded in knocking it into their brains by dint of blows and much bloodshed.

"In the meantime," continues M. Gfrörer, "the converted lords were very far from being contented with the naked gospel alone. And in this Luther endeavoured to meet their wishes. Just the same as in 1524 he had acted towards the grand-master Albert, so immediately after the close of the peasant war, he wrote a letter to another Brandenburg, likewise named Albert, and Archbishop of Mentz, inviting him to marry, and to transform his diocese into a temporal principality. In giving this piece of advice, Luther acted as if the archbishopric was a demesne having no lord; as if the Emperor of the Empire had nothing to say in the future administration of the great Church fiefs. The Archbishop himself, however, considered the matter otherwise. Though he had given more than one proof of his partiality to the new doctrines, he dared not follow Luther's advice; probably because he feared the vengeance of Rome, and of the party still adhering to the old faith. But other princes who had declared for Luther soon set to work. The cloisters and episcopal rights of jurisdiction were the first prey, whilst the great ecclesiastical foundations were reserved for a more favourable opportunity. From the moment that the protectors of Lutheranism usurped to themselves the inheritance of the old Church, we may date the birth of the Protestant Church. The delivery of the Augsburg Confession, in 1530, must be considered as a natural consequence of what had been accomplished in 1525. And now came the question, whether the Emperor would remain silent on the last step of the Lutheran princes; or whether he would not, as the protector of the Roman Church, put forth his strength against those who had fallen off from her tenets." (p. 244-5.)

Notwithstanding the suspicious conduct of Charles the Fifth on this occasion, our author gives him full credit for the sincerity of his attachment to Catholicism, and lays

the whole blame upon the court of Rome, if a true reformation was not sooner brought about at the instigation of the emperor. There are many historical facts which flatly contradict this affirmation; but we shall content ourselves with exposing M. Gfrörer's hypothesis, as nearly as possible, in his own words.

Like most Protestant writers, he has a strong belief in the efficacy of the temporal power to promote religious reforms and the welfare of the Church. And what was the great good which Charles was to win by this interference? A Catholic reader, and even any other, will be startled.

"The Pope," says M. Gfrörer, "would have been forced to accept the Augsburg Confession and the Bible as the highest authority for Christian doctrine. There is no doubt," adds he, "that Charles had no less the power than the will to direct the General Council in such a way as to make true the word he had given to the Lutherans by the Interim. The Roman court trembled before him, and the defeat of the Smalkaldish league struck as much fear into the heart of the Pope, as of the vanquished Protestants themselves. It stands also to reason, that our Emperor, in the further course of negotiations, would have set up a legal barrier against the future encroachments of the Papal See, and the repetition of such excesses as had brought forth the Reformation. At the same time, he would have obliged the German bishops and abbots to purchase the enjoyment of their fiefs by civil and financial sacrifices to a certain extent. The track when once cut out, must have led inevitably to the goal so ardently, so long wished for, by all true friends of their country,—the restoration of Church unity, together with the unity of the empire and the recovery of regal power." (p. 245-6.)

It is somewhat strange, indeed, that so many advantages should have escaped the keen and vigilant eye of the great German emperor. But, however, so it is. M. Gfrörer attributes the miscarriage of this finely spun design to the felony of the famous prince Maurice, of whom our author is no admirer, and whom he represents, on the contrary, as an unprincipled, ambitious adventurer. At the bottom, we rather believe Charles the Fifth to have known the character of our Church better than our Lutheran historian of the nineteenth century. Whatever may have been his secret views, whatever his own soaring hopes, whatever his efforts to restore the imperial authority, even at the expense of religion itself, still we believe him to have been kept back by one grand idea, by one noble scruple,—the

utter uselessness, nay, the sheer folly, of attacking the only solid foundation of temporal power,—*the Catholic Church*. Disgraced as she might then be by the dissoluteness of some portions of her clergy; oppressed as she was by the supporters of superannuated feudalism, and still more by the new upholders of absolutism; though torn suddenly in twain by a gigantic insurrection against her most sacred dogmas, against her most ancient observances, now made a laughing-stock, an object of insult for the wise and the learned; yet, still the Roman Catholic Church had that within her which made her a thing of life, destined to walk the deep and ride the waves until the end of the world. The son of Philip the Fair knew this, believed this, and for this reason did he not venture upon a path which has led on monarchs, even more powerful than he ever was, to their complete ruin.

Another consideration, which has not even escaped M. Gfrörer's notice, must have been constantly running in the mind of Charles the Fifth. Ages had rolled on, the knell of parting feudalism was tolling on the ominous bell of Time, and the world presented one vast scene of confusion and jarring elements;—one creation alone of the mediæval centuries seemed to survive their existence, and that was the Holy Roman Empire. As long as this idea was not extinct, the head of the Empire was the born protector of the Catholic Church, her *episcopus externus*, as it were, and to abjure that supreme qualification would have been to abjure the very essence of the institution itself. Now, as our historian properly observes, had Charles given up this high attribute, what a double force would he have secured to his rival, the King of France! Suppose the latter becoming the avowed protector of German Catholicism, backed as he was by the might of a most powerful kingdom, enthusiastically devoted to its brilliant and youthful monarch, how could the house of Austria have stemmed the torrent? And into what insignificance would the grandson of Maximilian have dwindled in the eyes of the political world! Is there any man in his senses who can for one instant imagine that this highly gifted sovereign was not fully alive to the consequences of such a false piece of policy as would have prompted him to join the Protestant league against the Pope, or, what is exactly the same, to impose upon the latter a string of heretical doc-

trines that would have ruined the very existence of the Catholic faith?

But enough of these worldly considerations. There were within the mysterious designs of Providence reasons of a far higher character to prevent the realization of a plan so monstrous in its nature, so foreign to all the traditions of Catholicism. The successive growth of heresies during the fifteenth century, added to the abuses and vices which degraded too many members of the church, no less than the pagan spirit which accompanied the resurrection of ancient literature and the Machiavelian policy that guided the several courts of Europe, had gradually engendered a mass of corruption unparalleled, we believe, in the annals of Christianity. Men grew tired of the blessings showered down upon them by their antique faith, and imagined that by reviving the obsolete and corrupt pasquinades of paganism, they would at once plunge into an ocean of sensual bliss. If you please to cast the scrutinizing eye of a moralist into the lives of the infatuated literati of those times, what else will you find but a scene fit to disgust the heathen philosopher himself? Divine Providence had, therefore, only to give up these deluded leaders of mankind to their own follies as a sufficient chastisement for their iniquity. The most hair-brained fantasies instead of reformation, tyranny instead of liberty, vice instead of virtue; such was their doom as well as that of their followers. In the meantime, the true Church would rid itself of a huge mass of corruption, and recover that innate strength, that purifying energy which blazed forth to the astonished eyes of the world at the close of the sixteenth and at the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. And as ages continued to roll on, as nations, in consequence of their deviation from Catholic truth, began to feel the bitter effects of their insanity under the appalling aspect of civil war, religious dissensions, bloody revolutions, pauperism, and the sundry evils brought on by Protestantism, the development of Catholic unity would run on in the same proportion, so as to strike more forcibly than ever the minds of the people by the sight of its peace and immutability when contrasted with the monstrous grievances we have just enumerated.

Such seem to have been, we presume to say, the designs of our Divine lawgiver, in His guidance of Europe during the three last centuries. Catholics and Protestants, believers

and free-thinkers, are insensibly chastening down to that humility which will make them proper recipients for grace, and the church, after her hard trials, will once more enjoy the serene comfort of faith and charity among her children. And now we beg leave to ask, what is the puny conception of German unity or a German autocrat compared to this sublime result? What comparison can we establish between Catholic faith thus progressing towards the furthest extremities of the known world, irradiating the whole universe with the light shining forth from the word of the Most High, with the insignificant fact that a superannuated edifice reared by the hands of those who had long gone their way, should have crumbled to pieces, worm-eaten and weather-beaten as was the throne occupied by the Hapsburg family? What other princes indeed could better deserve their fate by their headstrong opposition to the most beneficial measures of the Roman Pontiff; by their constant support of sectarian views, and by their almost invariable tendency to establish a national church in antagonism against the Universal Church of Christ? That such a high philosophy of history should have escaped the Protestant eye of M. Gfröerer is by no means surprising; but it is the duty of Catholic writers to bring it forth in vivid colours, were it for no other purpose than to obliterate the unphilosophical materialist system that presides over historical compositions of our days.

The picture of the sixteenth century would have been incomplete had not our historian endeavoured to delineate the organization and achievements of a body whose wide influence extended from its very birth over the whole world, whilst its eminent services towards the Catholic Church have made it an object of hatred and obloquy to all kinds of unbelievers. We are speaking of the Jesuits. Notwithstanding the late confessions of a Whig statesman and writer, it was no easy matter for a Protestant to lay down his innate prejudices concerning the sons of Loyola. We must give M. Gfröerer credit for what he has done, and pity him for the blind prepossessions which have made such a keen-sighted writer echo back the absurd accusations of regicide, and utter regardlessness of means, that fill to nausea, the pages of so many common-place scribblers. Here is a man who brings before our eyes a most noble picture of the energy, the zeal, the abilities, the learning, of the Jesuits—a portrait such as would be deemed partial

if penned by any Catholic author, and who there tells us gravely that the Jesuits blended *crime and virtue* for their purposes; that they won the hearts of the people by piety, real or *affected*; that they actually *practised* regicide! And when you ask this man for his proofs, what do you think is his answer? There is no proof, but it is a *moral certainty, public opinion accused them of this crime!* A moral certainty, indeed! And what tribunal, unless it be among barbarians, would ever condemn a man upon a *moral certainty*? Public opinion again! But what public opinion, if you please? The public opinion of Calvinistic bigots, or of the cringing magistrates belonging to the old French parliaments, who hated the Jesuits for the deadly blows they dealt to their Jansenist, jaundice-eyed tenets. And this, an impartial, cool-minded historian proclaims public opinion! Public opinion with a vengeance then; when shall we have done with this *cant*, which still lets out its impure oozings upon the learned world? For it is indeed ludicrous to suppose that any one but an ignorant fanatic will content himself with the fine conclusion that the Jesuits were too wary to be caught in their crimes; so that we must fain believe, that for three long centuries thousands of enemies who have ransacked historical documents against the Jesuits, should have never been able to catch one single authentic demonstration of their criminality in such important matters. Why, this is subverting the very laws of Providence itself, and trampling upon the ordinary rules of right and wrong, which are the very foundations of society. It would be an instance unknown in the annals of the world; an instance of a whole body of men devoted for ages to the most sublime virtues for the simple purpose of perpetrating the most heinous crimes. For our own part, we are at a loss to conceive how M. Gfrœrer could ever lend his name to such a string of nonsensical inferences. In this case, at least, we may say with justice:

“*Desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne.*”

But now let us come to our quotation.

“The glory of having moulded the Jesuit institute so as to become what it really did become, belongs to the second General, James Laynez, a man who possessed most extraordinary knowledge of the human heart and experience in affairs. If one wished to attain the object of the society, viz. the upholding of the hier-

archy, it was indispensable to give the strongest unity to the order in the midst of its multifarious avocations; it was indispensable to allure the most eminent men within its bosom; to monopolize the growing generation in all Catholic lands, and thus to make sure of futurity; in fine, to lord over the conscience of princes, to render abortive the hostility of antagonists, or, if this was unfeasible, to get rid of them. Above all, the order was to become the vehicle of education. But to gain this end, policy required compliance with the spirit of the age. The sunshine days of monachism were over; such orders as had hitherto formed a link between the Popedom and the people had outlived their fame: the Franciscans were derided for their ignorance and vulgarity, the Dominicans hated on account of their severity. Instead of the contemplative spirit of former times, the resurrection of science had awakened in the world a longing after practical knowledge and agreeable manners. The Jesuits soon distinguished themselves in the different branches which were then most highly esteemed: theology and the learned languages, mathematics and history, and poetry itself—they understood all, cultivated all. At the same time, they showed themselves gentlemen of the world, both refined in their acquirements and lively in their demeanour. No bigotry, no idle tokens of a merely external piety was to be traced in their behaviour; even when directing the souls of laymen, they enforced the observances of Catholic piety only when the latter chimed in unison with the disposition of their penitents. They carefully forebore the very appearance of priding themselves upon particular sanctity, and even in their dress they avoided all that was singular. In Catholic countries, their habit was that of the secular clergy; but wherever this became an obstacle to their admittance, they exchanged it for the usual garments of the country where they resided. They were likewise prescribed to proceed in their spiritual and political concerns with the greatest mildness; to win men by yielding to their individual tempers, and never to set up even open opposition against their antagonists, or to allow anything passionate to escape them. Again, the Jesuits were to observe the greatest secrecy concerning the rules of their Order, and to accomplish in the dark whatever might give rise to open resistance.

“The direction of their schools was excellent, and most admirably conformable to the wants of youth. A spirit of liberty, combined with an unceasing watchfulness; a friendly condescension to the pupils; a wise attention to the preservation of innocence and morals, distinguished from all others the Jesuit colleges, wherein love and confidence went hand in hand. Every combination calculated to excite emulation, such as public lectures, prizes, titles of honour, were used to stimulate diligence; gymnastic exercises contributed to the strengthening of the body, whilst the manners of the future gentleman in social life were heightened by theatrical representations. Even in the eighteenth century, their system of edu-

cation was considered as the best, and the nobility of Protestant as well as of Catholic lands flocked to their schools. Men who bore a deadly hate to the Church, and persecuted her throughout their whole lives, such as Voltaire, who had himself been educated by the Jesuits, bore a most favourable witness to the ability and zeal of the fathers. Their educational institutions, which arose all around with a most surprising rapidity, became also a nursery for their order, by affording them opportunities of directing young men of talent towards their society. For the choice of these novices, they were guided, not by external connections, not by birth or fortune, but by the circumstance that a young man had ability and a sound education.....

“The extraordinary privileges which the Jesuits owed to the popes, made them an object of no less envy to the Catholic clergy than of hatred to the Protestants. The only monks with whom they stood upon good terms were the Carthusians, who, on account of their vow to preserve perpetual silence, were likewise the only priests, except those of the order, to whom a Jesuit might confess. The society extended in an astonishingly short period of time. At the death of the first general, Ignatius of Loyola, they boasted already of a thousand members, distributed in twelve provinces. With a zeal which recalled the first and finest days of Christianity, they had established the domination of the Pope and faith of the Roman Church in the most distant lands, in India, China, Japan, the Moluccas, Ethiopia, Cafreria, in North and South America. Francis Xavier, who began the missions of the Order in 1541 in Portuguese India, converted hundreds of thousands to Christianity during his travels, and died on his way to China in 1551, with the reputation of a most heroic devotedness, which earned him the title of *Apostle of the Indies*, and the honours of canonization. In old Europe, their activity was in no ways behindhand, though it bore a different form, because here there were no heathens to convert. At the close of the sixteenth century they had long been in possession of flourishing establishments in Portugal, Spain, France, Italy, England, in the Low Countries, in Catholic Germany, such as Austria, Bavaria, and Poland. The most different characters, from the ardent enthusiast, who sought for death in the promotion of Catholic faith to the most practical genius; from the cool-headed learned thinker to the wildest zealot; from the noble soul burning with the spirit of the Gospel to the most crafty statesman; from innocence to crime;—all served the order in an harmonious unison, contributing to its grandeur, because under the perpetual watchfulness and the eminent spirit which governed the whole body, each force obtained its proper sphere of action and in accordance with that whole. Whilst ardent minds thirsting after martyrdom laboured in far-laid missions, and frequently obtained the object of their ambition, in Europe, other Jesuits, deeply versed in learning, attacked the Protestants in their books; others again won the hearts

of the people by real or affected sanctity, or spun their nets round the consciences and understandings of noblemen, princes, and kings, by the most subtle arts and measures. There were Jesuits who buckled the cuirass over their cassock, and fought as engineers in the Thirty Years' War. If peaceful means, craft, and persuasion served not their ends, they sought to attain it through sheer force. *If all probabilities be not false*, they did not only preach, but practise regicide. It is admitted that the Emperor Maximilian II., a prince favourable to Protestants, was to have been poisoned in his twenty-fourth year. Now this plot strangely coincides with the first appearance of the Jesuits in Austria. Public opinion attributed likewise to them the murder of the Prince of Orange. That it was they who whetted the poniard which killed Henry the Fourth of France is a moral certainty, though it is still *juridically* unproved. The murderous attempt made, as we shall show hereafter, against the life of Gustavus Adolphus, was laid by that very prince to their door. *That the guilt of such a crime could not be proved against the Order, is by no means a demonstration of its innocence.* The Jesuits would not have been either so crafty or so prudent as they really were, had they allowed themselves to be discovered."—pp. 255—260.

The *reservatum ecclesiasticum*, it is well known, was the principal, if not the very first cause of the conflagration which, during a period of thirty years, covered Europe with bloodshed and ruin. The reformed princes had promised in 1555 that in case of any dignitary of the Catholic Church apostatizing to their persuasion, he should give up his lands, on the plea that the original donors had never intended that these pious foundations should fall into the hands of heretics. That it was not their intention to observe this clause of the Augsburg treaty, can hardly be denied, if we consider their subsequent conduct and their leading maxims of policy. Among the latter we may justly reckon the monstrous idea that prevailed at that period, relative to the obligation under which subjects stood of adhering to the religion of their sovereign. The words *cujus regio, ejus religio*, laconically expressed this newly-invented and perverse dogma. In the eyes of the Protestants, this was merely an allurement to despoil the Church of all her property. On this head there can remain no doubt, after M. Gfrörer's own confessions. On the authority of Ranke, he attributes this invasion to the Catholic party, a circumstance in no ways qualified to give us a high idea of their sincerity and pure zeal for religion.

“ This new right,” says he, “ was laid down in the formula, *cujus regio, ejus religio* ; a most wrong principle, which struck out with one stroke of the pen the religious freedom of the German nation, and degraded it to the rank of Helots. But it is not at all surprising that things should have taken this turn. Instead of *religion*, write down the words *Church lands*, and the sense becomes clear enough. It will then run thus : The Church lands shall belong to him who is the master of them. The more serious question, concerning the faith of the subjects, then becomes a secondary one, such as it really was, and must be answered by the decision of the first. If a prince be desirous of usurping the lands lying within his own possession, it stands to reason that he must needs unfurl the standard of the new doctrines, in order to justify his robbery. The treaty of Augsburg exposed to the whole world the secret views which guided the German aristocracy from the very beginning in regard to the Reformation. Doubtless Luther's intentions were pure when he commenced his great work ; doubtless he wished to serve the cause of God : but those under whose protection he stood, and whom he made the princes of the new-born Church, had no other object in sight but worldly advantages, but the aggrandizement of their own dominions, of their own power, and this object, which had hitherto been glossed over with all sorts of masks and pretensions, broke forth to light in the intoxication of victory.” —p. 248.

It would be difficult to set forth in more striking language the disgraceful dispositions of the German princes when they embraced Luther's tenets. The constant interference of government in affairs of religion and the establishment of national churches, became henceforward the prominent feature of the period ; it is perceivable in every direction, even where it is least to be expected. The democratic and anarchical spirit of Calvinism bore the stamp of this fatal tendency, and the Catholic hierarchy itself, judiciously observes our author, was obliged to lean more than it would otherwise have done, on the strong arm of power, in order to maintain its position against its audacious antagonists.

In regard to Calvinism this is certainly one of the most remarkable instances of its fickleness and pliancy to circumstances which history can produce. Whatever may have been the stern tyranny of Calvin in his own city of Geneva, nevertheless his system was undoubtedly favourable to democratical forms of government. Hence the easy introduction it found in the Low Countries and among the peasantry of the Rhine ; hence the anarchical

tendencies it assumed in France at the close of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. In Germany, however, the case was very different. Lutherans and Catholics were both bitter in their animadversion against men who were intent upon destroying every remnant of what had been held sacred and Christian since the very dawn of our religion. Still the Calvinists succeeded in obtaining a firm footing in Germany; but in what manner and by what means we shall leave to our author to tell.

“We once more repeat, what we asserted before: Lutheranism *threatened* the futurity of Europe with the most serious dangers, not only because, within its own pale, it laid at the feet of princes all civil and ecclesiastical power, but likewise because it obliged its opponents, the Catholic clergy, to purchase the assistance of kings at the price of a blind submission quite unknown to the middle ages. Had Lutheranism remained alone with the old Church, according to all probabilities, the western world would have witnessed a system of servitude paralleled only in the Byzantine Empire and the Levant. For what does distinguish the Latino-German nations from the despotic and enslaved tribes of the east, if it be not that constant vindication of the ideal world, that characteristic opposition of spiritual and civil government, with its natural consequences, viz. the ponderation of royal, clerical, and popular power by each other? Now, it was not the fault of Lutheranism, if Europe was not bereft of these blessings.”

After such an admission we are hardly prepared to attribute their preservation to Calvinism; yet such is M. Gfrörer's singular conclusion. The more singular indeed, that we have but to turn over a few pages to see a flat contradiction of his affirmation. He himself compares the Calvinistic fanaticism and fury to that of the Mahometans of the middle ages, and in the secret affinity of their tenets sees the reason of the alacrity with which the Protestants espoused the cause of the Turks on many an occasion. But a still more striking instance of their proneness to crouch before the will of princes is, as we said above, their conduct in Germany. The passage we allude to is too important to allow any omission.

“In the territories belonging to the princes, the democratical genius of Calvinism, which was fed from without by Holland, could not thrive unless the reformed clergy countenanced a similar tendency. This was very far from being the case. The character of the German people has proved so truly aristocratical from its very

birth, such as depicted by Tacitus, down to the scribbling government of actual Protestantism, that on this ground the Calvinistic Church could not develop her democratical principles, but modified a most important part of her organization. The reformed preachers showed themselves no less zealous courtiers than their Lutheran contemporaries, whom they, however, pretended to look upon as creatures of an inferior cast. Ever breaking forth into revilings against the Romish Antichrist and the Pope; into the most odious accusations against the German Emperor, and the constitution of the state which they were impudent enough to call a miracle of the devil; they nevertheless found all the encroachments which their gracious lords, the petty Calvinist princes, made on the clergy and people, dispensations of a most equitable and natural character. On the one hand, so much obedience certainly caused great pleasure; but on the other, it was pregnant with lamentable consequences. Among the worst of these we reckon the unhappy circumstance, that of the many good municipal laws, of that popular feeling, of that ability to shape a government congenial to the wants of the times, which marked the progress of Calvinism in other countries, not one spark was kindled in our own land; no, not even did it use its democratical force to avenge upon the princes themselves the utter forgetfulness of divine and human duties with which they introduced a new sort of religion within the empire. But for that very reason the more luxuriantly do we then see shoot forth the very worst offsprings of Calvinism: its thirst after destruction, its proud contempt for all that was permanent, its hatred against historical traditions. The powerful men of this world are ever ready to turn off to their own selfish account the religious belief which in general is seriously adhered to only by the middle and unfortunate classes. What a help must this disposition offer to a party whose clergymen daily preached before the sovereign, and maintained that Catholicism was a complete, and Lutheranism a demi-system of idolatry; that the Pope was the whore of Babylon, of whom John speaks in his Apocalypse; the German empire an offspring of superstition, priestly craft, and nonsense; whilst the popish clergy, that princely vanguard of Rome, deserved to be utterly ruined! In fact, the political heads of German Calvinism dreamt of nothing else but Church robbery and destruction."—(p. 468-469.)

If such were the *clerical* representatives of Protestantism in Germany, its political leaders, during the Thirty Years' War, were truly worthy of the tools they employed, and by whom they were likewise turned to account. The picture of the different Protestant courts of those times, such as M. Gfrœrer draws them, provokes both contempt and disgust: they alternately cringe before the emperor when they fear him, or at the feet of Gustavus when his strong arm forces them into the combinations which he

arrays against the house of Austria. In regard to their individual selfishness and flagrant immorality in private life, it would disgust the reader, were we to follow our writer in his laudable exertions to inflict condign punishment upon these miscreants, and to hold them out to posterity with their true features. There are, however, two or three among these worthies who are entitled to more consideration, because they played a more prominent part in the politics of those days. We mean, in particular, the Electors of Saxony and of Brandenburg. If, henceforward, German Protestantism be proud of these men, it will certainly not evince a high sense of religious or moral virtue.

To begin by George William, Elector of Brandenburg, he was a complete nullity as well as a profligate debauchee. His sister Eleanora had married the King of Sweden, and he had thus unwillingly become bound, through this relationship, to Swedish politics. This prince was constantly governed by his favourites, and of the qualities which attached him to these we may judge by a most striking example. Curt von Burgsdorf, his confidential adviser, enjoyed the rare gift of swallowing eighteen measures of wine in one sitting, and of this he was exceedingly proud in that drinking age. After the accession to the throne of George William's successor, he one day expressed himself in the following manner: "In the days of your father, things went on much better than they do now; for then indeed we used to drink brandy, and now and then one might get a castle or a village by hard drinking: well I remember the time when in one meal I could send down eighteen measures." It is a matter of course that his ducal master vied with him in these feats: however Burgsdorf had other means of maintaining himself in favour. He was the Elector's purveyor of *beauties*, piqued himself upon being an excellent *entremetteur*, as the French style those persons, and generally presided over the public or private pleasures of that disgraceful court. Nay, he even sought to justify the amorous propensities of his lord by sentences of a political cast. "A Prince Elector," he was wont to say, "ought to give himself up to gallantry, in order not to have too many legitimate children, because as these cannot all obtain principalities, some of them must become beggar-princes." The eye witness whom we here follow gives some finishing touches which evidently show that he drew from nature.

“Curt von Burgsdorf is full of humbug and bombast, notwithstanding the presence of the Elector and the other lords. He even pretends to divine revelations. On one occasion, he said, he was leading a troop of horsemen through Germany, on a road where he ran the risk of being cut to pieces ; but God admonished him in a dream to decamp and cut his way through and through. He constantly insults and turns into ridicule every one of his prince's neighbours :—the Swedes are a set of dog keepers, the Dutch a pack of hares, pepper-boxes, &c. He is as bulky as a hogshead of wine, can keep no secret, whatever may be its importance. In any secret council, even before the prince, he calls out and bawls so loud that every one without can hear him : so he overpowers everybody, without excepting his master, brings all opinions to his own conclusion, and makes every one dance to his flute. His whole life has been one continued series of debauchery with harlots, drunkards, dice, night raking, and dancing. And yet he is not in the least ashamed of this, but boasted at the prince's table that on one evening he lost 80,000 rix dollars, swearing by his share in the book of Life (his greatest oath) that he told them down honourably. Besides, Burgsdorf has drunk forty fellows to their death, the first of whom was a nobleman at the court of Saxony, not reckoning a hundred other tricks which he would not confess were he to suffer torture for it. He holds an estate more than princely, has numerous stables full of princely horses, a crowd of costly coaches and chariots. He has likewise his own lackeys, gentlemen, governors, councillors, secretaries, trumpeters, just as if he was a great prince. He possesses no less than four hundred dresses, to which he is continually adding new ones. He is, besides, such a horrible swearer, that in this he acknowledges no master, and has always a thousand devils at his command. Towards his lord and sovereign he shows no kind of respect ; remains seated when the prince is standing before him, or walks to and fro ; makes him repeat the same question three times ere he gives an answer, just as if the prince were his servant ; allows himself to upbraid publicly the prince's actions ; often leans upon his right arm when the latter happens to be on his right side ; or even shows him his back parts. His table is most sumptuous : when on the prince's there is not a single piece of venison, his own groans under the weight of it ; and if in the prince's cellar there is not one drop of wine, you would find in Burgsdorf's barrel heaped upon barrel, pipe upon pipe, hogshead upon hogshead. He likewise holds the prince so sparingly, that the latter is obliged to borrow money of him even for gambling ; sometimes he likewise says openly, ‘A favourite desirous of keeping his ground must act in this way.’ Burgsdorf is as selfish and miserly as the devil himself ; abstains from no artifice in order to win money, and thus keep up his debaucheries. As for his lord's honour and welfare, that is the slightest of his cares ; in law-suits he suffers himself to be corrupted by the parties, bending and warping justice

according to the will of the man who offers him the most. Under the cover of his high command over the militia, he impoverishes and fleeces the prince. In all negotiations in which the Elector's name comes forward, he invariably reserves a few thousands to himself; selling the offices to the highest bidders, without any regard to their capacity, or whether they are not bitter papists and reformers. He proudly breaks open the seal of every letter addressed to the prince, and after reading it sends it up to him; or if such be his pleasure, he frequently does not communicate it to him at all, or by small scraps. Most of his confidants are suspected of sorcery. However he has made himself completely master of the prince, and watches him so narrowly that no one can speak to him but with Burgsdorf's good will, and in the presence of some one or other; so that one might truly deem the Elector to be his prisoner or hostage."

This minute description, written by an avowed Calvinist, gives us, we trust, a thorough knowledge of the court and prince we are speaking of. It would hardly seem credible, were not its admissions confirmed by sundry other proofs, which admit of no doubt whatsoever. Burgsdorf continued to enjoy his ill-acquired influence under the present, and even under the following reign. But what an idea such a man's government and vices convey of the princes who bestowed their favours upon similar upstarts! What an idea it conveys also of the Protestant clergy who submitted, almost without a murmur, to such a total dereliction of all moral principle, as would have shamed a pagan philosopher!

And again, we repeat with M. Gfroerer, that the other German princes were much of the same character and manners. He sums up the merits of each party in a few words, which have much weight in his mouth, and thus are calculated to make a deep impression on the reader's mind.

"Though the Protestants," says he, "were apparently superior in point of numbers and external strength, yet in reality they were inferior to the Catholics. It must be admitted that moral strength and virtue were on the side of the latter. Thanks to the triumphant career of the Reformation, the Catholic princes were now placed in a predicament which made them fear the worst for their very existence, no less than for their faith, and forced them to bethink themselves of forthcoming events. Their tutors, the Jesuits, were likewise far superior to the Lutheran court preachers, to whom the Protestant grandees lent a docile ear. Better manners prevailed within the Catholic court, whilst the Protestant princes, who had

now become so many little Popes, in consequence of the peace of religion, but too frequently laid aside all shame. It is indeed surprising to what a low level the morals of the Protestant party had descended since Luther's time. Drunkenness, especially at court, had become so fashionable, that the diet thought it necessary to send forth the following admonishment: 'The electors, princes, and states ought to avoid setting their subjects the example of drunkenness.' Other vices went hand in hand with this. High play then attained its wildest frenzy. The Jews became, as well as goldsmiths, an indispensable appendage of a court, and with them a most astounding government formed of princely mistresses. The prince elector, Joachim II., of Brandenburg, kept a whole band of concubines, but they did not prevent him from practising usury along with his Jews; and at the expense of his hard-oppressed subjects, he built a tolerable number of pleasure seats, in which he celebrated his orgies. The prince elector of Saxony, had made himself a cripple through his immoderate taste for drink, and his unbridled licentiousness. The other princes were not behind-hand. Germany was now to taste the bitter fruits of the total want of fear or reverence towards the Church and Emperor, caused among the aristocracy by this deep degeneracy of the Reformation. Doubtless, among the Catholic princes there were some who suffered themselves to be hurried along by the torrent. The majority, however, set a better example. The Emperors Maximilian II. and Ferdinand II. were distinguished for their modesty, whilst Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, was a sworn enemy to wild debauchery. The Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol, married the beautiful Philippine Welser, a burgher's daughter, and the Duke William, of Bavaria, took for his wife Maria Pettenbek. If such marriages were contrary to the customs of courts, nevertheless they did but show the better a strong feeling of morality, for these princes would not degrade to the condition of concubines, the women whom they loved." (p. 268-269.)

Such was the real state of things in Germany when Gustavus Adolphus resolved to invade that country, assuming the part of a Liberator, a defender of Protestant rights and liberties. The defeat of Christian IV., king of Denmark, by Tilly, and the conquests of Wallenstein, had humbled the insurgents so much, that the Emperor Ferdinand II. was then as powerful as Charles V. after the battle of Muhlberg. It would have been a favourable moment to restore peace and tranquillity to the distracted country; and this might perhaps have happened, had not the jealousy of the Catholic princes themselves deprived Ferdinand of his best general, whilst the intrigues of

France constantly tended to excite new difficulties and divisions.

The king of Sweden had just concluded a treaty of peace with Poland, after a successful and bloody war; he pretended to be called over by the German Protestants, though subsequent events showed how untrue was this position, and that he simply followed the impulse of his own ambition. It was with the greatest difficulty that he succeeded in obtaining the compliance of his own subjects to his daring enterprize. They had been engaged for many long years in an arduous struggle against the Poles, their pecuniary means were next to exhausted, but the ability of their monarch, added to his overpowering influence, precipitated them into a series of wars in which they rose to great political and military glory, but after which they sunk into insignificance and comparative weakness. It would seem that this gigantic effort exhausted the strength of Sweden. Very different in this respect from France of our own days, which so soon recovered from the disaster of Waterloo, and of a double invasion.

M. Gfroerer produces many authentic proofs that the real object of Gustavus was to place the imperial crown upon his own head after the total annihilation of the house of Austria. Even supposing that his triumphant career had not been arrested by a premature death on the field of battle, it is hardly possible to conceive how this plan could have been accomplished. Though the Catholic populations of southern Germany might be vanquished, as they really were, on the field of battle, it would have proved a sheer impossibility to maintain for any length of time a Protestant government among the stubborn peasantry of Bavaria, who spontaneously opposed to the Northern conqueror a desperate resistance, which was not unlike the patriotism of the Spaniards in our own century, when they had to defend their nationality against the ambition of Napoleon. On the other hand, is it to be supposed, that either Ferdinand, or the celebrated Wallenstein, or Maximilian of Bavaria, would have tamely submitted to such a humiliation? The Protestant princes themselves were by no means desirous of exchanging their present condition for the strict rule of a prince whose manners and habits were not at all congenial to the Germans. However demonstrative they might be in their professions to the king of the Swedes, when his victorious army over-

ran their dominions, they secretly hated the man who despised their vices no less than their dastard policy. He was too keen-sighted not to know that the loss of a single battle would make them turn against him with the same fickleness which had prompted them to desert the true interest of their own nation.

And then, if we cast our eye towards France and Spain, is it not evident that Richelieu, so intent upon humbling the house of Austria, would however have never permitted the establishment of a foe, still more formidable, at his very door? Gustavus had reserved to himself the possession of the largest ecclesiastical demesnes along the Rhine, and thus would have ever been ready, at a moment's warning, to pour his armies into the very heart of France. That this did not really happen may probably be attributed to the premature fate which the Swedish monarch met with on the field of Lutzen; for Gustavus had already threatened to visit Louis XIII. with a body guard of 100,000 men, in Paris. A war with France appeared unavoidable, and Richelieu was not a man to quake before the *northern conqueror*. Thus the whole weight of the French monarchy would have been thrown into the balance, in order to restore the rights of Catholicism in Germany, and avert a peril which now menaced the very existence of Christendom itself.

That the invader had to encounter great difficulties when he landed on the shores of Pomerania, is rendered evident by the conduct of the Protestant princes and towns. No where was he received with pleasure; and he succeeded in obtaining a sure footing only by sheer force, and by showing that he would seize such places as were necessary for the success of his expedition, if they were not given up into his hands with good will. The treaty he concluded with the Duke Bogislas was of such a nature as to ensure the possession of the duchy to the crown of Sweden, in case the reigning sovereign should die without posterity, a circumstance which afterward actually took place. This was not at all calculated to inspire the Protestant princes with a high idea of the disinterestedness of the king, whatever might be his boastings on this score. Had Wallenstein been still at the head of the Emperor's military concerns, it is more than probable that Gustavus would have repented his rashness in venturing with such small forces into a foreign and still powerful country, notwithstanding

the enfeeblement caused by the ravages of the late war. Unfortunately the Imperial commanders were far from being equal to the Swedish monarch in military talent, and were successively beaten from their positions. But even as it was, Adolphus made but little progress in regard to alliances, until the battle of Breitenfeld, against Tilly, in which that hero was completely defeated. The Protestants were too much afraid of the Emperor's ascendancy to venture upon any bold measure to support the cause of their foreign ally.

"The great reigning princes of the empire," says M. Gfrörer, "who had anything to lose, such as the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony, held themselves aloof. The Duke Bogislas, of Pomerania, whose liberator Adolphus pretended to be, beseeched him, at the very moment he was setting sail, to stay at home. In fact, whatever might be the wishes of the Protestant people in northern Germany in favour of the promised arrival of their deliverer, Gustavus Adolphus had nothing to expect from the princes until he should have inspired confidence through victory. He had indeed endeavoured to sow dissension between the high aristocracy and the Emperor, by keeping up a correspondence with them, in 1629, by sorely accusing the Emperor, and by offering to play the part of an arbiter. But he had failed in his attempt. Through fear of Ferdinand, the electoral college had returned evasive replies to the king's letters, and went so far as to refuse him the regal title, a circumstance which he complained of..... One sees that on the day of his landing, Gustavus could rely on nothing else but his sword and on the deadly divisions that had broken out between the Emperor and the Catholic League." (p. 701-702.)

It is indeed highly remarkable, that even after his first victories, the only new adherents of the invader were such of the petty princes as had been already deprived of their estates, or who were accustomed to sell their services to the highest bidder. But these very turncoats were almost to a man intent upon obtaining of their new employer, conditions which would not oblige them to fight against the Emperor; a most absurd condition, and as such scornfully rejected by the invader.

It is somewhat singular, that his brother-in-law, the Elector of Brandenburg, was the most backward of all in proffering assistance to Gustavus. But this may be ascribed to the influence of a politician, whose features are very properly and very forcibly brought out by M. Gfrörer. This was the Count of Schwarzenberg, a Protestant, but

at the same time, a man who was in no ways blind to the secret views of the Swedish monarch. He was well aware that the mad precipitation which threw some of the German nobility into the arms of Adolphus, could but end in the humiliation of the princes. In case the latter should triumph with their help, they would only exchange a national for a foreign master, far more rigorous than his predecessor; but in case of the king's defeat, the Emperor would most certainly wreak his vengeance upon them. The crafty Schwarzenberg devised a plan to avert both these fatal results. It consisted in inducing all the Protestant States to coalesce their forces, in order to form a third party, destined to observe a strict neutrality between the two contending powers, and, according to circumstances, to throw the weight of their influence into either scale, so as to decide the question. Matters went so far as to give rise to four different parties within the realm, of which two, the Emperor and the Protestants, espoused sincerely the cause of peace; whilst the two others, the Catholic League and Gustavus, were momentarily forced into the same policy. Had Schwarzenberg's design been followed out, it is probable that the 'Thirty Years' War would have terminated much sooner; as it was, however, it only led to a convention between the Protestant princes at Leipzig, which was a complete failure, in consequence of their own divisions and cowardice. M. Gfroerer seems to lay a particular stress upon this political invention. "Had a Protestant armed force been able to interfere," says he, "its representatives might have held the following language, both to the Swedes and Imperialists: 'Cancel the edict of restitution; grant sufficient guarantees to freedom of conscience, and to the empire an honourable peace; or otherwise we will join the Swede, and then you are utterly lost.' The Emperor and the League would doubtless have yielded in such circumstances. This once gained, the second, and still more satisfactory measure was yet to come. It would then have been possible to tell the Swede: 'When you entered the empire, you declared that you aspired to nothing for yourself; that your only object was to obtain the free practice of the evangelical religion, and the restoration of German freedom. Well, this object is now attained; here are some pieces of gold for your trouble. But if you conceal any other purpose, know that we, the German Protestants, uniting with our allies, the

German Catholics, we are resolved to kill you, Swedes, wherever you go; to cut you down and drown you in the Oder, in the Haff, or in the sea. So, ye strangers, be off, or it will go hard with you.' ” (p. 744.)

Such is the homely yet strong language which our author puts into the mouth of his neutral party, and though there is some truth in his reasoning, we are more struck with its general fallacy. It is no difficult task, in our days of religious and political indifference, to establish those rules of neutrality, and combine coalitions of the character we are speaking of; but how is such a thing possible when all the passions and energies of man are goaded to madness by a long series of bloodshed and devastation? To the Protestant princes of Germany, whatever might be their own vices, the idea of combining their efforts with the Catholics, would have always appeared a sort of apostasy; whilst their own interest invited them not to rely upon the annulling of an edict which might have been not less easily re-established after the expulsion of the Swedish monarch. But a fact, admitted by M. Gfrörer himself, shows how dangerous it is for a historian to apply the ideas of his own time to another. The Emperor was by no means hostile to this famous plan; being disposed to grant reasonable conditions to the reformed princes, and add their strength to his own against the common enemy. And yet, even with this advantage, the plan proved abortive, and every one of those who had either hoped, or pretended to hope, for its success, were ere long hurried anew into the whirlwind which carried all before it. What better proof can we produce against its feasibility? But at the same time, the repeated efforts which many members of the Protestant aristocracy made to obtain Adolphus' consent, that they might be considered as neutral in his quarrel with the Emperor, show quite as powerfully how very backward they were in considering the invader as the bulwark of their faith, or the protector of German liberty. It is almost useless to add, that their demands were rejected with disdain.

It was evident besides, that the unfortunate divisions of the Catholic party were highly favourable to the development of the Swede's plans, and that he felt the strength of his position. At the head of an army long inured to a strict discipline and to victory, having to cope with an adversary, (Tilly,) who was equally obliged to follow the

impulse of the Emperor and the Duke of Bavaria, Gustavus was sure in the long-run of forcing his hesitating allies into compliance with his will. The time was indeed now come when he might enlarge, or rather, discover his secret views. The impolicy of the court of Vienna, had thrown the Elector of Saxony into his party, and the battle of Brietenfeld allowed him to turn his victorious arms towards any part of the Imperial States. It is well known that his hatred for the Catholic Church induced him to attack the ecclesiastical States along the Rhine, in order to tear to pieces that *nest of parsons*, as Bernard of Wiemar was pleased to call them. His real reason was, however, of a different sort. Had his only object been to deliver Protestant Germany from the Emperor's thralldom, his best course was doubtless to march on to Vienna, as another conqueror did repeatedly in our own days. The Restitution edict being once cancelled, he would have been proclaimed the Machabæus of Protestantism; and after dictating favourable conditions for himself and brethren, he might have returned to Sweden and finished his reign in peace. Instead of this, he was intent upon conquering Germany, and for this reason he turned aside to the Rhine, and did not push the Emperor to desperate extremities, a circumstance which would have deprived him at once of the nimbus of a religious hero, now the firmest foundation of his reputation.

"For, indeed," observes M. Gfrærer, "if the Swedes had appeared without encountering any serious obstacle before the walls of Vienna, the Emperor would have annulled the Restitution edict, for which Gustavus had, on a thousand occasions, declared that he had rushed into this war. With this the Protestant States and princes would have declared themselves satisfied. And then, what would the Swedes have wished for more? A thousand square miles of good land and the southern coasts of the Baltic sea? Why, in this case, both Catholics and Protestants would have united against the king; the public opinion would have turned away from him; for the hated conqueror would have stood forth in all his nakedness. What alarm did the Elector of Saxony, and the king's other allies betray, when Adolphus made the citizens of Augsburg swear allegiance to the Swedish crown! And if this was the case for one single town, what would have been done when the Swedes aspired to seize the whole country? Consider the question as you please, a march to Vienna would unavoidably have placed the monarch in a most false situation. He could not, therefore, think of leaving the Church lands, on which he had played the part of a

Protestant combatant, before he had made more important conquests, and was able to secure to his adherents more solid arguments than theological disputations." (p. 870-871.)

In consequence of these secret plans, Gustavus Adolphus overran the delightful regions where the vine flings its tendrils, and mantles with its richest hues the hills of southern Germany. He advanced successively towards Bayreuth and Nuremberg, whilst some of his lieutenants undertook the conquest of the Rhenish lands. It was one of his principal objects to win the good will of the free cities, whose strong bias in favour of Protestantism he was perfectly acquainted with. Gustavus was a perfect master in the art of flattering the populace, and that art he now applied with far better success than when he had courted the alliance of princes. The free towns proved indeed to the last the most useful and most sincere friends of the Swedes: thanks more particularly to the Lutheran clergy, highly flattered by the monarch's courtiers, and to the vanity of the citizens and burghers, delighted beyond description to behold the *humility* and affability of the victorious hero. The reader will probably be glad to know how things were managed on such occasions. The town of Erfurt was ready to strike an alliance with the king, but no less desirous of being freed from a Swedish garrison. This of course would not do; and after much cavilling, Gustavus put an end to all dispute by seizing upon the city by surprise. This was no unusual thing with the Swedes. After gracefully receiving the magistracy and corporations, he made a fine speech, says his secretary Chemnitz, before the people: "It is for the cause of God, for the enfranchisement of the Christian Church," said he, "that I left my palace in Stockholm, that I flew to arms, and that I have not yet laid them down. Long ago could I have obtained favourable conditions of peace for myself, had I consented to abandon my brethren in faith and blood. But no—I would lose fortune, blood, life, all, rather than betray German freedom. To be sure, I am yet unwounded and safe; but I am once more about to go forth against my bitter enemies, who are intent upon getting me out of the way through all means, foul and fair. Perhaps God will allow fortune to leave me, and deprive me both of health and life; but yet I turn not away from this danger. I am firmly convinced that without God's high permission nothing harmful can happen me, and that all the obstacles

opposed to my calling, though they may seem insurmountable to human reason, will bring me to my object. I should deem myself most fortunate were the Lord Jesus Christ to think me worthy of suffering crosses, misfortunes, danger, or even death for His dear name!" In this sort of preaching way did Gustavus continue to exhort the good citizens to follow his example and make the necessary sacrifices to their cause, and ended in entrusting his wife to their care.

It is impossible not to see that the king wanted to gull the people, and in this he succeeded the more completely as there was no resisting his power. We have great admiration for devotedness and christian self-renouncement; but above all we hate cant, and the Swede's speeches as well as his conduct too often remind us of another celebrated warrior named Cromwell, who was equally versed in the art of using sacred and biblical catch-words to infatuate and fanaticize his hearers. At any rate, the real pith and meaning of the king's fine speeches were shown in his dealings, for he kept the town for himself, and entrusted it to the care of one of his German confederates, who had likewise the command of Thuringia; but Adolphus was too prudent not to leave a Swedish garrison behind him. From Erfurt the king turned to the Catholic city and bishopric of Wurzburg, which was carried by storm and forced to take the oath of allegiance to the Swedish crown, so that the conqueror's designs became more and more apparent. It would be useless to follow him through his triumphant course in Franconia, and along the Rhine, which were soon subdued, though Tilly was hastening on his track. All these are well known facts, and we rather choose to select for our remarks such acts as offer a clue to the intricate history of this eventful period. In vain did France now endeavour to stop the progress of the torrent she had herself so assiduously contributed to let forth upon Germany; her efforts only added new strength to its fury. The Catholic party having sued for the boon of peace, the king of Sweden offered such conditions as at once removed the veil by which he sought to cover the mystery of his ambition. Amongst other stipulations we observe the following: 1. The Jesuits are to be banished from the whole empire as the prime authors of all evils, and disturbers of the general peace. 2. FROM A FEELING OF GRATEFULNESS FOR THE RESCUE OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE,

HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF SWEDEN WAS TO BE ELECTED KING OF THE ROMANS. Nothing could be more glaring than this revelation, and if the Catholics had consented to accept such terms, they would indeed have been worthy of their fate. Fortunately this was not the case, and we shall soon see how gloriously the Duke of Bavaria defended the land of his forefathers. In the meantime, Gustavus Adolphus lost no opportunity to manifest how ardently he thirsted after the grand object of his wishes. He refused to replace the Elector Palatine Frederic the Fifth in his newly recovered possessions, in order to add this territory to the lands which the Swedish arms had conquered along the Rhine, and thus form a new foundation for his own imperial power in Germany. Gustavus likewise offered the Elector of Brandenburg to marry his son with the king's daughter Christina, promising at the same time to make his future son-in-law Elector of Mentz and Duke of Franconia, provided George William would help him in the accomplishment of other plans. On another occasion, the monarch refused to sanction a treaty with one of the German princes, because his brother refused to acknowledge Adolphus as his lord paramount. Again, another duke is forced to hold all his lands and demesnes of *his royal Majesty, his heirs and successors*. The Protestant nobility were in no ways behind-hand in servility to the invader, totally forgetful of any feeling of patriotism, if they could but share the spoils he had won from his antagonists. They would first have taken his last bit of land, says M. Gfroerer, and then have made him their liege lord. But in this they mistook their man; he was profuse of promises, but very spare of giving; and when he did give, it was on such conditions as bound them fast to himself. But this very conduct soon cooled the zeal of his confederates; the Swedish alliance began to weigh heavy on their shoulders; some of them even ventured so far as to disobey the monarch's orders, and things were becoming rife for a reaction against him when he fell on the field of Lutzen.

From Franconia, the king marched forth into Bavaria, the seat of the Catholic league, and of his arch-enemy Maximilian. He had offered the latter such conditions as it would have been dishonourable to accept, and the noble duke preferred every sacrifice to infamy. The death of Tilly had at once deprived him of the only general worthy of being opposed to Gustavus, and of the last army he could

levy. Faithful to the dying recommendations of the old warrior, he had shut himself up in Ratisbon, which was the very key of the whole country on account of its position on the Danube: there he was resolved to conquer or to perish in the attempt. He had some good reasons likewise to reckon upon the fidelity and patriotism of his subjects. Under his vigilant and paternal government, they alone, in all Germany, had enjoyed peace and plenty at home, whilst they were proud of the influence and glory their sovereign had acquired in this bloody contest. Hitherto the Swedes had found support and favour among the conquered Germans; but now they came to a country where religion and patriotism fired the inhabitants with the most bitter hatred against them. Here, there was no division, no seeds of dissension between the nation and its governors, spiritual and temporal. Everything contributed to create what M. Gfrœrer is pleased to call a bad public opinion, but what we are far more disposed to term a right, a strong feeling of faith and honour. There prevailed among the old Bavarians of those times a general yearning for their religion, which reminds us of the Spaniards, when another conqueror invaded their country. At any rate, this adamant link between the Bavarians and their government became, as is always the case, the germ of future power and influence. In vain did the king of Sweden endeavour to win them over through mildness; in vain did he enforce with more rigour than ever the laws of military discipline upon his own troops; the Bavarian population turned a deaf ear to every solicitation. They considered Gustavus as Antichrist himself, and never failed to add to their usual prayers: "Lord, deliver us from our arch-enemy, the Swedish devil!" In their eyes, all means were allowable to get rid of their foes. A Swede could not venture from his camp without running the risk of being cut down by the peasantry; too fortunate indeed when his nose was not slit in two, when his arms were not chopped off, his eyes plucked out, and other mutilations of a no less horrid kind inflicted. In this state was the unfortunate left till death put an end to his sufferings. No safeguard could protect the prisoners from the popular fury. Outrages like these of course occasioned reprisals which bore the same character of reckless cruelty. Hence the war at once assumed an aspect more worthy of cannibals and savages than of Christians or civilized men. The infuriate soldiery

invariably set fire to the villages, drove the peasantry into the flames, and burned all together. Bavaria was soon a blackened and smoking heap of ruins; its flowery lawns, verdant valleys, and majestic woodlands that had been fattening for the last fourteen years, whilst all around was an immense scene of barrenness and desolation, were now in their turn given up to conflagration and sterility. But still enough remained to enrich the victor; the Swedes revelled in this new land of promise, which soon made them forget their boasted discipline. Gustavus endeavoured in vain to repress their excesses; his will was not sufficiently strong to stem the torrent, and he was perhaps obliged to overlook the delinquencies of men who had hitherto borne the greatest hardships, but now expected to find ample compensation for their long sufferings in the enemy's country.

The city of Munich soon fell into the possession of Gustavus Adolphus. He made his entry in company with Frederic V., the pseudo-king of Bohemia, who enjoyed the pleasure of parading in the capital of the man who, more than any other, had contributed to expel him from his newly-acquired dominions; but suffered likewise the bitter pain of seeing even his paternal estates in the hands of his powerful ally, without any hopes of ever recovering them. The palace of the elector of Bavaria was remarkable for its elegance and taste, which Gustavus enthusiastically admired. "Who was the architect of this fine building?" enquired he of the bailiff. "The Elector himself," replied the man. "Could I catch him," retorted the king, "I would send him to Stockholm."—"But he will take good care to keep out of your way," rejoined the faithful servant. According to Kherenhiller, the king was in no ways displeased with the reply. He seemed particularly desirous of making a favourable impression upon the inhabitants; and to give them a high idea of the Swedish discipline, he reviewed his troops in a neighbouring field. Like the greatest military commander of our own times he well knew how to strike the imagination by such acts as were sure to make him popular. Upon this occasion, the citizens were surprised to see the monarch alight from his horse, walk up to a common soldier who handled his arms awkwardly, take the gun out of his hands, shoulder it himself, and show the man how he should fire. He was likewise affable with his troops, and entered into a friendly

conversation with them. These peculiarities are not uncommon with great men, and who thus succeed in winning the hearts of those they are destined to command. But here Gustavus had probably a higher object in view. He was now master of the greatest part of Bavaria, and such an increase of dominion seemed, in his eyes, highly favourable to his plan of founding for himself a large territorial establishment in Germany. The extensive and fertile lands of Bavaria, added to the rich provinces his arms had conquered along the Rhine, would have made him one of the most powerful princes in Christendom, whilst it would have secured him the Imperial crown. But, fortunately for the Church and for civilization, Providence ordained otherwise.

Gustavus was soon obliged to leave Munich. In his march towards Augsburg, the same obstinate resistance was offered by the peasantry, and the same scenes of bloodshed, massacre, and conflagration were renewed. There was no conquering the indomitable spirit of these brave men, who showed themselves the worthy forefathers of those peasants who, in 1790, sternly drove back the French invaders. The Suabians evinced the same dispositions towards the Emperor, their sovereign. No less attached to their faith and government than their neighbours, they rallied round every detachment of regulars to repel their common enemy, preferring death to apostasy or slavery. M. Gfrærer opposes their devotedness and intrepidity to the cowardice of the Lutheran population, which he brands with due justice. Of the conduct exhibited by the Protestant princes at this very period, we have a sufficient sample in a letter addressed to Gustavus by his bosom friend and chancellor Oxenstierna, who expresses himself in the following manner: "It would be a pity to entrust any post of importance to the princes, or any other high-born personages, because they are deaf both to orders and remonstrances; and even before the military court, above which they suppose themselves to be, they act shamefully and according to their own private advantage or pleasure." It was to their dissensions and jealousies that the Swedish king owed the loss of his conquests along the Rhine.

Maximilian of Bavaria, on the contrary, though now reduced to the possession of one single town, did not belie his former grandeur. His situation was certainly more embarrassing than that of the Emperor in 1630, when the

duke had sold at such hard conditions his help to the Austrian court. Heaven had now taught him a severe lesson, but which he turned to good account.

“ There was no succour to be hoped for except from this self-same Austria. He sent messenger after messenger over the Bohemian mountains, to implore the protection of Ferdinand II., and even of that man to whom it must have been far more bitter to confess his utter helplessness, to Wallenstein, that victim of the Bavarian intrigues in the diet of Ratisbon. And yet under this appalling visitation of fate Maximilian preserved his presence of mind; he did not commit one single fault. Whilst the enemy was conquering his hereditary lands, whilst city after city was holding allegiance to the invader, he adhered to the firm resolution to hold out in Ratisbon, and not to expose his last troops for the defence of his electoral states, a thing desired by the Swedes, who would thus have inevitably and completely destroyed the remains of the Bavarian forces. Whether Gustavus Adolphus was guilty of an error, in conquering defenceless Bavaria, instead of crushing the newly rising ascendancy of Austria, we leave to competent men to decide. Doubtless had he broken into Bohemia, he would have incurred the danger of leaving to the duke of Bavaria all his conquests of the preceding winter, those rich lands of the Rhine, the Main, and the Danube, on which his heart was so strongly set. But on the other hand, he soon learned that all his labours of 1632 had been abortive. At the same time came the news that Prague and the whole of Bohemia had been wrenched from the Saxons: dark clouds were gathering on the mountains, threatening to descend from thence over the plains of Bavaria, to visit, perhaps, the king's own head, and bring along destruction within their womb.”—p. 961.

To speak without any metaphor, the famous duke of Friedland had once more undertaken the direction of the war against the Swedes. It is not our purpose to follow the political and military measures by which that extraordinary man endeavoured to oppose the victorious advance of Gustavus Adolphus: they are well known facts; and we have already but too long trespassed upon the reader's attention. On a future occasion we intend to apply the rules of criticism to the calumniated chiefs of the Catholic armies and governments at this memorable period: with the help of modern documents and researches we hope to glean many an interesting fact, to shed considerable light upon some of the most interesting, though most obscure portions of modern history.

But before the two greatest generals of their time came to try each other's strength in a pitched battle, wherein

the king of Sweden lost his life, the latter seemed, as it were, to be more than ever intent upon letting the world know what were his real intentions. One can hardly imagine how after writers have allowed themselves to be deluded, with such glaring facts before their eyes. The reader may remember how frequently Gustavus Adolphus had given broad hints of his intended usurpation of the Imperial crown. A short time before the battle of Lützen, he completely cast away all sort of dissimulation; and boldly appealed to the Germans. The town of Nuremberg had proved one of his most faithful allies. This celebrated city being now threatened by Wallenstein's troops, to avoid the fate of Magdeburg, the inhabitants implored the help of the Swede, who was not at all behindhand in answering their plea. Nuremberg was consequently put in a most respectable state of defence; but as a compensation his agents were commissioned to declare that the king was resolved *to assume the rights of sovereignty which the emperor formerly enjoyed over the Baltic provinces, as well as over those which he had taken from the papists.* The negotiators were likewise empowered to affirm, that before any standing peace could be concluded, *it must be grounded upon a firm alliance between the Evangelical countries and a proper head of the German empire.* The object of Gustavus was to decoy Nuremberg into a separate treaty with himself, and thus to present this example to the other free cities. In a set speech which he uttered himself on this occasion, he very plainly gave them to understand that it was all over with the old German constitution. That the Protestant states were to frame another, *and elect a proper head for the new confederacy.* This was clear enough; and the deputies of the city, situated as they were, replied, that the king of Sweden himself was the only person fit to be chosen! After such language as this, not the slightest doubt can remain, and well may M. Gfrøerer say that the Swede's intentions were as clear as broad daylight, that to put any other construction upon them is truly laughable.

In the preceding pages we have endeavoured to show under its true light one of the most intricate periods of modern history. It is one instance among many others of the thick mists by which truth has been purposely surrounded. Well may we recall on this occasion the celebrated words of Joseph de Maistre, who affirms that for

the last three centuries the compilation of history has been but one vast conspiracy against truth. To dispel these obstructive clouds is now the duty of every Catholic writer, and must still be the task allotted to him for a long space of time. A day may come when he will undertake to rear a new fabric, and to draw from purer sources the stream of historical science: but, for the present, he must be contented with more humble labours. When the Reformation broke out in the sixteenth century, the first efforts of our forefathers were directed towards the repelling of the new doctrines, and to prevent, as much as possible, their baneful progress. Ere they founded new institutions, or devised new means to instil fresh vigour into the bosom of the Catholic Church, they cleared the ground of the spurious and parasitical vegetation which had grown up around them. Something of the same kind must be done by us in this field of science: however arduous, however unacceptable may be such an undertaking, we ought not to repine, for it is highly meritorious in the eyes of Providence. Indeed, we may find a motive of encouragement in the fact that Protestants are already at work to do at least half our labour. Works like that which we have been analyzing are of the highest value, a value enhanced by the very prejudices they profess to maintain. And how many publications of this kind are already known to the learned world! How many that are daily contributing to knock down, as it were, the innumerable offsprings of error and falsehood which were the growth of the last century! To confine ourselves to the one before us, how different does the celebrated king of Sweden appear to us at present from what he has hitherto been thought to be! How truly despicable do we now view those reformed princes, noblemen, and clergy, who could not even reform their very selves! If the mind turns with disgust from such scenes of ribaldry and baseness, still it learns a good lesson for the future:—it learns not to trust in those sycophants who court public favour, and show without a whitened sepulchre, in order to cover their own corruption and black designs. And now we may well ask if it was worth while to blacken the German soil with ruins, to soak it with human blood in order to satisfy the vulgar ambition of an usurper? If the reader has still any doubt upon the subject, let him meditate upon the following words of Schiller, a most reputable witness, we trust, on such an occasion.

"As the Reformation," says he, "set up citizen against citizen, subject against sovereign, and brought forth new connections between them, so did she force all Europe into a new system of mutual relations. And just in the same way was it that, through an extraordinary course of events, this religious schism was destined to give rise to a closer union between the different states. It must be allowed, however, that this reciprocal universal sympathy was ushered in at first by the most shocking, the most fatal incidents:—a Thirty Years' War of the most atrocious kind; a war which depopulated the land from the heart of Bohemia to the mouth of the Scheld, from the sources of the Po to the shores of the Baltic;—a war which destroyed the richest harvests, laid in ashes populous towns and villages, caused the death of thousands, extinguished for half a century the glimmering light of civilization in Germany, and brought back to the rudeness of savage life the new-born germs of morality."*

— Audley (Paris)

- ART. V.—1. *A First Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, M. P., on the Present Persecution of a certain Portion of the English Church. With a Sermon, preached at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, on Sunday Morning and Evening, Nov. 17, 1850.* By the Rev. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M. A. Seventh Edition. 8vo. London: Cleaver, 1850.
2. *A Second Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, M. P.* By the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT. 8vo. London: Cleaver, 1851.
3. *Origines Liturgicæ; or, Antiquities of the English Ritual, and a Description of Primitive Liturgies.* By the Rev. WILLIAM PALMER, M. A. 2 vols. 8vo. Fourth Edition. London: Rivingtons, 1845.

BEFORE these pages shall have left the printer's hands, the once-famous "Durham Letter" will most probably have been forgotten, except for the consequences to which it has led. A day of fame it certainly enjoyed. It was the main instrument of an excitement almost unexampled within our memory. It had the inglorious distinction of evoking a degree of bigotry, which even the least sanguine lovers of peace had felt assured they would never see again in England. But the excitement was transitory

* *Geschichte des dreissig jährigen kriegs*, s. 6, Cotta's 12.^o Edit. 1838.

and unsubstantial. The bigotry, though loud-voiced, was superficial, and confined to a class. The missile has only hurt the hand which flung it. It has realized the well-known fairy tale, of the magic cudgel which was evoked by an enchanter but imperfectly acquainted with the words of the spell, and which only showered its blows upon the head of the luckless tyro himself. The "Durham Letter" has been the cause of the signal and inglorious humiliation of its author.

A good deal of argument has been expended in the attempt to decide what section of her Majesty's subjects was principally aimed at by the First Minister of the Crown, in the vehement and undignified denunciation from which we have borrowed the title of the present paper. Catholics and Tractarians alike felt themselves aggrieved. In the relations which the noble Lord had occupied with regard to both parties, there was much to give the attack, for whichever intended, all the semblance of treachery as well as ungenerousness. Perhaps, therefore, it was scarcely worth while to clear up the doubt. The odium might most prudently have been suffered to divide itself between both. But the noble Lord himself has thought otherwise. The private explanation which was reported to have been offered, early in the affair, to certain members of the Catholic body, has received authoritative confirmation in Lord John Russell's opening statement in the introduction of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill; and from this time forward the "unworthy sons of the Church of England" are alone officially privileged to consider their principles and practices as designated under the name of "mummeries of superstition," and to regard themselves as the parties whom Lord John Russell holds up to scorn and reprobation as "laboriously endeavouring to confine the intellect and enslave the soul."

It may appear at first sight that the declaration thus decisively and unhesitatingly tendered should shut out Catholics from all further concern in the discussion. But most inopportunately for his Lordship's explanation, and most infelicitously for his peace with offended Catholic friends, it happens that the principles and observances to which the obnoxious epithets were applied, are precisely those which are most peculiar to the Catholic religion, and which, as public and authorized practices, form the chief, if not the sole, distinguishing characteristic of the Catholic

system. The Honour paid to Saints, the claim of Infallibility, the use of the Sign of the Cross, the unknown language of the Liturgy, Auricular Confession, Penance, and Absolution, although they may be "pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption," form, nevertheless, the very essence of Catholic worship and Catholic practice wherever the name of Catholicity is known; and it is impossible to stigmatize those time-honoured observances with the opprobrious epithets which Lord John Russell did not hesitate to employ, without branding the religion into which, as a system, they enter so prominently and so peculiarly, as a religion whose ceremonies are a despicable mummery, and whose doctrines are an enslaving superstition.

For our own part, indeed, we are well content to bear with this imputation, in consideration of the unforeseen service which it has rendered to our cause. We have always held, that, in the present condition of England, the best hope of Catholicity lies in notoriety, even though it may at first sight appear a notoriety of obloquy and shame. There is a spirit of fair play in the very atmosphere of England, which seldom fails to ensure, from some at least, an honest response to the appeal of the injured party. The earnest cry, "Strike me, but hear me!" is seldom entirely unsuccessful with an English audience; and we have served too long an apprenticeship to obloquy and misconception not to accept with cheerfulness a temporary revival of it, and even with increased virulence, in consideration of the enquiry into the justice of our claims which it cannot fail to provoke. We submit without a murmur, therefore, to the outcry against our ceremonies as "mummeries of superstition;" well assured that the very cry will awaken some from the sleep of indifference, perhaps of absolute ignorance, regarding them, in which they have hitherto lain. Even while we write, we have before us the most consoling evidence that such is, and has been, its effect in the present instance, in a most marked and signal degree.

One of the best consolations which a Catholic could take to his heart under such imputations against his doctrines and practices, is the knowledge that they apply, even in their most offensive form, to the practices, not only of his own immediate forefathers in the faith, but of the whole body of Christian worshippers from the very earliest times.

The points selected for special animadversion in the Durham Manifesto, are precisely those regarding which the popular convictions of Catholics are strongest and most unhesitating. From the elementary catechisms up to the most elaborate of our books of controversy, the whole body of Catholic literature teems with evidence of the antiquity of "the Honour of the Saints," the "claim of Infallibility," "Confession," "Penance," and the other practices which are now held up to the contempt of modern England. Catholics may well afford to bear the taunt of superstition and mummery, when they are conscious that they bear it in the company of Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine; and the charge of "confining the intellect," and "enslaving the soul," falls lightly upon them, when they feel that it is shared with those mighty men of old, by whom the world was redeemed from the errors of a corrupt though self-reliant philosophy, into the humble but saving light of Christian truth.

Indeed, we know nothing so cheering to the heart of a Catholic, or so strengthening to his faith, as, with an earnest and docile mind, to trace the analogies of ancient and modern devotional principles and practice, and to observe the manifold and minute coincidences which they present;—sometimes in the literal identity of rite; sometimes in the community of spirit which the rites, though different in form, bespeak; sometimes in the evidence of common origin which they betray; and more frequently in the palpable development of the ancient germ to which the modern usage can always be traced. There is something indescribably consoling in the discovery—to which, as we can say from our own experience, such an enquiry cannot fail to lead—that, not alone in the general character of the popular devotion of the early centuries, the habitual tone of the christian mind of those times, and the great fundamental principles of thought and action on which their whole devotional system is based, but even in the most minute and seemingly unimportant particulars of their practice, it exhibits a truly wonderful identity even in detail, and a most complete and unmistakable harmony of spirit and of meaning, with that modern Catholic system which is so opposed to all the notions and ideas of the Durham school; and further, that this identity is nowhere more observable, than in precisely those points of modern Catholic usage which are regarded as peculiarly "popish," and to which,

in the views of this school, the epithet of "superstitious" especially and primarily applies.

To illustrate these assertions in reference to most of the topics of Lord John Russell's Letter, as, for example, Infallibility, the Honour of Saints, Confession, &c., would but carry us over the beaten track of Catholic controversy, with which every well-informed reader, whether Catholic or Protestant, is sufficiently familiar. But there is one of them—the use of the Sign of the Cross—which, popular though it be among the former, and peculiarly obnoxious to the latter, has nevertheless, by some strange accident, hardly ever, at least in this country, formed the subject of a regular and formal discussion. At all events it has never, as far as we are aware, received the full share of consideration to which its own intrinsic interest, as well as the unanimous consent of all christian communities, except those of purely Protestant origin, entitles it; and we gladly avail ourselves of the occasion presented by the late irreverent and unseemly denunciation of this beautiful Christian usage, in order to place before our readers a few of the numberless evidences of its antiquity, which all the early Christian monuments present. Few Protestants, we are assured, are aware of their copiousness and variety. Even among well-informed Catholics themselves, we do not hesitate to say, that very erroneous, or at least, imperfect, notions are entertained; and we may confess for our own part, that the minuteness and extent of the coincidences between the ancient and the modern Church in the use of this beautiful symbol, which our researches have revealed, have often filled us with a delighted surprise. Certainly if there be a difference between them, either as to the frequency of the use of the symbol, or the purposes to which it is applied, the charge of excess will be found to fall more heavily upon the ancients than upon the moderns; and, beyond all possibility of doubt, the epithet of "superstitious" would, in the views of the Durham school, have described the purposes, the occasions, the manner, and the other circumstances, of the ancient practice, with far more seeming justice and propriety than it does either the modified Tractarian usage of St. Margaret's, St. Andrew's, or St. Barnabas's, or even the most extravagant excess of the most zealous Romanist in the Church.

We shall not offer any apology, therefore, for the description of evidence which it will be our duty to lay

before the reader. At best, from the very nature of the case, it could only consist of a bare series of authorities, with hardly anything of interest to connect them together. But the narrow limits within which we are confined, will tend to render it still more dry and uninteresting. When it is recollected that the learned Jesuit, Father Gretser, has filled no less than three folio volumes with the subject *De Cruce*, it will be easily understood, that no ordinary amount of condensation must be employed, in order to adapt even a selection from the overflowing materials, to the brief popular form of an essay in our pages. We must, therefore, content ourselves with a few of the most prominent topics; intended rather to show the copiousness and variety of the sources of evidence, than to exhaust any single branch of the subject; rather to exhibit the general character of the mind of the ancient Church, than to accumulate proofs of any particular facts regarding it; and to show, that on this and all similar subjects, its habitual tone was not alone utterly opposed to the modern ideas of the un-catholic schools, but could never have subsisted in the state of thought in which they have their origin.

It can hardly be necessary, even for Protestant readers, to state, that in all the public services of the modern Catholic Church, as well as the private ministrations of the clergy, the Sign of the Cross enters as a frequent and prominent ceremonial. Of all private devotions among Catholics it is a constant accompaniment. At rising in the morning, before and after all prayers, at grace before and after meals, at entering a church, on lying down to sleep, every instructed and observant Catholic will sign himself with the cross. Continental Catholics, and the more exact among our own people, will employ the symbol more frequently. On all occasions of danger or alarm, as a preventive of evil thoughts or imaginations, on the occurrence of unforeseen accidents, at the commencement of important undertakings, and, indeed, in nearly all remarkable emergencies, as will appear more particularly in the sequel, the use of the sign of our redemption is with Catholics almost habitual and instinctive. Now it is precisely this use of the cross which is most obnoxious to Protestant minds, and which is principally denounced as the "mummery" and "superstition," which is held up to the scorn of every enlightened mind. And we shall see before we close, that it is precisely in

this obnoxious, and, according to Protestant ideas, superstitious use, that the coincidences of ancient and modern practice are most complete, most frequent, and most striking.

In truth, if there be any one practice which meets the student of antiquity more frequently than another, and which, as it were, forces itself upon his notice in every detail of early christian life, public and private, religious, social, and even political, it is this simple but touching usage. The evidence embarrasses by its very abundance. It seems as though the christian mind of those days was still so freshly and thoroughly penetrated with the recent memory of the mercy of the cross, that it could never suffer it to depart from its view; as though the generous declaration of St. Paul still found a living echo in every christian heart, and as if universal Christendom had, like him, renounced every other source of "glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." The whole mind of the Church was penetrated, and as if possessed with it. Of every conceivable action of life it was the accompaniment and the sanctifier. Into every thought and every view it was sure to enter. It was associated with almost every object. It was suggested by every conceivable image, even in external nature. If St. Ephrem, the Syrian, beheld a bird with its wings expanded in flight, he but saw therein a type of the sign with which all his hopes were identified. A ship, with mast erect and outspread yards, was a still more familiar emblem. The intersecting beams of a roof, the spreading branches of a tree, the petals of a flower, the letters of a manuscript, and a thousand other types, many of them so remote and fanciful as to show the depth of the feeling which could discover the resemblance, were all suggestive of the same ever-recurring idea. In a word, the whole spirit of the time would have revolted at the bare idea of indifference, not to speak of absolute disregard, towards the holy symbol. Can any one conceive, even as barely possible in such circumstances, a denunciation of it conceived in the tone of the Durham letter? How it would have jarred upon every feeling, and clashed with every sentiment of the age! How well, on the other hand, would those feelings have accorded with the tone of Mr. Bennett's defence of the christian usage! In their eyes, as in his, and in those of every lover of the holy emblem, "it seems to come so naturally and so gracefully from

the baptismal font, it seems so beautiful and simple a type of our love of our blessed Saviour, it seems so hallowing and purifying an invocation of His presence and of the atonement by which we are saved, that in the first instance, viewed abstractedly, and without prejudice, where the true christian could be found to object to it, it is beyond one's power to imagine." Who can doubt with what horror,—for it is impossible to conceive any other feeling,—an age habituated to such thoughts, such language, and such observances, would have listened to a voice raised in "contempt," or "scorn," against this holy sign?

The subject, however, will require a more detailed examination. If one were to judge from the practice of modern Protestants, there is no conceivable use of the sign of the cross which could hope to meet their toleration, or, at least, their approval; and, in arguing against the views popularly entertained by them, it would be quite sufficient to establish, in a general way, the habitual use of it in the early church. It would seem, however, from the marked introduction of the epithet "superstitious" in the Premier's letter, and from the modified expression of opinion in many other quarters which it has elicited, that it is sought to establish a distinction between the mere *use* of the sign and its *superstitious* use; and that the whole weight of the denunciation is directed, not against the sign itself, but against certain superstitious or unsanctioned usages or applications of it, by which its simplicity is alleged to have been corrupted. In order, therefore, to meet any possible distinction of this kind, it will be necessary to compare the ancient and the modern use of the sign, not alone in itself, but in all its circumstances, in the purposes to which it has been applied, and in its whole bearing upon the tone and spirit of the religious life.

The enquiry, therefore, will naturally divide itself into three parts;—first, the extent to which the use of the sign of the cross prevailed in the early church; secondly, the analogies, if any, which can be traced between its ancient and its modern use; thirdly, the effects ascribed thereto by the early Christians. In each of these points of the enquiry, we earnestly beg the attention of those who may be disposed to look upon the modern Catholic practice, either as deserving of censure in itself, or as carried to an undue and superstitious excess.

I. UNIVERSALITY OF THE USE OF THE SIGN OF THE CROSS

IN THE EARLY CHURCH.—It is hardly necessary to delay upon its use in the public services of the Church. Mr. Palmer, who is the last to admit in the early Church anything for which his own church preserves no counterpart, confesses that it was used “in some part of almost every Christian office.”* And the admission is extorted by the unanimous voice of antiquity. St. Cyprian calls it “the sign of the sacrament,”† so universal and indispensable was its use; and declares that “whoever may be the ministers of the sacraments; whatever may be the hands which either immerge the candidates for baptism, or anoint them; whatever be the breast whence issue the sacred words; it is the authority of His operation that imparts *the effect to all the sacraments in the sign of the cross.*”‡ St. Augustine goes still more into the detail of the sacraments, and enumerates them almost all. “What,” he asks, “is the sign of the cross, but the Cross of Christ itself? Which, unless it be applied either to the foreheads of the believers, or to the water wherein they are regenerated, or to the oil wherewith they are anointed, or to the sacrifice wherewith they are nourished, none of these is duly celebrated.”§ And St. Chrysostom completes the circle of evidence by declaring in general of all ministrations, whether sacramental or otherwise, that “all things which conduce to our salvation are consummated by the cross.”|| How would one of these good fathers have stared, had he found, some morning, proclaimed by the public crier at his church porch, or posted up in the forum of his episcopal city, a petulant manifesto from the prefect or proconsul, reprobating as superstitious even the most simple and modified use of the symbol in their public ministrations! The conception is too absurd to be entertained, even for the purpose of ridicule.

In truth, so deeply was this reverence for the cross impressed upon the church of the early centuries, so thoroughly did she identify it with the very idea of the Christian worship, that the Fathers regard its use as one of the “better things to come,” prefigured under the types of the

* *Origines Liturgicæ*, II., 191. † De Pass. Christi. Opp. 429.

‡ De Bapt. Christi. Opp. p. 410. [Ed. Pan.]

§ 11 Tract. in Joann. III. 1950. [Ed. Mign.]

|| 15 Hom. in S. Matt. VII. 301.

Old Testament. Thus St. Augustine, Lactantius, and others,* recognize as its type the sprinkling of the door-posts with the blood of the paschal lamb; the former declaring that the Christian too "signs himself upon his forehead, as on a door-post, with the sign of Christ's passion and cross;"† and the latter‡ pursuing the explanation of the type with that beautiful minuteness of illustration for which he is so remarkable, and declaring that the pure and innocent Lamb is "the salvation of all who shall subscribe upon their foreheads the sign of the blood:—that is, the sign of the cross upon which the blood was shed."

Others again regard the sign of the cross as prefigured by the mysterious TAU, ordered, in the ninth chapter of Ezechiel, to be inscribed "upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and mourn for the abominations committed in the midst thereof." So Cyprian,§ Tertullian, Origen, and especially St. Jerome, who comments upon the resemblance which this letter bears "to the cross which is painted upon the forehead of the Christian, and is impressed by the frequent inscription of his hand." Others, again, discover a type of the cross in the "scarlet cord" let down by Rahab from her window in Jericho;|| others in the "plate of purest gold" which is ordered (in Exodus xxviii. 36.) to be hung upon the forehead of the high-priest; and others even in the signet-ring of Pharaoh given to Joseph, as a symbol of his authority.

It would be endless to enumerate the passages of the Old Testament which the fathers interpret as bearing prophetically upon the same holy emblem. In many of them the allusion is so distinct as to be appreciated without difficulty. Thus St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Jerome understand of the sign of the cross, the "*Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui*" of the Psalmist. St. Ambrose applies in the same sense, in a very beautiful and striking passage, the "*Pone me ut signaculum super cor tuum* of the Canticle. Arnobius, Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, and others, regard the cross as the *signum in bono* of the eighty-fifth psalm, and the *metuentibus te insigne* of the

* For example, St. Cyprian, Ep. ad Demetrianum, Opp. 258. [Ed. Pom.]

† De catechiz. Rudibus, cap. 20. and Cont. Fausti. VIII. 270.

‡ Institut. Lib. iv. cap. 26.

§ Opp. p. 326.

|| S. Aug. Opp. VIII. 271.

fifty-ninth. Other allusions may seem more imaginative, but they come to us with equally venerable authority. St. Cyril of Jerusalem finds an image of the cross in the words *Impinguasti in oleo caput meum*. St. Ambrose discovers an exhortation to its use in the *Ostende mihi faciem tuam* of the Canticle. Indeed the very remoteness of these allusions, and the seemingly slender foundation on which they rest, may serve to show how completely the emblem had filled their minds, and how easily they identified it with the very essence of the christian worship. We may understand, therefore, how it was that they regarded it as one of those apostolic practices, the origin of which, even without any express warranty of scripture, they believed it impossible to call into question. It is no mean argument of this origin, that the only voice raised in antagonism, of which early history presents any record, is that of Faustus the Manichean.* The ground of his objection is precisely that on which a modern Protestant would rely; "that he finds nothing in the scriptures which refer to the foretelling of Christ and of the sign of Christ." And it is equally consolatory to find that the ground of reply assumed by Augustine equally bears out the parallel between the old and the modern controversy. Anticipating literally the defence of a modern Catholic, he replies: "What wonder if he has not eyes to see and a heart to understand, who, standing before the closed door of the divine secret, does not knock with pious faith, but insults with impious arrogance?" And thus in another passage,† he in the same breath maintains the apostolic origin of the practice, and yet declares that there is no warrant of scripture for signing the faithful with the saving sign of the cross: while St. Basil takes it as "a most common, well-known, and familiar" example of practices "derived partly from written teaching, partly from Apostolic tradition, both of which bear the same force for piety, and which no one possessing even a moderate knowledge of ecclesiastical laws will venture to gainsay."‡

With the knowledge that such were the impressions of the early Christians as to the apostolic origin of the use of the cross, and even as to its having been foretold in the

* S. August. contra Faustum, xii. 30. VIII. 270.

+ Cited by Gretser, I. 648.

‡ De Spiritu Sancto, cap. xxvii.

prophecies of the Old Law, we may be prepared for abundant evidence of its use among them in their private and personal devotions. The familiar passage of Tertullian places its universality beyond all possibility of doubt. There is no conceivable contingency of life in which he does not describe it, not merely as applicable, but even as actually employed. "In all their travels and movements, in all their comings in and goings out, in putting on their shoes, in the bath, at the table, in lighting their candles, in lying down, in sitting down, whatever occupation employed them, they were wont to mark [*terimus*] their foreheads with the sign of the cross."* Lord John Russell objects to the "superstitious" use of the sign of the cross. It would be difficult to say that the manifold purposes enumerated here by Tertullian could all pass without censure before such a tribunal as his. We fear there is hardly one of them which he would not brand as superstitious.

Nor were the uses here described confined to any particular class. It might at first sight appear possible that this was but the practice of the weak and uneducated Christians of Tertullian's days. But we have the clearest evidence of its having been as universal as the profession of Christianity. St. John Chrysostom declares that "the cross is found everywhere; among princes and subjects; among men and women; among married and unmarried; among slaves and free-born; and all alike sign themselves therewith."† St. Cyril of Jerusalem, addressing all without distinction, exhorts them to "make this sign in eating and in drinking, in sitting and in standing still, in speaking, in walking, in fine, in every work without exception;"‡ and as if this detail were not sufficient, he exhorts his hearers in another place to "imprint the cross boldly upon their brows, and in everything; over the bread they eat and the cups they drink; in their comings in and goings out; before they lie down and when they awake; when they are on their journey, and when they are at rest."§ And the beautiful reflection which accompanies the precept may show how strongly

* Tertull. De cor. mil. III. Oxford Trans. p. 165.

† Chrysostom. Oratio, Quod Christus sit Deus. I. p. 571.

‡ Catech. iv. 14, Oxford Transl. p. 40.

§ Ibid. xiii. 36, p. 160.

St. Cyril felt the universality of God's design in the institution. It has been made easy and acceptable, he says, that all might avail themselves of "so great a preservative." It has been made "without price, for the sake of the poor," and "without toil, for the sake of the infirm." Indeed the language used by many of the Fathers is so strong, that it might almost appear exaggerated at the present day. St. John Chrysostom's Homilies on St. Matthew, his Homilies on the Epistle to Timothy, or his Discourse on the Divinity of Christ, would almost appear too fervid for a modern congregation. We have noted above fifty passages of this eloquent father which we would gladly transcribe as an evidence of his feelings on the subject of the cross; but we must be content with the following, which is from the Discourse referred to above.

"The cross shines resplendent at the Sacred Table, in the ordinations of the Priests, and in the mystic Supper of the Lord's Body. You behold it blazoned everywhere;—in private houses, and in the public forum; in the deserts, and in the streets; on mountains, in meadows, and on hills; on the sea, in ships, in islands; on couches, on garments, and on armour; in the bed-chambers, and the banqueting-room; on vessels of gold and silver, on jewels, and in pictures; on the bodies of distempered animals, and on the bodies of persons possessed by the devil; in war, and in peace; by day, and by night; in the festival of the dancers, and amid the mortifications of the penitent;—with so much earnestness do all without exception cultivate this wondrous gift and its ineffable grace. No one is ashamed or put to the blush by the thought that it is the symbol of an accursed death; but we all feel ourselves more adorned thereby, than by crowns, diadems, and collars loaded with pearls; it shines everywhere; on the walls of our houses, on the ceilings of our apartments, in our books; in cities, and in villages; in deserts, and in cultivated fields."*

We really cannot imagine what it would be possible to add to this in the way of detail. It would seem to embrace every conceivable contingency. And yet a few pages before, he had said, in scarcely different words, that we "behold the cross upon the purple and on the diadem; in

* Orat. Quod Christus sit Deus. Opp. I. 571.

our prayers, in the midst of armies, at the sacred table ; in a word, its glory shines throughout the world more brightly than the sun."*

Such is the witness of the Eastern Church. St. Jerome who, from his long residence in both Churches, may be presumed to speak with the united voice of the East and the West, repeats the same exhortation to Eustochium. "In every act of thine," he writes to her, "in every movement, let thy hand describe the Cross."† St. Ambrose is equally comprehensive. He declares that we "must perform every work of the day in the sign of the Redeemer;" and while he reminds them of the superstitious anxiety with which, in the days of their paganism, they were wont to seek for signs and favourable omens, declares, that now there is but "one sign of Christ wherein there is safe prosperity for all things."‡ And St. Augustine is hardly behind St. John Chrysostom himself in the frequency and fervour of his allusions. We might fill whole pages with passages from his sermons, his treatises, and his commentaries, illustrating almost every single modern peculiarity of practice regarding it.

We must take care, however, not to exhaust our space in multiplying evidence of a usage which it is impossible for any student of antiquity to deny. There is one passage of St. John Chrysostom which, if all the rest were unknown, would place the universality and frequency of the practice beyond all reasonable doubt. So frequent, and indeed habitual was it in his day, that the act had become, with many, a purely mechanical one. "Many," he says, "are so habituated to the use of this sign, that they no longer require to be admonished of the occasion, but their hand itself, even while the mind is otherwise engaged, is drawn, of its own accord, to form the sign, as though it were moved by a living teacher."§ And in another sermon|| he enters more into the particulars, and describes the Christian as mechanically and involuntarily signing himself "on entering a door, at the lighting of the lamps," and on the other similar occasions in which its use was prescribed. Surely, in such times as these, even to have mooted a doubt as to the lawfulness of the practice, would have been to incur

* Ibid. 569.

† St. Jerome ad Eustoch., Ep. 22.

‡ S. Ambros. Sermo. 43.

§ XI. 698.

|| Ibid, 27.

the suspicion of hostility to the very first principles of christianity itself.

But without dwelling further upon these general evidences, which will receive abundant additional illustration in the second part of our essay, we shall proceed to enumerate a few of the most remarkable analogies of the ancient and modern uses of the sign of the cross.

II. ANALOGIES OF THE ANCIENT AND MODERN USE OF THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.—Many of these will be anticipated from what we have already said, and, indeed, are included in the general testimonies of Tertullian, Cyril, Ambrose, and Chrysostom; but it may be well to enumerate them in regular order, even at the risk of repetition.

(1.) *At rising and lying down to sleep.* Tertullian, in the passage already cited, bears sufficient evidence to the existence, in his day, of this use of the cross, still familiar to every Catholic from childhood upwards. But it may be useful to add, as an illustration of the importance attached to its observance, that in his book, *Ad Uxorem*, he employs as an argument against a christian woman's marrying an unbeliever, that such a marriage would interfere with the practice. "Shalt thou be able," he asks, "to escape detection, when thou signest thy body and thy bed?"* And, in like manner, he places among the blessings of a christian marriage, and the liberty of worship which it brings, that there is "no furtive signing, no hurried benediction."†

The testimony of St. Cyril equally bears out the analogy. It was the practice of Christians in his day to use the holy sign "when they lay down,‡ and when they awoke;" and, what is more important, by them, as by ourselves, it was regarded as "a preservative" against danger and evil influences. §

We are tempted to add a very pleasing confirmation of this belief, as well as a strong evidence of the practice which is contained in one of the Hymns of the christian poet, Prudentius, who wrote in the fourth century, and who is known to most of our readers by the beautiful hymn to the holy Innocents, *Salvete Flores Martyrum*, which

* *Ad Uxorem*, Lib. II. c. v. Oxf. Tr. 427.

† *Ibid.* 431.

‡ *Cat.* xiii. 36. p. 161.

§ *Ibid.* p. 161-2.

is preserved in their office, as it stands in the Roman Breviary.

"Fac, cum, vocante somno,
 Castum petis cubile,
 Frontem locumque cordis
 Crucis figura signet.
 Crux pellit omne crimen,
 Crucem fugiunt tenebræ;
 Tali dicata signo
 Mens fluctuare nescit.
 Discede, Christus hic est!
 Hic Christus est, liquesce!
 Signum quod ipse nosti,
 Damnat tuam catervam."

(2.) *At meals.* It would be tiresome to repeat the evidence of Tertullian, SS. Cyril, Chrysostom, Jerome. They all place this among the principal uses of the cross in their day. St. Athanasius, with more "superstitious" minuteness than any of them, directs that the sign be made three several times. And, although we have no means of ascertaining how far this peculiarity came into use, we have abundant examples of the fidelity with which the practice itself was observed. Even soldiers, though proverbially least exact in the observance of the duties of religion, did not fail to maintain this usage. Theodoret in his history* attributes to its use, at a feast in which a number of soldiers, who had weakly offered incense while receiving a donation presented by Julian the Apostate to his army were assembled, the enlightenment and conversion of those who had fallen into this unlawful compliance. We select out of a vast variety of examples, one single anecdote, told by St. Gregory of Tours, which is in itself sufficiently amusing, and which may serve to show that the practice was not confined to Catholics, but prevailed among the heretics of the fourth and fifth centuries. We shall relate it in the simple language of St. Gregory himself, as a sample of the "superstition" of the fifth century.

"There was a certain Catholic lady," he says, "who was married to a heretic. One day, a very zealous priest of our religion, having come to visit her, she went to her husband, and begged that the arrival of this priest, who had honoured her by a visit, should

* III. 16. p. 365.

be celebrated as a joyful event, and that a suitable banquet should be provided for his entertainment. The husband consented to the proposal, and soon afterwards another priest, who, however, was a heretic, arrived. 'We shall have a double joy to-day,' said her husband, 'for there is a priest of each of our creeds in our house.' When they sat down to dinner, the husband seated his own priest upon his right hand, and on his left the Catholic priest, placing at his side a chair for his wife. Before dinner was served, the husband said to his own priest, 'If you will follow my directions, we shall have a laugh at this priest of the Romans. The moment the dish is placed upon the table, be sure to be before him in signing it with the sign of the cross: if you do so, he will not venture to touch it, and, to his great mortification, we shall eat it ourselves, and have the joke into the bargain.' 'Very well,' said the priest, 'I will do as you desire.' Accordingly, when the first dish of vegetables was served, the heretic made the sign of the cross and laid hold of it. The lady begged them to desist; and expressing her regret for this unworthy treatment of her priest, ordered another dish to be served, of which he partook. Nevertheless, on the appearance of the second and third removes, the heretical priest did the same; and when the fourth dish was brought in, without waiting even till it was placed on the table, he hastily raised his hand, made the sign of the cross, and, the moment it was set down, plunged his spoon into it, and, without adverting to its being scalding hot, swallowed a huge mouthful. In a moment he was seized with a sudden burning pain in the breast, and soon afterwards died in great agony. The Catholic priest, regarding it as a judgment of God, turned to the husband, and said to him: 'This man's memory hath perished with a sound, but the Lord abideth for ever.' And the man fell down in terror at the priest's feet, and was converted to the Catholic faith with his entire family."*

The story needs no commentary. It would be amusing for its simplicity, were it not for the tragical end of the unhappy priest. But it establishes the usage beyond all possibility of doubt, and it shows very significantly the religious importance which the popular voice attached to its observance.

(3.) *In any undertaking of moment.* The passages cited already in the first part of the essay will sufficiently attest this. We shall but add a few examples. Only conceive, for instance, how the writer of the "Durham Manifesto" would have been astonished if, when the Queen called her parliament together to consider the momentous topics

* Greg. Tur. Mirac. ii. 80.

with which that letter purposed to deal, she had commenced the Royal Address by solemnly signing herself with the cross! And yet, "superstitious mummery" though it may be in the eyes of the noble Lord, such would have been the course of one of the early Christian Emperors in similar circumstances. So we are told, in express terms, of Justin II., by his panegyrist, Corippus.*

Ipse coronatus solium conscendit avitum,
Atque crucis faciens signum venerabile sedit,
Erectaque manui cuncto præsentate senatu
Ore pio hæc orans ait.

Indeed we find that even royalty itself conformed to *all* the pious usages already alluded to. In all his "*comings in and goings out,*" Justin employed the sacred emblem as faithfully as his meanest subject.

Egreditur luce nova frontemque serenam
Armavit sancti faciens signacula ligni.

The very generals and officers of the army, a class even less accessible, ordinarily speaking, to religious influences, were equally scrupulous in the observance. How oddly the following statement would read of a modern commander! Yet it was but a matter of every day occurrence in the history of those times, and in the idea of Theodosius formed but an ordinary act of christian duty. "Knowing," says Orosius,† "that under the sign of the cross, he should not only enjoy protection, but even victory, he armed himself with that sign, gave the signal for battle, and plunged into the fight, secure of victory, even though there were no one to follow him." Nor was this peculiar to religious men such as Theodosius. We read the same of his greatest and most distinguished general, Stilico, by no means remarkable for extraordinary piety.

Hujus adoratus altaribus, et cruce fronti
Inscripta, cecinere tubæ.‡

In a soldier of the deep religious temperament which distinguished St. Martin of Tours, it may surprise us less; but even with all our notions regarding him, it is difficult

* De Laudib. Justini, Lib. II., Gretser p. 685.

† Lib. vii. 35.

‡ Prudentius cont. Symmachum.

not to be struck by the noble sentiments put into his mouth in St. Paulinus's lines.

Primus ego abjectis præcedens agnima telis,
 Non arma arripiens hominis sed signa salutis,
 Tigmine nec fidens clypei sed nomine Christi,
 Atque crucem fronti auxilium pro casside ponens,
 Intrepido cunctis occurram corde periclis.

The practice was not confined to individuals. We find the whole army of Andronicus the Younger,* "arming themselves with the cross" [σταυρίζετε καθοπλίζαντες εαυτους] before they engaged the barbarians; and the Byzantine Historians, the great repository of the Catholic usages of the later centuries, are full of similar examples.

As a weapon of polemical warfare, the cross was equally familiar. When Porphyrius of Gaza was about to enter upon a controversy with a Manichean, he signed his tongue with this holy symbol.† And in this he was but complying with the every day use of the Christians of those times. "When thou art going to dispute with unbelievers," says St. Cyril, "first make the sign of the cross, and the gainsayer will be dumb."‡ St. Epiphanius§ repeats the same counsel, and in terms which enable us to understand the universality of the practice.

(4.) *Under any sudden terror.* "If they be smitten with fear from any cause," says St. Augustine, "they immediately sign themselves."|| St. Gregory of Tours in his life of St. Martin,¶ testifies to the same usage, and tells of a case in which even Theodoric the Goth availed himself of its protection.** The Byzantine historians supply many illustrations of it. When Isaac Angelus heard the news of the invasion of Alexius, Nicetas Choniates tells that his first impulse was, to "sign himself with the character of the cross," [τε σταυρος σημείω εαυτον εγχαράξας]. Theophylact relates the same of the emperor Maurice, when he was unexpectedly attacked by a wild boar;‡‡ and the later histories are still more fertile of examples.

(5.) *Against evil emotions of the mind.*—A still more

* Joannes Cantacuzenus. Hist. Lib. II.

† Gretser, I. 685.

‡ Cat. xiii., 21, 154.

§ Her. 26.

|| Opp. IV. 583.

¶ II. c. 45.

** Gretser, T. 692.

‡‡ Ibid. 693.

interesting coincidence of ancient and modern usage is discoverable in the sermons, homilies, and other ascetic remains of the fourth and fifth centuries. One of the most familiar suggestions of modern spiritual directors, as a safeguard against evil thoughts, or a shield against sinful impulses, is to make the sign of the cross upon the heart. It is consoling to know that the same suggestion was equally familiar in the "Church of the fathers." If a penitent of the great St. Chrysostom had sought at his feet, a remedy against temptations to anger, he would have told him, "If thou feel thy heart inflamed by anger, sign it instantly with the sign of the cross, and the angry impulse shall forthwith be scattered like dust."* Against every other passion [καὶ τὰ πάντα λοιπὰ πάθη.] he would have prescribed the same.† St. Ambrose, if we may judge from his *exhortation to virgins*, would have given the same counsel against temptations of concupiscence.‡ "Let not concupiscence," he said, "have dominion over this dead body of thine; take in thy hands the cross of the Lord Jesus." St. Augustine did not seem to know any other remedy. "If sudden temptation gnaw thee," he writes, "let the bite be healed by the medicament of the cross." Nor could he devise any other resource, no matter what might be the nature of the spiritual impediment. "If the Amalechite adversary," says he, "shall seek to close up thy path, and to obstruct thy journey, he must be overcome by the reverent extension of the arms of the same cross."§ In the same holy simplicity, St. Gregory of Tours advises that "if we feel ourselves led away captive by the law of sin, we fortify our brow with the glorious sign of the cross, wherewith we shall repel all the weapons of the insidious enemy."|| And he confirms his advice by these lines from the Hymn of Prudentius

"Crux pellit omne crimen,
Fugiunt crucem tenebræ;
Tali dicata signo
Mens fluctuare nescit"—

* 87 Hom. in Matt. vii. 820. † Ibid. vii. 551.

‡ Exhort. ad Virgines, ii. 290.

§ Opp. viii. 270.

|| Lib. 1. Mirac. cap. 106.

Of this sentiment, which is quite familiar in the writings of this poet, F. Gretser has preserved several other interesting examples. But we prefer to cite a passage from St. Paulinus's charming hymn on St. Felix, in which the same idea is more than once introduced.

“Nos crucis invictæ signum et confessio munit,
Armatique Deo mentem, non quærimus arma
Corporis.”

To the same conviction of the guarding and sanctifying power of this sign, we may trace many other similar details of its use, in which the ancient Christians will appear to have been even more “superstitious” than the most thorough-going modern Romanist. How strange it would seem in these days of enlightenment, to employ the sign of the cross upon one's ears, as a protection against the influence of evil counsel! Yet this was the rule prescribed by the great St. Ephraim, who “sealed up his ears with the precious seal of the cross, that the poison of wicked words might not have power to enter.”* Another no less distinguished father, St. John Chrysostom, prescribes the same antidote against angry and contumelious words.† Another, St. Augustine, commenting on the 93rd Psalm, directs the same preservative against the horror of blasphemy, or the suggestions of unbelief. In a word, there is hardly a detail of the devotional life of the early Christians, in which this feeling does not betray itself: a feeling of which our own pious practices still preserve numberless traces, and which the Church has solemnly registered and confirmed in the rite of administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, in which each of the organs of sense is signed with the cross, as an emblem of the remedy, or the expiation, of the sins committed through the instrumentality of that sense.

(6) *In sickness.* A still more touching illustration of the profound conviction which was entertained of the saving power of the cross, is the frequent and confident use of it in sickness, which the early records exhibit. The conduct of Gregory of Nyssa, in assisting at the death-bed of his sister, St. Macrina, would have been the extreme of superstition in the eyes of the Durham school. He signed the holy sign not alone upon her eyes, but “upon her lips,

* De Virtute, cap. vii.

† 87 Hom. in S. Matt. vii. 820.

and even upon her heart;" and he does not hesitate to assign as his reason, that "the eternal God has given the sign of the holy cross as a weapon against the enemy, and a safeguard of our lives."* Evodius, in a letter to St. Augustine, to which Augustine approvingly replies, speaks in high commendation of a certain youth, who, at the approach of death, began to arm himself with this saving sign.† St. Jerome relates with equal evidence of approbation, that the holy virgin St. Eustochium "impressed the holy sign upon the mouth and on the stomach of her dying mother, St. Paula;" and what is still more superstitious, he subjoins that "she trusted by the impression of the cross to mitigate her mother's sufferings."‡ He adds in another place, of the same Paula, that "she raised up her hand to her mouth, and printed the sign of the cross upon her lips."

(7) *In the hour of death.* A still more touching form of the practice, and one for which, though of course the principle and the foundation are the same, we are not aware of any exact modern parallel, is recorded in the lives of several of the early fathers. It was their wont to compose their bodies in their last hour into the form of the cross, and with their feeble arms outstretched in memory of the instrument of their Redeemer's sufferings for their sake, to resign themselves with humble confidence into his hands. St. Jerome tells that the body of St. Paul the Hermit was discovered, after his death, by his disciple, St. Antony, composed into this sacred figure.§ St. Gregory of Tours relates that St. Eugenius, Bishop of Carthage, met death in the same Christian posture.|| Paulinus, the biographer of the great St. Ambrose, the light of his age, records that during the last hours of his life he "never ceased to pray with his arms outstretched in the fashion of a cross;" ¶ and so familiar, so received, and so much in the spirit of the age was the holy usage, that Arnobius, in his commentary on the 140th Psalm, does not hesitate to apply to it the words, *Elevatio manuum mearum sacrificium vespertinum*; explaining the allusion to the evening,

* S. Greg. Nyssen, Vit. S. Macrinæ.

† S. Aug. Opp. ii. 694.

‡ Epitaph, S. Paulæ.

§ Hier. de Vita S. Pauli. Op. p. 82.

|| Greg. Tur. Mirac. I. 59.

¶ Paulin. in Vita S. Ambrosii. appended to his Works, ii. 12.

as a mystic description of the evening of life, and explicitly interpreting the "raising up of the hands" of the pious usage of contemporary Christians, who, "when they are going forth to meet the Lord, raise up their hands in the form of a cross, and rejoice in the Lord Jesus."

(8) *In going to martyrdom.* Akin to this usage of the peaceful times of the early Church, was the beautiful practice of the martyrs, in the days of her persecution. One of the most affecting scenes in Eusebius's well-known description of the Martyrs of Palestine, is that in which he tells of a "youth of scarcely twenty years, standing unbound, *with his arms extended like a cross*, but with an intrepid and fearless earnestness, intensely engaged in prayer to God, neither declining nor removing from the spot where he stood, whilst bears and leopards breathed rage and death, and almost touched his very flesh."* St. Ambrose's Homily on St. Agnes describes her as standing with outspread arms in the midst of the flames. St. Cyprian dwells with eloquent approval on the usage, and the generous Christian feeling in which it originated; † and one of the most striking passages in Prudentius' well-known Poem *περι στεφανων* is that in which he describes the very flame itself,—the instrument of the martyr's torture,—as almost miraculously interposing to free their arms from the bonds which confined them, and thus enable them to meet death in the attitude so dear to the generous soldier of Christ.

Hæc inter rapidos focos crepantes
 Infrant passibus, et minantur ipsi
 Flammarum trepidantibus caminis.
 Nexus denique, qui manus retrorsus
 In tergum revocaverant revinctas,
 Intacta cute deciderunt adusti.
*Non ausa est cohibere pœna palmas
 In morem crucis ad Patrem levandas ;
 Solvit brachia quæ Deum precantur.*

Nor are we left in doubt as to the meaning of this beautiful practice, and the virtue which was attached to it in the mind of the church of those days. St. Gregory Nazianzen tells of his own brother Cæsarius, that before an interview with Julian the apostate, he sought strength and

* Hist. viii. 7, p. 300, [Cruse's Tr.]

† De Exhort. Mart. c. 11. Opp. p. 304.

courage in the use of this emblem of the faith. "He armed himself with the sign of Christ as a shield, and sheltered himself under the power of his mighty word, against the attack of a man who was most experienced in military tactics, and distinguished for the power of his eloquence."* St. Basil † puts a similar interpretation on the act of Gordius the martyr, a centurion of Cesarea; and St. Ephrem ‡ in his panegyric of the Forty Martyrs, dwells with holy pride upon this characteristic of their martyrdom. In a word, it is impossible not to see that the feeling which in the early champions of the faith develops itself in this touching and impressive usage, is the very same which to the present day lies at the root of every Catholic observance, even of those practices connected with the sign of the cross which are regarded as most superstitious, and which are most offensive, even to those of our own body who pride themselves upon the liberality and enlightenment of their views.

(9) But we have already exceeded the limits originally proposed for this portion of the subject; and therefore we shall content ourselves with grouping together a number of the minor coincidences of ancient and modern use. Each indeed would be in itself sufficiently interesting to form the subject of special examination; and all, considered as a whole, furnish so complete and satisfactory evidence of the perfect identity of views, of feelings, and of general tone of mind between the ancient Church and its modern successor, as to make it difficult to understand how any one at all acquainted with antiquity can fail to recognize the modern Church of Rome, not alone as in these respects the exact counterpart of the "Church of the Fathers," but as the only existing community of Western christians which preserves, in its devotional system, even the slightest resemblance to the manners and observances of the early days of Christianity.

Let any one, for example, stand in the porch of a Protestant church, and observe the worshippers as they enter. Reverent, perhaps, they may seem in their bearing, and impressed with a sense of the solemnity of the duty which they are going to discharge. But they all without excep-

* Greg. Naz. in Laud. S. Cesarii. i. 167.

† Basil. Orat. in S. Gordium. i. 446. ‡ Eph. Enc. in 40 Martyres.

tion pass him by, and "make no sign;" and he must turn away to the humble, and, as it may seem, uninstructed, worshippers of a Catholic church if he would discover the true descendants of the Christians in the days of St. Augustine, who, "when they entered a church, signed themselves with the sign of the cross."* Let him observe them in the progress of their respective services. In a Church of Evangelical leanings he will find the sign held in absolute horror. If he chance to find himself in one of the churches whose congregations have been "led to the very verge of the precipice," as St. Andrew's, St. Margaret's, or St. Barnabas's, he may perchance hear the preacher commence his sermon with the words which, in Catholic usage, accompany the sign of the cross; but he will not see him boldly and openly employ the sign itself, with which, as we have already seen, even profane discourses, in the ancient days, were wont to begin. He will find that the modified and timid use of the cross which accompanies the dismissal of the congregation and the closing benediction, is one of the first and most serious grounds of charge against the incumbent of St. Andrew's; although every ancient liturgy which we possess, informs us that the *εὐφήμη πᾶσι*, PAX OMNIBUS of the bishop, which occurs in every page of the ancient ceremonial, was accompanied then, as it is now, by the sacred sign. And as for the worshippers themselves, he will watch in vain in the Protestant church for any public or private use of the cross; while the frequent and reverential crossings which accompany all Catholic prayer, from the peer down to the pauper, in every rank and every class, as in the days of Chrysostom, † "among princes and subjects; among men and women, married and unmarried, slaves and free-born;" cannot fail to call to his mind the bearing of one of those congregations whom St. Augustine was wont to address, and to whom he used to say, as would a Catholic catechist at the present day, "*Let all sign themselves with the sign of Christ, and answer, Amen.*"

And in the more every day concerns of the early Christian life, there were numberless uses of the cross, which, if publicly resumed at the present day, would provoke the ridicule of every Protestant, and would scarcely be secure

* St. Aug. 30 Tract. in Ioannem.

† Opp. i. 571.

from the censures of Catholics themselves. Protestant travellers in Italy will sneer at the poor *vetturino** who crosses himself as he mounts his box, and takes the reins in his hand. Yet in so doing he is but literally fulfilling the precept of Tertullian, of Chrysostom, of Jerome and Augustine. We ourselves recollect no small amount of ridicule to have been incurred by a person, who, before plunging into the sea to swim, made the sign of the cross upon his forehead; yet a Christian in Tertullian's time would have done the same before the *Lavacra*; and it was the practice among the contemporaries of Chrysostom to cross themselves at entering the baths, (*thermas ingressi*.) The now familiar practice, too, of crossing oneself on occasion of any alarming or inauspicious event, was as familiar in the church of the fourth century. "If a man strike his foot against a stone," says St. Augustine, "he forthwith crosses himself." St. Ambrose tells us that the cross was for Christians the one antidote for all the various evil omens which could possibly befall. † And St. Chrysostom repeats the same counsel, with even greater minuteness of detail.

It would be tedious to pursue this further; and we shall only add that the coincidences, when fully investigated, will strike even Catholics themselves with wonder. The single passage which we have cited from St. John Chrysostom's Discourse on the Divinity of Christ, reveals many most interesting ones; and, in fact, shows us that if there be any difference between the ancient and modern use of the cross, the deficiency certainly must be charged upon the moderns. There is hardly a circumstance or an occasion in which it would be possible to employ it to which St. John does not point. The practice so unsparingly criticised by Protestant travellers in Italy, of placing a cross in all the cafés and places of entertainment, is exactly analogous to that mentioned by him when he describes the cross as the attendant of all the banquets [*συμπόσια*] of his own day. The crosses which he alludes to as displayed in the streets

* This is by no means, however, confined to the poor and uneducated in Italy. We have seen a Roman noble observe the usage in getting into his cabriolet in the streets of Rome; and, even in this country, we knew a very celebrated "gentleman Jock," who invariably blessed himself at mounting for a race.

† Sermon 43.

of the cities and upon the mountains, were but the prototype of the rude but expressive figures which meet the eye at every street corner in the continental cities, and in the most solitary mountain roads of the Appennines or the Tyrol. The cross was then, as it is now, the ornament of the Christian's bed-room. [παστασιν.] It was employed to adorn his books [βιβλίοις], to decorate the walls of his house [τειχῶν γράφαις]; it was even marked upon his wearing apparel [ἱμάτιοις] and his ornaments [μυργαρίταις]. Nay, they carried the practice further than perhaps seem expedient to some of ourselves. It was graven upon their ordinary "vessels of gold and silver;" it was used upon the most profane occasions, as at festivals and dances [ἐν τρυφῶντων χορείαις]; and was not considered out of place in the very games of the circus themselves.* What would by many be almost considered vulgar superstition now, was then received and recognized by all. The vulgar usage of blessing a person who may chance to sneeze in our company, is but a reproduction of the olden rule, with this difference, that of old the sign of the cross accompanied the words: the custom of making the sign of the cross upon the mouth at yawning, is equally venerable for its antiquity;† and the crossing at grace before or after meals, which but a few years since weak Catholics used to employ so many amusing devices to conceal;—making believe, the while, to rub their forehead or chin, to settle the points of their collar, to draw out the tails of their cravat, or to adjust the folds of their waistcoat;—was a long established practice in the second century.

But we have said more than enough, we feel assured, upon this branch of the subject, to satisfy even the most sceptical. It is impossible, as regards this particular, to entertain a doubt, as to what community of modern Christians the fathers of the five first centuries, could they return to earth, would identify as their brethren or fellow-worshippers.

We shall, therefore, devote what remains of our space to the consideration of a point even more important than the bare history of the practice; we mean the purposes for which it was usual to employ it, and the effects which, in

* S. Aug. Opp. iv. 583.

† Chrys. in 3 Colos. Hom. 8.,

the views of those times, were attributed to it. We have already observed that it may be urged in reply to all that we have said, that what Protestants condemn in our modern practice, is not simply the use of the sign of the cross, for which they admit there is precedent in early christian history; but the "superstitious uses" to which modern Catholics have perverted it, and which were utterly unknown in the former ages of the church. This is, of course, the meaning, if it have any, of the epithet "superstitious" in the Durham manifesto; though it is hard to understand how, taking the official explanation of that document, and understanding it to apply solely to the sparing and modified practice of the "unworthy sons of the Church of England," there can be any use of the sign of the cross which is not superstitious, whereas that practised by the Tractarians, the very simplest and most limited which it is possible to conceive, is thought deserving of that opprobrious designation. It will be felt, therefore, that any examination of the question would be necessarily incomplete, which shall not include this important branch of the enquiry.

III. EFFECTS ASCRIBED TO THE SIGN OF THE CROSS IN THE EARLY CHURCH.—We do not hesitate, then, to say, that there exists precisely the same identity between the ancient and modern notions as to the virtue and efficacy of the sign of the cross, the purposes for which it is to be employed, and the effects which, under God's blessing, may be humbly hoped for from its use, as we have already shown to subsist between the ancient and modern practice itself; and especially that those uses of the holy sign, and those notions regarding it, which the Durham school would pronounce to be most unequivocally Romish and most hopelessly liable to the charge of superstition, were as frequent, as popular, and as authoritatively received, in the schools of Chrysostom, Augustine, Ephrem, or Epiphanius, as they would be in a modern society of the Living Rosary.

Our proof must of necessity be very brief; and perhaps it will be best understood from a few parallelisms of practice.

If there be any superstitious uses of the sign of the cross at all, we should suppose that to employ it (1) as a means of obtaining the cure of a disease, or (2) as a protection against diabolical influence, or (3) as a means of imparting a certain permanent holiness, and perhaps semi-superna-

tural virtue, to material objects, as for example, water, bread, oil, &c., must surely be reckoned in that category. Now there is not one of these and similar uses for which the history of the early centuries does not furnish abundant and most satisfactory precedents.

(1) One of the leading peculiarities of modern Catholic devotional feeling is that strong and deep consciousness of God's presence among the members of the Church, and the abiding and permanent manifestations of His power, by which He is believed to confirm, from time to time, the faith and stimulate the love of His children. Carried occasionally to imprudent excess—excited upon false or insufficient grounds—and hastily indulged without full and satisfactory investigation, this feeling, nevertheless, of the abiding power of miracles in the Church, and this tendency to accept and even to look for its occasional manifestation, has ever existed in the minds of devout Catholics, and has supplied to our Protestant adversaries the most abundant armoury of ridicule and invective. How seldom does it occur to them, and perhaps even to ourselves, that the same weapons precisely might be turned, and even turned against the Christians of the fourth and fifth centuries!

Let us suppose, for instance, the following case. After the death of a holy nun, one of her companions reveals for the first time, as an evidence of her sanctity, a great favour which she had received from God during life, but which her humility had concealed till the very last. A large and, as it was believed, incurable, tumour had once appeared upon her breast. Her mother urged her repeatedly to take the advice of some surgeon, and, if necessary, to have it removed by an operation. But through a feeling of virginal delicacy, which it is difficult not to call excessive, she could not be induced to expose her breast, even to the eyes of the physician; and after praying with tears to God, she entreated her mother to desist from her importunities, and with humble confidence to make the sign of the cross upon the affected part. Her mother, yielding, even against hope, to the earnestness of this entreaty, complied with her request. It pleased God to reward her faith. The tumour disappeared, and left no trace behind but a slight mark "not larger than the prick of a pin," which was visible even after death. Suppose a Protestant met this tale in one of the "Lives

of the Modern Saints," or was told it by one of the nuns of a French or Italian convent, no one can doubt that he would at once set it down as a weak delusion, or perhaps a pious fraud. Yet this very tale was told in almost the words of our text, to the great St. Gregory of Nyssa. The holy nun of whom it is related, and on whose virginal breast he saw with his own eyes after her death the "small mark like the prick of a pin's point," was St. Macrina, his own sister, and the sister of St. Basil; and his informant was Vestiana, a lady of the highest rank, and most unimpeachable veracity.*

Or a still more remarkable case, though in many respects not dissimilar:—

A matron of high rank, who had long been under medical treatment for cancer, was at length assured by her physician that her case was beyond all hope, and that the only relief within the range of medicine was to alleviate her sufferings by anodynes and fomentations. The lady, despairing of human aid, had recourse to God. In her sleep she was admonished by a dream, to watch in the baptistery of the church during the solemn administration of baptism at the approaching Easter festival, and to request the first of the newly-baptized simply to make the sign of the cross upon the diseased part. She followed the admonition, and was instantaneously cured. The physician, who was a pagan, was struck with amazement at his next visit; he eagerly enquired from her to what extraordinarily powerful remedy a cure so sudden and so complete was due; and so signal was the recovery, that he treated with ridicule her simple narrative of the manner in which it was effected.

Only imagine what a storm of ridicule and ribaldry a modern bishop would have to encounter, who should dare to publish with the authority of his name such a narrative as this. If Cardinal Wiseman, for example, were to hold an enquiry into the alleged facts, and to declare publicly and authoritatively his belief of their truth, how *The Times* would rail, and *The Globe* would sneer, and the *Examiner* would scoff, and the *Herald* or *Guardian* would pour out a torrent of the lowest Billingsgate! And yet if Cardinal Wiseman thought it expedient to hold such an enquiry, and to make such a publication, he would but be

* Greg. Nyss. in Vit. S. Macrinæ. See Gretser, I. 758.

following in the footsteps of one whom it should be the pride of every Christian bishop to imitate,—the great St. Augustine himself; who when he heard these facts, “was indignant that so great a miracle, not obscurely wrought in such a city, and on so distinguished an individual, should remain unknown;” and therefore called the lady before him, and required her to relate publicly “all the facts, in the order in which they had occurred.” If any one doubt this statement, let him turn to the eighth chapter of the twenty-second book of St. Augustine’s great work *De Civitate Dei*.*

In the same scoffing and incredulous spirit would they receive what Theodoret tells as having occurred in the case of his own mother. She was suffering under an affection of the eyes, which the faculty had declared incurable; when one of her friends recommended her to have recourse to the prayers of a holy man named Peter, assuring her that his own wife had already experienced the benefit of his intercession. Theodoret’s mother applied without delay to Peter. He expressed great reluctance to accede to her request, telling her that he was a weak and sinful man; but in the end, overcome by her importunity, he told her to pray with confidence to God, who might grant her prayer, “not as a favour to himself, but as the reward of her faith.” Thereupon he “laid his hands upon her eyes, made the sign of the cross upon them, and her disease was driven away.”†

It would be easy to multiply examples of the same class from Theodoret, Paulinus, Gregory of Tours, † and other writers of the same period. But we have said enough to establish a perfect community of feeling and of thought between the Christians of those days and the most superstitious of modern Catholics as to the remedial, and often miraculous virtue, occasionally ascribed to this holy emblem. It would be difficult to find any modern instance, illustrating this impression more strikingly than those which we have produced.

(2) The parallel is perhaps even stronger as regards the second effect—its protecting power against diabolical influ-

* Opp. vii. 763. [Migne’s Ed.]

† Theodor. Hist. Religiosæ. Vita Petri. III. 1190. [Halle Ed.]

‡ See Gretser, I. 758.

ence. If there be any point on which the ideas of the ancient Christians stand in marked and special opposition to those of modern Protestantism, it is that which regards diabolical agency. It is impossible to read, in the most cursory way, even the very earliest of the fathers, without being struck by evidences of a belief in the reality of diabolical interference, both physical and moral, in the affairs of every-day life, which will shock all the ideas of modern enlightenment. Indeed this belief is so strongly marked in the New, as well as in the Old Testament, that it is impossible not to regard as a strange anomaly in the creed of those who take Scripture as their guide, so strong a disinclination to admit even the possibility of such interposition. With the Catholic it is entirely different. The clear and unmistakable language of the Scripture; the practice of exorcism which the Church has maintained from the very earliest times; the frequent and unhesitating declarations of the fathers; the marked allusions in almost every office of the ritual; have all created for us a frame of mind believing and reverential, but yet free from all debasing or superstitious terror, which enables us to understand the nature of these influences, and to accept the antidotes which the Church has ordained against their power. To a Protestant, for example, how supremely ridiculous would be the idea of deserting a country-house, under the impression that it was subject to the influence of malignant spirits! Still more, what gross and silly superstition he would deem it, to seek to remove the visitation and to expel the evil spirits, by procuring the Holy Sacrifice to be offered within its walls! To a Catholic nothing is more easy, provided always there be sufficient reasons for it, than the belief; and nothing more natural and more fitting than the remedy. Which of the two is more in the spirit of the early Church? Let St. Augustine, in the same chapter of the twenty-second Book of the *De Civitate Dei*, decide. "There is an officer, [vir tribunitius] named Hesperius, in our city," he says. "He has a country-house called Zubeidi, in the Fussalan territory. Having suspected, from various visitations which befel his cattle and his servants, that the house was suffering from the noxious influence of malignant spirits, he begged that *some of my priests* (I was absent myself at the time) *would go there*, in the hope that they *might be driven away by his prayers*. One of them accordingly went, offered the Sacrifice of the

Body of Christ, and prayed with all fervour that the visitation might be put an end to. Through the mercy of God it ceased immediately afterwards." *

In this instance the antidote employed was "the Sacrifice of Christ's Body;" but no remedy is more frequent in the writings of the fathers, than the sign of the cross. Even in the days of persecution, this practice was so familiar as to be known even to the Pagans. The last and most terrible of all the persecutions, that under Galerius and Diocletian, was occasioned by the representation which the Pagan priests at Nicomedia made to Diocletian, that the omeus could not be successfully taken, because they were frustrated by the Christians in his train making the sign of the cross. † It was by the sign of the cross that the virgin martyr, St. Justina, defended herself against the incantations of the magician Cyprian, ‡ and against the power of the demons, whom he invoked, but who were "shamed and overcome by the sign of the cross." [*ἡσχυμμένους καὶ νενικημένους τῆ σταυρῆ τῷ τυπῷ.*] An equally interesting evidence of the belief is the anecdote told of Julian the Apostate; that, while consulting a magician who had evoked a spirit for him, he was so terrified by the apparition, that, under an impulse of early habit, he *made the sign of the cross, and thus unconsciously frustrated the whole incantation.* The anecdote is told by Gregory Nazianzen, by Theodoret, and at very great length, and with much poetical effect, by Prudentius. We are free of course to doubt the fact; but it is impossible to call in question the existence of the practice on which it is founded, or to deny the prevalence of the impression in which this practice had its origin.

The works of St. Gregory of Nyssa, of St. Jerome, of Theodoret, of St. Augustine, St. Paulinus, St. Gregory, and other fathers, § would supply an endless series of similar, and even more remarkable examples. The principle, indeed, is written upon the very face of the records of these centuries. To the unbeliever who regards the christian religion as a gigantic delusion, or the Latitudinarian

* Opp. VII. 764.

† Lactantius De Mort. Persec. iv. 27.

‡ Greg. Naz. Orat. in Cyprianum. I. 279. See also the Acts of Cyprian's Martyrdom in Ruinart.

§ See Gretser, i. 730.

who looks upon the Church as having lapsed into corruption in her very cradle, we can understand the absolute and total rejection of the doctrine, as involved in the insufficiency of the authority on which it rests. But that any one, who receives the authority of Scripture, or regards with feelings of even modified reverence, the practical interpretation put upon the literal text of the Gospel by the unanimous sense of the early Church, should entertain a doubt, much less a positive incredulity, with regard to this primitive usage, we profess ourselves utterly unable to conceive, and, with every disposition to the most charitable construction, utterly incompetent to justify.

(3.) The primitive belief in the sanctifying power of the sign of the cross, and its power of imparting a permanent and abiding consecration, is equally certain and indisputable. Indeed, the traces of this belief are so abundant, so interesting, and, in many respects, so curious, that we should gladly, if circumstances permitted, enter at some length into this special branch of the subject. For the present, a very few facts will suffice to establish the same parallel of ancient and modern practice in this particular, which has been shown to exist in every other detail connected with this great christian emblem. The history of the fourth and fifth centuries contains numberless examples of blessing with the sign of the cross, which, in unbelieving eyes, will appear the grossest superstition, and for which certainly no modern Church, except that of Rome, presents, either in the rite or the spirit which it supposes, the faintest shade of resemblance. Even in the boldest devices of innovation to which the Tractarian movement gave occasion, we have never heard of any imitation or adaptation of the Catholic practice of blessing water for devotional or other purposes. Yet one should have thought that among the many manifestations of zeal for the revival of primitive practice, this usage might have occurred to some one, at least, in a qualified shape. A very little research would have supplied abundant precedents; certainly as many as could be quoted in favour of the use of lights upon the altar, which actually met approval even from those who were by no means foremost in the race of innovation. St. Epiphanius* would have supplied a case of a Jewish convert, named Joseph, who

* Her. xxx. I. 134.

cured a violent lunatic at Tiberias by “sprinkling him with water signed with the sign of the cross;” and another, in which recourse was had to the same remedy against the supposed machinations of certain Jewish magicians.* Again, it would create no trivial sensation in these days, were it announced that a popish priest had been sent for to the royal stables at Windsor, and had cured her Majesty’s favourite horse, simply by giving him water to drink, blessed with the sign of the cross. Yet, if any lover of antiquity will refer to the *Historia Religiosa* of Theodoret, he will find it related, with all the simple confidence of undoubting belief, that the hermit Aphraates cured by this very process, the favourite horse of the Emperor Valens. †

In like manner, we have often heard travelled bigots dwell with no sparing bitterness upon the superstitious blessing against the plague of locusts, which is found in the Roman Ritual, and is occasionally employed in Rome on the occurrence of these disastrous visitations. Now it is very curious that Theodoret’s history of this same Aphraates, furnishes an exact precedent for this very usage. He tells with the utmost simplicity, how a poor man, who had but a single field as his entire means of subsistence, came to Aphraates, and with tears in his eyes, besought him to obtain for him protection against the threatened visitation, which, to him and his family, would prove certain and complete ruin. Aphraates simply made the sign of the cross over a vessel of water, and ordered him to sprinkle it around his little field. And Theodoret adds, that when the insects reached this charmed boundary, they were arrested “by the water, as by an impregnable wall,” [ἔρκεσ ἀμαχες] and spared in their devastation the little crop thus preternaturally protected. † How the congregation of a modern parish would stare if, in his zeal for antiquity, the rector, in a similar visitation, were to “go and do likewise!”

Another peculiar Roman usage, which furnishes abundant merriment to foreign sight-seers, is the blessing of the horses and other domestic animals on St. Anthony’s festival. In our eyes, this simple usage has always appeared most natural and appropriate;—not alone as a recognition

* Ibid.

† Hist. Relig. Aphraates. III. 1183.

‡ Ibid. 1184-5.

of God's providence over all His creatures, but as a special invocation of His benediction upon the creatures which He has bestowed for the use of man. But it has the further recommendation of being fully in accordance with the letter, as well as the spirit, of the ancient practice. The principle is fully recognised in the beautiful and expressive blessing which, St. Jerome tells us, the great saint whose festival is selected for the modern usage, bestowed upon the lions which did reverence to the dead body of St. Paul the Hermit.* The case of Aphraates, already cited from Theodoret, furnishes a literal precedent. A passage of St. Chrysostom, cited in a former page, and testifying to the use of the cross in the case of diseased cattle, supplies a further confirmation; and St. Gregory the Great relates an instance in which Fortunatus, bishop of Tudertum, cured a soldier's horse by "stretching out his hand and making the sign of the cross upon his head."†

So again, we find a precedent for the blessing of bread in St. Jerome's Life of Hilarion. ‡ The interchange of bread thus blessed (Eulogia), was an ordinary act of friendly communion. St. Paulinus sent bread from Campania to St. Augustine, with the request, *Rogamus accipiendo benedicas*; § St. Augustine sends it in his turn to Paulinus (II. 125); and he alludes to the practice of giving bread thus blessed to the catechumens, who were of course excluded from the participation of the blessed Eucharist.

Of the blessing of oil we have numberless examples. Tertullian|| tells, that the Emperor Severus was cured with oil by a Christian named Proculus; he alludes in his book *Scorpiace*, to the habitual use of oil against the bite of a scorpion; and in blessing it, although he does not expressly mention the use of the cross, yet this is no very difficult inference from what he says elsewhere of its universality among christians. St. Jerome tells, that the bishops, clergy, and people of the entire province in which the holy Abbot Hilarion lived, used to come in crowds to him for blessed oil during a time of pestilence. ¶ Theodoret's Religious History is full of such cases. An unhappy

* Opp. p. 83.

† Dial. i. 10. II. 197.

‡ Opp. p. 85.

§ Aug. Opp. II. 103.

|| Ad. Scap. iv., p. 147, Oxf. Tr.

¶ Vit. Hilar. Opp. p. 85.

wife comes to Aphraates, for some holy oil, as a means of recovering the affections of an unfaithful husband.* The clergy of Antioch apply to the hermit Polychronius, to bless oil, on occasion of a dreadful drought by which the province had been visited;† and even the Queen of Persia sends to St. Simeon Stylites upon a similar errand.‡ Only imagine Queen Victoria applying to one of the royal chaplains for such a ministration! And yet, in the early Church, this blessing was invariably accompanied by the use of the cross; for St. Augustine expressly declares, that “if this sign be not applied to the oil wherewith the faithful are anointed, it is not duly performed.”§

But we have allowed ourselves to be carried far beyond what we originally proposed. We must cut short all further details, trusting to those which we have brought forward as a means of stimulating to more complete and comprehensive inquiry. We shall only add that there is not a single material object connected with the public or private devotional services of the early christians, in which the use of the sign of our redemption may not be traced; from the blessing of the mystic salt|| which the Church employs in more than one of her services, to that of the temples in which we assemble for worship, and the altars¶ upon which the Body and Blood of Christ are offered for our salvation.

We are tempted, notwithstanding the length to which we have already gone, to transcribe, before we close, the manly and eloquent vindication of this symbol which Mr. Bennett has introduced in his letter to Lord John Russell.

“Next to the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church, you mention ‘*the sign of the cross*,’ and you call it superstitious. I do not suppose you mean to make any distinction between a superstitious sign of the cross, and a sign not superstitious; because if you only mean that, of course we grant your charge at once. Anything superstitious, as such, is of course objectionable. Superstitious prayers, superstitious reception of sacraments, superstitious reading of the Bible, as far as it is superstitious, is of course wrong; but take away the superstition and then the thing itself is right. This you would readily grant. But what you mean no doubt is this,

* III. p. 1184. † Ib. 1261. ‡ Ib. 1279. § III. 1950.

|| St. Greg., Turon.; also S. Aug. Opp. I. 668.

¶ St. Aug. 19 Serm., De Sanctis.

that all use of the sign of the cross is superstitious. If so, then you go against the Church, which commands it at the font in baptism. I myself will freely confess to you, that I highly delight in that holy sign. I have long been accustomed to use it on all great occasions, and in all holy places, and recommend it to others. If persons take offence at it, they must remember Him whose sign it is, and learn better. I use the holy sign, not for superstition, but in token that I am not ashamed 'to confess the faith of Christ crucified, but hope manfully (with God's grace) to fight under that banner against sin, the world, and the devil.' It seems to come so naturally and so gracefully from the baptismal font. It seems so beautiful and simple a type of our love of our blessed Saviour. It seems so called for in this present age of unbelief and worldliness. It seems so hallowing and purifying an invocation of His presence, and of the atonement by which we are saved, that in the first instance, viewed abstractedly and without prejudice,—where the true Christian could be found to object to it, it is beyond me to imagine. I can conceive a Socinian, or a Deist, or a Unitarian, or some violent heretic of that kind, to object both to the name of the Holy Trinity and the Cross of Jesus, both its doctrine and its sign; but how an orthodox Christian can object (always setting aside *prejudice*,) I am quite at a loss to understand. In Bishop Grindall's Articles of Visitation, it is said: 'No persons are allowed to wear beads...nor superstitiously to make the sign of the Cross when they enter the church;' upon which Collier remarks: 'But supposing they did not do these things superstitiously, it is possible they might not come within the censure of the article.'—Collier, part 2, b. vi. There may be an allowed distinction between doing a thing *superstitiously*, and doing it with a pure and devotional mind. Why should it be of necessity *superstitious*? Edward VI. and Elizabeth both used the sign of the Cross in touching for the king's-evil—both good Protestants. L'Estrange, in his *Alliance of Divine Offices*, mentions it with approval. Our own Canons speak of it as permissible (30th of 1603.) At the end of Edward VI.'s first Prayer-Book, I find this note: 'As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as any man's devotion serveth, without blame.' And it may be observed, that nothing in subsequent editions of the Prayer-Book has ever contradicted this. What we want is to get rid of *puritanical prejudice*, and to judge of matters intrinsically of themselves. I believe your Lordship is a great admirer of the writings of Dr. Arnold, whom indeed I quoted before concerning honour paid to saints. If you will turn to the life of that eminent man, lately published, vol. i., you will find that he was an advocate not for the Cross only, but for the Crucifix. 'The second commandment,' he says, 'is in the letter utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation. To refuse, then, the benefit which we might derive from the frequent use of the Crucifix, under the pretence

of the second commandment, is a folly, because God has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of Himself, when he declared Himself in the person of Christ.' In another place, he says: I like the simple crosses and oratories by the road side.' (Vol. ii., p. 362.) Again he says:—

“ 1. ‘The open churches, the varied services, the beautiful solemnities, the processions, the Calvaries, the crucifixes, the appeals to the eye and ear through which the heart is reached most effectually, have no natural connection with superstition.’—*Life and Corresp.* ii., 395.

“ 2. ‘In the crypt is a calvary and figures as large as life, representing the burying of our Lord. The woman who showed us the crypt, had her little girl with her; and she lifted up the child, about three years old to kiss the feet of our Lord. Is this idolatry? Nay, verily, it may be so, but it need not be, and assuredly is in itself right and natural. I confess I rather envied the child. It is idolatry to talk about holy church and holy fathers—bowing down to fallible and sinful men; not to bend knee, lip, and heart, to every thought, and every image of Him our manifested God.’—p. 402.

“ 3. ‘We found the afternoon service going on at the cathedral, and the archbishop, with his priests and the choristers, were going round the church in procession, chaunting some of their hymns, and with a great multitude of people following them. The effect was very fine; and I again lamented our neglect of our cathedrals, and the absurd confusion in so many minds between what is really popery and what is but wisdom and beauty, adopted by the Roman Catholics, and neglected by us.’—p. 434.”—(p. 35-7.)

It is impossible not to feel the warmth and heartiness of this appeal. Nor is it easy to suppress a movement of sympathy for a mind such as this appeal bespeaks, writhing under the trammels of a system with all whose details it seems utterly discordant. We can but hope and pray that the sense of this incongeniality may strengthen by the very indulgence of such feelings; and in that hope, we gratefully accept this and every similar manifestation.

For a sincere and earnest Catholic, the picture of early usages which we have endeavoured to sketch, will possess a significance, far beyond the mere evidence which they contain, of the use of the holy sign to which Mr. Bennett clings with so much enthusiasm. And we will confess that our object has been a far higher one than that of merely establishing the holiness and antiquity of this practice. We regard this, though a most cheering and consoling result, as of comparatively minor importance. Far

more grave and serious matter for reflection will be found in the general tone and character of the times themselves, as exhibited in the miscellaneous anecdotes which we have thrown together, and in the uniform spirit which pervades the whole body of the extracts from the fathers and other ecclesiastical writers, to whom we have appealed. That any man, or body of men, living in a religious atmosphere such as that which forms the very life of modern Protestantism, could think, or write, or act as we have seen the Fathers of the early centuries, is a patent impossibility. Every usage of the time would have clashed with their first principles. The whole frame of the public mind would have revolted them. They would have been strangers and outlaws in the Church of such worshippers as Jerome, Chrysostom, or Augustine. It is plain that the religious usages which, as we have seen, these fathers recognize, were not the offspring of a refined æstheticism, or the arbitrary expression of a fanciful appreciation of the poetical beauty and significance of the rites themselves. They were parts of one uniform and consistent scheme, and the natural and spontaneous outpouring of the soul which animated it and gave it consistency. And he who would throw himself honestly into the religious life of these times, must accept it humbly, sincerely, and generously;—not with the proud and sceptical criticism of an eclectic, but in the fulness of its system, and the integrity of its spirit.

Dr Russell

-
- ART. VI.—1. *A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on the position which he has taken in the Present Crisis.* By W. DODSWORTH, M. A. London: Pickering, 1850.
2. *A Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London, in Explanation of some statements contained in a Letter by the Rev. W. Dodsworth.* By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., &c. &c. Oxford: Parker, 1851.
3. *A Few Comments on Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Bishop of London.* By W. DODSWORTH, M. A. London: Pickering, 1851.
4. *Renewed Explanation in Consequence of the Rev. W. Dodsworth's "Comments."* London: Pickering, 1851.

THE origin and history of this correspondence may be thus briefly stated. After the celebrated "Gorham" decision, it was felt by a large majority of the high church

party whom it affected, that nothing short of an explicit declaration on the doctrine of Holy Baptism, accompanied by an appeal from the judgment of the Queen in council, to that of an ecclesiastical Synod, (*in posse*) could clear their Church from the effects of such a shock. Dr. Pusey, however, with an amiable desire, which he has ever manifested, to bring extreme parties together, appears to have shrunk from hazarding a final rupture with the "evangelical" section of churchmen, and accordingly proposed, as a measure of conciliation, a certain statement of the disputed doctrine, which, whether justly or not, his friend, Mr. Dodsworth, considered to be unworthy of him, and altogether inadequate to the emergency. Whereupon Mr. Dodsworth publishes the pamphlet which heads our list, in the way of exception and remonstrance against what he feels to be the line of compromise. His objections to the course proposed by Dr. Pusey, with a view to the actual necessity, seem to have been subsequently admitted by Dr. Pusey himself; for in a letter which he writes to Mr. Dodsworth, in the *Guardian* newspaper, of June 19, 1850, he withdraws the objectionable symbol, as at any rate, insufficient "at that time." And thus the controversy between himself and Mr. Dodsworth, so far as related to the Gorham case, was practically brought to a close. It is another matter how Dr. Pusey now gets over the fact, that the judgment which at first he thought it so necessary to obviate, remains on record, without a single united, or authoritative, protest against it, on the part of the Church of England. In the mean time, we all know to our great joy and edification, how Mr. Dodsworth has acted under the difficulty, or rather we should say, how he has dealt with the whole question of the claims of Anglicanism, which, we must consider, were in no sense *staked* on the Gorham question, although in that memorable judgment, their futility did undoubtedly receive a new and remarkable exposure.

The object of Mr. Dodsworth's pamphlet is to point out the contrariety between what he regards as Dr. Pusey's retrograde step in the Gorham matter, and his "teaching and practice" up to that time, which he proceeds to exemplify in several of its particulars. And Dr. Pusey begins his Letter to the Bishop of London by defending his "teaching and practice," a phrase which sounds unusual, indeed, in our Catholic ears. Let us imagine for a moment, one

of our own priests writing a letter to the Archbishop of Westminster, to vindicate "his teaching and practice." How clearly do such unpremeditated phrases indicate, beyond the power of argument to contradict, or its need to illustrate, the essentially uncatholic character of Dr. Pusey's ground! But, letting this pass with a cursory observation, we will proceed to Mr. Dodsworth's "points."

The first article of teaching or practice attributed to Dr. Pusey, is that of having "constantly and commonly" administered the sacrament of Penance, and of having encouraged, if not enjoined, auricular confession, and given special priestly absolution.

Dr. Pusey replies in a manner which ought to satisfy all but very unreasonable Protestants. Our own wonder is that either he or any one else should have ever understood Mr. Dodsworth's words as conveying a *reproach*. Dr. Pusey seems hurt by Mr. Dodsworth's word "enjoined," while he has no objection to be thought to have "encouraged" the practice of confession. Mr. Dodsworth, however, as will be observed, does not directly assert more than that he "encouraged" it; and thus there is really, as Mr. Dodsworth shows in his "comments," no difference between them. Nor, again, is there any difference as to the point of "administering the sacrament of penance," i. e., of having administered penance or "penitence, (as Dr. Pusey prefers calling it,) as a sacramental rite, for to this Dr. Pusey confesses. And the giving of special priestly absolution, or at least undertaking to give it, is but a part of the act of administering the duties of a confessor. But all this does not prove Dr. Pusey to be "a Papist," as he is so often called. We agree with him altogether as to the supreme injustice of such an accusation. Neither can we suppose that Mr. Dodsworth ever intended to bring it against him. He is, we are satisfied, too kind and amiable a man to have any thought of what is commonly called, "shewing up" his friend in the eyes of the Protestant public. He meant to state facts, and these facts Dr. Pusey has acknowledged. He meant no more, as we are bound to understand him, than to contrast Dr. Pusey's apparent wavering about the Gorham case with the known character of his "teaching and practice;" and for Mr. Dodsworth's argument nothing more was necessary than to prove that Dr. Pusey, after the Gorham judgment, was at variance with his former self. And this Mr. Dodsworth

does shew, (on the one hand,) in that Dr. Pusey was then content to accept a symbol on the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, which would have been understood by the Evangelical party as favourable to their doctrine of the universal necessity of conversion after Baptism; and, (on the other,) in that his views and conduct up to that time had been in a direction the very opposite to the tenor of his proposed declaration. To shew this was, we repeat, all that Mr. Dodsworth professed to do, and in this he has succeeded. With respect to Dr. Pusey's symbol, it is enough to say that it is open to the objection lying against all forms which are purposely drawn up to include the heretical with the orthodox construction. It is wonderful Dr. Pusey does not see that unless Anglicanism be a sham, it and "Evangelicalism" are in diametrical and irreconcilable opposition. On no principle can Evangelicals and Anglicans coalesce in the same communion but upon that of such communion being tolerant of opposite opinions. For, the profession of Anglicanism, if it have a profession, is distinctly sacramental, and the profession of Evangelicalism is distinctly the reverse, and these two systems, being in fact truth and error, can never be fused into each other, either in their integrity or in any of their parts. Dr. Pusey, then, in his simplicity, may fancy himself a Catholic; he may hear confessions and give absolution with the Lutherans; he may, with the Lutherans also, adopt a view of the Blessed Eucharist, which looks as like our doctrine as words can make it, but just lacks that dogmatic precision of statement which would cut it off from heresy; he may "adapt" Catholic devotions (as Mr. Dodsworth truly observes,) upon a "distinctively Protestant principle;" he may allow spiritual rosaries without beads, or beads without Aves; and in these ways he may gain all the obloquy of a better cause; still Catholic he is not, nor any thing but pure Protestant, as long as he admits fellowship with those who avow anti-sacramental, or rather anti-religious doctrines and principles, or act upon them where they do not openly avow them. Dr. Pusey does not see that neither Catholicism nor heresy admits of degrees. A man either is a Catholic or a heretic, or he is not. Persons of Catholic *tendencies* there may be who are not Catholics, and persons of heretical *tendencies* who are. But it is a question of fact, not of degree. A heretic is one (as the name imports) who *chooses doctrine for him-*

self; a Catholic one who accepts it on the authority, not of Scripture, (which is a document, not an authority;) not of Fathers, who are witnesses, not teachers; but of the living Church, the interpreter of both. And if it be said in reply, that this account does not meet the question, what and where the living Church *is*, we rejoin, that anyhow Dr. Pusey has nothing to which *he* can appeal but *documents* in the place of a Church. What, for instance, is *our* Church? A living, ruling, teaching authority, to whose recorded judgments we can point, whose oracles we can consult. And the same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of the separated Greek Church. But what is Dr. Pusey's Church? Not the Pope, not the Bishops, not the Emperor, nor any representation of any authority clothed in definite form; but certain Fathers, some of whom use language upon which subsequent, though early dogmatic decisions cast the shade of heresy; certain divines, arbitrarily chosen as the representatives of his own Church, which at most they did but represent during a brief and former period of its history; a select mediæval saint, a stray High-Churchman or two among the existing body of Bishops; parts of the Homilies, the least heretical of the Reformers, or of Continental Protestants; the more depraved heretics themselves in their more orthodox moods, or in their more "liberal" allowances, or in their more unstudied instincts of devotion; a medley, in short, of Ante-Nicene Fathers, Caroline Divines, Luther, Melancthon, St. Bernard, the Bishop of Exeter, and Dr. Arnold, collected as the interpreters of equivocal articles and a defective liturgy; and this against things that *do*, at all events, *look* like authoritative teaching on the other side; such as *ex cathedrâ* documents of Bishops, practical and operative judgments of ecclesiastical courts, and, more recently, the result of an appeal, (admitted on all hands as legitimate *till* it ended as it did,) to the highest tribunal of the Church of England. We say it reluctantly, because it bears against a most amiable, devoted, and, we sincerely believe, conscientious man; but say it we must, for it is a duty to the Church, that such a system is heretical to the very core; that if it could succeed in importing every Catholic doctrine in existence into the Church of England, it would be still essentially Protestant; for if it involve truth, it does so only by accident, by preference, and not on submission. Dr. Pusey

himself, little as we are sure he realizes it, is in fact the beginning and end of his own teaching; he is the deviser, the arranger, the interpreter, of his materials; he makes the witnesses speak for his own side; he dresses up the evidence, taking this treatise of one Father, and that of another, biasing the reader by notes, systematizing the matter by dissertations, magnifying the little, amplifying the scanty, protruding the favourable, and overlooking the adverse. His system is rightly called "Puseyism;" it began with him, and it will die whenever he, either in the course of nature, (*quod absit*,) or, (which God grant,) in obedience to the call of duty, shall cease to be its representative. To call it Anglicanism is almost as absurd as to call it Catholicism. There is not a single authority in the Anglican communion, either past, or actual, which could be quoted as simply sanctioning it. There are not two Bishops at this moment who do more than tolerate it; nor even one who consistently upholds it. Nor is it less distinct from any former phase of opinion in the Anglican communion than from the present teaching. There is, we are bound to say, a fervour, a large-heartedness, a poetry about Dr. Pusey's language, which are utterly wanting in any Anglican divinity, with the exception, perhaps, of Andrewes and Taylor. But Taylor was a heretic on more than one fundamental point of doctrine, and Andrewes does not sustain, in other places, the tone of his beautiful devotions. Dr. Pusey, like most thinking men in the Church of England, has passed through various stages of religious opinion; and in the more orthodox form which his views now take, there remain evident traces of the depth and warmth of religious feeling which is characteristic of the better, and, it would seem, rapidly decreasing, section of "Evangelicals." Oh that he might yet learn from experience the scope which our holy Religion gives for the exercise of such religious affections, by deepening and strengthening the foundations of holy doctrine in the soul, and securing that true peace which comes but with the utter annihilation of self before the authority and majesty of the Church!

We propose now to examine briefly Dr. Pusey's defence of himself on the different points of teaching and practice, brought under his observation by Mr. Dodsworth's pamphlet. In treating of these subjects we shall neither lay claim to, nor exact more theological knowledge than ordinarily

well instructed Catholics may be expected to bring to the consideration of questions affecting some of the most practical parts of our holy Faith.

And first, of Sacramental Confession. For the practice of hearing confession in his church, Dr. Pusey finds a warrant in the Exhortation in the Communion Office of the Prayer-book, bidding those who cannot otherwise quiet their consciences to go to "some discreet and learned minister of the Word, and open their griefs to him so as to receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of their consciences and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness;" words which certainly justify an Anglican clergyman in receiving a confession, on some special point of conscientious difficulty, with a view to holy communion, or rather oblige him to do so. It is however quite a different question, and one which we should have thought required a distinct reference to ecclesiastical authority, whether these words, quite unsupported by the general practice of the Church of England at any period of its history, can be considered to form a warrant for that extensive administration of the confessional powers which Dr. Pusey founds upon them. For such a construction of these words will be seen to transfer the judgment of the necessity for confession from the penitent to the clergy, and to change the rare occasion of an individual and partial scruple into an habitual and conscientious requirement: in short, it supposes the clergyman to say to his flock: "If you have no such scruples about going to holy communion, you ought to have them." For except they were thus construed, few and far between we conceive would be the insoluble perplexities of the Protestant conscience. And doubtless, if authorities actually ruled such to be the construction of the words, instead of—as they do—vehemently and universally repudiating it, we should be the last persons to quarrel with such an application of them—for, in fact, it would amount to a complete recognition of our own practice, which makes the sacraments of confession and of the blessed eucharist of all but coincident necessity. For we can nowise understand how Dr. Pusey's teaching and practice, in this instance at least, falls short of our own. In what sense does he suppose that the Church makes confession "compulsory?" Does he understand the word as implying anything more than a *moral* compulsion? Does he think our priests drive people to

the sacred tribunal by main force? But if not, what is the great difference as to this matter of compulsoriness between on the one hand, removing the case of confession from being the rare exception of the Church (as the communion office supposes it), to becoming the general rule (which Dr. Pusey would desire it to be), and, on the other hand, enforcing it as the Catholic Church does, under the pain of mortal sin, as an occasional duty? What evil, we ask, comes of requiring a *moral* security that Christians prepare their conscience for holy communion at least once a year? And will Dr. Pusey consider whether it be not one and the same laxity of discipline in his own communion which refuses to make confession obligatory under pain of sin, and requires no kind of pledge for even an annual *communion*?

But at any rate we regard Dr. Pusey as acting most inconsistently with his own ecclesiastical principles in making so vast an innovation upon the actual practice in this matter as is implied in his own acknowledgments. What would a Catholic priest feel—except the dread of his final account—were he knowingly and for years to exercise spiritual powers, which, though of course radically inherent in his office, were tied up for want of a committed jurisdiction? How would he like to be continually playing a game of hide and seek with his ecclesiastical superiors, and presuming for the warrant of his own temerity, upon their cowardice and supineness? For this, we must after all think, is the *gravamen* of Dr. Pusey's offence against ecclesiastical discipline and propriety, not that he hears the confessions of all comers, but that he hears *any*, without authority expressly delegated to him by his bishop either in writing or by word of mouth. Dr. Pusey truly says that the liberty of choosing a confessor, *among those who are authorized to hear confessions*, (as in our own country at present), may be quite unrestricted without any violation of ecclesiastical principle or canonical right whatever; nay, it is of the very utmost importance to contend for such liberty. But then this liberty is actually and invariably bounded by the condition we have specified. The confessor must be an *approved* one. Dr. Pusey may call this limitation a matter of form, and plead that as the power of absolving is radically vested in every priest in virtue of his ordination, it is open to him to exercise it without explicit permission, though it were better if the state of the Church allowed her to insist on this condition.

But so thinks not the Catholic Church, in whose judgment an absolution pronounced by a priest unauthorized, is *ipso facto* null and void, except in *articulo mortis*, or in the case where the continuation of faculties which have actually ceased is colourably presumed, in which case the Church herself comes in to supply for the want of form, as far as the validity of the absolution goes, although the priest would commit mortal sin if he knowingly presumed upon the mistake of the people. And surely, as Dr. Pusey must admit, there is sound reason in such a law. For many an ecclesiastic is fit to be a *priest* who is not fit to be a *confessor*. Is a clear "vocation" to be quashed, is the inexpressible blessing and happiness of offering the adorable Sacrifice to be denied to a worthy candidate, or are the living and the dead to be defrauded of so many masses of infinite value to their souls as any one priest may offer in an ordinary lifetime, or even of one single mass the fruits of which they might otherwise enjoy, because such candidate is deaf, for instance, and so physically debarred from exercising a portion of his priestly office, or because he is constitutionally scrupulous, and so would be a torment to his penitents instead of a comfort, or because he is called to other duties (as a teacher, or a canon), or to a state of higher perfection (as a cloistered religious), and is thus in circumstances inconsistent with the laborious and uncertain duties of the confessional? Non omnia possumus omnes: the theological bias of some is in the line of dogmatic, of others in that of moral or ascetic theology, and the Church recognizes too well the principle involved in the division of labour to accumulate (except in case of urgent necessity) disparate, if not inconsistent, obligations upon the same head. Dr. Pusey is certainly required to meet this objection more distinctly than he has yet done; to show us by what law he gives absolution without authority expressly delegated to him by his bishop; by what rule he knows himself, of himself, to be equal to a part of the sacerdotal duties, which, throughout Christendom, is held to involve a peculiar qualification, and to require for its exercise a distinct commission. And again, if A. B. may *constitute himself* a director of consciences, what is to prevent C. D. from doing the same? Yet what a fearful havoc of souls must be the consequence of such a license becoming general! We own we can find no escape

for Dr. Pusey between the Scylla of individual presumption, and the Charybdis of universal anarchy.*

To return, at parting, to the question of the *obligation* of sacramental confession. Dr. Pusey truly says elsewhere that it would be a grievous error so to understand the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as to make light of a certain real *conversion* to God, which (not in all cases, but which) is mostly needed in baptized persons. But if so, how can the Church make too effectual provision for securing the reception of that remedial sacrament (as Dr. Pusey himself considers it) which is expressly ordained by our Lord *for the remission of post-baptismal sins*? Alas, with all her wise precautions, many and many are the souls still lost to the Church by neglect of that sacrament! But what would it be if no moral obligation to apply for it were even recognized? Let the annals of the Reformed Churches supply the answer.

Dr. Pusey seems to be under some strange misapprehension about the effects of what he calls "compulsory" confession. He says somewhere, if we mistake not, that it has to do with the minuteness of questioning in the confessional. But surely the matter comes to this: either auricular confession is a great gain, and a religious duty, or we have no right whatever to require it. But no gain can it be, rather a snare, except it be a full opening of the heart. And should not the confessor strive with a gentle and delicate skill, to overcome the natural repugnance to the confession of shameful sins? Dr. Pusey's view, if we do not much mistake, is that an imperfect confession is a gain, *pro tanto*, and that a priest should absolve upon it, rather than try to elicit the confession of suppressed sins. Of course no priest can absolve upon a confession which he has good reason to believe seriously defective; though, with well instructed penitents, he may certainly take the integrity of the confession for granted without much probing. But it is quite otherwise with such as are not so

* Dr. Pusey will say that some who now object to his practice of hearing confessions as an Anglican minister, did the same when they were such themselves. But it must be replied that this whole question of jurisdiction, which is the turning point, was strange to them till they became Catholics. We are sure they would not have wilfully violated a known law of the Universal Church.

instructed; and in every case the confessor himself must be the absolute judge of circumstances.

Dr. Pusey contends that Penance is a sacrament ordained by Christ Himself. But if so, must not its reception be binding on the conscience? And can an institution of our Divine Redeemer, designed for the remedy of sin, if binding *at all*, be otherwise than so binding *under grievous obligation*? Being a "sacrament of the dead," how can it be innocently neglected, or how can any humble person presume to dispense with it in his own case? Surely our Lord knows "what is in man."

Mr. Dodsworth's next point is that Dr. Pusey teaches a "propitiatory sacrifice" in the Blessed Eucharist. Dr. Pusey replies by admitting the fact in a sense. He repudiates the idea of a virtue in the Mass independent of our Lord's sacred Passion; (an opinion which no Catholic in the world maintains), and contends (so far with us) that the Holy Eucharist, in its character as a sacrifice, is not reiterative, but applicatory, of the sacrifice of the Cross. Thus, in fact, he admits all that Mr. Dodsworth asserts. In the course of his proof, he uses a great deal of inadequate, not to say heretical, language, and involves his argument in a mist of words through which we cannot discover whether or not he accepts simply the Catholic doctrine, that the sacrifice of the mass is identical with that of the Cross as to its substance and co-extensive with it as to its effects, although in form different from it; but that it is what it is, only in and through the Passion of Christ, of which it is at once the divinely instituted commemoration, representation, and continuous application.

We next come to the sacred dogma of our Blessed Lord's Presence in the Most Holy Eucharist, upon which the reader will hardly expect us to treat fully in the pages of a popular review. Here again Dr. Pusey seems to admit all which Mr. Dodsworth asserts, as to his teaching, but uses language, in explanation, against which a Catholic must take exception. And first, as to the mode of our Lord's Presence in the Most Holy Eucharist. Dr. Pusey has the authority of the Catechism of the Council of Trent for saying, as he does, that the Presence on the altar is not "*ut in loco*;" i. e., that it has not the accidents of figure, position, and the like circumstances of a local presence. It is on many altars, and in many of the sacred particles at once, yet not so circumscribed by the limits of place as

that its several manifestations should be together more than one Sacrament. It is otherwise with the Presence now in heaven. There our Divine Redeemer is in one place, so as not to be in another at the same time. And hence there is no real contrariety between the Presence in heaven and the Presence on the altar, as the Anglican Prayer-book feigns; because in heaven the Presence of our Lord in His incarnate though glorified Body is strictly local, delineated in figure and confined to position; on the altar it is super-local, or, in ordinary language, sacramental. So far, then, we have no difference with Dr. Pusey. But we must demur to his disclaimer of a "*local adoration*." (p. 76.) Surely he will admit that our Blessed Lord, though super-locally and sacramentally, is still really, present in the Most Blessed Sacrament as He is not present out of it, on the altar where It reposes; and in so far as this His presence on the altar is at once bounded by the limits of the sacramental species (to speak inadequately) and yet perfectly realized in them, it is they *which define to our eyes* the Object of our adoration and love. Otherwise, it is not a real Presence in the Sacrament at all which we adore, but an idea in our own minds suggested by It, which is to reduce that Sacrament to the level of a mere memento, or representation. And this, we verily believe, is the alternative upon which those are practically thrown, who reject the Catholic dogma. Dr. Pusey has, like most writers of his communion, secured the *negative* side of his doctrine, but been more negligent about the less easy task of defining the positive. Hence such language as the following (and it is a specimen of much more of the same class) is at the same time unassailable, and yet unsatisfactory.

"I thought of the adoration of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, *not as confined or contained in place, much less so as to involve any worship of the consecrated elements, &c.* But believing Him to be Present, I believed with the ancient Church He was to be adored as Present."—p. 76.

"Present," truly, but where, and how? "In the adorable Sacrament," Dr. P. will reply. But if so present, we ask whether present, conjointly with the natural substances, (which is the Lutheran consubstantiation), or as if *incarnate* in them, as our Blessed Lord was present on earth in His human Body, (which is properly the con-

demned doctrine of *Impanation*, and which, it will be observed, is open to the objection, among others, of supposing an unmysterious *local* Presence,) or in the mind of the worshipper, (which is to make the Blessed Sacrament a mere *sign*,) or, if in none of these ways, *how*, except super-locally, sacramentally, but substantially, and therefore, really, *in* the adorable Sacrament, superseding the proper substance of the natural elements by That of His Own Most Precious Body and Blood? Dr. Pusey will again interpose, that this were "to explain the mode." No, to *define*, but not *explain* it. The latter belongs to the science of angels, which could only be imparted to men by an express and special revelation; the former is the proper office of Theology, if Theology is to be anything but a kind of loose literature. What is it but "definition of mode" which forms the impalpable barrier between orthodoxy and heresy? What, we ask Dr. Pusey, is the Athanasian Symbol itself, but a series of such definitions, applied to a subject, certainly not less external to the ordinary province of human research than the holy doctrine of which we are here immediately speaking? When Dr. Pusey deprecates this introduction of philosophical language into the department of religion, or at any rate ignores it, he should bear in mind what an advantage he is giving to the Sabellians and other heretics, who upon the very same principle, and with the same specious, because apparently humble, defence of shrinking from what is above them, dispose of the technical terms by which the Church has secured the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity against the last refinement of heretical subtlety.

We have again to observe the inadequacy of Dr. Pusey's language. Thus:

"I have retained the words 'under the form,' &c.....I have meant them in the same sense in which the Homilies use them I have never taught anything *physical*, corporal, carnal; but spiritual, sacramental, Divine, ineffable."—p. 69.

This (we must be excused from saying it) is rhetorical, not precise. Dr. Pusey would make it appear that "physical" is the same with "corporal" and "carnal," or that, at any rate, all these epithets go to express one idea, and that idea opposed to spiritual, sacramental, divine, and ineffable. But this is simply to assume the very point in controversy. The word *φύσας* may mean with reference to

this subject either the natural *substance*, or (as Dr. Pusey has it put afterwards) the natural *properties*. In the former sense it is used to express That which is changed by the words of consecration. In the latter, it expresses what we term accidents, i. e., not merely all that is cognizable by the senses, but all those qualities which produce the natural results of sustenance, exhilaration, &c. Dr. Pusey, not, we are persuaded, purposely, but by a habit of mind engendered by his position, uses the word equivocally, and thus, to adopt a common phrase, "throws dust in the eyes" of the public, or of a bishop, not wishing to be too keen-sighted. A little later he has the words "a popular *physical* interpretation." (p. 70.) But if he means thereby that the Catholic Church broadly repudiates the word "physical," as applied to the change in consecration, he is certainly mistaken. As to a sense of the word in which she would repudiate it, we can only say that we know of no persons in the present day, who hold or incline to hold that the natural properties (or accidents) are changed. We doubt if such ever did exist, except in the imagination of the Reformers. In fine, Dr. Pusey says:

"It appears that our article condemns Transubstantiation as implying a physical change."—p. 70.

This might pass, but for the explanation.

"This" (conclusion) "appears from the words 'is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture,' in that it entitles the consecrated element, 'bread,' 'overthroweth the nature of a sacrament,' in that a sacrament is a 'sign of a sacred thing;' and in this view the sign would be the Thing itself."—p. 70.

These words, we are sorry to say, must operate to the prejudice of Dr. Pusey in one quarter, in which he wishes to stand well, as much as they will benefit him in another. They separate him from us, just in proportion as they secure his footing in the Church of England.

For, 1. It is true that Holy Scripture calls the Blessed Sacrament after consecration "Bread," and so does the Church, "*Panem* cœlestem accipiam, &c." But there is a sense in which our Lord says of Himself, "Ego sum Panis qui de cœlo descendit." The Anglican Article must mean, and Dr. Pusey with it, that the natural bread remains after consecration *in its own substance*, which is quite a

different doctrine ; and we will add "repugnant to words of Scripture," much "plainer" than any in which the "bread" is said to remain after consecration ; we mean the sacred words of consecration themselves, "HOC EST, &c." Nothing but the Catholic doctrine is adequate to these words. A Presence there may indeed be, (if such a degrading conception can be tolerated,) in conjunction with the created matter, (which is Consubstantiation,) a Presence *incorporated* in the natural substance, (which is Impanation) a Presence (not real but ideal) in the mind of the worshipper, suggested by the natural substance, which is the common Protestant figment ; but in none of these cases such a Presence as comes up to the divine words, *Hoc est*. Let these words be pondered, *each by itself*, and it may be seen how, alone of all actual interpretations, the definition of the Church comprises their power.

2. As to the objection of the Anglican Article expressed in the words "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament," it proceeds on the old misrepresentation. If our Divine Redeemer were said to be present on the altar, in all respects *as He is present in Heaven*, or if the *accidents* of the natural substance were annihilated and vanished away as well as that substance, so that our Lord were to be present, not *under* the form, but *instead of it*, then indeed it would be true that such doctrine "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament." But Dr. Pusey himself ought to see that such words as applied to any statement of Transubstantiation allowed by the Catholic Church, are altogether inappropriate.*

* A comparison between the Missal and the Anglican Communion office is enough to show upon what view the alterations were made by the Reformers. It is a very different thing, *excluding* testimonies to doctrine, and not recognizing them ; and the course of the Reformers bears incontrovertible proofs of heresy prepeni. Every Rubric in the Missal which guards the adorable Sacrament from profanation, (even unintentional,) is found in the "adapted" office to be carefully expunged. In the Prayer Book there is, for instance, no provision whatever against the loss of the precious particles, a subject on which the Catholic Church requires her priests to be careful, almost to sempulosity. In such ways it is that our Holy Mother manifests her tender care of her Divine Lord ; and reciprocates His love in resigning Himself into her custody. But

Mr. Dodsworth's next point is, "the introduction of Roman Catholic books adapted to the use of the (Anglican) Church."

Dr. Pusey has to defend himself against this charge before his bishop, and this we are bound to say that he has done with entire success. The fear, indeed, which Protestants have, lest our standard works of devotion should obtain circulation in their body, is one of those remarkable testimonies, which they so often unconsciously bear to the mysterious power of our holy religion. It is parallel to a caution lately addressed by a bishop to his clergy, against listening to lectures in our churches, and to a memorable admission once made by Dr. Pusey himself, that, when he heard Catholics were praying for the conversion of his friend, he felt a painful presage of the result.*

Our Holy Mother is most winning, most subduing, in her every look and gesture—strangers know it, and they fear to trust themselves within the circle of her holy spell. It must be admitted, however, that Dr. Pusey is far removed from this narrow and suspicious policy. If he forbids a disciple to hear a Catholic lecture, or to read a Catholic book of controversy, it is, we are sure, upon the same principle on which we should forbid a child or a penitent to meddle with Protestant controversy; though it must be remembered that *we* start with considering Protestantism a deadly heresy, he, with considering Rome "a sister Church." And on this right principle (inconsistently applied, however,) we suppose it is that he refuses his dis-

how is it possible that a Church which makes no express law against the Body and Blood of God Incarnate being sacrilegiously handled, or contemptuously wasted, can hold that precious gift to be really in her keeping? Facts are well-known relative to the treatment of the bread and wine after "consecration" even by clergymen themselves, which must make a reverent mind rejoice to think that our Lord is *not* present there! One of our Priests, (from whom we heard the story,) was once moved to remonstrate with an Anglican clergyman, whom he met in a hospital, upon seeing him throw away, into the first vessel which presented itself to his eyes, the remnants of what he had given to the sick. And these indecencies, (for such on any view they must be regarded, are of constant occurrence.

* Letter in the *English Churchman* of Oct. 1845, on Mr. Newman's conversion.

ciples the uncontrolled use of Catholic devotions. Having said, then, that Dr. Pusey is quite clear from reproach as against Anglicans and Dissenters, who have always circulated our books of piety among their followers without suspicion of "popery," we wish we could regard him as equally clear, upon ecclesiastical principles. Personally, of course, we have every wish that Dr. Pusey should continue his practice of translating and circulating our devotional books, in any form. No one method, we are sure, has been so successful in making converts to our religion, and converts of the right stamp. For one whom our books of controversy have brought round, twenty at least have yielded to the power of our devotions. For their very type and structure (which omissions do not alter) cannot fail to prove a successful rival in the heart to all other forms of prayer, whether public or private. And it is moreover certain, that many a parent will allow Dr. Pusey's *adapted* devotions to remain in the hands of his children, who would refuse them the use of an unmitigatedly "popish" manual.

But we must not suffer any views of expediency to blind us to the fact, that Dr. Pusey's course, in respect of the publication of these adapted books, is, upon every principle of the Church, to say nothing of human society, utterly indefensible. We agree entirely with Mr. Dodsworth, that it is an act of rank Protestantism, not untinged, we must reluctantly add, with a certain hue of profaneness. Dr. Pusey justifies himself by the precedent of the Anglican Prayer Book, which is an "adaptation" from the Breviary. We certainly are not called upon to defend the Reformers in their sacrilegious tamperings with our holy Office Books; but, any how, the Reformers acted in the name of their Church, delegated to their office, and responsible for its execution; whereas Dr. Pusey is acting but as an individual upon his own responsibility, and even against the judgment of his authorities. He knows that the works which he mutilates have received, as they stand, the *imprimatur* of the Holy See, and that their writers are now, we may believe, in heaven. Who are we that we should deal thus freely with the words of the Saints, and make them speak, without their leave, in faltering and equivocal, if not even heretical, accents? What right have we to use, in respect of God's blessed Saints and holiest servants, a liberty which com-

mon propriety forbids us to take with the writings of any absent, and still more, any deceased author? But Dr. Pusey, it would seem, is for introducing Anglicanism into the court of Heaven itself. He says,

“As to the authors themselves, surely we may think *that in Paradise they must be glad that their writings, under any condition short of the denial of the truth, should do good to the souls for whom, with them, Christ died. They know not, in their rest and love there, the distractions and hard judgments in the Church here below. Nor, if they here lived in a system partly unsanctioned by holy Scripture and by the Primitive Church, need we think that, holy as they were, the sight of God has not purged away some errors which clave to them here?*”*

The “sight of God” purges no one from errors; for none can enjoy it till wholly purged. But let this pass. What is it to set up private judgment against God’s Church, if this be not that bold attempt? For Dr. Pusey’s words, done into homely English, come to what follows. “The Saints know now that the whole Roman Church has made unauthorised additions to the teaching of the three first centuries. They have learned, though late, to take my view of ‘St. Mary,’† and the other subjects about which they were, when on earth, ‘in error.’” “They no longer think us heretics, as they did, and must be sorry to have expressed themselves in their devotions so as to prejudice the cause of Anglicanism, and to delay the ‘re-union of Christendom’ upon the terms of mutual concession. Far, then, from doing them an injury, I am even conferring on them a benefit, by remodelling their works upon the principles of the early centuries. Not only are they patient of such corrections, they even rejoice in them.”

* Preface to Avrillon quoted in Letter, p. 105.

† We take this opportunity of expressing, once for all, our cordial dislike of this mode of designating the Blessed Mother of God. It is true that our Lady is a Saint, but she is so much more than the greatest of the Saints, and than all the Saints together, that there is something to our ears unspeakably cold and repulsive in giving her, as her characteristic appellation, a title which she shares with St. Mary of Egypt, and other *servants* of her Divine Son. It is true that some excellent Catholics had contracted the habit of so designating our Blessed Lady, but, thanks to those who have lately

We next come to "Rosaries and Crucifixes." Both of these aids to devotion Dr. Pusey appears to have allowed under certain limitations, such as that Aves were not to be said on the first, and that the second were not to be "worshipped." In one part of the adapted "Paradise" it appears that the use of the actual Rosary is even provided for; certain prayers being appointed to be said on the "large bead," and certain others on the lesser. We suspect that Dr. Pusey will never succeed in convincing the public that Rosaries are not "Popish," whatever be the devotions which they are employed to assist. We have little to say under this head, except to rejoice that Rosaries and Crucifixes are getting abroad, through whatever channel. We are sorry to find Dr. Pusey apparently giving in to the silly objection founded on the unequal distribution of Paters and Aves in the Rosary. If persons attach importance to numbers either way, we have quite as much ground for saying that the practice of the Rosary proves one Pater to be equal to ten Aves, as the Protestants, to conclude that because we repeat the "Our Father" once, and the Angelic Salutation ten times, we love the Mother ten times as much as the Son. People forget too, that the "Ave" is the memorial of the *Incarnation*.

The latter portion of Dr. Pusey's "Letter to the Bishop of London," supplies us with no particular occasion of comment. We observe in it an obvious desire of assimilation to ourselves, which would elicit our sympathy, did we not feel it to be grounded upon a complete misconcep-

drawn the attention of the English Catholic Church to such subjects, the practice is now nearly confined to the ranks of heresy. "Holy Mary" is the proper (because the untechnical) rendering of the ecclesiastical "Sancta Maria;" but the titles in use amongst ourselves are such as either indicate the incomparable dignity of that Blessed one, such as "the Mother of God," or such as intimate her relation to us, "Our Lady," "Our holy Mother," &c., or, again, such as sum up without other title, the powers and associations of her holy name "Mary." But the Anglican "St. Mary," is neither duly reverential, nor strictly theological, nor simply affectionate, nor powerfully expressive; it merely sounds like the respectful notice of one with whom we wish to be on distant terms. Of course, in all this, we are not so much criticizing Dr. Pusey, to whom our remarks will probably be new, but founding upon his language a general observation.

tion of the spirit and character of our holy Faith. It is to such a misconception that we must attribute the comparison which Dr. Pusey institutes between our devotion and those which are in use among the better class of Evangelicals. Whatever similarity in language there may be between the ordinary Catholic, and the more spirited Protestant devotions, there must ever be a difference so wide as to be absolutely irreconcilable, between the foundations upon which these expressions of feeling are respectively based. We hold it to be simply impossible that any one but a Catholic can approach, for instance, the subject of the adorable Passion, with the requisite qualification for indulging his devotion upon it. The doctrine of the Incarnation must be, not merely (as the phrase is) "held;" it must be *worked into* the mind by habitually acting upon it; and this, out of the Catholic Church is impossible without a miracle. It is no blame to a person that he cannot effect without circumstances, what another naturally effects with their aid. "He speaks to me that never had a child," says the poet of nature. Whatever approximation Dr. Pusey may make to Catholic doctrine, can he, we ask, perform the particular act called *hearing Mass* every day of his life? He would be the last person to answer such a question in the affirmative; he has his system, and we have our religion, and he is satisfied without even, (as some foolish people about him do,) *affecting* what is no part of his system. But then, it may be, that the Sacrifice of the Mass, not held as a doctrine merely, or insinuated under an equivocal phrase in the Communion Office, but openly taught and habitually acted on, is the appointed condition of making the Incarnation of our Lord a matter of *practical belief*. And if so, in the devotional expressions which are the result of this belief, there may be an external and superficial correspondence with such as are not, and yet between the two a real difference, as great as that between mere eloquence or mere sentiment, and what we understand by the term, devotion. This is a great subject, which none but a Catholic can appreciate, but which they especially are said to understand, by joyful, but yet incommunicable, experience, who have passed from Protestantism and Anglicanism into the Catholic Church: To convince opponents of this difference, is as hard as to teach the blind the idea of colour; but it ought not to be

so hard for a candid and intelligent person out of the Catholic Church, to understand that there may be something in this argument; and if there be, that this something must be the turning point of the question.

We have spoken of this experimental knowledge of Catholic doctrine as necessary towards deepening and (if we may so speak) consolidating, devotional feeling. But surely it is not less necessary towards *adjusting* the claims of different objects of devotional affection. This is especially true of that with which we are most commonly reproached,—the *cultus* of our blessed Lady. We really do not see how the expressions which are in use among us can ever be made to appear defensible in the eyes of a Protestant or an Anglican, without putting *our* eyes into *their* heads; for our own part, we have long since abandoned the attempt as hopeless. These expressions are the language of love, and the language of love was never meant to be taken to pieces, and made the subject of cold, dry criticism by those who do not love. How easy would it be to convict a mother's rapturous words of theological inexactitude, as well as utter absurdity, if any one had the heart to enter on such an undertaking! A very unwelcome counsellor, we trow, would he be, who should undertake to prescribe to a parent, the measure of her expressions in her intercourse with a dear and only child; who should be continually at her ear with his officious "Beware of idolatry." The mother would answer (of course we suppose her a Christian mother) that she knew herself better than her monitor can do, and, therefore, knows how far she can safely go; and this, not according to the rules of system, but in obedience to the dictates of nature. One *kind* of affection is not converted into a distinct kind by being carried to the highest extent of which it admits: and thus in charging the language of love with excess, you make no approach whatever towards proving it to be divine worship.* But then we admit that unless a person *energizes* in this higher kind of affection, the habitual use of such expressions will

* Of course, we do not mean the case of a mother and child as parallel in all respects to that of Our Lady's clients and herself, but only as an illustration, falling within the experience of the objectors. The love of Catholics towards the Blessed Mother of God is infinitely purer than even the purest human affection, and

tend to supersede it in his mind. And thus it is that the objections which Anglicans bring to our language about our Blessed Lady appear to us to be at the same time most absurd and quite beyond the reach of mere controversy, because the true answer to them is one of those matters of experience which are not only hard, but impossible, to establish by argument. And hence, when we are met by the objections which Dr. Pusey courteously, and the Exeter Hall orators rudely, make against our practice, that it is idolatrous, at least in tendency, we always feel two things; the first, that the proper idea of *worship* is really foreign to the mind of the objector; the second, that, such being the case, the objection, far from provoking us to anger, is entitled to a most forbearing treatment at our hands. For, in fact, objections to our practice made under the circumstance of the particular defect in question, are not merely reasonable; they are even solid. Dr. Pusey cannot go beyond ourselves in feeling that, on the lips of one of his disciples, our ordinary language towards our Blessed Lady would savour of idolatry. The true key to its interpretation is to be found in the doctrine and practice of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; concerning which we deem it neither presumption nor discourtesy to our Anglican opponents to say, that they lack as yet the very rudimental idea, and this solely because they know not as a Catholic knows, the power of the Holy Mass. Let them produce an expression from our writers which trenches upon the honour to our Incarnate Lord and to the Blessed Trinity which is involved in the *Mass*, (i. e., their appropriate and characteristic honour), and then, but not till then, they will have a right to expect an intelligible answer.

The same considerations apply to a subject which enters materially into Dr. Pusey's argument, the Worship of Images. It is to us, as it is to Mr. Dodsworth, a matter of astonishment how one who could pen the following sentence,

has within it that sort of running relation, (as we may call it,) to God and Heaven, which is a bar to any interference with the claims of the Creator. Maternal love on earth (there is no doubt,) involves a very serious "peril of idolatry." All we say is, that mere expressions prove nothing any way; whereas, it is upon these only that Protestants build their objection to the "*cultus*" of Our Lady.

“Who has not seen one kiss a picture of one loved, but absent,”
&c.—p. 147.

could, in the same breath, appeal to such an authority as *Dr. Arnold*, for a justification of his devotion to the Crucifix. *Dr. Arnold* had many good, and some great points; but he was characterized by denying that particular idea of christianity which *Dr. Pusey* is characterized by upholding; and the utmost to which his argument in favour of crucifixes amounts is this:—that the making of them does not militate against one of the Ten Commandments. *Dr. Pusey* needed not, one would have thought, have recurred to the judgment of a conspicuous heretic to prove as much as this; and if he means the argument as merely one *ad hominem*, certainly he pays *Dr. Blomfield* a poor compliment in advancing such a plea at his tribunal. But the point which *Dr. Pusey* has to show is, wherein those ardent acts of devotion towards the Crucifix which he justifies by the instance of the picture, differ from those which are in use among Catholics. Such actions as he describes are certainly inconsistent with treating a crucifix or other image as a mere memento. They amount, in fact, to all which we claim in asserting that the same honour is due to the representation as is due to the Original; not, however, for its own sake, but for the sake of that Original. This is certainly the approved doctrine of our greatest theologians; and we heartily wish it were acted upon by all Catholics just in the spirit of *Dr. Pusey's* defence. When *Dr. Pusey* justifies a Christian woman putting herself into the situation of *St. Mary Magdalene*, and kissing, and, if so be, bathing with penitential tears, the feet of a crucifix, he really contends for treating the representation as the Original, which is the precise teaching of *St. Thomas*. In fact, no other view is reasonable, because none other is *natural* to a devout mind. But words of endearment or acts of homage addressed to a crucifix, are expressions of *worship*, or they are nothing; were the idea of divine worship to be studiously and habitually separated from them, they would be far worse than vain; for how could such a process be otherwise than fatal in time, to the sort of feeling which we should entertain towards our Lord Himself? It is through the senses that such feelings are either deepened or dissipated. But after all, such an apprehension is purely hypothetical; for they who have devotion enough to kiss a crucifix, will certainly

not have cool calculation enough to prevent themselves from worshipping it. Nor need they be constantly reminded that this worship is *relative* only, (as of course it is), for the idea that it is absolute and final (though divines find it necessary to suppose such a heresy in order to protest against it), is far too monstrous to be dangerous. We are by no means insensible to the peril in which many Catholics stand of *superstition*; but neither our experience nor our inquiries have ever resulted in the impression that idolatry is a practical danger among us. As respects the veneration of Images and Relics, neither of the *criteria* upon which Protestants rest are worth even so much as discussing; we mean, on the one hand, devotional *phrases*, and on the other, devotional *gestures*. For as to the former, the *clue* to such phrases is (as we have already shown) in the experimental belief of Catholics; and, as to the latter, they are surely to be interpreted by the intention of the mind which they express, (on the one hand), and, (on the other), by the claims of the Object to which they are *implicitly* directed.

While our sheets are passing through the press, various occurrences prove that Dr. Pusey is still anxious to right himself with the public. The skirmish with Mr. Dodsworth has been prolonged by the interchange of one or two "passes," which come, however, too late in the current month for a distinct notice in our pages; and while we write these lines, Dr. Pusey is in possession of the field with a letter in the *Guardian* newspaper of March 19th, in which he so far deviates from his expressed intention of maintaining a strict reserve about his sisterhood, as to state circumstances relative to the admission of some of its members. The discussion of such matters in the pages of a newspaper has to our eyes, an undignified appearance, but every allowance should be made for a position so very anomalous as that which Dr. Pusey occupies. We suppose Mr. Dodsworth will hardly feel it worth while to prolong the dispute, which, as it now turns upon the memory of facts not probably noted at the time in anticipation of their being ever called in question, is not likely to be brought to a speedy or satisfactory issue.

Meanwhile, a new opponent to Dr. Pusey has started up from the ranks of his own church, and his own section of it; and one, we must add, far less measured in his tone of reproach, than Mr. Dodsworth, who is a Catholic.

The Rev. William Palmer, one of the original Tract-writers, has published (in the newspapers again) a letter to the Bishop of London, in which he indignantly disclaims sympathy with Dr. Pusey's course, and objects to the use which Dr. Pusey has made of his name and his theological statements. Dr. Pusey replies, through the same channel, that he did not mean to claim Mr. Palmer as an ally, and so the matter ends for the present. All this time the Bishop of London, who both of right and by invitation is the umpire of the whole question, holds himself aloof, quiescent, but far from easy. And the Catholic Church holds herself aloof also, awaiting the end, and too secure in her strength to be solicitous about it. One by one the more thoughtful and conscientious members of the Anglican communion will drop off from it, or rather be left by it, and then they will be taken home, like the foundlings who strew the banks of the Chinese rivers, by a mother who seeks not strangers, till they begin to cry to her for help, but who is ever at hand to fulfil her Lord's mission to the spiritual as well as the natural orphan, and who can make up to her children a hundredfold for all, and more than all, that they can ever lose in finding her.

Rev. J. Oatley (Emon)

ART. VII.—1. *The Address of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland to their beloved flocks.* Dublin: Duffy.

2. *Is the Papal Supremacy recognized by the Law of England? or is the Papal Hierarchy Legal?* By a Member of the Middle Temple. London: Richardson, 1851.

IT is not improbable, that before this paper meets the reader's eye, the last remains of the anti-hierarchical agitation will have died away. The legislature will either have passed a measure, which will render remonstrance vain, or will have refused to make any new enactment, which will make any explanation superfluous. It is more, therefore, by way of placing documents on record, than as wishing to aid deliberation, that we venture now, we trust for the last time, to put forward our sentiments on the question which still occupies the public mind.

The following remarks were indeed strung together at an earlier stage of the controversy: but events have run faster than debates, and the changes of years have been condensed into the space of a few weeks. Nor can the most sagacious of us conjecture what is in the morrow's womb.

Among the many writings, to which the establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy in England has given rise, a pamphlet by Lord St. Germans* is perhaps the most distinguished, for straightforward, dispassionate, and simple argument. As coming from a nobleman of high character, and not a Catholic, it justly produced a very beneficial effect. We happened to be mentioning, to a friend, the existence of documents to prove the views of Mr. Pitt's ministry on the present subject of controversy, collected by the late Sir John Cox Hippisley, when he gave us the pamphlet, not yet published, to peruse; observing that the subject was there alluded to.

On reading this excellent tract, it occurred to us, that it merited further attention, for a twofold purpose. The first is to strengthen some of his Lordship's statements by further evidence: the second to explain what he appears to have unintentionally misunderstood. At this moment, particularly, when we may trust, that the hour of clamour is past, and the time for reasoning is come, it seems important to collect whatever may serve as materials for arriving at just conclusions.

By this means also, we shall be able to explain, more fully, some important points touched upon in Cardinal Wiseman's "Appeal," called most unwarrantably in the papers a "Manifesto." That paper was written while His Eminence was at St. George's Church, not only without the command of books, but without access to memorandums or other documents; and we shall now be enabled to avail ourselves of this opportunity, to develop, or modify, one or two statements there made.

I. We will begin with the earlier history of the Hierarchy.

It is admitted, by all our ecclesiastical historians,

* "Reasons for not signing an Address to Her Majesty, on the subject of the so-called Papal Aggression." Second Edition. Ridgway.

that the appointment of Vicars Apostolic in England was only a temporary measure, and that it did not meet with the general approbation of the clergy. Dodd may be considered as representing, or giving expression to, the feelings of the discontented party. He maintains, incorrectly, that the first bishop, (Dr. Bishop) who was sent over by the Holy See, after an interruption of succession of many years, came with more extensive and independent powers than his successor, Dr. Smith. But this mistake, which Mr. Tierney has exposed,* leads him to express his views respecting the appointment of "an Ordinary" for England, with the title of Chalcedon. He does so in the following words.

"The discipline of the Church required that no Bishop should be consecrated without a title; and it being not safe to consecrate a bishop to any of the sees in England, for fear of exasperating the government, and raising a persecution, it was judged most proper to ordain a bishop titular of some vacant see among the infidels, and then assign him his power and jurisdiction in England ... though there were ancient sees enough in the nation; as Hexham in Northumberland, afterwards removed to York; and Lindisfarne, removed to Durham; and Dorchester in Oxfordshire, removed to Lincoln; with many others in several counties, to which a bishop might have been consecrated as safely, and with as little offence to the government, as to Chalcedon; † because they were as little known, or mentioned, or even thought of. But this was either not reflected on, or disregarded." †

In this remarkable passage, we find one of the most learned of the Catholic priesthood of England, above a hundred years ago, making these statements: 1. That the only ground for not consecrating or appointing a bishop to a see, occupied by an Anglican bishop in 1623, was fear of persecution. 2. That this would have been

* "Dodd's Church History of England." By the Rev. M. Tierney, vol. iv. p. cclxxiii. *note*, and cclxxx. *note*.

† When the re-establishment of the hierarchy was entertained in the last pontificate, it was proposed (among others by Cardinal Acton) to take all the new titles from ancient, but now suppressed, sees. This would have been a plausible, but inconvenient, arrangement.

‡ *Ibid, text.*

avoided, and no offence given to the government, even in those days, by a Catholic bishop being appointed with the title of an English see, if not actually occupied by a Protestant. And, as if to make the observation more striking, he selects, by way of illustration, one of the very sees now chosen. 3. He regrets that this course was not adopted from the beginning, instead of the provisional arrangement by vicars apostolic.

If such was the reasoning of one who himself knew the full rigour of the penal laws, concerning a period not beyond the reach of immediate traditions, when "exasperating the government" signified calling forth arbitrary and irresponsible proclamations, and "raising a persecution" meant renewing confiscations, banishment, imprisonment, and death, one cannot be surprised that the Catholics, restored to equal rights with their fellow subjects, and freed from fear of legal murder, and, it is to be hoped, of capricious legislation, should have thought the time at length come, for obtaining that ecclesiastical government, which their fathers, amidst their groans and perils, considered to be their due.

After the death of the second Vicar Apostolic, Dr. Smith, who passed the latter years of his life in banishment, there was another break in the succession, which lasted thirty years. He died in 1658. Under James II. Dr. Leyburn was first appointed Vicar Apostolic of all England; and then shared the administration with Dr. Giffard. Two more were added to their number, and thus was completed that "territorial" distribution of England into four vicariates, which continued till 1840. Here was a second and original reorganisation of the ecclesiastical government of Catholics. It must be observed, however, that even a persecuting government had been too wise not to permit the exercise of jurisdiction by the holy see, over Catholics in the realm.* In this interval, more than one ecclesiastical agent from Rome had come over to restore peace among contending parties, and confer with the ministers of state respecting the condition of Catholic affairs. And one of the great demands of the clergy was ever for a bishop. † What

* They were then calculated at 150,000, with a thousand priests to minister to their spiritual wants.

† We have before us a copy of a MS. in the Library of

followed, however, on this second nomination of vicars apostolic, we will relate in the words of an author, whose sentiments on the subject of the hierarchy have been lately gathered, apparently from some hand-writing on the walls, or some lingering echoes in the corners, of the chambers which he occupied, by his successor in tenancy, if not in lore. For we have not much evidence in Mr. Purton Cooper's late lucubrations on the subject, that Mr. Charles Butler left his legal cloak behind him in his tenement.

"The appointment of vicars apostolic was not, in the first instance, acceptable to the general body of the secular clergy. They presented to James II., a memorial against the appointment of Dr. Leyburn. Having been desired by His Majesty to state the difference between a bishop in ordinary and a vicar-apostolic, they stated in their memorial, that 'by a bishop, who is an Ordinary, is meant one who hath power, of his own, or in himself, to govern the flock over which he is set; and while he acts accordingly, he is not responsible to any, or revocable at pleasure.'" Then follows more at length the description of a vicar apostolic, after which Mr. Butler adds:

"Such were the sentiments of the secular clergy. But after the appointment of vicars apostolic was made, they acquiesced in it."*

Again, therefore, we have evidence of the anxious desire of the Catholic clergy to have, in England, the regular hierarchical government of the Church. It is certainly no new idea on their part.

During the earlier part of the following century, there occurred no opportunity of giving expression to their feelings on this subject. The system was established, and the millstone of a heavy, though now less sanguinary, persecution, still hung around their necks. As late as 1769, a vicar apostolic, the Hon. James Talbot, was tried for his life at the Old Bailey, for saying Mass. Still the the expressions of Dodd, above quoted, betray

Vienna, (No. 6547. fol.) of the reign of James I., (1611,) written by an Englishman to be laid before the Pope. The fourth chapter forms the bulk of the work, and is entitled: "De remedii malorum, et de Episcoporum in Anglia necessitate."

* "Historical Memoirs." 2nd Ed., vol. ii., p. 285.

the habitual feelings of the body. Towards the close of the century, the relaxation of the penal laws commenced, and attention began to be paid, both by themselves and by government, to the ecclesiastical position of Irish and English Catholics.

Indeed, we come now to what must be a painful topic to all Catholics; but one which may serve to correct erroneous notions lately put forth, on the subject of our hierarchy. For it is singular that opposition to this form of government should now be considered a badge of Cisalpine opinions, as they are called; and the recent existence of a "Cisalpine Club" has been alluded to, as a proof that the principles on which the hierarchy is based were not held by leading Catholics. The contrary, however, is the case.

In 1783 a "Catholic committee" was formed for "managing the public affairs of the Catholics of this kingdom." The first document which issued from it, was dated May 24, of that year. It consists, in part, of an attack on government by vicars apostolic: and the committee offers its assistance "to aid and support in taking such measures as may be effectual to constitute them with full power of ordinaries: in order that the frequent recurrence to Rome for dispensations, and other ecclesiastical matters, might cease." In 1787, the same committee put forth another declaration, complaining that "they are governed, not by diocesan bishops, but by superiors, commissioned by Rome." They further complain that this form of government "is in direct opposition to the statute of *Præmunire* and *Provisors*:" and go on to say: "when you reflect that it is the duty of christians to make the discipline of their church to conform as near as may be to the laws of their country, your committee doubt not but you will concur with them in thinking, that it is incumbent on us to use our endeavours, to procure the nomination of bishops in ordinary."*

This committee, having its duration for five years from the last date, met on the 13th of April, 1792, and formed themselves into a club, under the name of the "Cisalpine Club." The avowed purpose of the association was, to get rid of the vicarial government, and

* Milner's Supplementary Memoirs, pp. 47, 49, 99.

substitute ordinary bishops. It is true that the principles on which it advocated the change were erroneous, and untenable, and therefore were warmly combated by Milner and others: * but the fact is certain, that the now quoted Cisalpine Club avowed hostility to vicars apostolic; so that reference to it, as opposed to a hierarchy, is peculiarly unhappy.

At the same time it would be most unjust to consider that Club during the present generation, as any representative of a peculiar body of politico-theological opinions. The course of the French Revolution opened the eyes of many, and a higher interest in the cause of religion concurred to make the great body of our Catholic laity, noble or not, what it is the pride of our church to see them, sound Catholics without party divisions, zealous promoters of the education and happiness of the poor, practical examples of virtue, and faithful children of their Church. Nothing is more consoling, or more edifying, than the harmonious co-operation between clergy and laity, which, for years, has distinguished our body. Our poor-school system is the best proof of this.

So far, as to Catholics themselves. Now let us consider the views of government.

Whoever studies the history of Catholic emancipation will perceive how much the efforts of its zealous partizans were clogged, by the necessity of humouring the demand for securities. The entire *Veto* controversy turns upon that: and we find men like Sir John Cox Hippisley, Mr. Canning, and Mr. Grattan, proposing

* It is not necessary to refer more specially to this controversy; but it is clear that even Bishop Milner considered the government by vicars only temporary, and expedient under circumstances, which, thank God, have now ceased. "There is no question in our circumstances about the filling up of episcopal sees, or the appointment of ordinary bishops; because we are in extraordinary circumstances. We are no national church, we are only a handful of Catholics..... We have lost our hierarchy, and should have been equally deprived of our ministry but for the bounty, no less than the paternal solicitude of the successors of St. Peter. We, the clergy of this kingdom, are not a stationary clergy, but are, to a man of us, missionaries ordained in foreign countries,..... after having been educated, at least the greater part of us, at the expense of His Holiness."—A Clergyman's answer to a Layman's letter, p. 15.

conditions and pledges of a cumbersome nature, in conjunction with measures of relief; pledges which they themselves considered quite unnecessary.* Even when the Catholic Relief Bill was passed, it was admitted by the Duke of Wellington, that concessions were made to the feelings of the Establishment, which, in truth, would give it no security.

No unauthorised person ever took more interest, or was more active in our affairs than the Baronet just named. At Rome, in Ireland, and in England, he kept up an active correspondence; and he became a self-constituted negotiator between the different parties interested in Catholic emancipation, at home and abroad. The information which he thus collected became valuable; and at length, after much correspondence with Lord Castlereagh, secretary for Ireland, the Duke of Portland, on the 25th of Nov., 1799, expressed a wish to have a summary made out, by a confidential person, of all that had passed between the representatives of such various interests. Sir John compiled it himself, and had it printed, without a title, in a thin 4to. volume.† The copy before us is headed, in his own hand, "*Private, For Sir Arthur Pigott, &c., &c., with Sir J. C. Hippisley's best compts.*" The account of the origin of the correspondence is written at the beginning, evidently by Sir J. C. Hippisley, and often corrected by himself. We may therefore consider the statements made in such a document, as entitled to every attention. The following extract is long; but contains important information.

"In England the Ecclesiastical government of the Roman Catholic subjects of his Majesty is delegated by the Pope to four Bishops *in Partibus* as his *Apostolic Vicars*. Each of these Vicars

* So Mr. Grattan declared in 1813.

† The MS. title on the margin of the first page is as follows: "Summary of correspondence in 1799-1800, chiefly with Lord Castlereagh, when chief Secretary for Ireland." "Original summary drawn up at the desire of the Duke of Portland, when Secretary of State for the Home Department, and copy transmitted to Mr. Pitt." At the end is the following memorandum in the Baronet's hand: "The preceding summary was transmitted to the Duke of Portland and Mr. Pitt, 10th Sept. 1800."

has ordinarily a coadjutor, who succeeds him in cases of death or removal.

* * * * *

“The Apostolic Vicars exercise a jurisdiction only in countries where the Roman Hierarchy has been discontinued, as Bishops Ordinaries do in those countries where it has been preserved; in the latter predicament Ireland has been considered by Rome.

“The Apostolic Vicars may be removed by the See of Rome at pleasure. The Bishops Ordinaries, once appointed, can only be removed for some great canonical offence proved upon them by process canonically instituted. Apostolic Vicars, as Delegates of the See of Rome, can, by their special faculties, suspend or remove the inferior clergy, at their pleasure: but Bishops Ordinaries, though they appoint the parochial clergy, cannot suspend or remove them but for canonical offences, which also must be canonically proved.

* * * * *

“The eligibility of the [appointment of Titular Prelates in *Ordinary* in Great Britain in the same manner as in Ireland, may also become hereafter a subject of very beneficial consideration and arrangement.

“Such a change may probably be opposed by the established Clergy, who may think that Roman Catholic Bishops *Ordinaries*, though merely titular, thus appointed with the concurrence of Government, might seem to trench upon the prerogative of the Established Church.

“In Ireland nearly the same Metropolitan and suffragan sees are preserved in either Communion, and it would be difficult to effect a change:—In England it might be otherwise, the Titular Sees, or Districts of Roman Catholic Bishops Ordinaries, might retain the description of the Districts which are at present allotted to the Apostolic Vicars. The style of the Ordinaries might then be Bishops of the Northern, Midland, Eastern, and Western Districts, avoiding the titles of the Sees of the Established Church, and retaining also their nominal Sees *in Partibus*, though ceasing to be Apostolic Vicars.

“It certainly would materially contribute to the gratification of the community of the British Roman Catholics, and remove, at a still greater distance, the possible interference of a foreign authority by getting rid of all *Vicarial* and delegated power from Rome, which might be extended to an interference eventually dangerous to the State, the delegation of Apostolic Vicars being wholly at the pleasure of the sovereign Pontiff; “*Ad nostrum et sedis Apostolicæ beneplacitum.*” Of this interference our auces-

tors, in the time of Edward III. and Richard II., were as jealous as the most rigid adherents to the Church Establishment of the present age, and the statutes of *Provisors* and *Praemunire* still remain as monuments of their provident care.

“By some it had been considered doubtful whether Rome would consent to limit her ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Great Britain to titular Bishops Ordinaries, abandoning thereby the extensive powers delegated to her Apostolic Vicars. On this subject Sir I. H.—, in the years 1794 and 1795, had repeated conferences with the principal ministers of the late Pope, and particularly with Cardinal Antonelli, then at the head of the college of *Propaganda Fide*, (which has the exclusive superintendence of the missions.) His Eminence assured Sir I. H., that no obstacle would be opposed by Rome to such a regulation; but, on the other hand, Rome would not listen to the applications of the British Roman Catholics in favour of the change, unless countenanced by His Majesty’s government.

“In the construction of many Catholics, the powers delegated to Vicars Apostolic are incompatible with the independent principles of their protestation under the Act of 31st of Geo. III., and the security given to the State, under that act, is consequently imperfect.

“The Vicars being *mere agents* of the See of Rome, possess not the *canonical rights* with which Bishops Ordinaries are constitutionally invested, they have *no power to deliberate and consult whether they shall publish a Bull from Rome or not*; they must obey, and in this respect, in many instances they fall under the statutes of *Provisors* and *Praemunire*, as well as the 13th of Elizabeth.

“If canonically published, the great majority of the Catholics hold such Bulls to be binding on their consciences;—were the British prelates of the Roman Communion constituted Bishops Ordinaries, as in Ireland, they would then have an unquestionable canonical power to receive or reject any Bull from the See of Rome which they might deem objectionable.

“In many instances it is contended, and not without reason, that the exercise of spiritual authority, as delegated to the Apostolic Vicars, has often produced a civil effect, trenching on constitutional civil rights. *The appeal is now only to Rome*;—to the same authority which is delegated, and *the appeal to Rome is against law*. It would be otherwise in the case of Bishops Ordinaries, who would be relieved from any injurious interference of a foreign authority commanding their submission, and thus producing a conflict of contrasted duties.”—pp. 6—9.

We will add only a few observations. Sir John Hippisley is entirely mistaken respecting the possibility of such a hierarchy as he suggests; of bishops in ordinary

in England, with foreign sees; for example, a bishop of Chalcedon, and at the same time bishop of "the northern district." Such an arrangement would be new, unheard of, and simply impossible. If local or ordinary bishops were expedient for England, in preference to Vicars Apostolic, there was no alternative but that their sees should be in the country, where their jurisdiction lay. Again, no Catholic will agree with what is said respecting the danger to civil fidelity from the government of Vicars Apostolic: and we are sure many will disagree, as we certainly do, from what is stated on the subject of our being more detached from the Holy See by a hierarchical government. In fine, it is not as representing Catholic principles or feelings, nor as accurate in its theology or law, that we quote this passage.

But it must be deemed of some importance as showing, at the beginning of this century, exactly the opposite principles and feelings in statesmen, and in statesmen of no small eminence, from what, now half a century later, animate that class. The substitution of bishops in ordinary for vicars apostolic, was then deemed the most powerful means of securing and consolidating the fidelity of Catholics to the Crown of these realms: and for reconciling the minds of Protestants to further concessions of religious freedom. But now the same measure is spoken of as incompatible with the rights of the established religion, and the national liberties. The former was the sentiment of the tory, the latter is of the liberal, party!

To the speech quoted by Lord St. Germans, Sir J. C. Hippisley published supplementary notes* containing "Extracts from the substance of additional observations intended to have been delivered in the debate on the petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, on the 14th May, 1805." At p. 33, he repeats much of what we have given above from him, nearly verbatim. But the following additional remarks seem worthy of transcription. He alludes to a wish that had been expressed, "that the practice of the Catholic religion in Ireland, as to government, should be put on the same footing as it is in Great Britain."

* London, Ridgway, 1812, 2nd Ed.

“Now, Sir, I am so far from agreeing with the noble Lord in a wish to promote such a change as he professes to think desirable in Ireland, that I shall ever be of opinion, that while we are necessarily obliged, in justice, and policy, to tolerate, at least, the practice of the Roman Catholic religion among any part of our fellow-subjects, it would be highly desirable that the superior clergy should exercise an *ordinary* jurisdiction, circumscribed and limited by the known canons of the Church, in *spirituals*, rather than, as the case is at present in England, a *vicarial* and *indefinite* authority from the See of Rome. Were the constitution of the Roman Church government the same in Great Britain as in Ireland, we certainly should find the *possible* interference of foreign authority removed to a still greater distance, by thus getting rid of vicarial, or delegated power.

“I do not wish here to enter into an examination of the different opinions entertained by Catholics on this subject: I speak only to the fact, that in this respect, no inconsiderable number of Roman Catholics in Great Britain have expressed a wish to be so far on a footing with their fellow subjects in Ireland. The Vicars apostolic themselves also must naturally incline to such a reform, as investing them with an authority more agreeable to themselves, and more congenial to the constitution of their country.

“I can speak with the greater confidence on this point, it being one of the many considerations connected with this important subject, on which I have heard much discussion, both in this country, and also many years since, from the highest authorities in the quarter from which such a reform must originate, if at all.—I am persuaded also that there are many prelates of the established Church who view it in the same light, and are of opinion, that regulations might be made without difficulty, to guard against any possible encroachment of the See of Rome on the national Church, either in *name*, *power*, or *dignity*. With equal confidence I can affirm, that it would not have been opposed in the quarter to which I have alluded, if it had been considered as a reform, sanctioned with the concurrence of his Majesty’s Government.

“In this view of the subject, it is difficult to conceive how a preference can be given to the delegated Roman ecclesiastical government, as existing in Great Britain, though exercised as it is by prelates of approved and exemplary loyalty, to the exclusion of that canonically regulated system which is subject, in the instances I have described, comparatively, to much less dependance on a foreign jurisdiction.”—p. 33-35.

We have it here stated, upon very competent authority, that the Catholic laity with whom Sir John was in close intimacy, desired earnestly in 1805, to have the Hier-

archy in England. And it must be observed that the Rt. Rev. Dr. Milner looked over this paper of the Baronet, and added marginal notes. But to this statement he appends no correction. We further find an able, and well informed man, instead of being afraid of the canons forming the ecclesiastical code of English Catholics, alleging their necessary adoption under a hierarchical constitution, as a motive in favour of this form of government. In short, we have one who, while he greatly interested himself in Catholic affairs, was a most zealous stickler for securities as conditions of concession, most strongly urging the establishment of a hierarchy in England, as the best possible security. Catholics, therefore, and Protestants concurred at that period in desiring, or at least approving, of the change. Is it a mark of progress in liberality, or religious freedom, that now Protestants should consider it an act of aggression, an insult to the throne, and a peril to the nation? During the years immediately following, we have not endeavoured to trace the feelings of Catholics on this subject. The great measure of relief, first more earnestly sought, and then obtained, gave an interval of effort and of consequent repose, during which lesser matters remained in abeyance. In a few years, however, the natural impulses of Catholic feeling resumed their sway, and the subject of the hierarchy became warmly agitated in our body. In the "Catholic Magazine" for 1835, there is a correspondence traversing the entire volume, in which the subject is discussed by several writers. We refer to these letters, not with approbation of their tone and style (with exceptions, however,) nor of the principles maintained on one side of the question. But the editor, in his preface to the volume, clearly intimates an intention of making the discussion of the hierarchy a leading topic of his periodical. "We have thought," he says, "that as no subject is more interesting to the clergy than the restoration of the only recognised system of ecclesiastical government, it becomes a proper subject of discussion in our pages." He also refers to a previous number, in which he had stated, that "unfortunately this island once lost its hierarchy, and notwithstanding the universal aspirations of the second order of the clergy, it is to be feared, that measures are not yet contemplated for its restoration;" that "it may be well to

intimate to those whom it may seem to concern more immediately," (the Vicars Apostolic,) that "the clergy were becoming restless upon the subject," and "that a movement, strong, but orderly, was daily making progress, and that nothing could repress it, but the just concession of that ecclesiastical government, which only is recognised by the spirit and genius of the Christian religion."*

And yet, now it is pretended, that only the bishops have ambitiously pushed for the hierarchy, against the wishes of the clergy!

This sketch may suffice to connect the earliest period of the hierarchy question with that at which it is taken up in the Cardinal's "Appeal." It shows the desire of it, and the movement to procure it, to be nothing new in Catholic England; but as old as the existence of the vicariate form of government. It proves how groundless is the argument, that as the Catholics had been content with that form "for three hundred years," † they might still have gone on with it. They never have been content with it: there has been a continual anxiety to exchange the temporary, for the normal, constitution of the Church. It shows, likewise, that the hierarchy, when at length granted, was no sudden or aggressive measure, nor a "move" on the part of the Holy See, but a long-sighed for concession from it, to the clergy, after earnest petition.

II. Why was not Government consulted on the subject?

The Earl of St. Germans expressed a wish that the Pope had postponed the adoption of this measure till it should have been "expressly desired by the English government." We think no one will hesitate to say, that this would have been equivalent to delaying it indefinitely, or rather for ever. Lord John Russell, in 1848, openly declared that he would not give his consent, if asked, to the establishment of our hierarchy. As the passage is very important, we will extract it from the very useful little compilation, entitled, "Political Opinions on the Roman Catholic Question, by the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P." ‡

* Pp. 5 and 3.

† So Lord J. Russell has stated, but this is an erroneous calculation.

‡ Messrs. Richardson and Son.

“ An honourable gentleman has asked me some questions with regard to certain proceedings that have taken place. I do not know whether he means to ask me now with respect to the creation of Roman Catholic Archbishoprics in England. I do not know that the Pope has authorized in any way, by any authority he may have, the creation of any archbishopric or bishopric with dioceses in England; but certainly I have not given my consent—nor should I give my consent if I were asked to do so—to any such formation of dioceses. With regard to spiritual authority, the honourable gentleman must see, when he alludes to other states in Europe, that whatever control is to be obtained over the spiritual authority of the Pope, can only be obtained by agreement for that end. You must either give certain advantages to the Roman Catholic religion, and obtain from the Pope certain advantages in return, among which you must stipulate that the Pope shall not create any dioceses in England without the consent of the Queen; or, on the other hand, you must say that you will have nothing to do with arrangements of that kind—that you will not consent, in any way, to give any authority to the Roman Catholic religion in England. For my own part, I am not disposed to think that it would be for the advantage of this country, or that it would be agreeable to the Roman Catholics, that we should have an agreement with the Pope, by which their religious arrangements should be regulated. But although you may prevent any spiritual authority being exercised by the Pope by law, yet there is no provision—no law—my honourable friend could frame that would deprive the Pope of that influence which is merely exercised over the mind, or that would preclude him from giving advice to those that chose to attend to such advice. It is quite obvious that you cannot by any means and authority whatever prevent the Pope from communicating with the Catholics of this country. You may try to prevent such communication from being open; but I think it would be very foolish if you took any means of great vigour and energy for that purpose. If, however, such communication is not open, it will be secret. So long as there are Roman Catholics in the country, and so long as they acknowledge the Pope as the head of their Church, you cannot prevent his having spiritual influence over those who belong to that communion.”*

With this statement Catholics in Rome were well acquainted. It is at once an answer both to Lord St. Germans, and to others, who have thought that the minister's consent should have been asked, before the step was taken. Surely it is not necessary to ask leave, when you know beforehand it will be refused.

* Debate on Diplomatic Relations' Bill, Aug. 17, 1848, p. 31.

And if this declaration is sufficient proof that the hierarchy was not to be obtained by negotiation, it is surely a much more effectual bar to any hope that it would ever have been "expressly desired," by the present, or any other Protestant ministry. But when you are told beforehand that some one intends to refuse his consent to a measure which you propose, you naturally ask, if that consent, however desirable or advisable, be *necessary*? If not, there may be reasons why such consent had better not be asked. This will be often the more delicate course, and the one preferred by him who withholds consent.

These are therefore two important enquiries: and we proceed to answer them. Was it necessary to ask the Prime Minister's consent to the establishment of our ecclesiastical hierarchy?

Lord John Russell has here answered the question himself. You must either give the Catholics some advantage, and stipulate in return, that the Pope shall not "create any dioceses without the consent of the queen," or you must not have anything to do with the matter. Now for his own part, his Lordship declares, that he considers the latter course "for the advantage of the country," and more "agreeable to Catholics;" and therefore he naturally adopts it. What then follows? Why, that there is no legal obstacle to the Pope's creating dioceses, without Her Majesty's consent. Only a concordat can prevent him.

But from antecedents, had we any reason to suppose that we ought to have asked consent? This brings us to explain and enlarge on, some of the cases alleged in the "Appeal." As we have already observed, there were not at hand, when it was written, sources of accurate information; and we are empowered to correct some slight, and unintentional inaccuracies. For this purpose we will trace more minutely the history of the establishment of the Catholic hierarchy in our North American provinces; as it will thereby appear, how gradual, and well considered were the steps by which it reached its accomplishment. The details will perhaps be somewhat tedious, but they may have their use.

Mgr. Plessis, bishop of Quebec, wrote to Propaganda, Sept. 14th, 1814, that he had not succeeded in getting himself legally recognized as bishop, nor in being able

to propose the division of his immense diocese into several bishoprics or coadjutorships. In 1817, to reward his services to the government during the last American war, Lord Sherbrooke proposed, and the Prince Regent issued through Lord Bathurst, a *mandamus*, by which Mgr. Plessis was admitted into the Legislative Council of Canada, under the title of Bishop of the Catholic Church of Quebec. In the same year, Lord Castle-reagh wrote to Cardinal Consalvi that his court would agree to the erection of three Vicariates (not Dioceses however,) viz., Upper Canada, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward's Island. Mgr. Plessis agreed to this, *provided it should be considered a preparation for the erection of a proper Ecclesiastical Province in Canada*. Hereupon Pius VII. approved the petition of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, held Nov. 23, 1818, by which Mgr. Plessis was declared Archbishop of Quebec, without suffragans, but with two auxiliaries or Vicars, Dr. MacDonnell for U. Canada, and Dr. MacEachern for N. Brunswick, &c. This displeased Lord Bathurst, *because the Protestants had only a bishop and not an archbishop in Quebec*. On this occasion two other Episcopal Vicars auxiliary were named; Mgr. Lartigue for Montreal, and Mgr. Provencher for the north portion of Quebec. In 1825 Lord Bathurst, (so Dr. Poynter writes,) would not for many reasons agree to the erection of Montreal into a Diocese, but he was willing, in order to manage the many Irish settlers there, that Dr. MacDonnell should be declared *Bishop Ordinary* of Upper Canada.* In 1826, Feb. 2, Dr. Poynter wrote, that *Lord Bathurst would leave the Holy See quite free in erecting the Vicariate of Prince Edward's Island into a Bishopric*, provided it should be independent of Quebec. In 1836, 1837, a correspondence took place between Lord Gosford, Lord Glenelg, and others, regarding the See of Montreal, which deserves to be given more in detail.

LORD GLENELG TO LORD GOSFORD, May 20, 1836.

"My Lord,

"I have read and had under my consideration your Lordship's Despatch of the 9th Feb. last, No. 16, on the subject of the establishment of a second Roman Catholic

* Letters of Bishop Poynter, Nov. 2, 1824, Feb. 8, 1825.

See in Lower Canada, by the separation of the District of Montreal from that of Quebec. In your Despatch is endorsed a memorandum showing the correspondence which had passed between your Lordship's predecessor and this Department relative to the recognition by His Majesty's Government of Roman Catholic Bishops in the Province of Lower Canada. This question has also been brought under my notice by Dr. Bramston. I need not assure your Lordship of the anxiety which is felt by His Majesty's Government to take all necessary measures for supplying the wants, and for meeting the wishes of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Lower Canada, in regard to their religious instruction. But at the same time *the legal objections to the recognition by any formal instrument of a Roman Catholic Bishop within the British Dominions are insuperable*, and your Lordship will readily understand that the course pursued in the case of M. de Plessis, in the year 1817, for avoiding those objections, is no longer admissible. *I am happy, however, to feel that such recognition is not essential.* Neither Mgr. Panet, who immediately succeeded M. de Plessis, nor the present Roman Catholic Bishop of Quebec, have ever been recognized under that title by any more formal document than a Despatch, bearing the signature of the Secretary of State; and although Dr. Mac D., the Roman Catholic Bishop of Upper Canada, has a seat in the Legislative Council of that Province, he did not receive that distinction until some years after his investment with independent Episcopal authority; nor was he described in the mandamus under the sign manual by his local title. In regard to Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, a similar course appears to have been pursued; the Roman Catholic Bishops of those colonies having been merely sanctioned by letters from this department. His Majesty's Government are unwilling to pursue any course in this matter which might appear to be unprecedented or unusual. *But they at the same time desire to accede to the wishes of the Roman Catholic population on this subject*, supported as they are by your Lordship's recommendation, and enforced by Dr. Bramston. I shall be ready, therefore, to sanction in the same manner which was adopted in the case of Upper Canada and Nova Scotia, the appointment of a separate Roman Catholic Bishop for the District of Montreal, whenever the necessary arrangement shall have been completed by the Ecclesiastical authorities, and provided that your Lordship shall signify to me that the person to be named to that dignity is of strict moral conduct, of adequate learning, and of unquestionable loyalty. But it must of course be understood, that His Majesty's Government, in sanctioning this appointment, have no power to attach to the situation any secular advantages or emoluments of any kind.

"I have the honour, &c.,

"GLENELO."

Endorsed by Lord Glenelg.—“*Cannot recognize by formal instrument a Roman Catholic Bishop in the British dominions, but will sanction by a Despatch of the Colonial Secretary of State the appointment of a separate Roman Catholic Bishop for the District of Montreal, when the Ecclesiastical arrangements will be completed.*”

It appears, therefore, that Government could not sanction the nomination of new bishops, by any official act; but was glad that “such recognition was not essential.” But still a courteous recognition would be given of titles when bestowed by the Holy See.

The following documents refer to the same See of Montreal, and are of the following year. It must be observed that the appointments to the see and the coadjutorship, were both made by the pontifical authority alone, and not by concert with the State.

Lord Gosford to the Bishop of Montreal, 25 Jan., 1837.

“My dear Sir,

“I was anxious with the least possible delay to put you in possession of a copy of Lord Glenelg’s letter, conveying the king’s authority *for recognizing you as Bishop of Montreal*; but I was unfortunately so occupied at the time it left this, that I was precluded from accompanying it with the expression of gratification which I felt in receiving it, and also of assuring you of the pleasure it affords me in having been in any way instrumental in promotion of any object you were naturally so desirous of accomplishment. With every wish, &c.,

“GOSFORD.”

(Enclosure.)

“No. 150.

Downing Street, 2 Dec., 1836.

“My Lord,

“I have had the honour to receive your Despatch of the 8th Oct., No. 111, announcing that in conformity with the arrangement proposed in my Despatch of the 26th of May last, the necessary stages had been taken for dividing the Roman Catholic See of Quebec from that of Montreal, and for appointing the Rev. M. Lartigue to the Bishopric of the latter See. Under the circumstances, and adverting to the high character which M. Lartigue bears for moral conduct, for learning and for loyalty, I have much pleasure in conveying to you the authority *for recognizing him in the character of Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal*. I have the honour, &c.

“GLENELG.”

“MONSEIGNEUR THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF MONTREAL.

“ Monseigneur,

Sept. 9, 1837.

“I have been commanded by the Governor in Chief to acquaint you that the receipt of His Excellency's Despatch, reporting the appointment of the Rev. Ignatius Bourget to be your Coadjutor has recently been acknowledged by the Secretary of State, and it affords His Excellency great pleasure to have it in his power to communicate to you, that he has been informed by the Secretary of State, that in laying the Despatch in question before the Queen, Her Majesty was graciously pleased, *so far as it is competent to Her Majesty, to sanction this appointment, or necessary that such a sanction should be given, to signify her approval of it.* I have, &c.,

“ WALCOTT, Civil Secretary.”

A curious circumstance occurred, with respect to this appointment, which shows the jealousy of the Canadian bishops, about any State interference with their nomination. In the Registers of Canada, it had been stated, that Dr. Bourget had taken the Oath of Allegiance “*until the queen's pleasure with regard to his nomination could be known.*” He objected to this entry, and in May, 1840, the local government declared the entry erroneous, and ordered it to be amended in this form: “*Dr. B. has taken the oath as Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church of Montreal.*” In 1837, Dr. Mac Donnell had tried to persuade the home government, through Lord Gosford, Governor General, to recognize an ecclesiastical province in Canada, if the Holy See should be willing to establish one, but he died before anything was obtained, and the outbreak prevented any further mention of the subject. In the autumn of 1839, Dr. Bourget spoke to Lord Sydenham, (Poulett Thompson) on this matter, and he appeared favourable. Lord S. gave him a letter of introduction to Lord John Russell, then, we believe, (1841) Secretary for the Colonies, in order, that if the Holy See should agree to the erection of Canada into a Province, Dr. B. might, in passing through London, treat with Lord John of the civil recognition of this erection, and of the erection of the See of Kingston. This letter Dr. B. sent from Paris to Lord John Russell, in one dated June 15th, 1841, in which he says, he supposes Lord Sydenham has written home about the ecclesiastical affairs of

Canada, (but he does not explain them in detail, nor even name the heads of them.) He says, he shall defer his conference with Lord John *until he has conferred with the authorities in Rome*, and if they sanction them, “j aurai l’honneur de recourir a V. S. pour que dans sa sagesse, Elle veuille bien, *en tant que de besoin les reconnaitre pour les effets civils.*” Here is the reply :

“Downing Street, July 7th, 1841.

“MY LORD,

“I am directed by Lord J. Russell, to acknowledge your letter of the 15th ult., enclosing a letter of introduction from the Governor General of Canada, and stating your intention to wait on his Lordship relative to the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church in that province. I am directed, in answer, to acquaint you, that Lord John Russell will be ready to communicate with you when you arrive in this country. I have the honour, &c.

“R. VERNON SMITH.

“*The Right Rev. the Roman Catholic Bishop of Montreal.*”

This brings us to the Cardinal’s share in the transaction, and having before us authentic documents, the statement we are about to give, may be considered as corrective of any inaccuracy, (we believe none substantial) in p. 27 of the “Appeal.”

On the 27th of Nov. 1841, a letter was written to Bp. Wiseman by the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, informing him of the great desire expressed by the Bishops of Canada, to have an ecclesiastical province there established, of which the Archbishop of Quebec should be metropolitan, and should have for suffragans, the Bishops of Kingstown, Charlottetown, Montreal, of a new see to be established in the west of Upper Canada, and of the districts of Nova Scotia, and Newfoundland, which were to be converted into dioceses. It was further stated, that such a measure appeared advantageous to religion; that difficulties had been raised to this step in 1820, but that times and feelings had much altered since then, “*atque id confirmare potest epistola quam die 7 Julii, 1841, Exmus D. Russel, tunc temporis regius coloniarum Administer scribens ad R. P. D. Bourget Epum Marianopolitanum, significaverat, se paratum esse ad agendum cum eodem Epo de negotio isto.*”

The letter went on to say, that on Bishop Bourget's return to England, he had found the ministry changed, and the S. Congregation had no information as to the disposition of the actual ministry. The Bishop was, therefore, commissioned to ascertain, as prudently as possible, whether any obstacle was likely to be raised by Government, to the establishment of such a hierarchy.

Upon receipt of this letter, he took the liberty of writing to Lord Stanley, and bringing the matter under his notice. It was not till Feb. 3rd, 1842, that he received a note from his Lordship's private secretary, marked "private," in which, after an apology for the delay, he was informed that his Lordship could not as yet give any official answer, because he had yet to take advice upon some points. He afterwards received a second letter, (though the memorandum before us does not supply the date, and the original is not in London,) informing him, that the answer would be communicated to the Bishops themselves in Canada.

It seems, however, that no such answer was ever given. Rome did not proceed till fresh applications were made; and on the 13th of January, 1844, another letter was written to the Bishop, asking his opinion, as to whether the Holy See might proceed, without danger of a quarrel, to create the new hierarchy. Accordingly, on the 30th of the same month, he called at Downing Street, and had the interview alluded to in the "Appeal;" but which there, from want of the introduction of a new date, appears to have immediately followed the commission to apply to government in 1841. In the first interview, the Bishop expressed his desire to ascertain whether Lord Stanley's neglecting to give any answer to the former application had been intentional or accidental, as information on this subject would be very important, as a key to the intentions of Government. The answer was, that in the opinion of the gentlemen with whom the conference was held, the silence was intentional; but that reference would be made to the Secretary of the Colonies himself, and that the Bishop should have an answer in writing.

After a brief interval, he received a polite note, asking him to go up again to London, as a verbal answer would be returned in preference to a written one. Accordingly, on the 12th of February, he had the second interview, of

which we have a full account before us, written by the Bishop himself on the 13th. He was informed, that "it had been hoped, that the silence observed would be rightly interpreted; that if the plan had been confined to Canada, Her Majesty's government might have treated about it, because, by the act of cession of Canada, Great Britain was bound to recognise there a Catholic hierarchy, and there would have been little difficulty in acceding to a multiplication of bishoprics; but that the other countries comprised in the scheme, did not fall under the provisions of that act, and therefore government could not, in the present state of the laws, treat of the establishment of a hierarchy there." He was further reminded of what had lately been done in Australia, without objection; and it was intimated to him, that Sir Charles Metcalfe, then governor, would be privately written to, not to raise any obstacles to the proposed organization.

On the following day, the Bishop wrote the full particulars of these interviews to the proper authorities; concluding with these words: "It appears, therefore, that no opposition to the wishes of the Holy See need be feared from Her Majesty's Government." On the 13th of May, the constitution of the hierarchy in North America was decided; and this letter, as is stated in the "Appeal," became the basis of the transaction; for the province was confined to Canada.

We must apologize for the length of this narrative: but it is suggestive of some useful and practical reflections.

1. It shows that the desire for a hierarchy is natural, and almost instinctive in every imperfectly organized Church: Canada wanted it as much as England; nor was the expression of that want aggressive, or proof of aggressive principles. It was never deemed so.

2. For twenty-seven years the Bishops of North-America struggled, and negotiated, having begun in 1817, and persevered till 1844; when they saw their hopes crowned with success, six years before England obtained the same boon. The steps by which they advanced are well worth considering. Under what is looked upon as an illiberal administration, they were first checked, but at last left free to act in the matter. Then they were sufficiently given to understand, that no recognition of the titles by the Government could give any civil advan-

tage. Further, it is clear that so conscious was Government of there being no necessity for this recognition, that a qualifying phrase is added to the declaration of the Queen's consent, as if this was by no means necessary.

3. It is evident, also, that all the ecclesiastical arrangements for the re-establishment of the hierarchy were made directly between the Holy See and the Bishops, and that no objection was ever raised to this plan of action, nor has any complaint been since made of it. On the contrary, Lord John Russell expressed his willingness to see a Bishop, after he had been to Rome, to concert, independently, with the Holy See, the ecclesiastical arrangements of his country.

4. Finally, in the last negotiation on the subject with Government, it was more than implied, that it could make no objection to the full establishment of a hierarchy, and at the same time could give no consent to it. An official, or even a direct unofficial, answer was declined to be given to an enquiry concerning the wishes of ministers, on the subject.

What was to be naturally inferred from this course, but that, on the one hand, we had as full a right to establish a similar hierarchy in England; and that it was only embarrassing Government to make it a party to the arrangement?

A further question, however, arises: *could* Lord John Russell have given consent to the establishment of our hierarchy? From the Durham Letter to his last speech, his Lordship has been pleased to consider the establishment by the Pope of a hierarchy in England, as an act of temporal jurisdiction, as a usurpation of the royal power. Now the character of the act could not have been altered by his consent. The Crown itself cannot give away its prerogative, nor limit its own rights, by admitting any other person to exercise them. If we had asked Lord John, to permit the Pope to grant to Catholics an ecclesiastical organization, (for the Pope and not the Crown must have been the grantor), he would have been obliged to answer: "The distributing of England into Dioceses and the appointing of bishops with local titles are part of the prerogative of the Crown; no one but the Queen can perform these acts; and therefore under no circumstances can I, or any minister,

permit the Pope to exercise them." Again, Lord John Russell has taken the protestant oath of allegiance, which denies that "the Pope hath or ought to have," not only any temporal and civil, but any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, power or pre-eminence in England. Whether, therefore, we look at the Pope's act as an exercise of purely spiritual jurisdiction, or, as our opponents will have it, as one of temporal authority, the Prime Minister could not be a concurring or consenting party to it.

Such certainly was the celebrated opinion of the Attorney and Solicitor-General, Gifford and Copley, when consulted by Mr. Canning, as to whether any answer could be returned to the Pope's letter, announcing his accession, to our King. They declared that for the minister merely to acknowledge the letter, in which the Pope spoke of himself as raised to the Pontificate, might be "interpreted into an implied recognition" of his claim to "authority, jurisdiction, and pre-eminence over the whole Christian Church, and certainly over the Catholic Church in this realm."

Let us then suppose an application made to the Prime Minister to allow the issuing of a Brief, whereby territorial titles should be given to Catholic bishops, what must have been his answer? Why, that, to say the least, this would be an act of spiritual power on the Pope's part, and he, having made oath that the Pope has not, nor ought to have, any such power, he could not grant any consent. If so, Catholics were in this alternative. Either they must never expect a hierarchical government in England, or it must be established without the Minister's concurrence. To decide which they ought to choose, must surely depend on the question of their rights. If there is nothing illegal in the constitution of the hierarchy, certainly there is no principle which compels us to ask leave to have it, from one who is bound to refuse it. The same question may return in a thousand ways. The Prime Minister, bound by his oath, could not grant leave for the Pope to give a matrimonial dispensation, nor an Indulgence, nor faculties; he could not permit the creation of Apostolic Vicariates, nor of any other episcopal office. How, then, have we acted in times past, in respect to all these matters; and how shall we continue to act in future? We

consider whether, or no, there be anything illegal in these acts, and whether, or no, they be comprised in that religious freedom which we have at least imagined, had been granted to us; and we simply act, without going to Downing Street for leave.

On this same principle we acted in the case of the hierarchy, and the question to be answered by us is only, "is the institution of it contrary to law?" Fortunately it has been answered for us, by no suspected authority. Lord John Russell, during the present debate in Parliament, has shown no desire to be sparing or lenient towards his persevering, but now undeceived followers, the Catholics of England, their clergy, their religion, or their feeling. In spite of all pretences, and shufflings, it has already come out: that no generous or lofty motives have guided state measures since the Durham letter, and that there was no lull in the persecuting spirit during the interval between that singular document, and the legislative course now pursued. In the mean time the law was searched, its high state-officers were consulted; and the Prime Minister has spoken their award, that no law had been violated, and no remedy existed for the papal exercise of authority but a new act of Parliament. A great, and we believe, a new maxim has thus been laid down, that pains and penalties may be, and ought to be, enacted for an act which it is acknowledged was perfectly legal.

But at any rate, we certainly shall never be blamed again, for not going, cap in hand, to the first Lord of the Treasury, humbly to solicit his gracious permission to carry out that organization of our Church which there was no law to forbid. The probability of our obtaining any leave has now been very fairly ascertained: or perhaps the present legislation may be considered as the penalty of not having gone to ask a permission, which must necessarily have been refused. The result in any case is, that Catholics have completely misunderstood the meaning of their Emancipation.

II. It has been said, however, that the granting of territorial titles is an infringement of an exclusively royal prerogative.

The difficulty of closing with this objection lies in its total novelty. No one that we have seen has gone beyond a very vague principle as the basis of the objec-

tion, that the Queen, or the Sovereign, is the only fountain of honour. But to make this bear on the question, one of the following points must be made good. Is the Sovereign the fountain of all ecclesiastical, as well as civil honour? Or is the title of Bishop a civil one, or a title of honour at all, in the sense of the courtly axiom? As to the first, surely no one can seriously answer in the affirmative. Whatever title of ecclesiastical honour there is beyond the pale of the Establishment, no one will say is exclusively in the Sovereign's gift: not even, indeed, within that pale. No religious body will admit the Crown to be the source of those titles which it considers honourable, because connected with religious duties. Rabbi is still an honoured title among the Jews, so is Superintendent, or Elder, or Minister, in the dissenting bodies; yet no one ever dreamt that they belong to the honours of which Majesty is the fountain. We may, therefore, conclude, that the aphorism so often quoted signifies, that the Sovereign is the only source of *civil* honour.

Next comes the question, is the title of Bishop a title of honour in this sense? Let us take the two hierarchies together, where they agree in titles or appellations.

<i>Catholic.</i>	<i>Anglican.</i>
1. Deacon.	1. Deacon.
2. Priest.	2. Priest.
3. Bishop.	3. Bishop.

It is clear that one and two, Deacon and Priest, are not titles of honour, in the sense in which that maxim is applied. Catholic and Protestant are equal so far, and no one claims for the crown the granting of either title. Let us then ask, is the third anything more than a higher degree of the same class of titles as 2 and 3? The Bishop is an ecclesiastical rank and dignity evolved out of the priesthood; it is the *plenitudo sacerdotii*, the full development of the priestly office; not a new and distinct order of being. Yet in the Anglican Establishment No. 3 has annexed to it the peerage, which alone the crown can give, and thus it comes to be considered essentially a compound dignity; and it requires an effort, in common minds, to separate the civil from the ecclesiastical character. Indeed a dictum of Lord Thurlow's is recorded, when, speaking of some

bishops or other, he said that, "they must be only sham bishops, for they had no seat in the House of Lords." Hence too, that strictly English parlance, which applies the same word, "Bench," to the episcopal body and to its seat in the Upper House. But while No. 3 in the Anglican system is taken thus out of the ecclesiastical category, it is evident that no accident occurs to remove the same number in the Catholic hierarchy from its place; it is one in a series of purely spiritual functionaries. The title of "Bishop" in a Catholic is therefore no more a civil one than "Priest." It expresses a higher degree of ecclesiastical office, and no more.

But it will be said that the title of Deacon or Priest is bestowed directly by ordination, while that of Bishop proceeds, with us, from collation by a foreign power. We need not say that this would equally affect a Vicar Apostolic, a title of which lately statesmen have become strangely enamoured. Let us however shift the venue of this enquiry from Italy to Germany, from Rome to Herrnhut.

The United Brethren, or Moravians, of this Kingdom, are, in their ecclesiastical government, and in many social and even domestic matters, such as marriages, as much dependant on a superior foreign authority as English Catholics. The supreme jurisdiction of the whole body resides in the "Elders' Conference of the Unity," at Herrnhut, in Germany. This board is renewed by general synods held there, to which deputies from England, Ireland, and America repair. *All bishops are named and consecrated at the synod*: and no English or other "bishop has a right to ordain any minister without commission from the Elders' conference of the Unity, or from a provincial Conference of superintendence, acting by the authority of the synod."* All important matters too are referred to the Elders' Conference. Here then we have a religious body, not

* History of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren, by the Rev. John Holmes, Vol. ii. Lond. 1830, p. 325. The "Provincial Conferences of superintendence" are established in England, America, &c., and we are told that their functions "are similar to those of the Elders' Conference of the Unity, with the exception that the sanction of the latter is required in all important measures." Ib. p. 333.

numerous,* but scattered all over the world, held in unity to a supreme power resident in Germany—a council it is true, but as much a supreme power as a single ruler could be—deriving jurisdiction in its ministers from it, as much as Catholics from Rome, and even more. Of course no jealousy is felt of this foreign spiritual power. Let us then suppose that the synod of Herrnhut, petitioned, or advised, by its English bishops, were to multiply the number of these prelates here, and parcel out the country into new provincial conferences, equivalent to archiepiscopal provinces; little or no notice would, we believe, be taken by the public, of such a proceeding.

It has indeed been said, that the Moravian bishops have been recognised, incidentally, we believe, in some Act of Parliament. Be it so: but this only confirms our argument. If the derivation of an episcopate from a foreign source was an essential violation of a royal prerogative, no Act of Parliament could have sanctioned it. This very sanction, therefore, disproves this objection. It is not a foreign, but the Papal, power that makes the act unpleasant. It may be further added, that although a regulation exists that no foreign order, military or civil, can be worn without royal permission, and it is well understood at least, that such permission will only be granted, when the order has been awarded for military services. Russian orders have been, and are worn by the highest nobility in public, without reproof. Yet such orders confer a title of honour, bestowed by a foreign sovereign, and to accept them ought to be considered an infringement of the Sovereign's prerogative as the fountain of honour.

However, it will be further said, that the evil in our case lies in the territorial nature of the title. It is not being Bishop, but Bishop of a place in the Queen's dominions, that constitutes the crime. Did we consider this conflict as one of principle, and not of mere feeling, we should argue this point more fully. But we will content ourselves with one or two brief remarks.

First, then, in other cases, where a title is bestowed by the sovereign, it is the same whether it assume a territorial form or not. Thus Lord Truro, or Lord Langdale, or the Earl of Carnarvon, or the Marquess of Northampton,

* About 130,000.

though their names have been exchanged for territorial designations, are no differently, or in a higher sense, Barons, Earl, or Marquess, than Lord Petre, or Lord Stourton, Earl Craven, or Marquess of Conyngham, who merely append the family surname to their titles. In fact, no one doubts that the title which must flow from the "fountain of honour," which gives precedence, rank, and privilege, lies in the distinction of the dignity, not in its adjunct being territorial or not. If, therefore, there is no such title of civil honour in the designation of Bishop, without a peerage, it can make no difference whether it be given with a territorial determination, or a vague patronymic. Again we may observe, that a territorial appointment is as necessary as the title itself. If a Bishop be called Bishop Smith among the Catholics, or Bishop Foster among the Moravians, each by a foreign source of office, he must still have a limited sphere of action, even if it comprehend all England; and thus he is, to all intents and purposes, Bishop of that sphere. But his see does no more towards converting his title into one of civil or territorial honour, than does the parish which determines the priest's exercise of functions convert his. Each must have a circumscription of some sort, and that of a bishop is called his Diocese.

The real question, in fact, returns back upon us. It is now discovered, that Catholics were completely mistaken when they imagined, in 1829, that they received religious freedom, that is, the power of exercising their religion according to its laws, and with its proper organization; they were mistaken, if the preamble of the Bill before Parliament means anything, in fancying that the titles not occupied by Anglican prelates were open to other Bishops; they were more grossly mistaken in believing Lord John Russell's word, in 1845 and 1846, that he considered it foolish to keep up even the restriction that the Emancipation Act had retained; and they were stupidly mistaken in not knowing, that Episcopacy was to be for ever a monopoly of Anglicanism, and that Catholics, free and equal in name with all other religious bodies, must make up their minds to be before the law a Presbyterian, acephalous, bishopless Church, which must either so far bend to law as to unchurch itself, by cutting off its own head, or else must be content to be considered, and to treat with the State, as a body naturally existing, and morally

living, without that important functional organ. That inconveniences will be felt, resulting from the new arrangement, should it become law, there can be no doubt; and in Ireland particularly, the attempt to trammel episcopal action, or to put a new "brand" upon the acknowledged religious guides and teachers of the population—and the very phrase has been used—seems as wise a proceeding as would be the paralysing of the leading pair of nerves in a body, in hopes of thereby bringing it more easily under control. The Prime Minister, in his opening speech, with a naivete that was quite startling, assured the House, that the Bill which he was introducing had the approbation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of London. We say this announcement was startling; for it sounded to us, as if a judge on the bench should tell his colleagues his intention of giving judgment against the defendant, and recommend his decision by assuring them, that he had taken the opinion of the plaintiffs on the subject, and they fully approved of his purpose.

IV. Among the topics which have most invited the attention of legal orators, none has been more profitable to our opponents than the Canon Law. In our own opportunities of cultivating this science, we had apparently been totally misguided. One year of the Institutes, and four, at least, of the Text, of Canon Law has been considered in Catholic Universities a short course of study, barely preparatory to its practical application under the direction of experienced jurisconsults. For after this, to become a good Canonist, is considered the work of years, and even of a life. It is a study as extensive, and as complicated as that of the civil law, or of the code of any country. Indeed, except in Italy, or Spain, and perhaps occasionally in parts of Germany, what could be called a thorough and profound Canonist, is hardly to be found. But in England it is not so. Lectures on the Canon Law have been advertised and given in Concert Rooms; and Hippodromes, with the ready flippancy of a practised charlatan, sure of an audience at least a little more ignorant than himself, and as ready to swallow, as he was to cook, richly seasoned flams. Yet formerly to say of a person *Sacros Canones exposuit*, "he lectured on the canons," was high praise in the schools. Rising, however, to a more elevated platform, we have heard with astonishment, that

verged towards the mingled feeling between the ridiculous and the melancholy,

(“ Who would not laugh if such a man there be ?
Who would not weep if Atticus were he ? ”)

able and earnest men, who ought better to have known the difficulties of grappling with an immense system of foreign legislation, take quite as bold, though perhaps less reckless, a flight. Can Mr. P. Wood, for instance, really flatter himself that in a few weeks he has mastered, what we take on ourselves to assert, no professed Canonist in Europe pretends to do, the intricacies of the canonical rights which accrue to every part of the Church, under a newly constituted hierarchy, under a Protestant government? Never was there a more complete tissue of fallacies than he has put forth, both as regarding the introduction of Canon Law now among Catholics, and as to the authority and rights which it confers upon the new Episcopate. But this is a branch of our subject which we must reserve for another paper. For we do not believe that the bugbear of Canon Law is likely to make any great impression upon the public mind. It is rather for the sake of our Catholic readers that we shall treat the subject. While engaged with such incessant and persevering conflicts without, we have neglected treating the subject of the hierarchy, as it is interesting to our own body. In a future number we propose to ourselves to do this task. We shall go to press with what we have written just as a season for better thoughts approaches, and we are certainly thankful to Lord John Russell for one thing: for having allowed us our Holy and our Easter Week, and some few days of preparation before them, free from the bitterness of strife, and the tumults of contending passions. We have already gathered enough for one passion-tide, to make our bundle of myrrh, and bear with us among our sacred duties. Mr. Drummond alone has given every Catholic, man, woman, and child, sufficient to exact patience and forgiveness by the most pleading motives of mercy. Where “ they know not what they do ” could be urged against sacrilege, “ they know not what they say ” may be suggested to our hearts, as a ground of hope, that what is little less than blasphemy in our ears, may be a plea for forgiveness.

Cardinal Wiseman.

ART. VIII.—*The Royal Commission for visiting the Universities.* 1850.

ALMOST three centuries have passed away since the Convocation of the English Church, the two Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the English Bishops in their individual capacity, united in protesting against a measure urged through Parliament by the power of the Crown, at that time enormous, and the servility of nobles and gentry gorged with the plunder of religious houses. This united protest of the spiritual power against the aggression of the civil was fruitless: the act of Parliament passed; in virtue of it every member, save one, of the existing English episcopate was deposed and expelled from his see, a new episcopate was set up by the civil power, consecrated according to an ordinal composed by a parliamentary committee whose president disbelieved the Apostolical Succession, and deriving its jurisdiction from the Crown.

The civil law, by virtue of which the ancient English Episcopate descending from S. Augustine was thus extinguished, transferred to the sovereign of these realms that spiritual supremacy, which from S. Augustine downwards, had been exercised by the Pope. Fourteen heads of Colleges at Oxford, and near ninety fellows, and eleven heads of Colleges at Cambridge, besides several fellows, were expelled for refusing subscription to this same law. But the Convocation, in its protest, had expressed its belief not only in the Supremacy of the Pope, but in the Real Presence, and the Sacrifice of the Mass; doctrines which it conceived to be overthrown by the new law. The resolution, thus carried by the force of the civil power, involved therefore not only a change in the *person* from whom spiritual power descended, and to whom spiritual obedience was due, but a change in those objective *doctrines* on which the spiritual kingdom itself is built, and for which its officers have their functions. Up to that time Bishops had been instituted in virtue of a warrant from the Chief Bishop of Christendom; from that time they were instituted in virtue of a warrant from the Queen of England. Up to that time Priests had offered in mystical sacrifice the Body and Blood of Christ on the altar; from that time ministers distributed the Lord's Supper to their brethren. Up to

that time both Bishops and Priests had been consecrated by a ritual descending from remote antiquity, and conveying in the most absolute terms high spiritual powers: from that time these two orders were, aptly enough it must be confessed, set apart for their modified functions by a maimed and dislocated ritual, not ten years old, and drawn up by the command of the sovereign.

That fair and beautiful structure of worship, which sprung up beneath St. Peter's moulding hand, and had been hallowed through fifteen centuries by Greek and Roman, by Northman and by Saxon, was torn down by the sacrilege of the State, and its chiselled and polished stones, mixed with earth and rubble, served for the erection of a meaner and mongrel building, where the beauty of isolated parts did but set off the want of unity and harmony in the whole; as Roman architrave and Greek capital, encased amid the rubbish of the Turk, only make us indignant at the work of the spoiler, while we sigh over the glories of the past. A new episcopate and a hybrid ministry corresponded well to a fragmentary ordinal and an amphibious liturgy.

Thus the year 1559 inaugurated a complete change in the spiritual government and the worship of England. We propose to consider the effect of this change on the course of studies pursued at the universities, and on their character as ecclesiastical schools.

But what had been their previous history? It seems almost necessary to glance at this for a due understanding of the effects wrought by the above-mentioned change.

The universities, as they existed in the middle of the sixteenth century, carry us back to one of the most interesting periods of history. They sprung from that mighty movement of the human mind which arose in Europe about A. D. 1100, and continued to about 1300. It was the fresh intellect of young nations moulded by the Church into a unity of spirit, civilization, learning, and religious feeling, which now threw itself with passion and enthusiasm on the deepest and most intricate problems of human life. And this intellect was necessarily collected in certain great centres, because, as yet, before printing was discovered, the process of teaching was by the "*living word*," and not by the "*dead letter*." Perhaps the whole difference between ancient and modern times, and the whole

difficulty which has made the actual world so ungovernable, is summed up in this distinction. So then this intellectual life collected and energised at certain places, such as Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge. Then it was that thirty thousand students are reported to have been at Oxford. In the Universities the flower and youth of Europe met: here in consequence sprung up a system of religious and metaphysical philosophy, not belonging to any one nation, but common to Christendom, and under the inspection and guardianship of that Church, which was the soul of Christendom. The object of this philosophy in religion was to arrange and systematize and work out to its ultimate results that vast fabric of doctrine which had come down to the Church from the Fathers. It was on this field that Peter Lombard and Albert the Great, that the angelic and seraphic doctors, and their inferior but still mighty fellow-labourers, worked, and aimed at mental victories, as much more grand than Alexander's lust of conquest, or Cæsar's passion for rule, as mind is superior to matter. But a nobler impulse than ambition moved them. It was to bring all arts and all philosophy under the sway of that kingdom, which the true Sovereign of their hearts, the Son of God and Son of Mary, had set up in the world. Thus unity and universality, completeness and harmony, were the marks of that mental fabric which they reared. It overlooked and absorbed national differences as naturally as that kingdom which was designed to make all nations one. And the great seats and workshop of this philosophy were at Paris and at Oxford; where, accordingly, the studies were not national but European. Thus we read that "the University of Paris had far more of a European than of a French character, as to the elementary bodies which composed it. It comprised four *nations*, viz., French, English, Normans and Picards; the French containing, as *provinces* or subdivisions, Frenchmen, Provençals, Gascons, Italians, and Greeks. Under the English nation were ranked the British and Irish, Germans and Scandinavians. The third nation had no subdivision. The fourth comprised Picardy, Brabant, and Flanders."* It is true that the insular position of Oxford, and its remoteness, prevented such an

* Huber on the English Universities, translated by Newman. Vol. I, p. 80.

affluence of many nations, as at Paris. And so we find that "although foreigners often came to the English Universities for the advantage of study, they were never reckoned as integrant parts of the scholastic organization. Its two nations were wholly native, except that the Southernmen generally included the Irish and Welsh, while under the Northernmen were comprehended the Scotch." Yet the studies at Oxford and Cambridge and at Paris were mainly the same. The Latin, as it was the language of the Church, so it became the language of these philosophic schools, which aimed at being co-extensive with the Church. Grammar, logic, and rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, formed a ground-work of arts. The study of the Church's canon law, and the Roman civil law, made a faculty of jurisprudence. That of medicine was a third. While all these were viewed as the handmaids of theology, the crown of all human knowledge, as uniting man with God, and as itself wholly reared on that union of the Two Natures in one Person, which alone has made such unity possible. Thus it was that the mediæval universities were preeminently Catholic. They tended to efface nationalism in the greater whole of Christendom. S. Thomas, an Italian by birth, and a near kinsman of the German Emperor, became the common doctor of French and English, of Spaniard and Scandinavian. A glorious result, surely, of that day, when "Parthian and Mede and Elamite—strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes and Arabians" heard the Apostles speaking in their own tongue "the wonderful works of God." And in proportion were these great seats of learning and religious philosophy favoured by the Church, which gradually emancipated them from the superintendence of the local bishop, gave to their supreme officer spiritual jurisdiction over their members, and subjected them to the Pope alone. "No person," says Huber, "thought of denying that the Papal See was the last and supreme authority concerning the studies, belief, discipline, and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Universities. The only question was, whether and how far those nearer steps in the hierarchy, the authorities of the national Church, might be passed over, and the Chair of St. Peter reached at once."* "Nor did the kings scruple to inter-

* Vol. II., 210, 207, 215.

cede with the Popes in behalf of the Universities, as often as they desired to obtain for them new Papal privileges, or the Papal confirmation of the old and new, Papal and Royal, privileges." "For instance, Edward II. requested of the Pope (v. Wood, A. D. 1317), that the English Universities, as the University of Paris, might have the privilege of 'lecturing (legendi) in every part of the world,' that is to say, as in the case of so many other privileges, he asked him to confirm what already existed." "From the king to the peasant every one upon certain occasions addressed himself to Rome, when unable to obtain at home his real or supposed rights: and every one at such times looked upon Rome as a refuge and protection."

The spring of intellectual activity in the English Universities seems to have risen to its flood between 1200 and 1350: in which period we read of two hundred authors in England, one hundred and forty belonging to Oxford, and thirty to Cambridge. A period of declension both in numbers and spirit succeeds, which continues all through the fifteenth century. There is during this period the rise of the colleges, and a gradual improvement in wealth and stability; but the schools are no longer thronged with students. Whether it was the force of external causes, such as the wars of the roses, little enough favourable we should imagine to intellectual cultivation, or whether there was some deeper internal cause, we find that "in the year 1450, of two hundred schools only twenty were in use, and not a thousand students."* But during all these centuries, from the rise of the Universities to the change of religion, amid vast fluctuations in numbers, and with cycles of advance or decay in spirit, we find a *system* of study inseparably linked with the unity of Christendom. Whether or no the Universities were in favour with the laity as places of general education, they were throughout the nurseries of the Church. They were "grounded in arts" which subserved the Church's authority; they had a faculty of jurisprudence which illustrated and classified the Church's canon law; and the theology which they taught was a system in the arrangement of which the keenest intellects and the most sanctified hearts had laboured under obedience to the Church, and ruled by the

* Wood, quoted by Huber, vol. I., 162.

spirit which presided over her, for five hundred years. *One* life pervaded Christendom, and the Universities were the high schools and laboratories of Christendom, in which though this life might at different periods be more or less vigorous and expansive, yet throughout it was ever one, and homogeneous. In those days at least "the trumpet gave no uncertain sound for battle," and this is the single point which it has been the scope of the above remarks to set forth.

But other times are coming. The eighth Henry has seen the light of the Gospel shine in Boleyn's eyes, and when the common Father of Christendom refused to pander to his lust, he has torn himself free from all authority, constituted himself the lord of his people's consciences, and attached to his earthly throne the supreme authority in Christ's kingdom. The Universities are commanded to reject that spiritual head, by whom during so many centuries their privileges had been increased and defended. In religious, as in worldly matters, there is no longer any limit to the despotism of the crown. The king may, if he please, confiscate their property and extinguish them. As it was he kept their privileges for ten years suspended in his hands. In the year 1535, he ordered a visitation of Oxford and Cambridge, in which the scholastic philosophy and theology, and the canon law, were expelled as inseparably connected with the Papal Supremacy. But what was put in their place? Let us hear the notices of Professor Huber in this matter, to whom we are indebted for the most learned and accurate account of the Universities. He is a German Protestant, and a friend of the Reformation pure and simple, and therefore far removed from any tendency to favour Catholic views. Describing this visitation as "one of the first acts of the crown as inheritor of the mitre," he says, "arbitrary indeed enough was the state of things when the Papal authority was annulled, and Church dogma was yet to be maintained with the greatest strictness."* Notwithstanding, "the true doctrines of the Catholic Church were as earnestly recommended as the study of the classic languages and authors." Finally, "in Oxford in the year 1535, and in Cambridge in the year 1540, five Professorships—of The-

* Huber, vol. I. 251.

ology, Greek, Hebrew, Civil Law, and Medicine, were established and endowed with a yearly emolument of forty pounds. For Canon Law there was no place after the rupture with Rome. As far as regards philosophy, it would seem that in Oxford the whole subject was to be included in the sentence passed on the Scholastics: a matter in which Reformers and Classicists were agreed.* "As the schism worked on and on, it of necessity exercised great influence upon the resources and position of the universities. Not only were their revenues plundered or clipt, but the caprice of the supreme power left it for a time in doubt whether they should exist at all, as far as their estates and property were concerned. The abolition of the monasteries, and the transfer of an immense mass of ecclesiastical property to the crown, to private persons, or secular corporations, must have acted directly upon the universities, first to diminish their numbers to a minimum; next to give over to the greatest misery many of those who remained." † Passing on to the reign of Edward he says, "Whether the *omnipotence of the State* be or be not a Christian or a Protestant principle, this is at any rate the form which protestantism then assumed most distinctly in England. Political and worldly interest soon gained an entire preponderance over all questions of religion and of truth; with whatever sincerity the latter may have been pleaded at the beginning of the movement." ‡ "A royal commission was issued in 1549, with full power, for a thorough reform of the Universities, but the result was unsatisfactory to all parties. The *destructive* powers of this commission seem to have been enormous. Documents of the vanquished Church, Missals, Legends, writings strictly theological, Relics, Pictures or Images of Saints, Monuments, were burnt, broken, or degraded to the vilest uses. In the common ruin was inevitably involved all the literature of the middle ages, including both the poetry and the scholastic philosophy: for the limits between the latter and theology could not be defined, and the poetry was so impregnated with Popery, as to seem to carry the 'mark of the beast' on its face." § Its *constructive* powers were limited to enjoining with still greater earnest-

* Huber i. 255.

† Huber i. 258.

‡ Huber i. 209.

§ Huber i. 273.

ness the *classical* studies which the former visitation had encouraged. Yet all this while, "a decided majority of the academicians was in favor of the old religion, and this majority included the most learned men, and the best classic scholars."* Passing over the short restoration of Mary, which replaced in the university "Scholastic Philosophy, Theology, and Canon Law," and whose "visitation in many respects honourably distinguished itself from the preceding visitation of the Reformers,"† let us go on to the state of things finally established by Elizabeth. Of course a fourth commission, issued at the beginning of her reign, proceeded to purify the universities from every thing incompatible with the new creed. Once again the old philosophy and the old theology and the study of the canon law were expelled. On the other hand, the thirty-nine articles were introduced, and became the standard of public teaching. The result is thus summed up by Huber. "At Oxford, it is certain that of the Academic studies, some were in complete decay, others were pursued in a shallow, spiritless manner, as a mere form; or at best in a popular way such as might suit dilettanti. The morals and sentiments of the Academic youth are described at the same time as having been in the highest degree wild, selfish, loose, devoid of all earnestness, honour, or piety. More serious still, however, are the notices before us concerning the older and more influential Academicians: in whom every hateful passion took the deeper root, and pervaded their whole life the more thoroughly, the less it was able to find vent in open violent expression. Compelled to preserve a certain outward dignity, in seeking either personal ends or party objects in Church or State; they had to maintain a close secrecy, or at least to adhere to measures which were ostensibly legal."‡ Wood himself says of his beloved Oxford in the year 1582, "Of the university itself I must report, that although it had lately made laws most salutary alike to religion and to learning, yet all its hopes were disappointed; as all these laws were almost by all parties, violated and neglected. There were few indeed to preach the word of God, or attend on preaching, although in

* Huber i. 278. † Huber i. 288.

‡ Huber, i. 324.

these times a great multitude of clergy left the parishes of which they were pastors, and came to Oxford, with more appetite for indolence and sloth, than for propagating the faith. To this was added the inactivity of the Academic Tutors, &c. To return to the gownsmen: they were so given to luxury as to outdo in dress the London Inns of Court, and even the Queen's levee; and were so swollen in mind, that scarcely the lowest of the low would yield precedence to graduates, or to persons on any ground superior to him. Shall I add that the public lectures in the Greek and Hebrew languages, as well as in Medicine, Law, and Theology, were very rarely held? In fine, if you look at the state of logic and philosophy, you will confess that the men of our time have degenerated from the teaching of their forefathers. All these things being duly weighed, it may be said that in Oxford itself you have to search after the Oxford University: so greatly has every thing changed for the worse."* The picture is completed thus by Huber: "we cannot expect that other branches of the academic studies should flourish more than theology and arts, especially in such an age. Ecclesiastical law, properly speaking, existed no longer; for the Papal law was most severely forbidden, and the Protestant Church law, promised by Edward and Elizabeth, was for very intelligible grounds, never brought forward. Civil or Roman law, which had been much neglected before the Reformation, now pined just in proportion as Common or Statute Law thrived. Common Law, however, was not scientifically cultivated at Cambridge, or Oxford, and indeed had its head quarters at the supreme courts of justice in London." And, again, "of all the branches of learning, mental philosophy was perhaps the least favoured by the opinions of the times, in or out of the Universities. The reaction against the scholastic philosophy still prevailed in full vigour; and in giving up to oblivion as utterly worthless, all the exertions and acquisitions of half a millennium could not but be disadvantageous to philosophic culture."†

Contrasting then the state of the Universities after the changes introduced by Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, with their state up to the year 1534, we find not merely a

* Quoted by Huber, i. 325.

† Huber i. 343, 347.

period of confusion, and individual distress, and temporary disorganization, which usually accompany great changes, but a radical and fundamental subversion of the highest faculty, theology; the expulsion or grievous maiming of the second faculty of law; and the reduction of the primary faculty of arts to the study of the Greek and Latin classics in Oxford, and to the mathematical sciences in Cambridge. For when the theology of the Fathers, drawn out, arranged, and illustrated by the great scholastic writers, and exhibited in the practice of the Church during so many hundred years, was summarily rejected and anathematised, and when the spiritual ruler, who had built up and maintained the unity of Christendom, was in England ignominiously dethroned, what religious system of teaching succeeded to the former? or who became the bond of religious union, instead of the latter? We do not know what answer can be made to this question, save that the *Summa Theologica* was deserted for the thirty-nine Articles, and the Triple Crown melted into a Queen's Diadem. The grand result of Tudor reform was a spiritual society capped with a temporal head: and a theology the beginning, middle, and end, of which was *compromise*, the fusion of antagonist principles, the latitude of contradictory ideas; a hierarchy retained, with its jurisdiction bestowed by the sovereign; authority claimed for the Church, with the express declaration that it had erred and might err again; and yet, at the same time, the Holy Scriptures declared to be the sole standard of faith, but the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures left to the individual mind. What heart or head was ever satisfied with this heap of contradictions? But to deny it, was hanging, drawing, and quartering. No wonder that from this time forward theology ceased to exist as a science. In the Elizabethan prayer book, the Catholic element was at least largely retained: no one doubts now, or ever has doubted, the thorough Protestantism of the articles: while in the junction and imposition of the two lay hid from the first a latitudinarian element, destined to be by far the strongest, and to neutralise both one and the other, sapping honesty, and deadening conscience, and tending from the first to the utter denial of dogmatic truth. We have seen the ultimate result of this in a religious profligacy, of which christianity in eighteen hundred years had presented no example: the supreme tribunal of a communion decid-

ing concerning a great doctrine, not that it must be held, nor that it must be denied, but that it may be either held or denied, the holders maintaining it to be an article of the faith, the deniers, a "soul-destroying heresy," and both continuing ministers in the same Church. And how well that supreme tribunal has estimated the 'spirit which animates the communion over which it presides, is shown by the fact that but very few have refused, by their acts, to submit to such a decision.

There was then from the beginning this inherent impossibility that a theology could exist after the Elizabethan university reform, because theology requires thinking, and "no member of the establishment can believe in a *system* of theology of any kind, without doing violence to the formularies. Those only go easily along them and the prayer book, who do not think:" for assuredly, "there is no lying, or standing, or sitting, or kneeling, or stooping there, in any possible attitude, but, as if in the tyrant's cage, when you would rest your head, your legs are forced out between the articles, and when you would relieve your back, your head strikes against the Prayer book."*

Nor is this a mere theoretical statement of what ought to have been, from the heterogeneous and piebald constitution of a religious system in which the original basis was Catholic, the superinduced distinctive tenets Protestant, and the spirit which joined both together secular and latitudinarian. Not only *ought* there to have been no science of theology known in the Anglican establishment, and in the universities which are its high schools, from the year 1559 to the present, but there *has been none*. Professor Huber has, with the most exemplary diligence, followed every generation up to the year 1840, and whether in the Calvinism which was dominant during the reign of Elizabeth, or in the soi-disant patristic school of Laud and Andrews, or in the period following the Restoration, when the Prayer Book seemed to be in the ascendant, or in the long decline inaugurated by the Revolution, which some have termed the definitive triumph of Protestantism, a consistent and coherent theology is equally wanting. So continuous a result under external circumstances so varying points to an inherent cause in the nature of things.

* Newman on Difficulties of Anglicanism. p. 25, 137.

The State, disgusted with a religion which it could not shape and manage at its pleasure, and which kept repeating to it, "the things of Cæsar to Cæsar, but the things of God to God," had put together, under its own headship something which was to serve for a moral police. Now policemen are to *act*, not to *think*. Their superior requires of them *obedience*, not *learning*; at the best, administrative energy is the highest virtue of instruments. The *divine right of kings* was that which held the fabric together—what had they to do with the *Holy Ghost dwelling in the Church*? His inspiration was, indeed, claimed for that first Prayer Book, which lasted a year and a half; perhaps its fleeting duration advised them to be more cautious in future; or at least, to limit His assistance to the royal counsels, which, however much they might *change*, were sure to *prevail*. Thus of the *morale* of Elizabeth's reign Huber writes: "The principal energies of the government were exerted in clearing between the extremes of each party, a large neutral space, in which the majority could conveniently move about. But in effecting this object, every moral principle was set at nought, and every crooked path of state-expediency was trodden." "In the appointment to Church benefices, more especially, the pecuniary interest of the secular patrons and their families prevailed to such a degree, that this alone might have sufficed to bring about that lamentable condition, moral, religious, and intellectual, of the mass of the ministers of the state Church, of which we have only too credible testimony. In fact, precisely the best and worthiest members of the Catholic Church had been compelled to quit the ministry, and sacrifice their worldly interest to their convictions; while, among the Protestant ministers, those whose inward calling was the strongest, were forced by the secularization of the ruling Church into a sectarian position, which excluded them from her service, and sometimes altogether from academic life. This being the condition of the *Church*, it is not wonderful that we find the great mass of those connected with *school* instruction, in the highest degree neglected and corrupted, morally and intellectually."* Treating of the "moral and spiritual characteristics of the Episcopal Church in the seventeenth

* Huber, i. 340.

century," Huber says: "In entering on this subject, we are first struck by the little attention paid to intellectual interests, in comparison to those of religious party."* The principal object of the day was to harmonise the Universities according to the principles then ruling in the Church and State; and yet more to fit them to diffuse an education which should engender and support those principles. But more to Laud, of all men, is due the extinction of scientific theology. Huber describes the imperative necessity which his situation laid upon him of acting against what must have been his own turn of mind. "Theology might have been expected, in the midst of the ecclesiastical storms of the day, to have grown up a vigorous, though a onesided, plant. Within the limits of formal orthodoxy, as theoretically recognised by the Anglican Church, there was both room and material for constructing a stately building of learning: but we can find none such at the Universities. Not that the isolated and literary efforts of divines were either uninfluential, or without merit; but there was no systematic and scientific exposition of the doctrines of the Anglican Church, nay, nor any rudiments of such a thing, under the recognition of either Oxford or Cambridge. This deficiency is the more striking, the higher were the pretensions of those in power, to the glory of restoring the Church, and the greater their activity or success in its outward and moral reform. *Certainly the authorities of this period must bear the heavy responsibility of having excluded theological studies from the Universities for many generations.* After Leicester's profligate government, (he was Chancellor of Oxford from 1565 to 1587,) a decisive crisis at length came on under the era of Laud, when the course of divinity was of necessity to be either excluded or reformed, and it is impossible now to deny that destruction, not reconstruction, took place. Nor is this hard to explain. Eagerness for external conformity often gives a premium to hypocrisy; and Laud, with the prelates and the whole party, while substantially Armenian, had to pay deference to the substantially Calvinistic system of the thirty-nine Articles. They might honourably have determined on one of three things; either to profess Arminianism, and openly eject Calvinism; or profess Cal-

* Huber, ii. 29.

vinism, and openly eject Arminianism; or openly embrace both into the Church, declaring the controversy to be a matter, not for dogmatic decision, but for free learned enquiry. But they did none of the three. They chose to retain the letter of the Church formulas in its integrity; and so far from avowing Arminianism, treated as offensive its avowal by others. How, then, could they propound any learned and systematic course of theology at the Universities? How would they have been able to evade, within the schools themselves, a shock of battle which they must have sincerely judged to be most pernicious? Not that men are definitely conscious of such thoughts; nor make up clear reasons in themselves for what they do or leave undone: the inherent necessities of their position urge them, as if by instinct, along the track. And if the stormy times are pleaded in excuse for these failures, the fact must still not be forgotten, that Laud and his adherents are the men who effected that complete abolition of *scientific theology*, which is to this day so deeply marked a feature in the English Universities." "The Royal ordinances of Jan. 16, 1629 seem wilfully to have aimed at stopping all theological discussion, even arguments on the side of orthodoxy, for fear of stimulating thought and feeling on the subject." "Theology, then, even in the most limited Anglican sense, could no more flourish as an academic study, than jurisprudence or medicine. It is a sign of the times that the three higher faculties are not mentioned as faculties in the new (i. e. the Laudian) statutes, although they are pre-supposed as branches of study. At an earlier period traces are to be found of an effort after corporate organization of the faculties; but henceforth it vanished." *

Let us pass to the totally different outward state of things in the eighteenth century. Here we find "an entire neglect of the studies connected with the higher faculties," and that while Jurists and Medical students went to the capital or elsewhere, "the aspirants in divinity were left altogether to their own impulse, and to private study. Academic life offered no stimulus whatever in this direction. An individual might aim as high as he pleased, but the University took no cognisance of his exertions:

* Huber, ii. 65, 70.

according to its standard they were supererogatory.”* Then, after observing that the religious state of the Universities during the last century appears much more unfavourable than the moral, of which however he has drawn any but a pleasing picture, he continues, “nor was there any counter influence to be derived from the vigorous effort of religious instruction of a scientific character; for the theological studies were completely null.”† “The English Universities scarcely possessed or offered the very scantiest means for the studies in Law, Medicine, and Divinity, or for the foundations of the science of State economy. The philological and mathematical branches appear to be the only exception, inasmuch as the Universities offer every means for rendering those who devote themselves to these two branches real and most learned schoolmasters.”‡ And the result as to theology was, that after acquiring the character of a “gentleman” by a liberal, i. e. an university education, “Sound common sense, a knowledge of the world and of mankind, respectability and dignity of manner, with an understanding of the rules and ordinances of the Church, are looked upon as the best *pastoral* theology. The literature *necessary* for the dignified clergyman was only the new testament in the original tongue, the old testament in a translation with a commentary, some exposition of the thirty-nine articles, a few popular theological works, and some few collections of sermons.”§

Lastly, of the present state of studies in the Faculties, that is up to the year 1840, Huber says, “From all this it is clear that it is as little possible now, as it was in the last century, to think of forming oneself as Theologian, Jurist, Economist, or Physician, by help of the public instruction at Oxford or Cambridge. And in fact all that can be said with respect to these departments in England is, that whatever is known in them is gathered otherwise than in the course of the *university* studies; by practice in life, by private study, private instruction, or even by teaching.”||

What is the judgment which a foreigner, a philosophical bystander, strange to our religious parties, and moreover a protestant, passes as to the *prima mali labes*, which

* Huber ii. 302.

† Huber ii. 317.

‡ Huber, ii. 319.

§ Huber, ii. 341.

|| Huber ii. 377.

tainted the very spring of theological science in England? "The chief source," he says, "of these defilements of the Anglican Church appears to be *its connexion with the State*; or else with Royalty, that is to say, *with the King, and Court*. This connexion arose out of the course taken by the Reformation in England; which established on principle that the highest powers of the Church must be decisively vested in the Crown. If the evils which afterwards occurred did not *inevitably* proceed from this heterogeneous union, they were at least very much promoted by the manifold abuses and mistakes connected with it."*

Thus the actual history of the Anglican universities in the last three centuries entirely corroborates the view which the Elizabethan religious settlement of itself suggests. In that wonderful product of state-craft the doctrines of the old religion and the new—the principles of authority and of private judgment—the sacramental system and justification by faith only—a visible Church, and Calvinism—respect for antiquity and a bran-new constitution—were violently squeezed together by the whole weight of the civil power. Take that weight away, and the entire building would fall to pieces. But grievous as the tyranny was which then lay upon the conscience of England, it could not prevent a most violent war of parties, opposed to each other as light and darkness, which has been perpetuated to the present day. Puritan and Episcopalian struggled for mastery in the days of Elizabeth, and the issue of that contest in the time of Charles wrecked the vessel of the State itself. Non-juror and Establishmentarian continued the fight after the Revolution, and High Church and Low Church, succeeding them, after casting out Wesley, and forming a new schism in the middle of the last century, in our own days have developed into the Oxford movement on the one hand, the most defined expression of the Catholic element which Anglicanism has borne, and into Evangelicalism on the other, the proper end of puritanism, the denial of a formal creed, and of a visible Church, of altar and of sacrament: while that deadly principle which lurked in the violent pairing together of these two opposite beliefs at the beginning, has at length shewn itself with

* Huber ii. 30.

no common power and energy in the party which bears the name of Dr. Arnold: a party which the State, with the natural love of a parent for its offspring, welcomes and fosters. All these have subsisted and do subsist together—of all these the disciples and representatives—with a hundred shades of variation—are to be found at the Universities: of all these the Universities are the common instructresses. How could a Theology spring out of so deadly an antagonism of first principles?

And one thing more must be added. Theology cannot grow up save where a true, living, consistent authority exists: one which claims and receives the willing obedience of heart and mind and conscience. Now true though it be that the legal subjection of the Anglican Church to the State is complete, that the chains have been riveted too firmly to be torn asunder without entire destruction, yet not a single member of that Church can be found, whatever his private belief, who yields obedience in heart, or mind, or conscience to *such* an authority. Nobody can believe, nobody affects to believe, in a lay Papacy, lodged in a royal privy council. The communion which lives under it—the clergy which hold livings, canonries, deaneries, and bishoprics, in virtue of obedience to it—respect its sentence as little as that of the chief mufti of Constantinople. Moreover, one such authority alone exists in the world by the institution of Christ, His last and best and crowning gift, which should turn His very departure into a blessing, and it is lodged in the *whole* Church, in the *living*, not in the *dead historical* Church; it dwells not in each member, but in the body. So that were a branch church ever so normally constituted, as to the succession and as to the faith, this supreme and final authority it never could possess. And accordingly it could as little possess a theology, which is the code of belief sanctioned by such an authority. Under that authority the Catholic Church does possess a vast and varied structure of dogmatic and moral theology, consistent in all its parts, worked out by the labours and prayers of saints and doctors, in so many centuries, through the inspiration of that One Spirit who is pleased to dwell in the Church. Without that authority, and subject to a mock lay Papacy, the Anglican Church, at the end of the third centenary of her existence, has advanced so far in theology as to have no doctrine on the very first act of the Christian life, Holy

Baptism. "From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he seemeth to have."

But what has then been the staple of instruction given at the Universities since that great religious revolution by which the Scholastic Philosophy and the Catholic Theology were expelled? It was necessary to find some neutral ground on which the studies might be conducted, and the new passion which arose at the beginning of the sixteenth century for the learned languages and classic literature suggested at Oxford that they might fill the gap, while at Cambridge an original predilection for the mathematical sciences, carried in after times to the highest pitch by the great genius who arose there, caused these to be selected as the main instrument of education. Three centuries ago the choice was much more restricted than at present. The Baconian philosophy had not yet arisen: the inductive sciences were not even in their infancy. In our own days a crowd of competitors are knocking for admission, urging their claim, and pointing to England's wonderful development of power and glory as due to the vigour with which they have been prosecuted by private research and energy, unendowed by university patronage, unassisted by the magnificent foundations of our ancestors. Geography, geology, mineralogy, botany, and every branch of natural philosophy: jurisprudence and political economy: trade, manufactures, and statistics: this fertile progeny of the novum organon, not to mention a host of modern languages, burst upon our bewildered youth, and threaten to exhaust, or to dissipate on variety of objects, the energies of a life, under the claim to train an education. But the choice was much more restricted when the present bent of our universities was taken, and from that time to this, while the higher faculties of Theology, Law, and Medicine became a mere name, the real education given consisted in a limited course of the Faculty of Arts, comprising in Oxford the Greek and Latin languages, and the Aristotelian philosophy in some small degree: and in Cambridge the mathematical sciences.

But where, in the mean time, were the ecclesiastical training schools of the Anglican Church? Till a very late period it had none other than Oxford and Cambridge: and at this moment the great mass of its clergy have no other qualification for their sacred office than the course of

about three years which they pass at these Universities, and a few lectures subsequently, so trifling in number, and affecting the pupil's tone of mind and character so little, as hardly to enter into computation. The future clergyman's mind for good or for evil may be said to be formed at Oxford and Cambridge; there at the most important period of life his habits are moulded: there he passes from the constraint of school to almost the freedom of manhood: there the bias is received which will probably only be confirmed in future years: and thence he passes, always with a very brief interval, and sometimes with none at all, to the performance of his sacred functions. What the episcopal seminaries are in Catholic countries to the students for the priesthood, that Oxford and Cambridge are to the Anglican ordinandi. They are emphatically the 'formal cleri Anglicani,' and they act upon the youthful mind probably with a force far greater than that of any seminary, because, instead of a small number collected within the walls of one building, they contain the very flower and bloom of a great nation, of unexampled energy and industry, now in the spring-tide of worldly renown and material power. In such a society the tone and character which prevail—the impulses which with electrical agency charge the air—have a far greater force, a far more living effect, than any dry, material rules: the free-will, which often exerts itself against the latter, expands and exults in the former, and grows into them with all the energy of its being. All those who have passed through Oxford or Cambridge will know how they tell upon the mind. Those few years' sojourn leave an ineffaceable something on the gayest and most thoughtless, and the effects on the character of the intercourse which there takes place are often more valued by parents than any amount of information which the most industrious could attain.

These, then, are the ecclesiastical training schools for the great mass of the Anglican clergy, for there are none other: and therefore it is fair to compare them in this particular point of view with Catholic training schools, which otherwise it would not be fair to do, for the course of Arts in an University does not naturally comprehend special instruction in Theology, dogmatic, moral, or pastoral, and as little formation of ecclesiastical character. But these are either given here, or they are not given at all, to Anglicans. Moreover, the faculty of Theology which

nominally exists, is, and has been for three hundred years, as we have shown, a nonentity.

The efficiency of ecclesiastical schools would seem to consist partly in forming those inward habits, partly in conveying that special knowledge, which are needed for the clerical life and mission. It is of the utmost importance to the Church that her ministers in both these respects should be long and carefully adapted for the extraordinary and unworldly duties which they have to perform. Secular education is no more like clerical education, than the world is like the Church. Let us see how in these respects the chief and prime University of England, the more especial nursery of the Anglican Church, the citadel of her strength, and the chosen seat of her spirit, discharges its high office.

Behold the choicest of her youth from the richest country in the world, in the noon-day of her prosperity, out of the princely palaces of her nobility, out of the stately homes of her gentry, from her myriad of smiling parsonages, such as no other realm can boast, from mansions which commerce has reared and enriched with the costliest productions of sea and land, are met together in that ancient city of study. Eton, and Winchester, Harrow and Rugby, the Charter-House and Westminster, and hundreds of other schools have furnished their quota to swell this tide of life and energy. With dispositions as dissimilar as their aims and objects in life—as wealth or comparative want, early habits of luxury or of keen exertion, create—some for the senate, some for the bar, some for other learned professions, for arms, or for trade, some for enjoyment of country life, but a large majority for the ministry of the Church, they are drawn within the same walls, to submit for a time to a common discipline, to pursue common studies, to join in common sports. Gaze on them, and you will recognize the imperial Anglo-Saxon race, whose very merchants “hold the gorgeous East in fee, And are the safeguards of the West;” there is stuff of firm texture, out of which the world may be planted with self-governing colonies, the sea subdued, and the earth made one vast emporium of buying and selling: or, if need be, a Trafalgar or a Waterloo be won. They are of those born “*parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos.*” Independence, self-confidence, individuality of mind, shows itself in all their demeanour. It is true the college chapel and the college lecture receive

all alike; though some more frequently than others: and all sleep—unless college porters and scouts are corruptible—within the same walls. And the great poets, historians, and orators of Greece and Rome, and above all, he, whom mediæval times called with affectionate reverence the Master, are appointed for their most grateful occupation; and during their sojourn here they are to live in the thoughts of the great spirits of antiquity, expressed in their own incomparable languages. Something, no doubt, of Latin majesty, something of Greek harmony and genius, some voices from Salamis, some echoes of the Forum, will reach every spirit which is not quite *ἀμουσος*. But some are here for none of these things. Already of high rank and ample fortune, they live at least only in the tone and society of the place, even if they are not sent specially for these. They are devoted to the morning lounge, the afternoon ride, and the evening supper. Others are more or less widely affected by their example. Many are tempted to imitate a profusion which in their case has no excuse, nothing to redeem it from the most miserable folly. Again, many have a bent of mind so turned away from the above-mentioned studies, that they never enter into them with spirit, and relinquish the prospect of distinction in them. But the great point of all this is, that here the world has entered with a spring tide; not, indeed, a world with engrained habits of evil and hard-heartedness, but a world with all its powers of dissipation, spreading its thousand subtle influences around youth, and teaching them its own standard of things. A few years pass, and the majority of those who are now, if most industrious, studying Aristotle, Thucydides, and Tacitus, with an occasional boat-match or cricket-match, a grave after-dinner party or a more lively supper, who are urged to the utmost by the desire of renown, and whose motive principle is *αἰεν ἀριστένειν καὶ υπεῖροχον ἔμμεναι ἀλλων*, will be scattered far and wide over the country, preaching to corrupted towns and semi-heathen villages the cross of Him “Who was despised and rejected of men, the very scorn of men, and the outcast of the people.” What we would ask is, how and when, in the whole of that academical course—which as a system of secular instruction, if it has many defects, we yet most gratefully acknowledge has many excellencies—how and when is that all-important question of *vocation* brought before those, who, this course ended, are to take

upon themselves the awful burden of the Christian ministry? It is a fair question, for this academic course they go through as the chief qualification for orders. Now at what time in it—by what studies in it—by what persons—is this *vocation* brought before each individual? The course of studies in its main range is secular, even heathen. All the positive instruction in divinity given is lectures on the Articles: but we are not now so much speaking of instruction, as of bringing home to the conscience with all possible effect the peculiar duties, the peculiar qualifications, of those who are to “bind up the broken-hearted,” and bear the standard of the cross in the world. Here are a mixed mass of young men, those who are to continue laymen, those who are to become ecclesiastics, pursuing a common course of studies in the dead languages, and in the heathen authors; and the bond between Tutors and Pupils is not ecclesiastical, but academical. Lectures are given, not consciences directed. No doubt open immorality is discountenanced: non-attendance at chapel is punished. But the inward being of the pupil, the real man, remains during all these three years a complete mystery to the tutor, into which he does not even attempt to enter. As for an effort to ascertain that there is any real bent to the ecclesiastical state; any real endeavour to lead a pure and holy life, to avoid sins of thought, to mortify worldliness, it is never made. It would be out of character to make it: an ungentlemanly inroad on privacy. The tutor’s relation to his pupil is both far too external, and far too secular, nor has this a direct bearing on the schools for which the pupil is immediately studying, all important as its bearing is on that future life for which honours in the schools are sought. We should say that the subject of *vocation* as distinct from a decent moral life, is one which probably never occurs to the student from the beginning to the end of his academical life. We do not mean that he does not consider the subject of a *profession*, quite the contrary; as the young military man looks forward to a commission, and the lawyer to being called to the bar, so the future ecclesiastic contemplates taking orders. Thus he weighs the matter, and sometimes already has an eye to the future partner of his possible parsonage. But a man may be qualified to become a good lawyer, a good officer, a good merchant, and the rest, and moreover a good Christian in all these, who, becoming

with such dispositions a clergyman, would not only be a very bad minister, but probably a very bad Christian.

And next in importance to *vocation* is the *formation of tone and character*, and the inner spiritual life. This cannot be omitted, like vocation, for good or bad it must be, and of perpetual growth. And in this, as we have hinted above, our Universities have great force, and a most living energy, on account of the extent and the various classes from which they gather their pupils. They tell, because they are so worldlike and so worldwide. But *how* do they tell? In what way will that busy swarm of active youth—that medley of the richest and noblest, the dissipated and worldly, with the keen anxious student—they to whom learning is valueless, and they to whom learning is all in all—those who look to professions and those who look to the Church—be moulded? One thing is plain, they will be moulded according to this world, and not according to that which is to come. Here the studies are secular: the bond between tutor and pupil is secular: the society is secular: what is highest and what is lowest, the idleness and the study, the ambition and the sloth, are secular. The end of the *first class* is honour, distinction, and advantage: the end of the boat-race, the revel, and the chase, is pleasure: the end of the mass between, who neither gain classes nor commit dissipation, is gentlemanliness. Now honour, pleasure, and gentlemanliness are equally secular. Youth is seduced and seducing: rank and fashion are attractive: study is engrossing, and honour absorbing: and here all these have not a college but an University for their field: not the gleanings of a class, but the pick of a nation, for their food and range. Alas for the young ecclesiastic! the world, the world, the world is upon him before he is aware: by his warmest sympathies, by his most natural tastes, by the force of example, by the challenge of renown, it enthrals him. What is left for Christ? What are the forces here at work? Among those who do not study, pride of wealth and birth, fashion and custom, expensive habits fostered by a system of almost unlimited credit: among those who do study, emulation, the more intense, since as Greece looked upon her Olympian games and rewarded the winners, so England looks on those who win at her Universities, and welcomes them to the more real trials of life. Nor probably does any applause of listening senates so thrill through the speaker's

frame as the moment which places the young academician high in the class list: nor is there any struggle of after life so sustained and urgent as that which gains for him those first well-won laurels of Alma Mater. Can it then be vain-glory, which has cost so much, which is gained so hardly, which has seemed to be so encouraged by partial voices at home, by superiors here so eager for the honour of their college, that conquest almost seemed virtue, and failure quite a crime? And so that pleasing poison of praise has run into and infected the whole being. How will it brook hereafter the obscurity of a country village, the reforming of clownish minds, the stirring up of consciences sunk in the pettifogging of daily trade, the converse of those "whose talk is of oxen?" Is not a certain love of ease and refinement, a taste for well-furnished rooms and comfortable sofas, a keen voluptuous enjoyment of literature, and, most markedly, an indisposition to suffering, and a calculation of virtue by worldly success, generated in the higher class of minds by such an education? Should we expect such to be ready to inhale fevers over sick beds, or teach the first articles of the creed to the children of ignorance?

But daily habits are the best indication of the inner spiritual life, which they so deeply affect. And what are the daily habits of Oxford, especially in regard to devotion? How much and how often is the unseen world of the Christian's hopes and fears brought before the youthful mind? Attendance at the daily morning prayers, usually at eight o'clock, is enjoined: in many colleges this is imperative, being used as a security against sleeping out, as exit is not allowed before then. In others attendance in the evening is allowed instead. But what are those morning prayers? Surely a more formal service was never devised, nor one in which there is less worship of body and soul. But to know and feel to what degree that which is of itself stiff and formal can be made lifeless and perfunctory, as the voice of a parish beadle or the crier of a court, that service must be heard day after day with its stereotyped exhortation, its unbending monotony through fast-day and festival, from the mouth of chaplain or tutor, with its lessons gabbled by the scholar, who seems to fear that he shall utter the words of Scripture with too much decency, or too little unintelligibility. When this half-hour is over breakfast succeeds, and then two, or, it may be, three lectures with the tutor on some Greek or Latin writer. The later afternoon

•

passes in recreation. Dinner about five reunites the students in their several halls: after which they "wine" with each other. Tea follows, before which there is chapel, which all may, and some do, attend a second time: and then the more studious prepare for the morrow. It will be seen how large a disposal of his own time is left to each: how very much for good or ill he is independent of all control. But is any examination of the spiritual state daily, weekly, or monthly, inculcated? No such thing is thought of. It is matter for the private conscience. Of course if the natural piety of the individual lead him to it, if parent or master have previously drawn him to practise it, he may continue it; but the college never enters into any such matter, and far less the University. True it is that once in the Term each is called upon to attend the Holy Communion; but in what state he comes to it is left wholly to himself. He has been brought up to think that over the internal world of his thoughts no one ought to have the slightest control. How should any one? He was never brought to confession even before his first communion: he was never told there was any such duty. And to whom should he confess? Where is the place for it, or the time, or the person? He does not hear that his college tutors, if they are priests, are in the habit of receiving confessions, or, indeed, have been instructed how to do so. When he entered the college its superior never told him it was a duty: in fact he does not see any of his comrades practising it, at least openly. Most probably the notion never occurs to him at all. In the meantime the Sunday on which Holy Communion is administered is approaching. He wishes it was not, but he does not know how to escape. He feels so perfectly well that he can't feign indisposition. He has a sort of unreasoned conviction that he is not at all fit to go: he is quite sure he would rather not go. Then a few evenings since he drank rather too much at supper: and the songs sung strike him, as he thinks of it, to have been a little too free. Well, if there be not more than thoughts of evil recklessness indulged, more than a throng of idle words and careless actions. What a bore it is that these tutors will have this every Term, and look for every one to attend. But, however, he cannot post himself to the college as an immoral person, and to his own knowledge half his friends are as ill prepared as himself. So he goes. In another year such an one may be, and has

full often been, in Deacon's orders, with the partial care of a parish: and as he went to first communion, and to every communion since, without submitting his spiritual state to any guide, so he has entered into holy orders without enquiry made into his vocation, the Bishop supposing that the solemn appeal addressed to him by the Prayer-book, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration?" is sufficient guarantee that the conscience has been examined and the vocation ascertained by each for himself. What else can we expect when confession has been made what is called "voluntary," that is entirely disused by men and women, young and old, ninety-nine out of a hundred: when the hundredth practises it under the rose, and with the stigma of being popishly inclined? In such a state of things it would be an insult to suppose that the student at college, or the candidate for orders, needed any enquiry into his spiritual state. At least no one is competent to make it, for he is clear of all open immorality, and, approaching either Holy Communion or orders, who has a right to suggest what would be a sort of token of suspicion? But what sort of supervision of the inward life of his people will a minister so educated and prepared be competent to take? His own heart from his childhood up has been left a wilderness, in which first self-will, and then the passions, ranged at pleasure: no fatherly voice has warned him of the commencements of sin: no skilful physician probed the depth of corruption, arrested the disease, and applied the remedy. How can he do for others what has never been done for himself? In what will consist his "Cure of souls?"

And here we must remark in passing, that among the daily habits of University life, there is no note whatever of mortification or the ascetic principle, as good for the Christian in general, or in any respect necessary to the minister. We are all familiar with that excellent tutor immortalized in "Loss and Gain," who astonished his college servant by ordering no sweet sauce to his plain joint of mutton on a fast day. This however is below the mark, and we are sure that many a "Head" would consider the absence of the sauce a most suspicious circumstance on any day which the calendar marked as fast or vigil; and the present Bishop of Hereford proved at least his orthodoxy, if he did not add to his existing claims on a mitre, by having a

sort of ball on an ember day. Not that the contrary tone of mind does not exist, but then it is individual, and in spite, not in consequence, of the habits of the place.

Now compare in these three points, the formation of daily habits, the cultivation of the inner spiritual life, and the ascertaining of vocation, what is done for Catholic students at a seminary. Let us take them in the inverted order. Here is the course of a day's study and devotion at S. Sulpice.

“5 a. m. They rise; recite the ‘Angelus,’ (Angelic Salutation.)

5 to 5½. Dress, come down stairs; the most pious go for two or three minutes before the Holy Sacrament.

5½ to 6½. Vocal prayer for ten minutes, and then prayer for the rest of the hour, each by himself, kneeling, without support.

The Professor says his prayer aloud, in order to teach the pupils, on his knees, in the hall.

6½ to 7. Mass: those who have communicated attend another mass for returning thanks, which may last to 7¼. The rest mount to their rooms.

7. Reading of Holy Scripture in private.

8 to 8¼. Breakfast: dry bread, wine and water; nothing else allowed, save that, in case of necessity, milk or soup is sometimes given. Each reads in private.

8¼ to 9½. Preparation of theological lesson in their rooms.

9½ to 10½. Lesson in theology. Morale.

10½ to 10¾. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.

10¾ to 11¼. Deacons have a lesson in theology; the rest a singing lesson for half-an-hour, and then go up to their rooms.

11¼ to 12. Private examination of conscience. During seven minutes meditation, kneeling, on some fact of the New Testament; and for the next seven Tronson read.

12 to 12½. Dinner. For three minutes a chapter of the Old Testament read aloud, then the life of a saint, or ecclesiastical history. They end with the Roman Martyrology for the morrow. Then a visit to the Holy Sacrament for a minute: recitation of the Angelus.

Dinner consists of a little soup; one dish of meat, potatoes, or ‘legumes.’ For dessert, an apple, or such like. Drink, wine and water.

12½ to 1¼. Recreation. At 12¼ talking is allowed for the first time in the day. Letters are delivered. The Professors are bound by their rule to take their recreations with their pupils; they make a great point of this.

1¼. Recitation of the ‘Chaplet:’ sixty-three Paters and Aves.

2 to 3½. Private study in their rooms. From 2 to 3½ class of ecclesiastical singing four times a week. From 2 to 5¼ adoration of the Holy Sacrament by each person for half-an-hour.

- 3½ to 4½. Theological class. Dogma.
 4½ to 4¾. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.
 5½ or 5¾. According to the season, bell for all in holy orders to say their breviary. Time for conferences.
 6½ to 7. 'Glose,'—spiritual reading by the Superior.
 7 to 7½. Supper. One dish of meat, 'legumes,' salad, wine and water. Reading at all meals. Talking never allowed but at the Archbishop's visit once a year. A chapter of the New Testament read; a verse of the Imitation of Jesus Christ.
 7½. They go before the Holy Sacrament; recite the Angelus.
 7½ to 8½. Recreation.
 8½ to 8¾. Evening prayers; litanies, vocal, with private examination of conscience. Mount straight to their rooms, or go just before the Holy Sacrament. The Superior remains in his place: each, in passing beside him, accuses himself of any outward faults committed during the day against the rules.
 9 to 9½. Bed-time; at 9½ to be in bed. Each has a room to himself; a table, a bed, a candlestick, and fire-place. A priest sleeps in each corridor.*

Such a course of daily occupation speaks a volume by itself. We note in it three hours and a half given to devotion: eight and three quarters to study: four to meals and recreation. But what a cultivation of reverence to our Lord's eucharistic Presence! What a perpetual realizing of the Incarnation through that most loving and awful mystery! The whole day seems brooded over by it, as though they were walking beside the lake of Galilee, listening to our Lord's parables, and gazing up into His face.

Secondly, what are the means taken to cultivate and foster that inner spiritual life, the most precious of all qualifications for the Priesthood?

"They confess themselves every week, ordinarily in the morning during the meditation. They choose their own confessor among the masters, who are at present twelve, but the number is not fixed. As to communicating, they are free, but are exhorted to do it *often*. Often is all the Sundays and festivals. Some communicate, besides, two, three, four, five times a week, especially as the time of their ordination draws near. The priests every day. After the communion twenty minutes' 'action de grâces.' On entering the seminary a general confession of the whole past life is made. At the commencement of each year, after the vacation, in October, a confession of the year is made. At the beginning of each month there is a retreat for one day, ordinarily the first Sunday. *Direction* is twice a month. It is intercourse between each young man and his director for the purpose of making known his inward state. There is a

* Allies' Journal in France, p. 30-1.

general retreat after the vacation for eight days; in this no visits are allowed; no letters received; no going out into the city. There are recreations, but the rest of the day is consecrated to prayer, to confession, and to sermons. Each has his own rule, (*règlement particulier*), which he draws up in concert with his confessor.

“The day, the hour, and the mode of using the following exercises, to be determined on with the director. Private examination of oneself. Confession. Holy Communion. Direction. The monthly retreat. La monition, (which consists in making known to him who has charged us with that office of charity his imperfections and external defects contrary to Christian and ecclesiastical virtues). Any special reading. Accessory studies.

“What has been determined on by the director, relatively to the preceding exercises, is to be written in the ‘*règlement particulier*’ of each.

“The main resolution necessary to ensure the fruits of the semi-nary is fidelity to the ‘*règlement*,’ and especially to silence at the prescribed times, and to the holy employment of one’s time.

“The virtues to be studied are collectedness, the thought of the presence of God, modesty and good example, charity and humility, religion, and fervour in the exercises of piety.

“The order of exercises for a day in the annual retreat is as follows:

“5 a. m. Rise; preparation for prayer; short visit to the Most Holy Sacrament.

5½. Prayer.

6½. Messe de communauté.

7. Preparation for general confession, or for that of the annual review, and especially for that of the time spent in the vacation.

8. Breakfast.

8½. Petites heures.

8½. Reading or direction.

9½. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.

9½. ‘Entretien.’

10½. ‘*Délassement*,’ during which there may be either reading or direction.

11. Writing of one’s resolutions, and then reading the prescribed chapters of Holy Scripture.

11½. Private examination.

12. Dinner, followed by the Angelus and recreation.

1½. Vespers and Compline, recollecting of oneself, to examine how one has done the morning’s exercises.

2½. Reading, with meditation of the chapters of the Imitation.

3½. Visit to the Holy Sacrament.

3½. ‘Entretien.’

4½. Matins and Lauds: writing of resolutions. Then ‘*délassement*,’ as in the morning at 10½.

6. Recitation of ‘*chapelet*,’ meditated.

- 6½. A spiritual lecture.
7. Supper, followed by the Angelus and recreation.
- 8½. Prayer; examination of conscience.
9. Bed; making preparation for (the morning's) prayer.*

In the "picture" which is given to each student as a general summary of the objects to be aimed at, he is told that,

"The object of the monthly retreat is, 1. More deeply to examine the conscience; 2. To make firmer resolutions for the correction of faults; 3. To choose the most effective means to advance in virtues, and specially to be confirmed in the life of faith, and in contempt of the world, by a serious preparation for death.

"In order to profit by this exercise, the seminarist sets before him the following considerations:

"1. To learn his ruling and oftenest recurring fault; for instance, love of the world, and its pleasures; sloth, and want of application to his duties; fear of humiliations; inclination to slander, and unfavourable judgment of his neighbours; liking for his own will, and opposition to obedience.

"2. To search into the causes of lukewarmness and slackness; habitual heedlessness: little preparation for prayer and attendance on sacraments; frivolous reading and conversation; indisposition for and want of openness in direction; irresolution in complete surrender to God, in avoiding slight faults, and in seeking the society of the most earnest.

"3. To examine the most necessary virtue, and pursue the practices fitted to acquire it; to meditate seriously on the necessity of obedience, humility, self-denial, charity, good example, in the holy ministry.

"4. To write down his feelings and resolutions, communicate them to his director, and read them over frequently.†

Thirdly, as to vocation, besides that it is a subject perpetually recurring in this system of inward discipline, on which no one can enter, and in which, still less, can any one persevere, without a severe trial of it, there is yet a last and crowning test.

"There are, moreover, retreats for eight days before each ordination. Exposition of the pontifical is given. Before the ordination of any individual is decided on, there are two 'appeals' to be gone through. 1st, That of outward conduct; 2nd, That of inward conduct.—If these are passed, there is a third examination of himself and his fitness for the ministry to be gone through by the pupil in private. Fourthly, if he is thoroughly persuaded of his

* Journal, p. 32—5.

† Journal, p. 379.

vocation, his confessor finally decides whether he shall be accepted for the ministry or rejected.”*

It is plain that in tone and spirit, and in the standard set before the student, no two lives can be more opposed than that of a candidate for the Anglican ministry at Oxford, and for the Catholic priesthood at S. Sulpice; and the force of the latter is thrown exactly on the point which in the former is entirely neglected,—the interior qualification of heart and temper.

But another point of primary importance, to which we referred above, remains to be considered,—the imparting that special knowledge which is needed for the clerical life and mission. The subject matter of this knowledge is, again, threefold—dogmatic and moral theology, and the practical application of these in ritual and discipline.

Now, doubtless, in a course of Arts, and especially for the baccalaureate, we should not expect such knowledge as this to be imparted at all. But then, this course of three or four years, terminated by the Bachelor's degree, is the only course of systematic study by which the Anglican minister is qualified for his functions; and after its termination, generally not more than a year, and sometimes less, remains, before he enters into Deacon's orders. We must, therefore, inquire what space theology occupies in the studies which all those who attend the universities go through.

Now, the acquisition of the Greek and Latin languages themselves occupies the far larger portion of the *ordinary* student's time in those three or four years; while the history, the chronology, the antiquities, which are necessary to illustrate the prose writers, and the exquisite graces of idiom which mark the poets, supply an ample field besides, for the student *in honours*; not to say that the main stress of the battle will be with him in philosophy, that is to say, in mastering the ethics, rhetoric, and poetics of Aristotle. A certain amount of logic is also necessary. But as for divinity, every student knows, indeed, that something is so imperatively required, that the want of it will not be compensated by any degree of knowledge in other things. This something is, the being acquainted with the four Gospels and the Acts, in Greek, a general knowledge of

* Journal, p. 36.

sacred history, the subjects of the books of the Old and New Testament, the evidences of christianity, and the being able to quote the text and understand the meaning of the Thirty-nine Articles. To which the student in honours may add one or more of the Epistles, and Ecclesiastical History. With this amount of divinity every one's examination begins, and not to reach the minimum in this is fatal to any further trial: But at the same time, every one knows, that nothing more is wanted than to do *respectably* this amount of divinity. The class will not turn on any further proficiency in it. And it needs but a glance at this list of subjects, to see that the only portion of it which can be termed dogmatic is the Thirty-nine Articles; on these, accordingly, as the distinctive code of the Anglican Church, lectures are given in the various colleges, and in such lectures must be contained the only appearance of systematic instruction given to the student on the Church of Christ, as a great living system, on its belief and on its sacraments. These Articles, save the first six, being negative rather than positive, and consisting in certain one-sided protests against supposed errors of the Church of Rome, the natural view for a student to take, to whom they are presented as the code of faith, and the text-book for comment, will be, that the main function and high prerogative of a christian in this world, is to keep himself clean from the corruptions of Popery. We doubt if he will leave the university half so well convinced of the Two Natures of our Lord, and the Hypostatic Union, as that the Papacy is an enormous system of fraud; or that he will feel there to be "one holy Catholic Church" half so keenly as he enters into the fact that "as the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome has erred, in matters of faith." Then again, as to our Lord's dwelling with His people in the Sacrament of His love, he will have a very timid, guarded, and hesitating apprehension; but he will be bold as a lion to declare that "Transubstantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions;" while his knowledge of counsels of perfection, and of the duty of the clergy, to whom he is about to belong, to spend and be spent for their people, will be conveyed under the negative form that "bishops, priests, and deacons, are *not* com-

manded by God's law either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage." Besides, he is told that "general councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes;" by which he may infer the independence of our Lord's kingdom,—and that "when they be gathered together, being an assembly of men, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God,"—whence he may form a notion as to its infallibility: and that "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another;" which may, perhaps, suggest a thought about the Church's fidelity to her office, as if Church and Scripture stood in a sort of normal opposition to each other.

But we have seen Professor Huber again and again declaring, that as for any positive and systematic exposition of what even Anglican orthodoxy admits, it has never been found at the Universities. Now what the University neither has, nor ever has had, in the three hundred years since the Reformation, of course, it cannot impart to its students. But to give the true cause for so long continued an effect, a science of Anglican theology does not exist, because prayer-books, homilies, and articles, are fragments of three contradictory systems, which refuse to coalesce, the forces of which negate each other, and the inconsistency of which is not felt only by those who do not consider the bearing of one doctrine on another. The one real and living idea of the Reformation, which is reproduced again and again in the three centuries of its existence, was to substitute the text of the Bible, interpreted by each according to his fancy, for theology. Here was an appearance of venerating God's word on the one hand, and an unlimited range for private judgment on the other. For the authority of the one Church to interpret and set forth the true meaning of Scripture being rejected, every individual became free to maintain his own interpretation. Now, to this one principle all Protestants are true, whatever their individual bias. Accordingly, they do not contemplate the christian faith as a whole, nor the relation of one doctrine to another; that is, they have no theology, and they feel no need of it. They have no sense of inconsistency and contrariety, not being in possession of any definite faith by which to test what is brought before them.

Thus the Church's dogma appears to them a human invention, and they oppose it to the Word of God, not perceiving that the real opposition lies between the mind of the individual as to what *is* God's Word, and the mind of the Church, and that while the former may, and naturally will, run into all manner of error, the latter is protected from this, not only by every human safeguard, but by an express divine promise.

Quite true to this is the university in her examination of students. She puts them on the *text* of the Gospels and Acts, on sacred history, on the subjects of the Old and New Testament, on evidences, on the *text* of the Epistles again, or on early ecclesiastical history. The only apparent exception is the thirty-nine Articles, as a system of belief. Yet these too are mainly a protest against another system of belief, and so negative rather than positive. Thus he who gains a first class, and he who takes the common degree, will alike go forth from the schools at Oxford ignorant that there is one, coherent, uniform system of belief necessary to salvation: it needs not to say that he will be uninstructed what it is. Chance, so to call it, may have thrown him in the way of Puseyite, or again of Evangelical, or of Latitudinarian influences. According to circumstances will his bias be: an Arnoldite if he fall upon an amiable and accomplished tutor of that persuasion, who is not content with giving college lectures, but seeks to gather round him a school by the charm of his conversation, the absence of donnishness, and an affectionate interest in his friends: Evangelical, or Puseyite, if such be the prevailing temper of his college or his circle. There is nothing to prevent young men going forth from the same public schools, with the same honours, out of the same discipline, with principles of belief *toto cœlo* opposed, some believing in Sacraments, in the Priesthood, in the Eucharistic Presence and Sacrifice, and the existence of a Church: some in that "spiritual" religion which denies all these: and some in that comprehensive and convenient persuasion, that it is great folly to squabble about such things at all. And these will carry their respective opinions into the Anglican ministry, and subscribe the Prayer book, with its baptismal, confirmation, and ordination services on the one hand, and the thirty-nine Articles on the other: all alike professing that "whosoever

will be saved, it is before all things necessary that he hold the Catholic faith, which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly."

It must not be forgotten, however, that in the last few years a voluntary theological examination has been established at Oxford and Cambridge for those who have gone through the schools. Many bishops already require candidates before ordination to have attended this, and probably all will in the end. Does this then supply that utter want of dogmatic teaching which we have been noting? Nay, it offers a remarkable proof that the evil is inherent and ineradicable in Protestantism. This examination has arisen from a sense of the utter inefficiency of the theological instruction given to the future clergy in the course of Arts. It is the latest remedy devised for an acknowledged fault. Let us see how far it reaches. The subjects appointed for the examination at Cambridge in October, 1851, are these. The Greek Testament: the first Apology of Justin Martyr: Ecclesiastical History: the thirty-nine Articles: the liturgy of the Church. At Oxford the student must attend four courses of lectures, each comprising at least sixteen from the divinity professors, one course of which, however, may be from the professor of Hebrew: and he will be examined on the subjects of these lectures: that is, probably, on the thirty-nine Articles, on Ecclesiastical History, on some part of pastoral theology, as preaching, and on some part of the Hebrew Bible. What can be more vague and uncertain, more neutral and devoid of dogma, or every ruling principle, than this? Puseyite, Arnoldite, and Evangelical will go through it, and come out just as they entered.

But suppose the candidate for the clerical state to have passed through both schools and voluntary examination, and to present himself before the bishop a few months preceding his next ordination. He will probably be asked a few questions on the Articles, set to construe a passage in the New Testament, and recommended to study Pearson on the Creed, and Burnet on the Articles, with one or two more, in the intervening period. A friend of ours, indeed, who applied to the bishop most distinguished for his attempt to assert the dogmatic character of the Anglican establishment, was not so fortunate; he failed to elicit any text book so positive as Pearson on the Creed, or the essay

of the trigamist ecclesiastic, who was bishop of Salisbury, friend of Dutch William, and hero of England's brilliant Whig historian. Having taken his degree early, and wishing to employ a considerable time in study for orders, he begged to be put upon a regular course: the bishop replied that he should expect from him "a competent knowledge of the Old and New Testament." Chillingworth, it seems, was right after all: he took the common sense view, and discerned the only adequate safeguard against Popery: "The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants."

Such is the amount, such the definiteness, and such the authority of the instruction given to the Anglican candidates for Orders on those mighty and soul-thrilling subjects for the christian's contemplation, the Being of God; the Divine Persons; the Incarnation, and its manifold consequences; the angels; the creation; the mysteries of Christ: the blessed Virgin; the doctrine of Grace and Justification. How many of them even know that a wonderful fabric of dogma on all these has been elaborated under the inspiration of that Spirit who dwells in the Church?

But if such be the case concerning dogmatic theology, what concerning moral? That the very distinction is unknown, that few Anglican ministers, or even bishops, are aware what it means, or that it exists, is a certain fact. For the Anglican establishment not being a government of souls at all, but a state department for religion, how can it authorize instruction in a science which from beginning to end it considers to be an invasion of the rights of the individual conscience? Moral theology is in fact an utter blank in Anglican literature, from the year 1559, downwards: there is no school on it existing: no tradition known. Should an Anglican minister advise himself, being in charge of a parish or otherwise, to attempt the functions of a Catholic Priest, he will, after conferring faculties on himself to hear confessions in general, and the reserved cases in particular, have to construct, out of his private reading of Catholic books, his whole method and rules of action. We know what we should think of a learned amateur, who, after studying in private the best works on surgery, illustrated with the most accurate engravings, set himself, having never attended an hospital, nor bound up a limb, to operate for the stone. It would be a marvel indeed if the patient escaped with his life, or the

operator without meeting St. John Long's punishment for charlatanism. The individual might have in germ the talents of a Cooper or a Brodie, but we should not judge the less severely of his presumption. Exactly parallel is the case of a spiritual doctor, who, uninstructed by Church, unauthorised by Bishop, assumes the authority of a grand penitentiary, constructs a confessional after his own eclecticism, and ventures to deal with the most difficult cases of conscience on a system of rules framed by himself. If constitutions escape under such dealing, it must be that there was a natural process of healing going on, which anticipated the operator. Now the Anglican minister, urged by the wants of his people to enter on a duty for which no previous education has fitted him, in which he has no landmarks save those furnished by a communion against which his own protests, such a one will painfully feel what it is to have heard pronounced over him the words "whose sins thou dost remit they are remitted, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained," without one single instruction before or after concerning so awful a gift, and the way in which it was to be used.

This is but an instance of the non-existence of moral theology on one particular point: but when we come to the whole doctrine of the sacraments themselves being unsettled, a series of "open questions" comes into view which quite takes away the breath. Parties which number their adherents in the ministry by thousands dispute whether grace is given through the sacraments, or by faith alone: the former denounce the latter as heretical: the latter represent the former to be Judaic and unspiritual. The State holds both parties together in its cold embrace, and says, "why will you not join together and educate my people? Leave disputing about forms."

One point of instruction remains, as to the administration of the practical ritual and discipline. But where the doctrine of sacraments is unsettled, it is hardly to be imagined that the mode of celebrating them will be less so. What Anglican minister is taught, at the University, or elsewhere, how to baptize a child, or how to celebrate Holy Communion? Or wherein the 'forma' of the one, or of the other, consists? He probably takes his own custom in these from the minister with whom he happens to be at his first curacy. As little is there any special instruction in the mode of catechizing children, of visiting the sick, or

the many other details of ministerial life. What an amount of neglect has arisen from the utter disregard of ritual regularity, it would be impossible to express in words. All these things have in truth been dead forms to the mass of the clergy: that they were living and moving in a divine system which their Lord was administering by their hand or voice, was never, till quite of late, impressed on their minds. They administered Baptism with far less care than the registrar of births takes in inscribing a name. And as for the one other sacrament out of the seven which the Articles allow them to keep, if the Anglican clergy do indeed possess that most awful supernatural gift, which the Puseyite portion of them at least claim most earnestly, the amount of profanation respecting the Holy Eucharist which in the course of three hundred years has taken place is something quite inconceivable. The mind revolts at the thought, and is happy to take refuge in absolute unbelief of the gift from so literal a trampling under foot of the Blood of the Covenant.

To the triple subject of moral, dogmatic, and pastoral theology, thus neglected in the Anglican Universities, we find that three years of study are devoted in the college of S. Sulpice. They are thus disposed.

“FIRST YEAR.

Morale.	Le traité de actibus humanis.
	... de legibus.
	... de peccatis.
	... de decalogo.
Dogme.	... de vera religione.
	... de vera ecclesia.
	... de locis theologicis.

SECOND YEAR.

Morale.	Le traité de jure et justitia.
	... de contractibus.
Dogme.	... de Trinitate.
	... de Incarnatione.
	... de gratia.

THIRD YEAR.

Morale.	Le traité de sacramento pœnitentiæ. (Under this head would fall the whole direction for the guidance of souls.)
	... de matrimonio.
	... de censuris et irregularitatibus.

Dogme.	...	de sacramentis in genere.
	...	de baptismo.
	...	de confirmatione.
	...	de eucharistia.
	...	de ordine. (There is also a special course on this)
	...	de extrema unctione.

"A course of Holy Scripture twice a week, exclusive of private study of it.

"Authors used—Bailly, 8 vols.; Bouvier, *institutiones theologicæ*; Carrière, *de jure et justitia*, &c.; Tronson, *Forma cleri*. These three years of theology are sometimes expanded to four. From Easter to the vacation they are instructed in the duties of a pastor in great detail. At three o'clock on Sundays, at S. Sulpice, the young men exercise themselves in catechising, except from Easter to the vacation."*

And the general result of this remarkable contrast between Anglican and Catholic education for the ministry has been thus summed up:

"The work of educating the French clergy is largely in the hands of the congregation of S. Sulpice, a celibate body of course, and whose members are not paid, but merely clothed and boarded. They necessarily teach one uniform dogma, that is, within that sufficiently wide range of doctrine on which the Church has set her immutable seal. More than this, they impress one uniform sacerdotal mould and type, and exercise one discipline on all committed to them. It results, of course, that all who go forth from them, passing through their various public and private scrutinies, are trained and practised combatants to the extent to which their teaching goes. More yet than this; a severe ascetic and self-denying character is from the beginning attached to the sacerdotal life; they take the Apostle literally, 'no man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life'; parents who consent to their children entering into the priesthood think and speak of it as 'a sacrifice'; those who look forward to it have it so set before them, and can count the cost before they take the first step. Few situations to which they can afterwards be called require the exercise of greater self-denial than has been expected from them from the first. Does not this point out to us the quarter from which a reform among ourselves must proceed? Surely before the laity can become sound churchmen, the priesthood must be *uniformly taught*; 'the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth.' But High Church and Low Church, not to mention the interminable shades of distinction in individual

* Allies' Journal in France. p. 53, 32.

minds between and beyond them, are utterly incompatible with each other. After the dogma of the Trinity they part company. Until, then, the Anglican Church teaches her priests an uniform dogma, and moulds them in a severe and uniform discipline, she cannot hope for any other fate than that her bosom should be rent with interminable heresies and divisions. The existence of the Seminaries, and the order of S. Sulpice, is a reform in the Roman Church. Are we never to reform? Not by introducing novelties, but by recurring to ancient practices. The continual encroachment of the world upon the Church rendered it necessary to promote Seminaries as places of spiritual retreat for candidates for holy orders; and when, as a consequence of the revolution, the course of study in the University became quite secularised, it became also necessary to detach the candidates altogether from that course, and to provide all that was requisite for instruction, as well as for inward discipline, within the walls of the Séminaire. This, as to instruction, is not completely done yet. But it is in course of doing. Now does not that necessity, which sprung up in the French Church, exist just as much among ourselves? Are our Universities at present a fit school for preparing men for a life of the utmost patience, self-denial, and humiliation? Is the sacerdotal type impressed there at all? Is anything like an uniform dogma known? Is it not precisely there that moral control is relaxed, and habits of indulgence are commonly introduced? Is there any attempt made to form the inward life, and discern a man's vocation? Oh, is it not the severest censure of our Universities even to mention such things? And without any special training, without any knowledge of his inward state, the young man who has been accustomed to unrestricted company, to studies almost exclusively classical or mathematical, to every kind of worldly amusement and sport, or to travel at the time of life most perilous to innocence, is taken and made a priest of, and sent to the 'cure of souls' in a parish. Can any state of deeper practical corruption than this be well imagined? Or any system more thoroughly opposed to that pursued in the Church, which is proverbially mentioned among us as 'corrupt?'"*

Thus, powerless, then, have been the teaching and the discipline of the Universities, as well in producing the ecclesiastical tone and character, as in maintaining and impressing a uniform dogmatic system on the minds of those subjected to their influence. But let us consider the matter a little more widely. For three hundred years they have possessed unexampled material resources for the prosecution of all learning, human and divine, and during

* Journal, 350-3.

all that time, the very flower of the English nobility, gentry, and commonalty, has been from generation to generation nurtured in their halls. What has been their effect on society, on manners, on the nation, which in that period has passed from infancy to full manhood, and now exults in her political position and material power as the head and crown of the world's civilization?

"The English Universities," says Professor Huber, "content themselves with producing the first and most distinctive flower of the national life,—a well-educated gentleman." It is not the special knowledge requisite for lawyer, physician, or clergyman which they undertake to convey, but their glory is to lay a prior formation of character, which shall develop afterwards according to individual tendencies. Their main intellectual instrument in doing this, has been at Oxford the study of the Greek and Latin languages, and the Aristotelian moral philosophy; at Cambridge, the mathematical sciences. But their chief moral force has lain in the old influences of Church and State acting upon the youth drawn together into them from the higher ranks in all parts of the empire. It is unquestionable, that a very peculiar moral, political, and religious character has been formed and widely diffused in our nation from this their teaching; a character marked by delicate and correct taste, the proprieties and amenities of life, whose standard is honour and respectability, whose sympathies are more with Horace and Augustus than with John the Baptist and Athanasius. The heathen virtues have thus been seen to spring out of the christian creed, and the devotion which banished St. Antony to the desert, and stretched St. Lawrence on the gridiron, has been cooled down for the occasions of ordinary life in the possessors of comfortable parsonages, and the fathers of large families. And no less in its political than in its domestic aspect this character has been valuable to the State; the enthusiasm which was unbecoming in religion it has shown for the prizes of the world, and the children of Oxford and Cambridge have distinguished themselves in arts and arms in every climate of the globe, and have watered a thousand battle-fields with their blood.

With another remark of Professor Huber we agree,—that the Universities have possessed, and have not been slow to use their extraordinary facilities "for forming accomplished schoolmasters." To which must be added a

special praise of Cambridge, that she is the mother of able lawyers. The intellect, which has been so keenly engaged in the study of mathematical sciences, naturally gains distinction at the bar, and energises with precision amid the intricacies of English law.

Moreover, a very great merit has seemed to belong, at least hitherto, to the system of the Universities, which belongs also to some public schools, that they call out voluntary energies, and, not overburdening the mind with too great a variety of subjects, leave the individual character to exert its sway, and to produce, perhaps, in after life, richer fruits than if it had from the beginning been subject to a severer and more cramping course of training. This, indeed, is a merit which belongs to the whole of English, as compared with continental, life, and touches on an original difference of blood; for hitherto, the Anglo-Saxon race seems to be the only self-governing one, and to thrive on an independence which would waste itself in mere wildness of blood in other nations.

But the making gentlemen, schoolmasters, and lawyers, and the encouraging individual tendencies, was rather a falling in with the natural bias of the age, and race, and nation, than a correcting and subliming of it. For what is a citadel of religious intellect set up in a country, if not to discharge a nobler office? To raise and bear to victory a standard which otherwise had not been seen, and a cause which otherwise had been lost. England, since the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, has become the great commercial power of the world. "Tyre of the West," she has been called by friend and foe. She has thriven on the inductive sciences, according to the course mapped out by her own great philosopher; all her recent glory and greatness are built on her discoveries in the realm of matter, her applying, combining, and perfecting those discoveries of her own and others. Earth, air, fire, and water do her bidding, and submit to her rule. A boundless capitalised wealth moves those myriad arms by which she subjects these elements to the progress of human civilization. Doubtless, it is a great destiny. It is an endless task of curiosity and interest to read those secrets which the Almighty Creator has hidden in the bowels of the earth, to collect and arrange for the advantage of man powers which He has dispersed, to improve the well-being of society by impartial laws, and to open fresh sources of

prosperity in a boundless trade. . England will have the first glory of embracing the whole world's productions under one roof. But in such a scene of turmoil, such a struggle for worldly pre-eminence, such an exhibition of material power, more need was there for a continual memento that man is not merely "an exchanging animal," but a "living soul." The earthly empire tended to obscure the heavenly citizenship. Have the Universities maintained this latter as a real and living idea in the minds of men? A spiritual creed, demanding faith,—a spiritual kingdom, involving citizenship,—a spiritual authority, claiming obedience,—these were the correctives to the overbearing tyranny of worldly wealth and power. Three centuries ago these were living in the heart of the nation; they were throned in immemorial possession. The Englishman had not only a national inheritance of language, land, and law, but he spoke likewise a Catholic tongue, was heir of a spiritual realm, and subject to a divine code. And these it is which the Universities were created to maintain and set forth,—these, too, are what they have suffered to perish out of the minds of men. Our legislators, while their debates are borne on the wings of steam to the ends of the world, and read by all civilised men, have no sense of the Church's independent spiritual existence, feel no need of a system of belief, one, complete, and coherent, and yield it no obedience. That is, with greater power than the Cæsars, and a civilization "reminding one of Rome in the time of Heliogabalus," they have sunk in religion back to the state of savages, and have come to consider the individual's independence the perfection of spiritual manhood. They have wandered back, each in his self-will, into that confusion of tongues out of which Abraham was taken.

And so it is that when the Catholic Church spreads out her arms to receive men, and would mould them into her divine unity, they recoil, and cry out, 'We are wiser than you. We can read for ourselves, and think for ourselves, and be a law to ourselves. What can you give us which we have not? The press has made your book ours too. You may burn incense before it, and chant it in an unknown language, but it lies upon our tables all the time.' They have forgotten that what subdued the world of old was not a book, but the tongues of fire descending on twelve men assembled in an upper chamber. And the fire

once kindled on the earth is there still, and goes through the nations yet to quicken or destroy.

Now it is to this most sacred trust that the Universities have been unfaithful: yet it could not be otherwise: they could not raise the nation with a power which had its centre and abiding place in the nation, and therefore was subject to it. When for ten years their rights and privileges lay in the hands of a despot drunk with blood, it was an image of their future helplessness; of their doom not to guide and teach society, but to be its cupbearers and lacqueys. When an act of Parliament violated the wills of all founders, and transferred to the new religion what had been left to maintain the old, it cast away all pretext for resisting any future confiscation which the utilitarian spirit may demand. You have already entered into possession of other men's goods; when the nation cries, you have held them too long, and done little service with them, what can you reply? A robber cannot plead the rights of private property, and colleges built to say masses, wherein mass is never said, cannot complain, should reform be for turning chapels into museums, and lecture upon the structure of beasts and reptiles in preference to the thirty-nine Articles.

And it would seem that at length some such destiny is approaching. The age is angry with the universities for quite a different fault from that with which we reproach them. Not because they have taught no theology, and sent forth no apostolic ministry, but because, besides Latin and Greek and Mathematics, they have not taught modern languages and modern sciences, because Aristotle is old-fashioned, and Toryism out of date, they are threatened with a remodelling by a power with which they have no sympathy. We cannot exult at such a prospect. If these noble foundations have been kept so long, through changes so marvellous, and with effects so apparently inadequate, we could have hoped that it was for some better end at last than to be sacrificed to the shortsighted educational empiricism of the day. Creedless men will not build up what the eighth Henry demolished, nor the spirit of the counting house restore life to halls built by a Wykeham or a Waynflete.

For indeed amid this wonderful growth of the arts and commodities of life, this rise and continual development and working out of the inductive sciences, spiritual princi-

ples have been in a continual ebb, doubt has won ground upon faith, and first axioms in theology, from which our ancestors started, have been shaken. To such a degree have tricky and compromising formularies sapped all honesty of perception, that a doctrinal decision, making the virtue of baptism an open question, and so equivalent to a denial of Christianity itself, in the mind of one who has a creed, is already acquiesced in by a vast majority of the establishment. We indeed as Catholics only see in this the necessary result of certain principles which were at the bottom of Henry's and Elizabeth's reform. The evils which we have briefly traced as clinging so pertinaciously to university ecclesiastical education through three centuries are not temporary and accidental, but spring from the logical basis of the Reformation. Want of dogma could not but follow from the principle of private judgment on which alone the whole revolt was based: want of moral theology, disregard of vocation, neglect of the spiritual life, from the overthrow of the sacerdotal relation between pastor and people, and the non-interference on principle, with the individual conscience. The necessary secularisation of a married clergy carried with it the want of spiritual life, and bore the full flood of the world into the sanctuary. It is not corruption in practice, nor the fertile springing up of abuses, which we note, but the radical perversion of the idea; the State taking the place of the Church; and so the dissolution of spiritual authority, and the melting of truth into opinion. And the process is now complete: from the primary mystery of Baptism, to the crowning one of the Eucharistic presence, all is brought into doubt: the learner, having the choice of schools quite contradictory in their most essential tenets, is put in a position of superiority to his teachers: he is critic rather than disciple. He can render no submission of the heart or intellect, for there is no authority to receive it. Unity is so utterly broken up, that men defend themselves from retracing their steps by asserting that our Lord did not mean His disciples to be one.

A strange contrast it is which assails the thoughtful mind in Oxford, which must have struck with peculiar force foreign Catholics hastening in the freshness of their enthusiasm to a spot more telling of the past than any other in our island, and still bound up with so many sacred recollections. The world, which has swept away

almost all other marks of mediæval life, has left the structures of Wykeham and Waynflete, of Walter de Merton, and so many others, intact. You may enter still, alas you cannot worship, in a chapel* where St. Thomas himself may have offered the Holy Sacrifice, which, in the perfect proportions of its sculptured beauty, is like his own Summa, cut in stone, so serene, so complete, so stately, and so reverential; the roof of which the pious genius of a living son, in a spirit like his own, has decorated with the portraits of Saints and Martyrs; the very likeness of the Doctor Subtilis yet hangs within that College of which he was a student. These are societies whose corporate life held on through the overthrow of all sacred things at the Reformation, whose actual statutes, no less than their buildings, speak of fixity, system, formed character, and definite aims, and pay homage to Theology as the end of all arts and sciences: while, for ten generations, those who have thronged these halls have been the prey of every conflicting religious opinion, fanatical at one time, apathetic at another, but ever, in the diversity of their judgments, their waywardness, and ambiguity, shewing the fatal effect of that compromise which state policy struck between ancient truth and modern error, when it produced a hybrid whose members live on in perpetual conflict with each other, wasting, in intestine opposition, the vital energy of a being which, by the fault of its birth, has been cursed with sterility.

— *Allies.*

Summary Notice of Foreign Catholic Literature.—French Catholic Publications.

We are induced to resume, after a long interval, a plan which, for many years, was followed in this Journal with much success, and the abandonment of which has been a subject of frequent and earnest expostulation with many of our oldest and best friends. The number and variety of Catholic publications on the Continent, rendered it impossible for a Journal like ours, sufficiently occupied with subjects of domestic interest, appearing at intervals so distant from each other, and so limited in the number

* Merton College Chapel.

and extent of its critical essays, to keep pace with the literary progress of our brethren on the Continent. Many foreign publications, of course, were too important to be overlooked; and we have the satisfaction of feeling, that, from time to time, our Journal has recorded all that is best and most valuable in the Catholic literature of France, Germany, and Italy. But the great mass of Catholic publications, those which belong to the useful rather than the brilliant class, were necessarily passed over without notice; and in an age so eminently practical and so prolific, if not in original works, at least in useful compilations from the old ones, much valuable information, in every department of Catholic literature, was thus withheld from the reader. With the view of at least partially remedying this defect, a "Summary of Foreign Catholic Literature" was, for some years, appended to each number of this Review. It was not intended to contain elaborate criticisms of the works which it comprised; but merely to keep the reader *au courant* with the progress of Catholic literature; to register the appearance of all works of importance; and to direct special attention to such among them as were deserving of more particular examination. The utility of the plan was universally recognized. It was abandoned with great reluctance. The editors have long desired to resume it; and arrangements have at length been made by which they hope to carry it on without further danger of interruption. It is purposed, as an ordinary rule, to distribute the subject over the four quarterly publications; allotting the first to French Literature, the second to German, the third to Italian, and the fourth to Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, and Belgian. With regard to many of the publications, we shall content ourselves with little more than a record of their appearance; but all works of special merit shall be carefully considered, not so much with the hope of conveying an adequate notion of their contents, as with that of enabling the reader to decide whether he may consider them worthy of further examination.

The long arrear for which we have been obliged to provide in the present number, will sufficiently explain the brevity of some of the following notices; but arrangements have been made, by which we hope, in future, to render the Foreign Summary, in many respects, one of the most useful and interesting departments of our Journal.

FRENCH CATHOLIC PUBLICATIONS, 1850-1.

SECT. I.—THEOLOGY.

Demonstrations Evangeliques, ouvrage publié par M. MIGNE. Tome XVIII. et dernier chaque volume se vend séparément, prix f.6. Paris, Migne, 1850.

It would be difficult to resume our record of the Catholic literature of France more worthily than with the labours of the indefatigable press of the Abbé Migne. His great Exegetical, Theological, and Patristical publications are too well known to require any notice at our hands. But the series whose title is prefixed to these lines, although it is now brought to a successful termination, is less familiar even to the best informed English readers. Although the unsettled state of France, and the consequent depression of trade, have interfered materially with M. Migne's labours, he has just completed his *Demonstrations Evangeliques*, one of the most valuable collections ever published. Commencing with Tertullian, it embraces all the able defences of Gospel truth which have appeared since his day. It contains the productions of no less than 117 authors. Among them we meet with the names of Locke, Tillotson, Sherlock, Paley, Chalmers, and other English writers. In the later volumes we are glad to find the Controversial Treatises of Milner and Lingard, and the complete works of Cardinal Wiseman. The volume noticed above contains four works from the pen of the Abbé Chassay, Professor of Philosophy in the grand Seminary of Bayeux: *Dissertations sur les Etudes Clericales*; *Le Docteur Strauss et ses Adversaires in Allemagne*; *Tableau des Apologistes Chrétiens depuis la Renaissance jusqu'à la Restauration*, and *L'Indicateur Apostolique*. *Strauss et ses Adversaires* is a work unique in its kind. After giving an idea of Strauss and his book, the author passes, one by one, before the eye of the reader, the long array of German writers who have taken the field against him, giving a resumé of the points established, and the arguments employed by each. M. Chassay says that his object was merely to collect materials; but his production is, without doubt, the most complete refutation of the *Leben Jesu* which has yet appeared.

Histoire de la Redemption, par l'Abbé CHASSAY, vol. 1, 18mo. Poussielgue-Rusaud.

If the Abbé Chassay's first volume can be taken as a sample, the History of the Redemption promises to be an admirable work. It will contain a full and complete history of our Saviour's life, and of the contemporaneous events which bear upon it, gathered from all available sources, sacred and profane. The pith of all that has been written to illustrate the Gospel history, is presented to the reader, not in a scientific form, but either interwoven with the text, or subjoined in the shape of explanatory notes. The work

abounds in quotations from the Fathers and ascetic writers. The first volume reaches only to the massacre of the Holy Innocents.

Le Mysticisme Catholique ; Reponses aux objections de M.M. Panthier, Pierre Leroux, Jouffroy, Michelet, Cousin, Guizot & Barthelemy St. Hilaire, par l'Abbé CHASSAY. 1 vol. 8vo, f.6. Perisse.

Another work by the same distinguished author. In his *Le Christ et l'Evangile* he replied to the attacks of modern rationalism upon the dogmas of religion. In *Le Mysticisme Catholique*, he defends the sublime morality of the Gospel with equal zeal and success.

Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis Decreta Authentica, quæ ab anno 1588, ad annum 1848, prodierunt Alphabetico ordine collecta, 1 vol. 8vo, f. 3, 50. Julien Lavier et comp.

It is impossible to overstate the practical value of this collection. The most useful decrees of the Sacred Congregation are selected from Gardellini, and arranged according to the order of their subjects. At the end of every decree is placed the number which marks its place in Gardellini's collection. Two indexes are subjoined, one alphabetical, the other chronological. Numerous notes are added to the text, consisting of extracts from Benedict XIV., Ferraris, Merati, and all the best liturgical authorities.

Spicilegium Solesmense ; Complectens S.S. quorundam Patrum Auctoritatemve Ecclesiasticorum, qui a primo inde Sæculo ad duodecimum usque florere, anecdotæ hactenus opera, publici juris facta, curante Domino J. B. PETRA, O.S.B, Monacho, e Congregatione Gallica, nonnullis ex Abbatia Solesmensi opem conferentibus.

We shall notice this noble collection more fully hereafter. For the present, its nature can be sufficiently gathered from its title. It will contain upwards of 150 works, never before published. The collection is divided into two series. The first series extends from the second century to the tenth, the second from the tenth to the twelfth inclusive. The text is unburthened with notes, all the necessary observations being included in the prolegomena. Each series consists of 5 volumes. It may be useful to add that the price is f.10 a volume to a limited number of subscribers, and f.15 to others.

Année Liturgique, par le R. P. Dom. GUERANGER, Abbé des Solesmes, 4ime volume 8vo, f.3 75. Julien Lavier et comp.

The *Année Liturgique* is a kind of *pendant* to the well known *Institutione Liturgiques* of that learned author, a worthy child of the great Benedictine school. It will contain a commentary, dogmatic, mystic, and historical, on the offices of the entire year. The first volume commences with the Advent offices; the fourth is devoted to the time between Septuagesima and Lent.

Manuel des Sciences Ecclesiastiques, par le R. P. Dom. BRUNO LACOMBE, 2 vols. 8vo, f.12. Julien Lavier et comp.

Faithful to the spirit of their Order, the fathers of Solesmè are indefatigable in their zeal for everything regarding sacred bibliography. Within the last few years we have had many volumes of Liturgy from Dom. Gueranger, and of Patrology from Dom. Pitra. Dom. Le Bannier is untiring in translating ascetic works. There are at this moment, in the press, two books of his—a translation of the Divine Psalmody of Bona, and an accurate edition of St. Bonaventure's Meditations. The work which Dom. Lacombe has just published, though appearing under such an unpretending title, is a complete repertory of information regarding all that has been written on Ecclesiastical Science. Of the many similar performances already existing, some, as those of Dupin and Ceillier, for instance, are too voluminous for the ordinary student; others, as that of Zaccaria, are too meagre to be of any value; others, again, are incorrect; and all are now old, and therefore valueless to any one who desires information on the works of the present age. The *Manuel*, though neither voluminous nor costly, notices all the Ecclesiastical works worth consulting, from the Christian era down to the present day. Taking Scriptural Science as a specimen, we find the Canon of the inspired writings; the Apocryphal books; the different texts and versions of the Bible; an account of all the principal manuscripts; all the translations, ancient and modern; a catalogue of the principal editions; a list of Commentators, orthodox, Protestant and Jewish, &c. It is only necessary to add that Notes are appended when necessary, indicating the character and value of each work.

Du Concile Provincial, ou Traité des Questions de Théologie, et du Droit Canon qui concernent les Conciles Provinciaux, par l'Abbé BOUÏX, 1 vol. 8vo, f.7. Lecoffre.

Up to the appearance of this work we had no professed treatise on provincial Councils. The revival of these Councils in France caused the want of such a treatise to be sensibly felt. M. Bouix undertook the task of compiling and arranging all the dispositions of the Canon Law and the decision of Theologians regarding the subject, and succeeded so well, as to merit the warm approbation of Cardinal Fornari, the Papal Nuncio, and of several French prelates.

The work is divided into five parts. The first part treats of the nature of provincial Councils, their object, and the obligation of holding them. The second part treats of those whose right it is to convene the Council, and of those who should be admitted to take part in it, as also the rights and duties of the officers of the Council. The third part is taken up with the relations between the Council and the Holy See, the *Causæ majores*, the

necessity of having the decrees confirmed before publication, &c. The fourth part regards the proceedings of the Council, and the laws by which they are regulated.

Many difficult incidental questions are decided concerning the power of Councils over individual Bishops, the case of disagreement between the metropolitan and his suffragans, the precise limits to which the authority of the Council extends in matters of faith and discipline, &c. The fifth part is devoted to the ceremonial. The work in all its parts evinces considerable historical research and a familiar acquaintance with all the best theologians.

The order of the subject is natural, and the style remarkably simple and clear.

Manuale Juris Canonici ad usum Seminariorum. Auctore, J. M. F. Lequeux, Editio tertia, aucta et emendata. 4 vols. 12mo, f. 12. Mequignon.

An enlarged reprint of this extremely useful digest of Canon Law. The fourth volume is in French, and contains a history of Canon Law. It is sold separately.

Catechisme du Concile de Trente, Traduction Nouvelle, avec des Notes. Par l'Abbé Dassance, V. G. Montpellier. 2 vol. 8vo, f. 8. Mequignon.

Mons. Dassance's edition of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, contains many valuable notes, and its value is enhanced by an abridgment by way of question and answer, and a division of the catechism, corresponding to the Sundays of the year.

Symbolique ; ou Exposition Apologetique du Symbole des Apotres. Par l'Abbé Constant Clerc. 1 vol. 8vo. Waillé.

Perhaps the best mode of meeting the infidel opinions of the present day, is to give a simple and plain exposition of the tenets of Christianity, after the manner of the early Apologists. Many among the enemies of revealed truth are now in the same position as were the pagans in the early ages of the Church : they oppose the truth because they are ignorant of it.

M. Clerc, in his *Symbolique*, takes up the articles of the creed in succession, expounds them, and vindicates their truth by philosophical and theological arguments. The idea is a good one, but the author has not been very felicitous in carrying it out. His style is forced and exaggerated ; his ideas are sometimes confused and now and then inaccuracies are met with, slight, indeed, but unpardonable in a work of the kind.

L'Évangile dans son Unité. Par Pere Lacheze. Nouvelle edition. 1 vol. 8vo, f. 6. Lecoffre.

A concordance of the four Gospels, in Latin and French. The additions necessary to connect the extracts are in small type.

Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi. Auctore, Claris. 2 vol. 12mo, f. 4. Poussellque-Russano.

A companion to M. Claris's treatise on Religion. They contain nothing new upon the subject. The treatise on the Church has been approved by Cardinal Giraud.

Mariages Mixtes. Observations sur le choix des Conditions Religieuses auxquelles on peut les contracter. Par un Chanoine de Besançon. 1 vol. grand, 8vo, f. 1, 25. Sagnier de Bray.

Compendium Theologiæ Moralis. Auctore Joanne Petro Gury, S. J. in collegio Romano Professore. 2 vol. 12mo. Parisse.

We have coupled these two works together from their affinity of subject. The treatise on Mixed Marriages is practical, and displays considerable learning. The plan of the latter treatise is admirable. Every question commences with an accurate definition fully explained. All the divisions of the subject are then pointed out. Next in order come the principles upon which the decisions depend, and then, and then only, does the author proceed to the practical resolution of cases. In these, the opinions of St. Liguori are generally followed. M. Gury is preparing for the press an extended course of Moral Theology.

Les Rationalistes et les Traditionalistes. Par le R. Pere Chastel. 1 vol. 8vo, f. 1, 50. Mequignon.

An attempt to define the province of reason in matters of faith, and to combat on one side the errors of the rationalists, and on the other, the scarcely less pernicious errors of those who deny that reason can arrive at certainty in any matter without the aid of revelation.

We can but recite the names of the following publications, with which, for the present, we close our theological list. The reprint of Catalani's great work is admirably executed.

Catéchisme historique dogmatique et pratique des Indulgences et du Jubilé ; avec un appendice contenant tout ce qui a rapport au Jubilé de l'année sainte, 1850. Par l'Abbé Ambroise Guillois. 1 vol. 12mo, Julien Lavier et Com.

Synopsis Demonstrationis Christianæ et Catholicæ ; complectens tractatus de religione, de ecclesia, de locis theologicis, et fide divina. Ad usum Sem Lugdunensis. 1 vol., 8vo, f. 3. Mequignon.

Immutabilitas Religionis Christianæ et Infallibilitas Ecclesiæ, c. 40. Mequignon.

Pontificale Romanum Prolegomenis et Commentariis Illustratum. Auctore Josepho Catalano. Edit. 2nd, 3 vol. 4to, f. 60.

SECTION II.—PHILOSOPHY.

La Science de la Vie. Par l'Abbé Martinet. 2 vols. 8vo, f. 10. Lecoffre.

M. Martinet is a well-known writer. He has often before entered the lists as the champion of the Church against the infidel philosophers of the present age. His *Solutions des Grands Problemes*, his *Statolatrie*, and his *Emmanuel*, have procured for him a wide-spread celebrity. In the present volumes, he undertakes to solve the great problems of human life: "Whence have we our life? What is its object? How is this object attained? and, finally, what shall be its termination?" He establishes, by a chain of most forcible reasoning the doctrines of christianity on these heads, exposes and refutes the theories of the German rationalists and French Eclectics, and the monstrous errors of Pantheism. He shows that Socialism and Communism are the legitimate consequences of these systems, and that the remedy for all our social disorders is to be found in christianity alone. His arguments are for the most part borrowed from our ordinary theological treatises; scarcely any are entirely new; but, by accompanying them with apt illustrations, and clothing them in rich and beautiful language, he has rendered them attractive for the ordinary reader.

The work is in the form of conversations between a professor and his pupils; but the interruptions are too few to break the continuity of the professor's discourse.

Jacques Balmes; sa Vie et ses Ouvrages. Par A. de Blanche-Raffin. 1 vol. 8vo, Sagnier et Bray.

A faithful and interesting sketch of the life and labours of Balmes by his pupil and intimate friend. The subjoined analysis of his works is executed with great judgment. The work contains many curious particulars concerning the Spanish universities, and gives an insight into the state of ecclesiastical studies in that country.

La Pierre de Touche des Nouvelles Doctrines. Par M. B. d'Exauvillez. 1 vol. 12mo, f. 1, 60. Gaume Frères.

Historie de la Vie de N. S. Jesus Christ; au Point de Vue Apologetique, Politique et Sociale. Par l'Abbé Barthelemy de Beauregard. 1 vol. 12mo. Lecoffre.

It is a frequent practice among Socialists to make blasphemous appeals to the maxims and the conduct of the Redeemer in support of their monstrous doctrines. This life of Jesus Christ, as well as the work which precedes it, is written with a view to show the absurdity of such attempts, to exhibit the principles of social life which follow from the gospel, and to prove that all the evils of the present social system in France, result from contempt of the precepts inculcated in the inspired writings.

Art d'Arriver au Vrai; ou Philosophie Pratique. Par J. Balmes. Traduit de l'Espagnol, par M. Mauce; avec une Preface, par M. de Blanche. Raffin. 1 vol. 12mo, f. 2, 50. Sagnier et Bray.

Institutiones Philosophicæ. Auctore, J. B. Bouvier, Ep. Cenomaniensi, Nona editio, cæteris multo auctior et emendatior. 1 vol. 12mo. Mequignon.

Institutiones Philosophicæ; ad usum Sem. Suessionensis. Auctoribus, J. M. Lequeur et S. Gabelle. 4 vols. 12mo, f. 6. Mequignon.

Theodicée Chrétienne. Par l'Abbé Maret. 2nd edition, f. 6. Mequignon.

It is only necessary to register the publication of the new editions of these well-known works; most of them, and especially that of Mgr. Bouvier, are much enlarged.

Dieu et le Peuple. Appel à la France et à l'Europe, sur les véritables principes de la Constitution sociale et politique, et Solution par la Religion Catholique des Problèmes posés, par l'état actuel de la Civilisation. Par G. A. Battur, Docteur en droit. 1 vol. 8vo, f. 6. Sagnier et Bray.

M. Battur, unhappily for Catholic literature, did not live to read the proof sheets of his book. He was one of those upright laymen, (of whom there are not a few in France,) who have preserved themselves from the taint of prevailing impiety, and who range themselves boldly on the side of truth.

His work is written in a high Catholic spirit. After vindicating the doctrines of christianity regarding the attributes of God and the destinies of the soul of man, he enters on the question of property and the bonds of family, proves them of divine origin, and exposes the folly of the modern antisocial systems. He then proceeds to questions connected with government and political economy, and proposes means for the re-establishment of peace and order in Europe. Among these, he insists upon the restoration to religious orders of their civil rights, and the restitution of the plundered property of the Church. He inveighs strongly against the countenance given by England to Socialist propagandism, which he ascribes solely to her hatred of Catholicity. Would that we could offer a complete and effective reply to the charge!

Legendes des Philosophes. Par le Neveu de mon Oncle. 3eme edition, f. 1, 25. Waille.

A happy attempt to ridicule some of the chiefs of the revolutionary school of philosophy, Condorcet, Volney, and others, by holding up to view the excesses and miseries of their private life.

Examen Critique de la Theorie Catholique de la Raison. Par l'Abbé Maret. Au Bureau de Annales de la Philosophie.

M. Maret is one of the many zealous Catholics who are labouring to unite the modern philosophy with the great foundation of all truth, religion. His essay is carefully and pleasingly executed.

Le Pretre et le Medecin devant la Societé. Par le R. P. Debreyne. 1 vol. 8vo, f. 5. Poussielgue-Rusand.

Pere Debreyne is a Doctor of Medicine, of the faculty of Paris, who has joined the religious of la Trappe. Since he became a religious, he has published some works which we cannot recommend too strongly to the notice of the missionary priest, for whose use, indeed, they are exclusively intended. An idea of their eminent usefulness can be gathered from their titles. *Essai sur la Theologie Morale Considerée dans ses Rapports avec la Physiologie et la Medicine. Etude de la Mort, ou Initiation du pretre a la connaissance des Maladies Graves. Mæchialogie, &c.*

SEC. III.—HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND ASCETICISM.

Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise, par M. L'ABBE ROHRBACHER. 2nde Edition, Revue et corrigée, 29 vols., 8vo. Prix de chaque volume f. 5. 50. Gaume Freres.

A work so well known as that of M. Rohrbacher it is needless to say anything in praise of. His vast erudition; his perfect familiarity with almost all the sources of history; his philosophical mind, which seizes intuitively all the bearings of a question, and presents them in the clearest light; his strict impartiality; and the strong faith which infuses life and spirit into all his labours, are already familiar to most of our readers.

The issues of the first edition, consisting of from 4000 to 5000 copies, having been exhausted, the author took the opportunity of making some important corrections, and enriching history from sources lately placed within his reach. The publications of Cardinal Mai, and the interesting work *Monuments Inédits sur l'Apostolat de Sainte Marie Madeleine en Provence, et sur les autres Apôtres de cette Contrée*, published in 1849, by M. Faillou, furnished him with many facts and documents of great value. The resumé of the opinions of the Fathers and Theologians, upon the amount of knowledge possessed by the Pagans regarding revealed truths, which occasioned so much discussion in the first edition has been suppressed, and replaced by a long extract from the dogmatic Theology of Cardinal Gousset. A refutation of the errors condemned in the late Provincial Councils is added.

M. Louis Veuillot, of the Univers, has undertaken the literary revision of the work. A volume appears every month; fourteen have been published already. The paper and type of the new edition are unexceptionable.

Histoire de St. Amand, Eveque Missionnaire, et du Christianisme

chez les Peuples du Nord au septième Siecle, par L'ABBE DESTOWBES. 1 vol. 8vo., f. 4. 50. Guyot.

A work of considerable erudition ; containing, besides the essential facts of the history, a number of very interesting details, regarding ecclesiastical affairs in the seventh century. The design of the author is to show that the Church of the Middle Ages was the great organ of civilization, the protector of the weak, and the promoter of learning.

Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise, par Alzog, traduite sur la cinquieme edition par M. Goschlun directeur au College Stanislas, et C. F. Audley. 1 vol. 8vo. f. 16. Waille.

This work, the success of which in Germany can be estimated from its having already run through four editions, has met with an equally favourable reception in France ; it has been adopted as a class-book in many of the Diocesan Seminaries. M. Alzog is professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Seminary at Posen. His object in writing this History, was to supply a work which might serve at the same time as an elementary history for the young student, and as a text-book for more advanced classes.

Ceuvres Completes de Fénelon; Augmentées de l'Histoire de Fénelon. Par M. le Cardinal de BEAUSSET, et précédées d'une histoire littéraire ou revue historique de ses œuvres. Pour servir de complément de son histoire par M. * * * Directeur au Seminaire de St. Sulpice. 10 Vols. grand in 8vo. Prix de chaque vol. f.7. Gaume Frers. Cinq volumes out paru.

Histoire de Fénelon, par M. le Cardinal de BEAUSSET. Nouvelle edition, revue, corrigée et augmentée d'après les MSS. de Fenelon, et d'autres Pièces Authentiques. 4 vols. 8vo. f. 15. Le Coffre.

The history of Fenelon, by Cardinal Beausset, was first published in 1808. In 1817 appeared a complete edition of Fenelon's works. Mgr. Beausset then perceiving that he had many omissions to supply, formed the intention of giving a new edition of his history, but was never able to accomplish his design. The Abbé Gosselin having undertaken to carry it out, consulted a vast number of authentic documents, made a minute search into all that remains of Fenelon, and embodied the fruits of his labours in the text of Mgr. Beausset, distinguishing his interpolations by typographical marks.

The parts collected by M. Gosselin are most curious and interesting. Many of them appear in print for the first time.

Histoire de l'Eglise de France, par l'Abbe Guettée. Prix de chaque volume, f. 6. Guyot.

This work will extend over 12 volumes. The publication has already reached the sixth, which carries the history from the

year 1096 to the year 1226. M. Guettée is not a mere compiler. He is indefatigable in searching after original documents; and has succeeded in throwing new light upon many points connected with the history of the French Church. His history is characterised by strict impartiality, and is remarkable for its lucid order, and the clearness of its style.

Fastes Sacrées de l'Afrique Chrétienne. Par Mgr. DUPUCH, ancien et premier évêque d'Alger. Premier Epoque, de la predication de l'Évangile en Afrique jusqu' à Constantin. 1 vol. 8vo.—Deuxieme Epoque (sous presse) Troisieme Epoque, de l'invasion des Vandales jusqu' à Belisaire. 1 vol. 8vo. f. 5.—Quatrieme Epoque, de Belisaire à Mgr. PAVIE, second Evêque d'Alger en 1846, 1 vol. 8vo. f. 5. Sagnier and Bray.

Essai sur l'Algérie Chrétienne, Romaine et Française. Par le même. 1 vol. 8vo. f. 8. (Turin, Imprimerie Royale.) Sagnier et Bray.

This book consists chiefly of extracts from the *Africa Christiana* of Marielli, with notes and additions by Mgr. Dupuch. It contains an interesting account of some of the ancient sees of Algiers.

Legendaire d'Autun, ou vie des Saints et des autres personages pieux du diocèse. Par l'Abbe F. Pequignot. 2 vols. 12mo. f. 3. Leoffre.

Les Femmes de la Bible, principaux fragments de l'histoire du peuple de Dieu. Par l'Abbé G. DARBOY. 2 vols. 8vo. f. 20. Garnier Freres.

M. Darboy is well known as a frequent contributor to the *Correspondant*. He has given us in these volumes a series of charming lives, written with great taste, and in an attractive style.

The numerous plates which accompany the text are executed in a superb manner; but assuredly they are not in the spirit of christian art. It is but just, however, to say, that the blame rests not with M. Darboy. The engravings were first completed, and he was requested by the publishers to write an accompaniment for them.

Cours d'histoire Ecclesiastique. Par M. l'abbé Blanc V. G. de Rheims. 2 forts volumes, 8vo. f. 12. Gaume Freres.

This history is intended to serve as a class-book in seminaries. The first volume contains the history of the first two centuries; but includes besides a number of dissertations upon the faith, discipline, constitution, and government of the Church, tracing them to their origin, and demonstrating their antiquity. In the second volume the author carries on the history to the year 1831. He touches on all the important facts, investigates their bearing on each other, and clears up, as far as the case allows, the doubtful points which occur from time to time; so that his book is not, as one would be led from its inconsiderable size to conclude, a mere dry abridgment, but a lucid, connected, and philosophical history.

Histoire du Sonderbund. Par M. Créteineau-Joly, 2 vols. 8vo. f. 15. Plon.

Every one knows what an active part the anarchists of Switzerland played in fomenting the revolutions by which Europe was lately agitated. Switzerland, always an asylum for anarchists, became of late years the den into which the enemies of order and religion gathered from every country in Europe. While the results of their intrigues were open to the day, the authors remained in comparative obscurity. Créteineau-Joly, already known to the literary world—*History of the Jesuits* and other works—has at length revealed the mystery of their secret doings. He commences several years back, and paints in vivid colours the disorders of which Switzerland has been the scene. He relates the history of the secret societies, published in their proceedings, the correspondence of the refugees with delegates at home, exposes the relations existing between them and the Socialists of Europe, and lays completely bare all the ramifications of their conspiracy. He studied the events which he recounts on the scene of action itself, and supports his statements by a vast number of original documents. A new work, by the same author, is soon to appear; it is called *Histoire des sociétés secrètes*.

Memoires d'Outre-Tombe. Par CHATEAUBRIAND. 8 vols. 8vo. f. 95. Penard, Freres.

The publication of these Memoirs, which have obtained so much notoriety, was completed in February. The former works of Chateaubriand have been issued in the same style, and the whole forms the only complete edition of Chateaubriand as yet published.

Histoire de la Revolution et de l'Empire. Par M. AMEDEV GABOURD. 10 vols. 8vo. Lecoffre.

This work, well known to those who study the history of France in a Catholic point of view, was terminated last month. (March.)

Saint Athanase. Histoire de sa Vie, deses Ecrits, et de son Influence sur son Siecle, suivi de notices sur Saint Antoine et Saint Pacôme. 1 vol. 8vo. 3f. *Saint Cyprien, Histoire de sa Vie, et extraits de ses eorits.* 1 vol. 8vo. 3f. *Saint Ephrem, do. Saint Jerome, do.* Sagnier and Bray.

Messrs. Sagnier et Bray have undertaken a series, illustrative of the lives and writings of the fathers, and the volumes here recited are an instalment of the work. They are executed in an easy and popular style, and will prove a valuable addition to our Patristic literature.

Vie de Paul Granger de la Compagnie de Jesus. Par J. SUFOUR ASLAFORT, de la meme Compagnie. Leclerc.

The life of a young man who entered the Society after making

the most heroic sacrifices, was a model of sanctity during the short time he lived in Religion, and died in the college of Brugelette, on the 4th of June, 1850. Some beautiful poems by him are given at the end of the volume.

We can but record the names of the following books. The two biographies are interesting, and the historical works are of considerable merit.

Mgr. Flagat Eveque de Burdstown et de Louisville; sa Vie son Esprit et ses vertus. 1 vol. 8vo. Lecoffre.

Etudes historiques sur la collegiate de St. Pierre a Lille. 1 vol. grand in 8vo. f.3. Leclerc.

Vie de l'Abbe Gagelin, Missionnaire Apostolique et Martyr. Par l'ABBE JACQUENET. 1 vol. 12mo. f.3. Lecoffre.

Baudouin de Constantinople, Chronique de Belgique et de France. Par le R. P. A. CAHOURS, S. J., one vol. 12mo. f.2. 50. Poussielgue-Rusaud.

Bibliographie Universelle. Par F. X. DE FELLER, Edition revue et continuee jusqu'en 1848. 8 vols. grand in 8vo. f.56. Mequignon.

Besides numerous additions inserted in the body of the work, this edition contains a supplement, which consists of about a thousand articles, and continues the biography as far as May, 1850. M. Charles Weiss, administrator of the Library of Besançon, and the Abbé Busson have been charged with the superintendence of the new edition. It is got up in admirable style, printed on fine paper, and with large clear type.

La Question religieuse en 1682, 1790, 1802, et 1848, et historique complet des travaux du Comité des Cultes de l'Assemblée Constituante en 1848. Par M. P. PRADIE, Representant du peuple, et Secretaire du Comité des Cultes. 1 vol. 8vo. f.5. Sagnier et Bray.

M. Pradie is the author of *Essais sur l'Être Divin*, and many other works of a religious tendency. The present volume commences with a general view of the actual position of the clergy, and of the state of religion in Europe. It contains an account of the various turns taken by ecclesiastical affairs in France since the year 1682, gives particular information regarding the boundaries of dioceses, the nomination of Bishops, the faculties of theology, seminaries, monastic institutions, ecclesiastical tribunals, &c., and concludes with a comparison between the spirit of former legislation on Church matters, and that which characterized the proceedings of the Assembly of 1848 regarding the same subject.

Esquisse de Rome Chrétienne. Par l'Abbe Ph. GERBET. Tome 2. 1 vol. 8vo. Au Bureau des Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne.

Six years have elapsed since the publication of the first volume of

this work. The labours of the author have been retarded by the late disturbances in France and Italy, but he is at present engaged in a third volume, which is destined to complete the work. The object which M. Gerbet has in view is to trace among the monuments of Christian Rome the emblems which they display of the faith, the discipline, and the attributes of the Church. He follows neither the chronological nor the topographical order of those remains, nor does he even treat them separately and distinctly. He seizes on some trait in the constitution of the Church, discovers it symbolized in some ancient monument, traces its appearance in other monuments and other times, until at last the point in question is placed in a light too clear to derive any aid from Archeology. In the first volume his subjects were the external characters of the Church: her Unity, Catholicity, and Perpetuity. The second is devoted to matters connected with her internal organization; the Primacy, and its attributes; the more prominent points of Catholic faith, and the boundless charity which always burns in the hearts of the faithful. Treating of the articles of faith, he takes up in succession the unity of God, original sin, revelation, the sacraments, penitential works, prayers for the dead, invocation of Saints, &c., and reading the belief of the early Christians in the vestiges which remain of their time, proves triumphantly that the doctrine of the Church upon these points has remained without an iota of change since the Apostolic age.

The second volume contains some historical details of deep interest concerning the precious relics of the Passion; and at the end is placed a dissertation on the catacombs.

Cours d'Archeologie Sacrée. Par M. l'Abbé GODARD, Professeur d'histoire Ecclesiastique et d'Archeologie au grand Seminaire de Langres. 1 vol. 8vo. f.7. Guyot.

The study of Archeology is rapidly progressing in France. Not many years ago it was confined to a few individuals, whose peculiar turn of mind inclined them to antiquarian researches; now it is almost a necessary branch of education. Already classes of archeology have been established in many of the diocesan seminaries. The want of a class-book having been felt, M. Godard was commissioned by the Bishop of Langres to compile one. The first volume of his treatise is published, the second will shortly appear. M. Godard sets out from the altars of the Patriarchs, and delineates the various styles which have been adopted in sacred edifices from that remote period to the present day. He applies the principles of æsthetics to the several styles, and points out the religious ideas embodied in them. The second volume will contain lengthened dissertations on Iconography, Church music, sacred vessels, and other subjects which are necessarily treated in a cursory manner in the first volume.

Melanges d'Archeologie d'histoire, et de litterature, redigees ou recueillies. Par les auteurs de la Monographie de la Cathedrale de Bourges, les R. R. P. P. CHARLES CAHIER et ARTHUR MARTIN, grand in 4to. Avec de Superbes gravures noires en couleur et en or. Prix de chaque volume, f.32. Poussielgue-Rusaud.

This valuable work is published in numbers, each containing four pages of text, and from three to five engravings. Eight numbers are published every year, and form a volume. The volume of last year contains descriptions of the shrines of Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle, morsels of sculpture and brass-work from Bamberg, Ratisbonne, Munich, Paris, and London, Byzantine tissues, paintings, and bas-reliefs of the Carlovingian epoch, &c. The text is from the pen of Pere Cahier, the engravings have been executed principally by Pere Martin. The latter are truly magnificent.

Dictionnaire Iconographique des figures, legendes et actes des saints tant de l'ancienne que de la nouvelle loi, et Repertoire alphabetique des attributs qui sont donnes le plus ordinairement aux Saints, par les artistes du moyen age et des temps posterieurs; avec l'indication des ouvrages et collections ou sont conservees et publiees les representations de ces divers attributs. Ouvrage suivi d'appendices ou l'on trouve une foule de documents, &c. Par M. L. J. GUENEAULT, Publie par l'Abbé Migne. 1 vol. 4to. f.7.

A complete and most useful repertory of sacred symbolism.

Antiphonaire de St. Gregoire, avec de pieces justificatives, &c. Par les soins du R. P. LAMBILLOTTE, S. J., Poussielgue-Rusaud.

The MS. of the Antiphonary sent by Adrian the First to Charlemagne, is still preserved in the Benedictine monastery at St. Gall. This interesting relic is about to be published under the superintendance of Pere Lambilotte, together with numerous proofs of its authenticity, collected by him, and a key to the musical notation of the period.

De l'Education. Par Mgr. l'EVEQUE D'ORLEANS. 1 vol. 8vo. f.7. Lecoffre.

The first volume only of this work has appeared. It is divided into five books. After a few preliminary observations concerning education and the dispositions of childhood, the venerable author discusses the means to be employed, and insists eloquently on the paramount influence of religion. Although Education is a work which requires authority on one side and obedience on the other, he demands that due respect be paid to the liberty of the child's nature. He closes the volume by examining what religion can and should do for the education of the people. Mgr. Dupanloup has had long experience in the nature which he treats of, having been Superior of the Petit Seminaire at Paris.

Influence des Peres de l'Eglise sur l'Education publique pendant les

cinq premiers siècles de l'Ere Chrétienne. Par J. A. LALANNE, Ch. Hon. Beauvais. Dissertation admise par la Faculté de Lettres à Paris pour le Doctorat. 1 vol. 8vo. Sagnier et Bray.

This little work is divided into two parts; the first is chiefly taken up with combating an assertion usually made, that the fathers of the first three centuries discountenanced profane literature, because they dreaded the light of Philosophy. In the second the author sets forward in a forcible manner the successful efforts made by the Fathers of the Church to reform the education of youth. They destroyed a false philosophy and a sensual literature; protected the child against the abuse of parental authority; made chastity respected; and by making the marriage bonds indissoluble, shielded the child from the unhappy consequences of the divorce of their parents.

La Verite sur la Loi d'Enseignement. Par Mgr. L'EVEQUE DE LANGRES. 1 vol. 8vo. Lecoffre.

This little brochure is already well known in Ireland. It is a calm discussion of the advantages possessed by the new Law over the *status quo* on the one hand, and of the evils and dangers resulting from it on the other.

Reforme Universitaire. Par M. Amadée Margerie, f.1. 50. Lecoffre.

A remarkable pamphlet, by a member of the University. He upbraids that institution with having destroyed the faith and blunted the moral sense of the youth of France; and complains, too, of the evident falling off in the University studies. Among other means for checking these growing evils, he proposes the erection of separate colleges for students of different religious persuasions.

Loi sur l'Enseignement; avec un Commentaire. Par M. DE CHAMPEAUX. c.75. Lecoffre.

Extracted from the Bulletin de lois civiles Ecclesiastiques, a most useful periodical, conducted by M. De Champeaux.

Cours Alphabetique, Theorique, et Pratique de la Legislation Civile Ecclesiastique. Par l'Abbé AUDRE. 3 vols. 8vo. Perisse, f.21.

The third volume contains the most complete commentary which has yet appeared on the new law of public instruction.

Documents Inédits pour servir à l'Histoire Littéraire d'Italie. Par M. OZANAM. f.5. 25. Lecoffre.

M. Ozanam was sent to Italy, in 1846, by M. Salvandy, the then Minister of Public Instruction, to collect materials for a literary history of that country. The present volume is the result of his

researches. It is preceded by an introduction, consisting of a rapid sketch of the state of learning in Italy, from Gregory the Great to the time of Dante. He traces the continuance of secular instruction through the long series of grammarians who form the chain which connects the Imperial Schools with the early Italian Universities. He shows that ecclesiastical studies were uninterruptedly carried on in the Episcopal Schools and Monastic Institutions. The conclusion he arrives at is, that "if the sun of letters set upon Italy to rise upon Ireland, England, Germany and other countries of the north, the time of her darkness was one of those beautiful summer nights when the twilight of evening is prolonged until it mingles with the dawn of the morning." Among the documents which he has been able to collect, are the following: A description of the city of Rome, in Latin verse; a collection of Hymns; the Poems of two monks of Monte Cassino, in 11th century; Verses by Buonagiunta of Lucca, &c.

Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet, et la Chine. Par M. l'Abbe Hur. 2 vols. 8vo. f.10. Leclerc.

M. Hur delineates graphically the manners of the Nomade tribes, and relates with such spirit and humour the many strange adventures which befel him amongst them, that his book possesses all the attraction of a romance.

Bibliothèque des familles chrétiennes et des maisons d'éducation; ou collection des meilleurs ouvrages Français et étrangers revus, corrigés avec soin, et adaptés à l'usage de jeunesse. Publiée sous la direction de M. l'Abbé CRUISE. Chaque volume, broché. f.3.

Among the works published in this collection we find Robertson's History of America, corrected by the Abbe Millault; and a Tableau de l'Empire Romaine, abridged from Gibbon's Decline and Fall by Abbe Cruise. M. Cruise is born of Irish parents, and is one of the most distinguished among the clergy of Paris; he is Rector of the Ecole des hautes Etudes in that diocese. His name is a sufficient guarantee for the works which compose this collection.

Selecta Patrum Latinorum ad usum omnium Scholarum Humanitatis et Grammatices, approbante P. L. Episcopo Lingonensi (Langres). Chaque vol. f.1.

Five volumes are published. The first contains Sermons by the Fathers of the Latin Church; the second, Odes, Epistles, &c., by the same; the third, the Doctors of the Church of France; the fourth, the Lives, and extracts from the writings, of the principal Latin Fathers; the fifth, Lives of Martyrs, History of Persecutions, &c.

Etudes Morales et Religieuses. Par Mdlle. Curo. 2nde édition, corrigée et augmentée. Hachette.

Thirty-one simple conferences destined for the use of children. The conferences consist of the explanation and development of a text from St. Paul, followed by an amusing and instructive story.

Cours de Litterature Francaise. Par une Religieuse Ursuline du Sacre Cœur. 2 vols. 12mo. f.2. 40. Perisse Freres.

This Religious has already published an Abridgment of Sacred History, and a Short Course of Ancient History. Her treatises are admirably suited for female education.

Defense de Sept Sacraments, publiée Contre Martin Luther par Henri VIII. Roi d'Angleterre et Seigneur d'Irlande. Traduite. Par R. J. POTTIER, Licencié des-lettres. 1 vol. 8vo. f.6. Garnier freres.

A very faithful translation of this rare and interesting work ; it is to be lamented however that the Latin text is not given. It is preceded by an introduction by the Bishop of La Rochelle, in which the authorship of the work is attributed to Fisher. A translation of the Bull *Auctorem fidei*, by the same prelate, is placed at the end of the volume.

Des Causes de la Situation Actuelle de la France. Par l'Abbe Clement Grandcour. c.75. Sagnier et Bray.

A great number of brochures on the same subject have appeared during the last twelvemonths, some of which are written with considerable ability ; their object is to show that the political and social evils of Europe derive their origin from the spread of infidelity, and that a return to the profession and practice of Catholicity is the only remedy to be hoped for.

Conferences de Notre Dame de Paris. Par le R. P. HENRI DOMINIQUE LACORDAIRE. Tome 3^{ieme}. f.7. 50. Sagnier et Bray.

Pere Lacordaire is still engaged in carrying out his design of giving a series of discourses on the principal dogmas of religion. Two volumes of these discourses have been for some time in print, the first containing the Sermons of 1835, 1836, and 1843, and the second those of 1844, 1845, and 1846. The volume just published contains those of the last three years. The Sermons delivered in 1848 are upon the Existence of God, His essence, His attributes and His works ; those delivered in 1849 are headed "Du commerce de l'homme avec Dieu : " they treat of Revelation, Prophecy, Mysteries, &c. The subjects of last year are the Fall of Man and his Redemption through Christ. The Sermon on the Evidences of Man's Fall in the Condition of the Human Race, is one of surpassing truth and eloquence.

Petits Sermons, &c., Cinquieme edition, revue et Augmentee d'un Sermon sur la Grace. Par M. l'Abbe ROHRBACHER. 1 vol. 12mo. f.3. 50. Gaume.

Discourses well worthy the reputation of the author.

Imitation de Jesus Christ. Traduction nouvelle. Par M. L. MOREAU. 1 vol. 32mo. f.3. Lecoffre.

M. Moreau, the Curator of the Mazarine Library, has already given to the world beautiful translations of the "City of God" and the "Confessions" of St. Augustine. His present work has more simplicity and unction, and comes nearer to the style of the original, than the version of Lamennais. In his preface M. Moreau contrasts the pride, the hate, and the ambition of the present age, the causes of all existing evil with the principles inculcated in the *Imitation of Christ*, the book of humility and self-denial. Every chapter is followed by commentaries, reflections and prayers extracted from the Fathers and the Masters of a spiritual life.

Culte de Marie. 1 vol. grand, 8vo. f.3. 50. Sagnier et Bray.

Besides a number of offices, litanies, devotions, &c. in Latin and French, this little work contains an historical resumé of the devotions established in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

Meditations sur l'Eucharistie. Par M. l'Abbe de la BOUILLERIE, Vicairé General de Paris. 1 vol. 12mo. f.3. Sagnier et Bray.

There exists in Paris a Society of fervent Christians called l'Association de l'Adoration Nocturne du tres Saint Sacrement. M. Bouillierie is the Director of the Society, and gives a lecture once a month upon the Holy Eucharist to the assembled members. He has been induced to publish these discourses for the use of those who attend the *Quarant ore* now established in Paris.

Marie, des Glories et des Souffrances. Par l'Abbe S. M. VIARDS du diocese de Langres. 2 vols. 12mo. f.5. Lecoffre.

Beauté dur Culte Catholique Par l'Abbe M. X. RAFFRAY. 3eme edition. 2 vols. 12mo. f.3. Sagnier et Bray.

Conferences Adresses au Protestants et aux Catholiques. Par JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. Traduites de l'Anglais par J. GONDON. 1 vol. 8vo. f.6. Sagnier et Bray.

M. Gondon is the writer of the articles on English affairs in the *Univers*. He has translated also the "Conferences of the Oratory," and the "History of Developments," and has published some works of his own on the Catholic Movement in England.

Vies de Jesus et de Marie méditées. Par une jeune pensionnaire Suivies de Visites au Saint Sacrement et a la sainte vierge. Par l'Abbe STEPHEN FRUCOT. 1 vol. 32mo. f.2. 25. Lagnes Freres.

An excellent body of meditations.

Pelerinage a Jerusalem. Par. Mgr. MISLIN, Abbé Mitré de Deg en Hongrie. Avec de gravures. 2 vols. 8vo. f.14. Guyot.

An interesting account of the Holy Monuments of Palestine, and especially of Jerusalem itself. It will take the place of the once popular "Pilgrimage of Baron Geramb."

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

A Plea for the Rights and Liberties of Religious Women, with reference to the Bill proposed by Mr Lacy. By Bishop Ullathorne. London, Dublin, and Derby : RICHARDSON and SON, 1851.

IF our Legislators can still entertain any sense of right any good feeling, where Catholics are concerned, we think they must be touched by this pamphlet; in which Dr. Ullathorne has with so much dignity and mildness vindicated the rights of Convents. He has done so by a grave and circumstantial account of their admirable constitutions, the wise anxiety with which every abuse has been guarded against, and the high motives and purposes with which the ladies who inhabit them have selected this angelic life. Only at last, when he had read Mr. Drummond's shameful speech does the patience of the bishop waver, and a few sentences of noble indignation escape from him. Shame, indeed, to England, through all the wild outbursts of passion which revolutions have excited on the continent, the unoffending, holy, humble nuns, living for the service of God and the poor,—have been respected; in England only—chivalrous England, have such things been said and listened to concerning them, as could have been tolerated only in the House of Commons—or the street. The Bishop points out the insult offered by Mr. Lacy's bill, insinuating charges, that cannot be supported—much less proved; and which, if carried, will inflict punishment where there is no crime, subjecting the dwellings of some of the first ladies in the land, to such domiciliary visits, as could not be tolerated, *are* not tolerated, except in the mad-house or the gaol; shocking the delicacy and the feelings of persons as much entitled to the protection of the law as the Queen upon the throne—and this is done—Oh crowning touch of hypocritical insolence and humbug which only this age of ours could venture on,—under the pretence of protecting them. But

we do injustice to our feelings by expressing them in any other than Dr. Ullathorne's own language.

“These pages had gone through the press before that extraordinary episode had arisen in the debate on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, otherwise they must, in some parts, have taken a different tone and colour. A member of the honourable house thought fit to throw ribaldry of a description with which God forbid I should soil these pages, on Christ's most pure Virgins. They were English ladies; they were absent, unoffending, blameless; no matter, they had no known and individual protectors; and so this honourable gentleman pronounced them infamous. This conduct was decided to be not out of order, and no reproof could be given. I question not the decision, which was technical, and there was no remedy. But the Prime Minister, when called up, and not before, gave a mild opinion that the feelings of honourable members should not be wounded. Were there no other feelings wounded more deeply still? No rights invaded? Was no great injustice perpetrated? No one's gold, or land, or life were taken; but what even this world accounts to be more precious than land, or gold, or life,—the pure fame, the unsullied honour and good repute of their countrywomen, were assaulted in that assembly whose province it is to protect the subject from wrong. The age of chivalry is indeed gone. We are deeply indebted to Sir James Graham for rescuing us from the scorn of Europe on this occasion. If it is supposed that these and like contumelies will have any effect in deterring generous souls from convents, this is a grievous mistake. It is heroic hearts that are drawn thither, others are not wanted there. And hearts that are heroic in faith know well, they see it as an abiding vision, they feel it as a subsisting truth within their souls, strange and unmeaning as it may sound in the ears of worldlings, that contumely and reproaches with Christ are the lot of His saints. Persecution has always been the mallet with which God has driven firmly into their places in His Church the foundations of her hierarchies: and calumnious tongues are the instruments which He has deigned to use for chastening, fire-trying, and glorifying His faithful servants of her religious orders.”

Let our Catholic representatives remember that this bill is *pending*, and they will surely strain every nerve to save us from this new wrong.

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1851.

- ART. I.—1. *Petri Lombardi Novariensis Cognomine Magistri Sententiarum, Episcopi Parisiensis, Sententiarum, Libri Quatuor.* Parisiis excudebat Migne. 1841.
2. *Divi Thomæ Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici opera.* Accedunt vita seu eulogium ejus a Jacobo Echardo, diligentissime conminatum, et Bernardi, M. de Rubeis in singula opera dissertationes præviæ. 28 tom. 4o. Venetiis. 1775.
3. *R. P. F. Joannis Duns Scoti Doctoris subtilis ordinis Minorum opera omnia quæ hucusque reperiri potuerunt.* A. PP. Hibernis Collegii Romani S. Isodori, Professoribus. 12 tom. Lugduni. 1639.
4. *Jacobi Bruckeri, Reg. Soc. Scient.* Berolin. membri, *Historia critica Philosophiæ a Christo Nato ad Repurgatas usque literas.* 6 tom. Lipsiæ. 1743.
5. *Johannis Baptisti Gener Theologi Hispani Theologia Dogmatica Scholastica, &c.* 6 tom. Romæ. 1767.
6. *View of the state of Europe during the Middle Ages.* By HENRY HALLAM.
7. *Traité des Etudes Monastiques divisé in trois parties, &c.* Par Dom MABILLON. 1 tom. Paris. 1691.
8. *Dionysii Octaviis de Theologicis Dogmatibus.* 6 tom. Venetiis. 1721.

WE might have placed at the head of this article the names of Isidore of Seville, of Lanfranc, of Anselm, and of Bernard, and of many other mediæval writers whose works we have been obliged to consult, but we thought it would be useless to encumber the page with a catalogue which but few would take the trouble of perusing. It is still less likely that, in this age, when men travel by steam, and speak by electricity, even those who amuse themselves by publishing prolix disquisitions on their works and opinions, and by condemning both in the most absolute and relentless manner, could be induced to interrupt the

pleasant and easy occupation of imaginative compositions, and to devote a short time to the perusal of the writings of the monks and schoolmen of the Middle Ages. Their present mode of proceeding very much resembles that of the Knight of La Mancha, who commanded all those whom he met to acknowledge that Dulcinea del Tòhoso was the most beautiful lady in the world. Some persons were so unreasonable as to say, that they could not tell whether she was beautiful or not until they had seen her. But Don Quixote at once declared that this would spoil the whole matter—that if they saw her, they would have no merit for acknowledging her charms, and that the beauty of the thing consisted in their being obliged to swear, without ever having seen her, that she far surpassed all others. For the application of this story to the traducers of the Middle Ages, we can appeal, not only to Brucker, who acknowledges that he had not read the scholastics, but even to that very conceited person, Mr. Hallam, who, not content with professing his own ignorance of a subject on which he dogmatizes with the most insolent flippancy, declares that he “cannot bring himself to think that so many as eight living English writers have read even a part of Thomas Aquinas.* And yet, perhaps, it would not be unreasonable to expect that those who endite prolix dissertations on the scholastics, would read a little of Aquinas, and even of Scotus, who were the giants of their generation, who divided between them the empire of mind during no inconsiderable period, and whose works were read and commented on for centuries in every university in Europe.

It is only fair, however, to warn the English student who may wish to read a portion of the scholastics, that he will require to prepare himself for this study, by making himself acquainted with the philosophical terms which were in use in those times. This will not surprise us, when we remember that, in the Middle Ages, Theology was regarded as the chief of all the sciences, and that even at the present day, amongst ourselves, every science has its peculiar vocabulary. To those who are acquainted with the Latin and Greek languages, it is not difficult to acquire a knowledge of the philosophical terms of the scholastics; and yet, from the want of this knowledge, poor Mr. Hallam acknow-

* Hallam's *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*. Vol. II. c. ix. part 2. p. 230. note.

ledges, in the note already referred to, that he was sadly puzzled by some extracts from Duns Scotus, and Ockham, which he found in Turner. This is necessary to understand the letter of their writing, but something more is required to enter into their spirit. We must remember that these writers were men who fled from the world to seek religion and virtue in the seclusion of the cloister, and who thought that the great object of this life was to prepare for eternity. This doctrine is not acceptable to the worshippers of this nineteenth century, this age of enlightenment and progress in which we glory so much, and which we contrast so boastfully with those which preceded it, for if it were to be judged by the pursuits and occupations in which it is almost exclusively employed, we would be apt to conclude that it had no practical belief in any world but the present. Mammon is almost the only god who is now sincerely worshipped. In his service ships are built, railways are made, genius is toiling day and night, and the press teems with countless publications. And this age is jealous of its god, and calls those other ages dark, benighted, and ignorant, which placed another God before him, and in which old monks and schoolmen devoted their fortunes and their lives to the building and endowment of a vast number of houses, where the poor were fed and instructed, and in which they shut themselves up to spend their time in prayer and study, and in teaching mankind, by word and example, to look to a future world for true and permanent happiness.

But if the writers of the present day have neither time nor inclination to read the works of the scholastics, it is not, perhaps, unreasonable to ask them to abstain from reproaching those of whom they confessedly know nothing. Neither do we think that we require too much from those who have hitherto derived their notions of "lazy monks and barbarous schoolmen," from partial and ill-informed witnesses, when we entreat them to listen to a few, out of the many things which may be urged in favour of men to whose industry and piety we owe, at all events, the preservation of ancient learning, and what is of infinitely greater importance, of the Bible itself, as well as of the christian religion.

Although all the Protestant historians who have written professedly or incidentally concerning the Middle Ages, have not stated in express terms that the Catholic Church,

and especially the monks and schoolmen, were the cause of the darkness which then prevailed, yet this is most certainly the impression which, with very few exceptions, their works are calculated to leave on the mind of the reader. To remove so false and so unjust an imputation, it will be necessary to mention very briefly the causes which led to the decline of polite learning during the Middle Ages, from which we hope it will be clear to every impartial man, that we owe to the Church the preservation of the literary treasures of antiquity, as well as the knowledge of religion; and that her *ignorant* schoolmen contributed as largely to the revival of letters, as her *lazy* monks did to the cultivation of the soil, and to the advancement of practical agriculture. Even to this day, the land which surrounds the ruins of ancient abbeys and conventual churches, is distinguished by its superior fertility.* Indeed we are told continually that the old monks and friars knew very well how to take care of themselves, as they always selected the richest and most beautiful spots for the sites of their monasteries. Yet no statement could be more directly contrary to the truth than this is. A writer, † who openly avows his dislike of the institutions of the Catholic Church, is obliged to make the following admissions on this subject. "The devastation of war from the fifth to the seventh century, rendered land the least costly of all gifts, though it must always be the most truly valuable and permanent. Many of the grants to monasteries, which strike us as enormous, were of districts absolutely wasted,

*From the place where we write, we can look out upon the ivy-clad walls of an old monastery, in which no one has dwelt for three centuries, and yet the banks and slopes around it, which have never since been cultivated, are covered with a profusion of sweet violets. These violets are all perfectly white, whereas the wild violet is of the common colour, and, at least, in this part of the country entirely devoid of perfume.

† Hallam's *State of Europe*, &c. vol. 2, c. ix. p. 272. "Of the Anglo-Saxon husbandry, we may remark," says Sharon Turner, (*Hist. of Anglo-Saxons*, vol. 2. p. 167.) "the Domesday survey gives us some indication that the cultivation of the Church-lands was much superior to that of any other order of society." Those who may desire to be more fully informed upon this, as well as upon other subjects connected with the Middle Ages, should read that admirable book, Maitland's "Dark Ages."

which would probably have been reclaimed by no other means. We owe the agricultural restoration of a great part of Europe to the monks. They chose, for the sake of retirement, secluded regions which they cultivated with the labour of their hands. Several charters are extant, granted to convents, and sometimes to laymen, of lands which they had recovered from a desert condition, after the ravages of the Saracens."

The ancient French historian 'Mezeray, (quoted by Stuart, *History of Armagh*, Introduction, p. 50,) thus speaks of the services which were rendered to France by the Monks who went to it, especially from Ireland, during the sixth and seventh centuries.

"It must be admitted," he says, (Tom. i., p. 174-6, Edit. Ams. 1688,) "that these troops of pious men were most useful to France, even in her temporal concerns. For the prolonged irruptions of the barbarians having totally desolated the country, it was even yet in many places covered with woods and thickets, and in the low grounds inundated with marshes. These benevolent religious who had not devoted themselves to God, merely to lead a life of slothful indolence, laboured with their own hands, to grub up, to drain, to till, to plant, and to build, not so much for themselves, who lived in the strictest frugality, but to support and nourish the poor. So that uncultivated and frightful deserts were converted into agreeable and very fertile tracts. Heaven seemed to favour, with its kindest influence, a country managed by hands so pure and disinterested. I shall say nothing of their having preserved to us almost all that remains of the history of those ages."

Different authors have assigned a very unequal duration to the period which they have designated as the "Middle, or Dark Ages." Robertson, in the "View of Europe," prefixed to the *History of Charles V.*, is content with four centuries, that is, from the seventh to the eleventh, including the latter. Mr. Maitland, librarian to the Archbishop of Canterbury, has admirably illustrated this period in his "Dark Ages," and has shown the utter ignorance and perversion of facts on which, to use his own words, "such miserable second-hand writers, as Robertson and Jortin," have grounded their abuse of it. Other writers have added to this period a century or two; but Mr. Hallam has extended it so as to embrace a period of a thousand years, that is, from the end of the fifth to the end of the fifteenth

century. "The Middle Ages," says this writer,* "according to the division I have adopted, comprise about one thousand years, from the invasion of France by Clovis, to that of Naples by Charles VIII. This period considered as to the state of society, has been esteemed dark through ignorance, and barbarous through poverty and

* *State of Europe*, vol. ii., chap. 9, part i., p. 207. Since the days of Robertson no historical writer has been more overrated than Mr. Hallam. It is quite evident that his knowledge of the middle ages is derived, to a considerable extent, from Robertson; for he repeats some of the second-hand "proofs and illustrations" of that writer, which he could not have done if he had looked into the authors whom he quotes. As an instance we beg to refer to the chapter just quoted, pp. 231-2, in which he extracts a ridiculous definition of a christian from the sermons of St. Eligius, who was bishop of Noyon in 646. He admits, in a note to the fourth edition of his work, that this passage was quoted by Robertson, and that to him he was perhaps immediately indebted for it, and moreover, that Dr. Lingard has proved it to be a complete misrepresentation of Eligius. Yet (1) he asserts that "no one is, in fact, to blame for this misrepresentation, which being contained in popular books, has gone forth so widely; and, (2) after admitting that Eligius never gave any such definition of a Christian, he still retains the following passage in the text of his book, for which, of course, he is not to be blamed. "With such a definition," he says, "of a Christian, it is not surprising that any fraud and injustice became honourable when it contributed to the riches of the clergy, and glory of their order."

In the first of the pages just referred to (231), Mr. Hallam has given vent to one of those wholesale attacks upon monks and nuns, and the religious institutions of the Middle Ages, with which certain flimsy Protestant writers have rendered us so familiar. The sole authority which he produces to sustain his charges, not only against men, but against a whole sisterhood of religious ladies, is Eligius's definition of a good Christian, a passage from Clemangis, and the visitation under Henry VIII! It is as ridiculous to attach any weight to the reports of a commission which was issued for the purpose of enabling the king to plunder the religious houses, as to place it in the middle ages. We make Mr. Hallam a present of Henry VIII, and his commission, although we think he should have been satisfied with the thousand years within which period of darkness he promised to confine himself. He confesses, as we have seen, that the passage from Eligius has been completely falsified, and that it should never again be quoted for such purposes as it has been hitherto adduced to support. And yet Eligius alone, of the writers whom he quotes to prove the crimes of the

want of refinement. We begin in darkness and calamity, and though the shadows grow fainter as we advance, yet we are to break off our pursuit as the morning breathes upon us, and the twilight reddens into the lustre of day." It is enough to observe with regard to this extraordinary

monks and clergy of the Middle Ages can, with any propriety, be said to belong to that dark period, for his only remaining authority, Clemangis, died about the year 1440. We must therefore take Mr. Hallam's word for the crimes which occurred in the interval between the seventh and fifteenth century.

But as Clemangis is an especial favourite with Protestants, it is worth while to examine his testimony a little more closely. The title of the work quoted as his is Nicholai de Clemangis, *Scriptoris Velusti de corrupto Ecclesiæ statu studio Johannis a Fuchthe, 1620.* In the first place it is quite uncertain who is the author of this tract. Many persons (see Feller, Dict. Biog. at this word, &c.,) consider it almost certain that it was not written by Clemangis. There is no contemporary evidence whatever of its authenticity. The very words "ancient writer," which are applied to Clemangis in the title page, may suggest a doubt which will be confirmed by the commencement of the tract itself. It begins thus, Nicolai de Clemangis Catalaun. Deploratio Calamitatis Ecclesiæ per schisma nefaudissimam iltatæ cum annexa exhortatione Pontificum ad ejus extirpationem. Hoc manuscriptum suo Johanni Martini Lydio communicavit Antonius Thysius Theologus. So that, in fact, although the name of Clemangis appears in the title of this tract, it cannot be traced back to him. It may perhaps suggest an additional doubt to mention, that in Trinity College, Dublin, the tract *De corrupto Ecclesiæ statu* is bound up in a small duodecimo, with another little work, in which the authorship of the *Imitation of Christ* is falsely ascribed to Gerson. As Mr. Hallam never saw the work, of course he is not to be blamed for his ignorance of these facts.

If Mr. Hallam had read the book he would have known, moreover, (1) that it is a sort of philippic in which angry declamation is not sustained by the mention of even one tangible fact. (2) That in the first twenty-three chapters the author accuses all ecclesiastical persons, of every kind and degree, of all description of crimes. In the last-named chapter he says, "Now there remains the nuns *alone*, to bring down our narrative, as we promised, from the crown of the head to the lowest footprints, without passing by any degree." Then follows the passage which Hallam has borrowed from William Prynne, in which it is asserted, "ut idem, sit *hodie* puellam velare quod et *publice* ad scortandum exponere. And yet, in the 25th chapter, the same man says, "But I am unwilling that any one should think on account of what I have said about ecclesiastics, that I wish to

statement, that this period extends nearly two hundred years beyond that in which Dante produced the Divine Comedy, and a hundred and fifty years beyond the time (1341) when Petrarch was crowned in the Roman Capitol!

That literature was ruined, and that great ignorance and barbarism prevailed in Europe from the sixth century is what no man can deny who is in the slightest degree

be understood of all persons of this kind, without any exception. I know that He has not lied, and that He cannot lie who has said : Peter, I have asked for thee, that thy faith fail not. (Luke 22, ver. 25.) Nor am I ignorant that in every one of the states there are some, and perhaps *very many*, good, just, innocent, and altogether free from the wickednesses which I have enumerated. *Nec sum nescius in singulis quibusque statibus aliquos et forte plurimos, bonos justos, innocentes esse, ab illisque malificiis quæ supra memorata sunt separatos.* This admission fortunately deprives his former declamation of all credibility, for it is much easier to believe that this writer is an anonymous slanderer, than that many virgins led a life of purity in *public* brothels. (3) That this writer does not say one word about the crimes of ecclesiastics during the Middle Ages. On the contrary, he expressly confines himself to his own time (*hodie*), and attributes the calamities of the Church to the most wicked schism—*calamitatis Ecclesiasticæ per schisma nefaudissimum illatæ.* Now this schism commenced by the election of the Antipope Clement VII., on the 27th of August, 1378, and as some time was required to produce its bad effects, this writer, whoever he may be, cannot refer to a much earlier period than the beginning of the 15th century.

We are almost ashamed to have wasted so much time on this little insignificant anonymous pamphlet; for that it was anonymous is clear from the fact that it has been attributed to John de Chelm, and several others, as well as to Clemangis. Protestants however, and Du Pin, who blames its intemperate style, attribute it to Clemangis, as they wish to give it a respectable paternity. Yet this does not mend matters much; for he was secretary to the Antipope, Peter de Luna, and was banished from France on the charge of having been the author of the letter in which that person excommunicated the king of France, in May, 1407. Du Pin supposes that he wrote the tract *De Corrupto Ecclesiæ statu*, in 1414, when his mind had been embittered by seven years exile. But whoever may have been the author of this tract, it certainly came forth as a violent anonymous philippic, in which the great and undoubted evils which were produced in the Church, by the long continuance of the schism, were grossly exaggerated. It would be easy to produce against the morals of every existing Christian society

acquainted with the history of the period. It is to the constant irruptions of barbarians, by whom the western empire was finally destroyed in 476, to the disuse of the Latin tongue, to the colonisation of Europe by countless hordes of savages, to the inroads of the Saracens, Normans, Danes, and Huns, and finally to the civil wars which ensued on the death of Charlemagne, that we are to attribute the ignorance which prevailed during the subsequent ages. But the monks and friars are so far from having caused this darkness, that it is to them, and to them alone, we owe the preservation of the literary treasures of antiquity, and the revival of learning in Europe. We shall prove this assertion by the authority of a writer whom we have already frequently quoted, and we have only to direct the attention of the reader to the harsh expressions with which he so wantonly assails those whom he acknowledges to have been the preservers of literature, in order to show that this evidence is derived from a most reluctant witness.

“If it be demanded,” says Hallam, (*State of Europe*, vol. ii., chap. 9, part i., p. 222, and following,) “by what cause it happened that a few sparks of ancient learning survived throughout this long winter, we can only ascribe their preservation to the establishment of Christianity. Religion alone made a bridge, as it were, across the chaos, and has linked the two periods of ancient and modern civilisation. Without this connecting principle Europe might indeed have awakened to intellectual pursuits, and the genius of recent times needed not to be invigorated by the imitation of antiquity. But the memory of Greece and Rome would have been feebly preserved by tradition, and the monuments of those nations might have excited, on the return of civilisation, that vague sentiment of speculation and wonder with which men

far more plausible testimony than this, which might be confirmed by some terrible and undeniable facts, the like of which, had they existed, most certainly would not have been passed over by the author of the tract *De Corrupto Ecclesiæ statu*. At all events, we hope we have said enough to convince Mr. Hallam that neither Clemangis nor Eligius should ever again be quoted against the Church of the Middle Ages; and unless we greatly deceive ourselves, what we shall adduce in the course of this article, will convince every impartial man that the convents and monasteries were the asylums of virtue, as well as of learning, during those times. In both these respects Maitland justly lays it down as an undoubted fact, that ecclesiastical persons were always infinitely superior to the laity.

now contemplate Persepolis, or the Pyramids. It is not, however, from religion simply that we have derived this advantage, but from religion as it was modified in the Dark Ages. Such is the complete reciprocation of good and evil in the *dispensation of Providence*, that we may assert with only an apparent paradox, that had religion been more pure, it would have been less permanent, and that *Christianity has been preserved by means of its corruptions*. The sole hope for literature depended on the Latin language; and I do not see why that should not have been lost, if three circumstances in the prevailing religious system, all of which we are justly accustomed to disapprove, had not conspired to maintain it; the Papal supremacy, the monastic institutions, and the use of a Latin liturgy. (1) A continual intercourse was kept up, in consequence of the first, between Rome and the several nations of Europe; her laws were received by the bishops, her legates presided in councils; so that a common language was as necessary in the Church as it is at present in the diplomatic relations of kingdoms. (2) Throughout the whole course of the Middle Ages.....almost every distinguished man was either the member of a chapter or of a convent. The monasteries were subjected to *strict rules of discipline*, and held out, at the worst, more opportunities for study than the secular clergy possessed, and fewer for worldly dissipations. But their most important service was as secure repositories for books. All our manuscripts have been preserved in this manner, and could hardly have descended to us by any other channel; at least there were intervals when I do not conceive that any royal or private libraries existed. (3) Monasteries, however, would have contributed very little towards the preservation of learning, if the Scriptures and the Liturgy had been translated out of Latin when that language ceased to be intelligible.....One might presume, if such refined conjecture were consistent with historical caution, that the more learned and sagacious ecclesiastics of those times, deploring the gradual corruption of the Latin tongue, and the danger of its absolute extinction, were induced to maintain it as a sacred language, and the depository, as it were, of that truth and that science which would be lost in the barbarous dialects of the vulgar. They were habituated to the Latin words of the Church service, which had become, by this association, the readiest instrument of devotion, and with the majesty of which the Roman jargon could bear no comparison. Their musical chaunts were adapted to these sounds, and their hymns depended for metrical effect on the marked accents and powerful rhymes which the Latin language affords. The Vulgate Latin of the Bible was still more venerable. It was like a copy of a lost original; and a copy attested by one of the most eminent fathers, and by the general consent of the Church."

We have omitted nothing which could qualify this testimony, and but little of the abuse of the Church with which

the author has thought it his duty, as a good Protestant, to season his reluctant praise. Indeed, we would not wish our religion to be approved of by a man who thinks that Providence would not have preserved a pure, but that it did preserve a corrupt, faith. Still he is forced to admit that the Church had excellent reasons for not translating either the liturgies or the Bible into the barbarous, fluctuating, and often unintelligible jargon which prevailed for several centuries over Europe, after Latin ceased to be commonly spoken. She could not have changed the language of the former without destroying their dignity, and interrupting, in a matter of great moment, her connexion with the primitive ages of Christianity; nor of the latter without exposing it to certain, and, perhaps, irremediable corruption.

Brucker, another avowed enemy of the monks, is forced to admit, even whilst declaiming against their ignorance, that to the monasteries we owe the preservation, even of profane learning, during the middle ages. Having quoted a canon of the eighth Council of Toledo, A. D. 653, which prohibited a cleric to be ordained who did not know the Psalter, the hymns of the Church, and the Order of Baptism,* he asks, what must have been the ignorance of the eighth century when such was the state of things in the seventh? "Wherefore," he continues, "in this century, (eighth,) the minds of those who wished to be considered learned, were in great darkness, and the only remedy against barbarism, and that feeble and ineffectual enough, was found in the monasteries. In which at this time, those persons were to be received who had learned some few elements of the liberal arts. It hence happened that youths were prepared for this purpose; and thus some asylum was afforded to letters in these sacred places. This glory is usually attributed to St. Benedict, the father of the western monks, who, by prescribing in his rule that such of his religious as aspired to Holy Orders, should be previously instructed, caused the ascetics of his order to establish schools in their monasteries, in which polite letters, which were proscribed and banished in this age, took refuge, as in a secret retreat. †

Cassiodorus, he adds, certainly commanded his monks

* Brucker, vol. iii., p. 571.

† *Ibid*, 572-3.

to apply themselves to sacred and profane learning, but that it is a matter of doubt whether the application to study, which has rendered his order so famous, was derived from the original rule of St. Benedict, or afterwards ingrafted upon it. Into this controversy he declares that he will not enter, as the Benedictines have most learned men, who are perfectly able to uphold the glory of their order. But this, he says, he thinks it necessary to place beyond all doubt, that the torrent of barbarism was arrested by the aid of some monasteries; and that from the ninth century, the Benedictines had always been most distinguished in every kind of learning. "With the arms of the barbarians," he continues, "barbarism triumphed, which (not the monks, but) the Longobardi carried with them into Italy, the Saracens, &c., into Spain and Gaul. Britain alone, an island happy in the cultivation of letters, received exiled learning with open arms, and embraced philosophy, which had become an outcast along with the sister sciences, and so deformed as scarcely to be known. This glory belongs, in the first place and especially, to Ireland, whither, in this age, (eighth century,) the English were even yet accustomed to seek learning." On this subject Camden says: "Our Anglo-Saxons flocked in that age from all parts into Ireland, as to the mart of learning. Hence our writers say, in their histories of holy men: 'He went to school in Ireland.'" Brucker adds, that Camden proves this correctly by the following lines from the life of Sulgen:

"Qui postquam nablam primo tener edidit infans
 Perlustrat scholas studio florente Britannas
 At crescente simul ardore et tempore multo
 Exemplo patrum commotus amore legendi
 Ivit ad Hibernos sophia mirabile claros." *

Brucker adduces a great many other authorities to prove the superiority of the Irish in learning, in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. He quotes Eric of Auxerre, who says, in a letter to Charles the Bald, that nearly all Ireland, despising the dangers of the seas, had migrated to foreign lands, bringing her crowds of philosophers along with her, and mentions John Scotus Erigena, and the

* Id. Ibid, p. 574.

learned men whom Alcuin, in the life of Willibrard, declares to have imbibed their learning in Ireland.

It is certainly not a little singular, that a country which was alike a stranger to the arms and the arts of Rome, which was regarded by the proud mistress of the world and her refined provincials, as a barbarous island, which was situated beyond the utmost limits of civilisation, should have become the school of Europe. Indeed, learning almost immediately followed the introduction of Christianity into Ireland. Sedulius, an elegant writer of Latin poetry in the fifth century, calls himself an Hibernian Scot, in his comment on St. Paul's Epistles. Music, the twin sister of poetry, also flourished in Ireland from a very early period, for Fleury* relates, that in the seventh century, Gertrude, the daughter of Pepin, sent to Ireland for learned men, to instruct the religious of the abbey of Neville, and for musicians and chaunters, to teach them church harmony, or psalmody. Stuart, (Introduction, p. 49,) quotes some beautiful lines from Bonaventura Moronus, a Tarentine, † in praise of Cataldus, the famous

* Hist. Ecclesiast, tom. viii, edit. in 12mo, p. 521. For this, and most of what follows regarding Irish schools, I am indebted to Stuart's Hist. of Armagh, (Introduction, and Appendix v. at end of volume.) He displays a good deal of research, but the narrative is very confused.

† We cannot help quoting some of these lines, which prove that multitudes, from all parts of Europe, sought learning in Ireland in the 7th century.

“ Spargitur occiduas sensim vaga fama per urbes,
 Huic Juveni primis tantum conatibus omnes
 Concecisse viros, eadem quos edidit ætas,
 Quantum ignes superat Phœbe, jam plena minores.
 Undique conveniunt proceres ; quos dulce trahebat
 Discendi studium, major nunc cognita virtus.
 An laudata foret. Celeres vastissima Rheni
 Jam vada Teutonici, jam deseruere Sicambri :
 Mittit ab extremo gelidos Aquilone Boemos
 Albis et Arverni cœunt, Batavique frequentes
 Et quicumque colunt alta sub rupe Gebennas.
 Non omnes prospectat Arar, Rhodanique fluenta
 Helvetias : multos desiderat Ultima Thule.
 Certatim hi properant diverso tramite ad Urbem
 Lesmoriam, Juvenis primos ubi transigit annos

Irish monk, who presided over the great school of Lismore, in the seventh century. Having resigned this charge, he went to Jerusalem, and thence to Italy, where he was chosen Bishop of Tarentum. Colgan has transcribed an epitaph, placed under his image at Rome, which records his birth, travels, and death:

“Me tulit Hiberne, Salymæ traxere, Tarenum
Num tenet: huic ritus, dogmata, jura dedis.”

Bede, (*Hist. Ecc. Brit.*, lib. iii, c. 7, and lib. iv., c. 26,) Alcuin *vita S. Willibrordi*, (lib. ii., c. iv,) and Eric of Auxerre *de Mirac. S. Germani*, lib. i., cap. ult.,) relate the vast number of foreign students who flocked to Ireland. These students were treated with great hospitality, and such as we can now scarcely bring ourselves to believe; for we are told, that they were not only educated gratuitously, at the public schools, but also supplied with diet, lodging, clothes, and books. But before the incredulous reader rejects this fact, he should recollect that “poor scholars,” who were educated, clothed, and fed gratuitously, were very common, even in the present century, in some parts of the province of Munster, and that they have not until within the last few years entirely disappeared.

The sciences and liberal arts taught in the Irish schools were Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, Astronomy, and Theology. Of these, the last seven were methodically comprised and digested in a disquisition which had been written by Martianus Capella, in the fifth century. (*Fabricius Bib. Lat.*, p. 638, *Ledwich Antiq.*, p. 352.) On this author, John Scot Erigena wrote comments, and Dumont, an Irish bishop, delivered lectures in St. Remigius' monastery, in Down. These works are still extant. (*Ledwich and Fabricius ubi sup.* *Warton's Hist. of English Poetry*, vol. ii., p. 75-6. See *Stuart, Appendix v.*, p. 594.) Certainly the Irish must have made considerable progress in the higher branches of

Mirantur tandem cuncti quod cognitus heros
Spe major, fama melior, preconia laudum
Exuperet, nullumque parem fert æmula virtus.
Jam videas populos quos abluit advena Rhenus
Quosque sub acciduo colustrat Cardine Mundi
Phœbus Lesmoriam venisse; ut jura docentis
Ediscant titulisque sacrent melioribus aros.”

mathematics, as a little before the middle of the eighth century, St. Feargall, known on the continent by the name of Virgil, maintained the sphericity of the earth, and the existence of the antipodes. St. Boniface wrote to Pope Zachary, that he asserted the existence of another race of men, (who were not, therefore, descended from Adam, and redeemed by Christ,) and of another sun, moon, and stars. The Pope said, that if he held such doctrines he ought to be condemned; but when the true nature of his doctrine was made known to the court of Rome, he was not only not condemned, but was elevated to the bishopric of Salzburg.

The proficiency which foreign students made under Irish teachers, may be inferred from the passage quoted by Stuart from Camden's *Wiltshire*, (p. 242,) in which that author says, that Adelm, an author of the seventh century, and the first of the English nation who wrote Latin poetry, was the pupil of Maidulph, an Irishman and a poet. Stuart asserts, (p. 595,) on the authority of Benedict, abbot of Aniam, in Languedoc, a writer of the eighth century, that the Irish monks had even then introduced in their own country, and upon the continent, scholastic divinity, and the use of scholastic reasoning in illustrating the doctrines of theology. This fact is in some degree confirmed by what we know of the history of John Scotus Erigena, an Irishman, of a dazzling, but rash and erratic genius, who went to France in the ninth century, and became the friend and companion of Charles the Bald. As an instance, at once, of his wit and of his familiarity with the monarch, it is related, that the king once asked, "what was the difference between a sot and a Scot," and that he instantly answered the table. He was a great linguist, for he translated from the Greek the works then falsely ascribed to Dionysius, the Areopagite, and Aristotle's *Moralia de Secretis Secretorum* into Chaldaic, Arabic, and Latin.* He is supposed by Ussher to be the author of the excerpts in Macrobius, concerning the Greek and Latin syntaxes, and of a treatise *περι φωνων*. His acquaintance with Aristotle renders it not improbable that the Irish writers of the two previous centuries were

* Guliel. Malm. lib. 2, digest. reg. Aug., c. 4. Tithem. de Script. Ecc. Bayle cent. 2. Script. Brit., c. 2. Quoted by Stuart, p. 594.

acquainted with that author, and that they had applied his rules to illustrate the doctrines of Theology. Indeed, from an incidental mention of Aristotle by Jugulf, abbot of Croyland, in the eleventh century, it would appear, that the works of that philosopher, or at all events his logic, had for a long time previously formed a part of the regular course of studies, for he says, that he was sent from Westminster to the school at Oxford, where he learned Aristotle, and the two first books of Tully's Rhetoric.

We think, that whoever will impartially consider these facts, that learning was so much esteemed, even in what is called the darkest portion of the Dark Ages, that crowds of students went to Ireland to acquire it, from distant countries, at a time when travelling, both by sea and land, was so difficult and dangerous,—that those students must have carried back with them the light of science, and diffused it over the continent of Europe,—that celebrated Irish scholars, such as Virgil, in the seventh century, Clement and Albin, whom we shall shortly have occasion to mention, in the eighth, and Scotus, in the ninth, who were well acquainted with Greek and Latin, and had no inconsiderable knowledge of the sciences taught upon the continent,—will be apt to conclude, that learning was in a very different state from that in which such writers as Brucker, Jortin, Robertson, and Hallam represent it to have been. If he will, moreover, condescend to recollect, that monasteries were not originally established as public schools, that they were designed as the abodes not of science, * but of retirement and of virtue, that many of the monks were mere laymen, who were no more bound to be learned than their neighbours, and that a good priest might be satisfied with a knowledge of Holy Scripture and religion, and might consider it, perhaps, somewhat inconsistent with his calling †

* See Mabillon's *Traité des Etudes monastique*, part 1.

† Not only Gregory the Great, who says, (Ep. 48,) *Quia in uno se ora Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non Capiunt*, who calls St. Benedict *Scienter nesciens et sapienter indoctus*, and who wrote to Didier, Bishop of Vienne, against profane studies; but Gregory Nazianzine, and Basil, *Carmen de vita Monastica*, will allow monks to study only the Holy Scriptures, and Gregory of Nyssa gave considerable scandal to the faithful by giving up his office of reader to study rhetoric. See Greg. Naz. Ep. 43.

The Abbot of St. Vincent of Voltorno, Ambrose Aulbert, has

to waste his time in disseminating the elegant, but in many instances, impure, writings of the Pagans, he will surely give some credit to those old monks, who spared no pains* or labour to get correct and perfect copies of profane authors, who procured at great expense † the materials on which to copy them, who spent a large portion of their lives in the drudgery of translating, and thus received science into their sacred abodes when her sweet voice was no longer heard in the world, where men had their ears stunned by the continual clash of barbaric arms.

The inestimable services which the Monks and Clergy of the dark ages rendered to profane literature may be said to have been owing in a great measure to accidental circumstances. Their chief duty was to save their own souls and to impart a knowledge of the Gospel to christian nations. These pursuits, we should have imagined, would have appeared far nobler to a true Christian, than if they had devoted their lives to the study of mathematics and to transcribing the poets. Between the sixth and eleventh centuries, the Goths and Vandals were reclaimed from Arianism, and the idolatrous nations of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Bulgaria, Hungary, Saxony, Poland, and Russia, were instructed in the knowledge of the true God. The Church could not prevent Christian princes from contending against each other in arms, for she could not put an end to human passions, but she at least mitigated

left the following prayer in the end of his comment on the Apocalypse: "Neque enim ideo patriam parentesque reliqui ut mihi scientiæ dona largires; sed ut perfectione virtutum ad vitam æternam perduceres. Quod si utramque non mereor doctrinam scilicet atque operationem: aufer quæso doctrinam, tantum ut tribuas operationem virtutis." Even Alelard says of himself, after he became a religious: "Se post susceptam professionem vitæ monasticæ, sacra plurimum lectioni studium intendentem, secularium artium disciplinam quibus amplius assuetus fuisset, et quas ab ipso plurimi requisiti verunt non penitus abjecisse sed de iis quasi hamum quemdam fabricanisse quo illas philosophico sapore inuentos ad veræ philosophiæ lectionem attraheret.

* See a little further on.

† From the taking of Alexandria by the Saracens, in the seventh century, to the invention of making paper from cotton rags, about the end of the tenth, parchment was the only material used.

the calamities of war by bringing the savage invaders of Europe into the pale of civilized society, by mediating between the contending parties, by establishing asylums in her Churches where the vanquished could take refuge, and finally, by the institution of God's truce, by which private wars were prohibited on certain days of the week. "Truth and candour must acknowledge," says Gibbon (*Decline and Fall*, chap. 55, at the end), "that the conversion of the North imparted many temporal benefits both to the old and the new Christians. The rage of war inherent to the human species, could not be healed by the evangelic precepts of charity and peace, and the ambition of Catholic princes has renewed in every age the calamities of hostile contention. But the admission of the Barbarians into the pale of civil and ecclesiastical society, delivered Europe from the depredations by sea and land of the Normans, the Hungarians, and the Russians, who learned to spare their brethren and cultivate their possessions. The establishment of law and order was promoted by the influence of the clergy, *and the rudiments of arts and sciences were introduced into the savage countries of the globe.*"

The Monks not only restored agriculture in Europe, but they taught humanity to the lords of the soil, both by word and example. It may not be uninteresting to read the following brief extract from a letter written by one old Monk to another, at a time when agricultural labourers were either slaves, or worse than slaves, all over Europe. "The same argument," says Peter, the venerable Abbot of Clugni, writing to St. Bernard, about the middle of the twelfth century, "may be used as to peasants, servants, and handmaids, and by it we may most excellently prove that Monks have a legitimate right to possess them. For everybody sees how secular masters rule over their peasants, servants, and handmaids, for they are not satisfied with their accustomed and due service, but always unmercifully claim their persons with their property, and their property with their persons. Hence it is, that beside the accustomed payments, they, three or four times in the year, or as often as they please, spoil them of their goods, they oppress them with innumerable claims of service; they lay upon them grievous and insupportable burthens. Hence they force many to leave their native soil and fly to foreign parts, and (what is worse) their very persons, which

Christ hath redeemed with so rich a price, even his own blood, they are not afraid to sell for one so mean, that is for money. Now, monks, though they may have such possessions, do not possess them in the same way, but very differently; for they employ only the lawful and due services of the peasants to procure the conveniences of life. They harass them with no exactions, they impose no intolerable burthens, and if they see them in want, they maintain them at their own expense. They have servants and handmaids, not as servants and handmaids, but as brothers and sisters; and receiving from them reasonable service according to their ability, take care in return that they shall suffer no want or injury; so that they are (to use the words of the Apostle) 'as having nothing, yet possessing all things.'**

After all, these old monks, although of course they must have been horribly ignorant, seem, nevertheless, to have had a tolerably correct notion not only of the theory but, moreover, of the practice of Christian charity. If they required a reasonable quantity of work from their domestics, they were not idle themselves, for some of them, as we have seen, were employed in cultivating their fields with their own hands, many others in transcribing, and some even in composing, books. That transcribing was one of the ordinary occupations of monks even in the darkest ages, is clear, from those very instances which are adduced by popular writers to demonstrate the contrary. Robertson, in the introduction to Charles V. sect. 1, says, that "even *monasteries of considerable note* had but one missal."† The monastery of considerable note was that of St. Michael, at Pisa, and the authority on which Robertson relies, is the statement which the Abbot Bonus left of what he had done in founding and maintaining it. From this statement it appears that it was no monastery at all when it had only one missal, but a chapel, in which there

* A long extract from this letter will be found in Maitland's *Dark Ages*, from p. 387 to p. 397.

† For this fact he quotes Muratori *Antiq. v. ix. p. 789*. The reference is to the *Brevi Recordationis* of the Abbot Bonus, which Muratori has printed, not in the ninth (for there are only six altogether) but in the fourth volume of his *Antiquitates Italiæ mædii ævi*.

was neither monk nor abbot, nor any dwelling place, but merely a hut in which Bonus dwelt with his uncle. The good abbot complains not because there was only one missal in this old dilapidated chapel (for one would have been quite sufficient), but because they had not the other books required for divine service. But he boasts that after five years he restored the Church, for which he brought columns from Rome, and that he built a belfry in which he placed seven bells. He moreover procured splendid vestments for the altar, and replaced the single tin cup by four chalices, one of gold and three of silver. The single hut had expanded into a monastery with suitable offices, and a considerable estate in land; and the library contained thirty-four volumes, one of which was a Bible, for which he paid ten pounds.* Some of these books the pious abbot and his prior transcribed with their own hands. The library was indeed still small, but it was select, and as the number of transcribers certainly increased with the number of monks which it contained, we have no doubt that in a few years it contained a goodly number of volumes. Oldbert, who was abbot of Gembloux until the year 1048, and who must therefore have flourished in one of the darkest periods of the dark ages, wrote out a volume containing the whole of the Old and New Testament, and set his monks to transcribe so successfully, that he collected above an hundred volumes connected with divine scripture, and fifty upon profane subjects.† Othlonus, a monk of St. Emmerams, in the same century, has left amongst other writings, a book, “*De ipsius tentationibus, varia fortuna et Scriptis*,” in which he declares that he occupied himself so constantly in writing, that he seldom got any interval of rest except on festivals. “And when,” he says, “I had a mind to compose anything, I very commonly could not find time for it, except on holidays or by night, being tied down to the business of teaching the boys, and the transcribing, which I had been persuaded to undertake. Therefore, besides the books I composed myself, which I

* The whole of this Breve Recordationes will be found in Maitland, pp. 57—61.

† His biographer says that he did not suffer either their minds or their hands to be idle. Mab. A. S. Tom. 8. p. 531, quoted by Maitland in extenso, p. 197.

wrote to give away for the edification of those who asked for them, and of others to whom I gave them unasked, I wrote nineteen missals; three books of the Gospels, and two with the Epistles and Gospels, which are called lectionaries, besides which I wrote four service books for matins. I sent seven books to the monks of Fulda, two to the monks of Hirshfeld, one to the abbot of Amorbach, four to brother William, among which there was a very valuable missal, one book to the abbot of Lorsch, four to friends dwelling in Bohemia, one to a friend at Passau, two to the monastery of Tegernsee; a volume containing three books to the monastery of Priel, one book and various epistles to my sister's son; three books to the monastery of Obermunster, one to that of Nidermunster, and to many other persons I gave or sent at different times, sermons, proverbs, and edifying writings." What a lazy old monk this must have been! And yet his labours are far surpassed by those of a nun who flourished about the same time. The catalogue of the works she transcribed, which is too long to be inserted here, will be found in Maitland, pp. 419—21. It contains besides a large number of missals, office books, and books of epistles and gospels, two complete Bibles, a large portion of the works of SS. Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, Origen on the Old Testament and on the Canticles, the Tripartite history of Cassiodorus, the lives of many Saints, and Eusebius' Ecclesiastical history.

No doubt the monks were chiefly employed in transcribing religious books, such as the sacred Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, Church history, the lives of Saints, and the service books of the Church. But they by no means confined themselves to these. The Abbot Bonus, already mentioned, entreats a friend to bring him the *Catiline* and *Jugurtha* of Sallust, and one of the works of Cicero, which he had not in his library. Another old monk who lived in the tenth century, and therefore in the very darkest period, may throw some additional light on this part of our subject. He was a native of Auverne, and his name was Gerbert. Having taken the habit in a monastery in his native country, he was made Abbot of Bobbio, in Lombardy, which had been founded by the famous Irish Saint, Columbanus, in the seventh century. He afterwards taught school at Rheims, where Robert, son of Hugh Capet, was among his scholars. He was sub-

sequently raised to the Archbishopric of Ravenna, through the influence of the Emperor Otho, who had also been his pupil, and finally on the death of Gregory V. became Pope, and took the name of Sylvester II. Of his writings there are extant one hundred and forty-nine epistles, the life of St. Adalbert, Archbishop of Prague, and some works on Mathematics. In his letters, he notices his own works on rhetoric, arithmetic, and the completion of a sphere. In letter 44, to Egbert, Abbot of Tours, he mentions his diligent study of philosophy, and the arts of eloquence, and states that he had been for a long time eagerly engaged in collecting a library: for which purpose he was paying constantly, transcribers in Rome (this was before he became Pope), and other parts of Italy, as well as in Belgium and Germany. In other letters he writes to friends for parts of the works of Cicero and Boethius which were wanting in his copies; and in letter 130, which was also written long before his elevation, and addressed to a monk called Mainald, he says, "I entreat you to render me one service, which you can do without danger or injury to yourself, and which will bind me most closely to you. You know with what zeal I seek for copies of books from all quarters, and *you know how many writers there are everywhere, both in the cities and the country parts of Italy.* I entreat you then, and without any other person knowing it, and at your own cost, that transcripts be made for me of M. Manilius de Astrologia, Victorinus de Rhetorica, and the treatise of Demosthenes the philosopher, called Ophthalmicus. I promise you most faithfully that this kind service shall be kept in sacred secrecy, and that whatever you lay out I will pay you to the full, according to your accounts, and whenever you require it."*

Indeed, it is not necessary to enter into these details in order to prove that the monks devoted themselves labori-

* See a note by the Rev. H. J. Rose, printed in Maitland's *Dark Ages*, p. 56. This gentleman justly observes, "If in the tenth century we find the work of transcribing so common, that there were writers everywhere, in the cities and country places in Italy, and as it would seem from other letters, no difficulty in finding them elsewhere, if the collection of a library was so great a matter, that many were ready to assist, surely matters were far different from our common notions. For some further account of Gerbert's works, see Mabillon *Analect.* Tom. ii, p. 215.

ously and incessantly to the work of transcribing, for are we not indebted to their pens for all the vast treasures of sacred and profane literature which have been handed down to us from ancient times? Maitland declares (p. 290) that although Mabillon and his companions did not think of mentioning the manuscripts of the Scriptures which they met with in their literary journey, "unless some accidental circumstance rendered them remarkable, yet it would be easy to specify a hundred copies of the whole or parts of the Bible, which they happen thus to mention, and which had existed during the dark ages." These are but a small proportion of the copies which must have survived all the calamities of near a thousand years, the ravages of war, of fire, of Danes, Hungarians, and housemaids.* Will so many of all those which at present exist remain after a similar period, if they should be obliged to pass through as many and as great vicissitudes? The following story, which belongs to the tenth century, will give some idea of the literary labour of the monks during that dark period. Whilst the Abbot Hugo was extending the fame and dependencies of Clugni by the ministry of the monk Ulric, William, a Bavarian by birth, was Abbot of Hirschau. He was educated in St. Emmeram in Ratisbon, and "in a short time became very learned," says Tithemius,† "in all kinds of knowledge. In philosophy he became a most acute disputant; in music he was unusually learned, and composed many and various chants in honour of the saints. How skilful he was in astronomy, mathematics, and arithmetic, his works testify: on these subjects he bestowed much pains." Although he was continually sending out colonies of monks to the religious houses which he founded, yet he contrived to keep up the number of a hundred and fifty in his own monastery, who "were perpetually engaged either in the performance of divine service, or in prayer, meditation, and sacred reading. Those who appeared less fit to be employed in sacred things, were appointed to perform such manual labours as were necessary, so that none of their time might pass in

* For the share these last had in the work, see "Letters of Eminent persons, from the Bodleian, vol. i. p. 140, quoted by Maitland, p. 277.

† Chron. Hirsang, tom. i. p. 221. Sub. Am. 1070, see Maitland, p. 328—332.

idleness. The holy father knowing moreover what he had learned by laudable experience, that sacred reading is the necessary food of the mind, made twelve of his monks very excellent writers, to whom he committed the office of transcribing the holy Scriptures, and the treatises of the fathers. Besides these, there was an indefinite number of other scribes, who wrought with equal diligence in the transcription of *other books*. Over them was a monk well versed in all kinds of knowledge, whose business it was to appoint *some good work as a task for each*, and to correct the mistakes of those who wrote negligently. In the course of time the monks wrote a great many volumes." The historian of Hirschau acknowledges that at this very time Clugni was superior to it, and no doubt had as many transcribers. Moreover, as the Abbot William thought this practice so necessary, we may be sure that he insisted on its observance in the eight monasteries which he founded, and the hundred which he reformed. Indeed, every monastery, at least of any note, contained a *Scriptorium*, or room for the scribes, where they worked in company, and at a somewhat later period, a general chapter of the Cistercian Order directed that the same silence should be observed in the Scriptorium as in the cloister. Sometimes private cells were called by the name of Scriptorium, but these were given as a special favour to persons who held a high office in the monastery, or probably to such of them as were engaged in original composition.

The reader, who will attentively consider the vast number of monks who were engaged in transcribing gratis, and the vast number of seculars, who employed themselves in the same lucrative occupation for hire; who will, moreover, remember, that every printed book has been first written with the pen, and generally more than once, will not feel much difficulty in admitting the justness of the following observation. "We come, I think, fairly to the idea," (says Maitland, p. 416.) "that although the power of multiplication at work in the Dark Ages, was infinitely below that which now exists; and even although the whole actual produce of the two periods are not to be compared, yet, as regards those books which were considered as the standard works, in sacred and secular literature, the difference was not so extreme as may have been supposed."

Whoever has read over the few extracts and quotations which have been given in this paper, will see that the old

monks were not only diligent transcribers of the works of others, but that they occasionally composed books themselves, in which, amongst many other things, they give us a very vivid picture of their own manner of life, and every day pursuits. We also see that in the very darkest period they spent a portion of their time in the study of science, and that some of them even then constructed spheres, and wrote upon mathematics. Their knowledge of the arts is attested, not only by the glorious gothic churches which they erected, but by their splendid illuminated manuscripts, the colours of which are still unfaded after the lapse of a thousand years. And certainly we have never been able to look upon one of these old manuscripts without the deepest veneration for those who wrote them. We behold a large work transcribed upon parchment, without a single blot, every letter of which is perfectly and beautifully formed. And then every page is so splendidly illustrated with those glorious capital letters which have been painted in the imperishable colours invented by the old monks, and which are still as bright as the day on which they were formed. When we add to this, that they reclaimed Europe from barrenness, that they were the founders of schools where science and religion were taught, and of hospitals where christian charity was practised; we will, if not blinded by prejudice, admit that they did not live in vain, and that they contributed their full share to the advancement of society, the preservation of religion, and the true and permanent happiness of mankind.

When these old monks took to writing books, it is but natural to suppose that religion and theology would be their most constant and fertile themes: for from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. As we have just seen, they by no means neglected other branches of knowledge; but of their works on scientific and literary subjects, we shall add nothing to what we have already stated, as we have determined to devote the remainder of this paper to a brief notice of scholasticism.

Our word School, as well as the Latin, Schola, the French, Ecole, &c., are derived from the Greek word, σχολη, which signifies leisure, but was used by the more modern Greek writers, such as Plutarch, to express the same idea as its derivatives. From σχολη, is derived (1) σχολαστικός, which signified "unoccupied" according to the original meaning of the noun from which it is formed, and "addicted to

study” according to the later acceptation of the same word; and (2) the Latin scholasticus, which, like the substantive Schola, has lost the original meaning altogether, and signifies, of, or belonging to, a school or scholar.

According to Brucker, (tom. iii. p. 710.) who quotes Petronius, Scholasticus, first signified pupils, but was applied to teachers of Rhetoric a little before the time of Cicero.* Thus scholasticus had the same meaning as σοφός, and signified a professor of eloquence. Hence it was used to express eloquence of discourse, and St. Jerome uses it in this sense when he says of himself, that he had adorned many things with the flowers of scholasticism—*multa scholastico flore pinxisse*. The word retained this meaning in the Middle Ages, in which, whatever was most elegant in literature, was called scholastic. Hence, we find that Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, (A. D. 320) Socrates, who lived in the time of the younger Theodosius, Aurelius Prudentius, a sacred and noble poet—*sacer nobilisque poeta*—who flourished under the younger Theodosius,—Evagrius the historian, and many others, were called scholastics. Jerome also says, (*de viris Illust.*) of Sarapion, “that on account of the elegance of his genius, he deserved the surname of scholastic.”

Charlemagne earned the name of Great, not only by his success in arms, but also by his glorious exertions in the cause of learning. In his youth he had been taught reading and grammar by Petrus Pisanus, an old deacon. When he invited the famous Englishman, Alcuin, into France, to aid him in the noble work of diffusing knowledge among his subjects, he became a pupil in the school established in the palace over which that illustrious foreigner presided, learned rhetoric, logic, astronomy, music, &c., and acquired a knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages, the former of which he spoke after he was forty years old.* He also kept in the palace, persons acquainted with the Syriac, to assist him in collating the text of the Holy Scriptures.

Two Irishmen, Clement and Albin, had also the honour

* *Deduci in scenas scholasticorum qui rhetores vocantur quos paulo ante Ciceronis tempora extitisse, &c.* Quintilion, quoted by Brucker, *ubi sup.*

† Eginhard quoted by Brucker, vol. iii., p. 589.

of assisting Charlemagne in his glorious undertaking. Of these an old monk* tells a pleasant story, which is not to be rejected as entirely false, although the facts are conveyed in a romantic narrative. He says that two Irish Scots, deeply versed in all kinds of sacred and profane learning, accompanied some British merchants to the French coast. The crowds which flocked to the ship every day were astonished that these two had no merchandize for sale, and that they cried out to all who came to purchase, "If any one is desirous of wisdom, let him come to us and receive it. We ask no money in exchange for this commodity." The people, mistaking them for madmen, reported the matter to the king, who sent for them, and was filled with great joy when he found that they were so learned. Clement he commanded to reside in France, to whose care and instruction he committed a *swarm* of boys; and the other, (Albin,) he set over the monastery of Padua, in Italy, where he established a famous school.

Assisted by these eminent persons, Charlemagne opened a great number of academies, in all parts of his vast dominions, and, moreover, says Brucker, † "earnestly exhorted the bishops to aid in the advancement of art and science, by annexing schools to the cathedral churches. This was attended with so great success, that during the reigns of Charles the Great and Louis the Pious, schools were established in most of the sees by the bishops and canons. And although the chief aim of these institutions was to teach the children of freemen and slaves, grammar, music, and arithmetic, so that the school of Osnaberg obtained from the emperor the singular privilege of comprehending Greek and Latin within its course of studies, in order that there might always be found clerics well skilled in both languages; nevertheless, it is evident, from the testimonies of contemporary writers, collected by Lannoy, that a knowledge of the liberal arts was also imparted in these schools. It is clear that, in addition to sacred learning, the other sciences, or what was called the Trivium and Quadrivium ‡ course, were explained in the episcopal and monastic

* Monachus Sangallensis, (the monk of St. Gall,) quoted by Brucker, vol. iii. p. 585.6. He wrote two books: *De Gestis Caroli Regis Francorum, et Imperatoris ad Carolum Calvum.*

† Ibid, p. 593.

‡ The Trivium included grammar, rhetoric, logic. The Quadrivium, music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. This was

schools over each of which a scholastic or professor presided." The second Council of Chalons, which was celebrated by order of Charlemagne, in 813, commanded all bishops to establish schools, in which profane literature and the sacred scriptures should be taught. The person who presided in these schools was called the *Scholastic*.

That these schools continued to exercise a beneficial influence upon the clergy, even during the darkest period of the Dark Ages, may be inferred from the Pastoral Letter which Riculphus, Bishop of Soissons, addressed to the clergy of his diocese, in 889. In addition to many other matters of great importance, he orders each of them to have a Ritual to administer baptism, a Missal, a book of the Lessons, a book of the Gospels, a Martyr-book, a book of Anthems, a Psalter, and a copy of St. Gregory's forty homilies; to be able to repeat by heart, the Psalms, Canon of the Mass, Creed, the symbol *quicumque*, &c., and to be acquainted with ecclesiastical music and the Calendar. He counsels them to celebrate Mass frequently, at which they should exhort their people to be present; commands them to preach on Sundays and holidays, to instruct the Catechumens during Lent, that they may be baptised and receive the holy Eucharist at Easter; to watch over Public Penitents, and to administer to the sick the Holy Unction, after Confession and Absolution, but before Communion. He advises them to be charitable and hospitable, and commands the Deans to assemble the clergy of their districts on the first day of every month, for the purpose of holding conferences on the duties of their ministry and the necessities of their parishes. This letter, which is printed at length, (Tom. 9, Concili, at the end of Condesius' edition of Hincmar's works, Paris, 1615.) and an abstract of which will be found in Du Pin's Hist. of Ecclesiastical Writers, (cent. 9, versus finem,) will, we think, show, that even in the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century, the clergy, as a body, could not have been so ignorant, dissolute, or idle as they have been represented. Nay, perhaps some of those ministers who sneer at the Dark Ages, might find in this letter

exclusive of the theological course, some idea of which may be formed from the passage of Riculphus, quoted a little further on, from the council of Chalons, and from the fact just stated, that some of them should know Greek well.

some very useful instructions, of which they would do well to avail themselves.

The method of teaching Theology has been divided into Positive and Discursive. The former relies chiefly on the exposition of the Holy Scriptures, the teaching of the Fathers, and the decrees of Popes and Councils. The latter, receiving all these with the most profound reverence and unhesitating faith, evolves them by the light of reason, and deduces from them various consertaries. It calls to its aid the subtle definitions of philosophy, makes numerous divisions, and subjects every argument to the most severe rules of dialectics. But, as true religion is founded on reason as well as on revelation, it is evident that he would be unworthy the name of theologian who did not combine both these methods. Positive theology must employ reason in establishing the divinity of our holy religion, in the interpretation of Scripture, and in explaining the writings of the Fathers, the bulls of Pontiffs, and the decrees of Councils; whilst discursive theology must build upon authority that faith which it afterwards adorns and defends by the principles of philosophy. The theology of Augustine is positive, that of Aquinas, discursive; and yet no one can use the weapons of reason more powerfully than the former, or urge the authority of the Scriptures and of the Church more felicitously than the latter. They differ, however, in this, that discursive theology makes a larger use of the principles of reason, discusses a great many subtle questions, connected sometimes as much with the speculations of metaphysics as with doctrine, and employs the terms, definitions, divisions, and artificial method of philosophy. Reason is necessary to explain and defend the faith; its artificial rules are not necessary; but when used with moderation and caution, they may be rendered as serviceable to the cause of truth, as when abused they become certainly and ruinously pernicious.

There can be no doubt that numerous and most pernicious heresies were derived, first from the writings of Plato, and afterwards from those of Aristotle. To the former, the Fathers of the Church trace the Simonians, Valentinians, Marcionites, and Manichæans, with many other wide-spread Eastern sects; and to the latter, the Arians, Ætians, and Eunomians.* Hence some of the more

* See this whole subject discussed by Petavius with his usual

ancient defenders of the faith would appear not only to have rejected the science of dialectics, which supplied its enemies with their most powerful weapons, but all kinds of profane philosophy; whilst others, restricting both within their proper limits, extracting from them what was good, and casting away what was bad, successfully combated the opponents of the Church with their own arms. And this is indeed one of the principal services which dialectics render to religion. Clement of Alexandria says, (lib. 1, Strom.) "The doctrine of our Saviour is in itself perfect, and requires not the aid of any man's philosophy, because it is the science and wisdom of God. Hence, when Greek philosophy is taken into its service, it does not render truth stronger, but by weakening the sophistical attacks which are made against it, becomes a fitting wall and rampart to guard the vineyard." "Logic is the hedge," he says, (lib. 6,) "which prevents truth from being trampled down by the sophists." Even Basil, who inveighs against Aristotle, when defending the faith against Eunomius, admits this use of dialectics in nearly the same words: "Logic," he says, (in cap. 2, *Isaiæ*) serves as a wall to doctrine, because it does not allow it to be torn down easily, nor leave it exposed to every sudden assault." Of Basil himself, Gregory Nazianzine says, (Orat. 20,) "that he so excelled in logical demonstrations and disputations which they call dialectics, that those who contended with him could more easily extricate themselves from a labyrinth than get out of his arguments." And, indeed, the works of Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, against Eunomius, as well as the commentaries of Cyril of Alexandria upon St. John, may be said to be a contest in dialectics with most subtle heretics, in the refutation of whose sophisms they show themselves to be admirably skilled in the art of logic. The heretics soon found that the arms of Aristotle were more powerful in the cause of truth than of error. Serapion, in

learning, tom. 1. De Dogmatibus Theologicis, Cap. 3. Both Socrates, (lib. i., cap. 5,) and Sozomen, (lib. i., c. 15,) testify that Arius was a most sharp dialectician. *Διαλεχτικωτατος* is Sozomen's expression. Of Ætius, Epiphanius says, (Hær. 76, p. 2,) that being ignorant until he became old, he at length studied Aristotle's Philosophy, at Alexandria, and that, having learned logic, he afterwards applied himself strenuously to explain the entire relation of the Divine Word by certain figures.

his contest with Arnobius, says: "You break out into a logical sophism." To which the Catholic answers, "A logical sophism has two properties: it establishes what is true, and if there be falsehood anywhere it detects it." "Throw away logic," cries the heretic. "Logic," replies the Catholic, "enters into obscure things, that what is true may be recognized for the truth." Something exactly similar happened in later times. The enemies of the Church pressed Aristotle into their service, but when her champions encountered them with their own weapons, they also discovered that logic is more formidable on the side of truth than of error, and it has been remarked of most of them, that they would as willingly encounter Satan as a syllogism.

Nor indeed were the ancient Fathers opposed to each other regarding the use of dialectics in matters connected with religion, for we find the very same persons condemning it at one time and approving of it at another. They admitted the use of logic in defending as well as in explaining the faith, but they justly reprobated the abuse of human reason as well as of dialectics, when they were set up as the judges of faith, and when nothing would be believed whose truth they had not previously established. But this perversion of reason is by no means peculiar to those who use Aristotle's philosophy; it is far oftener conveyed in the well turned periods of the rhetorician; and in a dry syllogism it is infinitely less attractive and dangerous than in the sparkling pages of Voltaire or of Gibbon. On this subject the great Augustine says (Ep. 222), "With regard, therefore, to certain things appertaining to doctrine which we are not yet able to understand by reason, although we will be able to do so at some future time, let faith, by which the heart is cleansed, go before reason, so that it may be enabled to admit and to bear the light of great reason. This certainly is reasonable. And therefore it is reasonably said by the prophet: unless ye shall believe ye shall not understand. Where without doubt he distinguished these two, and advised us to believe first, that we may be able to understand that which we believe. Therefore it is reasonable that faith should precede reason." The method pointed out here is that which has been always followed in the Catholic Church, and it certainly would be a novel charge against the theologians of the Middle Ages

to accuse them of giving too much to reason and too little to authority.

The second objection which the Fathers preferred against the Greek philosophy, and which is in a great measure peculiar to logic, is the contentiousness and the pride of triumphing even in a bad cause, which it is apt to produce, and the passion with which its abettors often debate the most trivial questions, neglecting those that are of real importance. "The science of disputation," says Augustine, (*Lib. 2. de Doct. Christ. cap. 31.*), "is very useful in enabling us to penetrate and resolve all kinds of questions that are found in the sacred writings. Only we must avoid a passion for disputation and the puerile vanity of deceiving an adversary." We confess that many of the schoolmen were not free from this fault; but it is not inherent in the science of dialectics, but a defilement that obscures its beauty, impairs its usefulness, and from which it should therefore be carefully purified.

Avoiding these faults, logic is sometimes necessary and always useful in doctrinal discussions. St. John Damascene—a Greek writer of the eighth century, who, in his four books on the orthodox faith, was the first to comprise in one treatise the whole body of Christian doctrine—thus elegantly expresses how far the science of dialectics is necessary for the Christian theologian: "Every artist," he says (*Dialog. cap. 1.*), "requires some tools for the performance of his work, and it is right that theology, which is the queen of arts, should be attended by some of her handmaids. Let us therefore receive the other sciences as the servants of truth, and free them from the tyrannous and usurped rule of impiety. And let us not use what is good for a bad purpose, nor convert the art of disputation into a means of deceiving the simple. And although truth has no need of those sophistical inventions, nevertheless we must make use of them to confute those mischievous disputants, and to refute that false-named science."

The treatise upon logic that was in most general use in the episcopal and monastic schools, in which as we have seen that science formed a regular part of the course of studies, was that which went under the name of Augustine. This great Saint says in his retractations, that he had written a treatise upon grammar, and commenced others upon logic, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, and philosophy, none of which were completed. He also read and easily

understood without a master* the ten categories of Aristotle. It is certain that the treatises on logic and the categories† which are found among the works of Augustine, were not composed by him, but he was believed to be the author, and this caused them to be revered in the schools.

Boethius, a writer of the fifth century, who has been rendered famous by his misfortunes as well as by his philosophy, translated and wrote commentaries on the works of Aristotle. He was born of an illustrious family about the year 455, was three times consul, an honour which he lived to see conferred upon his two sons in 522, was stripped of his possessions, banished to Pavia, and beheaded in 524 by order of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, to whom he had discharged the duties of a wise and faithful minister. His treatise on the consolation of philosophy, which he composed in prison, is partly in prose and partly in verse, and is written with elegance and purity. His theological works consist of a treatise on the two natures of Jesus Christ, a treatise on the Trinity addressed to Symmachus, and a letter to John, Deacon of Rome, which treats of matters connected with the same mystery. In all these works he has made use of Aristotle's philosophy, whose definitions of substance, person, &c., he has adopted, and on this account he is very generally considered the first who used the acute subtleties of the Stagirite in explaining the doctrines of Theology. We have already had occasion to state that the philosophy of Aristotle was known to some ecclesiastics during the four following centuries, most probably by means of the translation of Boethius, and though its principles may have been very rarely and in a very limited degree used to illustrate the faith, they certainly did not take place to any considerable extent until the Saracens of Spain exchanged the sword for the syllogism. They at first disdained to use any argument but the scimitar in propagating the doctrines of their prophet. But after their fiery career had been extinguished by

* Confessionum, lib. iv. cap. xvi.

† At the end of each tome of St. Augustine's works are placed the spurious treatises connected with the subjects treated of in it. The grammar, logic, categories, and rhetoric, are at the end of the first tome.

Charles Martel, in the blood of their chief and a hundred thousand of his warriors, they assailed Christianity with other arms. Aristotle was translated into Arabic, and a vast number of Mahommedan writers commented on his works with incredible subtilty. The Christians were obliged to exercise themselves in the same kind of arms, to enable them to combat their enemies, and it is clear that Aristotle's logic was taught in some of the schools as early as the beginning of the eleventh century, since Ingulf, who was secretary to William the Conqueror, and afterwards Abbot of Croyland, speaks of it not as if it were a recent importation, but as forming a regular portion of the course of studies pursued at Oxford in his time. Hallam states, (vol. ii. chap. 9, part 2, note) on the authority of Brucker, that it was Boethius' translation of parts of Aristotle's logic which was in use at Oxford, and that it is to this Ingulf refers. This seems to us to be a pure conjecture without any foundation whatever, for it appears to be almost certain that a complete translation of Aristotle's logic and metaphysics must have existed at this time in Latin. Hermannus Contractus, the son of Count Weringen, in Livonia, was at the age of fourteen sent to the monastery of St. Gall to be educated. He was lame and *contracted* in body, and made little progress in learning on account of the slowness of his mind. Hilperic, his master, seeing how bitterly he bewailed his misfortunes, pitied him, and advised him to apply himself to prayer, and to implore the assistance of the immaculate virgin, the mother of God. Hermannus obeyed his master, and in less than two years he thought he saw the holy Virgin one night whilst he was asleep, and that she thus addressed him: "O good child, I have heard your prayers, and at your request have come to assist you. Now therefore choose whichever of these two things you please, and you shall certainly obtain it—either to have your body cured, or to become master of all the science you desire." Hermannus did not hesitate to prefer the gifts of the mind to those of the body, and such from this period was his progress in human and divine science, that he was esteemed the most learned of his contemporaries. He excelled them all in philosophy, rhetoric, astronomy, poetry, music, and theology; composed books upon geometry, music, astronomy, the eclipses of the sun and moon, the astrolabe, the quadrant, the horologue, and the quadrature of the circle;

wrote commentaries on Aristotle and Cicero, translated some Greek and Arabic volumes into Latin, composed a chronicle from the creation of the world to the year 1052, a treatise on physiognomy, and several hymns, amongst which the *Salve Regina*, *Alma Redemptoris*, and the *Veni Sancte Spiritus* are enumerated. He belongs to the earlier portion of the eleventh century, for he died in the year 1054, at the age of forty-one. And will any one believe that persons who understood the Greek and Arabic, in both which languages there were numerous copies of Aristotle's writings, and who actually translated works from both, would have left in unknown tongues an author on whom they wrote commentaries, if a perfect Latin version had not already existed? Indeed, Brucker himself (vol. iii. p. 670), on whom Hallam relies, expressly says that the story of Hermannus proves the falsehood of the assertion that Aristotle was first translated into Latin in the twelfth century. We think there can be no doubt but that there existed a complete Latin version of Aristotle as early as the year 1000, and that it was made not from the Greek but from the Arabic. Not to enter into the internal evidence upon this point, which is quite decisive, it may be sufficient to observe that the intercourse between the Christians and the Saracens of Spain who esteemed Aristotle highly, was so intimate, that many copies of the Arabic version must have fallen into their hands, and that their attention must have necessarily been directed to a work from which their enemies derived almost all the objections which they urged against the holy religion which they professed. Consequently Aristotle's logic and metaphysics began to be taught in the commencement of the eleventh century, in the episcopal and monastic schools, and in a short time it formed a part of the regular course of ecclesiastical studies. Other causes, which we shall explain just now, contributed to accelerate the revolution which was taking place in favour of Aristotle, so that before the end of the century the study of his philosophy and its application to the science of divinity had become so universal in the schools, that this mode of teaching theology was emphatically called the *Scholastic* method, and those who adopted it *Scholastics*, or schoolmen.*

* (Brucker, vol. iii. p. 675.) He says, that this kind of philosophy which began to prevail in the schools from the middle of the

The same philosophical subtleties which were urged by the Mahomedans against the Christian religion, were in the eleventh century used by the Greeks to impugn the Catholic dogma of the procession of the Holy Ghost. Nor were there wanting in the West during this same period, men who endeavoured by the aid of the philosophy of Aristotle to justify their rebellion against the Church. Berenger, Archdeacon of Angers, who was born at Tours about the year 1000, undertook to prove that our Lord is not really present in the Holy Eucharist, by metaphysical quibbles derived from this new-fangled philosophy. Even Sigebert of Gemblours,* the violent partisan of Henry IV. against St. Gregory VII. distinctly charges Berenger with obscuring or destroying the faith by his subtleties. He says that "he was a distinguished dialectician, and that by abusing philosophical sophisms to destroy the simplicity of the Apostolic faith, he perverts what is clear rather than elucidates what is obscure." Guitmond, who was bishop of Avern, about the year 1080, brings the same charges against Berenger, in reply to whom he has written three books on the Eucharist. All those who have examined this matter, although most unfriendly to scholastic theology, are forced to admit that the heretics, and especially Berengarius and his followers, obliged the schoolmen to prepare themselves to defend the Church by exercising themselves in the disputations of Aristotle. "All confess," says a bitter enemy of the schools, "that this kind of theology had its origin in an over-curious reading of the doctrine of Aristotle, which, as Bede declares, was formerly quite a stranger to the schools. But in this century, and principally on the occasion of the Berengarian controversies, meddling persons, and for the most part such as favoured or seemed to favour Berengarius, introduced the dialectics of Aristotle into the schools. Whence it happened that those were looked upon as heretics who first used the newly imported terms and refinements of this philosophy in the scholastic exercises.†

eleventh century, was called scholastic, because it crept abroad out of the monasteries and cathedral schools. "Eo quod ex scholis cathedralium et monasteriorum proreperit.

* Quoted by Brucker, *ibid.* p. 660.

† Cæsar Egassius Bulæus, tome i. *Hist. Univ. Par. Cet.* iii. apud Gener. p. 4.

When the most sublime mysteries of faith were thus submitted to the judgment of reason, it was not to be expected that the doctrine of the Trinity, any more than that of the Eucharist, would escape its quibbles. Hence we cannot be surprised when we find that before the end of the same century, Roscelin, a priest of Campiegne, a famous dialectician, and the leader of the *nominalists*, advanced doctrines inconsistent with this great mystery. Modern protestants who almost instinctively take under their protection all heretics, including even those who reject what they are pleased to consider fundamental articles of faith, have of course endeavoured to defend Roscelin. With them his condemnation by the Catholic Church is a patent of orthodoxy. But Brucker himself (vol. iii. p. 673), admits that "he profanes the simplicity of this tremendous mystery, by the introduction of strange notions and vain meaningless abstractions."

In the year 1079 was born of a noble family, at the village of Palais, near Nantes, Peter Abelard; a man whose adventures are so singular, and at the same time so inseparably interwoven with the triumphs and the errors which were occasioned by scholastic pursuits, that it would be unpardonable to pass him by without notice. Although the oldest son, he abandoned his birthright to his brothers in order that he might be able to devote himself entirely to the study of logic and metaphysics. For this purpose he left his native country, and after visiting several schools during his journey at length came to Paris and placed himself under William of Champeaux, Archdeacon of Notre Dame, and the most famous dialectician of his time. At first he lived on very friendly terms with his master and school-fellows, but his vanity soon led him to dispute the opinions of the former; and the tone of arrogant superiority which he assumed over the latter rendered him extremely odious to the entire school. He therefore left Paris and opened a school of his own not far from that city, at the royal castle of Melun, where he obtained a license to teach publicly. He afterwards removed to Corbeil, which is still nearer Paris, with the hope of eclipsing the fame of William of Champeaux and attracting his scholars to himself. Being obliged to go home on account of ill health, which had been induced by intense application, he found on his return that William had become regular canon in the Church of St. Victor, where he con-

tinued his lectures, and he again enrolled himself among his pupils for the purpose of studying rhetoric. But he soon renewed his old metaphysical disputes with his master, especially concerning the universal *a parti rei*, which he urged so successfully that he forced him to change his opinions. This gained him such reputation that the person who had succeeded William in the school of Paris was not ashamed to surrender his chair to him, and to place himself under him for instruction. But William soon resumed the school of Paris, and Abelard went to St. Genevieve, where he continued to lecture publicly. When his father became a monk and his mother also retired from the cares of her family to lead a religious life, he was again obliged to break up his school and go home to his own country. Finding on his return to Paris that William had been made bishop of Chalons, he went thither for the purpose of studying divinity under Anslem, Canon and Dean of Laon. But as usual he soon exchanged the character of pupil for that of master, and expounded the scriptures with great applause, and very probably not without great errors. His lectures being on this account interdicted by his master, he returned to Paris, where he resumed his exposition of the Holy Scriptures. It was at this time he became acquainted with Heloise, a young lady of great beauty, and niece to Fulbert, canon of Paris. Abelard became her tutor, and employed baseness and falsehood to effect her ruin. He persuaded her uncle to take him to board in his house under what he declares to have been the false pretence of devoting more time to her instruction. As soon as his conduct was discovered he was turned out of doors, but he induced Heloise to abandon her uncle's house disguised in the habit of a nun, and to accompany him to his own country, where their son Astrolabe was born. To pacify her uncle Abelard married her privately in Paris, after which they met very seldom, and then in secret. Her relations, as was to be expected, divulged the marriage, but Heloise at the instigation of her husband, or actuated by a noble but mistaken self-sacrifice, denied it, lest by its acknowledgement she should injure his interests. Abelard was ungenerous enough, in order more effectually to impose upon the public, to ask her to assume the habit of a nun, without, however, taking the vows, in the monastery of Argenteuil. This new injury enraged her relations to such a

degree, that they entered his chamber by force and reduced him to the degrading condition of an eunuch. Nothing could exceed the shame and confusion of Abelard. He sent Heloise to Argentueil, and hid himself in the Abbey of St. Denis, and both made their religious profession on the same day. He was at length prevailed upon to resume once more his lectures upon the liberal arts as well as theology, and it is reported that the number of his pupils amounted to three thousand.

His treatises regarding the unity of God and the Trinity were declared by many persons to be full of errors. Abelard was cited to the Council of Soissons, in 1121, where his writings were condemned, and he was himself sentenced to be confined during his life in a monastery. He cast his book into the fire with his own hand, and recited the Athanasian Creed as a profession of his orthodoxy. He was treated with great kindness by the monks of the abbey of St. Medard, of Soissons, where he was confined. After a few days he was liberated by the Pope's legate, and allowed to return to his own monastery. But having, with his usual fortune, rendered himself odious there, he fled to Provence; and by the liberality of some private persons, and with the approbation of the bishop, was enabled to build a Chapel in a solitude near Troyes. To this place he was followed by a great number of his pupils, who furnished him with necessaries, and built cells for themselves, so that they appeared more like hermits than pupils. They also built a Church, which was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, and to which Abelard gave the name of Paraclete. When the abbot of St. Denis took from the nuns, of whom Heloise was prioress, the abbey of Argentueil, Abelard gave them the Church of the Paraclete, and its dependencies, whither he often returned to assist them in their necessities. This donation was confirmed by the bishop of Troyes, and Pope Innocent II., and in a short time the convent was richly endowed by the liberality of the faithful. It was from this place that Heloise wrote her three famous letters to Abelard, which, with his replies, are still extant. There is nothing in the genuine correspondence unbecoming persons who had devoted themselves to God. But a vast number of spurious letters have been circulated under their names, which are full of false sentiment, and are by no means free, even from obscenity. The exquisite poem

which Pope has founded on their correspondence, has rendered the names of Heloise and Abelard famous wherever the English language is understood.

Abelard still continued to propagate his errors so notoriously in his lectures and writings, that William, abbot of St. Thierry, wrote to St. Bernard, the celebrated abbot of Clairvaux, to get him condemned. When St. Bernard had read Abelard's book, and convinced himself that he had certainly advanced the errors of which he was accused, he wrote to him privately, and charitably admonished him to retract them. But this only exasperated the proud spirit of Abelard, who challenged St. Bernard to meet him, for the purpose of discussing their differences, and having them decided by the Council, which was about to assemble at Sens. St. Bernard did attend, not without great reluctance; "but," says one of Abelard's apologists,* "he had recourse to shifts, and would not answer expressly, though he had leave to do it, had very favourable judges, and was in a place where he needed not to fear anything." He appealed to the Pope, from the very tribunal which he had himself selected, and which therefore only condemned his opinions, without passing any sentence upon his person. Innocent II. confirmed the decrees of the Council, and imposed perpetual silence on Abelard himself as an heretic. The latter having published an apology for his writings, set out on his journey to Rome, to defend himself before the holy Father in person. But when he arrived at Clugny, he was detained there by the abbot, Peter the Venerable, who reconciled him to St. Bernard, and persuaded him to strike out of his writings anything offensive to Catholics which was contained in them.

Abelard at length found in Clugny that contentment and happiness which he had sought in vain in the indulgence of his passions, the enthusiastic admiration of numerous scholars, and the applause of mankind. He lived here near two years in great humility and holiness, but becoming very infirm, was removed to the more healthful and pleasant monastery of St. Marcellus, on the Seine, where he died in 1142, being the sixty-third year of his age. In his answer to the first letter from Heloise,

* Du Pin. See his *History of Abelard amongst the writers of the 12th century.*

Abelard had expressed a desire to be buried in the monastery of the Paraclete, that she and her nuns might pray for the repose of his soul. Peter the Venerable acquainted her of his death by a letter, in which he praises his manner of living ever since he had joined their society, and adds an epitaph to be put over his tomb. He also had his body conveyed to the Paraclete, to be interred there, and afterwards visited that monastery, where he said Mass, delivered an exhortation to the religious in the chapter-house, administered to them the Holy Eucharist, and promised Heloise to have prayers offered up for her for thirty days together after her death. She thanked him for all these favours in a letter full of tenderness and gratitude.

Of Abelard the apologist above quoted acknowledges* that "some of his propositions were insufferable, his expositions of Scripture intolerable; that his way of speaking, and explanations of the mysteries, was novel; that he relied too much on his own reasoning, and was fond of prying too curiously into incomprehensible doctrines." Indeed, any one who will take the trouble of reading even a small portion of his theological works, must acknowledge that they are filled with abstruse and unintelligible metaphysical subtilties, and that St. Bernard's charge is not without a legitimate foundation—that "he disputed in such a manner as to betray himself to be an Arian when he treated of the Trinity, a Pelagian when he treated of Grace, and a Nestorian when he treated of the person of Christ." It is not a little remarkable that the most vehement assailants of the schoolmen are the defenders of Abelard, who did more to advance scholasticism than any of his contemporaries. Perhaps not one of his eulogists has ever read a line of his writings, except possibly his letters to Heloise; and he certainly owes the tenderness with which his memory has been treated, to his errors and his amours, neither of which, we should imagine, can be considered very honourable to him. Indeed, his theological writings are perhaps the most subtle that were ever produced by any schoolman; and one of his letters is written against those who condemn the use of logic. He says they remind him of the fable of the fox and the

* Du Pin, ubi sup.

grapes, and that they despise logic because they have not the genius to comprehend it. Nor can his letters be compared with those of Heloise, which are far more beautiful. She was not much inferior to him even in learning, for she understood Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, was well acquainted with theology, and could interpret the most difficult texts of sacred Scripture. She attained just the same age (63) as Abelard, when she died, on the 17th of May, 1164. She was consequently twenty-two years his junior, and survived him as many years.

In the early part of the eleventh century, Peter de Bruis and his followers produced many subtle paradoxes against the sacraments, and towards the middle of it, Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers, misled by the same overacute refinements of philosophy regarding the sublime mystery of the Trinity which had deceived Abelard, advanced doctrines that were inconsistent with the persons and attributes of the Diety. But above all, the Manichæan heresy appeared in the west during this century, and early in the twelfth had extensive followers in most of the continental countries. The Paulicians had revived and propagated this heresy in Armenia during the eighth and ninth centuries. They ascribed the creation of the world to an evil spirit, whom they supposed to be the author of the Old Testament, which they consequently rejected, and denied the reality of the death and resurrection of our Lord, because they believed that his body was not mortal, but impassive and celestial. Being driven out of their own country, they took refuge in Bulgaria, whence they promulgated their errors over the western Church. As early as the year 1007, some heretics were burned at Lyons for teaching Manichæan doctrines, and in the early part of the following century we find them spread over a great part of France, Germany, and Italy. It may be worth while to extract a brief outline of their doctrine from a tract regarding the Cathari, or Manichæans of Italy, written by one of their teachers at Milan after his conversion.*

They all believed that it was the devil who arranged the elements, but whether he made them or not was an open

* This tract has been published by Father Dachery, (*Spicilegii*, Tom. xii. An abstract of it will be found in Du Pin's *Hist. of the Heretics of the 12th cent.*

question;—that it was he who made Adam's body, and Eve, of whom he begat Cain;—that the fruit which Adam was forbid to eat, was the carnal knowledge of Eve;—that all bodies in the air, earth, or water, were made by the devil;—that he appeared to the Patriarchs, and is the god of the Old Testament;—that Christ had not a real body, and consequently, died and rose again in appearance only;—that he is not equal to the Father;—that the cross is the mark of the beast, and St. Sylvester Antichrist, since whose pontificate the Church has been extinct;—that no one can be saved in the married state;—that it is unlawful to eat flesh, eggs, milk, or any thing else that proceeds from animals;—and that the sun is the devil, and the moon Eve, who bear to each other the relation of man and wife, and visit once a month.

It will be observed, that the errors regarding the cross and the Pope, which are still popular, are here placed in excellent company. Indeed, the Waldenses, to whom Protestant writers are not ashamed to trace the origin of their sect, were certainly Manichæans,* although we do not mean to assert that they were orthodox believers in every article of the diabolical creed which we have just recited. But, however, intuitively absurd this doctrine may appear, it is founded on the great mystery of the existence of evil, to explain which they endeavoured, with the most acute metaphysical subtleties, to prove the necessity of two supreme beings, one infinitely good, and the other infinitely wicked.

The champions of the Church were obliged to study the logic and metaphysics of Aristotle, in order to be able to refute these numerous heretics. Amongst the earliest and most successful cultivators of this science in the western Church, were Lanfranc and Anselm, the celebrated Archbishops of Canterbury, who opposed and refuted Berenger and Roscelin. St. Bernard, indeed, alarmed by the errors of Abelard and others, stoutly opposed himself to the new philosophy, and gloried in his ignorance of it; and the Popes issued several instructions to moderate its use in the schools. But all opposition was now vain, and, indeed, we can hardly conceive the universal passion for this kind of study which existed at this period. The cloister had more numerous and far more enthusiastic knights-errant

* See this proved by Hallam, vol. II. cap. ix. part 2. note 4.

than the camp. We have seen that the disciples of Abelard built huts round his dwelling in the wilderness, in which they lived like hermits. The name of a celebrated master was sufficient, in spite of the delays and dangers of the journey, to attract crowds of students from the most distant countries of Europe. Learning was rewarded with fame, riches, and honors, and, as a natural consequence, so many set themselves up for masters, that an order was made in the twelfth century, that none should teach without the license of an official, who was called the Scholastic of the diocese.

Paris was at this time the most celebrated theological school in the world, and amongst those attracted to it by its fame, was Peter Lombard, who was born in a village near Novara, in Lombardy, to which circumstance he owes his surname. He brought with him a letter of introduction from the Bishop of Lucca to St. Bernard, who provided him with all necessaries so long as he resided at Rheims, and on his departure for Paris, wrote to the abbot of St. Victor to entertain him gratis. In Paris, he acquired so great a reputation, that he was appointed, first professor of divinity, and afterwards bishop of that city. When the see became vacant, Philip, Archdeacon of Paris, son of Louis the Gross, was elected by the chapter, but he, although the son and brother of a king, nobly resigned this exalted dignity to an obscure but learned foreigner, who had taught him philosophy and theology. Peter Lombard took possession of his See in 1159, and died in 1164. He wrote commentaries on the Psalms, and on St. Paul's Epistles, and composed the *Four Books of Sentences*. To call the last-named work famous, is saying little; for it undoubtedly continued for nearly four centuries, one of the most celebrated books that was ever written by mortal man. It was the Iliad of the schools, and its annotators and commentators were incomparably more numerous than those who have employed themselves in the illustration of any other human production.*

* About this time academical degrees were introduced by the university of Paris. The original degree was that of licentiate. It was in fact simply a substitute for the license of the scholastic of the diocese, without which no one was allowed to teach philosophy or theology, even in the *private* schools of the monasteries. Afterwards the degree of master or doctor (which were originally

This work of Peter Lombard's is a compendious treatise upon the entire of Theology. He called it a book of *sentences*, because it is chiefly made up of quotations or sentences from the Sacred Scriptures, and the most esteemed Fathers of the Church. "The chief design,"

identical) was added, to be conferred as the reward of superior merit. In conferring this degree, *bacillus*, a word was used from which *baccalureus* (a bachelor) is derived. This soon became the name of a separate degree, which was lower than that of licentiate. Persons were still licensed to teach in private schools without the university degrees, although many of these teachers had in fact obtained them. But no public school could be opened except by a person who had obtained his degrees, and hence it often happened that candidates for degrees had taught for many years in private schools. At present this does not appear strange, but it must be remembered that at the time of which we write, degrees were in no case looked upon as a mere honour, and that they were never conferred, except upon persons who were destined for the profession of teaching, of whose fitness they were a public and authentic testimony. The degrees were three in number, bachelor, licentiate, and master or doctor. The candidates for these honours must have been trained from their earliest youth in the private schools. Some persons (see de Rubeis dissertatio de commentariis S. Thomæ in Sententias, cap. i. nu. 2 et 3) say that academical degrees owe their origin to Gratian, a monk of Bononia, and author of the famous decree which bears his name, and to Peter Lombard. However this may be, the studies to which the candidates were subjected produced countless commentators on the works of the latter. No secular was permitted even to aspire to degrees who had not completed his university course, both in philosophy and theology. He was then subjected to several rigorous examinations, and if he passed through these successfully, he became a bachelor. The religious orders had the privilege of presenting one selected from their entire body each year to the university, from which he received the degree of bachelor. The licentiate entered the school of some master, under whose care and direction he explained the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard (for many other authors had written works with this title) publicly, during an entire year. At the expiration of the year, the master under whose inspection he had been placed, some other masters, and the prior of the Jacobite college, presented him to the Chancellor of the university, affirming upon oath that they considered him fit to receive the degree of *licentiate*, which would entitle him to teach as a master. As soon as he received his *license* he delivered his inaugural lecture in the episcopal palace, in the presence of the entire theological faculty. Hence he was said, *Aulam suam habere*. Here he received his *rod*, and was

says Gener, (Hist. Schol. Prodrum. 1, cap. 1,) "which Lombard had in view, was to whet the genius of the orthodox, so that they might be able to refute the numerous errors which at that time assailed the venerable dogmas of the faith with sharp and subtle disputations, as the author himself expressly declares in his preface." The *master* explains the plan of his work with his usual brevity, clearness, and precision. He begins by stating, that having again and again studied the sacred pages under the guidance of preventing grace, he had come to the conclusion, with Augustine, (Lib. de Doct. Christ.) that all knowledge regards either *Things* or *Signs*. All signs are indeed things also, but because they are primarily intended to signify something distinct from themselves, he calls them signs, in contradistinction to things. The latter he divides into, things that are to be enjoyed, things that are to be used, and things that are to use and to enjoy. The thing to be enjoyed, is that by loving and possessing which we are made happy; and this is nothing else but the Holy and Undivided Trinity,—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The things to be used, are those which assist us in our efforts to know, to love, and finally, to obtain possession of God. These things are, this world and the creatures which it contains. As St. Augustine says, (ubi sup. cap. 4,) "we must not enjoy but use this world," that the invisible

declared master. He was then entitled to open a school of his own, in which he was obliged during another year to lecture on the sentences. These lectures, although spoken in the schools, were always written beforehand with great care, and accurately committed to memory. The preparation for them required, constant study of the scriptures, of the fathers, and of philosophy. The students were obliged to write them during their delivery. These writings were called *Reportata*. After the expiration of a year he was entitled to have a bachelor under him to lecture on the sentences, and was at liberty to teach what he pleased himself. Another year having elapsed, he became a *Magister emeritus* or *doctor*, and was qualified to preside in the monastic schools, and even in the public schools of Paris. For more extensive information on this interesting subject, see Du Cange's *Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinatatis*, at the word *Bacchalaratus Licentia*, Doctor Echard's (not the English historian of this name, but the French Dominican) *Bibliothèque of Dominican writers*, in his lives of Ægidius, Albertus Magnus, and St. Thomas Aquinas, and De Bubeis *Dissertatio de Commentariis S. Thomæ in Sententias*.

things of God may be clearly seen from the creation of the world, (Rom. i. 20.); that is, that by temporal things we may understand the eternal. Lastly, angels and men are the things which have the use of creatures, and are destined to enjoy of God. In accordance with this partition of knowledge, the Master divided his work into four books, in the three first of which he treats of things and in the last of signs. Each book is divided into distinctions, and the distinctions into paragraphs, and even the most intricate and perplexing subjects are discussed with admirable order and perspicuity.

In the first book, which treats of the thing to be enjoyed, he proves the Holy Trinity from Scripture and tradition, and from the same sources illustrates the attributes and providence of God. In the second book, which treats both of things to be used and of things which are to use creatures and to enjoy God—that is, angels and men—he continues the history of the creation, refutes the Manichean doctrine regarding the existence of two supreme beings, discusses the fall of the angels and of man, proves that an angel-guardian is assigned to each of us, explains the nature of original and actual sin, of grace and free-will, and handles with great power and acuteness a vast number of questions connected with these delicate subjects. In the third book, he continues to treat of things which are to use and to enjoy, and having in the second detailed the fall of man, he now proceeds to examine the manner in which his redemption was effected by the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. In the end of the book he explains, faith, hope, and charity, the cardinal virtues, and the precepts of the decalogue. In the fourth book, which regards signs, he unfolds the nature and efficacy of the holy sacraments. He observes that sacramental signs are of two kinds: some whose entire use is to signify and not to justify; such were the sacraments of the old law. Others, which not only signify, but confer grace, and such are the evangelical sacraments. In the eleventh distinction he proves that the change in the Eucharist is substantial, so that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are under the accidents that before covered the substance of bread and wine, which is now annihilated or returned to the first matter. In the following distinction he declares that the accidents remain without a subject, and that *they only* are broken and divided into parts. In this book he also treats of the

celibacy of the clergy, prayers for the dead, and of the invocation and intercession of saints.

Peter Lombard was not infallible any more than Cyprian and many other great lights of the Church. He has not been followed in every thing by his commentators. But in some things he seems to have been misunderstood, and at all events his errors are few, and for the most part not very important. Books consisting of sentences taken from the scriptures and the fathers, and arranged according to the order of the doctrines which they proved, had been composed long before the time of Lombard. So early as the seventh century, Samuel Taju, bishop of Cæsar Augusta, in Arragon, wrote a theology in "five books of sentences."* And not to speak of John Damascene and others who wrote similar works, but with different titles, Hildebert composed a book of sentences in the eleventh century, and Peter Abelard, who had been Lombard's master, compiled a book with the same title in the beginning of the twelfth. † But all these minor lights, as well as many others which appeared contemporaneously with himself, were instantly lost in the blaze of his reputation, and his book appropriated to itself the name of *the book of sentences*. Professorships for the explanation of the master were established in Paris and Oxford, which were filled with the most illustrious men of their times.

Amongst the most distinguished scholastics who flourished during the twelfth century—or as it was generally designated in the schools, the first scholastic age—may be mentioned Robert de Melun, bishop of Hereford, and Cardinal Pullus or Pullen, an Englishman, who, like Peter Lombard, wrote a book of sentences, which he divided into eight parts. The subjects and order of treating them are nearly the same as in Lombard's work. He adds, however, some new matters of importance, such as that the soul is immediately created by God at the moment

* Libri v. Sententiarum Theologicarum. See Mabillon *Etudes Monastiques*, part ii. cap. 6.

† This caused some persons to accuse Lombard of having stolen his book of sentences from others, but he is triumphantly vindicated by Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, Tom. ii. Ad. Ann. 1140 page, with me 1218, and following, Leipsic edition, 1722.

when it is united to the body. He also makes larger use of the arguments derived from reason, but such as are always clear and pertinent. Having studied in Paris, he returned to England and restored the school of Oxford in 1133. This had been a flourishing academy in the reign of Edward the Confessor, but seems to have been deserted or neglected for nearly a century afterwards. It was revived by Pullen in the last years of the reign of Henry I. Very soon afterwards Vervinus read lectures in it during the reign of Stephen. It continued to flourish during the subsequent reigns, so that when John ascended the throne (1199), it contained three thousand students. A charter was granted to it by that prince early in the following century. Although Pullen was appointed archdeacon of Rochester, he returned to Paris, and resumed his office of professor of scholastic divinity. He was the intimate friend of St. Bernard. Being invited to Rome by Innocent II., he was created Cardinal by Lucius II. in 1144. He died in 1150, in the pontificate of Eugene III.

The history of another English Cardinal, whose scholastic career belongs to this century, is too well known to be detailed in this place. We mean Stephen Langton, whose name is indissolubly connected with the great charter of our liberties. He studied in the university of Paris, in which he successively held, with the highest reputation, the offices of professor of scripture, of divinity, and of Chancellor.

A vast number of scholastic writers and teachers appeared in the thirteenth century—the second age of scholasticism; and in spite of the sneers of the ignorant, the narrow-minded, and the bigoted, we venture to call many of them great and enlightened men; the very standard-bearers in the onward progress of mind; whose motto was ever, “forward; who laboured all their life long with unwearied zeal in the pursuit of knowledge, and who therefore deserved and obtained a world-wide renown. Amongst these we are proud to name two Englishmen; Alexander of Hales, who professed philosophy and theology in Paris, and by order of Innocent IV., wrote a commentary on the sentences, and Roger Bacon, whose intellect being sharpened by scholastic disputations, penetrated the mysteries of nature, and pointed out the way to those glorious discoveries, with which in a later age

Newton and Leibnitz dazzled the world. He made great proficiency in mathematics, mechanics, and chemistry, and was so well skilled in astronomy that he proposed to Clement IV. to undertake the correction of the Calender. In his *Specula Mathematica et Perspectiva*, he tries to resolve several problems regarding the *foci* of spherical mirrors and burning glasses, treats of the refraction and apparent magnitude of the stars, and of other matters which greatly advanced the knowledge of optics; and was not altogether unacquainted with the principles on which glasses, telescopes, and microscopes, were afterwards constructed. He was acquainted with the effects which saltpetre is capable of producing, on which account some persons attributed to him the invention of gunpowder. But this discovery more probably belongs to Schwartz, another Franciscan friar, who was also the contemporary of Bacon.

Albert the Great (Albertus Magnus) illustrious by his descent from the Lords of Bolstadt, and still more illustrious on account of his virtues and learning, was born at Lavingin in Suabia, in 1205, and at the age of eighteen entered the order of St. Dominic. He at first succeeded so badly in his studies, that he resolved to leave the monastery. One night he fancied in his sleep that he had placed a ladder against the wall for the purpose of making his escape, but when he reached the top he beheld four matrons, one of whom united the greatest dignity with the most dazzling and enchanting beauty. As he was about to leap down from the wall, one of them approached and pushed him back into the monastery. A second attempt resulted in the same manner, and as he was about to make a third, one of them asked him why he wished to leave the order. He replied that he was ashamed of his ignorance. Upon which one of the matrons pointing to the blessed Virgin, said, "Behold the Mother of God and Queen of heaven: recommend yourself to her and she will obtain from her Son what you require." Having said this, she presented him to the blessed Virgin, who promised that he should become learned and famous, "but," she added, "upon a certain time, whilst you shall be lecturing in the public chair, you shall forget on a sudden all your learning." He soon after, as this vision foretold, eclipsed all his competitors in the knowledge of sacred scripture, theology, and philosophy. He, like Roger

Bacon, was fully acquainted with Euclid, on whom, as well as on Aristotle, and the master of the sentences, he wrote commentaries, and, like the English philosopher, he had made great progress in mixed mathematics.* Being an accomplished linguist, he made himself master of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ægyptian philosophy, from which we may infer that he was not ignorant of algebra, which was known to some Italians as early as the commencement of the thirteenth century. He spent his life in teaching philosophy and theology with great renown in Cologne and in Paris, with the exception of two years, during which he had been reluctantly compelled by Alexander IV. to bear the weight of the dignity of bishop of Ratisbon. But he gladly retired to his convent and his chair, which he continued to fill until within three years of his death, when in the course of a public lecture which he was delivering to a numerous audience at Cologne, all his science suddenly deserted him. Having related the story of the apparition of the mother of God, he took leave of his pupils, and devoted the remainder of his life exclusively to prayer and meditation. He died on the 15th November, 1280, at the very time when St. Thomas was lecturing in Paris; he, it is related, suddenly stopped the lecture and exclaimed, "Albertus, my master, is dead."

Amongst those who attended the lectures of Albertus Magnus, both in Cologne and in Paris, was Thomas de Aquinas, son of the count of that name, grand nephew of the Emperor Frederick I., and nearly related to Henry VI., and Frederick II. He might, with equal justice, have been called the hero, and the angel of the schools.† Placed by his father, in 1232, when he was only five years old, under the care of the monks of St. Cassino, he imbibed that affection for a religious life which enabled him, in its pursuit, to triumph over almost insurmountable difficulties,

* See Aventinus, *Annales Boiorum*, quoted by Natalis Alexander *Hist. Ecc. in Scriptores Sæculi*, in *vita Alberti Magni*, xiii.

† It was the custom of that age to confer some such epithet on the most distinguished teachers. Thus Alexander of Hales was called *Doctor Irrefragabilis*, Roger Bacon *Doctor Admirabilis*, St. Bonaventure *Doctor Seraphicus*, St. Thomas *Doctor Angelicus*, Scotus *Doctor Subtilis*, &c. Friar Geruud is very witty on this subject.

and that love of virtue which preserved his innocence in the midst of licentiousness. So rapid was his progress in learning, at this place, that, by the advice of the abbot, he was sent to the University of Naples when only eleven years old. The attendance at this University, which Frederick II. had established in opposition to Bologna, in 1224, was very large, because that emperor had commanded that students should resort to no other in Italy. In this place St. Thomas studied rhetoric under Peter Martin, and philosophy under Peter of Ireland, (Petrus Hibernius,) in both which sciences he made wonderful progress. The disorders into which he saw young men of the world fall at the University, made him still more anxious to secure himself from temptation within the walls of a monastery; and he accordingly took the habit in the Dominican convent at Naples, in 1234, being then in the seventeenth year of his age. The countess Theodora, his mother, immediately set out to Naples, to force him to return to the world; but he fled to Rome, and not considering himself secure from her pursuit in this place, set out for Paris, but was intercepted during his journey by his two brothers, who endeavoured to pull off his habit; and not being able to effect this, they carried him in it to the seat of their parents, at Rocca-Secca. Neither the tears and entreaties, nor the reproaches of his mother and sisters, nor close confinement, could shake his resolution. His brothers, who were officers in the Emperor's army, determined to conquer him by violence. They tore the habit off his back, shut him up in a tower, and introduced a beautiful courtesan into his chamber, promising her great rewards if she could induce him to sin. But none of these attempts could shake the resolution of Thomas. The year of his confinement passed swiftly, at first in heavenly meditations alone, and afterwards in studying the Bible, Aristotle's Logic, and the works of the Master of the Sentences, which his sisters, pitying his lonely condition, had given to him; and the courtesan he chased with a burning brand from his chamber. Both Innocent IV. and the Emperor remonstrated against his confinement, and the Dominicans of Naples being informed that the countess would connive at her son's escape, some of them came in disguise to Rocca-Secca, into whose arms he was let down in a basket by his sister. In the following year he made his profession in that convent. He resumed

his studies under Albertus Magnus, at Cologne; and so great was his humility, that he concealed his proficiency from his fellow-students, by whom he was called the Dumb Ox. But his master, who had penetrated the depths of his genius, told them "that this Dumb Ox would one day give a bellow that would be heard over the whole world."

Amongst the fellow-students of St. Thomas at Paris was St. Bonaventure,* who, in his twenty-second year, (1245,) received the habit of St. Francis, in the province of Rome, from the hands of Haymo, an Englishman, who was at that time general of the order. Bonaventure was of so sweet a disposition, that his master, Alexander of Hales, said of him, that he "seemed not to have sinned in Adam." He was also so eminent a scholar, that he and St. Thomas were invited by the University of Paris, to take the doctor's cap together. A generous contest took place between them, each insisting that the other should take precedence; but at length St. Bonaventure prevailed, and thus, as it has been happily expressed, triumphed at the same time over his friend and himself. Both these saints professed theology, wrote commentaries on a large portion of the sacred Scriptures, and on the Master of Sentences, and composed numerous other theological treatises. The works of St. Thomas were printed at Venice, in 1490, in nineteen folio volumes; those of St. Bonaventure were not so voluminous, having been issued from the Roman press, in 1588, in eight folios.

The extent of the writings of St. Thomas must be regarded as truly prodigious, when we remember that he was only fifty years old when he died. Nor did he write anything for which he had not prepared himself by study and meditation. Aristotle, whom Tertullian calls the Patriarch of Heretics, had been so long allied with infidelity, and had led some of the first Christians, who had applied themselves to his study, into so many errors, that he was still dreaded by the friends of the Church, and his works were proscribed by the Council of Paris, in 1209. But St. Thomas purified him from his errors, converted

* His original name was John, but being very ill in his childhood, he was restored to health by the prayers of St. Francis of Assyssium, who, when he saw the boy afterwards growing up in virtue, exclaimed, O buona ventura, (good fortune,) by which name the Saint was ever afterwards known.

him to Christianity, made him the champion of truth, and the obedient child of the Church.* In his metaphysical speculations St. Thomas is everywhere exact, original, and profound. He established the principles of Natural Theology by abstract reasoning; and we venture to affirm that there is not one convincing argument of this kind in favour of the existence, the attributes, and the providence of God, the germ of which will not be found in that admirable, concise, and masterly body of theology which is called his Summ. † Many persons imagine that

* It is evident from St. Thomas's writing that he had only a bad Latin translation of Aristotle. And yet a translation had been made from the Greek before his time, as appears by the following passage, which is cited by Brucker, vol. iii. p. 672: "In illis diebus" ait Rigardus citatus a Launoio de varia fortuna Aristotelis in Acad. Paris, "anno 1209, legebantur Parisiis libelli quidam de Aristotele, ut direbantur, compositi, qui docebant metaphysicam, delati de novo a Constantinopoli, et a Græco in Latinam translati." It is a very great mistake to suppose that Aristotle was blindly followed by St. Thomas, or any other of the distinguished schoolmen. They, on the contrary, pointed out his errors, and refuted them. A distinguished monkish writer of the twelfth century, after censuring the revilers of Aristotle, proceeds as follows: "not that Aristotle always either thought or wrote so as to render whatever he thought or wrote inviolable, for the light of reason, as well as the authority of faith, prove that he erred." Having pointed out many gross errors in his metaphysics and ethics, he continues thus: "Many other errors of his are enumerated by Pagan and Christian writers; but I have never read that he had an equal in logic. Hence he should be used in preparing youth for the study of more important philosophy as a teacher, not of morals, but of reasoning." John of Salisbury, *Metalogii*, Lib. ii., cap. 7. This author, who was an Englishman, and bishop of Chartres, was born about 1110, and died in 1180. He was the friend of St. Thomas A'Beckett. He wrote many works, an account of which will be found in Bayle's Dictionary. The one referred to by us is his *Metalogius seu Tractatus de Logica Philosophia, &c.*

† This is expressly admitted by Buhle, *Hist. de la Philosophie Moderne*, t. i., p. 723, quoted by Hallam, vol. ii., chap. 9, part 2. Note. He adds, "This author raises on the whole a favourable notion of Anselm and Aquinas; but he scarcely notices any other." Buhle is a German writer, and the reference is to the French translation.

the scholastics were so taken up with the study of Aristotle, that they neglected the Scriptures. Nothing can be more unfounded. The theological course included lectures upon nearly the whole of the Old and New Testament, and there is scarcely a theological writer of any note during the middle ages, who did not compose commentaries upon some, and often upon very large portions of the Bible. Thus St. Thomas wrote upon Job, the Canticle of Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the four Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul. The *Catena Aurea* on the four Gospels, which he dedicated to Urban IV., is a work of prodigious labour, for the exposition consists entirely of quotations from the fathers. There is, moreover, amongst his works a commentary of his own upon Matthew and John. The former is a *Reportata*, which was taken down from the lectures of St. Thomas by his pupils. The latter was partly written by St. Thomas, and the remainder, though a *Reportata*, was afterwards corrected by him. The spiritual works of St. Thomas, and especially his beautiful hymns, *Pange lingua gloriosi—Sacris solemnibus juncta sint gaudia—Verbum supernum prodiens, and Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, are well known to all those who are in the slightest degree acquainted with books of Catholic devotion.

St. Bonaventure wrote, besides an Introduction to the Holy Scriptures, and Sermons on the Six days of Creation, commentaries on the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and on Matthew, Luke, and John. He also wrote numerous spiritual works, which have been always held in the highest estimation* by all devout persons. The Franciscans look up to him and Duns Scotus as their guides in theological opinions. They generally fix the date of Scotus's birth in 1274, the year in which St. Bonaventure died, and do not fail to claim the special protection of heaven for their order, which was no sooner deprived of one great light, than it was supplied with another. Scotus was certainly one of the most renowned schoolmen of his times; and his eulogists remark, that not only cities, as in the case of Homer, but that three nations contended for the honour of being his birthplace. He, however, sometimes carries his love of subtle disquisitions too far; and on the

* See Eulogiums upon his spiritual works extracted from Tithemans, Gerson, and others, in Du Pin's Life of Bonaventure.

whole, is very much inferior to St. Thomas, whom it was his great ambition to rival.

The schoolmen have been accused* of wasting their time in "trifling disquisitions about the nature of Angels, their mode of operation, and their means of conversing." These disquisitions still appear to many persons very curious and interesting; † they served as useful themes for the exercise of the intellectual faculties, and were, at all events, infinitely more innocent than the obscene novels, the bigoted pamphlets, and atheistical tracts, with which the press is now loaded every day and every hour. Scholasticism sharpened the intellect, and prepared it for triumphs in every department of science. It made learning the most honoured of all possessions; so that when St. Thomas died, sovereign princes and the most celebrated Universities, contended for the honour of possessing his body; and when it was granted to France, it was received at Toulouse by one hundred and fifty thousand people, at the head of whom were the Archbishops of Toulouse and Narbonne, and Lewis, duke of Anjou, brother to king Charles V: and when Scotus went to Cologne, he was received by the whole city in procession. Almost immediately after the introduction of Scholasticism, celebrated schools appeared in a vast number of places, which became Universities at the end of the twelfth, and during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Such were Paris, Bologna, Oxford, Padua, Naples, Toulouse, Salamanca, Montpellier, Orleans, Cambridge, Prague, and Leipsic. The number of pupils who attended each of these Universities, have been estimated at from ten to thirty thousand. In these same Dark Ages the Popes and dignified Clergy were the munificent patrons of learning, the mariner's compass, and the art of printing was discovered, the Divine Comedy was written,

* See Hallam, ubi sup., p. 322.

† These disquisitions did not appear trifling to the Fathers of the Church who had previously discussed every question of this kind, the mere repetition of which has been since imputed as a crime to the schoolmen. We only require any one who has the slightest misgivings on this point, to look at the words *Angelus* and *Angeli*, in the index to the sixth and seventh volumes of the Benedictine edition of the works of St. Augustine, where he will find a vast number of subtle enquiries regarding the creation, nature, endowments, and operation of angels.

and Petrarch was crowned in the Capitol, Perhaps the impartial student of those times will acknowledge that scholastic pursuits, so far from being hurtful, were the very best which could have been adopted to arouse all the energies of the mind, and to create a burning thirst for knowledge; that if there was more useless, there was far less pernicious learning in the ancient than in the modern schools; and that, as the monks preserved the fire of knowledge from being utterly extinguished by the deluge of barbarism, the schoolmen fanned the feeble flame into that blaze which has since so brightly and so steadily illumined the world.

Rev Prof. Cooley (Maynooth)

-
- ART. II.—1. *Der Wahnsinn in den vier letzten Jahrhunderten, &c.* Von Dr. RUD. LEUBUSCHER. (Insanity during the four last Centuries, by Dr. RUD. LEUBUSCHER.) 8vo., Halle, 1848.
2. *Geschichte der Hexenprocesse.* Von Dr. WILHELM GOTTLIEB SOLDAN. (History of the Trials for Witchcraft, from the original sources, by Dr. WILLIAM GOTTLIEB SOLDAN.) 8vo., Stuttgart, 1843.

THE true history of witchcraft yet remains to be written, after all that has appeared on the subject. English authors have contributed but little to the investigation of this dark page of the history of mankind; it is in the works of the French physicians and philosophers, and still more among the speculative writers of Germany, that we shall find the amplest store of material relating to the black art. Of those who entered the field of controversy regarding this occult science, during the prevalence of the witchmania, there is scarce one who openly professes his disbelief of all magical dealings. The opponents of this hideous delusion confine their pens to the discussion of individual cases, or to just animadversions on the conduct of many of the judges and advocates in these celebrated trials; yet all seem agreed as to the occasional existence of witches, and as to the truth of magic being really practised, and with success. Men of all ranks, of all religions, and of all political views, too often united, in this dark period of Europe's history, in hurrying wretches to the stake, or to the gibbet, whom we now should consign to

the lunatic asylum, or to the gaol. It was not until the gradual progress of science, and especially till the study of mental diseases had become more general and more complete, that men began to doubt of the reality of witchcraft, to rub their eyes, and to ask if it was not all a horrid dream, out of which the world was but just awakening. It will be our object, in the succeeding pages, to enquire how far magic was really practised in sincerity and truth, how far the accusers and the accused were alike the victims of a terrible and sanguinary delusion, and to unravel the dark tangled web woven by popular credulity, and fostered by penal enactments, for which we may now-a-days truly blush.

By certain Protestant and Calvinist writers it has been attempted to cast all the odium of these trials, these torturings and burnings, upon the Catholic faith and its professors, forgetful as they are, or at least unwilling to own, that it was not till the full blaze of the so-called glorious light of the Reformation had beamed forth, that Europe saw unmoved the daily executions, and the daily arrests of supposed witches, both in Catholic and Protestant lands. To an English Protestant king we owe one of the most fully developed and most credulous works on the doings of the necromancers; and while Catholics partook largely of the general delusion, their clergy at least deserve the character of impartiality, for no small number of the sufferers were priests, and religious men and women.

Up to the present time, the few English writers upon magic and witchcraft, have contented themselves with detailing the more harrowing and exciting of the fearful histories, wrung by torture from the wretched victims; or at the best, if they attempted to account for these strange doings, they have classed all the revelations together, as a concerted system of lies and deceit, forgetful that people do not ordinarily swear to falsehoods which would conduct them most certainly to the worst of deaths. We do not, at the present moment, remember a single English medical writer who has treated scientifically, or otherwise, the all-important psychological question, "How far were the accused witches guilty of the deeds they swore to? and how far were they guilty of their own deaths by inventing falsehoods, the sole offspring of their excited imaginations?" Nor has any Catholic writer handled this subject in our language; all that has yet been published has been

the work of Protestants, who have too often made use of their researches to heap calumnies and false imputations upon our holy religion. It will hardly become the writer of this paper, a physician, and no theologian, to enter upon the disputed question, does demoniacal magic, the "Teuffische Magie" of the Germans, really exist? are certain incantations efficacious to raise up the devil? or can his help, by such means, be obtained to perform, by God's permission, supernatural feats; such as flying through the air, floating on water, or passing through bolts and bars without let or hindrance? That possession by the devil really did occur under the Jewish dispensation, we have the undoubted testimony of the Author of all truth himself; that it has existed in some form under the Christian Dispensation, the unanimous testimony of the Fathers, and the very institution of the office of Exorcist sufficiently establish; but with this question, as it relates to the present day, we shall only grapple, in so far as we shall investigate, by the light of modern science, the records of the supposed cases of demoniacal possession that have been published during, and since the dark period of the Witchmania. While thus preparing to try, by the means afforded in these our days, the instances adduced in favour of the direct agency of the evil one, let us not forget, that in this age of scoffing unbelief we may err by obstinate incredulity, as much as did our ancestors by too great readiness of belief. We indeed possess, now-a-days, means of analysing and explaining many of these singular histories, which were not available to our forefathers, even could they for a moment have emancipated themselves from the slavery of the delusion and popular belief of the day. Thanks to the German writers on Insanity, the knowledge of the aberrations of the human intellect when diseased, has greatly advanced during the last half century; and much that was before ascribed to demoniacal influence by the credulous, or to wilful and systematic deceit by the unbeliever, will now be sheltered under the all-powerful plea of insanity. It is in this spirit, then, that we propose to examine the volumes now before us, to sift the evidence presented to us in the elaborate, but unconnected work of Leubuscher, as compared with that which we find in the more lucid, more classical, but infinitely more bigoted work of Soldan.

Both these writers are, however, evidences of the spirit

of Rationalist unbelief, which has of late years gained so much ground in Germany. It is plain that Leubuscher places no faith in the recorded miracles of our blessed Lord; he believes not in the reality of the expulsion of devils by Jesus of Nazareth, but looking with Strauss upon all these wonders as exploded myths, he classes them with the impostures and marvellous tales of the witchmania, as alike unworthy of belief. Yet still this author exhibits no bitter rancour against the Catholic faith; he investigates the facts laid before him from a medical, and not from a controversial point of view. And even when touching on the delicate subject of demoniacal possession in the convents of Germany and France, he rarely turns aside to inflict a blow on those who differ from him in religious creed. Not so, however, the second author on our list. Though he too, as far as scepticism and doubt of the miracles of Scripture will go, may take his place among the Rationalist illuminati of Germany, yet in the bitterness of his hostility to the Catholic faith, he might rank with Calvin, or with Luther himself. In the fury of his antipapal zeal, he draws under his fostering wing all the heretical sects that have existed, from the foul mysticism of the Gnostics, to the Lutherans and Calvinists of the present day. Every heresy that has sprung up since the days of the apostles, he regards as a manifestation of the spirit of Protestantism against the insidious tyranny of the Roman Church, and endeavours to gloss over their manifold and fearful enormities, both in doctrine and practice, by impugning the veracity of the historical testimony against them. Thus St. Jerome, St. Epiphanius, and many of the brightest lights in the Catholic Church are, by Soldan, branded as false witnesses, who have suppressed the truth, to make their foes appear in an unfavourable light. We willingly relinquish to this author the heretics he claims; we give him credit for having classed them all as "*Protesting*" against the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and congratulate him upon the favourable point of union he has discovered amid so many conflicting sects. Still the narrative of Soldan, with this exception, is a work of great talent and interest. Though not a man of science, he has spared no pains in research, and where his judgment has not been warped by hostility to the Jesuits, or to the Inquisition, he has produced a volume free from the mysticism of Germany, and from

the idle tale-collecting and retailing of the English writers upon Necromancy.

We cannot better commence our investigation than by quoting the introduction to Leubuscher's work.

“To form a right judgment of the spiritual life of any individual man, it is necessary to consider it from two opposite points of view. Man's inward life must be studied in its individual existence, and also in its relation to society at large. A man of high commanding genius can, by the very force of that genius, incite and lead thousands on in the way of mental development and cultivation; but on the other hand, the prevailing ideas of society, and of the public, exercise an irresistible influence on the individual man. No individual can entirely shake off the prejudice of the age he lives in, the error and the falsehood peculiar to his time, hangs like a leaden weight around him, to keep down the boldest exertions and inspirations of genius, and leaves but too often a dark stain upon the purest and the noblest characters.”—p. 1.

Insanity may arise in two ways, it may be the result of gradual morbid changes within the body, and then the disordered condition of the frame exercises, sooner or later, its influence on the mind; or, secondly, from external causes, as by popular outcry and delusion, the mind may be directly shaken, and the intellect disturbed, while the body still in appearance, if not in reality, retains its health. But in whichever form insanity develops itself, the created being remains the same; all that is marvellous in the symptoms is nothing really new, but an altered and abnormal manifestation from the diseased and altered condition of the mind. Our author then strives to prove that the effects of the popular belief in witchcraft, in the middle ages, had a decided influence on those whom insanity marked out for its victims. As the minds of even the most sensible men are swayed more or less by a violent popular outcry and belief, so is it ever seen that the delusions of the lunatic are an exaggeration and distortion of the prevailing ideas of his time. Visit an asylum of the present day, and the lunatic will there gravely tell you of the imaginary dangers by which he is surrounded. Steam guns of fearful power are being constructed to destroy him, the electric telegraph conveys his every word and thought to his implacable enemies, who watch his steps through telescopes of enormous power, while mesmerists and magnetisers have exercised their nefarious arts upon his frame, till he is no longer the same

being, but his soul has migrated into some other body. And the like delusions prevailed during the witchmania, only that they assumed a shape in accordance with the prevailing terrors of the day. That which even sound minds then dreaded as a possibility, became a fearful reality to the maniac of the 15th and 16th century. The direct influence of incantations, the bodily presence of Satan at his hideous midnight revels, where every species of blasphemous orgy was perpetrated, was but the realization, in an individual, of the popular belief, which fed with a greedy appetite on these details of unnatural horrors and marvellous feats, till at length, even the sounder minds were shaken, and philosophers, divines, and last, but not least, learned physicians joined in the popular outcry, and hounded on each other in the chase of the supposed witches. As might be expected, it was especially on the excitable temperament of the weaker sex, that these tales and fears produced the most marked effect. There is a form of malady well known to medical men, where, with or without apparent bodily derangement, the mind becomes strangely prone to delusion and deceit, where the powers of invention, too, seem often to be multiplied a hundred fold, so that the most improbable stories, the most impossible sensations and maladies, are related or simulated by the patient. That "Hysteria," for so we name this disease, was as frequent in former days as it is now, there can be no doubt; and so constantly did those thus affected simulate the supposed symptoms of demoniacal possession, that witchcraft came to be considered almost the exclusive property of the fair sex, while the aged men of the community escaped unaccused, and consequently unhurt. One of the most singular characteristics of hysteria, is the faculty of imitation developed by this disease. A girl is seized with an epileptic, or it may be merely an hysteric, fit in a public school, and forthwith many others of her companions are affected in like manner. The same was the case in the convents in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A hysterical nun or novice exhibited the phenomena of hysteria, her fellow nuns gathered around her, and retired, perchance to their cells, deeply impressed and terrified at the strange scene they had witnessed. Pondering over the case and its possible causes, the all-prevailing idea of witchcraft and of demoniacal possession had, perhaps, ere the morning

came, fixed itself in the minds of many of the community; the subject was soon openly discussed, and possession by the devil once agreed upon, it only remained to point out the author of the mischief. Soon some hapless nun or lay sister, or dependant on the charity of the convent, became the object of suspicion, and once suspected, her every action was watched and canvassed, till the feeling broke forth in a general accusation. Let us take out of the numerous examples before us, one related by Weier, or Wierius, in his curious book "*de Præstigiis dæmonum.*" Weier, it is true, was a Protestant, but though a believer in the existence of magic, his good sense occasionally enabled him to discover disease of both mind and body in cases laid before him.

"The convent of Kentorp, in the old Mark, became suddenly the scene of a strange malady. At first only a few nuns were attacked with convulsions, but speedily the nervous paroxysms extended (by imitation) to the other inmates. During the accession of a paroxysm, the patient did not lose her recollection, she was conscious of surrounding objects, but had altogether lost the power of speech. The muscles of the throat were fearfully convulsed, the patients uttered fearful shrieks, and frequently endeavoured to bite the bystanders. If when they had retired for the night, one of the community was seized with convulsions, the very sound of her struggles, even in the dark, brought on the fit in numerous others who lay in the same chamber."

It seems that the malady first appeared in a certain Anna Lemgon, who was affected with fits of epileptico-hysterical character. Indeed, her fits seem to have partaken more of epilepsy than of hysteria, till her mind, at length, gave way, and she became dull and incapable of carrying on rational conversation. All the community, however, with Anna Lemgon at their head, laid the blame of the supposed demoniacal possession upon the cook of the convent, one Else Kamensis, as Weier calls her, and upon the mother and brother of this unfortunate creature. The poor cook had been affected with convulsions like the rest, but this did not avail, they swore that on her part it was merely simulation, that her evil deeds might not be suspected. Else Kamensis was then, in the usual course, put to the question and to the torture by the authorities, and shortly confessed the whole; but on the scaffold she retracted what she had said, viz., that she had bewitched the community by mixing poison with their food, and con-

fessed that she had acted only by means of incantations. It is easy to see that hysterical convulsions were here, even by the judicious Weier, mistaken for the work of the devil, and the delusion terminated, as but too often happened, in a judicial murder. It may be urged that the unfortunate victim made a confession of her guilt; but when we have examined, with the aid of Soldan's researches, the mode of investigation in common use in those cruel days, we shall cease to wonder at these apparently death-bed confessions, or to regard them as testimonies of the slightest weight or value.*

We could multiply instances of this kind without number, the work of Weier, from which we have just quoted, supplies numerous cases, but our space will not allow us to extend this portion of our subject.

It will be seen then, that Dr. Leubuscher admits of two forms of insanity, the individual and the social; the former isolated as it were from the world, and only to a certain degree influenced by the prevailing doctrines and errors of the times; the latter, often arising from a single case, but spreading like a fearful epidemic through all classes of the population. The convulsive movements and wild vagaries of an excited preacher at the present day, soon spread among his hearers, as the hysterical paroxysm of a single nun was speedily imitated by the whole community. All medical men are aware, that strong impressions thus

* The disorders here described, occurred chiefly in those convents where the originally strict rule of discipline had been relaxed or broken, and where the spirit of holy mortification, so essential to a religious life, had not been sufficiently sustained. Like the rest of his Protestant brethren, Dr. Leubuscher is totally unable to understand the hidden sweetness of a full and entire devotion to the service of God; the perfect and happy calm of a soul whose whole mind is directed to the contemplation of the life and passion of our blessed Lord, and to the singing of those hymns of praise and love here on earth, which they humbly hope to sing more perfectly before the face of God in heaven. That the monastic life is to be censured as a fruitful cause of insanity we utterly deny, it only may become so to those unhappy individuals, who, like Luther, have fallen from their first fervour, and have become tepid in the service of God. In such persons the combat between their solemn engagements, and their worldly predispositions, frequently shakes and disturbs the mind to such a degree, that the wild vagaries of the maniac succeed to the humble and happy obedience of the monk.

repeated, day by day, on a weak and timorous mind, may become, at length, to that mind, absolute realities, the intellect becomes disturbed, sights are seen, and sounds are heard, which have no real existence, but which, to the diseased imagination, are now no longer dreams, but assume a positive and real form.

We must beware, however, of fatiguing our readers by professional details and disquisitions on the precise limits of insanity, a matter indeed, concerning which there is yet considerable difference of opinion. It is generally, however, acknowledged, that so long as no positive delusion exists, insanity cannot be said to be present. For individual cases this definition may suffice, but under the influence of popular excitement, the soundest minds may become tinctured with the prevailing error, even in defiance of their better judgments and feelings. Need we seek further for an illustration on this point, than the recent popular delusion in England on the subject of the Catholic Hierarchy? At first, sensible men smiled at the idea of danger from the Pope of Rome, but as the tide of popular fury, lashed into the wildest excitement by the "insidious" letter of a Prime Minister, rose higher and higher, and roared at their very thresholds, the courage of the best, with a few noble exceptions, wavered and trembled, till at length, they yielded to the stream, and were borne onwards on its breast to persecute and insult their fellow citizens. The most absurd and ridiculous tales found greedy listeners; we heard, at Exeter, of wise churchwardens and a vicar gravely investigating a monstrous story, invented by a fanatical girl; old ladies of sound Protestant mind trembled, lest in hiring an illiterate female servant, they might introduce a hidden Jesuit into their families, and all Europe laughed at honest John Bull frightened out of his usual dignified propriety, by the apparition of a scarlet hat within the precincts of Westminster.

Soldan, however, differs materially from Dr. Leubuscher upon the subject of epidemics of insanity, he almost denies the possibility of their occurrence, though he has before him the well known incontrovertible instances of the dancing mania, of the Flagellants, and of the Tarantismus, of the Middle Ages. In our opinion, the witch-mania was, in a great degree, but another of these popular delusions. Indeed, in the latter part of his most readable volume,

Soldan explains a seeming difficulty which he puts forth prominently in his introduction. In combating the supposition of epidemics of insanity, he says :

“ We meet with the same difficulties when we attempt to refer the phantasies of the witches to mental alienation. Is there then such a thing as a methodical madness, which, with a thousand peculiarities, shall yet pursue, amidst hundreds of individuals, the same path ? Is there a spiritual intercourse between the insane, so that one person can declare before the bar of justice what have been the delusions of another, and when and where these delusions have been manifested ? Does there exist a special policy in madness, which for years shall know how to conceal and deny its own delusions, and shall only first declare them as truth under the influence of torture, and why, in fine, has this madness lasted but so long as it led to the scaffold, while it is unknown in the asylums of the present day ?” — p. 506.

To these questions Leubuscher most satisfactorily replies, that the universal belief of the times regarding the proceedings of the witches, and the well known, repeatedly discussed proceedings and confessions of the accused, necessarily produced the greatest similarity in the replies of the fresh victims ; and that, when we come to examine individual cases in reference to special times, localities, individuals and deeds, we shall find that often the first of the accused under torture, or under the terror thereof, indicated and implicated others, who were forthwith seized, and subjected to the same horrible torments, while leading questions were put to them *to force* them to agree to all that the first accused had detailed of their misdeeds. Indeed, too often it is plain, that the torture was only applied to force out revelations of this nature, and so well was this known, that popes, emperors, kings, jurists, and clergy, constantly protested against the foul injustice of prejudging thus the accused. But this mode of procedure was, after all, only the usual one adopted in all suspected criminal cases in those days, only that, from the zeal of the judges and advocates, too ready a belief was accorded to these miserable accusations, the offspring of a distempered brain, or wrung forth by the atrocious torments inflicted on suspected individuals. The narrative of Soldan supplies us with a lucid history of the ordinary mode of proceedings in cases of suspected witchcraft. The whole of the chapter, the fourteenth of his work, is full of instruction, and reveals in hideous, but, alas, too correct colours,

the whole ignominy of the witch trials. In the first place, the judges themselves were predisposed against the accused. Witchcraft was so universally believed in by Catholics and Protestants alike, that no doubt seems to have been raised of its prevalence, and the investigators or inquisitors, of what religious belief they might be, directed their whole care, not to the question whether the accused were guilty or no, but to the one point of laying open before the world the fearful dealings of the suspected individuals with Satan and his myrmidons. Soldan even insinuates that the secret of the confessional was not kept on these occasions, but brings forward no proof to substantiate this accusation. From the Protestant clergy no such secrecy was required. Thus, in the witch-processes at Burg-friedberg, in 1665, the Protestant inspector was daily in the prison visiting the accused witches, he worked on their minds by threats and by persuasion, till he elicited fresh matter for accusation, all of which he duly conveyed to the judges. And this treacherous proceeding elicited no reproof, but, on the contrary, received the warmest approbation of the court, even so, that the private report of the pastor was ordered to be enrolled among the judicial accounts of the trial! It seems to have become gradually an universal practice to commence the "inquisitio" before the "accusatio" was openly brought forward, and then collecting evidence on every side, they called the whole a "cumulatio," and directed this engine of destruction against the suspected witch. Horst relates a curious instance of the blind perversity of the judges.

"Five or six women of Lindheim, were frightfully tortured to make them confess that they had dug up the body of a child recently buried in the churchyard of that place, in order to concoct from it the witch-broth (Hexenbrei) for their incantations. They acknowledged the fact. The husband of one of the accused, at length, prevailed upon the authorities to allow the grave to be opened in the presence of the pastor of the village, and of several witnesses. They found the child's body untouched in its coffin. But the authorities, in the excess of their fanaticism, declared that the body they found was a mere image, placed there by the devil to balk the process of justice; they insisted, that as the accused had confessed, their confessions must stand good, and that, for the honour of the Trinity, as it was commanded that all witches and necromancers should be destroyed, the accused must be brought to the stake. And so the whole six were burnt."—(Horst. *Zauber Bibl. Th. ii. p. 374.*)

Rewards were liberally offered to all who would denounce or discover a witch, and in some of the churches, as in Milan, according to Bodinus, a box was placed with a slit in the lid, into which anonymous accusations might be inserted. What a field was here opened for private malice, for avarice, and for revenge!

“When the judge had collected the necessary facts (*Indicien*) he opened the trial. But what were these indications, (*Indicien*) as received by the authorities, or rather what was not received as such? A bad reputation, often depending on the word of some poor wretch, who, years before, had suffered tortures and death for similar crimes, often, too, not even supported by witnesses; being the daughter of an executed witch; being starved and houseless, or being sunk in the depths of sin and degradation; all these were sufficient *indicia*. On the other hand, great diligence at work, a rapid and unaccountable rise of fortune, a simple threat to a neighbour, followed or not by some evil befalling that individual, or even having been in the fields before a sudden storm of hail fell and injured the crops, was quite sufficient to establish the reputation of a witch. She who avoided Scylla, fell into Charybdis. It was not less dangerous to heal than to injure. In the witch-trials of Buseck, it is remarked, ‘that the accused had administered laurel-berries to her sick daughter-in-law, whereupon her sickness abated. And the Fiscal (law advocate) concludes from thence, that she had previously induced the malady she afterwards healed. Again, a cabinet maker’s wife frequently visited her neighbour’s house, in Schletstadt, and had (by witchcraft) lamed the arm of a young child therein, which she afterwards in part healed with lotions and herbs.’ (*Theatrum de veneficis Frankf. 1586, p. 5.*) Suspicion fell upon those who neglected the services of the church, and not less on the most regular attenders thereon, for the latter sought by this hypocrisy to escape suspicion. If, when arrested, the supposed witch exhibited signs of terror, it was the result of her evil conscience; if, on the contrary, she showed no fear, but humbly followed her captors, it was the devil who had hardened and fortified her soul.” (*Soldan, p. 259.*)

How was it possible for the suspected to escape? The marvel to us is, not that so many witches were put to death, but that more were not destroyed under the influence of this hideous delusion.

The accused was now arrested and imprisoned. The prisons, three hundred years ago, were, alas, not such as we see now, after the exertions of Howard and Beccaria. They were veritable dungeons, fearful gaols of the worst kind, and if, in a prison, there was one cell more horrible

than the rest, to it the suspected witches were consigned. The details of their horrors by an eye witness who even in those dark days raised his appealing voice, may distress, but will likewise instruct our readers.

“The prisons are ever in thick strong towers, in gateways, block-houses, or in cellars or deep pits. And in these there are huge beams piled two or three upon the other, so that they may be raised by a post and screw, and through these beams are holes to receive the arms and legs of the prisoner. When a prisoner is brought in, they raise or screw up the beams, and the prisoner sitteth down on a block of wood, or on a stone, or on the ground, with his legs in the lower, and his arms in the upper tier of holes. Then they let down the beams again, and screw them fast, so that the prisoner may not move leg or arm, and this they term lying in the stocks.

“And some prisons have great iron or wooden crosses to which they attach the prisoner by the arms, legs, and neck, so that they must ever stand, or lie, or hang, according as the cross is placed, whereunto they are fastened. And some have strong iron bars, five, six, or seven fourths of an ell in length, with iron bands at either end, whereunto they fasten the arms of the prisoner at the wrists. And these bars are attached by huge chains unto the walls, so that the prisoners must ever stay in the same spot.

“And some fix heavy irons on the feet, so that the prisoner cannot stretch them out, nor yet draw them up to his body. And some have narrow cavities in the walls, wherein a man scarce may sit, or lie, or stand, and therein they shut up many with iron doors, so that they cannot move nor turn round. And in some prisons there are pits fifteen, twenty, and thirty fathoms deep, all walled around like wells or cellars after the strongest fashion, and opening into the prisons above by narrow holes with strong doors or gratings, and into these they let down the prisoners with cords, and draw them out when they have need of them. And such places have I myself seen when I visited those detained therein, but there are many more and of divers forms, some even more horrible, some likewise less terrible than these.

“And according as the nature of the place shall be, the prisoners sit in fearful cold, so that their feet freeze, yea, are verily frozen off, and if they ever come out they must for their lives long crawl about as cripples. Some lie in constant darkness and never see the light of day, so that they know not when it is day and when it is night. All, sooner or later lose more or less the use and power of their limbs, they lie restless in filth and noisome smells, much more miserably indeed than the very cattle in the stalls. They are ill fed, nor can they sleep in quiet, they have much woe, heavy thoughts, evil dreams, terrors and contests. Moreover are they daily ill-treated and beaten by the gaolers and their assistants, for to sum up in one word all prisoners are poor!

“And because all this endureth for the poor prisoner often not one week, but months, and even two, three, and four years, so do they, although at first of good heart, assuredly become at length weak and timid, impatient and sullen, and if not quite mad, they are distrustful and capricious.

“O ye judges! what then are ye doing? Of what are ye thinking? Do you not fear that you are often guilty of the terrible death of your prisoners?”—(Prætorius—von Zauberey, p. 211.)

Before the witches were examined by the judge, the witnesses against them were heard in private. No testimony was rejected. Individuals whose word would have been scorned at even in that age, were here received as true and faithful witnesses. James the First of England expressly declares, that accomplices, perjurers, the spouse or husband of the accused, nay their very children, should be allowed to swear away their parents' lives. The most ridiculous incidents were greedily accepted, coincidences the most natural and the most simple were noted down as the work of Satan, while all this time the accused pined away in her hideous prison, ignorant of the testimony against her, ignorant of the very names of those who bore false witness to her prejudice.

And next they passed to the examination of the prisoner. Trembling and exhausted with the rigours of her imprisonment, the poor victim was brought forth to meet and rebut the questioning of those long practised in all the chicanery of the law as it then stood, with the heavy conviction too upon her soul, that to deny her guilt, was but to subject her to torments more terrible than those she had already endured. The “*Malleus Maleficarum*,” the text book of the witch-finders, and a work replete with the grossest credulity, cruelty, and intolerance, but withal emanating from the spirit of the age, and accepted by Catholics and Protestants alike, advises that the interrogation shall commence by the question, Do witches really exist? And it adds as comment, “*Nota quod maleficæ ut plurimum negant.* N.B. That witches generally deny the same. Then must you ask—How then? are they unjustly condemned to the stake?” “But whosoever,” continues this benighted book, “denies the existence of witches must be burnt as a witch, for ‘*hæresis est maxima, opera maleficorum non credere.*’ It is the greatest of heresies not to believe in the evil doings of witches.”

We have just quoted from a Catholic work, for alas, the

Malleus Maleficarum was the work of Catholic writers, though it was a text book among Protestants also.

Let us see how the latter proceeded in their investigation. In the sentence of the sheriff's court (*Schoppenstuhl*) at Leipzig, in 1599, we read as follows :

“Hath the accused poured liquids on the boy of W. Brosius (a favourite mode of bewitching), so that thereafter the boy hath become blind? and finally, when pardon was promised unto her, she has *of her free will* acknowledged that at the pouring thereof she used the words, ‘The youth shall become blind in the devil’s name.’ And as you have now satisfied yourselves thereof, or yet may hereafter satisfy yourselves thereof, that the boy became shortly after blind, and should the prisoner adhere unto her former confession, so shall she for such deeds of witchcraft here confessed, and because she hath received promise of free pardon from you, and hath beside her confession been subjected to the torture, so shall she suffer death by the sword.”*—Benedict Carpzov, No. xvi.

Our readers may find it difficult to understand the cramped and abstruse language of a German legal document which we have here closely translated. It is scarcely possible to believe, in these days of well ordered judicial proceedings, that such manifest iniquity, such barefaced falsehood, could pass unnoticed and uncondemned. Yet such indeed was the case, every art, every falsehood was justifiable, if it were only employed in rooting out the supposed plague of witches which had spread over the land.

As was usual in crimes of high magnitude, no advocate was allowed to the accused. What could a wretched, and too often an illiterate female do, to avert the impending sentence? Exhausted by the bitter rigours of her incarceration, terrified by the certainty of the most fearful tortures if she persisted in denying her guilt, she too often anticipated her sentence, by a voluntary confession, or else, if opportunity occurred, laid violent hands upon herself and perished, a wretched suicide, within the walls of her prison. It was the dread of the rack that brought about this fearful termination of her worn out life,—for the torture (*Folter*) was the chief engine for eliciting confessions of witchcraft. Of the horrors of the torture we scarcely dare to speak, but in justice to the poor criminals who

* Had she not confessed she would have been burned alive.

underwent the same, we must proceed. Whoever, like the present writer, has examined the fearful dungeons of the old Castle of Baden, or still more, has stood in the torture chamber, yet existing in all its integrity in the Rathhaus of Regensburg, will realize the horrors that have been perpetrated within those walls in the name of justice. In the latter locality, every engine of torture yet remains as it was two hundred years ago. The rack stands idly in its place, the iron ladder leans against the wall, the iron hare, "eiserne hase," lies upon the rack, and bristles with its iron points in vain; the Spanish ass, a narrow upright board on which the victims must ride for hours with heavy weights attached to their feet, is now no longer bestrode by weeping criminals; yet two hundred years ago, these instruments were in daily use. The desk, behind which the judges and the Reporters sat, is yet spotted with ink which flowed commensurate with the tears and lamentations of the tortured, but the ink has been dry for two centuries past. To convince our readers that these hideous instruments did not stand displayed for mere empty show, we extract from Leibs Consil. et Respons.—*Francof. 1666*, p. 463, the report upon the "question" of one of the suspected witches. The report emanates from the officers of Justice appointed to examine the delinquent, while she was subjected to the torture to force from her a confession of her guilt.

"Philipp Wagner, the second witness, and the magistrate there appointed, deposes. 'That the accused Maderin, hath not under the first question deposed anything, and thereupon that the torture was repeated, after the executioner had cut off her hair, and bound together her hands, and placed her then upon the ladder, and poured brandy upon her head and set fire thereunto, so as to burn away the scalp entirely. And he then lighted feathers dipped in sulphur (schwefelfedern) and burned her therewith under the arms and on the neck. Thereafter he drew her up to the roof by her hands which were tied behind her back, and so left her hanging there for two or three hours, while the master went to his breakfast. And when the master returned, the executioner poured brandy upon her back and set fire thereunto, and he laid many heavy weights upon her back and then drew up her body from the ground. Thereafter he placed her again upon the ladder, and placed a rough unplanned board with many sharp points thereon beneath her back, and so drew her by her hands up to the roof. And further he hath screwed together her two great toes and her thumbs, and then putting a strong bar between her arms, hath

hanged her up thereby, and she hanged there for about a quarter of an hour, and in that time she fell out of one fainting fit into another."

It is true that on this occasion a complaint was made of the torture having been too unsparingly applied, but from numerous other processes it is too plain, that the above was no extraordinary course.* The learned and Saintly Jesuit, Frederick Spee, tells us that in certain places the executioner had full power of directing and deciding upon the amount of torture to be administered, and that many of this confraternity openly boasted, that they were such

* In some cases the poor tortured wretch exhibited the most extraordinary power of enduring pain. This was ascribed by her tormentors to the agency of the devil, and to the efficacy of her having anointed herself previous to the "question" with an unguent made of the boiled flesh of unbaptized children. We believe that in many cases the nervous energy was so exhausted by the rigours of the previous imprisonment, that the nerves of the extremities, the afferent nerves of Marshall Hall, failed in their office of conveying the sensation of pain to the brain, or on the other hand through mental excitement and terror, the brain itself had lost more or less of its receiving power. Under the influence of strong excitement as in a battle, or from the mental effect of supposed mesmeric passes, individuals certainly become insensible to pain, though not all to the same degree. The belief in the power of a salve concocted by the demons and sorcerers was universal. The receipt for this hellish unguent is given in two different formulæ by old John Baptista Porta, in the second book of his natural magic. 'Puerorum pinguedinem aheneo vaso decoquendo ex aqua capiunt, inspissando quod ex elixatione ultimum novissimumque subsidet; cum hac immiscent eleoselinum, aconitum, frondes populneas, et fuliginem. Vel aliter sic, Sium, acorum vulgare, pentaphyllon, vesperilionis sanguinem, solanum somniferum et oleum.' It was a singular addition to the popular fallacy regarding this dreaded ointment, that it was said to be harmless when used or touched without the "animus lædendi," or evil intent, while princes, magistrates, and men in power, were exempt at all times from its influence. Leubüscher is inclined to believe, that certain drugs were really swallowed by the sorcerers, which produced hallucinations similar to those which in our own day we see to result from the mastication of "Hachish." This powerful drug was well known in those days in the East, and may it not perhaps have been occasionally brought over from thence into Western Europe, and handed about mysteriously as possessing supernatural powers?

adepts in their art, that no one came under their hands whom they did not at length force to confess; and these men, he adds, were therefore esteemed the best of their kind and were greatly sought for, when others of more tender conscience refused to proceed to such extremities.

All the above horrors were perpetrated with the view and sole object of obtaining the acknowledgment of guilt. Human nature could not, in general, resist such extreme and long continued pain; unsupported, as in the case of the Christian martyrs, by a higher power, the wretched subjects of the torture-question sooner or later confessed to all the questions put to them, and the ice once broken, they poured forth a catalogue of their crimes, and implicated others, to any amount that their credulous judges required. The obstinacy of the accused, and her patience and endurance under the first tortures, was ascribed solely to the assistance of the enemy of mankind, and each question and answer having been duly enrolled in the protocol, the whole was openly read and commented upon, till the public were as well acquainted with the case, as were the judges themselves. Often, when the pains of the "question" had subsided, the poor wretch recalled her former confession, and thus assuredly subjected herself to fresh torments and to a still more painful death. For it was needful, thought the sages of those days, that the relapsing sinner should be punished more severely, than those who adhered to their first confessions of guilt. One great argument constantly employed by the advocates of the existence of witchcraft was, that we so constantly find gratuitous confessions to have been made by suspected persons, of their own free will, and before any torture was applied. But when the real facts and occasions of these confessions are laid before us, we discover, that every acknowledgment of guilt was considered voluntary, so long as it was not made under the actual application of the torture. The fear of the question being applied here counted for nothing; yet the poor accused, well knowing that she could never regain her place in society, that her neighbours, even if by some chance she escaped with her life, would ever look upon her with suspicion and hatred, often freely sought by a voluntary acknowledgment of guilt, to escape the reiterated tortures, and to exchange the frightful death of burning alive, for the more merciful execution by the sword. Nay it even seems from the testimony of the truthful and noble hearted

Jesuit, Spee, that it was only certain degrees of torture that were supposed to render a confession involuntary, and that the minor or milder stages of the "question" elicited only *voluntary* acknowledgments of guilt. In his famous "Cautio Criminalis" he speaks as follows:

"But in further proof that they understand not, I refer to their usual mode and manner of speaking, when they say, that of the accused some had confessed to the sin of witchcraft without being submitted to the torture. For the like have I heard more than once with my own ears, and this, not only from judges and commissaries, but also from clergymen, and all these have I heard declare that such and such a one had freely and voluntarily acknowledged his sin, and therefore must be guilty thereof. Is it not indeed a matter of wonder, that men should make so evil a use of the gift of speech? For when I questioned them still further how and in what manner it had happened that these voluntary confessions were made, they acknowledged to me that the said individuals were indeed tortured, but only with the hollow or toothed leg screws (Beinschrauben, a species of engine resembling the Scottish "Boots"), on the shin bones! whereby on that tender part, the flesh and the bone is jammed together as it were into one mass, so that the blood spurteth out, and many hold that not the strongest man can withstand the same; and yet is this said to be a confession voluntarily made and without torture, and to this they subject the poor creatures, and write forthwith to their Lords and masters."

The uniformity of the confessions made by the witches has been already alluded to, but was this to be wondered at, when the confessions of the first tortured among the accused were bruited abroad, and when certain individuals who had long laboured under a suspicion of witchcraft, it was no marvel that the same were constantly indicated by the tortured prisoners as being their accomplices? We will again have recourse in confirmation of this to the unshaken testimony of Spee.

"A certain judge that I well know of, used constantly, when a prisoner having confessed her guilt, was interrogated regarding her accomplices, to ask her the following questions, if she persisted in saying that she knew of no others guilty like herself. Eh, dost thou not know A——? hast thou not seen *her* at the dance (The devil's sabbath)? And if she answer no, she knew nothing evil of that person, he exclaimed, 'Master,' (to the executioner) 'pull harder and screw up tighter.' And as the executioner did so, and the tortured person could withstand no longer for pain, but screamed out, Yes, yes, I know *her*, and that she had often seen *her* at the

dance, and begged that they would only let her down and she would confess all; he then caused this forced denunciation to be written down in the protocol, and then he continued: Dost thou not know B——? naming another, and hast thou not seen *her* at the like place? And if she denied the same, he again addressed the executioner and reminded him of his duty, and this lasted until B—— likewise was denounced, and so on until three or four others had been in like manner accused.”—*Cautio Criminalis*, Quæst. xxi.

Stricken with terror and amazement at these most unjudicial proceedings, the good Jesuit reduced the observations above noticed to paper, and communicated the whole history to an intimate friend, prior to laying it before his Prince. His friend, having perused the whole, returned the MSS. to Spee with the observation that he might strike out the examples he had given, for what need was there to bring forward examples of that which was now a daily practice?

“From hence we do conclude,” continues this good man, “that the commissaries (as I myself have observed) after the above described manner do question the accused not only concerning their accomplices, but likewise about their deeds, and the time and place of the holding of the dances, and this so clearly and regularly, that the words are put into the mouths of the accused, and all this they do to obtain greater glory with their masters and with men, for that the witches they have questioned have all confessed, and their testimonies have agreed.”—(*Cautio Criminalis*, l. c.)

It is obvious from the above extracts that no means of escape were open for those who fell under these terrible suspicions. To be suspected was to be guilty, for the object of the commissioners was not to judge of the truth or falsehood of an accusation of witchcraft; all they sought for was to elicit a confession, and the more the poor wretch denied the accusation, the more severely was she tortured, till many, we hope through the madness of despair, ended their lives by suicide in prison. Leubuscher strenuously maintains that too often actual insanity was produced by the long continued mental and bodily torments to which the accused were subjected.

“Abandoned, as they believed themselves to be, by God and man, objects of horror and detestation to the ignorant public, an enigma to themselves, tormented by their own morbid imaginations, by the terrors of the prison, of the rack, and of the executioner

and his assistants, having the fear of a dreadful death by fire on earth, to be exchanged for an eternal death in unquenchable flames hereafter, the unfortunate accused too often sank into a condition of mental confusion calculated to excite the deepest pity."—(Horst. *Dæmonomach.* Th. ii. p. 380.)

Let us for an instant place ourselves in the situation of one accused of witchcraft, let us abjure for the time being our superior enlightenment, in the gaining of which we have too often made shipwreck of our faith, let us place ourselves as in the middle ages, and give implicit credit to the then received doctrines of the mysterious and all pervading power of the devil, and we shall then be able, faintly indeed, to realize to ourselves the mental condition of a prisoner for imputed sorcery. Revenge, curiosity, or the morbid feelings of a depraved imagination, or flowing from a depraved life, may have originally led her to seek alliance with the dreaded fiends of hell, for all believed in those days, that a compact could be made with the evil one, and that by bartering the soul, the desired vengeance, or a temporal advantage could be obtained. Thus influenced, and thus morbidly excited, they practised the necessary incantations, with the details of which they had become familiar through listening with greedy ears to the confessions of others, and then fancying themselves irrevocably sold to the enemy of mankind, they plunged deeper and deeper into despair, till the constant image of their sin unsettled the mind, and real insanity ensued. That under such circumstances, many believed and voluntarily proclaimed their connexion with evil spirits, was only what would occur even at the present day, were the delusion regarding the prevalence of witchcraft as general now as it was two hundred years ago.

In addressing the general reader and not those only of our own profession, we are necessarily constrained to pass over many circumstances, which would greatly strengthen the opinions we hold upon the subject.

The records of the witch trials exhibit so fearful a picture of the most hideous passions, and pourtray in such abhorrent colours the debased condition of minds degraded by previous immorality, that often we must altogether withhold and abstain from noticing trials and confessions which otherwise would afford strong arguments in favour of our plea of insanity. But the evidence is often of so

gross and repulsive a nature that it cannot be called into court.

We have so long engaged the attention of our readers upon the general question, that small space is left us for the more special notice of the works we have proposed to review.

The work of Leubuscher is, as we have before said, an analytical history of the witch trials of the middle ages, investigating them chiefly by the light of medical science, while Soldan's history of the witch-processes is a more connected, more readable, but at the same time a more one-sided production.

The first case considered by Leubuscher, is the cold-blooded murder of Joan of Arc by the English commanders. The deeds of this noble-minded maiden were truly akin to the marvellous, yet our author is inclined to regard the exaltation of her mind as positive insanity. But in this instance at least, mania did not debilitate the intellect, but spurred on Joan to accomplish deeds almost superhuman. It is well known, however, that when the two great objects of her life, the liberation of the city of Orleans, and the crowning of the French King at Rheims were accomplished, her mission was complete, the mental excitement subsided, and she became feeble and vacillating in her counsels and in her actions, as she was before wise and resolute. Joan herself was no believer in magic, at least as regarded her own person, but it served the purposes of the English to indict her as a witch, and thus to consign the name of one who had broken the power of England to everlasting infamy. During her imprisonment Joan's excitement more than once returned, again she dreamed of battle fields and sieges, again she was visited in visions by the saints, but these hallucinations only furnished fresh materials for the malice of her implacable foes.

Our author next touches on the Waldensian heretics, and investigates the truth of the atrocities laid to their charge. Strange to say, though a Protestant, he is inclined to believe in the truth of these accusations, which Soldan indignantly denies, but he ascribes their deeds of darkness to the insane ferocity and superstition of a few individuals of that sect.

“The question is,” says he, “whether lunatics really did exist

among the Waldenses, who believed that they held communication with the devil? Our answer is in the affirmative, and it is based, not only on the reports drawn up by the judges and inquisitors, but likewise upon the testimony of the Waldenses themselves. Many confessed to the murder of young children, and to the boiling down of their flesh to a species of hell-broth of which those present partook." "A woman," says Nider, "who was executed in Berne, made the following confession. We lie in wait particularly for unbaptized children, but not for these alone, especially when they are not guarded by the sign of the Cross, and we kill them while in the cradle, or lying by the side of their parents, by means of our words and ceremonies (incantations), so that people generally believe them to have been suffocated, or to have died a natural death. And then we steal them secretly out of the earth wherein they are laid, and boil them, till the flesh, after the bones are separated, is quite fluid, and may be drank as broth, and of the more solid parts we concoct a magic salve for our arts and transformations, but the fluid residue we put into flasks, and when a new comer hath drank a few drops thereof, he obtaineth a knowledge of our art."—(Nider, p. 717.)

Leubuscher believes such deeds to have been really perpetrated, and such may truly, in that rude and fanatic age, have been the case. But that real insanity was then probably present, we are inclined with our author to uphold, for even in these our enlightened days, and among men of education, we can bring forward examples, where monomaniacs have violated the sanctuaries of the dead, have torn open the grave, and revelled like Ghouls upon the decaying carcases.

Passing by the curious rabbinical traditions of the offspring of Adam and the evil spirit Lilith, which are given more completely by Soldan, we must likewise omit the notices of earlier tales and accusations of magic, to descend to the beginning of the fifteenth century. Although the belief in magic, sanctioned as it is by the authority of Scripture, has been almost universal from the earliest times, it does not seem to have taken its station as a great popular faith and outcry, until the middle of the fifteenth century. There can be no doubt that the publication of the bull of Innocent VIII., "*Summis desiderantes affectibus*," enormously augmented the popular terror and hatred of the black art of sorcery, but at the same time, this most curious document bears full testimony, that at this date, 1484, many learned clerics and laymen opposed with all their might the popular delusion, and were

in particular averse to the secular arm being employed to repress these supposed crimes. In judging of this bull of Pope Innocent, and of the prosecution that ensued, we must ever recollect, that in those rude days, the most cultivated intellects knew little of the wanderings and vagaries of the deranged and unsettled mind. When individuals of previously unblemished life and reputation came forwards, and under the influence in reality of temporary hallucination, acknowledged the commission of the most hideous crimes, it was scarcely to be expected that they, who knew nothing of the singular phenomena of monomania, should refuse to credit their confession, that they had dealings with the enemy of mankind. We enter, however, into no defence of Sprenger and Henricus Institoris, the authors of the *Malleus Maleficarum*, but we regard these men as types and consequences of the errors and delusions of the age, just as Luther and Calvin were, some twenty years later, the types of more serious and soul-destroying errors in matters of faith.

We have now arrived at the close of this eventful century, to enter upon one of infinitely greater importance in a religious point of view. The delusion of the direct influence of Satan was not the offspring of the brains of Inquisitors or Theologians, but the great intellects, who in that age mainly contributed to the spread of medical and legal science, led the way in maintaining and promulgating these doctrines. Ambroise Paré, the father of French surgery, and Fernelius, the renowned physician, may be cited as examples, and the latter has obtained an undying reputation by his researches and calculations as to the size and figure of the earth. "How then," asks Leubuscher, "could the herd of less instructed medical men come to any wiser decision, when these opinions were supported by authorities so decisive?" There is not an accusation, however absurd, that has been made against the witches, that is not corroborated and repeated by these otherwise undoubtedly great men. The medical profession, so generally reproached with incredulity, especially in regard to the spiritual world, has here shown itself more credulous than the theologians, for the latter were not illumined by the feeble rays which science shed over the world at that period. Still, even at that day, in the midst of the darkness and religious dissensions of the sixteenth century, there were men in all professions, who rose superior to

popular prejudice, and braved the popular hatred, by combating their favourite belief. Among these we may mention the Protestant physician, Weier, or Wierius, whose work contains much of what is good and sensible, but yet Weier fully believes in witchcraft, only that he at times elucidates certain cases that fell under his own observation by the light of medical science. Soldan would make Weier a hero, and the first who stood boldly forth against the witch mania; but the opinion of the more candid Leubuscher coincides with our own, that the work of Weier furnished more materials for further prosecutions against witches, than that it prevented the torture or saved any from the stake. The forcible arguments that Weier employed to prove that many cases were indeed only insanity and not sorcery, fell unnoticed by the world, while the portions of his work which treat of witchcraft as an acknowledged fact, were greedily caught up, as the forced confession of an unwilling witness of the truth.

“Weier indeed does not hesitate to ascribe most of the diseases which affect our frame to demoniacal agency, and he classifies the demons in their different ranks, and reckons them at many millions of evil spirits. ‘Melancholia,’ he observes, ‘may be a true disorder, but, in general, it arises from the operation of evil spirits upon the brain; for,’ observes he, ‘the evil demons have a special liking to the *atra-bilis* of the human constitution. The convulsions of hysterical females originate likewise from the presence of the devil. All the singular sensations of which the possessed complain, do really exist, for the evil spirits cast themselves upon the senses, and the consequences of this their persecution are the more painful in proportion to the debility of the nervous system.’”—(Leubuscher, p. 51.)

Such are the boasted opinions of Weier, whom Soldan, in his bitter hatred against Catholicity, puts forward as the first champion who took the field against the witchmania, seeking thereby to tarnish the fair fame of the Jesuit, Friedrich Spee.

But, in sooth, Ponzinibius, Andreas Alciatas, and others, have far more title to this honour than the Protestant Weier. Ponzinibius was a lawyer of great and undoubted genius, and in his essay, “*De Lamiis*,” he fearlessly canvasses the judicial proceedings of his times. He regards the honouring of the devil—devil worship, (*Teufels verehrung*,) as a disorder of the intellect, and asserts, that

the Lamiaë (witches) who believe that they give themselves to Satan, are a prey to mere mental delusions. He maintains, too, that it is an act of fearful cruelty to condemn the insane to the stake, or to employ against them their own confessions, or to use these confessions for the prosecution of others. We are far, however, from refusing all honour to Weier, for the clear way in which he, in many instances, makes out a case of insanity where the patient was suspected of witchcraft, and for his earnest pleadings that the insane should not suffer with the guilty.

The diseases of the nervous system began now to be more carefully studied, and epilepsy, which from the time of the Romans, had been regarded as a diabolic disease, now took its proper place among nervous disorders.

Wonderful and great was, at this time, the terror of all civilized Europe concerning the doings of his satanic majesty; edict after edict was put forth against sorceries and witches, and judges vied with each other who should procure the greatest amount of victims. In the province of Lombardy, above 1000 processes were instituted against supposed witches, within twelve months, and one hundred victims, (not one thousand, as is generally stated,) perished at the stake within that period in the diocese of Como.

That the Inquisition, that tribunal so dreaded and abhorred by English Protestants, not unfrequently cited sorcerers and witches to appear before it, is well known; it was not to be expected that in that age, the members of that tribunal should be superior in intelligence to the Paré's, the Fernelius's, and others, whose whole lives were devoted to the investigation of the arcana of nature. And we can cite, even from the volumes before us, many instances where this supposed most sanguinary tribunal dealt with suspected witches far more leniently and cautiously than did the secular power. In the year 1511, the following occurred at Salamanca.

“A certain maiden of that city had devoted herself with so great enthusiasm to prayer and to godly practices, that she became a lunatic, and was afflicted with grievous hallucinations of the mind, and believed that Christ and our Blessed Lady were ever present, and kept up a constant conversation with her. She assumed the dress of the order of St. Dominic, and soon after gave herself out to be the actual spouse of Christ. In this capacity she believed that she was accompanied wherever she went, by Our Blessed Lady, so that when about to go into any house, she always drew back at the

door, as though to permit some one to pass in before her. On such occasions, she assured her friends, that Our Blessed Lady always besought her to enter first, and to take precedence, because she was the spouse of Christ. But the girl ever refused, saying, 'Oh, Blessed Lady, hadst thou not given birth unto Christ, he would never have been my husband, and it is but fit that the mother of my husband should take precedence of me.' The people of Salamanca believed the maiden to be inspired, and miracles were reported to have been wrought by her intercession. She was cited by royal mandate to Madrid, and examined by the Inquisition and by the papal commissioners, who found in her nothing of evil, but it was resolved to wait until time should unmask the real character of her delusions."—Llorente Hist. crit. d l'Inquisition, vol. i., p. 361.

Hallucinations of this precise nature are by no means uncommon at the present day, even among the bible-reading English, and we doubt much if the poor lunatic girl would have met with the same merciful treatment at the hands of our royal witch-finder, James the First.*

Even the Jesuits, the supposed incarnation of all that is cruel and malignant, are admitted by their worst adversaries to have shown at times wonderful tolerance in regard to accused witches. Bodinus relates, that in the year 1554, eighty maidens, who had recently been converted from the Jewish faith, and had received baptism, entertained and practised the delusion, that they had likewise received the gift of tongues. When they were exorcised by Bodinus, the devil answered through their mouths, that the other Jews, enraged at their conversion, had sent him into the souls and bodies of these damsels. And the worthy Bodinus hoped thereby to have obtained sufficient data to procure the burning of these wicked Jews. Fortunately

* A month or two ago, the writer of this review was visited by a female, of the middle ranks, who informed him, that her life was become a burden, for that she was possessed by the devil. We cannot enter into the details of her case, but it afforded a singular instance of the old doctrines of the Incubi and Succubi being yet in existence in this country. The woman, though a Protestant, told us that her only hope of cure was through the prayers of some Catholic priest, for that the devil had assured her, that it was they alone who were all-powerful against him.

Instances of a similar kind are not uncommon, and several curious cases are related by Leubuscher, in his pamphlet "Grundzüge zur pathologie der psychischen Krankheiten." Berlin, 1848.

for the poor children of Abraham, a Jesuit stood forth and convinced the Pope that no man possessed the power of causing the devil to transmigrate into the body of a fellow mortal.

We now come to a period when a fearful revolution took place in religious belief, when the ties of family and of kindred were loosened and broken by differences of faith, and as a natural consequence, religious controversies and religious wars raged over the whole face of Europe. That the Evil One put forth his utmost powers at the epoch of the so-called Reformation, no Catholic will doubt, but the agitation of men's minds, the disunion, and above all, the highly extolled doctrine of private judgment in matters of faith which emanated from that unhappy period, was, we consider, amply sufficient to account for the great increase of hallucinations, especially in regard to demoniacal possession. The more we prove and test by the light of medical science, the individual cases that then appeared in such appalling numbers, the more clearly do the majority of the symptoms point to insanity as the origin of the delusions. We ourselves are fully prepared to admit to the fullest the doctrine of the existence of mental epidemics, and among the greatest of these we class the witchmania of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The leading men of the opposition to the Catholic Faith, Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon were all firm believers in witchcraft; and Luther himself gives in full detail, the history of his conversations and nocturnal conflicts with the devil. Amid the cases that in the fifteenth and the succeeding century crowd themselves upon our notice, it is no easy matter to make a judicious selection. There was but one point on which Catholics, Protestants, and Calvinists agreed, viz., the spread of witchcraft, and the necessity of employing the secular power to suppress it. Every town, every hamlet, swarmed with the supposed worshippers of the devil, who generally held his orgies on some high mountain or desert place in the vicinity. It is curious to remark, that while in Germany the Brocken mountain, one of the Hartz range, and in Sweden, a certain hill called Blockula, was the place honoured by his satanic majesty's throne, in France various spots were fixed on in the immediate vicinity of the towns where the witches were examined. Into the details of the witches' sabbath we forbear to enter, our pen refuses to trace the

picture of blasphemy and obscenity which is revealed by the forced confessions of the poor tortured prisoners, but which had no other existence than in their distempered brains. It is consoling, amid this almost universal darkness, to meet with the following enlightened observations of Pigray, the pupil of the superstitious Ambroise Paré, and one of the most celebrated surgeons of France, after the death of his great master. Pigray had been appointed, with Leroy and others, to examine the cases of fourteen supposed devil-worshippers, at Tours :

“ We conversed with them,” said he, “ in various ways, as one is accustomed to talk with the insane, but we found them to be only poor stupid creatures, to whom death seemed a matter of indifference, and even by some to be desired. We came to the conclusion that it were better to fill them full of Hellebore, and thereby to purge them well, than to inflict punishment upon them, and the magistrates followed our advice.”

It has been remarked by Calmeil, and corroborated by many others, that the hallucinations of supposed witchcraft frequently became infinitely more abundant after any great public calamity, and especially when famine or pestilence had appeared in the land. Protestant countries fared no better than Catholic. The exercise of the imitative faculty, so strongly developed in man, becomes morbid under the influence of a strongly excited imagination. Imitation is yet one of the most frequent modes in which hysteria first shows itself, and we believe that many cases of supposed demoniacal possession were propagated in like manner. A memorable example of this kind is given by Möhsen :

“ In the year 1593, sixty individuals, and shortly after, one hundred and fifty, were possessed with the devil at Friedeberg, in the Neumark of Brandenburg. And these persons gave rise to great scandals in the churches, so that the preacher, Heinrich Lemrich, who had long conversed with these possessed persons, did suddenly in the pulpit behave like one possessed with an evil spirit, and was truly thought to be so, which caused the power of the Evil One to be more feared than ever. And on this account, it was ordained by the Protestant consistory there, that in all the churches of the Mark public prayers should be offered up, to free mankind from the power of the devil, but thereby was the evil not at all diminished, *it rather took on the form of a contagious disorder of the understanding.* When a possessed person appeared in any place, there soon came forth more afflicted in that way.”

The history of the demonomaniacs of Lorraine is better known than many others to those who have read any of the ordinary works of witchcraft. The symptoms among the wretched women who on this celebrated occasion were tortured and burned, are precisely such as at the present day we observe among hysterical females, but increased and deepened in their hue by the prevailing delusion, and by the forced nature of the confessions extorted from them on the rack. Much, indeed, seems to have depended, even at this early period, upon the credulity or the caution of the judges and commissioners. While Remigius, in the excess of his blind zeal, was forcing the most revolting acknowledgments from the witches of Lorraine, other commissioners, more moved by mercy, or more enlightened by the dawn of science, dealt more sparingly with isolated cases. It is remarkable, that wherever the commissioners exercised extraordinary diligence, the number of witches augmented day by day, while when a wise and prudent man refused to entertain a case of alleged sorcery, or, having investigated it, declared the accused not guilty, we rarely find that the delusion spread, but on the contrary, rapidly subsided. As an example of this, we will extract from Leubuscher's work, the history of Martha Brossier, though it may be already partially known to some of our readers.

"In the spring of the year 1598, Martha Brossier, the daughter of a clothier at Romorantin, in Cologne, left her home, and wandered about, seeking spiritual aid, being, as she gave out, possessed by a devil, who caused her to fall into the most fearful convulsions. The credulous people flocked about her by thousands. Miron, bishop of Angers, with the official commissioner of Orleans, carefully investigated her condition, and declared that she was not possessed by any devil, but that the whole was an imposture on her part. Following out this decision, he forbid, under pain of excommunication, any ecclesiastic in his diocese, or in the diocese of Orleans, to practise any exorcisms upon her. One of his experiments was, to give the girl a hearty meal, and then to present holy water to her; but the possessed remained unmoved, yet when the spring water was offered to her she became immediately and violently convulsed. Miron then ordered, in a loud voice, that they should bring him the book for exorcism, and began, in elevated and solemn tones, to repeat the first lines of the *Æneid*. The bait took, and the supposed possessed one increased her convulsive movements, as if the devil within her was mightily disturbed by the solemn exorcism. In Orleans the official placed before her a Lexicon, bound after

antique fashion. She regarded it as a work of sorcery, and shuddered at the mere aspect of the binding. They obliged her to read therein, and stumbling on some hard and obsolete words, she mistook them for the strongest forms of exorcism, and was terribly convulsed. In the spring of 1599, Martha Brossier came to Paris, and made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Genevieve. The Capuchins there regarded her as possessed, but the Cardinal of Gondi, then Archbishop of Paris, ordered the physicians Riolan, Marescot, and three others, to examine the case. (We pass over, as unnecessary, the strictly medical portion of the report.) The patient was tried with various questions in Latin and in Greek, (the devil, it was thought, spoke well all languages,) but she could not understand or respond. In a second examination, Duret, one of the physicians, pushed a needle deep into her hand, but she gave no sign of pain. At the third examination, Father Seraphim, the exorcist, exerted his utmost power, and Martha thrust out her tongue, rolled her eyes, trembled all over, and sprang with great jumps to the door of the Chapel. The victorious Father exclaimed, let him that yet doubts risk his life, and enter into combat with the devil! Marescot instantly accepted the challenge, seized the patient by the throat, and commanded her to be still. She instantly obeyed, and afterwards excused herself by saying that the evil spirit had at that very moment left her. At the fourth examination Martha remained still as long as the physicians were present, but the convulsions returned as soon as they concealed themselves; but when they reappeared, Marescot again produced a total calm."

The parliament of Paris, on Riolan's report, ordered her to be confined for forty days, and closely watched by a commission of fourteen doctors. The result was, that Martha was sent back to Romorantin, and placed under the superintendance of the police. But the people were not so easily quieted. The Government at length, through the Cardinal d' Ossat, laid the case before the Court of Rome, and the affair was not at rest until it became known that the Pope and his Cardinals took no part with Martha Brossier. We consider this female to have been throughout an impostor. We cannot even believe, that, like too many of her fellow-sufferers, she gave implicit credit herself to her being possessed by an evil spirit. A careful perusal of the whole reminds us strongly of the phenomena we have seen produced by the so-called art of Mesmerism, and which were suddenly arrested by the same rude means as were employed by Marescot. Man is ever prone to seek out the supernatural, and the mysterious, and the

place of the witches, and the possessed, is now occupied by the mesmerists and their dupes.

With the case of Martha Brossier we close the consideration of the witch trials of the sixteenth, and enter upon the (in this respect) still darker period of the seventeenth century. Mental disorders began now to be more closely studied, and their nature was carefully illustrated by Baillon, and especially by the celebrated Felix Plater. The latter was far beyond his age in medical science; but we yet see that he could not emancipate himself from its trammels altogether; he believes in witchcraft, and he carefully describes the symptoms of possession, giving for their recognition groups of symptoms which would now be regarded as indicating positive insanity.

We pass by the mournful histories of the witch trials in Germany, and in the Pyrenees, to call the attention of our readers to the singular and melancholy case of Louis Gaufridy, the aged parish priest in one of the Churches of Marseilles. On the accusation of two Ursuline Nuns, who, from their subsequent conduct, proved to be hysterical and insane, this most respected and beloved pastor was dragged before the Commissioner. Gaufridy was tortured in the most fearful manner, and at length condemned to the scaffold. It is reported by his adversaries, that poor Gaufridy made a voluntary confession of his iniquities; but if he did, and the fact is doubted by Soldan, he recalled it ere his death, and it was probably only wrung from him by excess of torture. If the Catholic Church has been blamed for judicial murders of this nature, it cannot at least be denied that she was eminently impartial in her punishments, since many priests, monks, and nuns, expiated their imputed crimes at the stake. Nor were these individuals, who, like Urbain Grandier, had rendered themselves obnoxious to the higher powers of the state, or of the Church; many were men and women of most blameless lives, beloved by their parishioners or fellow religious; and yet, on the accusation of one or two parties, they were dragged to prison, and the whole tide of popular fury was let loose on their devoted heads.

“When the wretched Gaufridy swore, by the name of God, by the Blessed Virgin, and St. John the Baptist, that the accusations against him were entirely false, Magdalene Mandouls, one of his accusers, replied, Yes, yes, I understand you well; that is the oath

of the synagogue. When you speak of God, you mean Lucifer, when of Christ, Beelzebub, when of the Holy Ghost, Leviathan; by the Blessed Virgin you understand the mother of Antichrist, and the Devil, the forerunner of Antichrist, is your John the Baptist.”*

The demonomania, of the department of Labour, in the lower Pyrenees, was marked by similar credulity and obstinate blindness on the part of the Commissioner Delancre. This man seems to have been cruel, superstitious, and blinded to the last degree; yet he enjoyed, we believe, no small reputation as a jurist at Paris, and has left behind a detailed account of his proceedings in the most minute particulars of the investigation. We have no space for examining either Delancre's works, or the witch trials he superintended; but one instance of his mode of proceeding may suffice. Among the host of witnesses against the accused there appeared, as in the Swedish trials, a host of children, who deposed that they were constantly taken out of their beds at nights by witches in the shape of cats, and carried through the air upon the back of a goat to the witch's sabbath, where Satan himself presided in person. If the animal's back were not long enough to carry all the little wanderers, it was easily elongated by means of a spit inserted along the body of the poor goat. All these absurdities Delancre religiously received, and when it was urged that some of the children, from their extreme youth, were hardly worthy of credit, he replied, that the younger the children, the more important was their testimony; for in proportion to their youth, were they the more pure and uncontaminated by the world. On this occasion, too, the peasants, after detailing the revels at the witch sabbath, informed Delancre that the principal depot for the deadly poison employed by the magicians, was upon an almost inaccessible rock on the sea-shore, near Handaye. The Commissioners proceeded in a body to this desert spot, every inch of ground was carefully investigated in the course of two consecutive visits, but, as might be expected, nothing was discovered. Delancre relates this failure, but ascribes it to the agency of the devil. Leubuscher acknowledges that Delancre surpassed, by many degrees, in cruelty, the

* Leubuscher, p. 162.

fabled horrors ascribed to the Inquisition in its palmyest days.

Many of the witch-trials of their age contain confessions and accusations so gross, that they may not even be referred to in these pages; and for this reason we must pass over several, to arrive at the melancholy and well-known judicial murder of Urbain Grandier. This famous process occupies twenty pages in Leubuscher's work; and he endeavours to shew that Jeanne Belfiel, and the other Ursuline Nuns, who were Grandier's principal accusers, were in reality insane. Their delusions commenced, he thinks, by the simulations and contortions of hysteria; at a later period, irritation and excitement still more inflamed their imaginations, till they themselves believed that Grandier had exercised his demoniacal influence upon them, and then burst forth a storm of calumnies and imputations, so marvellous and so unconnected, that they can only have originated from distempered brains. Once that these false witnesses had testified, their testimony was held to be irrevocably good; and though the accusations were frequently recalled, though their convulsions were excited by the supposed, as well as by the actual presence of Grandier, all this availed nothing before judges, who, under the influence, it is supposed, of Cardinal Richelieu, were sworn to destroy the accused. It is said that Grandier had been discovered to be the author of a bitter and anonymous satire upon the Cardinal. That many, however, of the clergy and monks who urged on the trial and execution, really believed the accused to be a magician of the blackest dye, cannot, we think, for a moment be called in question. Father Lactantius, and Father Tranquillus, both died, not long after, completely insane. We cannot doubt that the minds of these credulous men, overwrought by the excitement of the trial, and by the hideous spectacle of the executions, at length gave way under the influence of the general delusion. If, however, it be true, as has been often asserted, that Father Lactantius acted not in good faith, but from a personal dislike to Grandier, then indeed was the murder of the accused terribly avenged. Within thirty days after Grandier was burned alive at Loudun, Father Lactantius expired in a fit of maniacal frenzy. It is said that Grandier threatened him on the scaffold with the wrath of God, and that ere long he would be called to an account for his misdeeds.

Father Tranquillus lived some time after, but likewise died insane. The excellent Surin, one of the most amiable and most pious of our spiritual writers, did not entirely escape. He had taken no part in the process against Grandier, but came to Loudun after the death of Father Lactantius. Fully impressed with the belief of that time, Surin proceeded to exorcise the possessed; but the excitement seems to have been too great for his gentle mind. Hardly a month had elapsed before the good father exhibited symptoms of mental derangement. He believed himself to have become possessed by the devil while exorcising the evil spirit out of the nuns of St. Ursula, and the delusion became so strong, that he was obliged to give up his pastoral duties, and was placed in a species of confinement. For many years afterwards he remained a prey to the most distressing nervous affection, which he ascribes, in his works, to the agency of the demon. But these were not the only victims of this terrible mental epidemic. The surgeon, Manouri, was one of the chief agents against Grandier.

“This man had greatly strengthened the testimony against the accused, by pretending to discover upon Grandier’s body numerous moles, or marks, which, being insensible to the touch, were regarded as the marks of the devil, (*sigilla diaboli.*) In searching for the aforesaid marks he behaved with the greatest cruelty, piercing the body in many places so deep with a sharp probe, that the patient could not refrain from crying out. After the execution of Grandier, Manouri suffered much from the reproaches of his friends, and from the still more bitter testimony of his own conscience. One evening about ten o’clock, when he was returning from visiting a patient, accompanied by his assistant and another individual, he suddenly exclaimed, There, there comes Grandier! what does he desire of me? His friends conveyed him home, and placed him in bed; he trembled all over, and constantly saw before him the image of the murdered man, and after a few days of unutterable anguish, the unhappy man expired.”*

It is a relief, indeed, to turn from the contemplation of these hideous proceedings, to the 20th chapter of Soldan’s work. Of all the religious bodies that exerted themselves for the suppression of witchcraft, the Jesuits have been, by Protestant writers, the most severely handled, and the

* *Histoire des diables de Loudun, 1716, p. 209.*

most unsparingly condemned. That many of this noble order were carried along by the stream of popular delusion is certain; but that, on many occasions too, the much maligned Jesuits interfered, and saved innocent lunatics from the stake, is conceded by both Catholic and Protestant writers. Even Soldan, embittered as he is against the Catholic Church, and the professors of our holy faith, dares not refuse the full meed of praise that is due to one of that persecuted society, for his exertions to arrest the fearful progress of the witchmania.

In the year 1631, there appeared at Rintel, a work entitled, "*Cautio Criminalis; seu de processibus contra sagas, &c., &c.* Auctore incerto Theologo Orthodoxo," which excited great attention. At first the author seems to have been unknown; but it was discovered to be the saintly Jesuit, Friedrich Spee, whose merits as a missionary were less known to the world than the beautiful poems in which he has sung the praises of God. Friedrich Spee, of the noble house of Langenfeldt, was born in 1591, at Kaiserswerth, in the district of Cologne, and became an alumnus at the Jesuit college at Cologne, in 1610. After his ordination as priest, Spee was employed in various parts of Germany as a missionary; and it is said that he was so successful in this work, that within the space of a few months he converted the whole of the town of Peina, in Lower Saxony, to the Catholic faith. His success excited the fury of the Protestant party, and a Lutheran of Hildesheim attempted to assassinate the holy man, leaving him for dead, with seven wounds in divers parts of the body. God, however, preserved his servant for further trials, and when the plague broke out among the soldiers at Treves, in 1635, Spee was everywhere to be seen, succouring both the souls and bodies of the afflicted, till, having himself taken the disease, he closed his life on the 7th of August of that year, a sacrifice to his charitable and heroic exertions. As a sacred poet Spee ranks among the first of Germany, evincing the utmost command of language, with the noblest and most exalted feeling of the beauties of natural scenery; while throughout all his verses runs the never varying, and yet never wearying theme, the praise of the Creator in his marvellous works. We could devote a volume to the consideration of the poetry of this good man; but our business here is to consider his prose, as put forth in the caus-

tic pages of the *Cautio Criminalis*. It would appear at first sight impossible that one whose poems breathe throughout the deepest humility, and the most unalloyed sweetness of disposition, could have indited the nervous paragraphs and caustic satire of this celebrated work.

The great Leibnitz has left us the following sketch in his *Theodicee*, vol. i., pp. 96 and 97.

“This great man (Spee) held in Franconia the office of Confessor at the time that many persons were accused and burned for witchcraft in the Bamberg and Würzburg districts. John Philipp of Schönborn, afterwards bishop of Würzburg, and finally Churfürst of Mayence resided then as a young canon in Würzburg, and was on terms of the most intimate friendship with Spee. One day the young canon asked the worthy father why his hair had become prematurely grey, and Spee answered, that this was to be ascribed to the witches whom he had accompanied to the scaffold. Schönborn was greatly surprised at this reply, but Spee soon solved the enigma. Throughout the whole of his career as a Confessor, he had, he said, met with no single case in which he could believe that the accused person was guilty of the crime of magic. Many simple individuals had at first confessed to him, as their spiritual director, that they were really guilty of what was laid to their charge, influenced by the fear of a repetition of torture if they denied the accusation. But when they discovered that they had nothing to fear from their Confessor, they had become more confident, and had entirely changed their tone. With lamentable sighs and groans they had all and each one deplored their miserable condition, and the ignorance or malice of their judges, and in their last moments had called upon God to witness their innocence. The repetition of the dreadful scenes had so deeply impressed the tender heart of Spee, that his hair became grey while he was yet young.”

It is true that Spee published anonymously his *Cautio Criminalis*, but it cannot be maintained, as Soldan would infer, that he was not known to be the author; for Massenius expressly states that he was exposed to no small trouble for having printed a work without the approbation of his superiors.

We have already, in former pages of this Essay, given an extract or two from Spee's work; but they will hardly convey to the reader the sharp and cutting tone in which he reproves the disorders of the epoch in which he writes. In the bitterest words he exposes the superstition and prejudices of the common people; the ignorance, avarice, and

contradictions that prevailed amongst the judges, the levity and indifference of the Governments, and the fanatical spirit of many of the clergy. We have space only for an extract from his 51st question as to the mode in which the processes were then conducted. After relating the preliminary forms, if they really deserve the name, he proceeds to the consideration of the torture.

“When, therefore, the witch hath been duly singed and shaved, she is straightways tortured, to make her tell the truth, that is, to make her confess herself a witch at once. She may deny it if she please, but her denial is a falsehood, and *cannot* be the truth. And first they torture her after the worst fashion, whereby perhaps you would understand they apply the severest punishments the first; but no, it is but termed the worst in comparison to the better and more complete torments that are to follow. And if now the witch doth at once confess, it is all right, and they give out that she has confessed of her own free will. And how can a prince or magistrate overlook such a testimony? how can he refuse to believe such and such a one to be a witch, when she has acknowledged voluntarily her crime? So then people give themselves no further trouble about the matter, but hurry her away to death, as they would likewise have done if she had not confessed at all; and in truth it doth therefore seem that when once the torture is commenced, the game is won, the poor wretch must in any case die. Confess she, or confess she not, it is all the same. Doth she confess, the matter is clear, and she must be executed, for recalling of her word availeth not; doth she prove obstinate, then is she tortured a third and a fourth time, for the commissioner hath power to ordain, in this regard, what he wills, and hath no fear of being called to account for excess of torture. Should the witch, when tortured, roll her eyes, or stare with open orbs, these are new ‘indicia’ of guilt; for the bystanders exclaim, ‘Behold, she looks after her familiar spirit!’ When she stares wildly she seeth him, and if she persisteth in her denial, she is tortured more sharply than ever. And should she under such pains contort her face, or should she faint away, then do they say she smileth or sleepeth on the rack, or she hath taken something to prevent her confessing her guilt, and therefore must she be burned alive, as has happened to several of late. And if it should chance that she dieth upon the rack, they maintain that the devil hath broken her neck. And forthwith cometh Master Jack Ketch, (‘Hans Knüpfau’, ‘Jack tie-him-up’) and drags forth the corpse, and buries it beneath the gallows. Should the poor wretch meet with a judge so merciful as that he will not condemn her to the stake without confession of her guilt, she doth not escape, but is forthwith thrust into a deeper and a

darker prison for a year or more, there to rot in filth till her heart be more tender.

“And now (God alone knoweth,) I would fain know how any mortal can escape or free himself from the like toils, as it is certain that both they who confess, and they who do not confess, must alike suffer death. O most miserable witch! What didst thou hope for? Why didst thou not acknowledge thy guilt as soon as thou wert brought into prison? Oh most foolish woman! Why wouldst thou die so often, as then thou wouldst have had to die but once? Follow my advice, say at once you are a witch, and die, for in vain dost thou hope for freedom. The law in Germany knoweth of no such words.”

We dare not detain our readers longer upon the merits of this excellent man: The *Cautio Criminalis* was greedily read, and much good, no doubt, ensued from its publication; but the world was as yet not sufficiently enlightened to break through the dense barrier of popular ignorance on this subject. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the belief in witchcraft rapidly lost ground, yet executions frequently took place. The famous process of Mora, in Sweden, occurred in the year 1669, the witch trials in England and Scotland still went on, and the last execution for witchcraft in the latter country took place at Dornoch, in Sutherland, in the year 1729.

In 1693, Balthasar Bekker, a pastor of the Reformed Church at Amsterdam, published his famous work, “*De Betoverde Weereld*,”* which was immediately translated into various languages, and contributed immensely to the suppression of the witchmania.

In the commencement of the succeeding century Christian Thomasius put the finishing stroke to this hideous delusion, in his celebrated “*Theses Inaugurales*.” Both Bekker and Thomasius were Protestants; but though their works were more generally read, we doubt, if in sharpness of criticism, and bold opposition to prevailing doctrines, they can be reckoned with the *Cautio Criminalis*.

The last execution for witchcraft, among the Catholics of Germany, was the case of the aged nun, Maria Renata, at Wurzburg, in 1749. The whole process is given by Soldan, and it is one worthy of the darkest periods of the witchmania; but a full equivalent to this disgraceful

* The Enchanted World.

affair may be found in the process and decapitation of Anna Göldli, by the Protestants of Glarus, in 1782. There are men yet living in that town who remember this last judicial murder for sorcery; and though in various remote districts the belief in witchcraft still lingers, we may, thank God, regard the witchmania as totally extinct. Mental epidemics have since arisen of various kinds, but the light thrown upon the real nature of hallucinations and of insanity, has for ever extinguished the torch of persecution for magic and witchcraft.

It is, in our opinion, an act of the grossest injustice to attempt to lay the witchmania to the charge of either the Catholic Church, or of the numerous Protestant sects. All religions, all sects, prosecuted to the death the supposed witches; all were intimately convinced of the reality and of the positive existence of the crime of magic. Many bad men, it is true, availed themselves of the popular credulity, in this regard, to further their own designs of avarice or revenge; but it is impossible to rise from the perusal of the witch processes without being convinced that the majority of the Commissioners, Inquisitors, Pastors, Jurists, and Physicians, who took part in these mournful trials, were fully impressed with the idea that they were promoting the glory of God, and resisting, as by conscience obliged, the works of the Spirit of Darkness.

The progress of humanity, and the greater perfection of our laws, have abolished the once universal application of the torture in criminal cases; the progress of medical and chemical science, and a more complete acquaintance with insanity and hysteria in their various forms, have destroyed the calling of the magician, and turned his art to ridicule; but while we plume ourselves upon the superior enlightenment of our age, let us not forget that mental epidemics will again prevail, and let us humbly pray, that whatever character they may assume, the children of God's Church may be mercifully preserved from their influence.

Dr Charlton (Newcastle on Tyne)

ART. III.—*Vermischte Schriften von Karl Ernst Jarcke.* (Miscellaneous Writings, by Charles Ernest Jarcke, Doctor in Philosophy and Law.) 3 vols. Munich. 1839.

NEXT to Theology and Philosophy there is not a more important science than that of public, and more particularly Constitutional Law. The ignorance of speculative, as well as practical politics, is, in men of rank and station, often productive of great detriment and misfortune to the State, especially in times of great political commotion. Melancholy examples might be cited from the history of the French Constituent Assembly of 1789, and more particularly of the Spanish Cortez of 1812, where, from ignorance, respectable Catholics were led away by revolutionary sophisms, and so by degrees became instrumental in the work of religious and social destruction.*

The study we speak of is most necessary to the peer, the country gentleman, the magistrate, the lawyer, and the clergyman, and the higher classes of electors, whose responsibilities, of course, increase, with the measure of their knowledge, and the circumstances of their condition. It is superfluous to observe, that without a due knowledge of the theory of Political Science, no great statesman can be formed. And though good sense and habits of business, will enable a member of the Legislature to go through his duties in a respectable manner, yet how much will good

* The French nobles and clergy who in 1789 quitted the sittings of their respective orders, and joined the Tiers-Etat, committed an error from which all the subsequent political acts of the revolution were necessary corollaries; for they substituted for the old Constitution of States the chaos of revolutionary anarchy. The first cry of that revolution, destined to be so fatal to religion and her ministers, was "Vivent les Curés."

In Spain, it was the Moderados, headed by Martinez de la Rosa, who confiscated the property of the Church.

In both the historical instances we have cited, we feel persuaded that the error of many individuals engaged in these transactions, proceeded, especially in the first case, more from ignorance and vanity than from a deliberate hostility to the Church and to the monarchy. Yet surely this was a culpable ignorance.

sense be sharpened and elevated, how much will experience be informed and enlarged, by a comprehensive investigation of domestic and foreign politics. The sages and lawgivers of ancient Greece were not content with studying the laws and political institutions of her different States, various and dissimilar as they were, but undertook long and painful journeys to examine those of Asia Minor, Egypt, and even Persia. How much more necessary is such a comparative study to modern statesmen, since the different European kingdoms and states stand in such close connexion, religious, political, and commercial, with each other. In all departments of human activity, the bulk of mankind is incompetent to appreciate theory, but must be content to follow the routine of practice. And the science of politics forms no exception.

But if the ruling classes of society be always called upon to pay attention to the fundamental principles of legislation, how much more is such attention requisite in periods of revolutionary ferment, when ancient political systems are sifted to their bottom, when anti-social doctrines undermine the foundations of society, and the theory of revolt is so quickly followed up by practical insubordination. When the dictates of duty only should be consulted, must chance, favour, connexion, and self-interest, determine our course of action?

How critical, too, at all times, and more especially in periods of political commotion adverted to, is the condition of a Catholic minority in a Protestant country, like our own, where the foreign and domestic policy of our rulers may happen, and has at times happened, to be repugnant to justice, adverse to the interests and liberties of the Catholic Church, and injurious to the moral and material well-being of our own country!

The system of hereditary politics, which has prevailed in the great families of England, as in those of ancient Rome, is admired by Niebuhr, who thinks it has not a little contributed towards the stability of the British Constitution. Much, doubtless, may be alleged in its favour; but the advantages of such a system apply only to the ordinary routines of political affairs, where no great questions of religion, social order, and international justice are involved. Thus among the great aristocratic houses of this country, which, with few exceptions belonged to the Anglican communion, religious dissent did not intervene

to inflame political differences. And in the more peaceful times of the eighteenth century, momentous questions of constitutional policy were rarely agitated in the British Senate.* No organized party of destruction existed in the country, or was represented in Parliament; and abroad, no revolutions convulsed society, disturbed the balance of power in Europe, and so afforded to the Protestant State of England a motive or a pretext for interfering in the internal concerns, religious and political, of Catholic countries.

But far otherwise hath it been since that fatal year, 1789, which ushered in the era of storms. Thenceforth the old trade-winds of constitutional politics have given way to the more violent blasts which have blown from every point of the political compass, and defied the calculations of the most experienced pilots. Hence the old party tactics, that belonged to the exclusively Protestant parliament of the last century, became inapplicable to the more mixed legislature of the present times,—a legislature, too, be it remembered, on whose decisions, (from the peculiar posture of European politics in this age, as well as from the great power of our country,) depends the weal or woe of entire nations, and the solution, good or evil, of the most momentous problems of civilization. Hence the impossibility of a conscientious Catholic following implicitly or unreservedly in such a parliament, the system of hereditary, or family politics. Hence the serious responsibility which, especially in critical times, like the present, attaches to the British Catholic, whether as an elector or a senator, in the execution of his political duties. Hence, too, the duty imposed on the higher classes, and especially

* This expression must, of course, be understood in a relative or modified sense; for during the last century, England was not exempt from all political commotions. The question, however, which most agitated our country in the last age,—the pretensions of the House of Stuart to the throne,—was one which on the whole remained external to Parliament; and, however important, involved rather dynastic interests than fundamental points of constitutional polity. Yet even on this question Catholics could not remain neutral. The interests of their Church, and old hereditary feelings of loyalty, as well as the sufferings and persecution they had to endure from the new dynasty, induced many of them to give their support to the Jacobite party.

the clergy, or at least a portion of their body, of devoting some attention to the study of civil government.*

But when we recommend the study of political science, we, of course, understand, a science based on sound religious and social principles; for a vicious theory perverts practice, and is worse than none at all. But how are we to know what is a vicious theory? For a Catholic, the standard is not far to seek. Political, like every other branch of ethical science, hath its roots in revelation,—that is, in Scripture and Tradition, transmitted and interpreted by the Church. Where the Church hath not pronounced a formal dogmatic decision, her spirit is evinced in her practice, or in the more general teaching of her doctors; and where these are silent, or divided in opinion, the other data of political science must be sought for in the general sense and experience of mankind, the traditions of nations, and the analogies of reason. Such are the elements of the science of legislation, such the primary and secondary principles that must guide the Publicist in the construction of his theories. But two things are here to be observed. The first is, that saving certain fundamental points, the Catholic Church allows in politics the fullest freedom of opinion; more so, indeed, than in any other department of ethics. The second is, that like all the moral sciences, so especially is the science of legislation not always susceptible of rigid formulas of reasoning; for much must here be left to feeling and experience.

Having thus pointed out the importance of this study, we shall now, before reviewing the work at the head of our article, proceed to give an account of the most eminent Publicists who, within the last sixty years, have combated revolutionary errors, and so, in a greater or less degree, helped to bring about a Catholic regeneration of political science.

The founder of the modern anti-Jacobin school was our illustrious countryman, Edmund Burke, that great doctor, whom we do not hesitate to say, Providence raised up to combat the political heresies of his day. † Even in re-

* In Catholic Universities there are always some ecclesiastical students, who follow a course of the *Jus Publicum*.

† His youthful admirer and follower, George Canning, addressed

ligion, we scarcely know any protestant of former times, except Grotius, Leibnitz, and some of the great Anglican Divines of the seventeenth century, who have spoken in a more kindly, and even reverential tone of the Catholic Church and her ministers, than Edmund Burke.* And this is one of the reasons why his political writings came to exert an influence in Catholic Europe, such as the more frigid productions of the Anglican Tories have never been able to acquire.

This illustrious man brought to the defence of social order the fruits of long political experience, acquired in one of the most celebrated schools of modern statesmanship;—a genius eminently sagacious and observant, enriched and invigorated by ancient literature, and modern historical knowledge, and an eloquence, fervid, teeming, and splendid, which has not been surpassed, and rarely equalled by any of his successors. Nor is it true, as we have sometimes heard it stated, that this great man refuted only the grosser errors of Jacobinism. First, his genius was more practical than metaphysical; and consequently that rich treasure of moral and political observations, which lie scattered through his writings, was not reduced to a systematic form. Next, he was a protestant, and therefore though on many points he looked with a favourable eye on our Church, he could not of course grasp all the deep latent causes of that awful moral and political malady which filled his declining years with anguish and dismay. Lastly, he was a statesman of the eighteenth century, and on that account rather inclined to over estimate material prosperity, as the test of national greatness. Yet he saw that the irreligious philosophy of the last age was the main cause of that dreadful Revolution, which he analysed with so much skill. Nay, he

him in 1796, as one, "Born to instruct, delight, and mould mankind." Alas! that Canning had always been mindful of the lessons of his great master!

* Burke persuaded, or tried to persuade himself, that the great doctrines which divided the various Christian Churches, were mere scholastic opinions, and that on all fundamental articles those Churches were agreed. This was the fatal seductive theory of fundamental points, on which so many eminent protestants have split.

goes further ; and the Latitudinarianism and Socinianism, which after their dispersion through Europe had crept in among the French protestants, he assigns as the cause of the coalition of the immense majority among them with the French Jacobins. Who has ever shown, too, better than he, the utility, nay, the necessity of an independent Church for the maintenance of social order, and the protection of freedom ? The encroachments of the Emperor, Joseph II. on the ecclesiastical and political liberties of his subjects, he called *Jacobin innovations*,* and remarked how they facilitated the conquests of the French revolutionary armies in the Netherlands. And with regard to the political causes of the Revolution of 1789, he was not insensible to the dangers of a too numerous body of functionaries. The utmost contempt did he profess for those "creatures of the desk," as he calls them, † dead alike to high generous feelings, and incapable of grasping mighty principles, and who in the latter part of the last century, drew the French government into perilous innovations at home, and urged it into ambitious enterprises of aggrandizement abroad. Yet what would he have said, had he seen the gigantic power which Bureaucracy has attained to in modern France, in Austria, and still more in Prussia, and the minor States of Germany—a Bureaucracy which has been the Church's most deadly enemy, which has usurped the functions of the natural, legitimate aristocracy, flattered royalty in the moment of prosperity, and sometimes betrayed and deserted her in the hour of need ?

On the various elements of the mixed monarchy, and the relations between royalty, aristocracy, and democracy, Burke entertained the soundest notions. In the first he saw the key-stone of the political edifice ; in the second the column that imparted to it solidity as well as grace, and in the last the strong enduring buttresses, that upheld the structure. He never would have lent his countenance to those sham monarchies, those parodies on the British Constitution, in which the ties of interest and sentiment between the upper and lower Houses are dissevered ;—the clergy not only unrepresented in parliament, but unen-

* See his Letters on a Regicide peace.

† See his Letters on a Regicide peace.

dowed, and reduced to a miserable state stipend; and where a despotic, centralizing administration usurps all the functions of free municipal government. Mixed monarchy, he undoubtedly advocated; but a monarchy, where, as in the old *States-Constitutions*, royalty retained the supremacy, or where, as in the British Constitution of 1688, aristocracy was lord of the ascendant. To the commonalty he was for assigning a due share of power; and its political functions he regarded as no less conducive to the cause of order, than of liberty. And on this very point, indeed, he has evinced more discernment than several of his distinguished successors. It is needless to add, that this great man was not only the warm friend of religious toleration, but was for conceding full liberty to the Catholic Church in her internal administration.

As in the midst of the struggle against the French Revolution this illustrious writer was called away, his mantle fell on the Baron von Gentz, who in many respects became to Germany what Burke had been to England—an oracle of political wisdom, and the soul of the Anti-Gallic Alliance.* Gentz, without the lofty eloquence and profound wisdom of our great countryman, united extraordinary knowledge and political sagacity, to a clear, animated style.

To the principles of the Revolution, indeed, he offered but a negative opposition; but he has the immense merit of having been among the first to combat with energy those doctrines, as well as having in the character of a publicist and a diplomatist alike, zealously promoted the cause of German independence.†

Just as our great luminary, Burke, was about to set, two stars of the first magnitude rose above the dark, tempestuous horizon of France; Count Maistre, and the Viscount de Bonald. The first, though a native of Savoy, may

* Gentz translated Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution" into German, with notes. He was also sent on a diplomatic mission to our country, where he had an important conference with Mr. Pitt.

† Baron Gentz had under Prince Metternich a principal share in the direction of Austria's foreign policy. He was a protestant; but as we have heard from persons acquainted with him, he entertained kindly feelings towards the Catholic Church.

from the language in which he wrote, the peculiar turn of his mind, and the influence he has exerted over the French public, be classed among Frenchmen. To a noble character, and generous enthusiastic faith, Count Maistre joined the charms of the most brilliant wit, fervid eloquence, the most varied learning, the utmost cogency of reasoning, and an almost intuitive profoundness of observation. Of his transcendent merits, both as a theologian and a metaphysician, it is not our business here to speak; for it is with the publicist only we have now to deal. It is especially in his two admirable essays, entitled "*Considérations sur la Révolution Française*," and "*Esprit générateur des Constitutions politiques*," that this great man combated *ex professo*, the principles of the French Revolution; but his larger works, "*Du Pape*," and "*Les Soirées de St. Petersbourg*," teem (among other things) with a rich variety of political remarks. The metaphysical errors of the Revolution, which Burke had for the most part left untouched, this great writer probed to the quick. The divine origin of the civil power, as proclaimed by Christianity, he ably defended against the revolutionary sophists, showing how political society was an evolution from domestic society, and political authority a development of domestic power. Nay, he went further;—and affirmed that all political constitutions are in a certain sense *divine*; for they are the result of time, circumstances, and events, over which man has no control. He asserts that the excellence or the viciousness, the durability or the instability of a Constitution depend on its adaptation to the religion, manners, population, geographical situation, and political and commercial relations of a people; and as these a nation has received and not created, and as they are mostly independent of its will and control, it follows that a sound political Constitution is not a human, but a providential work.

Count Maistre, though in his ardent polemics against the French Revolution, he was too much biassed in favour of absolute royalty; yet in other places expresses his regret at the suspension of the old states-general of the French monarchy; and more than once pronounces his admiration for the British constitution. No one, too, abhorred more strongly than he, the excesses of regal despotism, as well as those attendant on popular licentiousness. Hence the zeal with which he defended the

Papal umpirage of the middle ages, as the institution best calculated to promote the harmonious development of order and liberty in each state, as well as to preserve peace and a good understanding among different nations. On the whole, however, this eminent publicist is more successful in refuting the theoretical errors and sophisms of the Revolution, than in suggesting remedies for preventing or counteracting its practical evils.

Simultaneously with his illustrious friend Count Maistre, the Viscount de Bonald came forth on the stage of public life. Inferior to the former in learning, and in depth and comprehensiveness of genius, M. de Bonald was still pre-eminently distinguished for force of reasoning, solidity of judgment, profoundness of observation, and dignity of style. In metaphysics this great philosopher solved with brilliant success the most arduous problems, especially that of the divine origin of language, and that of the spirituality of the soul, while his writings display in general great knowledge of the human heart.

As a publicist (and this is the light in which we have here principally to consider him), M. de Bonald ably pointed out the analogies in the constitution of the state and of the family, showing how the authority of the father, the tender ministrations of the mother, and the obedience of the child, correspond to the mutual relations of royalty, nobility, and the people. *Le Pouvoir, le Ministre, le Sujet*—this triple element, he shows, pervades these two forms of social existence. His fundamental maxim in politics, "Monarchy in the constitution, democracy in the administration," is a proposition which, with some limitations, is entitled to general acceptance. This maxim the French Revolution reversed, as it established despotism in the administration, and democracy in the constitution. We said, *with some limitations*, the proposition of M. de Bonald was to be received: for, under the temperate Christian monarchy, the element of democracy must to a certain extent enter into the constitution itself. Warmly as this eminent publicist advocated municipal institutions, he yet did not sufficiently appreciate the states-constitution. Like his friend, Count Maistre, he had been a victim of the French Revolution, had witnessed all the sacrilegious abominations and bloody atrocities which it gave rise to, and therefore from the frightful abuse of popular institutions, was inclined to look upon all legislative assemblies

with distrust and aversion. Moreover, though a most thoughtful observer of human society, this distinguished philosopher had neglected historical studies. He wanted the learning which qualifies too broad and sweeping statements; and therefore although his general propositions be almost always just and profound, he yet is not equally successful in applying them to details.

M. de Bonald was one of the purest and noblest characters, as well as distinguished intellects that France has produced in latter times; and the most exalted sentiments, as well as the warmest attachment to the Catholic Church pervade his writings.* To this writer, as well as to his illustrious compeers, M. de Maistre, and the abbé de la Mennais (prior to his unhappy fall), we owe a lasting debt of gratitude for the moral edification, and the mental discipline, which our youth derived from the perusal of their immortal works.

While these great French philosophers were thus courageously standing up against the torrent of revolutionary principles, Germany was not wanting in noble champions of the same holy cause. Endowed with a genius not less profound than Count Maistre's, and more versatile and comprehensive, enriched, too, with all the resources of a boundless erudition, Frederick von Schlegel treated political science with the same superiority, as every other department of moral philosophy. Through his various works, "Modern History," "Philosophy of History," "Philosophy of Life," and more especially, his Journal entitled, "Concordia," his political views are to be found scattered. There are, according to this illustrious philosopher, five great corporations—the family—the church—the state—the guild—and the school. As it is only with the author's political philosophy we have here to deal, we shall confine our remarks to his views on the state. "Between the family" (says his biographer, who analyses his political system), "Between the family—the smallest and simplest of all corporations, the ground-work of the others—and the church, that high, expansive and luminous vault above,

* The chief works of M. de Bonald are "Theorie du Pouvoirs civils et religieux," (1796), *Legislation Primitive* (1802), *Divorce* (1806), *Melanges et Pensées* (1817), and *Recherches Philosophiques* (1818).

stands the state." The State Schlegel defines an "Institution armed for the maintenance of peace." Its existence, says he, is bound up with all the other corporations; it lives and moves in them; they are its natural organs; and as soon as the state, whether with despotic or anarchical views, attempts to impede the natural functions of these organs, to disturb or derange their peculiar sphere of action, it impairs its own vital powers, and sooner or later prepares the way for its own destruction.*

The five corporations we have named are essential and immutable, but each of them has subordinate institutions or corporations, variable and accidental in their nature, and destined to fulfil the special ends and objects of each. These it is the paramount duty of the state to protect. The latter contains within itself a multitude of Corporations, on whose due development depends its stability, as well as freedom. The clergy in its spiritual relations is independent of the temporal power: but in its civil relations, it is a member of the state. The clergy together with the *school*, which is a subordinate, dependant corporation, represents the intelligence of a state; the nobility its outward energy; and the people with the guild, which is the intermediate corporation between the family and the state, symbolizes the powers of production.

The state, according to F. Schlegel, is a physical being, subject to the natural laws of birth, growth, maturity, and decay; but it is a physical being swayed by the action of intelligence, composed as it is of free, rational agents. The accustomed laws, too, of this physico-intellectual being are overruled by the special agency of divine providence, as well as by the influences, salutary or pernicious, of good and evil spirits.

Not content with merely refuting revolutionary principles, Schlegel opposed to them a compact body of positive doctrines. Beside the shapeless ruins which the Revolution had left everywhere in its course, he pointed out the magnificent structure of the free temperate monarchy, that the Church had erected in the Middle Age, but whereof the Reformation had prevented the completion. The various occupations, however, of this no less versatile than profound genius, prevented him from giving to his political doctrines their full development. This task was

* See Robertson's Life of F. Schlegel.

reserved for another great contemporary—the illustrious Görres, of whom we shall now say a few words.

Extensive learning, a rich imagination, profound understanding, and fiery eloquence, characterized this remarkable man. To politics and history he devoted for many years his chief attention, and therefore he has investigated with great minuteness and accuracy all the component elements of the Christian state. He has the merit of having shown with great skill how the mediæval temperate monarchy could be adapted to the wants and circumstances of the present time. Agreeing with all the great Catholic Conservatives on the fundamental points of policy, he has ably set forth the nature of the relations, that should subsist between the church, royalty, aristocracy, and the commonalty: and especially demonstrated the usefulness of the democratic element as a principle of stability, no less than of progress. All the political errors of our time—the doctrine of popular sovereignty—the subordination of the Church to the state—the total separation of Church and state—the Bureaucratic absolutism—the revolutionary democracy—in a word, the doctrines of political rationalism, have found in Görres their most formidable adversary. In short, when we consider the soundness of his doctrines, the depth and comprehensiveness of his views, the solidity of his judgment, and the extent of his learning, we should say that, as a political writer, Görres has never been surpassed.

Prior to the two illustrious Germans we have named, a distinguished Swiss writer rendered the greatest services to the cause of order and liberty. Endowed with a clear, sagacious intellect, invigorated by extensive learning, Lewis von Haller has devoted his exclusive energies to the science of public law; and his great work entitled, “Restoration of political science,” has formed an epoch in that department of learning. A grandson of the celebrated physiologist, Albert von Haller, our publicist, too, treated with the same originality, what may be called the *physiology of the state*. The rise, growth, and expansion of civil societies—the legitimacy of property—the evolution of royalty from domestic authority—the character of the various forms of government—the universality and the necessity of nobility—the limits and the conditions of personal freedom—are all set forth by him with remarkable clearness of reasoning and extent of learning.

The greater part of his important work—"the Restoration of Political Science"—Haller wrote, while he was still a protestant, and consequently less competent to take an unbiassed, comprehensive view of all political and social questions. Hence the higher, more spiritual elements of politics—such as the influence of the Church on society, the mutual relations of Church and State, and the rest—were not so vividly present to the mind of our republicist as those inferior, more earthly conditions and relations, which attach to the state as a physical being. We say, *not so vividly present*; for every page of Haller's work reveals a religious-minded man; and it was, indeed, his Christian sincerity, that, under God, was the means of bringing him to the true Church.

Besides the defect we have mentioned, this publicist falls occasionally into other faults—the result of a too systematic theorizing—and does not sufficiently appreciate the action of democracy in the monarchical system. On the whole, Haller has treated the science of public law with more method and copiousness, than any other modern writer; and if he did not equal some of his great Catholic contemporaries in profoundness and comprehensiveness of intellect, he is inferior to none in judgment and practical sagacity.*

Dr. Jarcke, whose political essays stand at the head of this article, may in many respects be considered as a disciple of Haller; but a highly original disciple withal, who has developed the doctrines, and corrected some mistakes of his celebrated master. We shall now give a sketch of his life, and then analyze his political system, and review his essays.

Dr. Charles Ernest Jarcke was born of highly respectable protestant parents, at Königsberg, in Prussia, in November, 1801. He prosecuted his studies in philosophy and jurisprudence, at the University of Bonn. The lec-

* Haller's great work, "Restoration of Political Science," is in six vols. 8vo. An excellent synopsis of it has been published by Scherer, which it would be well to translate into English. About twelve years ago, Haller published a history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century in Switzerland, which is much admired. His political essays and miscellanies (in 4 vols. in French and German), are very valuable. This venerable man is at Schlothurn, in the enjoyment of a green old age.

tures of one of the most distinguished ornaments of that seat of learning, Dr. Windischmann, the Catholic professor of philosophy, as well as the *Essai sur l'Indifférence en matière de Religion*, by the abbé de la Mennais, made a deep impression on the mind of the youthful Jarcke, and assisted him in his enquiries into the truth of the Catholic religion. At length in the year 1825, he made at Cologne, his solemn abjuration of protestantism, and was received into the bosom of the Catholic Church. He then took his degrees in philosophy and jurisprudence at Berlin, and published shortly after a much admired work upon criminal law. On the breaking out of the French Revolution of 1830, he founded, together with his distinguished friend Dr. Phillips, also a convert, and some other publicists, a weekly political journal, called the "*Wochen-Blatt*," for the purpose of combating the revolutionary doctrines, which had obtained the ascendancy in France, and were exerting so fatal an influence in Germany. To this Journal the illustrious Haller sent contributions, and was gratified to find such worthy co-operators in the North of Germany. Many of Jarcke's essays in that Journal have been collected in the work, which stands at the head of our article, and will later come under our notice. The ability with which this journal was conducted, and the boldness wherewith it put forth conservative principles, attacking alike absolutism and the revolution, and showing the identity of their essential principles under a difference of forms, excited the greatest sensation in Berlin. But in that capital, the strong-hold of rationalism and pantheism, and where a despotic Bureaucracy was then in the height of its power, two such liberal conservatives, and zealous Catholics, as Dr. Phillips and Dr. Jarcke, were naturally viewed with suspicion and distrust. Their efforts were counteracted on every side. At length Dr. Phillips undertook the professorships of Modern History and Canon Law, at the university of Munich; and not long afterwards prince Metternich tendered to Dr. Jarcke an important place in the foreign office at Vienna, which he accordingly accepted. It is to the credit of that eminent statesman, that he sought out and patronized Catholic talent, and employed it in the service of the state. Those two distinguished publicists, F. von Schlegel, and Adam von Müller, had previously held under him situations similar to those now offered to Dr. Jarcke. The knowledge and

experience, which our author here acquired of the political affairs of a great empire, as well as intercourse with consummate diplomatists and statesmen, were doubtless of the greatest advantage for enlarging and maturing the political views of the publicist.

In 1838, the Catholics of Germany felt the necessity of establishing a journal in order to defend the liberty of the Church, so rudely outraged in the person of the venerable archbishop of Cologne, by the Prussian government, and to enforce Catholic principles in Church and state, so violently assailed by the protestant press. Dr. Phillips, and the younger Görres, undertook the editorship of this journal; while the elder Görres, Moehler, Döllinger, Moy, Ringseis, Freyberg, and lastly, Jarcke, engaged to give it their active support. This is the celebrated periodical,* entitled, *Historisch-politische Blätter*, which we have so often had occasion to cite. This journal, for the soundness of its religious and political principles, and for the great learning and ability with which it is conducted, as well as for the influence it has exerted, and continues to exert, is quite unrivalled in Germany. Not the least valuable of its papers are the contributions from the pen of Dr. Jarcke. Among many others, we would particularly advert to his admirable essays on the political motives and personages that had a part in bringing about the German Reformation of the sixteenth century (a subject that had been before little treated), on the war of the peasants in 1525, the revolt of the anabaptists in Westphalia, and at a later period, on the articles on Josephism, and the causes of the recent Revolution in Austria.

In the fatal year, 1848, when the Austrian empire was shaken to its foundations, Dr. Jarcke, and his friend Hurter, who have precisely the same political opinions, as well as religious convictions, became a butt of calumny and invective from the Jewish literati, who then mostly conducted the revolutionary journals of Vienna. On the emperor Ferdinand's second flight from his capital, our author found it expedient to leave Vienna. Since that period, he has taken up his abode at Munich.

Though holding office under the Austrian government, Dr. Jarcke has ever been the energetic opponent of that

* It appears twice a month.

political centralization, and of those restrictions on ecclesiastical freedom, which until the happy accession of his present majesty, had from the time of the emperor Joseph II. obtained in that empire. His writings, like those of his illustrious predecessors, F. Schlegel and Adam Müller, breathe a warm love for the Church, and an ardent zeal for her liberties, as well as a determined hostility to the false political liberalism, whether it profess despotic or anarchic principles.

We intimated on a former occasion,* while we freely criticised his general policy, the enlightened patronage, which prince Metternich had extended to those Catholic publicists, and inferred from thence, as well as from other facts, the opposition of that eminent statesman to ecclesiastical Josephism and political Bureaucracy. We added, that though he had not achieved for the Church all he could, and ought to have done, he yet had rendered good service in his day, and had relaxed those fetters on her spiritual independence, which after a bitter experience his successors have been able to strike off. These great changes are often brought about by degrees only. It was thus in our own country, the relaxation of the penal laws against Catholics in 1778, and 1792, prepared the way for their total repeal in 1829.

To return to our author. Philosophic depth is not with him as with Görres and F. Schlegel, the habitual characteristic of his genius, though when his subject requires it, he is at times very profound. But the predominant qualities of his intellect are, on one hand, extraordinary sagacity, and on the other, a rare dialectic acuteness and precision. His historical knowledge is ample, and his acquaintance with the religious, social, and political condition of the various countries of Europe quite extraordinary. The weapon of satire he wields with an able hand, and his style is remarkable for clearness, and a manly vigour. He has also a great insight into the human heart; witness his masterly portraits of Robespierre and Buonaparte (*Essays*, vol. ii). Since the death of the illustrious Görres, he is certainly the first living publicist in Germany. In the collection of *Essays* at the head of our article, there

* See *Dublin Review*, for July, 1849. Article, *Political State of Germany*.

are few on ecclesiastical subjects, as they mostly appeared in the *Wochen-Blatt*, which was published in a protestant capital, and addressed in great part to protestant readers. With few exceptions, the essays are of a purely political kind; and though entitled miscellaneous, may be classed under certain heads, so as to render the work a regular treatise on political science. They are, as may be supposed, partly of a polemic, partly of a didactic kind, partly laying down the true philosophy of legislation, and partly refuting the errors of the various absolutist and revolutionary schools. The very enumeration of subjects treated will show the importance of the present work. The actual condition of the science of public or constitutional law—the origin and rights of property—the domestic constitution—the origin of the state—the primitive forms of government, such as the patriarchal, the patrimonial, the military, and the theocratic states—later, the republican form of polity—the states-constitution of the Middle Age—the British constitution—the modern representative system—the Bureaucratic state—the different elements or component parts of the Christian monarchy, such as the prerogatives of royalty—the privileges of nobility and of the clergy considered as a body politic—the rights of municipal and provincial corporations—the causes that brought about the French revolution—and lastly, the political remedies for the regeneration of Europe;—such are the momentous matters, to which our author has devoted his enquiries.

We shall now proceed to the analysis of the work.

Let us begin with the author's considerations on property.

Kant and his followers founded fifty years ago a school of abstract legislation, which taking no account of established institutions, existing laws, and vested interests, or the religious doctrines and discipline, and social habits, customs, and manners of a people, would fain abolish all systems of polity, which corresponded not with its self-conceived ideal. This philosophical school, which in religion produced so much infidelity, led in politics to the revolution. Within the last thirty years, a pseudo-historical school in Germany has risen up to oppose it. According to the system of the latter, whatever is, is right—whatever has once an historical existence, must be respected.

It is not difficult to show that such a theory involves consequences nearly as fatal, as the system it combats. It would sanction every violation of right and justice—every monstrous iniquity, that could show an historical existence. Now every law, every political institution, repugnant to religion, or to eternal justice, or to the dictates of common sense, can claim no prescriptive right. Take, for example, the law enforcing the subdivision of landed property, which has prevailed in France for the last sixty years. This law, which is ultimately ruinous to the interests of agriculture, that cannot be carried on without capital, and which saps the existence of the aristocracy, without which in a large state order and liberty cannot subsist, is certainly one, running directly counter to the sense and practice of mankind. Yet this pseudo-historical school, of which we speak, would, at whatever cost, insist on the maintenance of an institution that has been productive of so much evil to France, because it can show a prescription of sixty years. It is with reason Dr. Jarcke says, that the partisans of this system lend a helping hand to their opponents, the political rationalists, and are wont to resist the introduction of all anti-revolutionary measures, however cautiously conceived.

Before the fall nature was in entire subjection to man, while his will was in untroubled union with God, and humanity itself formed one unbroken, undivided unity in itself. But since the fall sin has disturbed the union with God; nature yields him an unwilling, grudging obedience; for it is only by the sweat of his brow he can till the earth; and the rigid principle of individualism has succeeded to the unbroken harmony of the state of original justice. Unity, or community of outward possession, was consistent only with a state of internal or moral unity. As soon as sin had implanted in the hearts of men mutual envy, jealousy, hatred, covetousness, avarice, and pride, separate interests necessarily arose; community of goods would have become a source of endless strife and confusion; and private property, with all its rights and claims, was indispensable.

Private property is not the creature of civil law, but anterior to it; for it is the necessary substratum of domestic society. The sacredness of property, which is a principle inherent in the consciences of all men, would, if it were merely the child of human legislation, be utterly

inexplicable. To deduce this institution from a mere human compact, is to deny its inviolability, and expose it to the envy of the multitude, and the caprices of tyranny. Its universality and perpetuity, its necessary co-ordination with domestic and social order, the solemn sanction which it has received under the different dispensations of God, and the instinctive reverence it has in all ages commanded from the consciences and the laws of men, prove that private property hath its root in the Divine economy of things. Human laws *protect* indeed, but *transfer* not property; or at most, they determine, in disputed cases, to what parties, by Divine right, property belongs.

But let us hear Dr. Jarcke set forth his own views, and describe the admirable manner wherein Christianity harmonizes the principles of right and charity.

“Private property, as we said above, is in its present rigid, isolated, and exclusive separatism, a consequence of the fall and of sin. Without sin, this exclusive, jealous domiunon over a part of nature would not have existed. But in the present condition of humanity, with sin inherent and transmitted in its bosom, and its relation to nature perverted, property, as well as all private right, is *necessary and unavoidable*. This being established, it is clear that any attempt to alter or put an end to this state of things by *external means* (such as the abolition of hereditary right, a new distribution of earthly possessions according to the capacity or moral worth of individuals, introduction of community of goods among all the members of a state, or a concentration of the same in the sovereign power, which would allot to each individual his usufruct), such an attempt, we say, will not and cannot attain its end. To point out triumphantly the evils of private property, and of the distinction between wealth and poverty, is no difficult task. But whoso knows that the root of the evil lies in man's corrupt *will*, in his avarice, his envy, his pride, his selfishness, in short, will not be deluded into the belief, that *mere external* remedies, such as have often been proposed, and recently by the St. Simonians, will affect the roots of the malady. Would all such measures alter the corrupt nature of man? Would man (supposing such a state of things as that proposed, could ever, and even for the shortest space of time, be realized, and independently of the enormous servitude which would be the inevitable consequence of such an attempt), *would man, we say, cease to desire to possess, and to possess for himself alone?* If these questions must be answered in the negative, then every reflecting man must admit that then, perhaps under other forms, the old evil would press with even aggravated weight upon mankind.

“Since its first promulgation, Christianity, while it hath respected the necessary and inviolate sanctity of private right, hath unceas-

ingly laboured to remove, by moral means, the doubtless undeniable 'evils of private property.' If the root of the disorder lies, as we said, in the will of man, then it is only by working on that will that the evil can be removed; the selfishness of private property can be set aside only by *charity*.

"Christianity has accordingly suffered to subsist in the full plenitude of its rights, that dominion of the human will over the domain of nature, which each individual had acquired; and those external rights, which divide men, it has sanctioned by its precept. An unjust invasion of the rights and property of our neighbour, is in the eye of the Christian religion a grievous sin, which until compensation for the injury inflicted be rendered according to the best of our power, cannot be forgiven. Instead, therefore, of (as the ancient and modern antagonists of private property do) depreciating or undermining its rights, or secretly or avowedly preparing the way for its utter abolition, Christianity, by its sanction and consecration, imparts to that institution the fullest, most solid, and most absolute guarantee which can be imagined. Private right, indeed, in its selfish, uncharitable, rigid exclusiveness, is not considered by the Christian religion, as the ultimate and highest, or a self-dependent object. It is not, and cannot be its own end—when God committed to man the dominion over nature; so is this only a *fief*, a stewardship of a good intrusted to him, which he has to use and to employ, in the sense of the Giver. From this point of view our neighbour is no longer an alien, or an adversary, as in the rigid eye of law; but a brother of the same original extraction, and who hath the destiny and calling to be one day united with us. So beside and above *the division*, there is a *community* of goods. The rich man breaks his bread for the hungry; and he who possesses, to him who is needy. No one stands absolutely alone with his earthly goods: and there is a general claim of one to the possessions of the other. But no one is *forced*. It is not the outward coercion of human laws, or a new external distribution of goods, or even a compact, which may trace other bounds to property, or a poor-rate, commanded by law, that can insure the aid, which the wealthy imparts to the indigent. But these donations must proceed purely from compassion, sympathy, love, in short, from the free will of proprietors. As on one side these feelings set aside or mitigate the rigid rights of property, so they render homage on the other hand to the strictest maxims of private right. Thus both these principles—right and charity—must never be absolutely severed from each other in the consideration of private property; and it is only by such an union that this institution will be strong enough to repel attacks, to which, more than ever, it is now exposed."—Vol. iii. p. 192-5.

Let us now hear our author speak of the origin of civil government. Before entering on this subject, he refutes

Senor Marina,* the apologist for the Spanish Cortez of 1812, who cited St. Thomas Aquinas as a witness to the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people. First, the work, "De Regimine Principum," cited by Marina, is not by St. Thomas Aquinas, but from the pen of one of his disciples, Archbishop Agidius Romanus. Secondly, the passage quoted, which is in the sixth chapter of the first book, in stating the cases when a tyrant may be lawfully deposed, refers (as our author clearly proves from the context) not to a primitive and general social compact, but to a special elective kingdom.

Dr. Jarcke observes that the Aristotelian philosophy, which was the groundwork of the political science of the Middle Age, was the true parent of the modern false philosophy of government. Traces of an erroneous view, as to the origin of States, are, he admits, discoverable in the writings of the schoolmen. But the essential difference, as he shows, between them and Rousseau, is, that in the former an erroneous opinion, borrowed from Heathen philosophy, was neutralized by the influence of Christianity, and the practical politics of the Middle ages; whereas the sophist of Geneva, and the modern liberals, seek, by their false political system, to annihilate, or at least paralyze, the influence of Religion.

We may, for our part, be permitted to observe, that one thing is the *exposition of sound ecclesiastical, or political doctrine*; another, a *sound philosophic explanation of it*. Thus the Divine origin of the civil power, and the unlawfulness of active resistance against legitimate authority, except in certain extreme cases, the schoolmen, in conformity with the teaching of the Church, clearly inculcated. But whether they never used expressions, that accurately examined, were inconsistent with such a doctrine, or whether their philosophic theories on this matter always harmonized with their own dogmatic teaching, is quite another question.

"No error," says our author, "has been attended with more eventful, and far-reaching consequences, than the false but wide-spread doctrine, that after being preceded by an irregular and lawless state of nature, the state sprang out of a social compact of free individuals living within it. This theory was followed by the

* See his work entitled, "Theory of the Cortez."

divergent, but ruinous results of the revolution and of absolutism, which have undermined the old Christian Germanic states of Europe, and have prepared the way for a licentious anarchy as well as for a despotism, that insulted and trampled down all legal freedom.

“Whence sprang this theory? is a question which cannot be here examined. Deeper enquiries lead to the result, that the first roots of this error go beyond the origin of the party-struggles of the present time. Even Hobbes, and the writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, are not chargeable with the *invention of the theory*, though certainly the first practical application of it must be laid at their door. On the contrary, this unhistorical, and (as we must add), in its inmost essence, false and unchristian doctrine of the origin of the state, was an effect of the resuscitation of the study of Greek and Roman antiquities in the Middle Age, and especially of the exaggerated reverence, which the whole Christian west paid to the writings of Aristotle. In the Aristotelian politics, we can trace, on a nearer investigation, the first germs of what the new and better school of publicists denominates the pseudo-philosophical statesmanship.”—p. 32-3.

The origin of the state is a fact that must be examined, like all facts, not by reasonings a priori, but by historical investigation. We see at various periods of history, and even in our own times, the rise of states; and we know that these have never sprung into existence by way of a social compact. And although the origin of the first state is of course involved in the obscurity which envelopes all primitive history; yet analogy, the experience of mankind, and the clearest deductions of reason, demonstrate the absurdity, as well as danger of this hypothesis. If this were the necessary preliminary condition to the rise of the first state, how is it that on the subsequent formation of states in the course of ages, the same principle has not been found to prevail?

The question as to the origin of the state is implied in that of the origin of mankind. If mankind sprung from one couple, then society is of Divine origin; but if they were originally *autochthones*, as the later Heathen philosophers conjectured, then the theory of the social compact is intelligible, and satisfactory. But happily the historical, philological, and physiological researches of recent times have given a brilliant confirmation to the record of Revelation, as to the origin of mankind, and rendered the doctrine of the *Autochthones*, though occasionally

put forward by modern rationalists, as laughable as it is impious.

In the family we see the first germ of all society. Man and woman are formed for each other, formed to give mutual aid and solace to one another, as well as to perpetuate the human race. The nature of their physical, moral, and intellectual endowments points out the character of their relations to each other, in which authority is tempered by love, and the determination of free-will blends wonderfully with the ordinance of nature. Offspring completes this society; and the nature of the relations between parents and their children cannot for a moment be doubted, since not only under God, do the latter owe their existence to the former, but their protection in helpless infancy, their sustenance, their speech, their education, and their provision and maintenance in later life.

Thus is the family the first state, and, indeed, a monarchical state.

Holy Writ furnishes little information respecting the infancy of human society; but as it expressly records the longevity of the first patriarchs, we may conclude (and, indeed, we know the fact from tradition) that they exerted a royal authority over their tribes. After the great catastrophe of the deluge inflicted on a guilty world, mankind was renovated by the family of Noah so miraculously preserved. The human race again formed one family, till, on an extraordinary event mentioned in Scripture, they dispersed, and were divided into a multitude of tribes, races and nations, independent of, and even hostile to, each other, and possessing each its own political laws and institutions.

The tribe which at first consisted merely of the children, kinsmen, and immediate descendants of the patriarch, is gradually augmented by the acquisition of captives in war, the purchase of slaves, and the voluntary submission of others who seek the protection of the chieftain, or desire to cultivate his lands, or tend his flocks. This is the first territorial monarchy, or, as it is rightly termed by Haller, the patrimonial state.

When, in course of time, the territory becomes too contracted for the increased numbers of the tribe, or they are hard pressed by formidable foes, then a portion of young adventurers, under a leader of their choice, migrate in search of new lands. These territories they subjugate, reducing

their inhabitants by force of arms, or entering into treaty with them, by allowing them, under certain conditions, the retention of the whole, or part of their lands. This is the military state, or the monarchy founded by conquest.

Although these two forms of government, the patrimonial and the military state, spring not so immediately or directly from nature, as the patriarchal constitution, or domestic government, yet are they necessary developments of the latter. No social compact creates or precedes the patrimonial state; for the captives who are made in war, and the slaves who are bought, make no treaty whatever; and the engagements which individuals, families, or even tribes, enter into for their own protection sake, or for the purchase of lands, and the performance of domestic services, do not create the patrimonial state, but only augment and enlarge its boundaries and numbers. These secondary, subordinate, and specific contracts, which expediency, or even necessity dictate, must not be confounded with that primitive, universal, social compact, which a rationalist philosophy dreams of; and this for several reasons. 1. These contracts are not made between isolated independent individuals, possessed of equal rights and power, but between the strong and the weak, the one seeking protection, the other service, or augmentation of power. 2. These engagements are made with a pre-existing authority, and pre-suppose an already organized community, and, consequently, are posterior to the formation of human society. 3. These contracts regard specific individual interests, (though, doubtless, they form an important element in the growth of states,) but involve not the permanent general interests of mankind.

The same remark holds good in respect to the military state. Unity of power is necessary for the successful conduct of war; and the band of adventurers who go out in quest of conquest, are commanded, either by their natural hereditary chieftain, or by one whom, on account of birth, character, valour, or martial skill, they have elected for their leader. But the natural endowments which imperiously dictate such a choice are a gift of God; and men in the election of such a chief, follow, as it were, the voice of Heaven.

Then there is the theocratic state, where the chiefs hold their authority, not by a popular delegation, but by a commission, true or false, derived, or pretended to be

derived, from Heaven. These three forms of government, the patrimonial, the military, the theocratic, are derivations or offshoots from the domestic or patriarchal constitution.

“To these original simple forms of rule,” says our author, “must be referred every independent government, that is to say, every relation of authority and obedience among men, which is not subject to a higher sway. But here we must not overlook the fact, that in history and in actual life these forms of government are not so strongly and rigidly separated, as for the sake of scientific purposes, we must classify them in theory. Thus, as the independent tribe, though it be even nomade, if it desires to maintain a permanent independence, must call some territory its own, the tribe, or patriarchal constitution, becomes thereby transformed into the territorial or patrimonial dominion. The patrimonial state is, in course of time, inevitably necessitated to take in defence of its territory and independence, measures of resistance against foreign foes, and consequently to assume, more or less, the form of the military monarchy. On the other hand, the warlike band and its leader, when they wish not always to live on booty, but to obtain a lasting footing and establishment in the conquered land, must settle down, more or less, into a patrimonial state. Lastly, every government has a certain admixture of theocratic elements; whether the territorial lord or military chief unite in his person the dignity of a Pontiff, or whether, as protector of an independent Church, he receive from the latter a religious consecration, as the German emperors received, not by their coronation merely, but by the doctrine of the office and calling of christian sovereignty. Even the purely theocratic constitution, when it acquires an independent territory, must assume some of the characteristics, not only of the patrimonial, but of the military monarchy.” —p. 52-3. vol. iii.

But there is another form of government which we have not spoken of, and which seems at first sight to be repugnant to our author's theory, as to the origin of the state. This is the republic. It may be objected, indeed, that as this government represents a division of powers, and as it is the creature of a contract between independent individuals, it is neither the product of nature, nor the representative of those relations of superiority and dependency, which enter into the very constitution of the Governments we have described.

In the establishment of the Republic, as the author well observes, the will of man is, indeed, more prominently active, than in the rise of the tribe-constitution, which is

the immediate development of the family. But, as he shows, the Republic is not the creature of human fancy or caprice, but the result of circumstances independent of man's volition. The fiction of a primitive social compact does not cease to be a fiction, because of the existence of Republics; for in those early forms of monarchical government, which grew immediately out of the family, specific and secondary compacts, as we have seen, served to enlarge and augment their power. It is so with the Republic. Firstly, in this government, as in all others, there are the same relations of authority and obedience, superiority and dependence; and the only difference is, that power is vested in the hands of many instead of one. Even in the most unbridled democracy, there is a ruling class; and the majority of its inhabitants, consisting of women, children, minors, the destitute, servants and slaves are excluded, not only from a direct, but even indirect, participation in power. In every Republic, whereof history records the establishment, it has been the *heads of families*, and not the latter description of persons, that have taken part in the foundation. The assertion of Locke, that "no one possesses a power over another, which the latter has not transferred," is utterly belied by history. In even the wildest democracy, the great bulk of the inhabitants are ruled, not only without their co-operation, but even against their sanction and consent.

Secondly, reason as well as experience, proves that the Republic was not the primitive government; but that wherever it occurs, it grew out of those earlier constitutions of civil society above described. And the reason for this is very justly assigned by Haller in the following passage.

"The foundation of republics," he says, "is extremely arduous, and still more arduous is the acquisition and perpetuation of their independence; and here must the reason be sought for, wherefore their occurrence in history is so rare, and of so late a date. Men of themselves are not so inclined, as is generally thought, towards relations of community, towards common possessions. One is never free, never master of one's own, and no one would fain tolerate a partner in his power. 'Omnisque potestas impatiens consortis erit.' Community is rather the mother of all strife; for, in cases of collision, the pretensions of two men equally entitled to one and the same object, cannot be reconciled. No man in the world willingly submits to his equal, when he can help it, or even

likes to receive orders from him ; and the too frequent compliances which, even in things over which he has a share of controul, are exacted of him, become at last onerous to the most pacific. Hence, even common lands and possessions, which may serve as the basis of a community, are rather distasteful to men, and mostly give occasion only to disputes and hostilities.*

Let us hear our author describe the manner in which Republics usually arise.

“The circumstances and conditions under which an independent community comes into existence, cannot, as is evident, be previously determined as to all particulars by any theoretic deduction. Here doctrine must be inferred from the enlarged experience of our kind—history to wit ;—but the enumeration of all particular cases can never be reduced to a rigid, logical, systematic form. The simplest case of collective power most proximate to monarchy, is that where several sons or heirs of a potentate share among them the heritage of his dominions, and administer them in common. By such co-dominion, doubtless, a commonwealth is founded ; but its duration, as history shews, is never of a very lasting kind. More frequently doth the independent commonwealth spring out of the ruins of monarchical power, when a common necessity prevents their utter destruction, and moulds them into a Republic. In these cases a new regal dominion is prevented coming into life, *only because* the elements composing society are equal in strength ; or because when such is not the case, all have an interest that each should remain independent. Thus to take a near example ; after the downfall of the old Imperial Dignity, and the sad interregnum of a foreign domination, which had brought home to all the necessity of mutual co-operation, the commonwealth of the Germanic Diet sprang out of the ruins of the Holy Roman empire of Germany. This Diet owed its origin to the sense of the necessity of a common defence against foreign foes, and did not assume the imperial form, because, on one hand, no one would sacrifice his independence, and on the other hand, no one would burthen himself with an impotent sceptre.†

* See Haller's Restor. of Polit. Science, vol. i.

† This is a proof of the above enunciated proposition, that it is not the volition and deliberation of men, but the pressure of circumstances, that is to say, *nature* which founds Republics as well as monarchical states. *The will* to restore the Germanic Empire was, doubtless, to be found in many ; but as the common people are wont to say in like cases, “it was as if it were not to be,” and the nature of things imperiously required the *Diet*, that is to say, the federative Republic.

“In other cases a community has grown up in a state of dependence on some prince, or has been founded by him ; but from increase of power, and by turning to account favourable outward circumstances, it acquires a *de facto*, or even legal independence of its former sovereign. Thus did the North American Republics, the Lombard cities in the Middle Age, and the still existing cities of the Germanic Diet, rise to the rank of independent states.

“Lastly, history shows, moreover, a third series of cases, where external circumstances, such as common necessity and danger, or common wants, and common possessions, united together a certain number of families or individuals, independent of each other, and equal, or nearly so, in power, such families or individuals then, urged by the very necessities of contact and close community, were forced to conclude a mutual league, and enter accordingly into social relations. Those who in such cases found a commonwealth, are mostly fugitives, or emigrants and colonists from other countries, who quit another state of society, meet in a third place, and here, on account of their equality in power, establish a Republic. Had any individual or family possessed preponderant power, the nature of things would have led to the establishment of a principality, as, in the course of time, such always arises, when authority is concentrated in the heads of some members of the Republic. An example of this kind is presented, not only by the Colonies of Antiquity, and the League of the seven chieftains in Ireland—who, weary of perpetual feuds, founded among themselves a judicature, called Althing—but by the Republic of Venice. There, Italian nobles, flying before the ravages of the half-savage hordes who were inundating Italy, took refuge in the islands of the Lagoones, and established a commonwealth, based on strict equality in the ruling class of nobles.

“In the foregoing dissertation, we have described the manner in which nature calls into life independent principalities and Republics. By this view of the subject, not only is the doctrine of the origin of government established on the domain of real life, and a reconciliation brought about between theory and reality, but by the overthrow of the fiction of the *Social Compact*, a multitude of erroneous deductions, equally fatal to rulers and to subjects, is swept away.”—Vol. iii. p. 61-4.

From an enquiry into the rise of civil government, we are naturally led to investigate the question as to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of power ; and this subject the author treats with great ability. We shall give a brief analysis of his remarks.

Political power is as much the subject of legitimate ownership as any other possession, and the confusion of ideas that prevails in our times on this matter, is one of

the most fearful symptoms of the moral and political depravity of the age. If the possession of the throne be not held inviolate, what other right, public or private, will be esteemed sacred among men? Legality is often opposed to legitimacy by the partisans of revolutionary disorder; but if human laws have not a foundation in divine right and eternal justice, what respect will they obtain, and what stability will they ever acquire?

Royal legitimacy is the best protectress of freedom; for the usurper, who obtains a throne by craft or violence, must employ the same means to perpetuate his sway. As he is almost sure to encounter resistance from the partisans of the dethroned dynasty, he must, in self-defence, have recourse to measures of repression and severity against them; and these measures will, of course, affect the rest of the community. If the usurper, as our author well observes, be a man of energetic character, then he must be a tyrant; and if, on the other hand, he be a man of only ordinary capacity and feeble purpose, then he is sure to be overturned, and only prepares the way for new commotions and revolutions. A legitimate king may have a tyrannic temper, but as his interests are bound up with the institutions of his country, and as all respect his hereditary rights, he has infinitely fewer motives or temptations to commit abuses of power than an usurper.

But legitimacy of power is a principle not absolute, but relative. Not to mention the fact, which is beside the question, that a legitimate king may, by certain acts and in certain cases become illegitimate, an usurper may, in respect to certain persons and things, be the rightful monarch. This matter our author illustrates with an admirable clearness of reasoning. He cites the example of the late Elector of Hesse, and of the usurper, Jerome Buona-*parte*, whom his brother, forty years ago, intruded into that principality. Jerome, though evidently an usurper, was still the legitimate prince in respect to those Frenchmen who had accompanied him from Paris, and had never owned the Elector of Hesse for their sovereign. He was such also, at least for the time being, in regard to all those Hessians who had taken an oath of allegiance to him, and received from him honours and pensions; * and the same

* If they wish to rise against the usurper, they must first give up their honours and pensions.

remark holds good in regard to those foreign powers who in the treaty of Tilsit had acknowledged his authority. As the Protector (for the time being) of social order, he was the rightful sovereign, in respect to all criminals and malefactors, as likewise against any usurper or revolutionist, who, by virtue of any other title than that of Elector of Hesse, sought to subvert his throne.

But in regard to the great mass of the inhabitants of Hesse, who had viewed the usurpation with repugnance, and had given only a passive acquiescence to what they could not avoid, as well as those who with the rightful sovereign had fled the country, Jerome Buonaparte was in every sense an illegitimate prince. These would be perfectly justified in rising against the usurper, and driving him from his throne. Yet any such attempt that had no possibility or even probability of success, any attempt that without accomplishing the end proposed would serve only to throw the country into misery and confusion, would be highly punishable and sinful.

The authority of this usurper might have become legitimate in various ways; either by a renunciation of his rights on the part of the lawful sovereign, or by the extinction of the ancient dynasty, or by such a lengthened prescription of years, that the expulsion of the usurper or of his family is either wholly impracticable, or would at least entail immense evils on the State.*

Hence, as the author concludes, the one proposition that Jerome Buonaparte was as legitimate a sovereign as any other in Europe, and the other proposition, that Jerome Buonaparte had no more claims on his subjects than any highway robber; these two propositions, so unqualified, are both equally false.

With the doctrine of popular sovereignty, no doubt, the notion of legitimacy is utterly incompatible. Hence the war which all revolutionists wage against the latter principle.

In connection with the subjects we have just analysed, it may be in place to advert (for want of space will not allow us to do more) to some of our author's observations on the inequality of social conditions.

* What length of prescription be needful to constitute legitimacy, is a matter which cannot be beforehand theoretically determined, for it depends on a thousand circumstances, that elude analysis.

Man, as we have seen, is a being essentially social; and where there is society, there must there be subordination. The inequality of ranks is, moreover, only the expression of that inequality which prevails in the physical constitution, the intellectual capacity, the character, the temper, the industry, the education, the opportunities, and lastly, the virtues of different men. And supposing it even possible that by any external violence this inequality of ranks could even for a short space of time be set aside, it would, from the very nature of men, in the course of a generation or two, revive, perforce, under nearly the same forms as at present. The harsh forms, indeed, which that inequality now assumes, are one of the melancholy results of the fall of man.

We regret that we cannot cite some of the author's interesting observations on nobility. This institution, which upholds the dignity of the Crown and protects the liberties of the people, is the key-stone to the political edifice. And it is no exaggeration to say, that the Catholic who thinks soundly on nobility, (provided he be sincerely zealous for the liberties of his Church,) will be sure to think soundly on almost every other constitutional topic. But if a man be hostile to an hereditary nobility, (especially if he be a Protestant, or a Catholic indifferent about the spiritual independence of his Church,) then is he sure to be the conscious or unconscious partisan of a military despotism, or a licentious democracy.

The author has several able dissertations on the old States-Constitution, which, copied unconsciously from the constitution of the Catholic Church, insured, even in its undeveloped form in the Middle Age, the harmonious co-operation of authority and freedom. Between this form of government and the modern representative systems that have, since the French revolution of 1789, sprung up out of a defective or superficial imitation of the British Constitution, he institutes some interesting comparisons.

In the States-constitution, the prince, who, as we have seen, was in the origin of society the first landed proprietor, enjoys his own independent patrimony. In the modern representative system, he is a mere pensioner on the bounty of Parliament. In the States-constitution, the monarch within the sphere of his prerogatives, is a perfectly free, independent agent. In the other system of government, he can act only by the advice and instru-

mentality of his responsible counsellors ; so that, hereby, in fact, the sovereign power is virtually lodged in the hands of the ministers. In the States-constitution, the lords spiritual and temporal sit in Parliament by virtue of their hereditary rights and ecclesiastical sees ; but in many of the modern constitutional governments, as they are called, these peers, whether lay or ecclesiastical, are nominated by the favour of the Crown.

Then with regard to the representation of the Commonalty, "the States," in the words of our author, "grant their subsidies out of their own means, and are, at any rate, the natural representatives of specific corporations and interests. The popular representatives, on the other hand, in the modern system, are nothing more than a quota out of a mass of individuals, with whom they stand in no natural connection, and are not representatives of common interests but of mere individual opinions, as to the well-being of the State, and its wants and necessities. They are a fraction, which by mere accident of election has issued, as by lottery, out of an arbitrarily designated body of electors, who, according to an equally arbitrary rate of taxation, constitute a privileged minority, having no necessary connection, and in no wise representing the interests of the bulk of the population."

Again, the old States-constitution was based on the principle of self-government in the administration, on the freest municipal system, on provincial parliaments, city corporations, and on local laws, customs, privileges, and franchises. The representative system, on the other hand, in most modern constitutional countries, as they are called, is founded on the revolutionary system of Bureaucratic centralization, which is incompatible with all free, municipal government, and is destructive to all local liberties.

Between the old States-constitution and the modern representative system, the British Constitution holds a sort of a middle place. Apart from the great religious change of the sixteenth century, which by bringing the clergy into a state of servile dependence on the Crown, exerted no unimportant influence on its social position, and apart from the important modifications which the revolution of 1688 introduced, in the exercise of the royal prerogative, the British is in many respects a surviving remnant of the old States-constitution. Our Constitution is indeed a

splendid Gothic pile, where the old, deep, broad foundations remain unimpaired, and the strong buttresses and the elegant turrets and pinnacles of the mediæval time have been preserved, while there have been some strange alterations in the chancel, and a tower of quite a modern construction has been erected. In our author's eulogies on the excellent municipal government, the free local institutions, the wise laws of England, and on the vigorously organised aristocracy, which has struck such deep roots in the national soil, all constitutional Englishmen will be disposed to concur. But in regard to his strictures on the state of impotence to which the royalty of 1688 has been reduced, there will not be the same unanimity of opinion. This subject, which on a former occasion we have adverted to, we cannot here stop to discuss. But we may observe, that Cobbett long ago pointed out the evils resulting from the sale of the Crown lands, whereby not only was the revenue charged with heavy obligations, but royalty was bereaved of its ancient patrimony, and rendered dependent for its very subsistence on the good-will of Parliament. The excessive restrictions, too, set at the revolution, on the exercise of the royal veto, have been lamented by recent English writers, who consider the strengthening of the royal prerogative as the only barrier against the advances of democracy.

The following is an admirable sketch of the Bureaucratic State, whereof Dr. Jarcke witnessed so striking a specimen in Berlin.

"The opposite doctrine," says he, "that the 'State' should bring about a certain condition of universal felicity, and should prosecute this 'state-object' at the cost of justice, necessarily led to the most various evils. The immediate effect of this doctrine was, as we before observed, the necessity imposed on Governments of taking into their hands the actual conduct, administration, and economy, of all things; for only under this condition could they fulfil the task they had proposed, of conferring universal happiness, and only upon this condition could they be responsible for this engagement. From this necessity followed, as matter of course, the intrusion of the civil power into every sphere of life, the *much-government and over-government*, and again, the stifling of all free, independent life, in every department, and especially the annihilation of all self-government, or self-administration of different interests. All must emanate from and revert to the huge, all-devouring body of the

state, which a master* in the theory of this liberal absolutism fittingly termed '*Leviathan.*' Hence was the Church deprived of all free, independent action, of all self-government and administration of her affairs; but her freedom was annihilated, either directly by the usurpation of ecclesiastical power on the part of the state, or in an indirect and covert way, by the pretended right of supervision, or protection, or prevention of so-called abuses. Hence no more freedom for civil corporations, but a rigid tutelage exerted by the state over all their internal concerns; the destruction to their autonomy; and the control over the management of their property, coupled with a thousand restrictions and limitations in its enjoyment and possession. Hence also the attempt from the same quarter to regulate by laws, and control by functionaries private individuals in the management of their family concerns, to direct their household by the laws of political economy, to interfere with the education of their children, and restrict in every way their power over their servants and workmen.

"How much in this course of policy so pursued by the state, the sanctity of right, and personal liberty in a certain sense identical with it, must suffer, is evident of itself. But even by the total annihilation of individual freedom, the object sought for—the happiness of all, would not be attained. On the whole, it is beyond the power of human government, *to make men happy*; at most it can by the rights which it exercises, and the protection which it imparts, insure to the personal liberty of the individual a scope, within which the latter may provide for his material well-being. But happiness, so far as it can exist on earth, can come only from above, and is a blessing of God. But by government measures to make *all* happy, is one of the most absurd ideas that can be conceived; for the relations of men in society are so peculiarly constituted, that a measure which according to all appearance, promotes the earthly prosperity of one individual, obstructs, undermines, and destroys that of another. Lastly, those bound together by a common interest, understand what can best forward it, far better than all the functionaries of state, who would take it under their tutelary care. The former mostly desire only permission to have free, unfettered scope for their exertions and energies.†

"Besides the destruction to personal liberty, and the utter impossibility of attaining the end proposed, this system of Bureaucratic centralization leads to the weakening and degradation of regal power. By mixing up the authority of government in all concerns, this system appears indeed to give indefinite extension to the royal prerogative; but it is precisely this very indefinite extension of the

* Hobbes.

† The merchants replied to the minister Colbert, on his demand, What he could do for them? "*Laissez-nous faire, Monseigneur?*"

power of the 'state,' which seriously endangers the good, old, substantial, legitimate rights of sovereignty. If government meddles with everything, so every one will in turn meddle with what was formerly the proper concerns of government, and what was exclusively *its* interest, for which it had to render account to no man. But if all are to be made happy at the cost of all, then the sovereign must not be excluded from the general lottery; he must throw in his rights, his prerogatives, and his liberty into the hotch-potch of the public weal, thence to draw out again his share in the common prosperity."—p. 383-6. vol. iii.

To this state of things the author opposes the admirable system of administration which prevails in England. After stating the objection, made by the advocates of centralization, that the free system of administration might be well suited to the Middle Age, which possessed not the high political intelligence of our times; and that necessity has introduced the modern Bureaucracy, which is adapted to modern manners and modern wants, he replies as follows:

"To this assertion we may oppose the example of England. Far from England's being behind the age, it is precisely the European country, which in respect to industry has reached the highest pitch of refinement; and in all which appertains to the well-being of the individual, and to the ease and conveniences of life, has attained to the highest degree of development. But in that country, almost everything is administered by the parties interested themselves, and as a modern writer* has said with incomparable truth, the dread of governing on the part of the government, and the spirit of association in individuals, lend each other the hand, and realize the most extensive enterprizes.

"In fact England's political constitution and administration not merely in themselves, but in the influence which they have exerted on the other countries of Europe, are in the highest degree remarkable. England is indeed the country, which it is so frequently boasted to be by the friends and foes alike of revolution—the land, where freedom (in the true and Germanic sense of the word) hath by a wonderful coincidence of fortunate circumstances, though together with many abuses, and even undeniable excesses, been preserved. But at the same time England's constitution hath

* See the work entitled, "Description of the internal administration of Great Britain" (in German). By Baron von Vincke, Royal Prussian president, Berlin, 1815. The work is cited with much praise by Dr. Jarcke.

exerted the most unhappy influence on the rest of Europe, as it led to the general, calamitous misunderstanding, * that liberty consists in 'the three powers.' Thus arose, as it was easy to fashion, two chambers after a general model, the abortions of the representative system, which are now the scourge of Europe.

"The true English liberty remained hidden from the eyes of the world. People constantly lulled themselves with the hope that freedom would spring up in a land, when they only there transplanted a copy, and (often so miserable a copy) of parliament, without considering what foundations the two houses in England rest on, and that these form merely the summits of a mighty edifice, concealed from the eye of the superficial observer. The English parliament doth not constitute freedom itself; but the freedom, existing independently of it, is there manifested. The genuine English liberty, and the feeling of contentment which, in direct opposition to the mock freedom of the representative system, it diffuses over the public mind, has its root in other principles.† It consists partly in the religious reverence for all private rights, by virtue whereof each one knows that his life, his property, and his whole condition cannot become the sport of legislative caprice neither on the part of an individual, nor of a deliberative assembly, and partly, and chiefly, in the *internal administration*, which with admirable wisdom secures full liberty to every development of life in every sphere, and forms the direct antithesis to the despotic Bureaucracy of Napoleon.

"The interior government of Great Britain rests on the great principle of letting the administration, which in other countries falls to the care of the rulers, be exercised as much as possible by the administrated themselves. This self-government takes place in such a way, that either fitting and trustworthy persons are invested by the people with certain official functions, or so far as it is practicable, the care of providing for certain public wants, whose satisfaction with us falls within the province of the state, is abandoned to private enterprise."—p. 390-5, vol. iii.

The author has many admirable reflections on the

* Particularly with Montesquien and Delolme. The former, while we render full justice to his personal intentions, must still be regarded as the father of modern constitutionalism—a system which undermines all monarchical authority, as well as all true freedom.

† Let every honest, unprejudiced man answer the question; whether the representative system in all the countries where it has been established, doth not engender the sense of insecurity for all existence, universal distrust, and a feverish excitement, and destroy all serene, innocent joys on the part of the people.

French Revolution, from its first rise in 1789 down to that of the three days of July. And though these essays were written fifteen, and some of them twenty years ago, he has predicted with wonderful skill the course which that great social movement has since taken. Among other things, he foretold, in the year 1831, that the next institution which the Revolution would assail in France, would be property, and more especially, monied property. How well did 1848 respond to this prediction! He pointed out, in 1832, the dangers that would ensue to the Catholic party in France from any alliance with the Revolution, and refuted with consummate ability, the political errors of the journal, "L'Avenir," and the more monstrous aberrations into which its once illustrious editor subsequently fell.

We must now conclude with the following interesting account of the States-General in ancient France. The author takes occasion to refute the vulgar error, that the old French Government was a purely arbitrary one. He shows, that even after the extinction of the States-General, freedom, however imperfectly, was defended by provincial states, local customs and franchises; and lastly, by the parliaments.

"Originally," says our author, "the same constitution existed in France, as in the rest of Europe. The French Kings lived in former times, as all other sovereigns in Europe, upon their regalia and demesnes, waged war by the aid of their vassal subjects, and in cases of distress, solicited the good-will of their free subjects for a grant of money. Since the time of Philippe-Bel (1301), the deliberations of the representatives of the three free estates in behalf of those pecuniary subsidies had become habitual. In all relating to the maintenance of his prerogatives, to the preservation of peace at home and abroad, to public order and the administration of justice, the king, indeed, was and remained supreme lord and master, and in the possession of undivided sovereignty. But the states had the right of opposing any ordinance which might trench on their property or their liberties. They demanded justice for any abuses and transgressions in this respect, and desired accounts, nay often self-administration of the monies they granted, as a security for their application to the useful purposes intended. Moreover, there were special states-corporations in the provinces, and more particularly was this the case in the provinces that had been conditionally incorporated with the French monarchy, where these states retained a large share of their rights. These provinces, called Pays d'Etats, were Provence,

Burgundy, Languedoc, Brétagne, Navarre, Béarn, and some small districts in the south of France, and on the Spanish frontier.* In these provinces the provincial states assembled at certain fixed periods, and without the royal convocation, and after the model of the *Etats Généraux*. The subsidies which they granted to the crown, they levied on all subject to imposts according to a settled quota, and gathered them in by means of their own functionaries, charged them with debts, and instituted measures for their liquidation. 'Even the police and other branches of the civil Administration were within the jurisdiction of the states, and usually the king on the acquisition of these provinces explicitly bound himself to act in all affairs as their lord paramount, with the concurrence only of the states, and especially to change nothing in the existing laws, and in the forms of judicature and civil administration, without their express consent.†

"It is well known that in France, since the commencement of the seventeenth century, the same phenomenon occurred, which with the exception of England, took place in every other European country. Monarchical authority had obtained the preponderance; the power of the states was cramped, or thrown into the back ground; and the *Etats-Généraux*, after having been assembled for the last time at Blois, in the year 1614, were never again convoked. Even the provincial states were paralysed in their action; many of them were entirely suppressed; and others by a prudent spirit of accommodation, saved their existence and their rights. From this period the crown levied imposts in all those districts, which had lost their provincial states, without the consent of those subject to taxation. Yet an accurate enquiry instituted by the author of the above-cited work,‡ shows that the *Pays d'Etats*, relatively to their power, contributed, though under other denominations, at least as much to the public burthens, as those provinces that were taxed by the court. Hence we may deduce the inference that the result of this arbitrary taxation was on the whole the same, as if these provinces had raised and apportioned their own taxes.

"That this extinction, or repression of the states-constitution was a misfortune;—that this work of destruction was a blunder and an error, we certainly would be the last to call in question. The consequences of such a suppression were manifest, when the court took steps to convoke the states-general. The hundred and seventy-five years' desuetude, into which this institution had fallen, had produced on the part of government an utter ignorance of par-

* *Frauche Comté* was also included among these.

† See the German work entitled "History of the Political Revolution in France under King Lewis XVI."

‡ *History of French Revolution*, vol. i. p. 91-2.

liamentary forms and deliberations, which was now to receive a fearful and bitter chastisement. It is equally beyond a question, that that vertigo which seized on the whole nation, and drove it into the abyss, when after so long an interval the question as to the convocation of the *Etats Generaux* was agitated, was the effect of the suspension of the constitutional functions of the 'states.' But this was not a mere French, but an European calamity—an abuse, but no material distress, least of all one, which would have occasioned the subversion of the state. Moreover, it is to be observed, that it was not the adherence of the government to that abuse, but precisely the abandonment of it, which brought about the outbreak of the Revolution. But the question immediately before us is, whether the power of the French kings at the period when Lewis the Sixteenth mounted the throne, was theoretically and practically a despotism, whose intolerable weight necessarily produced the overthrow of the constitution. In direct variance with such a view, history shows us, that in despite of this non-convocation of the *Etats-Generaux*, the old idea that the king in the exercise of his authority, was bound to the inviolate maintenance of the rights of his subjects, subsisted in France, though under a new and fantastic form, yet with much more vigour and vivacity, than in many other countries."—p. 423-5.

We regret that want of space prevents us from rendering full justice to these remarkable volumes, which, besides the purely didactic articles, contain some essays of an historical kind, such as the history of Illuminism and Carbonarism, and a biographical sketch of the late emperor, Francis II., which are well deserving of attention.

Whoever wishes to know the true spirit and character of political liberalism, should study it in the writings of a master, who has had ample opportunities for the execution of his task. Surely this study on the part of British Catholics, is no work of supererogation. The recent persecution, or attempt at persecution of our Church, has sprung not from the vulgar protestant bigotry, not from the anti-Christian radicalism (though these have been agents and allies in the work), but from that despotic liberalism, which will tolerate no authority external to itself—or what it calls an *imperium in imperio*. If it could once succeed in suspending what it calls "the Synodical action of our Church" in these realms—in prohibiting our ecclesiastical councils, and suppressing our religious orders, it would soon lay its irreverent hands on our municipal corporations, and establish its cherished system of administrative centralization. This is a warning which all enlightened protestants should take to heart.

J. B. Robertson (Prof)

ART. IV.—*Christianity in Ceylon. Its Introduction and Progress under the Portuguese, the Dutch, the British, and American Missions.*
By Sir JAMES EMERSON TENNENT, K.C.S., L.L.D., &c. John Murray, London.

“FOR some years past,” says Sir Emerson Tennent, in his Introduction, “I have been engaged in the preparation of a work on Ceylon; its history, its topography, its capabilities, its productions, its government, its present condition, and its future prospects, as a colony of the Crown.” This, he goes on to say, will account for a good deal that may seem abrupt or obscure in the present chapters, as they were intended as part of a larger work. To our minds it will account for a good deal more. We must say, that it was with the greatest surprise that we heard Sir Emerson had written a book on Christianity in Ceylon. We knew him indeed to be a scholar, a man of genius and thought, and one who, finding himself in so interesting a colony, would be sure to make himself master of a great deal of information respecting it. Had he written on any one of the subjects he enumerates,—the history of the island, its topography, its capabilities, its productions, its present or possible condition as a colony of the Crown,—nothing would have seemed to us more natural. But we never did expect him to choose the present condition and future prospects of the Christian Church there. It never struck us that a missionary spirit was his hobby. But now we see how it is. Sir Emerson was going to publish a large work, and tell us all about Ceylon and the Singhalese. All people except the costermongers, as Mr. Mayhew tells us, have some religion. Religion being one of the little accidentals of our existence here below, the work would have been incomplete without some notice of it. Besides, even statesmen have discovered, like Gibbon’s philosophers, that religions, if not true, are at least useful; they civilize mankind, and keep them in order. Religion is a sort of spiritual police,

“Emollit mores nec sinit esse feros.”

It must not, therefore, be overlooked by the politician. It

is then, with reason, that Sir Emerson says, that in such a work as he proposed, "Christianity necessarily occupied a prominent place." And thus the present chapters swelled in bulk until they were of sufficient size to form a separate work, under the title of "Christianity in Ceylon."

We do not wish to be uncharitable towards Sir Emerson, but we really do desiderate in his book something indicative of a real interest in the progress of Christianity, as the means not merely of making men good citizens and respectable members of society, but of saving their souls. He tells us in his Preface, that he hopes that his work "will be read with interest by all who look on missionary labour not merely in its loftier capacity, as the disseminator of immortal truth, but who regard it in its incidental influence as the great pioneer of civilization, and the most powerful agent for the diffusion of intellectual and moral enlightenment." There are indeed a decent number of passages which allude to the fact that Christianity has another object besides that of civilizing and improving the state of a country. Desirable, indeed, as it may be, that the gardens of the Singhalese should be enlarged, their dwellings embellished, cultivation extended, and new roads opened, as we are told is the case, (p. 324,) in the neighbourhood of every missionary station, yet the eye of the Christian missionary rests with far greater pleasure on the humble souls, who in the midst, it may be, of their ignorance and uncivilization, are yet in the way, as he hopes, of being saved. In *his* mind, education and civilization are important, as a means made use of to make men Christians. The statesman seems ever haunted with the idea that Christianity is the means to them.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, the book may be read with interest. There is a good deal of information in it. And one test of its general accuracy is, that the mis-statements of one place are corrected by another. However strangely perverted the view which the author takes of certain facts, yet he has had the good sense to give the facts and the perversion separately; so that we can take the one without accepting the other. Indeed, with respect to the latter, as we shall hereafter have occasion to point out, we could not have a more complete refutation than is afforded in the work itself.

It is divided into six chapters. The first gives an

account of the introduction of Christianity into Ceylon, and its progress under the Portuguese, *i. e.*, from A. D., 1505 to 1638. The second is the Dutch period, from 1638 till Ceylon became a British possession, in 1802. The third chapter gives an account of what has been done by different missionary societies under the British Government. In the fourth and fifth chapters, we have a short account of Brahminism and Buddhism respectively. And the sixth chapter is entitled, "Moral and Social character of the Singhalese," but it is chiefly taken up with the present state of the Protestant missions there, and their prospects for the future. Our present object is, to give an account from the work itself of the progress of Catholicism in Ceylon, and to show the comparative results which have followed from the attempts of Protestant missionaries to establish their religion.

There is but little certain information respecting the first introduction of Christianity into the island in the Apostolic and the Middle Ages. But Sir Emerson remarks, that before the arrival of the Portuguese, Christianity had from one cause or another almost disappeared from Ceylon, and they found the doctrines of Brahma and Buddhu the prevailing religions respectively of the Tamils in the north, and of the Singhalese throughout the rest of the island. The progress of Christianity under the Portuguese is certainly most remarkable. Sir Emerson himself tells us, that the Catholic clergy "succeeded in an incredibly short space of time in effecting multitudinous conversions" among the Singhalese of the south. With regard to the north, he says :

"In point of time, the conversion of the Singhalese Buddhists to Christianity, preceded by several years the earliest attempt to reclaim the Tamils in Ceylon from the superstition of Brahma. The Portuguese got possession of Colombo in 1505, but it was not till 1548 that they obtained such a footing in the northern province as to enable their missionaries to commence their labours with security amongst the natives of Jaffna. Immediately after constructing the fort of Colombo, the adjoining districts were erected into a Bishopric, and under the directions of the new prelate, Christianity was speedily proclaimed throughout the Singhalese districts ; but it was not till A. D. 1544 that it was first preached to the Tamils of the north by the 'Apostle of India,' S. Francis Xavier. He was invited from Madura by the Parawas, or Fisher caste, who had established themselves around the pearl fishery of

Manaar, of whom he baptized from *six to seven hundred*. But almost immediately after, they were cut to pieces by the Rajah of Jaffna, who was incensed at their apostacy. His efforts to extirpate Christianity from his dominions, were, however, utterly futile; the influence of the Portuguese and their priests was too powerful to be long resisted; his own sons and relations became converts, and flying from Ceylon, they placed themselves under the protection of the Viceroy of Goa."—pp. 9, 11.

The effect of this was, that the power of the Portuguese was so much increased, that at last the Rajah was in fear for himself, and made overtures to Xavier, professing his readiness to become a Christian. First an alliance was made, and at last he was expelled from the island, and his kingdom was incorporated with the Portuguese dominions.

"The whole extent of the peninsula was thus brought by them under the authority of the Church. It was divided into parishes, each of which was provided with a chapel and a school-house, and where required, a glebe for the residence of the Franciscan Priest who was to officiate; and the ruins of these ecclesiastical edifices, even at the present day, attest the care and expenditure which must have been applied to their construction. In Jaffna itself, they had a college of Jesuits at the west end of the town, a church and a convent of S. Dominic on the east, besides a convent of S. Francis; and when the Dutch made themselves masters of the fortress, in 1658, there marched out, according to Baldæus, from forty to fifty ecclesiastics, Jesuits, Franciscans and Dominicans. *In short, there is sufficient evidence extant connected with this province of Ceylon, to justify the assertion, that within a very few years from its occupation by the Portuguese, almost the entire population of the Jaffna peninsula, including even the Brahmans themselves, had abjured their idolatry, and submitted to the ceremony of Baptism.*"—pp. 13, 14.

And the progress of conversion among the Singhalese was equally encouraging. The kings of Kandy and Cotta embraced christianity, and received baptism at the hands of the clergy of Colombo and Manaar.

"On occasion of the latter, the emperor of Cotta being baptized," says the *Rajavali*, one of the sacred historical books of Ceylon, 'many of the nobles of Cotta were baptized likewise; and from this day forward, the women of the principal people, and also the women of the low castes,—the barbers, the fishers, the hinnawas, (mat-makers,) and challias for the sake of Portuguese gold, began to turn Christians, and live with the Portuguese; and the priests of

Buddhu, who till now had remained in Cotta, retired into the interior, to Situak and Kandy.'"—p. 24.

If any more complete evidence is required of the extraordinary manner in which Christianity took root and flourished as soon as it was introduced into the island, it will be found in the fact insisted on by Sir Emerson, that "up to this day, the most distinguished families among the Singhalese chiefs bear, in addition to their own names, those of the Portuguese officers which were conferred on their ancestors at their baptism by the Roman Catholic clergy three centuries ago." (p. 28.) And that the Buddhist religion was in so weak and precarious a state that it was necessary afterwards to send to Arracan for fresh priests to support it, a measure to which the Dutch lent their approval and assistance purposely, in order to counteract and make up for Catholic influence.

The extent and rapidity with which Catholicism grew and prevailed under the Portuguese is then an undeniable fact, and one of so striking a character, that Sir Emerson conceives, as indeed every Protestant must, that it requires explanation. That Mahometanism should prevail there in the Middle Ages, so as even to extinguish Christianity, is not only a conceivable supposition, but so extremely probable in the eyes of Sir Emerson as to be taken for granted. That the Baptists, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Independents, and other denominations do not carry all before them is to him a matter of astonishment. But that Catholicism, a religion which Great Britain had rejected, and with which he himself had no sympathy, should have made such progress, and taken a strong hold on the people, is exceedingly awkward and vexatious. Without an explanation, it would not do at all to publish so unpalatable a truth.

Accordingly, he gives us various little charitable suggestions, as to the motives which the natives had, or might have had, for being converted; the Rajavali says, it was for the sake of Portuguese gold. "Those," he tells us, "who are acquainted with the Singhalese, their obsequiousness, and the pliancy with which they can accommodate themselves to the wishes and opinions of those whom it may be their interest to conciliate, will have no difficulty in comprehending the ease with which the Roman Catholic clergy, &c." (p. 9.) "The imagination of the Sing-

halese became excited by the pompous pageantry of the Roman Catholic religion," (p. 15.) "The Catholics adapted their religion to the country,—their ceremonies and processions differed only in name from those of the heathen." (p. 22.) "Their tenets and doctrines too were similar; their adhesion was the result of political conformity, not of religious conviction, and along with the profession of their new faith, they cherished a still closer attachment to the superstitions of Buddhism." He speaks, (p. 77,) of the "era of artifice and corrupt inducement practised by the early priesthood of Portugal;" and still more plainly in another passage:

"It is difficult on any other ground to account satisfactorily for the readiness with which so many thousands of the Singhalese consented, almost without solicitation, and altogether without conviction or enlightenment, to adopt a religion which was so utterly new, and whose tenets must have been so entirely unknown to them. It was, in fact, an adoption without a surrender of opinion; and if scruples were seriously felt respecting the change, they must have been speedily overcome by the prospect of personal advancement, and by the attractions of a religion which, in point of pomp and magnificence, surpassed, without materially differing from the pageantry and processions with which they were accustomed to celebrate the festivals of their own national faith."—p. 29.

Such are the private opinions of the late Colonial Secretary respecting the causes of the conversion of the Singhalese. We need nothing more for their complete refutation than to quote not the *opinions* but the *facts* which he himself furnishes. First as to the charge of the Portuguese gold. We will not insist on the interest which the sacred books would have to make out such a case, nor on the transparency of making out the women to have been bribed, when from their circumstances they would have been less exposed to such influences than the men; but we will quote one or two passages from his own book on the subject.

If the natives of Ceylon became Catholics from corrupt and sordid motives, or from the influence of authority under the Portuguese, the Dutch ought to have been equally, not to say a great deal more successful in making converts. For according to Sir Emerson they made use of these instruments to a much greater extent than their predecessors.

"Cordiner," he says, "must have been but imperfectly informed, when he states that the Portuguese compelled the natives of Ceylon to adopt the Roman Catholic religion without consulting their inclination, and that the Dutch, unlike them, had refrained from the employment of open force for the propagation of their religious faith; and Hough, in his important work on Christianity in India, has adopted his assertions without due examination. *On both points the historical evidence is at variance with these representations. I have discovered nothing in the proceedings of the Portuguese in Ceylon to justify the imputation of violence and constraint; but unfortunately as regards the Dutch Presbyterians, their own words are conclusive as to the severity of their measures, and the ill success by which they were followed.*" p: 65.

Again, in a note at the foot of page 42, he observes:

"The only writer who has ventured to do any justice to the conduct of the Portuguese in regard to religion, as compared to that of the Dutch in the same particular, is the Rev. Mr. Bissett, who, under the name of Philalethes, published in 1815, an account of Ceylon, in which he guardedly observes, that the Portuguese were more tolerant in religion than the Dutch, and the Dutch were less tolerant than they ought."

And again:

"The same fury against the Church of Rome continued at all times to inspire the policy of the Dutch in Ceylon; and their resistance to its priesthood was even more distinct and emphatic than their condemnation of the *Buddhists and Brahmans*. In 1658, a proclamation was issued forbidding on pain of death the harbouring or concealing of a Roman Catholic Priest; but such a threat was too iniquitous to be carried into execution, and the Priests continued their ministrations in defiance of the law. In 1715, a proclamation was issued prohibiting public assemblies, or private conventicles of the Roman Catholics, under heavy fines for the first and second offence, and chastisement at the discretion of the magistrate for the third. In the same year by a plakaat which was afterwards renewed from time to time, it was forbidden for a Catholic clergyman to administer baptism under any circumstances; and in 1773, the proclamation of 1658 was republished against entertaining or giving lodging to a Priest, but with no better success; for twelve years later the same sanguinary order had to be repeated by a fresh plakaat of the governor. In 1748, it was forbidden to educate a Roman Catholic for the ministry; but within three years it was found necessary to repeat the same prohibition, as well as to renew the proclamation for putting down the celebration of Mass. Notwithstanding every persecution, however, the Roman Catholic religion retained its influence, and held good its position in Ceylon.

It was openly professed by the immediate descendants of the Portuguese, who had remained in the island after its conquest by the Dutch; and in private it was equally adhered to by large bodies of the natives, both Singhalese and Tamils, *whom neither corruption nor coercion could induce to abjure it.*"—pp. 41-2.

Sir Emerson tells us the exact means of corruption that were used "to quicken their apprehension."

"With this view proclamation was publicly made that no native could aspire to the rank of Modliar, nor be even permitted to farm land or hold office under the government, who had not first undergone the ceremony of baptism, become a member of the Protestant Church and subscribed to the doctrines contained in the Helvetic confession of faith."—p. 45.

This system, we are told, had the effect of bringing many to a profession of the Dutch religion. Many of the 'Lowland Chiefs,' as well as the 'Landowners,' and those who aspired to be petty headmen and police vidahns of their villages, were prompt to show themselves qualified for office. How could it be otherwise? There ever will and must be tares growing together with the wheat. A proportion of imposters, Sir Emerson himself tells us, must be expected. Moreover, the greatest national failing of the Singhalese is a want of regard to the truth. And this leads them to have far too easy a conscience about outwardly professing one religion while they really adhere to another. Nay, they have even a theory, as Sir Emerson takes pains to shew, p. 240, for reconciling their consciences to this. But with all this, the effect of all the coercion and corruption of the Dutch was very small, according to Sir Emerson's own account. Mr. Palm, one of the Dutch Presbyterian ministers, avows that 'they designated the natives as nominal or baptized Christians, because many made a profession only from considerations of personal advantage, and that native (he should have said Dutch) Christianity throughout Ceylon was in an unsound and critical condition.' With regard, however, to the Catholics, Sir Emerson says:

"As the influence of the protestant clergy declined, that of the Roman Catholic Priesthood had risen into unexpected importance. Their worship, notwithstanding every discouragement, had maintained its hold on the natives by its gaudy ceremonial; whilst the less attractive and sterner discipline of the Dutch could only be sustained by prospects of personal advantage, or enforced by pecu-

niary fines. At Jaffna, in particular amongst the Tamils and Fisher caste along the Western coast, *its ascendancy was neither weakened by persecution not undermined by corruption.*"—p. 50.

Again he observes, p. 58 :

"It would appear that obstacles to the extension of Christianity from the influence of idolatry, were even less apprehended than the difficulties now encountered from the rising ascendancy of the Roman Catholics, *whose numbers had actually multiplied under persecution.*"

And he gives us so striking an account of the progress of Catholicism under this persecution, that at the risk of wearying our readers we shall transcribe it.

"From Kandy, where they had been alternately invited and proscribed by the kings, the Roman Catholic Priests made their way into the low country, visiting in secret their scattered flocks, and administering the sacraments in defiance of the plakaats and prohibitions of the government. Amongst the most distinguished of these preachers was Joseph Vaz, of the Oratory of St. Philippo Neri, at Goa, whose adventurous journeys and imprisonments, and his extraordinary zeal in the service of his Church, have obtained for his memory amongst the Roman Catholics of Ceylon, a veneration little short of that accorded to the name of St. Francis Xavier, in India. He prevailed on the king of Kandy, in 1694, to permit him to rebuild the Churches of the Roman Catholics, in the Bogambra suburb, which his predecessor had ordered to be destroyed ; and having been appointed by the bishop of Cochin his Vicar-general for Ceylon, he prosecuted his labours with such vigour and success, that in an incredibly short space of time he had re-established the Catholic communion in its former strongholds at Jaffna and Manaar, extended its influence in the maritime provinces, and added to the Church upwards of 30,000 converts from the heathen. Father Vaz died at Kandy, in 1711, but the impulse which his fervour and toil had communicated to the advancement of his religion, underwent no apparent diminution after his decease ; and at length the Dutch government, abandoning whatever portion of practical moderation may have characterized the earlier years of their rule, were persuaded by the protestant ministers to adopt a more active, but as it eventually proved an equally inefficient policy for the forcible suppression of Popery. The Dutch clergy and their consistory appear at all times to have been inclined to religious coercion ; but it was only when alarmed by the increasing pressure of the Roman Catholics, that the government yielded to their solicitations, and ventured to enforce the series of measures which have already been enumerated, *and which were designed not*

merely for the restraint of the Priests, but the actual extinction of the Roman Catholic religion in Ceylon. The Priests thus proscribed were however far from being silenced; they abandoned their opened residence in the territories of the Dutch, and retired to villages and towns on the Kandian frontier, whence they returned in various disguises to visit their congregations throughout the maritime districts. The proclamations of the government were either too late to be effectual, or too tyrannical to be carried into force, and in 1717, only two years after their renewed promulgation, the Roman Catholics were in possession of four hundred Churches in all parts of Ceylon, whilst the Dutch Presbyterians had barely one-fourth the number, either of congregations or converts. Other measures equally unwise and abortive followed those of 1715. Roman Catholic marriages were at first heavily taxed, and then ordered to be solemnized only by ministers of the Reformed Church, or by the officers of the court of justice; and all this proving ineffectual, their celebration by a Roman Catholic Priest was at last absolutely prohibited, and their registration declared void. Their burials were forbidden in cemeteries of their own, and extravagant fees were exacted on their interment in those attached to the protestant Churches. Roman Catholics were declared equally with heathens to be ineligible to office; and freedom was conferred upon the children of all slaves born of protestant parents, whilst those of Roman Catholics were condemned to perpetual servitude; a device so short-sighted, as to counteract the intentions of its framers by giving every slaveholder an interest in preventing the extension of Protestantism."—pp. 51-4.

And yet notwithstanding all this, their numbers, Sir Emerson tells us, increased under persecution, and not only so, but he adds:

"Whatever may have been the instrumentality resorted to by the Portuguese priesthood, and however objectionable the means adopted by them for the extension of their own form of Christianity, one fact is unquestionable, that the natives became speedily attached to their ceremonies and modes of worship, and adhered to them with remarkable tenacity for upwards of three hundred years; whilst even in the midst of their own ministrations the clergy and missionaries of the Reformed Church of Holland were overtaken by discouragement; and it is a remarkable fact, that notwithstanding the multitudinous baptisms of the hundreds of thousands of Singhalese who were enrolled by them as converts, the religion and discipline of the Dutch Presbyterians is now almost extinct amongst the natives of Ceylon."

Whatever, then, may be the private opinion of Sir Emerson on the subject, and however curious it may be to analyse the mind and thoughts of a man who within a

few pages refutes the assertions he had made, it is quite clear from his own repeated statements, that as a matter of fact, the Portuguese were successful and the Dutch were not successful in converting the Singhalese; secondly, that the means by which the former succeeded were not coercion and corruption, for they were used abundantly, and yet without success by the latter; and thirdly, that the work of the one endured under every discouragement and even severe persecution, while the little that was effected by the other fell speedily to pieces of itself.

It is not very common to find a man who is so straightforward and candid as Sir Emerson. He is too honest for himself. His facts are too much for him. He writes a book on Christianity in Ceylon, and really the result of his investigations is most unpleasant. Those who read his book will see that Catholicism immediately took root and sprung up, no one could tell how; while Protestantism, the religion of the British empire, the most enlightened religion of the greatest power in the world, could not be made to succeed. This will not do at all. At least if the facts cannot be altered they must be explained. And so he returns once more to the attack, and suggests that the conversion of the natives was hollow and insincere. The change was little else, he tells us, than one in name. The Singhalese were attracted by the gaudy ceremonial of Rome. The fact was, Sir Emerson has found it all out, there was no need for a change at all. The Catholic Church is so like Buddhism, and Buddhism so like the Catholic Church, that the natives had only half a step to take from one to the other.

"Buddhism," he says, "like the ceremonial of the Church of Rome, has to some extent its pageantry and its decorations, its festivals and its fireworks, its processions, its perfumes, its images, its exhibition of relics, its sacred vestments, and its treasures of 'barbaric pearl and gold.' It has its holy places and its pilgrimages in prosperity and in health, and its votive offerings in calamity and disease. The priests of both are devoted to celibacy and poverty, to mortification and privation. Each worship has its prostrations and its genuflections, its repetitions and invocations in an ancient, and to the multitude, in an unintelligible tongue: and the purgatory of the one has a counterpart in the transmigrations of the other. Both have their legends and their miracles, their confidence in charms, and in the assistance of guardian Saints and protectors: and in the general aspect of their outward observances, not less than

in the concurrence of many of their leading beliefs, it is with the least conceivable violence to established customs, and the slightest apparent disturbance of preconceived ideas, that the Buddhist finds himself at liberty to venture on the transition from his own faith to that of his new advisers."—p. 95. .

Here again as to his facts Sir Emerson is tolerably correct. Not only have both systems their feasts, their relics, their offerings, and their priests devoted to celibacy and poverty, not only are 'the votaries' of the one as well as the other taught to kneel down when they say their prayers, but it is true that the 'leading beliefs,' as he calls them, of the two religions coincide. Both, for instance, believe that man has a soul, that he will live in a future state, that there is not only a purgatory, but a heaven and a hell, in which men will be rewarded or punished. Not only this we say, but there are some really curious approximations to the truth, which it will be interesting and instructive to draw out. If the above passage is brought to prove that the counterfeit resembles the genuine, we easily admit so common a truism. We will even found an argument upon it, and superinduce a practical conclusion. If, on the other hand, he would insinuate that the Catholic religion itself was bent and adapted to suit the tastes and belief of the Singhalese, then why does not the Church, in pursuance of the same policy, adapt herself to the state of public opinion in the present day? Why will she be so old-fashioned? Why will she persist in retaining all her ancient mummeries in these enlightened times, and not rather suit herself to the altered circumstances of the day, to the haughty scepticism of France, or the Protestantism of England?

We will enquire then, from the materials Sir Emerson himself affords us, into the reality and sincerity of the Catholic conversions in Ceylon. He shall furnish us with the tests of true conversion, and shall himself apply them. The reality of conversions may be tried by an enquiry into their durability, into the morality of the converts, their abstaining from heathen observances and customs, their giving up their substance for the support of their new faith, and their enduring persecution. These are the very reasonable and yet searching tests, Sir Emerson speaks of in different parts of his work. First, we will quote the passage immediately following our last quotation, which a reader uninitiated into Sir Emerson's style, might fancy from a certain important little monosyllable, was intended

to be confirmatory of, instead of directly contradictory to, the genius and spirit of what had gone before.

“One remarkable circumstance, *too*, is observable in their converts, however meagre may be their acquaintance with Christianity—that the number of nominal Christians who still adhere in secret to the rites and tenets of Buddhism, is infinitely smaller amongst the Roman Catholics than amongst the professors of any other Church in Ceylon; an incident which has been ascribed to the overruling influence of the confessional, and the unintermitted control which it exerts over the feelings as well as the actions of its votaries. *In fact, if any evidence were wanting to substantiate the real ascendancy thus acquired and maintained by the Church of Rome, it would be found in the munificence with which the natives contribute habitually for its support, and the liberality which they have manifested in the erection of costly chapels and highly decorated altars for its worship. It is due likewise to its priesthood to declare that whatever may be their individual feelings towards protestantism and its agents, they have carried on their operations in Ceylon with an absence of active jealousy.....* Harvard, himself a protestant missionary, has borne his willing testimony to the sincerity and demeanour of the Roman Catholic converts, whom he describes ‘as more detached from the customs of paganism, more regular in their attendance on the religious services of Christianity, and in their general conduct more consistent with the moral precepts of the Gospel than any other religious body of any magnitude in Ceylon.’ However merited may have been this testimony of Mr. Harvard, or however truthful as regards the comparative claims of the several Christian communities at the time when it was written, the thirty years which have since elapsed have so far altered their relative aspects, that the converts of the Roman Catholic Church may fairly rest their moral reputation on their own merits, without being indebted to a comparison invidiously instituted with those of others, who in point of conduct and Christian bearing, exhibit no evidences of inferiority.”—p. 96 and 97.

And in the next page, speaking of Christianity under ‘its least purified form,’ he says:

“Even as an agent of social progress, its importance is self-apparent, and however superficial may be their religious convictions on the part of the great mass of the population, there are to be found amongst the Roman Catholic Singhalese, men whose morality is as undoubted as their attachment to the forms of their adopted religion is sincere, and whose conduct and demeanour as Christians are as consistent and becoming as those of any other sect in Ceylon.”—p. 99.

Other tests of the reality of the conversions are their

durability and standing persecution, but it is unnecessary to enlarge on these, as it has been shown from the passages already adduced, that the natives of Ceylon underwent persecution even to blood, first from the heathen, and afterwards from the Dutch and English; that their numbers actually increased under persecution, that neither coercion nor corruption could induce them to renounce their faith, and that they are now by far the greatest community of Christians in the island; while of the Dutch, he himself says, that when the English missionary bodies arrived between the years 1812 and 1818, 'the protestant form of Christianity, and certainly its purity and influence, might be considered almost extinct.' Let us however apply one more test.

"It may be taken," says Sir Emerson, "as a demonstrative evidence of a certain amount of sincerity in avowed converts, when they attest it by their willingness to contribute from their pecuniary resources to the support of the form of Christianity which they have embraced."—p. 298, note.

Such is the principle, a true and fair one, which he brings forward to prove the sincerity of some of the protestant converts. Immediately after he subjoins the minor premise.

"The Roman Catholic converts are by far the most willing to contribute from their own means to the support of their clergy and churches, and their donations for these purposes are on a scale of extreme liberality."—p. 299.

And he incidentally relates in the first chapter of his book, an extraordinary instance of this. In 1840, the British Government in Ceylon remitted the tax on fish, which amounted to about £6000 annually, a great sum to come from these poor men. The fishers however determined instead of benefitting by this themselves, to transfer the tax to the Catholic priests, by whom it has been collected, or farmed for collection, ever since. It should be mentioned that the Fisher caste were among the first to embrace Christianity, and are now almost all Catholics.

We have seen the extraordinary success of the Catholic missions of Ceylon. Let us next briefly enquire from Sir Emerson what were the results of the attempts to convert the natives to protestantism. Let us apply the tests *here*:

Some passages have already been quoted with respect to the Dutch, to show that the progress of conversion was, to use his own words, "unsatisfactory and unsound." In page 56, he gives us a quotation from the records of the Dutch Consistory at Galle, in which it is stated that the native chiefs, though they had in compliance with the wishes of Government assumed the designation of Christians, were still "incorrigible Buddhists," and it goes on, to set forth at length all the numerous practices and superstitions not only of Buddhism, but of Devil worship, which were as habitual with these 'professing Christians,' as if they had never been converted at all. Among the Tamils of Jaffna the Dutch seem to have been more successful; yet according to their own official accounts, as well as the opinions of historians of the period, they were for the most part 'merely Christians in name;' 'their profession was unsound,' and the converts themselves were "*sine Christo Christiani*," p. 65. A little further on he says:

"Even in the midst of their own ministrations, the clergy and missionaries of Holland were overtaken with discouragement, and it is a remarkable fact, that notwithstanding the multitudinous baptisms, and the hundreds of thousands of Singhalese who were enrolled by them as converts, the religion and discipline of the Dutch presbyterians is now almost extinct amongst the natives of Ceylon. Even in Jaffna, where the reception of these doctrines was all but unanimous by the Tamils, not a single congregation is now in existence of the many planted by Baldæus, and tended by the labours of Valentyn and Schwartz: and in Colombo, and throughout the maritime provinces, there are not at this moment fifty native Singhalese, even amongst the aged and infirm, who still profess the form of religion so authoritatively established and so anxiously propounded by the Dutch."—pp. 67-8.

At the end of the chapter in which this passage occurs, Sir Emerson makes some reflections on the missionary efforts of the Dutch, and concludes by saying, that 'at the close of their ministrations the clergy of Holland left behind a superstructure of Christianity, prodigious in its outward dimensions, but so internally unsound as to be distrusted even by those who had been instrumental in its erection, and so unsubstantial that it has long since disappeared, almost from the memory of the natives of Ceylon.'

Turn we next to consider the success of the mission of the Americans and the English. Of these Sir Emerson

throughout his book speaks in the very highest terms. He describes the work undertaken by each. He enumerates those who had most distinguished themselves for zeal and energy, and passes the highest encomiums on their self-devotion. Nor are we disposed to underrate the efforts they have made. We know from other sources besides Sir Emerson's book, that the missionary establishments of protestants in Ceylon are carried out on a most magnificent scale. We have seen in the men who conducted them a zeal to admire, and a devotion worthy of a better cause. No pains have been spared, that human ingenuity or worldly wisdom could devise. There has been a Paul to plant and an Apollos to water. One thing alone they had not and could not have—God to give the increase.

That such is the case is perfectly plain from Sir Emerson's own statements. "The clergy of the Church of England," he says, p. 168, "are equally (with the Wesleyans) indefatigable in their labours amongst the heathen, but although the section of the peninsular which is occupied by their mission, contains a dense population of upwards of 30,000 Tamils, the number who ordinarily attend their ministrations seldom exceeds an average of twenty individuals."

"I come now," he continues, "to the enquiry, *what has been the practical effect of this system upon the minds and morals of the Tamii natives of Ceylon?* And looking first to the declarations of the American mission as the most extensive in its operations, as well as the most comprehensive in its experience, I am bound to declare that as yet the ostensible result of their labours falls far short of the expectation which might have been formed from their magnitude and zeal."—p. 169.

After the American mission the Baptists are considered by him to rank next in their success, as well as in importance. They occupy one hundred and thirty villages, they have thirty-five schools, with an attendance of eight hundred and thirty pupils, and have fourteen missionaries, yet the number of converts whom they have admitted to communion, amount to but four hundred and fifty one. They established a printing press in Kandy in 1841. But 'the moral results,' observes Sir Emerson, 'have been limited and unsatisfactory, although industriously applied to the multiplication of the Scriptures and Scriptural tracts.' The Wesleyans have been at work there since 1814, and

are abundantly furnished with all human means for the conversion of the natives, yet the number whom they have admitted into full membership with their body, is, according to their own account, but little over a thousand. The Church of England mission has an establishment in Ceylon, which is carried on at an annual expense of £10,000, as we have been informed, to the home society. Yet a mission had been opened for years in the Kandyan province, before a single Kandyan could be got to attend. The Bishop of Calcutta visited it in 1831, and confirmed thirty-six converts; and he cautiously remarks, that he found there '*sufficient to encourage but nothing to elate them.*' 'The number of actual converts,' we are told, 'are few,' and 'the avowals of innate conviction rare.' Then as to the character of those who profess themselves converts, Sir Emerson says that 'idolatry is too often replaced by infidelity,' and that 'the missionaries themselves are fully aware of the fact, that amongst their nominal adherents there are numbers whose life and inward feelings are at variance with their seeming profession.'

This want of success, disheartening as it must be to the protestant missionaries, is not only fully admitted by Sir Emerson, who certainly would not do so unnecessarily, but it is also candidly acknowledged, as we have had opportunities of knowing, by some of the most sincere and zealous of themselves. They look upon the real number of souls saved as *very* small.

We have not now the time to follow Sir Emerson in the sketches he gives us of the Buddhist and Brahminical religions; but the history of 'Christianity in Ceylon,' and the simple statement of facts as they may be gathered from the book, is too instructive to pass over entirely without comment. Here is an instance such as we often desiderate. Protestantism in its many forms, and Catholicism in its one, tested each of them their separate strength, and vitality in Ceylon. It was a favourable field for the trial. There were two nations for them to work upon of widely dissimilar character and genius. During the space of nearly three hundred and fifty years, the government and fortunes of the island have been sufficiently varied to afford every combination of circumstances that would foster or put to trial the two religions. One exception indeed must be made, for protestantism has never once

during all this time met with anything approaching to persecution. Yet Catholicism at once took root and flourished there, while protestantism has never had more than the semblance of an existence. And what is the natural conclusion? Our Lord likens his Church to good seed, that a man sowed in his field, and which sprung up, he knew not how, and took root. But if with every natural and artificial advantage, if with light, and air, and sunshine, if with protection from cold and storm, and every facility for forcing growth, still the seed remains barren and unproductive, what can we suppose but that there is a want of vitality? And so indeed it is. Protestantism has no life in itself. It is, what its name imports, a negative religion. It may indeed take life elsewhere and graft its evil nature on another stock. But let it be sent out among the heathen to set up for itself, and on its own resources, and it fails.

Or we may view the subject in another light. Sir Emerson searches about for some sufficient reason to account for Protestantism not *taking* among the natives of Ceylon. It may perhaps be, he thinks, that preaching is not quite enough attended to, or that the intellect must be cultivated before religion can be received. Yet what an utterly insufficient account of the matter. Let a man travel through Ceylon. He comes to a protestant missionary station. It is like a little village. There is a large Church or Chapel, houses for the missionaries, schools for boys and girls, and perhaps a large College as well for native teachers, with houses for the masters. In several places a printing establishment and charitable institutions for the sick and poor. The whole is going on with the regularity of machinery, often with a good deal of energy, and at the annual cost of some thousands. He next visits the Catholic chapel, which he generally finds in the least fashionable part of the town, and sees one or two small rooms built on to it, which are, he is told, the Priest's house. The Priest is a plain simple man, with perhaps but little learning and less worldly wisdom, and his sole means for the support of himself and the expenses of the chapel, are the *half-farthings* of his poor congregation. Yet while the Baptist or Wesleyan has but few converts at all, and fewer that he can think of with any satisfaction, the Priest will tell you that he has not only a congregation of some hundreds or thousands round him, but several others in

different places at a distance, and that if there were more priests in the island, or but *one* seminary for native teachers and missionaries, they would be able to receive into the Church thousands more souls, who need more the opportunity than the disposition. How, we say again, is so great a difference to be accounted for, but that the God of nature who formed man and regulated his passions and affections to suit his external condition, made likewise the spiritual world, the system of grace and of religion, and suited it exactly to fill the cravings of our spiritual nature. The Singhalese do not feel *drawn* to Protestantism; they have no natural appetite for what it offers, and so the only way as Sir Emerson says, is by instruction. For as the intellect is cultivated, they may *learn* to want that which in their natural condition they care not for. But Catholicism they are attracted to, not as he thinks from 'its gaudy ceremonial,' but because under that outward form there is a soul and a reality which occupies the void which nature had formed in them. 'Strange as it may sound,' says Mr. Davies, a protestant missionary quoted by Sir Emerson, 'to those who have had no practical intercourse with unenlightened races, yet it is a fact, that when spoken to on the subjects of sin and salvation, of time and eternity, the attention of the Singhalese is more readily arrested, their resistance more easily subdued, than when addressed on the more ordinary topics of moral and economical instruction.' Strange indeed on protestant principles, but only natural to those of the Catholic.

'Mental debasement is,' indeed, as Sir Emerson says, 'unfavourable to the access of Christian truth,' but if we find a nation in a state of mental degradation, are we to wait till they are civilized before their conversion can be attempted? Are thousands and millions of souls to pass first into eternity without the means of grace or the hopes of salvation offered to them? Has the Maker and Redeemer of the poor provided no means by which the hearts of the ignorant and unenlightened may be reached? We doubt very much whether S. Peter and most of the Apostles were not in a state of what the world would denominate 'mental debasement,' when our Lord called them. And this may have been done purposely, in order to show us that Christianity was not like protestantism, a religion addressed to the intellect; a religion which never has and never can come home to the hearts, and alter the lives of the great

masses of the poor and ignorant, but that it is *Catholic*, a religion adapted for all ages and all countries, and all states of society; a religion that could soften the hearts and tame the passions of fierce hordes of barbarians, of Vandals and Goths, while it could at the same time overawe and keep in submission the intellect of a St. Austin and a St. Thomas.

On the whole, Sir Emerson comes to the conclusion, that the causes which prevented the conversion of the natives of Ceylon are twofold; first, the firm hold which their old superstitions still have on them; and secondly, the excessive apathy which they display, and which he looks upon as a greater obstacle than any that had to be contended against by the apostles themselves. However this may be, there is no doubt that the main difficulties are rightly stated by him. And how are they to be met? Protestantism has no weapons keen enough for the contest. Such obstacles as these can be overcome by nothing less than supernatural means. A few words on this subject may serve to put in a clearer point of view the weakness of Protestantism, and the strength of Catholicism, in converting the heathen, and shall conclude our present remarks.

When, therefore, Sir Emerson complains, as he repeatedly does, of 'the habitual apathy' 'and listless indifference to all religions' displayed by the Singhalese, we should like him to tell us how it is that this difficulty, great as it confessedly is, was overcome by the Catholic missionaries? Sir Emerson has not answered this question, which might, and which ought to have occurred to him. But the facts he has furnished us with, like the separate pieces of a puzzle, have only to be put together and the answer will come out of itself. First, the Singhalese are, he tells us, naturally shrewd and keen, and of very acute judgment. The Portuguese arrive, and having made themselves masters of a great part of the country, their first care is to bring missionaries and to plant the Church. Without persecuting the heathen religion of the island, they do all they can to discountenance it, as what is dangerous to the souls of men. The natives find that missionaries preaching the same doctrine, are going about on the continent of India, and they hear that they are men of extraordinary mortification of life, whose zeal is such, that labours and toils are as nothing to them. Afterwards

the Dutch come, and by a most flagrant act of perfidy, obtain a footing in the island (p. 39). Their first care is not to convert the heathen, but against the Catholics, to persecute and insult them. They see the Catholic converts bearing willingly loss of goods, and even of life for the sake of their religion. On the other hand they observe 'the licentious and offensive lives of the (Dutch) Europeans themselves; who encourage the natives in debauchery, and show them an example in the practice of every vice' (p. 57), as one of their own body complains. Moreover, they see the Dutch assisting the Buddhists to send one if not two embassies to a distance in order to revive their religion. The next phase of protestantism is under the British, who come without any missionaries or religion at all; who, provided they may be allowed to take possession of Ceylon, *guaranteed to the Singhalese by an express stipulation, the maintenance of their religion; whose soldiers mount guard daily over the tomb of Buddha; a part of whose revenue is paid annually for the performance of Buddhist ceremonies and devil worship; and one of whose first Governors took part in a Buddhist procession.* Then the British missionaries come over accompanied by 'their amiable ladies,' and appearing in the light of kind, charitable, and amiable men themselves; but they see in them nothing heroic, nothing supernatural, nothing of that austere self-denial that impresses on us the fact, whether we will or no, that here are men living not for this world, but for that which is unseen. Looking at all this, what is more easy and natural, than that the Singhalese, not being prejudiced by preconceived notions, should see in the one, messengers of God, to tell them of another world, while in the others, living as they did ordinary lives, and appearing in the light of benevolent ladies and gentlemen, respectable members of society, they saw nothing of a sufficiently startling character to rouse them from that apathy and indifference of which Sir Emerson complains.

A remarkable illustration of this view is afforded by Sir Emerson himself, in the account he gives us of a Mr. Daniel, a Baptist missionary. Mr. Daniel lived for some time in the capital of the island, and laboured among the natives in the ordinary way. Afterwards he met with some trials and lost his wife, and 'the bereaved old man,' we are told, 'as if nerved for bolder exertion by these disasters, shortly after changed the scene of his labours from

the civilization of the capital to the solitude of the forest.' For two years he employed himself in going about from village to village, preaching and instructing, and enduring many hardships, toils, and discouragements. And what was the result? The attention of the natives was roused. They began to talk of Mr. Daniel with curiosity. Afterwards they not only thought of him with interest, but spoke of him with respect and admiration, and he came at length to be looked up to and to gain an influence among them such as no other protestant missionary, that we have heard of has ever enjoyed. We have heard of a thoughtful Singhalese, though one that had no love for anything Catholic, who expressed his belief that if the Protestant ministers were unmarried, and lived more like Mr. Daniel, the effects of their ministrations among the heathen would be much greater. Sir Emerson deploras indeed the small results of his great labours, and Mr. Daniel candidly acknowledges with grief that 'success was at present denied them,' but we venture to affirm that had the truth of his doctrines been equal to his zeal in propagating them, it would not have been so.

This then, we take it, is one principle that must ever be kept in view, in attempting to convert the heathen; viz. that the only way of meeting apathy and indifference is by devotion and self-sacrifice. It is not reasonable to expect that men should be induced to leave their old ways, unless for some cause of a sufficiently stirring character. And it is of no use for men who come with no great pretensions, who are living like the rest of mankind, and making themselves at home in the world, to proclaim to others the necessity of renouncing it. Even in the first ages of the Church, when she was endowed with some special gifts for the conversion of the heathen, the apostles did not come before the world but as men who in their own persons shewed forth the truth of the doctrine they preached, and renounced all that could comfort and delight them in this world, because they looked forward to the happiness of the next.

The other cause to which Sir Emerson attributes the few conversions made by the protestants, is the firm hold which their present superstitions have on them. Though indeed this has not prevented the Catholic missionaries from succeeding, as we have already seen, yet it is regarded by him as an insurmountable barrier to the progress

of Christianity, With regard to Brahminism, he says, that it is 'manifestly idle to suppose that the overthrow of that gigantic imposture can be ever effectually achieved till the foundations of the system have been shaken by the exposure of its imaginary science, and the explosion of its false and fanciful philosophy' (p. 139). And in another place (p. 173), he speaks of 'the first grand object' being 'to shake the confidence of the people in their own superstitions,' and speaks elsewhere (p. 196), of the truth having been 'successful' to a certain extent, because it had shaken the confidence of the people in their national faith, though it had not led them to embrace any form of Christianity. Now in all this we recognize, what we humbly conceive to be, a very false principle, viz. that the process of rejecting error is a previous and separate one to that of embracing truth, in other words, that infidelity is a step towards Christianity. Whereas we are fully convinced that no form of belief, however superstitious and degrading, which men hold in ignorance and sincerity, is so dangerous to the soul, or so displeasing in the sight of God, as infidelity, and that viewed as a state of mind, no soil is so barren, none so unhopeful from which to expect good, as one of unbelief.

And the reason is plain. Good has an existence of its own, evil has none; it is only an absence or a perverted condition of good. Hence the very worst superstitions have in them an element of good by which they live. The good, however small, is the essence of their existence. The evil, however great, is accidental. But root out all belief, and you also take away life. You have nothing left but a negative state of mind. You cannot now any longer *graft*, but must begin from the seed; nay, even the soil must be prepared. You must not only implant faith, but likewise that habit of mind in which alone faith lives and thrives.

When the Pagans were converted in the times of the Roman empire, the Christians did not destroy their temples, but cleansed them, and adapted them to their own use. And what was done with the material structures was but a type of the way in which they treated the spiritual ones. It is used as a reproach against the Catholic Church, that so many of her usages and ceremonies were borrowed from the Pagans, that so many of her doctrines were grafted on those of the Heathen. And the fact is

true, though the reproach is undeserved. We read in the Acts of the Apostles of an instance in which St. Paul himself made use of the superstitious belief of the people, to graft on it the true doctrine. And in modern times the Jesuits, the great apostles of conversion among the Heathen, have done the same, though it *may* perhaps be granted to Sir Emerson, that in individual instances they have gone somewhat too far. On the other hand, we do not know of a single instance of a nation converted first to no belief, and then to the true one. Among the natives of Ceylon, indeed, the Protestant missionaries, if they have followed out this system, have certainly succeeded in conducting their converts to the first stage. But we attribute this not so much, we confess, to the *manner* in which conversion has been attempted, as to the want of some plain and definite teaching to offer to their belief, to the want of something that shall awaken their spiritual natures, and go home to their hearts. In the multitude of sects, and the different doctrines that are set before them, 'the Singhalese,' Sir Emerson acknowledges, 'can discover little more than that they are offered something still doubtful and unsettled, in exchange for which they are pressed to surrender their ancient superstitions.' 'The choice of sects,' he says again, 'leads to utter bewilderment.' 'Idolatry is too often replaced by infidelity,' p. 235. 'Instances are not rare,' he says in another place, p. 277, 'in which the scholars reared by these devout and untiring men, so far from returning their care by an alliance with their objects, have proved, by their scepticism and infidelity, more dangerous enemies to the truth than even heathenism itself.' It ought, indeed, to be an instructive lesson to the Protestants, that some of their most highly educated converts in Ceylon have become Catholics, while others have become Infidels.

This, then, is the second principle that we would lay down in the conversion of the Heathen, that in contradistinction to Sir Emerson's plan, their present belief and superstition should be made use of as the groundwork of the truth. No doubt this is more or less practicable in different cases; and 'the process,' as he says, 'must be adjusted to the subject.' In the case of Ceylon there are extraordinary advantages for carrying out this system. In many respects there is in the Buddhist religion a very close resemblance to the truth. Sir Emerson has made

this the ground of his uncharitable suggestion, that the natives found Catholic doctrines and ceremonies so similar to their own, that they did not need to make a change except in name. We wish this were so. But we fear that the natives will always find a great deal to change both in heart and belief, in becoming Catholics. We admit, however, that there is, from whatever source derived, a great deal in the popular belief, as well as in the doctrines of Buddhism, that contains at least the essence and germ of the truth, and requires not so much to be unlearned as to be purified, explained, brought out, and elevated. We will give some examples.

Sir Emerson tells us that "the doctrines of Buddha recognize the full eligibility of every individual born into the world for the attainment of the highest degrees of intellectual perfection and ultimate bliss." They recognize, too, the doctrine that man is here in a state of probation, and that, according to his conduct here, he will pass into a more or less happy state of existence. As to the next world, they "believe in the existence of lokas, or heavens, each differing in glory, and serving as the temporary residences of demigods and divinities, as well as of men whose etherialization is but inchoate, and who have yet to revisit the earth in future births, and acquire, in future transmigrations, their complete attainment of Nirwana. They believe, likewise, in the existence of hells, which are the abodes of demons, or tormentors, and in which the wicked undergo a purgatorial imprisonment preparatory to an extended probation upon earth. Here their torments are in proportion to their crimes, and although not eternal, their duration extends almost to the infinitude of eternity; those who have been guilty of the deadliest sins of parricide, sacrilege, and defiance of the faith, being doomed to the endurance of excruciating deaths, followed by instant revival, and a repetition of their tortures without mitigation, and apparently without end."—pp. 212-13.

The *Nirwana* he speaks of has given occasion to much controversy as to whether the Buddhists recognize the immortality of the soul, as some take it to mean *extinction* or *annihilation*. For ourselves we incline to the belief that it means absorption into the Divine essence. Here indeed they go wrong, in making the highest bliss of heaven to involve the loss of personal existence. But this is the

less surprising, as even the Supreme Being is, in their belief, almost, perhaps entirely, without personality. God is regarded by them as too far off to take interest in the things of the world. Men are ruled by immutable laws of good and evil, or as it is sometimes expressed by fate, their good and bad actions having certain moral consequences attending them. Works of kindness and charity gain merit, and procure reward. Bad actions, as they regard them—for their code of morality is, *in some points*, exceedingly loose—deserve, and will inevitably meet with punishment. To a certain extent, indeed, they seem to believe that their actions are ruled by fate; but if only they could be taught that God had a personal existence, and interfered in the affairs of men, which miracles would surely impress upon them, they might easily be led to believe that their actions depend, not on the immutable decrees of fate, but on the gift of God's grace, and the doctrine of atonement, which they appear to have no notion about, would not then seem so unnatural to them.

Their veneration for sanctity, and their idea of the priesthood as those who are given up to a holy life, is very remarkable. We will quote once more.

“Buddhism accords honour to all in proportion to their approaches towards absolute wisdom, and the extinction of all the desires and passions of humanity; and as the realization of this perfection is regarded as almost hopeless in a life devoted to secular cares, the priests of Buddha, on assuming their robe and tonsure, forswear all earthly occupations, subsist on alms, not in money, but in food, devote themselves to meditation and self-denial, and being thus proclaimed and recognized as the most successful aspirants to Nirwana, they claim the homage of ordinary mortals, acknowledge no superior upon earth, and withhold even the tribute of a salutation from all except the members of their own religious order.”—p. 216.

As to outward ceremonies and religious usages, we have already quoted a passage in which Sir Emerson insists on the close similarity between them and those of the Catholic Church. But we have no space to pursue this very interesting subject further, or to give more than the merest outline of the features of Buddhism; and we are the less inclined to take notice of these lesser points of similarity, because these are properly viewed by them, not as the essentials, but only the accidentals of religion.

“Salvation,” says Colonel Sykes, speaking of Buddhism, “is made dependent, not upon the practice of idle ceremonies, the repeating of prayers, or of hymns, or invocations to pretended gods, but upon moral qualifications, which constitute individual and social happiness here, and ensure it hereafter.”—p. 221.

And Sir Emerson tells us, that when Buddhism was failing, and an attempt was made to arouse the attention, and excite the enthusiasm of the Buddhists by the adoption of ceremonies and processions, these, so far from being all-powerful with the people, were understood by them to be the innovations of priestcraft, or at least to have less of a religious than a secular character.

Without attempting to draw out a complete account of so difficult and obscure a subject as Buddhism, enough has been said to show the thoughtful reader that in the present superstitious and popular belief of the Singhalese, there is a most excellent soil on which to plant the truth. Of the two it is much easier, we conceive, to learn than to unlearn. To get rid of old associations, most especially in the case of the ignorant and unintellectual, is most difficult. To raise up new associations on the foundation of the old is comparatively easy. Looking then at the matter in a human point of view, we cannot but regard it as so much labour saved, and progress gained, that such a foundation already exists. True it is that it is not from human means, but from the grace of God, through human means, that success must be expected. Yet the present condition, no less than the past history of Ceylon, shew us, we say it gratefully, and yet mournfully, that in this case God has been waiting for man, and not man for God.

Rev. J. G. Wenham (Worthington)

ART V.—*A History of the Romans under the Empire.* By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D. Vols. 1 and 2. London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1850.

THERE are few periods of history more instructive than the last century of the Roman Republic. It was a century of reforms, both judicial and political. It

was a period of struggling principles: democracy or oligarchy, Rome or Italy, being the adverse war-cries. It was a century of conspiracies and revolutions: freedom had degenerated into licentiousness; the former tillers of the soil had gone to reap the harvest of war, or, returning home, swelled the ranks of idlers and rioters in the forum of Rome. The nation had grown out of its old habits, and yet knew not how to adapt itself to new practices. The Gracchi attempted to solve the problem by law, and perished. The sword was equally unsuccessful. Tumult followed tumult, war succeeded war: yet matters had only become more entangled. The Italians, indeed, had been satisfied or crushed; but even in the calmer interval between Catiline's death and the first Triumvirate, men were accustomed to see the law set at nought even by those that were its official guardians; and set at nought with impunity: what they thus learned to despise, they scrupled not to violate. Civil dissention with its innumerable private wrongs and public disasters, continually increased, until open hostilities shook the whole empire; and oligarchy and democracy alike perished, and Cato, Pompey, Cæsar, Brutus, Antony, added each his bloody death to tell the varying but relentless nature of the strife, and to prepare the way for that imperial despotism that seemed the only refuge from anarchy, and the only means of scaring back from Italy the vultures of Germany and Sarmatia.

Such is but the opening of the period which Mr. Merivale has undertaken to delineate. His object is to trace out the history of Rome from, what is generally termed, the first Triumvirate, to the age of Constantine. At present, however, his history terminates with the death of Julius Cæsar.

It is to be regretted that he has not distinctly shewn the nature of his authorities. An ordinary reader, seeing references constantly made, for more than a hundred pages, to Appian and Dion, and sometimes even to Orosius, would, perhaps, be inclined to take these writers for contemporary witnesses, instead of being compilers that lived two, or even six, centuries after the events which they narrated.

Of the five hundred pages of the first volume, about two hundred are filled with introductory topics. Upon only one or two of these can we pause to descant;—selected from among many others which betray some want of

caution, and yet a decision of tone, as strongly marked as if no solid reason for hesitation could possibly exist. In one of these passages, for instance, Mr. Merivale concludes in reference to the Italian war, that "the result of the contest was every way worthy of their (the Romans') military and political reputation. Successful every where in the field, they paused at the moment of victory, and to each nation, as it resigned its claims, presented the boon of citizenship as a free gift. The whole of Italy received the full franchise of the city." (p. 15.)

Now whatever may have been the military, where was the political, ability in all this? The Italians had long sought by legal means for the freedom of the city. They became, at last, impatient, and flew to arms. Rome for a time seemed tottering, but, finally, prevailed; and now granted what it had before refused. Where is there even ordinary policy in such conduct? Why not grant peaceably if the demand be just? Why grant at all if the demand be unjust?

In the second passage referred to we are told, that the advocates of "the restoration of the tribunitian prerogatives, and the *Judicia*," were "on the side of justice and substantial power." (pp. 66-7.) Is this so evident that it may be thus broadly stated?

Sylla's laws had stripped the tribunes of the privilege of proposing any bill, or of addressing the people upon any subject. Now what necessity of the state demanded a restoration of what had thus been taken away? The tribunes had acquired the root of their formidable power, their personal inviolability, for the protection of the "Plebs." That Plebs had now for centuries enjoyed the full privilege of citizenship, and free admission to the highest offices: their old protectors were no longer needed as protectors. Were they needed for the exercise of the *Veto*? The laws of Sylla had retained it.

In that age of faction, it is true, the full power of the tribunes in the hands of incorruptible men, would be of the highest benefit. Yet where were such to be found? Integrity was a virtue of the rarest growth; rarer than even in the days of Jugurtha. If, however, incorruptible men abounded, they could no longer use their powers with security: the inviolability of the tribune's character was all but lost: his person was still legally, but not practically, sacred. So Octavius found when he resisted Sempronius

Gracchus ; so Saturninus found when he poured out his blood beneath the Capitol ; so the younger Drusus found when the assassin's knife struck him in the crowd of his friends ; so Publius Sulpicius, when his head (despite of his 3000 hired gladiators) was cut off, and carried upon a pole in triumph. With such dangers and so little security, and this in an age notorious for bribery and open violence and bloodshed, the tribunes would either be silenced, or become the tools of factious men ; or else they, themselves, like Clodius, would become the leaders of factions. There are grave reasons, then, for supposing that the restoration of the contested privileges would neither be on the side of justice nor expediency. If there are grave reasons on the opposite side of the question, still the reverse should not be ignored as if it did not exist.

To hasten then to the formation of the first Triumvirate. Crassus and Pompey were, at that time, the leading men in the state ; but were at variance with a majority in the Senate, and with one another. Cæsar's influence lay principally in his popularity. Being an avowed admirer of Marius, he found it his interest to escape the wrath of the Senate, by bringing about a reconciliation between Pompey and Crassus. On this occasion all three pledged themselves to support one another, and agreed that, if any one of them disliked any measure, they should all three combine with the whole weight of their influence to crush it. It was evident that few measures could pass when opposed by men of such wealth, station, and popularity : they would thus become the virtual rulers of the state, and the dispensers of its offices and dignities. In this manner, without confusion, and, for a time, almost unobserved, they planned and completed a signal revolution. Such a triumvirate Marius had attempted to form with less craft and greater violence. His rash attempt ended in speedy confusion ; for his own safety he was obliged to turn upon Glaucia and Saturninus, his infamous associates. The triumvirate of Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus, had this failure as a beacon-light before it ; and, therefore, avoided the rock upon which Marius had struck. Yet, when they had thus far succeeded, what was there to bind together men so devoid of real principle, so opposite in character and views of policy, and so entirely bent, each in his own way, upon his own aggrandizement ? It was evident that disunion would soon appear ; and that a struggle, perhaps

a civil war, would almost certainly be the result. So, indeed, it happened; but, at present, each was too much engrossed with his own immediate object to trouble himself about ulterior views. Crassus thirsted still for gold; and in the pursuit of his darling vice was slain, and had the molten gold, it is said, poured down his throat in bitter mockery. Pompey wished to enjoy at Rome the fame which he had won in his wars against Mithridates, and his allies; and to enjoy, it would seem, his peculiar privilege of displaying himself at the public games in his triumphal robes. Cæsar longed for power; to be the first man, perhaps the king, of Rome. But a little while previously, when on his way to Spain, some one remarked to him, that even in the country through which they were passing, there seemed to be factions and struggles for power. Cæsar's answer betrayed his inmost soul: "Yes," he said, "and, for my part, I would rather be the first man here, than the second at Rome."

This reply, which Merivale has omitted to notice, completes the evidence furnished by Cæsar's own actions: his great object was to rule, to "be the first man" wherever he was. For this he had courted popularity when he brought before the eyes of the people the bust and the trophies of Marius. For this, in defiance of the law, he had, when Ædile and assistant to the Prætor, prosecuted the executioners employed in Sylla's proscriptions. For this it was, no less than for his own infamous pleasures, that he had contracted debts to such an enormous amount, that, as he himself is said to have declared, the gift of more than £1,000,000 sterling, would leave him still without a farthing. For this power he had braved the hostility of most of the senators. For this he had persuaded Pompey and Crassus to forget their enmity, and join with him against the senate. For this he was, on the one hand, passing agrarian laws to gratify many thousands of the people with portions of land at Capua, and other parts of Italy; while on the other, having obtained the government of Gaul for five years, and having thus a prospect of returning with fame, wealth, and a veteran army, he cared little that his union with Pompey and Crassus was now perceived by all, and that, instead of being received with the usual cheers, he was now every where ironically greeted with the official title of triumvir: he looked into the future, and saw how easily the spectacle of a triumph, the passing

of fresh agrarian laws, a few banquets for the populace, and an open, frank, and generous bearing, would turn their irony into enthusiastic shouts. For these means of becoming the ruler of Rome, he looked to Gaul.

This country possessed no attraction for either Crassus or Pompey. Heedless of Sylla's warning to "beware of the young trifler," they secured for him four legions, and the command of Gaul for five years, and exulted that the richest provinces, those of the east and south, were exclusively theirs.

Cæsar's operations in his new province seem to require some explanation of the state of the Gaulish population. To this task, accordingly, Mr. Merivale now addresses himself: but not with that full, pregnant, brevity with which alone such subjects should be handled. The fondness of the Gaulish chiefs for display, as shewn in their armlets, bracelets, collars, and sometimes breastplates, of solid gold, and in garments dyed of various colours, and strewn with flowers, and variegated with gold: their numerous clans of men little better, as Cæsar remarks, than slaves, and having no share in the government, indeed scarcely a will of their own; their boastful exultation in the hour of triumph, their depression in adversity; their return from battle singing their hymn of victory, with spoils reeking with blood borne before them, and with the heads of their enemies dangling at their bridles and soon to be set up on poles before the gates of the town, or the entrance to their own houses; their round built houses made of planks and hurdles and high-pitched roofs; their traffic in British tin, their exports of bacon and military cloaks into Italy; these and other similar particulars that give a real insight into the life of the Gauls are almost all omitted.

Even the account of the Druids is incomplete: nothing is said of the apparently different, yet really similar, accounts of Cæsar on the one hand, and Strabo and Diodorus Siculus on the other; nothing of the immunities of the Druids as a distinct and numerous class. With regard to their influence in all matters of every-day life, an insinuation is loosely made that "the councils and institutions of the Gallic nations were more independent of Druidical influence," but that it "exerted a vigorous ascendancy over the lower classes," (p. 261) and remote localities, though Cæsar expressly states that the Druids

were the national lawgivers and arbiters, and that all men without exception, whether in a private or public station, were compelled to obey their decisions, and that they no less than the nobles ("equites") existed in every part of Gaul. Even when Mr. Merivale speaks of their holding "the great religious assembly of the whole of Gaul," the expression is vague, and strictly speaking erroneous: it was an assembly for legal, no less than for purely religious, purposes. The following is Cæsar's statement: "At a certain time of the year, these (Druids) take up their abode in a consecrated spot on the borders of the Carnuti. To this place those that are at variance resort from every part of the country, and submit to their judgments and decisions." (vi. 13.)

Other inaccuracies with regard to Gaulish manners and customs are not unfrequent: Mr. Merivale declares, for instance, that "by the side of this Oriental theism there existed another system, much less distinctive in its character, an elemental worship of the grossest kind, in which the objects of nature were identified with the memory of deceased heroes, and the sun and the stars, the thunder and the whirlwind, were worshipped as the visible representatives of superior beings. The Roman sceptic was surprised to find the barbarians adoring, as he said, the same dignities whom his own critical acuteness had rejected." (p. 260.)

The authorities quoted for this passage are Cæsar and the poet Lucan. The latter, in a grave enquiry of this nature, we might dispense with; yet neither he nor Cæsar speak of the sun and stars as being worshipped "as the visible representatives of superior beings. Nor in the passages referred to, do these writers mention, as an unguarded reader might suppose, that they had discovered the folly of the Roman Mythology.

Another inaccuracy of a similar character is the description of "the Gauls crouching in abject terror before an enemy (the Germans,) whom they dared not encounter." It has, of late, been much the fashion in the literary world, to disparage every other race, in order to extol the Germans. That the Gauls might have crouched for a time after a signal defeat and great slaughter, is no wonder, has happened frequently to the German races; but to say that they dared not encounter them, is an assertion very far from the truth. Even when the German chief

Ariovistus, and two of the more powerful of the Gallic tribes had united against the Ædui, the latter immediately took the field, and, though defeated, ceased not the conflict until the cavalry, the flower of their armies, and their chiefs of every class, had been almost totally cut off. The Helvetians were a Gallic tribe, and so far from crouching with fear before the Germans, they made frequent incursions into their territories. The Belgæ were, probably, Gauls, or Celts, as Mr. Merivale himself maintains, and they, too, were incessantly at war with their neighbours, the Germans. Indeed, had they not been of quite a warlike character, most remote from fear, how could Tacitus state, on the authority of Cæsar, that they were once mightier than the Germans, and wrested settlements from them, and add, in his *Life of Agricola*, that their valour lasted as long as their liberty;* until they were crushed by the genius of Cæsar, and the discipline of the Roman legions.

There are some deficiencies in this sketch of Gaulish life, still more to be regretted than even these inaccuracies; and amongst the rest, the total omission of a description of the state of the lower orders. It is too true indeed, that our insight into their neglected lot is very obscure, yet for this very reason, an historian, with regard to such a point, should be unusually diligent.

Barbarian life is sometimes depicted as a state of noble simplicity and enviable freedom. Such descriptions, however, are only the dreams of self-styled philosophers: history, genuine history tells a very different tale. The debtors of Rome, and the debtors clothed in skins that tended their chieftain's herds in some Gaulish forest, had a similar fate; vexations incredible, ending too frequently in a perpetual slavery. To turn from the numerous class of debtors to one still larger; to turn to the poor and maimed, the aged and sick, where for these were the places of shelter? No voice whispered in their ears the comfort of a future world, though there was a dreamy idea of such a state; no fund had been bequeathed, no hospital reared, for the wants of the body. If a chieftain chose to reckon his able-bodied men as he reckoned his cattle, and to give them the same kind of aid, what was there to induce him to do the same for those that could make him no return? If

*" *Amissa virtute pariter ac libertate.*"

an only son's feelings towards his helpless parents shone forth above the darkness and paganism of his soul, and he were slain, where was now their hope? If, as often happened, the whole nation migrated, what was the fate of the many helpless ones? If the tribe were unusually tender-hearted, and neither left them behind nor suffered them to toil along on foot, what if the tribe were defeated, and defeated by men that had not the occasional clemency of Cæsar? Who were to succour them in the often-recurring seasons of famine and pestilence? In short, who shall unroll

“The short and simple annals of the poor?”

They have too generally been beneath the notice of the historian; but enough has been accidentally recorded in all ages and nations, to shew beneath the meteor-blaze of accumulated wealth and successful war, a boundless swamp of vice and misery. Thus has it ever been, thus will it ever be. Poverty and crime may be mitigated, as by the gigantic exertions of the middle ages; but poverty and crime there will always be. Man will always bear upon his face the stamp of his fallen condition; and the political empiricks that would deny the wretchedness of savage life, or, still more, that would complete the work of the Reformation, by uprooting the surviving institutions of charity, and by endeavouring to substitute socialism in place of religion, are only rendering that stamp more hideous; are wasting property and life in an untried speculation, which, as history and human nature itself alike proclaim, must, if put to the proof, terminate in defeat and confusion.

The very wretchedness of the poor makes them fond of change: they may gain, they can scarcely lose. Whether from this feeling, or from a mixture of many feelings, novelty, obedience, and martial ardour, the Gauls for many centuries before the time of Cæsar, had been almost constantly in motion, and by every movement had, again and again, agitated all the civilized nations of Europe. Braver than even the Germans, as the same great general tells us, and exceedingly numerous, they swarmed in great masses from their native fields, and, for a time, seemed about to execute that overthrow of old empires and institutions, which was reserved for the Germans and Huns, five hundred years later. Etruria, whose cities were singly almost a match for Rome, was laid prostrate, not more by

blows from the South, than by blows from the Gallic warriors of the North. Rome shared the fate of Etruria, and Italy that of Rome. The Romans, however, were as yet poor and hardy, and though trembling at the remembrance of the slaughter of the Allia, they dared to face their terrible invaders, and recovered heart from repeated victories.

Finding that they paid dearly for every inroad; the Gauls now moved towards the east. The valley of the Danube, Illyricum, even Delphi, saw the flash of their broad swords, while Thrace, with its numerous Greek colonies, and Asia Minor with the Greek cities that had so often defied the might of Persia, all became their prey. Nor did they forget their ancient hostility to Rome. As long as the unyielding Samnites could make good their mountain fastnesses, the Gauls were their brothers in the ranks of war. When Italy, from the Rubicon to the gulph of Tarentum, had sunk at the feet of Rome, the Gauls lent all the terrors of their name to the standards of Carthage. When Carthage, after a struggle of a century and a half, had sunk to ashes, the Gauls added their thousands to the ranks of the Cimbri and Teutones; and Rome, as it heard again and again of the slaughter of its armies, and the death of prætors and consuls, trembled at the vivid remembrance of past dangers; of the Allia, of the beleaguered capitol, and of Brennus, and his ferocious warriors. Even when Marius had stood in their path, and Cimbri, Teutones, and Gauls, lay in one red mass upon the plains of Aix and Vercellæ, the love of adventure and war ceased not to beat in the hearts of the surviving Gauls. Fifty years had not elapsed before the Helvetians, (the most numerous of the Gallic tribes that had joined the Cimbri and Teutones,) were again looking round for some new field for their restless valour. The news of their design ran through the Roman assemblies like an electric shock; but it was not confirmed, and the re-awakened dread of the Gauls served for no other purpose than, perhaps, to aid Cæsar in acquiring the coveted command of the Gaulish province. When his wish was now fully gratified, and he was yet lingering in the suburbs of Rome, news arrived that caused him to hurry at once to Geneva. The Helvetii, whose territories were on the opposite side of the lake, were all in motion. The smoke that rose from all their villages and towns, in valley, glen, and mountain, told plainly that they had given their own dwellings to the flames, and had begun

at last their long-rumoured emigration. Soon they were seen thronging in thousands, men, women, and children, with hundreds of loaded waggons, to the right bank of the Rhone, just where its waters rush deep and broad from the ample lake. The whole nation had resolved to abandon the graves of their fathers for new settlements. Well might the Allobroges, the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhone; well might the Romans that garrisoned Geneva, and guarded the only bridge across the river, ask with wonder and alarm, why the Helvetii had thus determined to abandon their homes. Was it the want of food? So, perhaps, they surmised: so, certainly, Mr. Merivale thinks, relying upon the authority of Dion Cassius and Cæsar. "The population," he says, "outgrew the scanty means of support, afforded by its mountain valleys." It would have been more correct, perhaps, to have said that the population had some fear for the future, but was chiefly impelled by the love of conquest. For, as Cæsar informs us, their warlike tempers could not brook the confinement of mountains and rivers: daring as they were, and thirsting for war, they were so pent within their natural barriers, that they could scarcely rove at all in quest of booty. On the west, the heights of Mount Jura; on the east, the central Alps walled them in. They could only sally forth either upon the Germans to the north, and then the passage of the Rhine was a dangerous obstacle, whether for advance or retreat, or upon their kinsmen, the Gauls, to the south, and this on one point only. "Hence it was," says Cæsar, "that they could wander with less freedom, and carry war less easily into the adjoining territories. For this reason, being men that longed for war, they were greatly afflicted. They thought that their confines, extending 240 (Roman) miles in length, and 180 in breadth, were narrow, in regard to the multitude of their people, and in regard to the glory of war and bravery." (i. 2.) The assertion that their means of support were "scanty," can scarcely be reconciled with the well-known fertility of the Swiss valleys; certainly not with Cæsar's plain statement, that he feared that the southern Germans might be tempted, by the "fertility of the soil," to take possession of the deserted country (i. 28.); nor with the address of the Gaulish chiefs to Cæsar, in which they declare that the Helvetians left their homes merely through lust of conquest, and while their affairs were in a most flourishing condition, (*florentissimis rebus*

i. 30.) As Dion Cassius lived more than two centuries and a half after the emigration of the Helvetians, his testimony cannot, for a moment, be compared with that of Cæsar and the Gaulish chiefs. Indeed, the very passage in which he mentions the emigration, contains some grave inaccuracies. He speaks of the dead Orgetorix as still living, and being the leader of the Helvetians, after they had burned their towns and begun their march; and he states that they intended to seek a new country "near the Alps," instead of which, their object was to leave the Alps, and establish themselves at such a distance, that the rocks and torrents might no longer impede their predatory incursions. It is plain, then, that we must be satisfied with the contemporary, and, indeed, sterling authority of Cæsar: The Helvetians thought that their territories would become too narrow for their numbers, and found them already too narrow for their love of peril and booty. With these very substantial reasons for disturbing their neighbours, and hazarding their own existence as a nation, they determined to move into the more open parts of Gaul. Such was the cause of their great gathering upon the banks of the Rhone.

The nature of the difficulties that lay before them may be estimated from that of their march along the river. Mr. Merivale's description of this difficulty is one of the most favourable specimens of his style, and of his manner of handling his subject.

"Two routes might conduct them westward into Gaul; the one following the defile of the Rhone, along the north bank of that river, and thus penetrating into the country of the Sequani, and the other lying to the south, and crossing the territory of the Allobroges in the direction of the province. The former of these roads was one of the utmost difficulty from the nature of the country.* For many miles the mountains descend almost perpendicularly into the torrent below. Modern engineers have succeeded in making a road along the brow of these cliffs; but the ease with which the traveller now winds round their projecting precipices, and

* Compare Cæsar's own words: "There were only two ways by which they could issue from their own country; one lay through the territory of the Sequani, a narrow and rugged (road) between Mount Jura and the river Rhone. Along this, scarcely one waggon could pass at a time, while a very high mountain hung over it, so that a very few men could keep (an advancing force) at bay." (i. 6.)

above the most tremendous abysses, serves to enhance his conception of the perils which must have attended a march among them before these obstacles were overcome. The emigrants soon decided that this route was impracticable in the face of an enemy. The other alternative offered a passage, the difficulties of which might not be insurmountable. The Rhone might be crossed, either by the bridge, which already existed at Geneva, the frontier town of the Allobroges, in possession at this period of a Roman garrison, or, if this was closed against them, the stream presented fords which might be used by bold men, accustomed to stem the torrents of the mountains. The Helvetians determined to force their way through the country of the Allobroges, and to trust either to arms or persuasion to obtain a passage through the province and across the Rhone, into the centre of Gaul." (p. 283.)

It mattered little to such men as the Helvetians that the Roman eagles were before them. Those eagles they had once before confronted, and had plucked down from their pride of place. The consul Cassius had felt their strength, and who was the obscure pro-consul, Cæsar? They soon discovered. Cæsar's first act was to destroy the bridge over the Rhone. His second, while the disconcerted Helvetians were awaiting his permission to march through the province, was to raise along the side of the Rhone, from the lake of Geneva to the gorge of Mount Jura, a strong fortification, made yet stronger by towers, and a fosse, and suitable garrisons.

"The Helvetii were not discouraged by this refusal. They made some hasty preparations, and resolved to force the passage of the river. The fords in so impetuous a stream were extremely difficult and dangerous; nevertheless, they made several attempts to cross, both by day and night; sometimes by plunging into the river, sometimes with armaments of boats and rafts. But the rampart, running close along the edge of the stream, was defended with military skill; every attempt to gain a footing on the left bank was defeated, and the assailants were compelled ultimately to abandon all hope of making good their exit in this direction."

To this passage the following note is appended

"Polyænus has collected, in his *Strategematon*, numerous stories respecting Cæsar's manœuvres, which are contradicted by the simple narrative of Cæsar himself. On this occasion he pretends, that the Roman general allowed a great part of the Helvetians to cross the river, and then attacked and destroyed them while they were reposing from their fatigues. Cæsar could not

have failed to mention this if it had been the fact ; but it is moreover, inconsistent with his account of the defences he threw up. The stories told by Polyænus are generally unworthy of credit." —p. 288, vol. i.

Mr. Merivale's remark upon Polyænus's merits, is perhaps, on the whole, correct ; but surely the inaccuracy alluded to is rather in his own narrative than in that of Polyænus. For Cæsar does not state that the "rampart" (? "murum," not "vallum,") "ran close along the edge of the stream." Indeed, with a "fosse" before it, which Cæsar expressly mentions, it was impossible that it should ; there must have been some, perhaps a considerable, interval between the wall and the river. The supposition that, in some places, at least, there was a considerable distance, is strengthened by the fact, that Romans almost invariably made their military works in straight lines, while, on the other hand, the river winds as it rushes towards the Jura ; and it is again strengthened by the words in which Cæsar briefly narrates the defence. He speaks of that defence being made not only by the fortification, and by missile-weapons, but by the charge, which here can only mean the sallying out of the soldiers, ("et militum concursu.") So far then Polyænus is correct, and Mr. Merivale strangely mistaken.

Defeated in their attempt to force the passage of the Rhone, they induced the Sequani, who held the right bank, to give them a free passage. Gaulish suppliants for aid were soon at Cæsar's feet, narrating, in terms of horror, the cruel ravages of the Helvetians. Cæsar had not forgotten his reasons for coveting the pro-consulship of Gaul. His purpose was now almost within his reach. With an enemy consisting of nearly 200,000 fighting men, he could increase his army without provoking suspicion or jealousy ; and with this increasing army improving every day in discipline and hardihood, it would be his own fault if ample spoils were wanting. Great must have been the exultation of such a man at the prospect of a war in the very centre of Gaul ; and greater yet to find that he could come forward as the champion of all the Celts that were either suffering from the ravages of the invaders, or were in any ways allied to Rome.

The Helvetians were now in the valley of the Sâone, and three-fourths of their warriors had slowly crossed the

river, when Cæsar swooped upon the remaining fourth,—the very canton that had formerly defeated and slain the consul, Cassius,—and at once furious for revenge, he trampled them under foot, or scattered them into the neighbouring woods.

The Helvetians on the opposite bank had accomplished the passage of the river in twenty days. In one day, Cæsar had built a bridge and crossed with his entire army. The Helvetians, dismayed, yet boastful, like all the Gaulish tribes, still menaced their pursuer with the fate of Cassius. It was not, however a Cassius that was watching their march; and this they soon experienced to their cost. Mistaking some movements of the Romans for a retreat, the Helvetians turned, and forming into one dense phalanx, gave battle. The conflict raged from “the seventh hour,” or one o’clock in the day to night-fall; and not “through *the whole* of the long summer’s day,” as Mr. Merivale supposes. Even after dark it continued around the waggons, till the night was far advanced. From the deeper shade of the cars and wheels, and from the vantage-ground of the waggon-tops, a thousand wounds were showered upon the Romans. During the whole battle, as Cæsar testifies, not a man of the enemy had turned his back, but now the very women and children were armed, and mingling in the desperate strife. It was the last effort of despair. Disciplined valour prevailed; and the survivors were glad to save their lives by surrendering their arms, and returning to their own deserted valleys: Cæsar’s triumph was the greater, because the Helvetians were esteemed the bravest of all the Gauls.

Scarcely had the confusion of this campaign subsided, when Cæsar’s attention was called to Ariovistus, a German chief, now located on the left bank of the Rhine. Called to the aid of the Sequani, in their wars with the Ædui, he acted the part of Hengist and Horsa in Kent. He took possession of one-third of the district, and reduced the rest to abject submission. Then, summoning around him fresh bands of his countrymen, he feared not to tell Cæsar, the champion of the vanquished Gauls, to attend to his own concerns, for that the Germans had as much right to their province in Gaul as the Romans had to theirs. When put to the proof, however, Ariovistus found himself as little able as the Helvetians were, to withstand the skill and discipline of the Romans. He fled across the Rhine with

scarcely a fragment of his army. Henceforth Cæsar, terrible as repeated victories had rendered him, encountered war after war, until his desire for wealth and a veteran army must have been fully sated. The Gauls justly began to regard him as an enemy. They could not understand why he, any more than Ariovistus, should remain in winter quarters amongst them, unless he had an equally hostile purpose.

In the campaign that followed, Cæsar found greater peril than in either of his previous wars. One Gaulish tribe, however, was still too ready to serve against another, and Roman discipline, thus befriended, again and again triumphed. For a time, indeed, Cæsar's fortune seemed to forsake him, and the energy of Vercingetorix, a chief of central Gaul, seemed able to expel the invader. The description of this struggle is given with much spirit, and, on the whole, is one of Mr. Merivale's best written passages.

We need not follow Cæsar to Pharsalia, nor into the Senate-house, to the scene at the foot of Pompey's statue. Enough has been said to show the character of the work before us. One further remark, which we hope to develop more completely on a future occasion, and we have done.

Mr. Merivale seems to have adopted the idea, that nations are always in a state of progress. Poor Cicero, statesman as he was, was very foolish to think that his country was retrograding,—to have no “reliance on the progressive improvement of mankind.” Cæsar “closed his eyes to the future, and shrank from even guessing at the end,” (ii. p. 539,) that end being “a career of tranquil expansion and comprehensive culture!” This is a bold assertion. Where are we to look for this “tranquil expansion?” In the days of the Second Triumvirate, and on the field of Philippi, and during the tearing away of lands from their rightful owners to bestow them upon successful veterans? Or, when Cicero, and, indeed, every one that was suspected of loving law and liberty, was ruthlessly butchered? Or, was it seated with complacent smiles on the Promontory of Actium? Perhaps, however, Augustus's reign was the golden age, not of literature only, but of liberty, and national and individual happiness. If so, what became of the theory after Augustus? Was Tacitus as simple as Cicero and Cæsar, when he wept for the days of the republic? Did men, notwithstanding his lamenta-

tions, still progress? In what? In literature? Assuredly not. In liberty? Let Tiberius, Nero, Domitian, Commodus, and Carraccalla, give answer. Let the groans of the municipal decurions, ground to the dust with taxes, give answer. Let the days of what are called the Thirty Tyrants, with their thirty conflicting armies, and the hordes of Germans rioting unscathed in the spoils of Gaul, Spain, and Africa, let these give answer. Was it when the flames of the Goths were kindled among the halls of Rome, or when the Heruli and Vandals had joined in the pillage? Or when Belisarius rode up the capitol, and saw at his feet only a vast marble solitude,

“The Niobe of nations
Childless and crownless in her voiceless woe?”

Or when the whole empire was disunited, and given for centuries to the barbarians, and to their almost incessant wars, with all the attendants of such wars, the famines and pestilences that desolated Europe, no less than did the Goth, and Vandal, and Hun, and Dane, and Saracen? If Cicero could have looked into their ages, would he not have found enough to justify his want of reliance on the progressive improvement of mankind? Would not Cæsar have shrunk more than ever “from even guessing at the end?”

“But the Roman statesmen and philosophers, with their strong practical instincts, took no comprehensive survey of the destinies of their race.” (vol. 2, p. 538.) No: they knew too much of history and human nature to indulge in any such dream, however comprehensive. They were too “practical” for a theory which threatens to degrade the followers of the Guizot school of history to the level of mere political enthusiasts.

On the whole, then, we must acknowledge, that we are disappointed with these volumes. If, indeed, they are really but an introduction to the History of the Roman Empire, we must suspend our censure; but, if, as the preface seems to intimate, circumstances have prevented “the further prosecution” of the work, then, indeed, is our disappointment complete. For our own part, we have waited several months in hopes of seeing the third volume coming forward, as a promise for the rest; in hopes of seeing an English writer occupying ground which is really a dreary

waste in our literature. With regard to the period included in the two volumes before us, we do not see that Ferguson, a writer of fifty years' standing, has been surpassed, or, in general, even equalled by Mr. Merivale.

This is an age of shew and splendid promise. We trust that in Mr. Merivale's case the promise will be speedily redeemed. As it is, at present, the title is anything but suitable. The history of the Roman Empire, a history very much wanted, is announced; and as the reader proceeds, he finds that it is nothing more than a history of the Life and Times of Julius Cæsar.

“ Amphora cœpit
Institui, currente rotâ, cur urceus exit ? ”

Rev. J. J. Lanagan (Canon)

ART. VI.—(1.) *Sacred and Legendary Art.* By MRS. JAMESON.
Second edition, royal 8vo. London, Longmans, 1850.

(2.) *Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts.*
Forming the second series of *Sacred and Legendary Art.* By
MRS. JAMESON, Royal 8vo. London: Longmans, 1850.

WE had believed that the days of Iconoclasm were long past and forgotten. It enjoyed, at its origin, a longer period of ascendancy, and under more powerful auspices, than almost any other form of religious mania that the world has ever seen. All that force, fraud, corruption and fanaticism, could devise, was pressed into its service for nearly half a century. At one period it would seem as if its triumph was complete and final. Nearly all the bishops of the Byzantine empire had bowed their neck to its yoke, and a powerful fleet was despatched to compel the submission of the opposite shore of the Mediterranean. But the attempt upon the West failed signally. Eventually, indeed, it led to the disruption of the fairest provinces of the degenerate empire: and even in the East, when the iron yoke of the odious tyrants who ruled from Leo the Isaurian to Irene, was withdrawn, truth and reason speedily vindicated their rights, and the eastern provinces

returned with enthusiasm, and even, as it seemed to their colder brethren of the West, with excess, to the cherished usage which had been so long and so cruelly proscribed.

Since that time the mania has occasionally re-appeared, but at distant and irregular intervals. The disciples of Pierre de Bruis, the Henricians, and the Hussites, are too distant from each other, and too dissimilar in principles, to be regarded even as straggling links of a chain connecting the iconoclasts of the seventeenth century with those of the seventh; nor can we find anywhere in history the genuine descendants of the followers of the two Leos, and Constantine Copronymus, except in the school of Geneva, especially in its earlier and more fanatical period.

Even this school, however, seemed to have modified its principles. There are few of its modern disciples who do not look back with regret, and even with shame, upon the blind fanaticism of its founders; and, although, in theory, the worship of images is regarded by them with the same feelings of abhorrence which, in their forefathers, led to the destruction of many of the noblest monuments of Christian art, yet in practice, the use of sacred art for the purposes of instruction and edification has long been freely tolerated, and even liberally encouraged. Indeed, the impulse which Christian art has received in England during the last fifteen years, is one of the most remarkable characteristics of the age; and although those who have been foremost in communicating this impulse have been far from appreciating its true import, or anticipating its necessary results, the work which they have done has lost none of its intrinsic efficacy, from the limited, or modified motives of its authors.

With the knowledge of these facts, therefore, the lovers of Christian art will have been but ill prepared for the formidable intelligence recently communicated to the public by a gentleman who, some months back, obtained a very unenviable notoriety by a correspondence of which it is impossible to speak without shame. The days of Iconoclasm, as we learn from certain late revelations of this gentleman, are *not* past. A new Isaurian has arisen. War has been declared anew against the debasement of the spirituality of religion by the devices of man's imitative art; and if the Church be not stirred once again from her foundations and aroused to holy enthusiasm in the cause of Iconomachy, it certainly will not

be the fault of its modern apostle. He spares no trouble and no expense in the sacred contest. With all the zeal of the olden image-breakers, we do not read of any of them who went to so generous lengths, or encountered so tremendous sacrifices, as Mr. George Rochfort Clarke informs us he has made. Although we have made the history of iconoclasm a very particular study, we can find no parallel for the enthusiasm of this devoted gentleman. We believe we are right in stating that the Isaurian, and the Armenian, and Copronymus and Theophilus, generally speaking, contented themselves with destroying other people's images, and especially those which they found in the churches and convents of the poor defenceless monks. But Mr. Rochfort Clarke, with far more of self-sacrificing zeal, directs his first indignation against his own. We believe, too, that the image-breakers of old destroyed the images wheresoever they found them, nor are we aware that they ever went through the ceremony of purchasing images in order to destroy them. But Mr. Rochfort Clarke carries his zeal to a much more refined length. He scorns to be virtuous at so cheap a rate. He buys his images for the purpose of destroying them at his own cost; and on learning that an eminent London firm had engraved a plate of Murillo's picture of "The Trinity," preserved in the National Gallery, he actually paid down out of his own pocket, *no less a sum than* "two guineas," for a copy of the print; brought it to a full meeting of members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; and regardless of expense, tore it to pieces before their eyes.* Whether he did so with the full approbation of the assembly, is a subject of controversy between him and a member of the society who was present at the meeting;† but the issue does not in any way affect the zeal, the generosity, or the self-sacrificing devotedness of Mr. Rochfort Clarke.

Nor is this one solitary act of this generous and enthusiastic gentleman. He informs us that it is the result of "twenty years' reflection and experience;" and is but a repetition on a small scale of a wholesale act of destruction

* See his letter, May 12, 1851, in the *Record Newspaper* of that date. Also in the *Morning Chronicle*, May 14.

† See a letter in the *Morning Chronicle*, May 23.

which he performed no less than twenty years ago. On one fatal day, twenty years since, Mr. Rochfort Clarke "went through" all his prints; nor did he spare, inexorable man, a single one, "however well done or costly," which was at variance with his notions. He describes the result in very glowing language. "The mythology of Rome, whether Papal or Pagan, received no mercy at his hands. Mary and Venus," he blasphemously adds, "fell together, and Jupiter and Peter vanished in the same smoke." Fortunately for the sculptor's art, he was not possessed of any specimens. They too would have been ruthlessly immolated. "However well done or costly," they would "doubtless have paved the roads."* This is now full twenty years since. We are not aware, that any very fatal consequences have since resulted to Christian art; but this certainly is not the fault of Mr. Rochfort Clarke.

At all events, now that we learn upon such authority that the enemies of Christian art have again taken the field, it behoves all its friends to exert themselves with double energy. And we trust that our readers will forgive our alluding to so ludicrous a revelation, when we use it as an occasion of bringing under their notice Mrs. Jameson's beautiful volume upon *Sacred and Legendary Art*, and the sequel to it, recently published under the title of *Legends of the Monastic Orders*. We can hardly account indeed, for the delay of our notice of the former of these two works; but perhaps it has had some advantage, in enabling us, by considering them both together, to place at once before the reader's mind the entire subject of legendary art in all its developments. Of the details of so extensive and so varied a compilation, it would plainly be idle to attempt to give an adequate idea; and much of what we shall have to say of its general bearings, applies to the "*Legends of the Monastic Orders*," equally with the "*Legendary Art*."

As a spirited and tasteful testimony against the principles of Iconoclasm, and its modern descendant, Puritanism in art, and as an elegant exposition of some of its principles as applied to sacred subjects, Mrs. Jameson's publication would at any time be welcome; and although we are loath to

* See his letter of May 12.

persuade ourselves that there is any special tendency in the temper of the present time, yet there have been some indications of a certain sympathy even with the wild fanaticism of such reformers as Mr. Clarke, which make it now more than ordinarily acceptable.

Still we can hardly bring ourselves to believe that there is any portion of the thinking community who can seriously require instruction or arguments upon a subject on which instinct and reason themselves supply the most satisfactory evidence. We are not now referring to the purely theological question of honouring sacred images or exhibiting reverence to them. Our observations apply exclusively to that use of them which is analogous to the use of pious reading, of pious conversation, of sermons or public lectures, and of the holy Scriptures themselves; namely, as incentives to devotion, and as safeguards against distraction and wandering of the mind. It is not merely as a means of instruction for the unlearned, for whom, to use the phrase of one of the most profound of thinkers, Leibnitz, the productions of sacred art may stand in the place of an alphabet. There is hardly any one who may not with advantage avail himself of its assistance. From the very nature of the operations of the mind, it is impossible that it should be otherwise. We cannot fix our thoughts upon any idea without forming to ourselves a sensible image of it; and upon the vividness and permanency of this image, the vigour and activity of the mental operations mainly depend. It is scarcely necessary to add that in the formation, and still more in the maintenance, of these mental images, the use of suitable representations, whether of the simple idea, or of the complicated subject which it is desired to bring before the mind, cannot fail to be eminently advantageous. In truth, in placing before the eye, by the aid of art, such a representation, though it addresses the mind through a different medium, we, in reality, employ the very same substantial device, as when we assist or stimulate the understanding by a written appeal or a spoken exhortation. In both operations alike, the mind is addressed through the medium of sense. In both alike, the end directly sought is the same;—the creation of a certain series of mental imagery. And whatever has been said of the difficulty of preventing the mind of the uninstructed from resting ultimately upon the image produced by such sensible representa-

tions as pictures, statuary, or other works of art, there can be no doubt that, in themselves, they do not tend a whit more to sensualize or materialise the operation of the mind, than the other aids of thought which may be employed, and which, though they appeal to a different faculty, are nevertheless all intended to produce the very same ultimate effect. A name is a representative of an idea, quite as much as a picture. A written or printed description of a scene, or a verbal narrative of an event, is as much a picture to the reader's or hearer's mind as though it had come from the painter's hand. The effect upon his imagination is precisely the same. The words of the writer tend just as directly, although in a different way, to produce the images of the various persons and things which he describes, as do the touches of the painter's pencil. Indeed, if any confirmation of the identity of the two mental operations were required, it would be found in the fact, that the writings of most primitive nations is but an adaptation of the pictorial art.

Hence the very constitution of the human mind, as it exists in this body of sense, appears to suggest the natural propriety, if not in some sense necessity, of the use of art as the companion and assistant of its operations. Dependent upon the external senses for every impression which it receives, and habituated by this very dependence to contemplate the objects of its thoughts solely under the sensible images of these objects which the senses present, its very first step in the process of thought is the formation within itself of a sensible image of the subject or thing which it proposes to consider. Nor is it possible for it to proceed in its very loftiest and most spiritualized conceptions, nor even in the contemplation of the most abstract ideas, and those seemingly farthest withdrawn from the sphere of sense, except by this process or some modification of this process. The highest and holiest of the saints, in his most sublime meditation upon the passion of our Lord, will find his mind, by a process over which he has no control, filled, in the very act of thought, with images of the various scenes in the sad history which he is considering; and in proportion to the vividness and distinctness of these images, is the fervour and truth of his meditation. His mental act is precisely the same in kind, though infinitely higher in degree, as that of the rude and uninstructed peasant, whose mind tries to follow with laborious piety

the representation of those scenes depicted in the series of stations of the cross, or to dwell upon the consummation of them all, of which his crucifix is to him the memorial and the type. So again the idea of the incarnation naturally calls up, or indeed, to speak more accurately, presupposes, the image of the infant God in the arms of His Virgin-mother. There is no other form under which the mind is physically capable of entertaining it. The history of the saints and martyrs as it exists in the mind, is but the memory of the mental pictures under which they have been presented to us. And it is so with the acts of adoration, of love, or of veneration, which are founded upon these ideas. If the soul be excited to love and gratitude towards the Saviour who redeemed it, the act by which these sentiments are elicited is mechanically directed to that sensible image of our Lord upon the cross, under which alone it is able to contemplate Him. The act of adoration of the God-Incarnate, has for its object not an abstract ideality, but the Divinity with the form which sense has conveyed. A saint is honoured or invoked not as a name or a vague generality, but in the form of some distinct and determinate image, under which, perhaps, without the smallest foundation in point of fact, the mind, from the very necessity induced by this habitual dependence upon the impressions of sense, has figured him to itself. In a word, from the very physical constitution of the mind, all its aspirations, even of the most abstract kind, are directly referred to these mental images; and all its acts of adoration, are, and must be, in a certain sense of the words, acts of mental image-worship.

The reasoning here employed must be admitted by all who admit any form of external religion. No one who recognises the utility of sermons, lectures, nay of the reading of Holy Scripture itself, can evade its application. It would be idle to apply it exclusively to those acts which are founded upon the impressions received from the imagery presented by pictures or similar works of art. The same is true, and must be true, of the impressions received from the images produced by words, signs, or any other sensible representations of ideas. It is well observed by the acute writer already referred to, that "names, too, are signs, although far inferior to images for significancy."* And

* Leibnitz's System of Theology, p. 63. (English translation.)

he argues that, inasmuch as the object of reading or hearing a history, is simply to obtain in the mind a representation of the scenes or events which it records, and as this object is equally, and indeed more effectively, obtained by painted or graven representations of these scenes, and especially as the impression which such representations produce is more lasting, more vivid, and better calculated to interest the imagination and stimulate the affections, it would be a grievous perversion of one of God's noblest gifts, and an unpardonable neglect of one of the most powerful means which He has given us of appealing to the heart, to discard from the service of religion the speaking and almost living creations of the art of the painter and the sculptor.*

And further, by the same beautiful and appropriate illustration, he shows, that as the Catholic Church never sanctions in the use of images, any act of honour or of worship, which is not referred to the original represented by the image, the honours which she thus permits are identical in principle, and actually the very same in kind, with those which all christians, in accordance with the words of St. Paul, exhibit to the sacred name of Jesus. In the one case, as in the other, the honour is paid not to the external representation (which in both cases is a sensible thing: in the first a written or spoken word, in the second a painted or graven image,) but to the internal or mental image which both alike are intended to represent and to call up in the mind. †

It is painful to think that, in an age of enlightenment like ours, there should be any for whom it is necessary to write the apology of Christian art. But it is gratifying to know that the necessity is felt by others, as well as by Catholics. The popularity of Mrs. Jameson's work, is a pleasing evidence that the impulse under which it was written is not solitary and isolated. The general tone of sentiment which pervades it has found an echo in the mind of a large section of the community; and although it falls short in many important particulars, of the true Catholic spirit, yet it cannot but be regarded as a useful pioneer in the wide field of Catholic art;—destined, we may hope, not only to remove many impediments from the way, but to effect an entrance where catholics would have no chance of

* *Ibid.* p. 54.

† *Ibid.* p. 64.

admission. A friendly critic, to whom the Authoress refers in terms of high respect in the preface of her second series, assured her that she had “spoiled her book by not making it Roman Catholic.” We cannot help, of course, regretting with Mrs. Jameson’s friend that her book is not Roman Catholic; but at least in the absence of such a work, we gratefully accept it as a useful preparative. Mrs. Jameson has frankly explained the principles which have guided her in this particular.

“To speak of the religious pictures painted for the monastic communities, and to avoid altogether any allusion to disputed points of faith, of history, of character, has been impossible. It was said of the First Series, by an authority for which I have a high respect, that I had ‘spoiled my book by not making it *Roman Catholic*.’ But I am not a Roman Catholic:—how, therefore, could I honestly write in the tone of thought, feeling, conviction, natural and becoming in one of that faith? I have had to tread what all will allow to be difficult and dangerous ground. How was this to be done safely, and without offence, easily given in these days? Not, surely, by swerving to the right and to the left;—not by the affectation of candour;—not by leaving wholly aside aspects of character and morals which this department of the Fine Arts, the representations of monastic life, necessarily place before us. There was only one way in which the task undertaken could be achieved in a right spirit—by going straight forward, according to the best lights I had, and saying what appeared to me the truth, as far as my subject required it: and my subject—let me repeat it here—is artistic and æsthetic, not religious. This is too much of egotism, but it has become necessary to avoid ambiguity. I will only add that, as from the beginning to the end of this book there is not one word false to my own faith—my own feeling, so I truly hope there is not one word which can give offence to the earnest and devout reader of any persuasion:—if there be, I am sorry;—what can I say more?”—*Monastic Orders*, pp. xiv., xv.

We freely admit that she has endeavoured to carry out this view honestly and sincerely, nor does her work present any indication of other than a disposition to avoid every cause of offence. But it is not in the nature of things that a work upon such a subject by any other than a Catholic pen, should be free from sentiments and expressions, which, however unintentionally and even unknowingly, must be painful to a Catholic reader. Indeed, the very plan of the work itself is one which will suggest sufficient cause of pain to a religious Catholic. The sub-

jects with which it deals are of such a character as hardly to be capable in his mind of being separated from religion, or treated with other than feelings of faith, reverence, and love. To separate them from this character, to deal simply with their poetry, their natural beauty, or their artistic propriety, is in itself to revolt in some degree the habitual tone of the Catholic mind. And although Mrs. Jameson's æstheticism is by no means of a cold and purely scientific cast, yet it falls far short of the warm and generous trustfulness in which we should desire to see such subjects discussed.

We say this, however, by no means in the spirit of complaint, nor as implying any censure upon the amiable authoress. On the contrary, we feel that with her present convictions, to have written as we should have desired to see the subject written, would have been to have violated truth, sincerity, and good faith itself. And what we say of the general tone of her volumes, and of the general views which pervade them, we would also extend to several inaccuracies in matters of fact, some of them in rather important particulars, from which they are not exempt. We willingly acquit her of any intentional mis-statement adverse to Catholic views; and while we feel how difficult it must have been for a writer obliged to receive much of her information at second hand, to avoid such inaccuracies, where her authorities were themselves strongly anti-catholic in their tone, we are bound to admit that the work itself supplies abundant evidence that such inaccuracies are the result of want of sufficient information, rather than of a desire to offend or give pain.

The portion of Mrs. Jameson's subject which is purely legendary, is one upon which no one can possibly write satisfactorily for catholics, but one who is himself a catholic. It is not alone that the principles which we apply to these subjects are different from those on which protestants are accustomed to judge. It is rather that the very mould in which the catholic mind is cast from infancy is essentially different. We are accustomed to realize more fully than even the most liberally disposed protestant can ever bring himself to do, the communion between the visible and the invisible world; and to look for, or at least to receive without incredulity, evidences of God's interposition, direct, or indirect, in the government of his church, or in the salvation, and all that regards the salvation, or

sanctification, of his chosen servants. What to our minds is familiar and habitual, to a protestant is revolting, or at least hard of belief; and this very characteristic, which to their eyes takes the appearance of credulity, and even superstition, is regarded as one of the leading peculiarities of the modern Church. That an event is supernatural, is, in the eyes of a protestant, *prima facie* evidence against its existence. To a catholic, if the circumstances be not of themselves calculated to create a doubt, the supernatural need not present more difficulty than the purely natural.

In discussing the subject of legends and legendary art, it is impossible to overlook this leading discrepancy; and the more so because it is to this that protestants most frequently point, as evidencing the corruption of the modern Roman Church, and her perversion of the primitive and scriptural simplicity of christianity. We are far from accepting the responsibility of all the so-called legends which may be found in the various local churches, whether of our own or of foreign countries. Many of them are undoubtedly false. Some, at least as they have been occasionally put forward, are even positively dishonouring to religion; and none form any part of the doctrine of the church, or in any way enter into the essential principles of catholic faith. And it may be necessary to caution the reader against receiving the version of each legend put forward by Mrs. Jameson, as the authorized, or even the popularly received, form in which the legend is, or has been, believed. Mrs. Jameson's version, generally speaking, exhibits the legend in its poetical or artistic form, and perhaps with all the fanciful and imaginary embellishments which they have received in both processes. This is especially true of the legends of the Rhine, and of Germany generally; and indeed will be easily understood to follow naturally from the plan of Mrs. Jameson's work, which is addressed altogether to the artistic, rather than the devotional or ascetic, view of the subject.

It would be wrong, however, to pass over this opportunity of offering a few observations upon this supposed characteristic of mediæval and modern Catholicism,—the tendency which it exhibits to receive, with blind and ready credulity, the most extravagant and incredible legends of the saints, even in cases where the evidences of falsehood and impossibility are palpable and conclusive. Mrs. Jame-

son looks with an indulgent eye upon this tendency in consideration of the manifold beauties and excellencies in art to which it has given birth. But we should be sorry, in accepting this compassionate indulgence, to recognize the seeming assumption upon which it is based ;—namely, that this tendency to receive, and even to look for, the supernatural, is a peculiarity of the modern Church ; that it was the fruit of the ignorance and credulity of the mediæval times ; and that it is inconsistent with the spirit of primitive christianity. Even Catholics themselves are too ready to recognize, nay, to dwell upon, this assumption ; and it is well that all misconception regarding it should be removed.

Now the truth is, that so far from being a characteristic of modern and corrupt christianity, this tendency has been discernible from the very earliest times, and has exhibited itself in forms precisely analagous to those which are commonly regarded as peculiar to modern or mediæval Catholicity.

It would be strange indeed if in those ages when the memory of our Lord's promise to His followers was still fresh ; while his assurance that " signs should follow them," was still ringing in men's ears ; while the very details of the wonders which they were to work ;—the devils they were to cast out—the new tongues in which they were to speak—the serpents they were to take up—the deadly things they were to drink unharmed—the miraculous cures they were to achieve ;—it would seem strange if an age taught to look forward to such events as these, should have been an age of incredulity. The history of St. John the Evangelist's delivery from the caldron of boiling oil has all the seeming characteristics of a mediæval legend, and is rejected as incredible, even by writers tolerably free from scepticism,* on the very same grounds upon which most of these modern legends of saints are disbelieved. Yet this circumstance, only fifty years after the event, is related by Tertullian† in terms which not only prove that he entertained no doubt of it, but that it was unhesitatingly admitted by all the christians of his time. The miracle of the Thundering Legion is of the same character. Yet it is told

* See Mosheim, i. 74. (Soames' Tr.)

† De Prescript, adv. Hereticus, cap. xxxvi.

by Apollinaris and Tertullian. It would be hard, again, to find a tale which seemingly involves more elements of what, according to popular notions, would be held to be the more incredible, than that of the collision of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, with Simon Magus, his attempted flight in the air by the aid of the devil, the apostles' prayer for his humiliation, his fall, and miserable death. If such a tale were found in the life of a saint of the twelfth or fourteenth century, it would be at once declared to be the offspring of the extravagant notions of those corrupt and ignorant ages. Now the story, with all its wonderful circumstances, is related seriously in a grave argument with unbelievers by Arnobius,* who lived in the latter half of the third century. And we shall see hereafter that it was universally received in his time.

It may be alleged that in the literary remains of these ages we found but few traces of those tales. But it must not be forgotten that these remains are scanty and imperfect, and that for the most part they are of a class to which such subjects were entirely foreign. Apologies of Christianity against the charges of the pagans, confutations of Paganism and of the heresies which had their origin in Paganism, purely dogmatical treatises upon the doctrines of the Christian religion, are not the class of works in which we should expect to find even a casual notice of the miracles of the early saints, and particularly of such miracles as we are now contemplating. With all the supposed credulity of the age in which they lived and wrote, the dogmatical works of St. Thomas of Aquin, the controversial works of St. Bernard, and a large proportion even of the ascetic writings of St. Bonaventure might be read through without discovering a trace of this legendary lore which is represented as the great characteristic of their age. And if all the other literature, and all the records, of these ages were lost, we would conclude from the exclusive study of these, as is now concluded from the similar works of the early fathers, that not a word was ever heard in mediæval times, of the fabulous and extravagant tales, the origin of which is now attributed exclusively to these ages.

But, indeed, even from the records of the early christians which we do possess, we can sufficiently discover

* *Adversus Gentiles*, ii. p. 64.

the prevalence and even universality of their belief in these miraculous powers. The seventh chapter in the Fifth Book of Eusebius's History, (which is specially important, inasmuch as it alleges the authority of St. Irenæus,) shows that the powers bestowed upon the Apostles were regarded as permanently enduring in the Church; and one of the earliest and most interesting monuments of the history of Christianity in the west, the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, preserved in the same book, contains a narrative which, if we did not know its source, would present indubitable evidence of mediæval origin. There is no class of the mediæval miracles and revelations which provoke incredulity more strongly than those for which no motive sufficiently important can be assigned, the principle of judgment being the rule laid down by Horace :

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus.

By this test are judged and rejected all those miraculous facts which are of a purely private and personal nature, and do not seem to be called for by any signal or important interest of religion. Suppose it were told, for example, that a saint who had been accustomed to practise certain austerities, received a revelation from God that he should discontinue these practices; would not this revelation at once be set down, either as a delusion, or perhaps an imposture? Now the letter of the Churches referred to relates this in express terms of one of the martyrs of Gaul, Alcibiades, "who had led a hard and mortified life, abstaining from all common food, and partaking solely of bread and water. When he was cast into prison, it was revealed to Attalus, (another of the martyrs) that Alcibiades did not do well in not making use of the creatures of God." *

But the scanty notices gleaned from such casual allusions as these must afford a very inadequate idea of the real spirit of the time. In the literature of modern Catholics, it is not to the dogmatical, or controversial, or philosophical, writings, we look, for an account of the lives and miracles of the saints. Neither should we expect it in the same department of the early Christian literature. The ancients, like the moderns, devoted to these subjects a special department of their literature—the Hagiographical;

* Euseb. v. 3, p. 164.

and we do not hesitate to say, that the earliest specimens of this literature which we possess display the most perfect identity to their spirit, and in their detail, with that of the modern Church of Rome. St. Jerome's Lives of the Oriental Saints; Paulinus's Life of St. Felix of Nola; Prudentius's Hymns; the twenty-second book of St. Augustine's City of God; would be unhesitatingly classed by any ordinary Protestant reader with the credulous and silly inventions of the mediæval cloisters; and the "Religious History" of Theodoret, though it consists but of thirty chapters, would supply a type for almost every single class of miraculous legend that has ever been circulated in the darkest time.

Our readers may recollect some specimens of the views entertained upon these topics by Paulinus, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and Prudentius, which formed the subject of one or two former papers in this journal.* So little is known, however, of the work of Theodoret, that we are tempted to devote a page or two to a short description of its contents, as illustrative of the notions of his contemporaries on the subject of miracles and miraculous legends. It is hardly necessary to say, that the writer is the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, that he is one of our chief authorities on the Arian and Macedonian controversies; and that he was one of the most distinguished and prominent characters in all the great controversies of the Incarnation, which agitated the Church during the first half of the fifth century.

The *Philotheus*, or "Religious History" of Theodoret, is a collection of lives of the most eminent Eastern saints, chiefly the anchorites of Syria and Egypt; some of these were contemporary with the writer, some lived as far back as the times of persecution. The Lives are thirty-one in number; the subjects of the three last being the female saints Marana, Cyra, and Domnica. Of the tone which pervades the entire, we may say in general, that it is calm, confident, and unhesitating. The facts are told not in the light of strange and incredible marvels, but as involving no difficulty of belief. Many of them are stated upon the writer's personal authority; others he professes to have

* See Vol. xv. pp. 485, and seq., also Vol. xxx., p. 115-52. The "Sign of the Cross."

heard from eye-witnesses; but his manner throughout is quite natural and self-assured, exhibiting not the smallest semblance of doubt upon his own part, and so entirely free from the appearance of expecting a difficult belief at the hands of the reader, as on the contrary, to seem to suppose that his relations will be received without hesitation, and almost without enquiry.

Now the reader who has been bred up in sentiments of pity for the blindness of the Romanists in receiving the miraculous legends popular in the modern Church, will be not a little surprised if he only examine the sort of legends which were thus put forward without fear by the ecclesiastical historian of the fourth century, and received without hesitation by his contemporaries. To give an adequate idea of them it would, in fact, be necessary to translate the entire volume; we can but select a few specimens; but we willingly challenge a comparison of these sacred biographies with the Lives of the Saints popular in the modern Church. Unquestionably, as regards the marvellous and supernatural, the ancient legends will hardly yield to the most exaggerated of the modern.

Thus of one saint, James, Bishop of Nisibis, (who lived in the persecution of Diocletian, and was present at the great Council of Nice,) an anecdote is told similar to that related of a modern saint, that a party of beggars who, in order to impose upon his charity, feigned that one of their number was dead, were punished by God by finding that their fiction had proved a fatal reality.*

Another anecdote of the same saint would be, we doubt not, pronounced yet more "unmistakably modern." A number of young women who were washing at a fountain exhibited great indelicacy of demeanour as he passed by. In punishment of their crime, he caused the fountain to be miraculously dried up, and struck the culprits with premature gray hairs; † and again, at the prayers of the inhabitants, he prevented the remission of the punishment.

* App. iii., p. 112. (Halle Ed.) We may add, as a specimen of the faith of the period upon another important principle of Catholic belief, what Theodoret subjoined, viz., that St. James offered prayers for him as for one dead, and besought God to remit to him the sins which he had committed in life, [ἀφεῖναι τὰ κατὰ τὸν βίον πλημμεληθέντα] and to admit him into the choir of the just.

† Ibid, p. 1110.

Imagine again a story of a widow's son falling into a deep well while his mother was engaged in discharging the duties of hospitality to a holy hermit; and in reward of his mother's good actions, being discovered after a considerable interval not only safe and unhurt, but placidly floating upon the surface of the water, without the smallest trace of alarm or anxiety, and full of wonder and delight at the superhuman beauty of a youth, by whom, he said, he had been kept from sinking in the water. Where shall we find a more marvellous legend than this, even in Jacobus a Voragine himself? Yet this is but one of many wonders attributed by Theodoret to Julian the Hermit.* Another saint, Marcian, while engaged in prayer, is observed by one of his disciples to be watched by a fierce dragon, who appears ready to spring upon him; but on the disciple's apprizing him of the presence of the monster, he makes the sign of the cross, and the dragon vanishes.† Of another, Simon the Younger, it is told that a converted Israelite who, in his presence, had made a vow of perpetual abstinence from meat, and on one occasion was tempted to eat a portion of a fowl, was punished by its turning to stone upon his lips.‡ A rich man who was remarkable for his harshness and severity towards his tenantry, treated with contempt the remonstrances of the holy anchorite, Masymas. His mules, as a judgment on his heartlessness, refused to draw his chariot, nor was he able to proceed upon his journey till the wheels were released by the intercession of the saint.§ An unhappy wife || recovered the affections of her unfaithful husband by means of a little oil, blessed by the hermit Aphraates. A poor man who had but a single field, the produce of which was the sole support of his family, applied for protection during a dreadful visitation of the plague of locusts, to the same hermit. The hermit blessed a vessel of water, and directed him to sprinkle it around the boundaries of his field. The locusts as soon as they reached the line thus sanctified by his prayer, were arrested as by a wall, and the field remained uninjured.¶

Some of these wonders, too, are related as having taken

* Ibid, 1132-3.

† Ibid, 1140.

‡ Ibid, 1277.

§ Ibidem.

|| Ibid, 1218.

¶ Ibid, 1184.

place without the knowledge of the miraculous agent. In a period of famine, application was made to Zebimas, an Egyptian anchorite, to bless the oil jars of some of his poor neighbours, who trusted that his prayer would procure a miraculous increase of their exhausted store. His humility revolting at the idea of such a favour from God, he declined their request. But the faith of the applicants was stronger than his own. While he was engaged in prayer, they placed the jar, without his being aware of it, behind his back. Their confidence was rewarded, and the desired blessing was accorded.* While Marcian, already alluded to, was praying at night in his cell, a ray of light from heaven, [*ὅν λυχναίον, οὐδε χειροποίητον, ἀλλὰ θεόδοτον*] was observed by his disciples playing around his brows. † St. Macedonius, while similarly engaged, was seen by some shepherds to be attended by two angels, who ministered to him as he prayed.

Frequent instances, too, are recorded of the interposition of Providence, for the purpose of protecting his saints from injury, similar to those familiar in the more modern hagiographers. The arm of a shepherd, who, mistaking the solitary Acepimas for a wild beast, was about to discharge his sling at him, was miraculously staid. ‡ A master, who sought to violate his slave, was seized with a supernatural blindness, so as to be unable to see her; § and at the prayers of the hermit Zeno, the Isaurians, who had made an incursion into the district in which he resided, were smitten with sudden blindness, and completely defeated, || and the holy man himself saw three angels engaged upon the side of the christian army. ¶

Many instances, too, are recorded of miraculous interpositions in vindication of the calumniated honours of the saints. A dead body which was treacherously placed at the door of the cell of Palladius, in order to involve him in the charge of the murder, was supernaturally compelled to point with its dead hand to the real culprit, and thus free the saint from the charge.** St. Peter compelled the devil, who had taken possession of a servant, to relate the entire history of the possession; and Simon the elder was

* Ibid. 1262.

† Ibid, 1139.

‡ Ibid, 1240.

§ Ibid, 1193.

|| Ibid, 1204.

¶ Ibid,

** Ibid. 1172.

enabled to discover hidden crimes, however studiously concealed by the delinquent.*

Coincidences, too, with more modern miraculous narratives are frequently discoverable. The possibility of visions and revelations were no less freely admitted than it has been at a more recent period. The hermit Julian saw in a vision which he related before the event, the death of Julian the apostate, and the consequent delivery of the Church; † and the instances of such predictions are too familiar to require special enumeration. Another very curious coincidence with modern practice, is related as having occurred in the case of Theodoret himself. The marriage of his parents had been for years an unfruitful one. At length his mother sought the intercession of a holy solitary Macedonius, of whom numberless miracles are recorded. He promised that, as the reward of her faith, a son should be granted to her prayers, but required as a condition that she should *dedicate him to the sacred ministry.* ‡

It would be easy to multiply examples of the thoroughly supernatural character of these sacred biographies. But we have already said more than enough to illustrate the spirit of the period, and to exhibit the easy faith both of its writers and its readers. In truth, there is not a page of the “Religious History” of Theodoret, that does not furnish a commentary upon the sentiment with which he prefaces the life of St. Maro, that while the physicians of the body apply to every disease its own special and peculiar remedy, the prayers of the saints are a panacea common to all possible ills.§

Now we suppose no one will for a moment doubt that if a volume such as has been described were to be put now-a-days into the hands of a protestant, he would at once set it down as a sample of “Romish” credulity, and that he would lay all these reputed extravagancies at the door of the corrupt and superstitious schools to which it has given birth. It would be hard to persuade him that it was otherwise; much more to induce him to believe that the author was not alone a member of the ancient church, but one of the most distinguished and learned men of his day; that his authority as a historian stands deservedly high; that his other writings are freely used by pro-

* 1169.

‡ Ib. 1213.

† Ibid. 1131.

‡ Ib. 1222.

testants themselves, in the Arian controversy, and that one of the most popular objections from tradition against the doctrine of transubstantiation, is founded upon a passage from one of his works, which in comparison with the "Religious History," it certainly would be difficult not to regard as of minor importance.

It is plain, therefore, that to look upon the miraculous and supernatural narratives, popularly known under the name of "Legends of Saints," as the growth of modern or mediæval times, is a gross and palpable delusion. The readers who, in the third century, received without incredulity the relation of Attalus's revelation, would not have hesitated, provided sufficient evidence were produced, to admit the revelations of St. Thomas or St. Bonaventure, had they survived until that age. The writer who produced the *Religious History*, would have equally compiled the *Legenda Aurea*; and the popularity which we know the former to have attained, not alone in the east, but in the west,* is an evidence which no reasonable man can overlook, that the spirit of the fourth and fifth centuries was, in this particular, perfectly identical with that of the thirteenth.

Of course we shall not be regarded as accepting unreservedly the miraculous narratives of either period. The church of the fourth century, is not committed to *the truth or authenticity* of these recitals; neither is the Church of the fifteenth. But the sense of the faithful in both periods is clearly exhibited in both, as testifying to *the possibility*, and even to the congruity of these or similar manifestations of the divine power, through the hands of God's servants. And it is this, as it were constitutional, character of mind, which is necessary to a full appreciation of the Catholic view of these subjects, and such as these. It will be easy, therefore, to understand how a writer like Mrs. Jameson, even while seeking most jealously to avoid every sort of offence to a Catholic reader, must be sure notwithstanding, at least negatively, to clash with the feelings of Catholics, perhaps in the very act by which she sought to conciliate them.

But while we have thought it necessary to be thus explicit in stating our own views, lest the high opinion which we are bound to express regarding the literary merits of her

* See St. John Damascene, cited in the Preface. T. iii. p. 1098.

work might be construed into an approval of its general tone, we feel that we owe the reader some apology for thus delaying him from matters in themselves more interesting, and the more so, because the length to which these observations have run, will render our notice necessarily brief and unsatisfactory.

The two works, already published by Mrs. Jameson, form, as will at once be understood, parts of the same series. The first regards "scriptural personages and the poetical and traditional saints of the early ages of the Church, as represented in art." The second is devoted to the saints of the monastic orders, and those immediately connected therewith. A third part, and probably the most interesting and beautiful of all, is already promised under the title of "Legends of the Madonna."

The arrangement of the first series is somewhat arbitrary, but on the whole the division of the subjects is tolerably complete and satisfactory. Beginning, after a brief general introduction, with the artistic representation of angels and archangels (a subject which she treats, perhaps, more successfully than any other in the volume), she considers in succession the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Doctors of the Church, the Penitents, the Patrons, and Patronesses of Christendom, the Martyrs, the Bishops, the Hermits, and the Warrior Saints. Many of the latter divisions are far from being complete, nor was it indeed to be expected, that within so small a compass it should be otherwise; but although the work no where makes pretension to original research, and in many places betrays marks of haste and inaccuracy, yet it contains a vast amount of curious and interesting matter, arranged in a pleasing and attractive style. It would plainly be idle to attempt any detailed account of the several parts, and we shall therefore content ourselves with a few examples of the general manner.

We are particularly struck by the justice and simplicity of the following observations on a peculiarity of the early christian schools of art, which has often been the subject of criticism, and, indeed, of ridicule; we mean the seeming anachronisms with which it abounds.

"Our ancestors of the middle ages were not particular in drawing that strong line of demarcation between the classical, Jewish, and Christian periods of history, that we do. They saw only

Christendom every where ; they regarded the past only in relation to Christianity. Hence we find in the early ecclesiastical monuments and edifices such a strange assemblage of pagan, scriptural, and Christian worthies ; as, Hector of Troy, Alexander the Great, King David, Judas Maccabeus, King Arthur, St. George, Godfrey of Boulogne, Lucretia, Virginia, Judith, St. Elizabeth, St. Bridget (as in the Cross at Nuremberg). In the curious Manual of Greek Art, published by Didron, we find the Greek philosophers and poets entering into a scheme of ecclesiastical decoration ; (as in the Cathedral of Ulm) : Solon, Apollonius, Plutarch, Plato, Sophocles, stand together, holding each a scroll, on which is inscribed a passage from their works, interpreted into an allusion to the coming of Christ : and I have seen a picture of the Nativity in which the sybils are dancing hand-in-hand around the cradle of the new-born Saviour. This may appear profane to some, but the comprehension of the whole universe within the pale of Christianity strikes me as being in the most catholic, as well as in the most poetical, spirit.

“But while such assemblages of holy persons are to be considered as quite independent of chronology, we shall find that the selection has been neither capricious nor arbitrary, and, with a little consideration, we shall discover the leading idea in the mind of the artist—that, at least, which was intended to be conveyed to the mind of the spectator, and which was much more intelligible in former times than it is now.

“Sometimes we find certain saints placed in companionship, because they are the joint patrons and protectors of the city or locality for which the picture was painted. Thus in the Bologna pictures we constantly find the bishop St. Petronius, St. Eloy, St. Dominick, and the warrior St. Proculus ; while in the Venetian pictures we have perpetual St. Marks, St. Georges, and St. Catherines.

“Or, secondly, they are connected by kindred powers and attributes. Thus we find St. Sebastian, the patron against pestilence, in company with St. Roch, who ministered to the sick of the plague. Thus St. Catherine and St. Jerome, the two patrons of school theology, are often found in companionship. Where St. Catherine and St. Barbara are found together, the first figures as patroness of the ecclesiastical, and the second of the military, power—or they represent respectively the contemplative and the active life.

“Or, thirdly, they are combined in the fancy by some inevitable association ; as St. Augustine and St. Stephen are often in the same picture, because St. Augustine dedicated some of his most eloquent works to the glory of the martyr.

“Or they were friends on earth, for which reason St. Cyprian and St. Cornelius are placed together.

“Or their relics repose in the same spot ; whence St. Stephen and

St. Laurence have become almost inseparable. When St. Vincent and St. Laurence are placed together, (as in a lovely composition of Parmigiano, where they sit reading out of the same book), it is because of the similarity of their fate, and that the popular tradition supposed them to be brothers.

“A point of more general importance, and capable of more definite explanation, is the predominance of certain sacred personages in particular schools of Art. St. Cosmo and St. Damian, for instance, are perpetually recurring in the Florentine pictures as the patron saints of the Medici family. In the Lombard pictures St. Ambrose is often found without his compeers—not as doctor of the Church, but as bishop of Milan. In the Siena pictures, we may look for the nun St. Catherine of Siena, and St. Ansano, the apostle of the Sienese, holding his banner and palm. And in the Augustine chapels and churches St. Augustine figures, not as doctor of the Church, but as patriarch of the Order.

“A bishop-martyr, holding his palm, and not otherwise designated either by name or attribute, would be—in one of Perugino’s pictures, St. Ercolano or St. Costanzo; in a Florentine picture, St. Donato or St. Romulo; if the picture were painted in the March of Ancona, it would probably be St. Apollinaris of Ravenna; at Naples it would be St. Januarius; at Paris, or in a picture painted for a French church, of which there are many in Italy, it would be St. Denis; and in German prints, St. Boniface or St. Lambert. I need not further multiply examples.”—*Legendary Art*, pp. 9—10.

The observations upon symbols, too, are very judicious and instructive;—not only the general remarks in the introduction, but those which are interspersed in the several departments of the work. The enumeration of symbols, however, is far from complete; nor are the explanations, in all cases, perfectly accurate. For example, it is a great mistake to represent the figure of the PELICAN as a symbol merely of “*our redemption through Christ.*” (*Legendary Art*, p. 13.) This signification is, undoubtedly, contained under the emblem, because the sacrifice of the Cross is identical with that of the Eucharist: but its true use is as a type of *the blessed Eucharist*. Indeed, it is only in this sense that it can bear its full and complete signification—that of the bird’s *feeding its young with its blood*: and it is frequently found combined with other emblems of the blessed Eucharist, which it is impossible to mistake.

We have already observed that Mrs. Jameson, in her treatment of legends, confines herself, or at least seeks to confine herself, to the artistic view of the subject. She seldom enters into a discussion of their historical truth or

probability; and although there is often a seeming tendency to dwell upon, or at least to bring prominently forward, the strangest and most improbable circumstances of the tradition, yet it can seldom be said to be done in a spirit of levity, and hardly even in a tone of ridicule. On the contrary, in most cases the tone of the narrative is sufficiently grave and solemn; in many it is almost as reverent as we should desire. We regret very much that the space which remains at our disposal, is too limited to admit of our introducing many passages which we had marked for extract. Perhaps the following account of the well-known legend of St. Peter, the *DOMINE QUO VADIS*, may serve as a specimen of the general treatment, both religious and artistical, of such subjects.

“The next subject in the order of events is styled the ‘*DOMINE, QUO VADIS?*’ After the burning of Rome, Nero threw upon the Christians the accusation of having fired the city. This was the origin of the first persecution, in which many perished by terrible and hitherto unheard-of deaths. The Christian converts besought Peter not to expose his life, which was dear and necessary to the well-being of all; and at length he consented to depart from Rome. But as he fled along the Appian Way, about two miles from the gates, he was met by a vision of our Saviour travelling towards the city. Struck with amazement, he exclaimed, ‘Lord! whither goest Thou?’ to which the Saviour, looking upon him with a mild sadness, replied, ‘I go to Rome to be crucified a second time,’ and vanished. Peter, taking this for a sign that he was to submit himself to the sufferings prepared for him, immediately turned back, and re-entered the city. Michael Angelo’s famous statue, now in the church of S. Maria-sopra-Minerva at Rome, is supposed to represent Christ as he appeared to Peter on this occasion; and a cast or copy of it is in the little church of ‘*Domine quo vadis?*’ erected on the spot sanctified by this mysterious meeting.

“It is surprising that this most beautiful, picturesque, and, to my fancy, sublime legend has been so seldom treated; and never, as it appears to me, in a manner worthy of its capabilities and its high significance. It is seldom that a whole story can be told by two figures, and these two figures placed in such grand and dramatic contrast—Christ in His serene majesty and radiant with all the glory of beatitude, yet with an expression of gentle reproach; the apostle at his feet, arrested in his flight, amazed, and yet filled with a trembling joy; and for the background the wide Campagna or the towering walls of imperial Rome;—these are grand materials; but the pictures I have met with are all ineffective in conception. The best fall short of the sublime ideal; most of them are theatrical and commonplace.

“Raphael has interpreted it in a style rather too classical for the spirit of the legend ; with great simplicity and dignity, but as a *fact*, rather than a vision conjured up by the stricken conscience and tenderness of the affectionate apostle. The small picture by Annibal Caracci in our National Gallery, is a carefully finished academical study and nothing more, but may be referred to as a fair example of the usual mode of treatment.”—*Legendary Art*, p. 123.

It may be well for the reader to know, that the legend which Mrs. Jameson thus slightly introduces, is told without the slightest expression of doubt by St. Ambrose, in his “Discourse against Auxentius, on delivering up Churches.”* Her account, too, of the legend of the Fall of Simon Magus, is extremely imperfect. She describes it as founded on some ancient tradition, not wholly unsupported by his trivial testimony. Now, the fact is, that it is not only related circumstantially by St. Justin, in his Apology, by St. Ambrose, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Augustine, Philastrius, Theodore, Isidore of Pelusium, and other christian writers ; but is not obscurely referred to by more than one Pagan historian of the reign of Nero. Dion Chrysostomus tells, that Nero kept for a long time in his court a magician, who promised to fly ; and Suetonius informs us in addition, that the attempt was really made ; that it proved a miserable failure, and that the blood of the unhappy experimentalist actually stained the balcony on which the emperor was seated, for the purpose of witnessing the performance.†

It would be unjust, however, to hold Mrs. Jameson responsible for omissions such as these. They cannot be said fairly to have come within the plan which she proposed. And we have alluded to them only for the purpose of enabling the reader to see that the subject has two distinct phases, the historical and the artistic, and that of these her work only professes to consider the latter. The knowledge of this fact is absolutely necessary, in order to form a just idea, either of Mrs. Jameson’s performance, or of the subject of Legends itself. Nor can we better explain this necessity than by suggesting, as a supplement to any single one of her notices, the perusal of Alban Butler’s critical history of the same subject ; in which the history is separated from the ornament of art, and, while the legend

* Opp. II. 867. [Ben. Ed.] † Suetonius. Nero. cap. 12.

is stripped of all that had been added for the purpose of effect, its true historical foundation is carefully and accurately exhibited.

The second series of *Legendary Art* comprises the "Legends of the Monastic Orders." Of the Introduction, which is prefixed to it, we do not mean to speak. Although we, of course, dissent from Mrs. Jameson's views of the Monastic Institute, we feel that they are perfectly natural in a Protestant; and they are explained in terms which need not offend the most austere Catholic. The plan of the work is very similar to that of the first series. It comprises St. Benedict and the early Benedictines in all the countries of Europe; the Reformed Benedictines; the Augustinians; and their kindred orders; the Mendicant orders;—under which she treats the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Carmelites;—and lastly the Jesuits. Speaking strictly according to historical principles, the distribution of subjects in the second series is far from being correct; but for the purposes of art, this strict accuracy of distribution is not required; and at all events, the leading characters of each school are introduced, although not always in precisely that order or connection which we should have preferred. The portion of the volume devoted to the Benedictine institute, and the saints connected with it, appears scarcely commensurate, not only with the historical importance of that great community, but also with the numerous monuments of early art with which they are identified; but the notices, though brief, are, on the whole, satisfactory. St. Francis, St. Antony, St. Dominic, St. Bernard, and especially the "dear Saint Elizabeth" of Hungary, receive a fairer share of notice. There is much in the accounts of each which we would gladly transcribe; but we must content ourselves with a single extract from the *Poetical Legends* of "St. Francis and the Animals," which perhaps will have more novelty than the rest. We need hardly premise that the account of the legend is Mrs. Jameson's own.

"Among the legends of St. Francis, some of the most interesting are those which place him in relation with the lower animals. He looked upon all beings as existing by, and through God; and as having a portion of that divine principle by which he himself existed. He was accustomed to call all living things his brothers and sisters. In the enthusiasm of his charity he interpreted literally the text, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel

to every creature.' He appears to have thought that all sentient beings had a share in the divine mission of Christ; and since a part of that divine mission was to enlarge the sphere of our human sympathies, till they embrace *all* our fellow-creatures, it should seem that the more the tender spirit of Christianity is understood and diffused, the more will the lower creation be elevated through our own more elevated intelligence and refined sympathies. Dr. Arnold says, in a striking passage of one of his letters, that 'the destinies of the brute creation appeared to him a mystery which he could not approach without awe.' St. Francis, in his gentle and tender enthusiasm, solved that mystery—at least to himself—by admitting animals within the pale of Christian sympathy. I shall give a few of these legends here, as the best commentary on the subjects above described. It is recorded that when he walked in the fields the sheep and the lambs thronged around him, hares and rabbits nestled in his bosom; but of all living creatures he seems to have loved especially birds of every kind, as being the most unearthly in their nature; and among birds he loved best the dove. 'One day he met, in his road, a young man on his way to Siene to sell some doves, which he had caught in a snare; and Francis said to him, 'Oh, good young man! these are the birds to whom the Scripture compares those who are pure and faithful before God: do not kill them, I beseech thee, but give them rather to me;' and when they were given to him, he put them in his bosom and carried them to his convent at Ravacciano, where he made for them nests, and fed them every day, until they became so tame as to eat from his hand: and the young man had also his recompense; for he became a friar, and lived a holy life from that day forth.'—St. Francis had also a great tenderness for larks, and often pointed out to his disciples the lark mounting to 'heaven's gate,' and singing praises to the Creator, as a proper emblem of Christian aspiration. 'A lark brought her brood of nestlings to his cell, to be fed from his hand: he saw that the strongest of these nestlings tyrannised over the others, pecking at them and taking more than his due share of the food; whereupon the good saint rebuked the creature, saying, 'Thou unjust and insatiable! thou shalt die miserably, and the greediest animals shall refuse to eat thy flesh.' And so it happened, for the creature drowned itself through its impetuosity in drinking, and when it was thrown to the cats they would not touch it.'—'On his return from Syria, in passing through the Venetian Lagune, vast numbers of birds were singing, and he said to his companion, 'Our sisters, the birds, are praising their Creator; let us sing with them,'—and he began the sacred service. But the warbling of the birds interrupted them, therefore St. Francis said to them, 'Be silent till we also have praised God,' and they ceased their song, and did not resume it till he had given them permission.'—'On another occasion, preaching at Alviano, he could not make himself heard for the chirping of the swallows,

which were at that time building their nests : pausing, therefore, in his sermon, he said, ‘ My sisters, you have talked enough ; it is time that I should have my turn. Be silent, and listen to the word of God ! ’ and they were silent immediately. ’—‘ On another occasion, as he was sitting with his disciple Leo, he felt himself penetrated with joy and consolation by the song of the nightingale, and he desired his friend Leo to raise his voice and sing the praises of God in company with the bird. But Leo excused himself by reason of his bad voice ; upon which Francis himself began to sing, and when he stopped, the nightingale took up the strain, and thus they sang alternately, until the night was far advanced, and Francis was obliged to stop, for his voice failed. Then he confessed that the little bird had vanquished him ; he called it to him, thanked it for its song, and gave it the remainder of his bread ; and having bestowed his blessing upon it, the creature flew away.’

“ Here we have a version of the antique legend of the Thessalian Shepherd and the Nightingale : but there the nightingale is vanquished and dies ; here the lesson of humility is given to the man. Mark the distinction between the classic and the Christian sentiment !

“ ‘ A grasshopper was wont to sit and sing on a fig-tree near the cell of the man of God, and oftentimes by her singing she excited him also to sing the praises of the Creator ; and one day he called her to him, and she flew upon his hand, and Francis said to her, ‘ Sing, my sister, and praise the Lord thy Creator.’ So she began her song immediately, nor ceased till at the father’s command she flew back to her own place ; and she remained eight days there, coming and singing at his behest. At length the man of God said to his disciples, ‘ Let us dismiss our sister ; enough, that she has cheered us with her song, and excited us to the praise of God these eight days.’ So, being permitted, she immediately flew away, and was seen no more.’

“ When he found worms or insects in his road, he was careful not to tread upon them ; ‘ he stepped aside, and bid the reptile live.’ He would even remove them from the pathway, lest they should be crushed by others.

“ One day, in passing through a meadow, he saluted the flocks which were grazing there, and he perceived a poor little lamb which was feeding all alone in the midst of a flock of goats ; he was moved with pity, and he said, ‘ Thus did our mild Saviour stand alone in the midst of the Jews and the Pharisees.’ He would have bought this sheep, but he had nothing in the world but his tunic : however, a charitable man passing by, and seeing his grief, bought the lamb and gave it to him. When he was at Rome, in 1222, he had with him a pet lamb, which accompanied him everywhere ; and in pictures of St. Francis a lamb is frequently introduced, which may either signify his meekness and purity of mind,

or it may represent this very lamb, 'which lay in his bosom, and was to him as a daughter.'—*Monastic Orders*, p. 274—8.

It would be unpardonable to close our notice of Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, without a tribute to the great Dominican artist, Fra Angelico, to whom the religious art, not only of his own order, but of the Church generally, owes so deep a debt. It is introduced in connection with his dear friend and companion St. Antoninus of Florence.

"The story of this good saint is connected in a very interesting manner with the history of art.

"He was born at Florence, of noble parents, about the year 1384. While yet in his childhood the singular gravity of his demeanour, his dislike to all childish sports, and the enthusiasm and fervour with which he was seen to pray for hours before a crucifix of particular sanctity,—then, and I believe now, in the Or San Michele,—caused his parents to regard him as one set apart for the service of God. At the age of fifteen he presented himself at the door of the Dominican convent at Fiesole, and humbly desired to be admitted as a novice. The prior, astonished at the request from one so young, and struck by his diminutive person and delicate appearance, deemed him hardly fit to undertake the duties and austerities imposed on the Order, but would not harshly refuse him. 'What hast thou studied, my son?' he asked, benignly; the boy replied modestly that he had studied the Humanities and the Canon Law. 'Well,' replied the prior, somewhat incredulous, 'return to thy father's house, my son; and when thou hast got by heart the *Libro del Decreto*, return hither, and thou shalt have thy wish,'—and so with good words dismissed him, not thinking, perhaps, to see him again. Antonino, though not gifted with any extraordinary talents, had an indomitable will, and was not to be frightened by tasks or tests of any kind from a resolution over which he had brooded from infancy. He turned away from the gate of the convent and sought his home. At the end of a year he appeared again before the prior:—'Reverend father, I have learned the book of Decrees by heart; will you now admit me?' The good prior, recovering from his astonishment, put him to the proof, found that he could repeat the whole book as if he held it in his hand, and therefore, seeing clearly that it was the will of God that it should be so, he admitted him into the brotherhood, and sent him to Cortona to study during the year of his noviciate. At the end of that period, he returned to Fiesole and pronounced his vows, being then sixteen. The remainder of his life showed that his had been a true vocation. Lowly, charitable, and studious, he was above all remarkable for the gentle but irresistible power he exercised over others, and which arose not

so much from any idea entertained of his superior talents and judgment, as from confidence in the simplicity of his pure unworldly mind and in his perfect truth.

“ Now in the same convent at Fiesole where Antonino made his profession, there dwelt a young friar about the same age as himself, whose name was Fra Giovanni, and who was yet more favoured by Heaven ; for to him, in addition to the virtues of humility, charity, and piety, was vouchsafed the gift of surpassing genius. He was a painter : early in life he had dedicated himself and his beautiful art to the service of God and of His most blessed saints ; and, that he might be worthy of his high and holy vocation, he sought to keep himself unspotted from the world, for he was accustomed to say that ‘ those who work for Christ must dwell in Christ.’ Ever before he commenced a picture which was to be consecrated to the honour of God, he prepared himself with fervent prayer and meditation, and then he began, in humble trust that it would be put into his mind what he ought to delineate ; and he would never change nor deviate from the first idea, for, as he said, “ *that was the will of God ; (così fusse la volontà di Dio ;)* and this he said, not in presumption, but in faith and simplicity of heart. So he passed his life in imaging those visions of beatitude which descended on his fancy, sent indeed by no fabled Muse, but even by that Spirit ‘ that doth prefer before all temples the upright heart and pure ; and surely never before nor since was earthly material worked up into soul, nor earthly forms refined into spirit, as under the hand of this most pious and most excellent painter. He became sublime by the force of his own goodness and humility. It was as if Paradise had opened upon him, a Paradise of rest and joy, of purity and love, where no trouble, no guile, no change could enter : and if, as it has been said, his celestial creations seem to want power, not the less do we feel that they need it not,—that before those ethereal beings power itself would be powerless : such are his angels, resistless in their soft serenity ; such his virgins, pure from all earthly stain ; such his redeemed spirits, gliding into Paradise ; such his sainted martyrs and confessors, absorbed in devout rapture. Well has he been named IL BEATO and ANGELICO whose life was ‘ participate with angels ’ even in this world !

“ Now this most excellent and favoured Giovanni, and the good and gentle-hearted Antonino, dwelling together in their youth within the narrow precincts of their convent, came to know and to love each other well. And no doubt the contemplative and studious mind of Antonino nourished with spiritual learning the genius of the painter, while the realisation of his own teaching grew up before him in hues and forms more definite than words, and more harmonious than music ; and when in after years they parted, and Antonino was sent by his superiors to various convents, to restore, by his mild influence, relaxed discipline,—and Angelico by

the same authority to various churches and convents at Florence, Cortona, Arezzo, Orvieto, to adorn them with his divine skill,—the two friends never forgot each other.

“Many years passed away, in which each fulfilled his vocation, walking humbly before God; when at length the fame of Angelico having gone forth through all Italy, the Pope called him to Rome, to paint for him there a chapel of wondrous beauty, with the pictured actions and sufferings of those two blessed martyrs, St. Stephen and St. Laurence, whose remains repose together without the walls of Rome; and while Angelico was at his work, the Pope took pleasure in looking on and conversing with him, and was filled with reverence for his pure and holy life, and for his wisdom, which, indeed, was not of this world.

“At this period the Archbishop of Florence died, and the Pope was much troubled to fill his place, for the times were perilous, and the Florentines were disaffected to the Church.

“One day, conversing with Angelico, and more than ever struck with his simplicity, his wisdom, and his goodness, he offered him the dignity of Archbishop; and great was the surprise of the Holy Father when the painter entreated that he would choose another, being himself addicted to his art, and not fit to guide or instruct or govern men; adding, that he knew of one far more worthy than himself, one of his own brotherhood, a man who feared God and loved the poor,—learned, discreet, and faithful: and he named the Frate Antonino, who was then acting in Naples as Vicar-General. When the Pope heard that name, it was as if a sudden light broke through the trouble and darkness of his mind; he wondered that he had not thought of him before, as he was precisely the man best fitted for the office. Antonino therefore, was appointed Archbishop of Florence, to the great joy of the Florentines, for he was their countryman, and already beloved and honoured for the sanctity and humility of his life: when raised to his new dignity he became the model of a wise and good prelate, maintaining peace among his people, and distinguished not only by his charity but his justice and his firmness.”—*Monastic Orders*, pp. 415—418.

We shall probably have occasion to return to this interesting work, on the publication of the third series, “*Legends of the Madonna.*” But we cannot part from it at present without expressing once again the exceeding gratification which we have received from the volumes already published. The form selected for the second Series, and for the second edition of the first, is admirably adapted for the display of the illustrations, which are introduced with almost lavish profusion; and the spirit and expressiveness which, generally speaking, distinguish them

all, even those of the slightest and least pretentious character, place the publication, even as mere specimen of mechanical art, in the very highest rank of ornamental typography.

As a contribution to the study of sacred art, we can scarcely exaggerate its value; and although its direct tendency is far from Catholic, and bears but remotely upon religious belief, we cannot help anticipating from its circulation, and from the tastes which it cannot fail to create, or to stimulate, the same results in influencing the religious opinions of its readers, to which the kindred study of sacred architecture, although undertaken with precisely the same views, has so largely and so notoriously contributed in England.

Dr. Russell

ART. VII.—*London Labour and the London Poor.* By HENRY MAYHEW. Vol. i. London, 1851.

IF we wish fully to sound the depths of misery, moral or physical, of society, it is to the great cities that we must resort. Thither, and particularly to capitals, all extremes tend and flow; and there we shall find mixed up together, the splendour, the refinement, the graces, the culture, the pomps and the luxuries of life on the one side; and all its wretchedness, squalor, ignorance, privation and despair on the other. Perhaps we are wrong in saying that we find them mixed together. In England at least, where there is more theoretical equality and democracy than elsewhere, there is a natural process of gravitation, by which poverty and suffering sink ever lower and lower, and leave the higher tenants of earthly life floating or gliding on the surface, unencumbered with their annoyance. The very whereabouts of poverty in London are an unknown region to the wealthy; its existence is an evil often confounded with low vice or imposture, or at least with poor-rates and parochial business. In the country the course of misfortune or negligence is short and simple. From the farm house to the labourer's cottage, and from

this to the Union, makes but two steps. But in London, there are innumerable gradations between the humbly independent tradesman, and the absolute beggar: and even when we have reached this lowest depth of ordinary society, there opens upon us a still lower deep, or series of abysses, down, down through every stage of vice, profligacy, and crime, into the very infernal pool of professional, heartless, and hopeless, depravity.

The accumulation, in one place, of so many fermenting elements of humanity, has always been a cause of alarm to statesmen, whose minds are able to rise above political littleness. Proletarianism was the dread of ancient Rome, and has been the scourge of modern Paris. It is yet a dormant power with us; and we despise it. The Roman chiefs, republican or imperial, humoured and coaxed the monster: built for it huge granaries, baths and amphitheatres; showered on it largesses, fed it with "bread and Circensian games;" stuffed and deadened its maw with troops of gladiators and bloody frays; and, as its appetite became more carnivorous, imported packs of lions and leopards, and hunted Christians for its sport. The French nation, a generation back, bent its neck to the guillotine which it erected in every market-place; and one cannot read the horrible scenes of the Carmes, or the Abbaye Saint-Germain, with their mob of male demons and female furies, and not shudder at the thought of what the evil-roused energies of this sleeping dragon may become. And lately, after the Roman-like policy of drugging and soothing by *ateliers nationaux* has been vainly tried, it has required an entire army paraded daily before it, face to face, with old Algerine generals at the head, to keep it in awe and check.

In England we are trying, and so far successfully, another course. The strong arm of the law is able to repress, the very first ruffling of its scales, and it lies cowering at the feet of the civil power. It is however perfectly amazing to contemplate, what an immense amount of activity, vigilance, legislation, and force are actually in constant employment, to keep down the vice and crime which belong to the poorer class. For in reality, a culprit at the bar, of even the class of a Rush, or a Mrs. Manning, is a rare object of wonder: and a captain confined for ten days has formed a new epoch in magisterial jurisprudence. So used are we to identify

poverty and delinquency, that our very compassion embodies itself in a penitentiary form, and our charity confounds relief with incarceration. Yet we speak not now of the workhouse or poor-law systems, which entail so much expense and keep up such a system of activity; but allude to the more judiciary forms of coercion. While Chancery reform bills that slumber and linger through successive sessions are for the rich; for the poor, in most part, are acts permitting summary convictions, or prohibiting the sale of poisons, which run rapidly through both houses. For them is the army of our admirable police; for them the daily labour of not quite so admirable magistrates; for them the gloomy prison van takes its frequent journeys, and new model gaols raise their dreary walls.

This is indeed a melancholy law of society: that the wisdom, education, influence and energy of one class should have to be constantly engaged in studying how to correct, to punish, and to check the other. Theoretically, we may say, justice is equal: and the dock is for rich that offends, as for poor. But practically it is otherwise: the rich and high portion of society is represented by judge and bar; the destitute and wretched by the culprit. This however has been from time immemorial the state of things; and therefore we have called it a law of society. But the work to which we wish to introduce our readers, and which must arouse attention to the brooding elements of London proletarianism, exposes, we think, an unwarrantable readiness to sacrifice the interests and very subsistence of the poor, to the mere comfort or avarice of the rich. The patient, persevering stall-keeper is driven mercilessly away from a standing of many years, on which his all depends, because it is inconvenient to the plate-glass shop opposite; and the industrious boy or woman is driven harshly from the street-side, where their bread is to be earned, because their presence narrows the path to the wealthy citizen, as he hurries to the city, to make in a few hours what would give them a capital for life.* It is a wise, as well as a holy saying: "The rich and the poor man have met; the Maker of both is the Lord." (Prov. xxii. 2.) The one should not be rudely jostled from the other's path; lest one day he may place himself sturdily

* See p. 59 of our work.

across it. Let them walk side by side, and see and know one another better, and judge more kindly of each other. Let not the rich draw his knowledge of the poor from the police reports: and let not the poor form his estimate of the rich, from tales of profligacy in penny Sunday papers. We are much mistaken if Mr. Mayhew's embassy from a higher sphere to the poor or destitute classes will not lead to some softening of the latter's feelings: and we are sure, that the publication of his negotiations among this, to the wealthy, newly-discovered race, will open the minds of many to more generous thoughts and kindlier efforts in its favour, than have entered there before.

The researches among the poor, presented in the serial before us, were first undertaken for a daily paper. It is no concern of ours what led to the separation of its writer from this periodical, and to the present form of his work. We are glad to have it as it appears, and to make it known to our readers. We cannot hope to give any thing like an adequate account of its interest; but we trust to excite this feeling in others, and thus induce them to read and to ponder it.

The portion of the work before us relates to "The Street-folk," that is to people who get their living, by occupation professedly honest, in the thoroughfares of London. Even this part of the subject is not yet completed; but we are sure that every reader will be startled, as we have been, at the details here collected and brought before him. And first let us see the generic classification of the "street-folk;" and that some idea may be formed of their further subdivision into species, we will give Mr. Mayhew's general view, with the further division of his first class.

"OF THE LONDON STREET-FOLK.

"Those who obtain their living in the streets of the metropolis are a very large and varied class; indeed, the means resorted to in order 'to pick up a crust,' as the people call it, in the public thoroughfares (and such in many instances it *literally* is), are so multifarious that the mind is long baffled in its attempts to reduce them to scientific order or classification.

"It would appear, however, that the street-people may be all arranged under six distinct genera or kinds.

"These are severally:

" I. STREET-SELLERS.

" II. STREET-BUYERS.

" III. STREET-FINDERS.

“IV. STREET-PERFORMERS, ARTISTS, AND SHOWMEN.

“V. STREET-ARTIZANS, OR WORKING PEDLARS ; and

“VI. STREET-LABOURERS.

“The first of these divisions—the STREET-SELLERS—includes many varieties ; viz.—

“1. *The Street-sellers of Fish, &c.*—‘wet,’ ‘dry,’ and shell fish—and poultry, game, and cheese.

“2. *The Street-sellers of Vegetables*, fruit (both ‘green’ and ‘dry’), flowers, trees, shrubs, seeds, and roots, and ‘green stuff,’ as (water-cresses, chickweed and grun’sel, and turf).

“3. *The Street-sellers of Eatables and Drinkables*,—including the vendors of fried fish, hot eels, pickled whelks, sheep’s trotters, ham sandwiches, peas’-soup, hot green peas, penny pies, plum ‘duff,’ meat-puddings, baked potatoes, spice-cakes, muffins and crumpets, Chelsea buns, sweetmeats, brandy-balls, cough drops, and cat and dog’s meat—such constituting the principal eatables sold in the street ; while under the head of street drinkables may be specified tea and coffee, ginger-beer, lemonade, hot wine, new milk from the cow, ass’s milk, curds and whey, and occasionally water.

“4. *The Street-sellers of Stationery, Literature, and the Fine Arts*—among whom are comprised the flying stationers, or standing and running patterers ; the long-song-sellers ; the wall-song-sellers, (or ‘pinners-up,’ as they are technically termed) ; the ballad sellers ; the vendors of play-bills, second editions of newspapers, back numbers of periodicals and old books, almanacks, pocket books, memorandum books, note paper, sealing-wax, pens, pencils, stenographic cards, valentines, engravings, manuscript music, images, and gelatine poetry cards.

“5. *The Street-sellers of Manufactured Articles*, which class comprises a large number of individuals, as, (a) the vendors of chemical articles of manufacture—viz., blacking, lucifers, corn-salves, grease removing compositions, plating-balls, poison for rats, crackers, detonating-balls, and cigar lights. (b) The vendors of metal articles of manufacture—razors and pen-knives, tea-trays, dog-collars, and key-rings, hardware, bird-cages, small coins, medals, jewellery, tinware, tools, card-counters, red-herring-toasters, trivets, gridirons, and Dutch ovens. (c) The vendors of china and stone articles of manufacture—as cups and saucers, jugs, vases, chimney ornaments, and stone fruit. (d) The vendors of linen, cotton, and silken articles of manufacture—as sheeting, table-covers, cotton, tapes and thread, boot and stay-laces, haberdashery, pretended smuggled goods, shirt-buttons, etc., etc. ; and (e) the vendors of miscellaneous articles of manufacture—as cigars, pipes, and snuff-boxes, spectacles, combs, ‘lots,’ rhubarb, sponges, wash-leather, paper-hangings, dolls, Bristol toys, sawdust, and pin-cushions.

“6. *The Street-sellers of Second-hand Articles*, of whom there are again four separate classes ; as (a) those who sell old metal articles—viz. old knives and forks, keys, tin-ware, tools, and marine stores

generally ; (b) those who sell old linen articles—as old sheeting for towels ; (c) those who sell old glass and crockery—including bottles, old pans and pitchers, old looking-glasses, &c. ; and (d) those who sell old miscellaneous articles—as old shoes, old clothes, old saucepan lids, &c., &c.

“7. *The Street-sellers of Live Animals*—including the dealers in dogs, squirrels, birds, gold and silver fish, and tortoises.

“8. *The Street-sellers of Mineral Productions and Curiosities*—as red and white sand, silver sand, coals, coke, salt, spar ornaments, and shells.

“These so far as my experience goes, exhaust the whole class of street-sellers, and they appear to constitute nearly three-fourths of the entire number of individuals obtaining a subsistence in the streets of London.”—p. 3.

When it is considered that the vendor of each sort of *friandises* enumerated in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, gives the subject of a separate section, the reader will be able to form some idea of the minuteness and extent to which Mr. Mayhew has stretched his labours. Indeed, although while we are writing, the work has reached the completion of its first volume, we shall be obliged to confine our attention to the first half, as containing quite sufficient for one article.

The first class to which we have alluded, as described in the three first paragraphs, is generally distinguished by the name of costermongers ; and it certainly deserves more special notice than any other. These may be said to form a race apart in the midst of the London population. They live together in particular localities ; have customs, ideas, systems, virtues, vices, education, occupation, modes of carrying on business, and of spending money, domestic moralities, and social principles, nay, costume and language, so similar, as to entitle them to form a community of themselves. It is impossible to read the account of them without sympathy and interest. There is much simplicity and kindness mixed with dishonesty and cunning, much independence of character, with great curiosity about higher ranks, coarseness of feeling, and rude luxury in taste, which give a peculiar savour to the composition of this class, distinct from others of the industrious poor. They are, moreover, almost instinctively a roaming, out of door people, whose children inherit the restlessness of their parents, as in all nomadic tribes ; and, like these, there is a lawlessness of character, and an innate hatred of restraint,

which make them consider the enforcers and representatives of order as natural born foes, to be at all times dreaded, and if possible, sometimes thrashed. It will be owned, that an insulated body, growing up in the heart of the population, with considerable idiosyncracies, and but slight attachments to the body that contains it, forms a dangerous element in society, and deserves a peculiar treatment, to prevent its becoming the source, or seat, of morbid action. Such a people are like the Jews in Poland, or the Gitanos in Spain, or the Boers in our Cape colonies,—unincorporated subjects, who never mingle with, nor get fairly into solution, but are only floating or suspended, in the community in which they live. Perhaps this danger is rather increased than diminished by the circumstance, that here the semi-extraneous family which exists in the midst of us, does not belong to another and a weaker race; but has all the energies and powers, physical and moral, of the national population.

Mr. Mayhew takes different modes of calculating the number of costermongers in London; and arrives at the conclusion, that there are 30,000 men, women, and children, who depend for their livelihood on the street-trade in vegetables, fruit, and fish. Here, then, is the population of a considerable city engaged in only the provision department of street-traffic. This may give us some idea of what the metropolis really is. One may live years in it, and never know what forms the occupation of tens of thousands of its inhabitants. Early in the morning, a few cries of water-cresses, or vegetables, sound along the street, too early for them to be heard by the rich or great; in the course of the day a truck-full of what are considered vulgar flowers, or a basket-full of what will be considered refuse strawberries, will be pushed or carried round the square, to tempt the humbler portions of the lordly household. These indications, probably overlooked, are the only ones that reach the eye of our legislators of the existence of a whole army, who, scattered over the vast space of London, but condensed into a mass by the unity of class, have to find their living by this precarious occupation.

It is not, however, among the rich, nor in their haunts, that the labours, the industry, the losses or the gains, of this class of traders find their place; but they carry on the traffic of large neighbourhoods, dependent mainly on them for food. Every morning, says Mr. Mayhew, there are the

following number of "costermongers attending the London markets: Billingsgate-market, 3,500; Covent-garden, 4,000; Spitalfields, 1,000; Borough, 250; Leadenhall, 100;—total, 9,350. Besides these, I am credibly informed, that it may be assumed, there are full 1,000 men who are unable to attend market, owing to the dissipation of the previous night; another 1,000 are absent owing to their having 'stock on hand,' and so requiring no fresh purchases." With the stock thus prepared, this multitude sallies forth; and by dint of perambulating, bawling, coaxing, and too often, lying, must have got rid of it by evening. This may give us some idea of the multitude who carry on their trade in the streets; but we believe our readers will be startled when they see the figures that express the amount of traffic thus carried on.

Thus, it will be hardly credited, that among these peripatetic merchants of London, the sum paid for rent of barrows to carry round their commodities, amounts annually to £16,250. But Mr. Mayhew's general conclusion on this head will better express the magnitude of this business.

"We may then, I think, safely assert, that the gross yearly receipts of the London costermongers are two millions of money; that their clear annual gain or income, is £425,000; and that the capital invested in their business, in the form of donkey-carts, barrows, baskets, weights, and stock-money, is £25,000; half of this being borrowed, for which they pay upwards of £20,000 interest per annum."—p. 120.

Now here we have really a trade which would make the wealth of a considerable commercial town. So huge in all its limbs is London! We must now, however, give more in detail the incredible amount of merchandise upon which this commerce is exercised, and we will divide it into fish, vegetables, and flowers or shrubs, and game.

It would not be thought, from superficial observation, that fish furnishes the most extensive branch of the street trade. It is but little seen hawked in the wealthier quarters of the city, and we are sure that none of our readers can be prepared for the returns which this traffic yields. The following is the quantity of "wet fish" sold every year in the streets of London, out of shops and mainly to the poor.

	No. of Fish.	lbs. weight.
" Salmon	20,000	175,000
Live-cod	100,000	1,000,000
Soles	6,500,000	1,650,000
Whiting	4,440,000	1,680,000
Haddock	250,000	500,000
Plaice	29,400,000	29,400,000
Mackarel	15,700,000	15,700,000
Herrings	875,000,000	210,000,000
Sprats	"	3,000,000
Eels, from Holland	400,000	65,000
Flounders	260,000	43,000
Dabs	270,000	48,000

Total quantity of wet fish }
sold in the streets of London. } 932,340,000 263,281,000 "

Now this is but one part of the food destined to satisfy the piscivorous maw of London town; to it we have to add the dry, or salt, and the shell fish. We will give their numbers in the table which states the value yearly spent in the streets on these commodities. It is as follows:

" Wet Fish,	£
175,000 lbs. of salmon, at 6 <i>d.</i> per lb.....	4,000
1,000,000 lbs. of live cod, at 1½ <i>d.</i> per lb....	5,000
3,250,000 pairs of soles, at 1½ <i>d.</i> per pair...	20,000
4,400,000 whiting, at ½ <i>d.</i> each	9,000
29,400,000 plaice, at ⅓ <i>d.</i>	90,000
15,700,000 mackarel, at 6 for 1 <i>s.</i>	130,000
875,000,000 herrings, at 16 a groat.....	900,000
3,000,000 lbs. of sprats, at 1 <i>d.</i> per lb.	12,000
400,000 lbs. of eels, at 3 lbs. for 1 <i>s.</i>	6,000
260,000 flounders, at 1 <i>d.</i> per doz.	100
270,000 dabs, at 1 <i>d.</i> per dozen	100
Sum total expended yearly in wet fish.....	1,177,000

" Dry Fish.	
525,000 lbs. barrelled cod, at 1½ <i>d.</i>	3,000
500,000 lbs. dried salt cod, at 2 <i>d.</i>	4,000
4,875,000 smoked haddock, at 1 <i>d.</i>	20,000
36,750,000 bloaters, at 2 for 1 <i>d.</i>	75,000
25,000,000 red herrings, at 4 for 1 <i>d.</i>	25,000
Sum total expended yearly in dry fish.....	127,000

" Shell Fish.

124,000,000 oysters, at 4 a penny	125,000
60,000 lobsters, at 3d.....	750
50,000 crabs, at 2d.....	400
770,000 pints of shrimps, at 2d.	6,000
1,000,000 quarts of mussels, at 1d.....	4,000
750,000 quarts of cockles, at 1d.	3,000
4,950,000 whelks, at 8 for 1d.....	2,500
3,600,000 pints of periwinkles, at 1d.....	15,000

Sum total expended yearly in shell-fish..... 156,650

"Adding together the above totals, we have the following result as to the gross money value of the fish purchased yearly in the London streets :

Wet fish	£1,177,200
Dry fish	127,000
Shell fish	156,650
Total	£1,460,850

"Hence we find that there is nearly a million and a half of money annually spent by the poorer classes of the metropolis in fish ; a sum so prodigious as almost to discredit every statement of want, even if the amount said to be so expended be believed. The returns from which the above account is made out have been obtained, however, from such unquestionable sources—not from one salesman alone, but checked and corrected by many gentlemen who can have no conceivable motive for exaggeration either one way or the other—that, sceptical as our utter ignorance of the subject must necessarily make us, still if we will but examine for ourselves, we shall find there is no gainsaying the facts.

"Moreover as to the enormity of the amount dispelling all ideas of privation among the industrious portion of the community, we shall also find on examination, that assuming the working men of the metropolis to be 500,000 in number (the Occupation Abstract of 1841, gives 773,560 individuals following some employment in London, but these include merchants, employers, shopkeepers, Government-officers and others), and that they, with their wives and children, make up one million individuals, it follows that the sum per head, expended in fish by the poorer classes every week, is a fraction more than 6½d., or, in other words not quite one penny a day."—p. 78.

We have added Mr. Mayhew's explanation, or vindication of this fish-census, because it really requires something of the sort to make one swallow it. We should, however, have preferred an appeal *ad stomachum* rather than *ad crumenam* ; a division of the consumption amongst

mouths, rather than purses. Suppose a million of consumers, as he puts them; and distribute among them 263,300,000lbs (in round numbers) of wet fish, *plus* a million lbs of salt cod, *plus*, nearly five millions of smoked haddock, *plus*, seventy millions of herrings; and put the first of these at three million lbs, and the second at fourteen, as we find they average; we shall have the prodigious number of 281 million pounds of fish, to be consumed by a million of mouths; that is, each must eat 281lbs of fish a year, man, woman, and child: or over three quarters of a pound per day. We are not desirous of being captious; but we should like to see the statistics of this work rendered as accurate as possible. And if the above calculation appears incredible, what shall we say of the consumption, when we add to it the countless numbers of crustacea of every class, oceans full almost, which must make up several millions more of lbs devoured?

The above estimates would lead one to believe that the inhabitants of London ought to be classed among the nations of Ichthyophagi which occupy such large tracts of land in ancient maps, and figure in primæval histories. But when we consider the huge mountains of vegetables which they consume with their fish, we must conclude, that they season the productions of the deep, very copiously with the growth of terra firma. The following is Mr. Mayhew's table of vegetable consumption.

“ GREEN FRUIT.

377,500 bushels of apples, at six a penny, or 4s. per bush., (288 to the bushel),	£75,500
193,700 bushels of pears, at 5s. per bushel,	48,400
1,215,360 lbs. of cherries, at 2d. per lb.	10,000
11,700 bushels of plums, at 1d. per half pint,	6,270
100 bushels of greengages, at 1½d. per half pint,	80
548 bushels of damsons, at 1½d. per half pint,	430
2,450 bushels of bullace, at 1½d. per half pint,	1,960
207,500 bushels of gooseberries, at 3d. per quart,	83,000
85,500 sieves of red currants, at 1d. per pint, (three half-sieves to the bushel,)	15,300
13,500 sieves of black currants, at 1d. per pint, (three half-sieves to the bushel.)	2,400
3,000 sieves of white currants, at 1d. per pint, (three half-sieves to the bushel)	530
763,750 pottles of strawberries, at 2d. per pottle,	6,360
1,760 pottles of raspberries, at 6d. per pottle,	40

30,485 pottles of mulberries, at 6 <i>d.</i> per pottle,	760
6,000 bushels of hazel nuts, at $\frac{1}{2}$ <i>d.</i> per half pint, ...	2,400
17,280 lbs. of filberts, at 3 <i>d.</i> per lb.	200
26,563 lbs. of grapes, at 4 <i>d.</i> per lb.	440
20,000 pine apples, at 6 <i>d.</i> each,	500
15,400,000 oranges, at two for 1 <i>d.</i> ,	32,000
154,000 lemons, at two for 1 <i>d.</i>	320
24,000 bushels of Spanish and Barcelona nuts, at 6 <i>d.</i> per quart,	19,200
3,000 bushels of Brazil nuts, (1,500 to the bushel,) at fifteen for a penny	1,250
6,500 bushels of chestnuts, (1,500 to the bushel,) at fifteen for a penny,	2,700
24,000 bushels of walnuts, (1750 to the bushel,) at ten for a penny,	17,500
400,000 coker-nuts, at 3 <i>d.</i> each,	5,000
<hr/>	
Total expended yearly in green fruit,	£333,420

" DRY FRUIT.

7,000 lbs. of shell almonds, at 20 a penny, (320 to the lb.)	460
37,800 lbs. of raisins, at 2 <i>d.</i> per lb.	300
24,300 lbs. of figs, at 2 <i>d.</i> per lb.	200
4,800 lbs. of prunes, at 2 <i>d.</i> per lb.	40

Total expended yearly on dry fruit, £1,000

" VEGETABLES.

60,500,000 lbs. of potatoes, at 5 lbs. for 2 <i>d.</i>	100,800
23,760,000 cabbages, at $\frac{1}{2}$ <i>d.</i> each,	49,500
3,264,800 turnips, at 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ <i>d.</i> per doz.	1,700
601,000 carrots, at 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ <i>d.</i> per doz.	520
567,300 brocoli and cauliflowers, at 1 <i>d.</i> per head, ...	2,360
616,666 junks of turnip tops, at 4 <i>d.</i> per junk,	10,270
219,000 bushels of peas, at 1 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per bushel,	16,420
8,890 bushels of beans, at 1 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per bushel,	660
22,110 bushels of French beans, at 6 <i>d.</i> per peck, or 2 <i>s.</i> per bushel,	2,210
25,608 vegetable marrows, at $\frac{1}{2}$ <i>d.</i> each,	50
489 dozen bundles of asparagus, at 2 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per bundle, (4 <i>d.</i> or 6 <i>d.</i> a doz. heads,)	730
9,120 dozen bundles of rhubarb, at 2 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per doz. ..	1,140
4,350 dozen bundles of celery, at 3 <i>d.</i> per bundle, ...	650
561,602 lettuces, at 3 a penny	780
13,291 dozen hands of radishes, at 3 bunches for a penny, and 6 bunches to the hand,... ..	1,330
499,530 bushels of onions, at 4 <i>s.</i> per bushel,	99,900

10,920 bushels of cucumbers, at 1d. each, (60 to the bush.)	2,730
3,290 dozen bundles of herbs, at 3d. a bundle,	490

Total expended yearly in vegetables, £292,240

“Putting the above sums together we have the following aggregate result:—

Expended yearly in green fruit,	£333,420
Expended yearly in dry fruit,	1,000
Expended yearly in vegetables,	292,000

Gross sums taken annually by the London costermongers for fruit and vegetables, }	£626,420
---	----------

“Then adding the above to the gross amount received by the street-sellers of fish, which we have before seen comes to as much as £1,460,850, we have for the annual income of the London costermongers no less a sum than £2,087,270.”—p. 95.

These two items, it would appear, make up the business of costermongering, properly so called. But we have by no means got to the end of the food provided by wandering merchants, for the daintier feeders among the poor. The following is the valuation, in number and cash, of the game annually consumed from the street.

	£
“ 5,000 grouse, at 1s. 9d. each	437
20,000 partridges, at 1s. 6d.	1,500
12,000 pheasants, at 3s. 6d.	2,100
5,000 snipes, at 8d.	160
20,000 hares, at 2s. 3d.	2,250
600,000 rabbits, at 7d.	17,500
500,000 fowls, at 1s. 6d.	37,500
20,000 geese, at 2s. 6d.	2,500
80,000 ducks, at 1s. 6d.	6,000
30,000 turkeys, at 3s. 6d.	5,250
10,000 live fowls and ducks, at 1s. 6d.	750
	<hr/>
	£75,953 ”

There is another dainty which must not be omitted. After an interesting account of the “industry” of preparing sheeps’ trotters in one particular *fabrique*, our author gives the following result.

“In this establishment are prepared, weekly, 20,000 sets, or 80,000 feet; a yearly average of 4,160,000 trotters, or the feet of

1,040,000 sheep. Of this quantity the street-folk buy seven-eighths; 3,640,000 trotters yearly, or 70,000 weekly. The number of sheep-trotter-sellers may be taken at 300, which gives an average of nearly sixty sets a week per individual.

“The wholesale price, at the ‘trotter-yard,’ is five a penny, which gives an outlay by the street-sellers of 3,031*l.* 11*s.* yearly.”—p. 171.

This is not, like substances, animal or vegetable, previously enumerated, a raw material; but one ready cooked. This brings us to another department of street-trading; the prepared food. We will not enter into it at length: but content ourselves with stating, that the amount spent annually in the streets, on food chiefly of a toothsome nature, is £203,115. In this list, ginger-beer figures at £14,660, tea and coffee at £31,200, pies at £3000, gingerbread-nuts a £6,630, and sweet stuff, at £10,000 *per an.* But there is one item in the list which gives the result a false colouring; and we must give it in the book’s own words, lest we should be thought tripping.

“*Street-sellers of Cats’ and Dogs’ Meat.*—There are 300,000 cats in the metropolis, and from 900 to 1,000 horses, averaging 2 cwt. of meat each, boiled down every week; the quantity of cats’ and dogs’ meat used throughout London is about 200,000 lbs. per week, and this sold at the rate of 2½*d.* per lb., gives 2,000*l.* a week for the money spent in cats’ and dogs’ meat, or per year, upwards of £100,000.”—p. 211.

However attached the dog may be to man, or the cat to the fire-side, it is too bad to add their quadrupedal food to that consumed by their masters. But what an item! And some perhaps will be inclined to add, what a waste! How many poor might be supported on what now goes literally to the dogs! But this would be a wrong view of the matter. For after all, old horses must die; and dead, must be disposed of. Now the very carrying round of this animal food gives employment to one thousand persons, who make a profit of £50 *per annum* out of it; in other words, there are £50,000 go to industrious poor people out of dead horse-flesh. Then when we consider the number of cooks, and other officers required to dress a thousand horses a week, at the canine and feline symposiums, we may be satisfied that this is a useful source of occupation to many who would otherwise be unemployed. Before, however, leaving this unsavoury subject, we must add that

the account given us by Mr. Mayhew, of our English equine abattoirs (p. 183), if complete, shows us to be much behind our French neighbours, in the same branch of industry, as described by Mr. Babbage, in his "Economy of manufactures." There we find, that twelve different sources of profit are found in the deceased charger; the last being the most ingenious—the sale to the furriers of the skins of rats attracted by the slaughter-house. In one room of the establishment, 16,000 of these vermin were killed in four weeks, without any sensible diminution of numbers; and their skins being valued at 3s. per hundred, an average is allotted, in the table of profits, of 1s. 6d. to each horse.*

We must now turn to something more refreshing: from the slaughter-house we will bend our steps towards the green fields, and pleasant gardens; and conclude this part of our subject, by what cannot fail to impart a favourable impression respecting the tastes of the poor. We allude to that love of flowers and plants, which, strangely enough, is more sensible in northern, and ruder, than in more genial, climates. It is true, however, that, the perambulatory gardener has one advantage. It is not merely the poor clerk or needlewoman, who nurses the sickly little plant in the garret window, that patronises him: but the lady in the suburban cottage, who has a flower-stand in her window, and her lord, who has retired from business, or comes home from it, to enjoy his rural occupations in a twelve feet square front-garden, collect their growing stock from his barrow. But these are not considered his best customers, as appears from the following.

"The customers for trees and shrubs are generally those who inhabit the larger sort of houses, where there is room in the hall or the windows for display; or where there is a garden capacious enough for the implantation of the shrubs. Three-fourths of the trees are sold on a round, and when purchased at a stall, the costermonger generally undertakes to deliver them at the purchaser's residence, if not too much out of his way, in his regular rounds. Or he may diverge, and make a round on speculation, purposely. There is as much bartering trees for old clothes, as for roots, and as many, or more complaints of the hard bargainings of

* P. 396, fourth ed. The profits of this trade seem much greater in France, by this account.

ladies : ' I'd rather sell polyanthuses at a farthing a piece profit to poor women, if I could get no more,' said one man, ' than I'd work among them screws that's so fine in grand caps and so civil. They'd skin a flea for his hide and tallow.'—p. 134.

We will now place before our reader, the general table of flowers and shrubs, purchased in the streets; and he will agree with us, no doubt, that the taste which it exhibits is one of those good symptoms that we eagerly seize upon, in prognosticating well or ill of the condition of the poor.

" CUT FLOWERS.

<i>Bunches of</i>	<i>per bunch</i>		
65,280 Violets ...	at $\frac{1}{2}d.$...	£136	
115,200 Wallflowers	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	240	
86,400 Mignonette	1d. ...	360	
1,632 Lilies of the Valley	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	3	
20,448 Stocks ..	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	42	
316,800 Pinks and Carnations	$\frac{1}{2}d.$ each	660	
864,000 Moss Roses	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	1,800	
864,000 China ditto	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	1,800	
296,640 Lavender ...	1d. ...	1,236	
Total annually			£6,277

" FLOWER ROOTS.

	<i>per root</i>		
24,000 Primroses	at $\frac{1}{2}d.$...	50	
34,560 Polyanthuses	1d. ..	144	
28,800 Cowslips ...	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	50	
33,600 Daisies ..	1d. ...	140	
46,080 Wallflowers	1d. ...	192	
28,800 Candy-tufts	1d. ...	120	
28,800 Daffodils	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	60	
38,400 Violets	$\frac{1}{2}d.$..	80	
30,380 Mignonette	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	63	
23,040 Stocks ...	1d. ...	96	
19,200 Pinks and Carnations	2d. ...	160	
3,456 Lilies of the Valley,	1d. ...	14	
12,960 Pansies	1d. ...	54	
660 Lilies ...	2d. ...	5	
850 Tulips ...	2d. ...	7	
7,704 Balsams ...	2d. ...	64	
3,180 Calceolarias ...	2d. ...	26	
253,440 Musk Plants	1d. ...	1,056	

11,520 London Pride	1d.	...	48	
25,595 Lupins	...	1d.	...	106
9,156 China-asters	...	1d.	...	38
63,360 Marigolds	...	½d.	...	132
852 Dahlias	...	6d.	...	21
13,356 Heliotropes	..	2d.	...	111
1,920 Poppies	...	2d.	...	16
6,912 Michaelmas Daisies	½d.	14

Total annually £2,867

“ BRANCHES.

<i>Bunches of</i>		<i>per bunch</i>	
59,040 Holly	...	at 3d.	... £738
56,160 Mistletoe	..	3d.	... 702
26,640 Ivy and Laurel		3d.	... 333
5,400 Lilac	...	3d.	... 67
1,008 Palm	..	3d.	... 12
2,520 May	...	3d.	... 31

Total annually from Markets, £1,183
Add one-half as shown,* 591

£2,774

“ TREES AND SHRUBS.

9,576 Firs (roots)	each root	at 3d.	...	£119
1,152 Laurels	...	3d.	..	14
23,040 Myrtles	...	4d.	...	384
2,160 Rhododendrons	...	9d.	...	81
2,304 Lilacs	...	4d.	...	38
2,880 Box	...	2d.	...	24
21,888 Heaths	..	4d.	...	364
2,880 Broom	...	1d.	...	12
6,912 Furze	...	1d.	...	28
6,480 Laurustinus	...	8d.	..	216
25,920 Southernwood	...	1d.	...	108

Total annually spent £1,388

“ FLOWERS IN POTS.

38,880 Moss Roses	at 4d.	...	£648
38,880 China Roses	2d.	...	324
38,800 Fuschias	3d.	...	485
12,850 Geraniums and Pelargoniums	}		3d.	...	210
(of all kinds)					

Total annually, £1,667

* Cut from hedges, gardens, &c., with, or without, leave.

“The returns give the following aggregate amount of stree expenditure :—

	£.
“ Trees and shrubs	1,388
Cut Flowers	6,277
Flowers in pots	1,667
Flower roots	2,867
Branches	2,774
Seeds	200

£15,173”—p. 139.

Before leaving the vegetable world, we must not overlook other sorts of “green stuff,” which, in our work, are classed rather incongruously together. To the vegetables bought in the streets must be added the following.

“ 6,696,450 bunches of water-cresses, at ½d. per bunch	} £13,949
5,616,000 „ groundsel, at ½d ..	11,700
1,120,800 „ chickweed and plantain ..	2,335
660,000 turfs, at 2½d. per doz. ..	520

28,504”—p.158.

Here again we must enter our protest against the foods of the plumed, and the implumed, bipeds being united. But here is certainly another of those extraordinary facts, which make us know the immensity of London. What the amount of canary-seed, or rape-seed, or other ordinary and daily “bread-stuffs” of little birds annually consumed in London may be, we have no returns before us to show. But it is almost frightful to think, that the extra, spring, food, of these little extravagant creatures costs London, £14,000 *per annum*. There is, or was, when such innocent things were permitted, in the good old days of monarchy, from *le bon roi Dagobert* downwards, a riddle in France, conceived as follows; “Quelle est la femme la plus sensible de Paris?” To which, when duly given up, the answer was, “Celle qui crie, ‘mouron (mourrons) pour les petits oiseaux.’” “Groundsell for little birds.” But £14,000 a-year for such a commodity is really no joke; and may well excite our sensibilities.

Hitherto we have sought to convey an idea of the immensity of laborious poverty which exists in the capital city of our empire. It is only by entering into some detail

that this could be duly represented. But now we have to enter on the social question, and ascertain what apprehension, and what hopes may justly be entertained, in consequence of this state of things. The question resolves itself into this: what is the moral condition of this multitude? The 30,000 people, who form an industrial class among the poor, better off than many thousands more, that have no employment, who are in constant contact with many other thousands on whose dealings with them they live, may well form a type, and give a test by which we may judge of the great mass of our poorer population, whether it be good or evil. Different persons will apply this test in different ways, according to the diversity of their views and opinions. Some would enquire whether this trafficking class were honest or not; and would be satisfied if the first could be affirmed. Others would desire to learn, what is their domestic morality, their idea of family ties and obligations; and be content if here all was sound. A third party would investigate, how they feel as to social duties, submission to authority, love of order, confidence in public justice; and deem all safe, if these guarantees of outward morals were secured. Finally, many, with ourselves, would look upon this as the primary and fundamental enquiry, what religious principle, what faith, what spiritual aids, what future and higher hopes, this class hold and cling to, and practically cultivate. But under whatever aspect one's principles lead one to view and judge the state of the poor, all and one are destined to receive, from Mr. Mayhew's book, a most appalling lesson of disappointed hopes.

As to the honesty of the street-traders, we fear there is not much to be said in its favour. It is pretty well confined to their dealings with one another: and as far as Mr. Mayhew's brief statement on this matter informs us, (p. 26) the code of honesty may be reduced to the following heads; first, Costers never steal from one another; second, their boys only cheat, but never rob their employers; third, all the rest is fair game. As to those from whom they buy, and who may be supposed to know them, we are told, "the salesmen, at the several markets, all agreed in stating, that no trust was given to the costermongers. 'Trust them,' exclaimed one, 'O certainly, as far as I can see them.'" (p. 5.) As to those who buy from them, it behoves them to keep a sharp look out. We well remember

the indignation of an aged friend of ours, who bought a pottle of fine-looking strawberries in the street, for a shilling; and, after taking off the top rows, found two chips across the pottle, which had stopped all further descent of the fruit. One habit of this race is essentially opposed to honesty; the inveterate and incorrigible vice of gambling. It is their great recreation, and their Sunday is spent in continuous hours, upon this corrupting pastime. Again, they see others act upon the most dishonest principles in their regard; they are made to pay exorbitant rates of interest for small sums advanced as capital, and rack-rents for whatever they borrow as implements of trade. This puts their ingenuity on the stretch to compensate for these extortions; and, like the nomads of the East, as they think every man's hand is against them, so is theirs against all men.

It is pleasing, however, to see how confidence begets confidence. Mr. Mayhew gives remarkable instances (to which we could add others, come to our knowledge), of the punctuality with which sums advanced to the industrious poor are honestly repaid. But one illustration we must introduce, not only because most interesting in itself, but because it has been confirmed to us, by the excellent, and in our eyes, most distinguished, lady, mentioned in it. It is as follows:

“Those who are unacquainted with the character of the people may feel inclined to doubt the trustworthiness of the class, but it is an extraordinary fact that but few of the costermongers fail to repay the money advanced to them, even at the present ruinous rate of interest. The poor, it is my belief, have not yet been sufficiently tried in this respect;—pawnbrokers, loan-offices, tally-shops, dolly-shops, are the only parties who will trust them—but, as a startling proof of the good faith of the humbler classes generally, it may be stated that Mrs. Chisholm (the lady who has exerted herself so benevolently in the cause of emigration) has lent out, at different times, as much as £160,000, that has been entrusted to her for the use of the ‘lower orders,’ and that the whole of this large amount has been returned—*with the exception of £12!*”

“I myself have often given a sovereign to professed thieves to get ‘changed,’ and never knew one to make off with the money. Depend upon it, if we would really improve, we must begin by elevating instead of degrading.”—p. 32.

If from the honesty of the street-merchants, we turn to the contemplation of their morality, in what regards

domestic relations, and the virtues springing from them, we have presented to us a frightful picture indeed. This class are almost driven to amusements of so low, degrading, and immoral a cast, that we cannot be surprised to find the very first germs of modesty plucked from the breast, before they have reached maturity, and all the frightful immorality, to which that virtue serves as a bulwark, ripened into vice, before principle or judgment is strong enough to check it. As gambling is the out-of-doors recreation of the costermonger race, so is the "penny gaff," or theatre, their evening in-doors amusement. The entertainment of these sinks of iniquity consists in, either loosely disguised, or barefaced, immorality; and the crowds of children and youth of both sexes who flock to them, if not already corrupted, must suck in a soul-destroying poison there. But the account given by Mr. Mayhew of these places of resort is too accurate in its horrid details, to be transferred to our pages. He has some very appropriate reflections, however, upon the importance of providing the poor with innocent, rational, and improving amusement.

This subject opens to us a wide and interesting field. In a former review of Lord John Manner's pamphlet on "National holydays," we had occasion to make observations on the subject; and we have only been confirmed in our views, by all that we have subsequently seen or heard. In spite of the turned-up eyes of fanatics, or the sneering frown of puritans, we are sure that the religion of the country has much to answer for, in the immorality of the poor. There is not to be found in Italy, or Spain, or any Catholic country, a mass of population so degraded as that described in this work. Religion ought to work upon the senses, and give them, as well as the soul, or rather, the soul through them, their truest and most wholesome gratification. The Oratorio, for instance, will supply genuine and beautiful music, where it can be established, interspersed with sound instruction. Processions, paintings, functions, in or about the poorest parish Church, where the poor have all the "getting up" in their own hands, and in which they have a share and interest, supply the place of court pageants, or lordly entertainments, which the rich find so necessary for their own enjoyment of life. Whatever pleasure religion gave, or can give, to eye or ear, has been withdrawn from the destitute classes; they

cannot afford that which is provided for the rich: and therefore they are left by society with one of these supposed alternatives: either that they can do perfectly without what society itself considers necessary; or that, untutored, undirected, unaided, they will be sure to provide themselves with what is virtuous and improving.

For some years it has been thought feasible to attain the same purpose by other means. The age prides itself on being, and making all, intellectual. It has, therefore, been thought, that, while the educated classes are scarcely fit in the evening, after a day's idleness, for anything but a ball or the opera, a mechanic or labourer, who has been toiling, in the sweat of his brow, from sunrise to sunset, and perhaps more, is exactly in right trim to go read mathematics or chemistry. Mechanics' Institutes became the rage, and every other sort of contrivance to overtax the brain, when nature called for repose, or, what we have no adequate English word for, *delassement*. For our parts, we are *obscurantists* enough to believe, that a walk in the green fields, or a cheerful recreation of a moral character, would produce a better race than the overload of ill-balanced learning upon a time-worn vehicle, not prepared to receive it. And, moreover, the mind goes off by a rebound, to seek compensation in diseased literature, for the heavy task-work of inapplicable science. We say not a word of the knowledge which puffeth up, nor of the sceptical tendency of such science, where there is no faith to counteract it.

We have wandered widely from our author, and yet have not said half what we wished. We must let Mr. Mayhew speak on the morality of his friends, the costers of London, for he really is their last friend, and feels for them. He will confirm our darkest views. Take the following.

"The fate of children brought up amid the influence of such scenes—with parents starving one week and drunk all the next—turned loose into the streets as soon as they are old enough to run alone—sent out to sell in public-houses almost before they know how to put two halfpence together—their tastes trained to libidinisism long before puberty at the penny concert, and their passions inflamed with the unrestrained intercourse of the twopenny hops—the fate of the young, I say, abandoned to the blight of such associations as these, cannot well be otherwise than it is. If the child be father to the man, assuredly it does not require a great effort of

imagination to conceive the manhood that such a childhood must necessarily engender.”—p. 101.

Such is the seed sown in youth; we may, indeed, easily anticipate the harvest. The following presents us with the state of marriage in this class of our population.

“Only one-tenth—at the outside one-tenth—of the couples living together and carrying on the costermongering trade, are married. In Clerkenwell parish, however, where the number of married couples is about a fifth of the whole, this difference is easily accounted for, as in Advent and Easter the incumbent of that parish marries poor couples without a fee. Of the rights of ‘legitimate or illegitimate children the costermongers understand nothing, and account it a mere waste of money and time to go through the ceremony of wedlock when a pair can live together, and be quite as well regarded by their fellows, without it. The married women associate with the unmarried mothers of families without the slightest scruple. There is no honour attached to the marriage state, and no shame to concubinage. Neither are the unmarried women less faithful to their ‘partners’ than the married; but I understand that, of the two classes, the unmarried betray the most jealousy.

“As regards the fidelity of these women I was assured that, ‘in anything like good times,’ they were rigidly faithful to their husbands or paramours; but that, in the worst pinch of poverty, a departure from this fidelity—if it provided a few meals or a fire—was not considered at all heinous.”—p. 20.

We will only give our readers one more extract on this painful subject.

“The costermongers, taken as a body, entertained the most imperfect idea of the sanctity of marriage. To their undeveloped minds it merely consists in the fact of a man and woman living together, and sharing the gains they may each earn by selling in the street. The father and mother of the girl look upon it as a convenient means of shifting the support of their child over to another’s exertions; and so thoroughly do they believe this to be the end and aim of matrimony, that the expense of a church ceremony is considered as a useless waste of money, and the new pair are received by their companions as cordially as if every form of law and religion had been complied with.

“The notions of morality among these people agree strangely, as I have said, with those of many savage tribes—indeed, it would be curious if it were otherwise. They are a part of the Nomades of England, neither knowing nor caring for the enjoyments of home. The hearth, which is so sacred a symbol to all civilized races as being the spot where the virtues of each succeeding generation are

taught and encouraged, has no charms to them. The tap-room is the father's chief abiding place; whilst to the mother the house is only a better kind of *tent*. She is away at the stall, or hawking her goods from morning till night, while the children are left to play away the day in the court or alley, and pick their morals out of the gutter. So long as the limbs gain strength the parent cares for nothing else. As the young ones grow up, their only notions of wrong are formed by what the policeman will permit them to do. If we, who have known from babyhood the kindly influences of a home, require, before we are thrust out into the world to get a living for ourselves, that our perceptions of good and evil should be quickened and brightened (the same as our perceptions of truth and falsity) by the experience and counsel of those who are wiser and better than ourselves,—if, indeed, it needed a special creation and example to teach the best and strongest of us the law of right, how bitterly must the children of the street-folk require tuition, training, and advice, when from their very cradles (if, indeed, they ever knew such luxuries) they are doomed to witness in their parents, whom they naturally believe to be their superiors, habits of life in which passion is the sole rule of action, and where every appetite of our animal nature is indulged in without the least restraint.

“I say thus much because I am anxious to make others feel, as I do myself, that *we* are the culpable parties in these matters. That they poor things should do as they do is but human nature—but that *we* should allow them to remain thus destitute of every blessing vouchsafed to ourselves—that we should willingly share what we enjoy with our brethren at the Antipodes, and yet leave those who are nearer and who, therefore, should be dearer to us, to want even the commonest moral necessities is a paradox that gives to the zeal of our Christianity a strong savour of the chicanery of Cant.

“The costermongers strongly resemble the North American Indians in their conduct to their wives. They can understand that it is the duty of the woman to contribute to the happiness of the man, but cannot feel that there is a reciprocal duty from the man to the woman. The wife is considered as an inexpensive servant, and the disobedience of a wish is punished with blows. She must work early and late, and to the husband must be given the proceeds of her labour. Often when the man is in one of his drunken fits—which sometimes lasts two or three days continuously—she must by her sole exertions find food for herself and him too. To live in peace with him, there must be no murmuring, no tiring under work, no fancied cause for jealousy—for if there be, she is either beaten into submission or cast adrift to begin life again—as another's leavings.”—p. 43.

We must therefore conclude, that it is not to moral

principles that we must look for any support of the fabric of society, when the poor may be tempted to take its pillars in their hands, and try, like the blind toiler at the Philistine mill, whether strength suffices for revenge. But perhaps our hopes may lie in the quiet with which police regulations are obeyed, and the unlikelihood of politics troubling the heads of these sturdy merchants of the streets. When, however, we symbolised them under the form of the irritated captive, recovering consciousness of long dormant might, we had this thought before us. These people are, unhappily, nursing a sense of wrong and of oppression, for total neglect wears often this appearance. They are brought up in the lowest school of chartist or socialist politics, and the hatred of police is instinctive to them. This part of our subject, as most important for studying the possible future in the certain present, we will illustrate, by extracts, which have a painful drollery intermingled with grave matter of thought, that will prevent their being heavy, though long. To begin with their politics, let us see where they are picked up, and what feelings their course of reading inspires.

“It may appear anomalous to speak of the literature of an uneducated body, but even the costermongers have their tastes for books. They are very fond of hearing any one read aloud to them, and listen very attentively. One man often reads the Sunday paper of the beer-shop to them, and on a fine summer’s evening a costermonger, or any neighbour who has the advantage of being ‘a schollard,’ reads aloud to them in the courts they inhabit. What they love best to listen to—and, indeed, what they are most eager for—are Reynolds’s periodicals, especially the ‘Mysteries of the Court.’ ‘They’ve got tired of Lloyd’s blood-stained stories,’ said one man, who was in the habit of reading to them, ‘and I’m satisfied that, of all London, Reynolds is the most popular man among them. They stuck to him in Trafalgar-square, and would again. They all say he’s ‘a trump,’ and Feargus O’Connor’s another trump with them.’

“‘The costermongers,’ said my informant, ‘are very fond of illustrations. I have known a man, what couldn’t read, buy a periodical what had an illustration, a little out of the common way perhaps, just that he might learn from some one, who could read, what it was all about. They have all heard of Cruikshank, and they think everything funny is by him—funny scenes in a play and all. His ‘Bottle’ was very much admired. I heard one man say it was very prime, and showed what ‘lush’ did, but I saw the same man,’ added my informant, ‘drunk three hours afterwards. Look you here, sir,’ he continued, turning over a periodical, for he had the number with him, ‘here’s a portrait of

Catherine of Russia.' 'Tell us all about her,' said one man to me last night; read it; what was she?' 'When I had read it,' my informant continued, 'another man, to whom I showed it, said, 'Don't the cove as did that know a deal?' for they fancy—at least, a many do—that one man writes a whole periodical, or a whole newspaper. Now here,' proceeded my friend, 'you see's an engraving of a man hung up, burning over a fire, and some costers would go mad if they couldn't learn what he'd been doing, who he was, and all about him. 'But about the picture?' they would say, and this is a very common question put by them whenever they see an engraving.

" 'Here's one of the passages that took their fancy wonderfully,' my informant observed :

" 'With glowing cheeks, flashing eyes, and palpitating bosom, Venetia Trelawney rushed back into the refreshment-room, where she threw herself into one of the arm-chairs already noticed. But scarcely had she thus sunk down upon the flocculent cushion, when a sharp click, as of some mechanism giving way, met her ears; and at the same instant her wrists were caught in manacles which sprang out of the arms of the treacherous chair, while two steel bands started from the richly carved back and grasped her shoulders. A shriek burst from her lips—she struggled violently, but all to no purpose : for she was a captive—and powerless !

" 'We should observe that the manacles and the steel bands which had thus fastened upon her, were covered with velvet, so that they inflicted no positive injury upon her, nor even produced the slightest abrasion of her fair and polished skin.'

" 'Here all my audience,' said the man to me, 'broke out with—Aye! that's the way the harristocrats hooks it. There's nothing o' that sort among us; the rich has all that barrikin to themselves. 'Yes, that's the way the taxes goes in,' shouted a woman.

" 'Anything about the police sets them a talking at once. This did when I read it :

" 'The Ebenezers still continued their fierce struggle, and, from the noise they made, seemed as if they were tearing each other to pieces, to the wild roar of a chorus of profane swearing. The alarm, as Bloomfield had predicted, was soon raised, and some two or three policemen, with their bulls-eyes, and still more effective truncheons, speedily restored order.'

" 'The blessed crushers is everywhere,' shouted one. 'I wish I'd been there to have had a shy at the eslops,' said another. And then a man sung out : 'O don't I like the Bobbys?'"—p. 251.

It appears, from this statement, which we see no reason to doubt, that the literature in vogue among this large class in London, and we may justly conjecture, through its allied or cognate races, is of the most dangerous character, and calculated to introduce or diffuse among them, a spirit of disaffection, combination, and anarch-

ism. But another extract, which treats professedly of the "politics of costermongers," and of "policemen," will give more definite information on the subject.

"THE POLITICS OF COSTERMONGERS.—POLICEMEN.

"The notion of the police is so intimately blended with what may be called the politics of the costermongers that I give them together.

"The politics of these people are detailed in a few words—they are nearly all Chartists. 'You might say, sir,' remarked one of my informants, 'that they *all* were Chartists, but as it's better you should rather be under than over the mark, say *nearly* all.' Their ignorance, and their being impulsive, makes them a dangerous class. I am assured that in every district where the costermongers are congregated, one or two of the body, more intelligent than the others, have great influence over them; and these leading men are all Chartists, and being industrious and not unprosperous persons, their pecuniary and intellectual superiority cause them to be regarded as oracles. One of these men said to me: 'The costers think that working-men know best, and so they have confidence in us. I like to make men discontented, and I will make them discontented while the present system continues, because it's all for the middle and the moneyed classes, and nothing, in the way of rights, for the poor. People fancy when all's quiet that all's stagnating. Propagandism is going on for all that. It's when all's quiet that the seeds are growing. Republicans and Socialists are pressing their doctrines.'

"The costermongers have very vague notions of an aristocracy; they call the more prosperous of their own body 'aristocrats.' Their notions of an aristocracy of birth or wealth seem to be formed on their opinion of the rich, or reputed rich salesmen with whom they deal; and the result is anything but favourable to the nobility.

"Concerning free-trade, nothing, I am told, can check the costermonger's fervour for a cheap loaf. A Chartist costermonger told me that he knew numbers of costers who were keen Chartists without understanding anything about the six points.

"The costermongers frequently attend political meetings, going there in bodies of from six to twelve. Some of them, I learned, could not understand why Chartist leaders exhorted them to peace and quietness, when they might as well fight it out with the police at once. The costers boast, moreover, that they stick more together in any 'row' than any other class. It is considered by them a reflection on the character of the thieves that they are seldom true to one another.

"It is a matter of marvel to many of this class that people can live without working. The ignorant costers have no knowledge of

'property,' or 'income,' and conclude that the non-workers all live out of the taxes. Of the taxes generally they judge from their knowledge that tobacco, which they account a necessary of life, pays 3s. per lb. duty.

"As regards the police, the hatred of a costermonger to a 'peeler' is intense, and with their opinion of the police, all the more ignorant unite that of the governing power. 'Can you wonder at it, sir,' said a costermonger to me, 'that I hate the police? They drive us about, we must move on, we can't stand here, and we can't pitch there. But if we're cracked up, that is if we're forced to go into the Union (I've known it both at Clerkenwell and the City of London workhouses), why the parish gives us money to buy a barrow, or a shallow, or to hire them, and leave the house and start for ourselves: and what's the use of that, if the police won't let us sell our goods?—Which is right, the parish or the police?'

"To thwart the police in any measure the costermongers readily aid one another. One very common procedure, if the policeman has seized a barrow, is to whip off a wheel, while the officers have gone for assistance; for a large and loaded barrow requires two men to convey it to the green-yard. This is done with great dexterity; and the next step is to dispose of the stock to any passing costers, or to any 'standing' in the neighbourhood, and it is honestly accounted for. The policemen, on their return, find an empty and unwheelable barrow, which they must carry off by main strength, amid the jeers of the populace.

"I am assured that in case of a political riot every 'coster' would seize his policeman."—p. 20.

"To serve out a policeman is the bravest act by which a costermonger can distinguish himself. Some lads have been imprisoned upwards of a dozen times for this offence; and are consequently looked upon by their companions as martyrs. When they leave prison for such an act, a subscription is often got up for their benefit. In their continual warfare with the force, they resemble many savage nations, from the cunning and treachery they use. The lads endeavour to take the unsuspecting 'crusher' by surprise, and often crouch at the entrance of a court until a policeman passes, when a stone or a brick is hurled at him, and the youngster immediately disappears. Their love of revenge too, is extreme—their hatred being in no way mitigated by time; they will wait for months, following a policeman who has offended or wronged them, anxiously looking out for an opportunity of paying back the injury. One boy, I was told, vowed vengeance against a member of the force, and for six months never allowed the man to escape his notice. At length, one night, he saw the policeman in a row outside a public house, and running into the crowd kicked him savagely, shouting at the same time: 'Now, you —, I've got you at last.' When the boy heard that his persecutor was injured for life, his joy was very great, and he declared the twelve months' imprisonment he was sen-

tenced to for the offence to be 'dirt cheap.' The whole of the court where the lad resided sympathized with the boy, and vowed to a man that had he escaped, they would have subscribed a pad or two of dry herrings, to send him into the country until the affair had blown over, for he had shown himself a 'plucky one.'

"It is called 'plucky' to bear pain without complaining. To flinch from expected suffering is scorned, and he who does so is sneered at and told to wear a gown, as being more fit to be a woman. To show a disregard for pain, a lad, when without money, will say to his pal, 'Give us a penny, and you may have a punch at my nose.' They also delight in tattooing their chests and arms with anchors, and figures of different kinds. During the whole of this painful operation, the boy will not flinch, but laugh and joke with his admiring companions, as if perfectly at ease."—p. 16.

However lively and amusing these recitals may be, they certainly inspire one with uneasiness, and almost, dread for the future. It is clear that a lurking sense of wrong is, like a smouldering fire, eating more and more deeply into the joists and beams which cross the tower levels of our house; and though we can now repress the power to burst forth, into a flame, we are allowing the destructive power to gain strength; for, as we shall see, nothing is done to check its progress. If one day we find these long neglected masses issuing forth from their desolate or squalid homes, to make war on property, whom shall we have to thank, but those that knew not what was for their country's peace, in the days of merciful visitation? It is not wonderful, that this class, who know so little of their betters, as the world calls them, should not have any great confidence in their administration of law. Accordingly we are assured that no inducement will suffice to take one of this race into a police court, to get himself justice. He looks to his own hand to render him what he wants of it. It is Lynch-law with these men.

"I may add that a very intelligent man from whom I derived information, said to me concerning costermongers never going to law to recover money owing to them, nor indeed for any purpose: 'If any one steals anything from me—and that, as far as I know, never happened but once in ten years—and I catch him, I take it out of him on the spot. I give him a jolly good hiding and there's an end of it. I know very well, sir, that costers are ignorant men, but in my opinion' (laughing) 'our never going to law shows that in *that* point we are in advance of the aristocrats.'"—p. 31.

Mr. Mayhew gives us a little anecdote, which may well

illustrate the manner in which these poor people get their notions of law. But it is worth a great deal more, on other accounts. First, it is quite as pathetic as, and more simply genuine than, Sterne's "Dead Ass;" and secondly, it gives us a good trait of this class of people, whose dark side stands out so much more prominently before us, than their brighter aspect. We love therefore to give it, as it is.

"'It's all nonsense to call donkeys stupid,' said one costermonger to me; 'them's stupid that calls them so: they're sensible. Not long since I worked Guildford with my donkey-cart and a boy. Jack (the donkey) was slow and heavy in coming back, until we got in sight of the lights at Vauxhall-gate, and then he trotted on like one o'clock, he did indeed! just as if he smelt it was London besides seeing it, and knew he was at home. He had a famous appetite in the country, and the fresh grass did him good. I gave a country lad twopence to mind him in a green lane there. I wanted my own boy to do so, but he said 'I'll see you further first.' A London boy hates being by himself in a lone country part. He's afraid of being burked; he is indeed. One can't quarrel with a lad when he's away in the country; he's very useful. I feed my donkey well. I sometimes give him a carrot for a luxury, but carrots are dear now. He's fond of mashed potatoes, and has many a good mash when I can buy them at 4lb. a penny.'

"'There was a friend of mine,' said another man, 'had great frouble about his donkey a few months back. I saw part of it, and knew all about it. He was doing a little work on a Sunday morning at Wandsworth, and the poor thing fell down dead. He was very fond of his donkey and kind to it, and the donkey was very fond of him. He thought he wouldn't leave the poor creature he'd had a good while, and had been out with in all weathers, by the road side; so he dropped all notion of doing business, and with help got the poor dead thing into his cart: its head lolloping over the end of the cart, and its poor eyes staring at nothing. He thought he'd drag it home and bury it somewheres. It wasn't for the value he dragged it, for what's a dead donkey worth? There was a few persons about him, and they was all quiet and seemed sorry for the poor fellow and for his donkey; but the church-bells struck up, and up came a 'crusher,' and took the man up, and next day he was fined 10s., I can't exactly say for what. He never saw no more of the animal, and lost his stock as well as his donkey.'"

—p. 28.

We come at last to the principal point to be considered, in estimating the moral character of this peculiar race. There is only one power which can be expected to act on them, to soften, to engentle, to reform, and transform

them, and to pluck the dangerous, nay poisoned, weapon, as yet sheathed, from their side. Religion is the great tamer of man in his wildness, and in his sullenness; in the deserts, whether of sand, or of peopled cities. A natural question presents itself; what influence has religion over the hearts of this great family, and the lower ranges of proletarianism, in our metropolis? The question, however, connects itself with others: what has been done, what is being done, what can be done, to make religion acceptable to them, or powerful over them, or even known to them?

We read of wholesale building of churches in certain poor districts of London: and there exists what is called a Church, buttressed up by endless societies, for additional curates, scripture-readers, tract-issues, with charities of all sorts. This establishment professes to have the exclusive spiritual care of the population, and jealously resents any intramission of other labourers into the field, which it cultivates. We shall see how gloriously it accomplishes its mission, and what marvellous fruits it produces among the poor.

Let us start first with the confession of one of the fraternity, given in these words: "I never go to Church; I used to go when I was a little child at Sevenoaks. I suppose I was born somewhere thereabouts. I've forgot what the inside of a church is like. There's no costermongers ever go to church, except the rogues of them, that wants to appear good." It appears, in other words, that going to church is at once a sign of hypocrisy in the opinion of these poor creatures, and that the body of them never think of going inside a sacred edifice. That there should be brutish ignorance of religion in such people can be no wonder, though it *is* a wonder how they are left in their present condition, by those who claim responsibility for their salvation.

Let us now see a few illustrations of this ignorance in all that regards the first elements of religion. People may talk of the darkness of the poorer classes in Catholic countries: but we have never yet seen a traveller, who would venture to say, that he had met thousands in any large Catholic city, who had never heard of the creation, or of our blessed Lord. Now read the following extract; and say, can religious ignorance be more appalling?

“Only last night father was talking about religion. We often talks about religion. Father has told me that God made the world, and I’ve heerd him talk about the first man and woman as was made and lived—it must be more than a hundred years ago—but I don’t like to speak on what I dont know. Father, too, has told me about our Saviour what was nailed on a cross to suffer for such poor people as we is. Father has told us, too, about his giving a great many poor people a penny loaf and a bit of fish each, which proves him to have been a very kind gentleman. The Ten Commandments was made by him, I’ve heerd say, and he performed them too among other miracles. Yes! this is part of what our Saviour tells us. We are to forgive everybody, and do nobody no injury. I don’t think I could forgive an enemy if she injured me very much; I’m sure I don’t know why I couldn’t, unless it is that I’m poor, and never learnt to do it. If a gal stole my shawl and didn’t return it back or give me the value on it, I couldn’t forgive her; but if she told me she lost it off her back, I shouldn’t be so hard on her. We poor gals ain’t very religious, but we are better than the men. We all of us thank God for everything—even for a fine day; as for sprats, we always say they’re God’s blessing for the poor, and thinks it hard of the Lord Mayor not to let ’em come in afore the ninth of November, just because he wants to dine off them—which he always do. Yes, we knows for certain that they eats plenty of sprats at the Lord Mayor’s ‘blanket.’ They say in the Bible that the world was made in six days: the beasts, the birds, the fish, and all—and sprats was among them in coorse. There was only one house at that time as was made, and that was the Ark for Adam and Eve and their family. It seems very wonderful indeed how all this world was done so quick. I should have thought that England alone would have took double the time; shouldn’t you, sir? But then it says in the Bible, God Almighty’s a just and true God, and in coorse time would be nothing to him. When a good person is dying, we says, ‘The Lord has called upon him, and he must go,’ but I can’t think what it means, unless it is that an angel comes—like when we’re a-dreaming—and tell the party he’s wanted in heaven. I know where heaven is; it’s above the clouds, and they’re placed there to prevent us seeing into it. That’s where all the good people go, but I’m afeerd,—she continued solemnly—‘there’s very few costers among the angels—’specially those as deceives poor gals.

“No, I don’t think this world could well go on for ever. There’s a great deal of ground in it, certainly, and it seems very strong at present; but they say there’s to be a flood on the earth, and earthquakes, and that will destroy it. The earthquake ought to have took place some time ago, as people tells me, but I never heerd any more about it. If we cheats in the streets, I know we shan’t go to Heaven; but it’s very hard upon us, for if we didn’t cheat we couldn’t live, profits is so bad. It’s the same with the shops, and I suppose the young men there won’t go to Heaven neither; but if people wont give the money, both

costers and tradesmen must cheat, and that's very hard. Why, look at apples! customers want them for less than they cost us, and so we are forced to shove in bad ones as well as good ones; and if we're to suffer for that, it does seem to me dreadful cruel."—p. 46.

This was from the mouth of a female; in whom more religious sentiment may be expected. The following is more characteristic of the other sex.

“ ‘On a Sunday I goes out selling, and all I yarns I keeps. As for going to church, why, I can't afford it,—besides, to tell the truth, I don't like it well enough. Plays, too, ain't in my line much; I'd sooner go to a dance—its more livelier. The 'penny gaffs' is rather more in my style; the songs are out and out, and makes our gals laugh. The smuttier the better, I thinks; bless you! the gals likes it as much as we do. If we lads ever has a quarrel, why, we fights for it. If I was to let a cove off once, he'd do it again; but I never give a lad a chance, so long as I can get anigh him. I never heard about Christianity; but if a cove was to fetch me a lick of the head, I'd give it him again, whether he was a big 'un or a little 'un. I'd precious soon see an henemy of mine shot afore I'd forgive him,—where's the use? Do I understand what behaving to your neighbour is?—In coorse I do. If a feller as lives next me wanted a basket of mine as I wasn't using, why, he might have it; if I was working it though, I'd see him further! I can understand that all as lives in a court is neighbours; but as for policemen, they're nothing to me, and I should like to pay 'em all off well. No; I never heerd about this here creation you speak about. In coorse God Almighty made the world, and the poor bricklayers' labourers built the houses arterwards—that's *my* opinion; but I can't say, for I've never been in no schools, only always hard at work, and knows nothing about it. I have heerd a little about our Saviour,—they seem to say he were a goodish kind of a man; but if he says as how a cove's to forgive a feller as hits you, I should say he know'd nothing about it. In coorse the gals the lads goes and lives with thinks our walloping 'em wery cruel of us, but we don't. Why don't we?—why, because we don't. Before father died, I used sometimes to say my prayers, but after that mother was too busy getting a living to mind about my praying. Yes, I knows!—in the Lord's prayer they says 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them as trespasses agin us.' It's a very good thing, in coorse, but no costers can't do it.' ”—p. 39.

But the next passage, which we will present, contains a mixture of the ridiculous, which relieves the seriousness of our subject.

“ ‘Well, times is bad, sir,' he said, 'but it's a deadish time. I don't do so well at present as in middlish times, I think. When I

served the Prince of Naples, not far from here, (I presume that he alluded to the Prince of Capua,) I did better, and times was better. That was five years ago, but I can't say to a year or two. He was a good customer, and was wery fond of peaches. I used to sell them to him at 12s. the plasket, when they was new. The plasket held a dozen, and cost me 6s. at Covent-garden—sometimes more, but I didn't charge him more when they did. His footman was a black man, and a ignorant man quite, and his housekeeper was a English woman. He was the prince o' Naples, was my customer ; but I don't know what he was like, for I never saw him. I've heard that he was the brother of the king of Naples. I can't say where Naples is, but if you was to ask at Euston-square, they'll tell you the fare there, and the time to go it in. It may be in France for anything I know, may Naples, or in Ireland. Why don't you ask at the square ? I went to Croydon once by rail, and slept all the way without stirring, and so you may to Naples for anything I know. I never heard of the Pope being a neighbour of the king of Naples. Do you mean living next door to him ? But I don't know nothing of the king of Naples only the prince. I don't know what the Pope is. Is he any trade ? It's nothing to me, when he's no customer of mine. I have nothing to say about nobody that ain't no customers. My crabs is caught in the sea, in course. I gets them at Billingsgate. I never saw the sea, but it's salt-water, I know. I can't say whereabouts it lays. I believe it's in the hands of the Billingsgate salesmen—all of it ? I've heard of shipwrecks at sea, caused by drowning, in course. I never heard that the Prince of Naples was ever at sea. I like to talk about him, he was such a customer when he lived near here.' (Here he repeated his account of the supply of peaches to his Royal Highness.) 'I never was in France, no, sir, never. I don't know the way. Do you think I could do better there ? I never was in the Republic there. What's it like ? Bonaparte ? O, yes, I've heard of him. He was at Waterloo. I didn't know he'd been alive now in France, as you ask me about him. I don't think you're larking, sir. Did I hear of the French taking possession of Naples, and Bonaparte making his brother-in-law king ? Well, I didn't, but it may be true, because I served the Prince of Naples, what was the brother of the king. I never heard whether the Prince was the king's older brother or his younger. I wish he may turn out his older, if there's property coming to him, as the oldest has the first turn, at least, so I've heard—first come, first served. I've worked the streets and the courts at all times. I've worked them by moonlight, but you couldn't see the moonlight where it was busy. I can't say how far the moon's off us. It's nothing to me, but I've seen it a good bit higher than St. Paul's. I don't know nothing about the sun. Why do you ask ? It must be nearer than the moon, for it's warmer,—and if they're both fire, that shows it. It's like the tap-room grate and that bit of a gas-light, to compare the

two is. What was St. Paul's that the moon was above? A church, sir, so I've heard. I never was in a church. O, yes, I've heard of God; he made heaven and earth; I never heard of his making the sea; that's another thing, and you can best learn about that at Billingsgate. (He seemed to think that the sea was an appurtenance of Billingsgate.) Jesus Christ? Yes, I've heard of him. Our Redeemer? Well, I only wish I could redeem my Sunday togs from my uncle's.'

"Another costermonger, in answer to enquiries, said: 'I s'pose you think us 'riginal coves that you ask. We're not like Methusalem, or some such swell's name, (I presume that Malthus was meant,) as wanted to murder children afore they was born, as I once heard lectured about—we're nothing like that.'

"Another on being questioned, and on being told that the information was wanted for the press, replied: 'The press? I'll have nothing to say to it. We are oppressed enough already.'

"That a class numbering 30,000, should be permitted to remain in a state of almost brutish ignorance, is a national disgrace. If the London costers belong especially to the 'dangerous classes,' the danger of such a body is assuredly an evil of our own creation, for the gratitude of the poor creatures, to any one who seeks to give them the least knowledge, is almost pathetic."—p. 22.

The sentiment expressed at the conclusion of this passage has been more developed by our author in another place, and we think the expression of his feelings deserves to be recorded.

"We have now, in a measure, finished with the metropolitan costermongers. We have seen that the street-sellers of fish, fruit, and vegetables constitute a large proportion of the London population; the men, women, and children numbering at the least 30,000, and taking as much as £2,000,000 per annum. We have seen, moreover, that these are the principal purveyors of food to the poor, and that consequently they are as important a body of people as they are numerous. Of all classes they *should* be the most honest, since the poor, least of all, can afford to be cheated; and yet it has been shown, that the consciences of the London costermongers, generally speaking, are as little developed as their intellects; indeed the moral and religious state of these men is a foul disgrace to us, laughing to scorn our zeal for the 'propagation of the gospel in *foreign* parts,' and making our many societies for the civilization of savages on the other side of the globe appear like a 'delusion, a mockery, and a snare,' when we have so many people sunk in the lowest depths of barbarism round about our very homes. It is well to have Bishops of New Zealand when we have Christianized *all our own* heathen; but with 30,000 individuals, in merely *one* of our cities, utterly creedless, mindless, and principleless, surely it would look more like earnestness on our parts if we created Bishops of the

New Cut, and sent 'right reverend fathers' to watch over the 'cure of souls' in the Broadway and the Brill. If our sense of duty will not rouse us to do this, at least our regard for our own interests should teach us, that it is not safe to allow this vast dunghheap of ignorance and vice to seethe and fust, breeding a social pestilence in the very heart of our land. That the costermongers belong essentially to the dangerous classes, none can doubt, and those who know a coster's hatred of a 'crusher,' will not hesitate to believe that they are, as they themselves confess, one and all ready, upon the least disturbance, to seize and disable their policeman."—p. 100.

Having seen how much Anglicanism, backed by the wealth of Plutus, has accomplished towards reforming those asserted by it to be committed to its charge, we have a right to enquire, whence is salvation to come to these unhappy and benighted creatures? Is there any other body to whom seems reserved this glorious mission, to convert to God, and moralize this huge population? This is to our minds the most important portion of our investigation; and Mr. Mayhew's evidence on the subject has every appearance of being disinterested. He is not a Catholic, yet here is his statement of the religious tendencies of the costermongers, as he had it from an intelligent member of their fraternity.

“RELIGION OF COSTERMONGERS.

“An intelligent and trustworthy man, until very recently actively engaged in costermongering, computed that not 3 in 100 costermongers had ever been in the interior of a church, or any place of worship, or knew what was meant by Christianity. The same person gave me the following account, which was confirmed by others :

“The costers have no religion at all, and very little notion, or none at all, of what religion or a future state is. Of all things they hate tracts. They hate them because the people leaving them never give them anything, and as they can't read the tract—not one in forty—they're vexed to be bothered with it. And really what is the use of giving people reading before you've taught them to read? Now, they respect the City Missionaries, because they read to them—and the costers will listen to reading when they don't understand it—and because they visit the sick, and sometimes give oranges and such like to them and the children. I've known a City Missionary buy a shilling's worth of oranges of a coster, and give them away to the sick and the children—most of them belonging to the costermongers—down the court, and that made him respected there. I think the City Missionaries have done good. *But I'm satisfied that if the costers had to profess themselves of some reli-*

gion to-morrow, they would all become Roman Catholics, every one of them. This is the reason:—London costers live very often in the same courts and streets as the poor Irish, and if the Irish are sick, be sure there comes to them the priest, the Sisters of Charity—they are good women—and some other ladies. Many a man that's not a Catholic, has rotted and died without any good person near him. Why, I lived a good while in Lambeth, and there wasn't one coster in 100, I'm satisfied, knew so much as the rector's name,—though Mr. Dalton's a very good man. But the reason I was telling you of, sir, is that the costers reckoned *that* religion's the best that gives the most in charity, and they think the Catholics do this. I'm not a Catholic myself, but I believe every word of the Bible, and have the greater belief that it's the word of God because it teaches democracy. The Irish in the courts get sadly chaffed by the others about their priests,—but they'll die for the priest. Religion is a regular puzzle to the costers. They see people come out of church and chapel, and as they're mostly well dressed, and there's very few of their own sort among the church-goers, the costers somehow mix up being religious with being respectable, and so they have a queer sort of feeling about it. It's a mystery to them. It's shocking when you come to think of it. They'll listen to any preacher that goes among them; and then a few will say—I've heard it often—'Ab—y fool, why don't he let people go to h-ll their own way?' There's another thing that makes the costers think so well of the Catholics. If a Catholic coster—there's only very few of them—is 'cracked up' (penniless), he's often started again, and the others have a notion that it's through some chapel-fund. I don't know whether it is so or not, but I know the cracked-up men are started again, if they're Catholics. It's still the stranger that the regular costermongers, who are nearly all Londoners, should have such respect for the Roman Catholics, when they have such a hatred for the Irish, whom they look upon as intruders and underminers.'—'If a missionary came among us with plenty of money,' said another costermonger, 'he might make us all Christians or Turks, or anything he liked.' Neither the Latter-day Saints, nor any similar sect, have made converts among the costermongers."—p. 21.

We have seldom read anything that has so cheered and encouraged us as this passage. It alters our feelings entirely about these neglected classes, and we can see them, in our mind's eye, stretching forth their hands towards the Catholic Church, and crying out: "Come over and help us." It seems reserved for our clergy, and perhaps for some of the mendicant orders, to penetrate into this class, and win it over to the consolations of the true faith. But we must not omit one most important corro-

boration of these hopes, the contrast, presented by Mr. Mayhew, of the Catholics corresponding in class and occupation, to those hitherto described. And first, let us have an honest Irish woman's mind about the religion of the English family of costermongers :

“ I was tould I'd do betther in London, and so, glory be to God! I have—perhaps I have. I knew, Mr. ———, he porthers at Covent Garden, and I made him out, and hilped him in any long distance of a job. As I'd been used to farrumin' I thought it good raison I should be a costermonger, as they call it here. I can read and write too. And some good Christian—the heavens light him to glory when he's gone!—I don't know who he was—advanced me 10s.—or he gave it me, so to spake, through Father ———, (a Roman Catholic priest.) ‘ We earn what keeps the life in us. I don't go to markit, but buy of a fair dealin' man—so I count him—though he's harrud sometimes. I can't till how many Irishmen is in the thrade. There's many has been brought down to it by the famin' and the changes. I don't go much among the English street-dealers. They talk like haythens. I never miss mass on a Sunday, and they don't know what the blissed mass manes. I'm almost glad I have no childer, to see how they're raired here. Indeed, sir, they're not raired at all—they run wild. They haven't the fear of God or the saints. They'd hang a praste—glory be to God! they would.’ ”—p. 106.

And now let us secure a second great point, by Mr. Mayhew's testimony to the marvellous preservation, by the poor Irish female, of the darling virtue of the nation. It is as follows :

“ Very few of these women (nor, indeed, of the men, though rather more of them than the women) can read, and they are mostly all wretchedly poor; but the women present two characteristics which distinguish them from the London coster-women generally—they are chaste, and, unlike the ‘ coster-girls,’ very seldom form any connection without the sanction of the marriage ceremony. They are, moreover, attentive to religious observances.” —p. 104.

Where this is safe, we may consider all 'else secured. Our readers must now bear with a couple of long extracts which will conclude this part of our subject. The first contains the general information on

“ THE RELIGION OF THE STREET-IRISH.

“ Having now given a brief sketch as to how the Irish people have come to form so large a proportion of the London street-sellers, I shall proceed, as I did with the English costermongers, to furnish the reader with a short account of their religious, moral, intellectual, and physical

condition, so that he may be able to contrast the habits and circumstances of the one class with those of the other. First, of the religion of the Irish street-folk.

"Almost all the street-Irish are Roman Catholics. Of course I can but speak generally; but during my inquiry I met with only two who said they were Protestants, and when I came to converse with them, I found out that they were partly ignorant of, and partly indifferent to, any religion whatever. An Irish Protestant gentleman said to me: 'You may depend upon it, if ever you meet any of my poor countrymen who will not talk to you about religion, they either know or care nothing about it; for the religious spirit runs high in Ireland, and Protestants and Catholics are easily led to converse about their faith.'

"I found that *some* of the Irish Roman Catholics—but they had been for many years resident in England, and that among the poorest or vagrant class of the English—had become indifferent to their creed, and did not attend their chapels, unless at the great fasts or festivals, and this they did only occasionally. One old stall-keeper, who had been in London nearly thirty years, said to me: 'Ah! God knows, sir, I ought to attend mass every Sunday, but I haven't for a many years, barrin' Christmas-day and such times. But I'll thry and go more regular, plase God.' This man seemed to resent, as a sort of indignity, my question if he ever attended any other place of worship. 'Av coorse not!' was the reply.

"One Irishman, also a fruit-seller, with a well stocked barrow, and without the complaint of poverty common among his class, entered keenly into the subject of his religious faith when I introduced it. He was born in Ireland, but had been in England since he was five or six. He was a good-looking fresh-coloured man, of thirty or upwards, and could read and write well. He spoke without bitterness, though zealously enough. 'Perhaps, sir, you are a gentleman connected with the Protistant clergy,' he asked, 'or a missionary?' On my stating that I had no claim to either character, he resumed: 'Will, sir, it don't matter. All the worruld may know my religion, and I wish all the worruld was of my religion, and better min in it than I am; I do, indeed. I'm a Roman Catholic, sir;' [here he made the sign of the cross;] 'God be praised for it! O yis, I know all about Cardinal Wiseman. It's the will of God, I feel sure, that he's to be 'stablished here, and it's no use ribillin' against that. I've nothing to say against Protistants. I've heard it said, 'It's best to pray for them.' The street-people that call thimselves Protistants are no religion at all at all. I serruve Protistant gentlemen and ladies too, and sometimes they talk to me kindly about religion. They're good custhomers, and I have no doubt good people. I can't say what their lot may be in another worruld for not being of the true faith. No, sir, I'll give no opinions—none.'

"This man gave me a clear account of his belief that the Blessed Virgin (he crossed himself repeatedly as he spoke) was the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and was a mediator with our Lord, who was God of

heaven and earth—of the duty of praying to the holy saints—of attending mass—('but the priest,' he said, 'won't exact too much of a poor man, either about that or about fasting')—of going to confession at Easter and Christmas times, at the least—of receiving the body of Christ, 'the reale prisince,' in the holy sacrament—of keeping all God's commandments—of purgatory being a purgation of sins—and of heaven and hell. I found the majority of those I spoke with, at least, as earnest in their faith, if they were not as well instructed in it as my informant who may be cited as an example of the better class of street-sellers.

"As I was anxious to witness the religious zeal that characterizes these people, I obtained permission to follow one of the priests as he made his rounds among his flock. Everywhere the people ran out to meet him. He had just returned to them I found, and the news spread round, and women crowded to their door-steps, and came creeping up from the cellars through the trap doors, merely to curtsy to him. One old crone, as he passed, cried, 'You're a good father, Heaven comfort you,' and the boys playing about stood still to watch him. A lad in a man's tail-coat and a shirt collar that nearly covered in his head—like a paper round a bouquet—was fortunate enough to be noticed, and his eyes sparkled, as he touched his hair at each word he spoke in answer. At a conversation that took place between the priest and a woman who kept a dry fish-stall, the dame excused herself for not having been up to take tea 'with his rivirince's mother lately, for thrade had been so bisy, and night was the fullest time.' Even as the priest walked along the street, boys running at full speed would pull up to touch their hair, and the stall-women would rise from their baskets; while all noise—even a quarrel—ceased until he had passed by. Still there was no look of fear in the people. He called them all by their names, and asked after their families, and once or twice the 'father' was taken aside and held by the button while some point that required his advice was whispered in his ear.

"The religious fervour of the people whom I saw was intense. At one house that I entered, the woman set me marvelling at the strength of her zeal, by showing me how she contrived to have in her sitting-room a sanctuary to pray before every night and morning, and even in the day 'when she felt weary and lonesome. The room was rudely enough furnished, and the only decent table was covered with a new piece of varnished cloth; still before a rude print of our Saviour, there were placed two old plated candlesticks, pink, with the copper shining through; and here it was that she told her beads. In her bed-room, too, was a coloured engraving of 'the Blessed lady,' which she never passod without curtseying to.

"Of course, I detail these matters as mere facts, without desiring to offer any opinion here, either as to the benefit or otherwise of the creed in question. As I had shown how the English costermonger neither had nor knew any religion whatever, it became my duty to give the reader a view of the religion of the Irish street-

sellers. In order to be able to do so as truthfully as possible, I placed myself in communication with those parties who were in a position to give me the best information on the subject. The result is given above, in all the simplicity and impartiality of history."— p. 107.

Our next extract gives a touching case of a small, poor, and young, Catholic family, in this class, struggling with its trials, which we have reason to hope have found alleviation through the publication of their simple history. It is as follows :

“OF TWO ORPHAN FLOWER GIRLS.

“Of these girls the elder was fifteen and the younger eleven. Both were clad in old, but not torn, dark print frocks, hanging so closely, and yet so loosely, about them as to show the deficiency of under-clothing ; they wore old broken black chip bonnets. The older sister (or rather half-sister) had a pair of old worn-out shoes on her feet, the younger was barefoot, but trotted along, in a gait at once quick and feeble—as if the soles of her little feet were impervious, like horn, to the roughness of the road. The elder girl has a modest expression of countenance, with no pretensions to prettiness except in having tolerably good eyes. Her complexion was somewhat muddy, and her features somewhat pinched. The younger child has a round, chubby, and even rosy face, and quite a healthful look. Her portrait is here given.

“They lived in one of the streets near Drury-lane. They were inmates of a house, not let out as a lodging-house, in separate beds, but in rooms, and inhabited by street-sellers and street-labourers. The room they occupied was large, and one dim candle lighted it so insufficiently that it seemed to exaggerate the dimensions. The walls were bare and discoloured with damp. The furniture consisted of a crazy table and a few chairs, and in the centre of the room was an old four-post bedstead of the larger size. This bed was occupied nightly by the two sisters and their brother, a lad just turned thirteen. In a sort of recess in a corner of the room was the decency of an old curtain—or something equivalent, for I could hardly see in the dimness—and behind this was, I presume, the bed of the married couple. The three children paid 2s. a week for the room, the tenant an Irishman out of work paying 2s. 9d., but the furniture was his, and his wife aided the children in their trifle of washing, mended their clothes, where such a thing was possible, and such like. The husband was absent at the time of my visit, but the wife seemed of a better stamp, judging by her appearance, and by her refraining from any direct, or even indirect way of begging, as well as from the ‘Glory be to God!’ the heavens be your honour’s bed!’ or ‘it’s the truth I’m telling of you sir,’ that I so frequently meet with on similar visits.

“The elder girl said, in an English accent, not at all garrulously, but merely in answer to my questions: ‘I sell flowers, sir; we live almost on flowers when they are to be got.’ I sell, and so does my sister, all kinds, but it’s very little use offering any that’s not sweet. I think it’s the sweetness as sells them. I sell primroses, when they’re in, and violets, and wall-flowers, and stocks, and roses, of different sorts, and pinks, and carnations, and mixed flowers, and lilies of the valley, and green lavender, and mignonette (but that I do very seldom), and violets again at this time of the year, for we get them both in spring and winter.’ [They are forced in hot-houses for winter sale, I may remark.] ‘The best sale of all is, I think, moss-roses, young moss-roses. We do best of all on them. Primroses are good, for people say: ‘Well, here’s spring again to a certainty.’ Gentlemen are our best customers. I’ve heard that they buy flowers to give to the ladies. Ladies have sometimes said: ‘A penny, my poor girl, here’s three-halfpence for the bunch.’ Or they’ve given me the price of two bunches for one; so have gentlemen. I never had a rude word said to me by a gentleman in my life. No, sir, neither lady nor gentleman ever gave me sixpence for a bunch of flowers. I never had a sixpence given to me in my life—never. I never go among boys. I know nobody but my brother. My father was a tradesman in Mitchel’s Town, in the County Cork.....Mother died seven years ago last Guy Faux day. I’ve got myself, and my brother and sister a bit of bread ever since, and never had any help but from the neighbours. I never troubled the parish. O, yes, sir, the neighbours is all poor people, very poor, some of them. We’ve lived with her’ (indicating her landlady by a gesture) ‘these two years, and off and on before that. I can’t say how long.’ ‘Well, I don’t know exactly, said the landlady, ‘but I’ve had them with me almost all the time for four years, as near as I can recollect; perhaps more. I’ve moved three times, and they always followed me.’ In answer to my inquiries the landlady assured me that these two poor girls, were never out of doors all the time she had known them after six at night. ‘We’ve always good health. We can all read.’ [Here the three somewhat insisted upon proving to me their proficiency in reading, and having produced a Roman Catholic book, the ‘Garden of Heaven,’ they read very well.] ‘I put myself,’ continued the girl, ‘and I put my brother and sister to a Roman Catholic school—and to Ragged schools—but I could read before mother died. My brother can write, and I pray to God that he’ll do well with it. I buy my flowers at Covent Garden; sometimes, but very seldom, at Farringdon.....The two of us doesn’t make less than sixpence a day, unless it’s very ill luck. But religion teaches us that God will support us, and if we make less we say nothing. We do better on oranges in March or April, I think it is, than on flowers. We never pawned anything; we have nothing they would take in at the pawnshop. We live on bread and tea, and sometimes a fresh

herring of a night. Sometimes we don't eat a bit all day when we're out; sometimes we take a bit of bread with us, or buy a bit. My sister can't eat tatars; they sicken her. I don't know what emigrating means.' [I informed her and she continued]. 'No, sir, I wouldn't like to emigrate and leave brother and sister. If they went with me I don't think I should like it, not among strangers. I think our living costs us 2s. a week for the two of us; the rest goes in rent. That's all we make.'

"The brother earned from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a week, with an occasional meal, as a costermonger's boy. None of them ever missed mass on a Sunday."—p. 135.

Before taking leave of the religious condition of the London industrious poor, we will say a few words of the state of religion among the poor of the northern capital, Edinburgh. Last year, a series of letters appeared in the Scotsman," and was reprinted in a pamphlet, "on the destitution and vice of Edinburgh." The writer, Mr. James Bruce, is a Protestant; yet he gives the same sort of contrast between the Scotch Presbyterian and Irish Catholic poor. We will throw together a few extracts, as we have not space for much commentary.

"But the great peculiarity of the city of Edinburgh is, that within bow-shot of the splendid mansions of a population boasting themselves to be, in point of mere worldly refinement, at the highest pitch which either ancient or modern times have witnessed, and possessed of a purity in religious knowledge and practice unexampled amongst Christian nations,—within bowshot of this population a kingdom of darkness, misery, and vice, has erected itself, and is daily strengthening its fortifications and deepening its trenches. In close juxtaposition with a population who vaunt that their city contains every element necessary to train them up as one family to God, there is growing up another population, strong in numbers and desperate in misery, who are to all intents and purposes *practical heathens*. In close geographical contact with each other, there are existing two populations,—the one of which is as far separated from the other in habits, feelings, and outward appearance, as if a hemisphere had intervened between them."—p. 3.

"As to the almost total neglect of the wretched and the criminal by the clergy, both Established and Dissenters, it is perfectly amazing, and is a subject to which I shall be obliged to return again."—p. 13.

"Especially and emphatically, I impute much blame to the general culpability of the clergy, who, holding an express commission to seek out the lost and the wretched, discharge almost

none of those duties which are more expressly laid on their shoulders than on those of other men. In a great many of these wretched places—in the haunts of female depravity, I found that the unhappy inmates knew not even the names of their parish ministers, nor of their dissenting brethren and rivals. I hope I am not to be impudently told that this is the blame of these wretched creatures. It is their blame indeed, but their sins are not those which the world neglects to condemn. But it is ten thousand times more the blame of the ministers of the gospel. The minister of the Established Church, in particular, I must hold to be the minister of all who live within the territory of his parish, without respect to creed, profession, or character. It is his business, if any of his parishioners, from wretchedness or profligacy, will not go to him, to go to them, and introduce himself to them, not waiting till the request for an introduction come from the other side. It is his business—for which he receives wages—to open the door where misery and crime have taken up their abode, and ‘where lonely want has retired to die,’ and say, ‘I am Mr. —, your parish minister; I am come to see you as is my duty, and to do you good if I can.’ I cannot look on a minister of an Established Church, who does not do this, in any other light than as a cheat who accepts payment for work which he does not work. But I must not discharge from sharing in his guilt the Voluntary ministers, who, with loud professions of zeal for the good of their fellow-creatures, have neglected a wide and glorious field for missionary labour in the dens of the High Street, the Canongate, and the Cowgate. I must not be told that ministers would be ill used or rudely received in these places. It is not true. I have sought out every place where I had information that vice and wretchedness were to be seen in their worst and most hideous aspects. I have mingled freely with drunkards, thieves, and unfortunate women, and I declare solemnly and gratefully that I have met with nothing but genuine natural politeness. Even the Scottish profligacy was civil; and while an unpolite Irishman is a rarity, an Irish woman not polite is, I suspect, something that has not yet been discovered in this world.”—p. 21.

Several similar charges of neglect occur; and we will now give extracts that refer to the state of Catholics, and the conduct of their clergy.

“In the West Port there is a great variety in the character and appearances of the dwellings of the poor and of the poor themselves,—all of them not being anything like equally wretched or filthy. In Inglis’s Court is a room with four families in it at once—all Irish and all Roman Catholics. There is the landlord, or master, Robert Kelley, who says he supports himself by keeping these lodgings—he has two children with him, and five in America, who have plenty of money.—‘I go to the Roman Catholic Church, with

the blessing of God, almost every morning—and particularly, with God's grace, on Sunday mornings,—it would be a hard thing that would keep me from the church, I feel such a happiness in the Roman Catholic religion.'”—p. 11.

“The High Street and its closes are inhabited, in a great measure, by a Scotch population, and it is here that female profligacy is most abundant. When the late Daniel O'Connell once asserted the superiority of his countrywomen over those of England, in respect to the comparatively smaller amount of unchastity amongst them, he was assailed by an injudicious portion of the press as a slanderer of the purest of the sex. He was perfectly right, however, in point of fact—as far as England is concerned—and if he included Scotland under the head of England, he was still more strongly in the right. Whenever, amongst the females in all parts of Edinburgh, you meet with those in whose whole appearance their wretched occupation is inscribed in unmistakable characters—you find them to be Scottish—a great many, indeed, of the native growth of the modern Athens, reared within the sound of many Sabbath bells, and under the eye of an infinite variety of benevolent and philanthropic institutions—reared in the very neighbourhood of ladies who are not content to be devout in private, but who crowd with their presence every assemblage where discourses are delivered on the best means of protecting from crime and degradation the more wretched of their countrymen and countrywomen. On the other hand, in the lowest hovels occupied by the Irish—where you find that thieves reside and resort—where riotous persons are every other night apprehended by the police—you do not find these appearances—but on the contrary, everything to induce you to believe that in this respect the females are distinguished from our countrywomen, living in what appear to be similar circumstances.”—p. 19.

“This is the only case of conversion that I met with; in most cases the Roman Catholics living in misery and dirt, and perhaps crime, felt a pride in avowing their attachment to a Church whose expansive arms embrace the most wretched of her children. The Roman Catholics in the low localities are twice as well attended by their priests as Protestants in similar circumstances are. I found that absence from the church on the part of the family was generally followed by a visit from the priest, and that the sick beds of his flock were not unattended. This is the way over all Christendom. The priests of Rome every where do their duty to their Church. The great and the wealthy have their polite confessors; but the poor, and the miserable, and the vicious, are not thrown out of the pale. It is with sorrow that the friends of the Reformation must confess that the magnificent eulogium which the Viscount Chateaubriand, in his work on English literature—where he claims Shakespere as a papist—has pronounced on Romanism at the expense of Protestantism, is, in respect to the sympathy which the

ministers of that church have ever shown with the condition of the lowest of the poor, not wholly unfounded. One fact on this point is decisive—the dirty Romanist family generally wash their faces once a-week and go to the idolatrous mass. The dirty Protestants will not wash their faces, nor go to the next street to hear the glad tidings of the gospel. Our clergy should really lay these things to heart. It is hard that the art of winning the affections of the poor should be all with the priests of a superstitious worship.

“I found in the large hall a Catholic class of about ninety-seven children. Their teacher, Mr. Donlevy, was catechising them. They were answering questions—it is right to speak plainly out—with regard to the degree of respect due to the Virgin Mary. I have at present no business with theological controversies, but I may in one word be allowed to say that these children were made to speak of the Virgin Mary in language quite similar to that which has been used towards her by Jeremy Taylor and Lord Bacon. One of the school books here is, ‘A Short Historical Catechism, by M. L’Abbe Fleury.’ The children sang a hymn beautifully.”
—p. 30.

“In the West Port, I found that the name of the Rev. Mr. Tasker of the Free Church was honourably coupled with the names of the Roman Catholic priests as one who did not neglect the duty of visiting.”—p. 42.

We feel sure, that the many coincidences between Mr. Mayhew’s and Mr. Bruce’s narratives, will serve as corroborations of what both state about the religious state of the poor, and the care taken of them by their respective clergies. We might now close our article, did we not wish to send our readers to bed in a good humour, which we do not think we can better do than by giving them an extract or two from the experience of a “street-patterer,” and “chanter,” on the subject of “papal aggression.” The patterer is one who shouts out “cocks,” murders, or any other wonderful news, along the streets, as the contents of a paper which he sells. The chanter is one who sings songs in a similar manner. We give first the patterer’s experience :

“From the same man I had the following account of his vocation up to the present time :

“Well, sir,’ he said, ‘I think, take them altogether, things hasn’t been so good this last year as the year before. But the Pope, God bless him! he’s been the best friend I’ve had since Rush, but Rush licked His Holiness. You see, the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman is a one-sided affair ; of course the Catholics won’t buy anything against the Pope, but *all* religions could go for Rush. Our mob

once thought of starting a cardinal's dress, and I thought of wearing a red hat myself. I did wear a shovel hat when the Bishop of London was our racket; but I thought the hat began to feel too hot, so I shovelled it off. There was plenty of paper that would have suited to work with a cardinal's hat. There was one,—'Cardinal Wiseman's Lament,'—and it was giving his own words like, and a red hat would have capped it. It used to make the people roar when it came to snivelling, and grumbling at little Jack Russell—by Wiseman, in course; and when it comes to this part—which alludes to that 'ere thundering letter to the Bishop of Durham—the people was stuuned:

'He called me a buffalo, bull, and a monkey,
And then with a soldier called Old Arthur conkey
Declar-d they would buy me a ninepenny donkey,
And send me to Rome to the Pope.'

“‘They shod me sir. *Who's they?* Why, the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman. I call my clothes after them I earn money by to buy them with. My shoes I call Pope Pius; my trowsers and braces, Calcraft; my waistcoat and shirt, Jael Denny; and my coat, Love Letters. A man must show a sense of gratitude in the best way he can. But I didn't start the cardinal's hat; I thought it might prove disagreeable to Sir Robert Peel's dress lodgers.' [What my informant said further of the Pope, I give under the head of the Chaunter.]—p. 224.

“Hollest weren't no good either, 'cause the wictim was a parson. If it had happened a little later, *we'd* have had it to rights; the newspapers didn't make much of it. *We'd* have shown it was the 'Commencement of a Most Horrid and Barbarous Plot got up by the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman *for-r* the Mas-ser creeing of all good Protestant Ministers.' That would have been the dodge, Sir! A beautiful idear, now, isn't it? But the murder came off badly, and you can't expect fellows like them murderers to have any regard for the interest of art and literature. Then there's so long to wait between the murder and the trial, that unless the fiend in human form keeps writing beautiful love-letters, the excitement can't be kept up. *We* can write the love-letters for the fiend in human? That's quite true, and we once had a great pull that way over the newspapers. But Lord love you, there's plenty of 'em gets more and more into our line. They treads in our footsteps, Sir; they follows our bright example. O! isn't there a nice rubbing and polishing up? This here copy won't do. This must be left out, and that put in; 'cause it suits the walk of the paper. Why, you must know, Sir. *I* know. Don't tell me. You can't have been on the *Morning Chronicle* for nothing.”—p. 225.

“I don't know of anything fresh that's in hand, Sir. One of our authors is coming out with something spicy against Lord John, for doing nothing about Wiseman; 'cause he says, as no one thing

that he's written for Lord John ever sold well, something against him may."—p. 226.

We think the idea quite excellent; that many of the newspapers of late, and in the matter of Papal aggression particularly, have taken after the patterer literature, and have modelled their articles upon the "horrid conspiracy" principle, and even stepped over the boundary line, into the "massacre" department. Where there has been such a "glorious rivalry," it would be invidious to make a selection by way of illustration.

The chaunter's experience on the same subject is as follows.

"'The Pope sir,' he began, 'was as one-sided to chaunt as to patter, in course. We had the Greeks (the lately arrived Irish) down upon us more than once. In Liverpool street, on the night of the meeting at Guildhall about the Papal Aggression, we had a regular skrimmage. One gentleman said: 'Really, you shouldn't sing such improper songs, my men.' Then up comes another, and he was a little crusted with port wine, and he says: 'What, against that cove the Pope! Here, give me half a dozen of the papers.' The city was tidy for the patter, Sir, or the chaunt; there was sixpences; but there was shillings at the West End. And for the first time in their innocent lives, the parsons came out as stunning patrons of the patter. One of 'em as we was at work in the street give a bit of a signal, and was attended to without any parade to the next street, and was good for half-a-crown! Other two stopped that very same day, and sent a boy to us with a Joey. Then me and my mate went to the Rev. W.'s, him as came it so strong for the fire-works on the Fifth of November. And we pattered and we pattered, and we chaunted and we chaunted, but no go for a goodish bit. His servant said he weren't at home. In course *that* wouldn't do for us, so down he came his-self at last, and says, very soft: 'Come to-morrow morning, my men, and there'll be two gentlemen to hear you.' We stuck to him for something in hand, but he said the business had cost him so much already, he really couldn't. Well, we bounced a bob out of him, and didn't go near him again. After all we did for his party, a shilling was black ingratitude. Of course *we* has no feeling either for or agin the Pope. *We* goes to it as at an election; and let me tell you, Sir, we got very poorly paid, it couldn't be called paid, for working for Lord John at the City election; and I was the original of the live rats, which took well. But there's a good time coming to pay Lord Johany off.

"Some of the tunes—there's no act of parliament about tunes, you know, Sir—was stunners on the fiddle; as if a thousand bricks was falling out of a cart at once. I think, 'The Pope and Cardinal Wiseman,' one of the first of the songs, did as well as any."—p. 226.

We take our leave of Mr. Mayhew's instructive volume, and we shall follow his steps with interest, into the haunts of every class of poor. We shall be satisfied if we shall have awakened Catholic sympathies, in favour of a great work which seems committed to our Church, that of evangelizing the poor in London. We well know what a lively zeal in those who have neglected them, the very starting of any plan of ours would excite; many, we believe, would rather let them perish as infidels or brutes, than see them reformed by us. But let us not fear to keep this duty before our minds, for the time may soon come, when it may become more nearly pressing.

Cardinal Wiseman

SUMMARY NOTICE OF FOREIGN CATHOLIC LITERATURE.

German Catholic Publications.—Serial Works.

THE publications of Catholic Germany have accumulated so rapidly since the last detailed notice of German Literature contained in this Journal, that we have found the attempt to embrace all, or even the principal portion of them, in a brief summary like the present, a perfectly hopeless task. We have thought, therefore, that it would be at once more interesting and more useful, to confine ourselves, in the first instance, to a few of the more important (especially of the serial) Catholic publications; reserving for a future occasion a detailed review, or at least a complete enumeration, of all the works of prominent merit which have appeared during the last eventful years in Catholic Germany.

The extent and variety of the Catholic literary establishments of Germany, and the number of Catholic laymen, as well as clergymen, who make literature the chief (or at least subsidiary to the chief) pursuit of their lives, afford an opportunity in that country for combined action upon a larger scale, and thus for the execution of more comprehensive literary projects, than we can venture to contemplate in these kingdoms, or even than it is possible to

expect from our more favoured brethren in France or Italy. It is to the great works, therefore, like the *Kirchen-Lexicon*, or the *Katholisches Conversations-Lexicon*, which have been undertaken upon this plan, that we would point, as illustrating far more than the productions of individual authors, the intellectual activity of Germany; and perhaps we shall best exhibit these peculiar characteristics by extracts from some of the remarkable articles which they contain, than by any general description of their contents.

(1.) *Conversations Lexicon für das Katholische Deutschland*. [A popular Encyclopædia for Catholic Germany. Edited by DR. WILLIAM BINDER, in union with a number of Catholic scholars.] 12 vols. 8vo., Ratisbon, 1846-50.

We must begin with the *Katholisches Conversations-Lexicon*, or German Catholic Cyclopædia. It is an attempt to supply to Catholics a safe and useful substitute for the popular Cyclopædia known in Germany under the same name, and rendered tolerably familiar in this country by the English translation published several years since. With a vast amount of useful and interesting information, however, the *Conversations-Lexicon* combines so much of bigotry, and so many dangerous, and indeed absolutely noxious principles, as to be entirely unsuited for a conscientious Catholic reader. Dr. Binder therefore formed, about ten years ago, an association of Catholic literati, for the purpose of compiling a Cyclopædia on strictly Catholic principles, the work whose title is recited above. It displays, perhaps, some marks of haste and want of concert in its compilation. But many of the articles are of the highest order of merit, especially those upon historical, philological, and ethnological subjects.

We must content ourselves with a single specimen from an article upon the Life of Christ; and this we select especially because, as the author is a layman, the reader may look with more of interest to his performance upon a subject which, among ourselves, would be supposed to be reserved exclusively for a clerical pen. With all the learning which it exhibits, the reader will not fail to be struck by the strong German character which pervades its entire tones.

The writer is Dr. Sepp, a very learned and talented disciple of the illustrious Görres, who has written a much admired work, entitled, "the Life of Christ,* in seven volumes," 1842-7. It is partly didactic, partly descriptive, and is throughout a confutation of the infamous book of Strauss.

* *Leben Jesu Christi*.

The article in question is a sort of summary of Dr. Sepp's large work, which though possessing many great merits, yet as the production of a young author, labours under some defects, especially that of want of condensation. The author has turned to great use the Rabbinical writers, and his researches have thereby contributed to throw much light on many passages of the Gospels. He has broken the critical weapon of Strauss in his own hands, and that writer's attempt to prove the mythic character, and later rise of the gospels, has served only to bring out in clearer light their historic reality, and their contemporaneous origin with the events they record.

The following passage on the universal expectation of the Messiah will be read with great interest.

"When by Adam's fall, man had lost the one original consciousness of God, and had fallen under the servitude of sin; when his intellectual faculties were narrowed, and himself given up a prey to every error; when he had become weak and wavering in his will, crippled as all its energies were; and when his body itself had become frail and mortal; then had the All-merciful consoled our first parents, banished from paradise, with the promise, that a deliverer should be born of the woman to crush the head of the serpent, or the principle of evil;—a *second Adam* to raise sunken man from his fall, to point out to him the true path, that is to say, the true religion, and lead him back to God, illuminate *his mind* with ideas of truth and virtue, strengthen *his will* for good by Divine Grace, and by his own resurrection and the victory over death, insure even man's *corporeal* immortality. All nations, separated as they were by diversity of language and of myths—a diversity, the result of the decay of the one primitive religion—had carried into their respective homes *the divine promise of the Crusher of the serpent*, the *Goël*, or the *θεος σωτηρ*, or by whatever other name they greeted the future Redeemer, and had there planted anew their paradise. The saga of redemption forms the real kernel of all mythology; and in every historical precursor who appeared to the heathen world as a typical God and Saviour, was prophetically shadowed out the type of Him, who in the fulness of time came forth as the true Son of God and the Redeemer, and by whose revelation were first opened to the mind of men the sense of nature or of creation, the understanding and the object of history, and the consummation of all religion. When now the middle period of time had arrived, then God sent his only-begotten Son. He was born of a Virgin, as this, too, was in the expectancy of all nations. But the middle or fulness of time is the holy jubilee period of redemption, after whose evolution the nations expected from the East the great Divine King, and regenerator of the world. Hence at the commencement of our era—at the acknowledged close of the four ages of the world, or of the golden,

silver, brazen, and iron periods, and the four universal monarchies corresponding to it, all the inhabitants of the earth were filled with the hope of the Messiah, and the eyes of all were directed towards the East. Among others, Tacitus (Hist. v. 13.) and Suetonius (Vespas. c. 5.) relate that men were convinced from an old and constant tradition, that it was determined by destiny, and was recorded in the old sacerdotal books, that about this time the East would attain to power, and a ruler would go forth from Judæa, who would possess the empire of the world. All nations had their holy cycles, or sacerdotal eras, according to which the future age of the promised deliverer was calculated.

“Thus a generation before the birth of Christ, the Etrurian Seer and Interpreter of the sacred books, Nigidius Figulus, according to the statement of Suetonius, announced to the assembled Senate of Rome, that the eight prescribed days of the world, as related in the Sybilline books, had run out their course; or that in other words, the *eight phœnix cycles*, or eight periods each of 540 lunar years,* thus in toto, 4320 lunar years of expectancy had come to an end. He in consequence hailed the new-born son of Octavius, the subsequent emperor Augustus, as the promised Saviour of the world. Nay, at the same time (according to the statement of Julius Marathus, recorded by Suetonius), a foreboding report being in circulation, ‘that nature bore a king to the Roman people,’ the Conscript Fathers were so terrified, that in the interest of the republic they decreed a sort of Bethlehemite infanticide. In the same way the Jews had a prophecy from the school of Elias, that the Messiah would come thirty generations after Abraham, or as it is still more clearly expressed in the Talmud, ‘This world will not endure less than eighty-five Jubilees, and in the last, that is, the eighty-sixth, the Son of David will appear.†.....

“The ancients all knew this proper human year of 273 days—the time, to wit, that man lies in his mother’s womb, or as many days as elapsed from the ebb of the Nile till the returning inundation. This we see particularly among the Chaldeans, who count 2222 years to the flood, which, as years of nine months, accurately coincide with the 1665 years of the Hebrew text. Thus between the computation of the Septuagint and of the Hebrew Bible, there is no real difference. Even the Jews, in civil life, reckon 4320 lunar years, or 4191 solar years, till the time of the Messiah’s birth. This is evident when we annex to the sum of the world’s years down to Christ, which they reckon according to their present computation, the 432 years (the tenth part of the holy period), that the Sanhedrin at Tiberias, under the presidency of the younger Hillel,

* Solinus. (c. 36.)

† Traktat Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 2.

in the year 358 after Christ, deducted from the old computation, and thus indefinitely prolonged the hope of Messiah's advent. The same law of the eight Phoenix periods of 540 years (the still prevailing Easter cycle), as well as the ten Indian yoghis of 432 years, or as the Persians call it, the Salchodai or Great Divine year of 1440 years (the great intercalary period of 365 days), forms in its triple course the end and the concluding number to all the chronological systems of the ancient world, and the pivot of its expectancy for the hour of salvation. This is the middle point, or the fulness and consummation of time, which the hand of the world's clock pointed to, and whereby the moment of Redemption, or of the second spiritual creation, coinciding with that of the first creation, appears marked out through the whole planetary system. A great jubilee—an apokatastasis—had occurred in the whole solar system, and throughout all the spheres of heaven there was intoned amid the eternal harmonies, a far sublimer *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*, than was heard by the shepherds of Bethlehem, for the Saviour of the world, and the Redeemer of all creation was born."—vol. ii. p. 1011-12,

We wish that our space permitted us to pursue the train of reasoning by which Dr. Sepp shows, that the Gospels, so far from being fabulous in their contents, as the impious Strauss had pretended, abound in allusions to the contemporaneous events of our Saviour's time, and that even the parables and similitudes of our divine Lord were sometimes drawn from historical incidents. Thus, the attempt to volatilize the Gospel history into a myth, has served only to establish more clearly its substantial reality.

We shall on some future occasion recur to this valuable and interesting work of Dr. Sepp, which has excited the greatest sensation among the Catholics and Protestants of Germany.

(2.) *Kirchen-recht* (Canon Law). By DR. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Professor of History and Canon Law at the University of Innsbruck. Vols. i.—iii. Ratisbon, 1848-50.

Professor Phillips's great work on Canon Law, although it is not, like the publication just described, the production of many hands, is at least so far a serial, that its volumes have appeared at regular intervals. It has now reached the third volume, which, to the general reader, is more interesting than either of its predecessors. The former volumes are occupied with the details of Church law, while the third is devoted to the general questions connected therewith.

In the first portion of this volume, the history of the relations between the Christian Church and the State, is traced out in their successive development—in the time of Rome's pagan emperors—of the Christian empires in the east and west—in the Mediæval period—and in modern times. Next are examined the relations

of the Church to the schismatical and heretical State, as well as its actual external condition, especially in Germany, In the appendix are inserted the concordats and other ecclesiastical documents of great importance.

In the second part of this volume the sources of Canon Law are investigated. These are, in the first place Scripture and Tradition—next, Papal constitutions, decrees of general councils, decisions of provincial councils and concordats. The volume closes with considerations on oral or unwritten law, or custom, considered as a source of ecclesiastical law.

An analysis of this important work is here of course out of the question. The reader will perceive that the first part of this volume is more of an historical than legal purport. And rarely in any regular historical work have matters of more intense interest been treated with so much ability and learning. The book is distinguished for the orthodoxy of its principles, for lucidness of method, extent of historical research, sagacity of observation, and a clear and lively style. The Gallican and Febronian doctrines have found in Dr. Phillips a most formidable foe.

Our readers will rejoice to hear that this able and learned Catholic writer, who, by the wretched ministry of Bavaria, that some years ago ministered to the vengeance of Lola Montes, was so shamefully deprived of his professorship at Munich, has been appointed by the Austrian Government to the chair of History and Canon Law at the University of Innsbruck, and is now, it is said, about to be invited to the Imperial University of Vienna. This nomination, which is a homage to Catholic principles, as well as to distinguished talent, reflects the highest credit on the present Austrian Ministers.

We must cite a passage or two from this remarkable volume; but we must remind the reader that the strength of such a work as this lies not in its detached parts.

“In the discord between Church and State, Godfrey, of Vendôme recognizes the overthrow of all divine order; yet the reconciliation, as it really took place, was possible, because christian society was completely imbued with the desire of belonging entirely to the Church, as the kingdom of God. She was completely conscious, (as we have proved in section 102 116,) of what divine right required for the relation of the two powers ruling the world; and if in those ages it did not attain to the entire fulness of this idea, yet the fact, as far as was possible among men, closely approximated to this idea. But the decisive principle was this: Church and State must be united; this concord, however, is only possible by the general refection of every opinion, which the Church designates as erroneous, only possible under the supposition of the unimpeded action of the Church in the administration of the sacraments entrusted to her, only possible as soon as her freedom in her government and administration is acknowledged. But collateral with

these rights, is the obligation entailed on the Church of respecting the free exercise of the secular power in its appropriate sphere, in so far as it violates not the divine law, compact and lawful customs. As these principles were then realised, so political society dwelt with the Church in one and the same house.....

“The Church was accordingly recognized as the all-embracing kingdom of God, wherein the highest secular potentates, as sheep belonging to Peter’s fold, must come in at the door of the sheep-fold, which is Christ. Hence, in this kingdom, all are mere subjects.

“If, accordingly, all Christendom forms in history but one great kingdom, so, on the other hand, the assumption is not consistent with historical truth, that the popes, especially Gregory VIII., had conceived the plan of founding a vast Theocracy, in the sense that all the kingdoms of the earth should be in a feudal relationship with the pontiff.* On the whole, in the later judgments which we form on history, we are too apt to consider it as the work of human design, and to regard many an historical phenomena, which has grown up according to the providence of God, as the result of the long devised and deeply meditated scheme of man. The popes had not any kingdom to found; the kingdom in which they were the sacerdotal kings, had been established by God Himself, and with all the greatness of character many among them exhibit, they were still mere instruments in the hands of the Almighty for the furtherance of His designs. But they were useful and apt instruments for their divine Lord and Master; and, inasmuch, as they consented to be so, they have their share in the glory and splendour of the Church. When, therefore, the popes cast out of the communion of the Church, even kings and emperors, who had revolted against the laws of God, and disturbed it by secession and schism; when they bereaved them even of their throne, and severed the bond which united them and their subjects; when, further, the holiest and most learned writers of that age regarded this power of the popes as perfectly natural and legitimate;—so these are, on one hand, thoughts which, in earlier times, had not been enunciated with such clearness, and, on the other hand, facts which had formerly not been brought out into equal prominence. But the former are no new discoveries of the human mind, and the latter no pretensions of human pride and ambition. Not then for the first time had the popes become the successors of St. Peter; not then, for the first time, had they received the power of binding and of loosing, nor the supreme ministry and sacerdotal royalty. But then

* The whole of this subject in regard to the particular kingdoms, respecting which this assertion has been put forth, Bianchi has illustrated with much learning. See his work, *Della Potestà e della Politia della Chiesa*.—tom. i. p. 328, and seq.

only could Peter in his successors exact from all society because it had become christian, and been subjected to him in Christ, the unqualified obedience, to which, in recompense of his love, the Saviour had brought the world under him. The principle was not new, that two powers are to govern the world—the maxim was not new, that the secular power should be subordinated to the spiritual; but it was only the comparisons, under whose veil the dogmas were set forth by the loftiest minds of those ages, which (and that only in a partial degree) might be called novel. But these comparisons were beautiful and pertinent: the divinity of the two powers—their strength and their sharpness were after the example of St. Bernard, fitly symbolized by the two swords which God had left on the earth.”—*Kirchen-recht*, Vol. iii. p. 180-2.

There are yet three more volumes of Dr. Phillips's Canon Law to appear; and every friend of religion, as well as of science, will hope to see a speedy termination to the work. When this labour is ended, Dr. Phillips will then resume the task of completing his great History of Germany, two volumes whereof appeared twelve years ago. When brought to a close, it will hold the very first rank in German literature.

(3.) *Kirchen Lexicon. F.* (Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia.) Published with the approbation of the Archbishop of Freyburg. Freyburg. 1848-50.

The *Kirchen Lexicon* is an Encyclopædia of Theology and the kindred sciences, edited by the most eminent divines, Biblical Critics, Canonists, Archæologists, and Historians of Catholic Germany, and numbers a staff of not fewer than one hundred writers. It is in alphabetical order, and the last number which has just issued from the press, reaches to the letter M. When completed, it will form about eight or ten large octavo volumes, at the very moderate price of sixteen or twenty dollars, or about two pounds ten shillings.

When we inform those of our readers, who may happen to be acquainted with German literature, that Theologians and Biblical Critics, like Döllinger, Haneberg, Staudenmaier, Kuhn, Hefele, Welte, Movers; Canonists like Phillips and Moy; and Historians and publicists like Hurter, Höfler, Guido Görres, Bass, and others, are among the contributors to this work, they may judge of its value. Many of its articles possess transcendent excellence; the work is conducted on the most orthodox principles, and is written throughout with great ability, learning, and elegance of style. It is adapted alike for the general scholar, and the man of the world, as well as for the Theologian; and some of the historical and political articles are of the greatest interest.

We shall best enable our readers to judge for themselves as to the great merits of this Encyclopædia, by citing, almost at random, a few passages on those matters in which they are most interested.

The Spanish Inquisition is a subject which much occupies, at the present moment, the attention of English Catholics. Dr. Hefele, a distinguished pupil of the illustrious Möhler, has a long and interesting article on this subject, which may be regarded as a very useful appendix to the no less solid, than brilliant letters of Count Maistre, whereof an English translation has recently appeared. The following passage contains a summary refutation of the mis-statements and calumnies often put forth against this tribunal.

“On the political character of the Spanish Inquisition, three Protestant authorities of our times have expressed themselves to the following effect. ‘If I do not err,’ says Ranke, ‘it follows that the Spanish Inquisition was a royal judicature furnished with spiritual weapons. In the first place, the Inquisitors were functionaries of the king. He had the right to appoint, and to dismiss them; like other offices, the courts of the Inquisition were subject to royal visitations; and often members of the Supreme Council of Castile were the assessors in such visitations.’ It was in vain Cardinal Ximenes objected to the appointment of a layman on the part of king Ferdinand the Catholic to the Council of Inquisitors. ‘Do you not know,’ replied Ferdinand, ‘that if this Council possesses any judicial powers, it is from the king it derives them?’ When Llorente speaks of a process which was attempted even against Charles V. and Philip II. it is clear, even from his own narrative, that Paul IV., then involved in open war with the Emperor and the King, proposed something of the kind, but not that it had ever been instituted, or even that an attempt of that sort had been made.

“Secondly, all confiscations decreed by this tribunal escheated to the Crown.....Thirdly, by this institute, the power of the Sovereign was completely consolidated; for he had in his hands an authority from which no Grandee, no Archbishop could escape. As accordingly this tribunal depended on the authority of the Sovereign, so the exercise of its jurisdiction, conduced to the extension of the royal prerogative. The Inquisition was one of those spoils of priestly power, such as the administration of the grand commanderies, and the appointment to bishoprics, that had served to aggrandize the Spanish Government; it was, above all things, in its spirit and object, a political institute. —*Fürsten and Völker* part i. p. 242).

“To the same effect does Professor Leo express himself. ‘By the Inquisition,’ says he, ‘which was an Ecclesiastical Institute entirely dependent on the Crown, and was levelled at clergy and laity alike, Isabella contrived to bend the Nobles and Churchmen of Castile to her will.’ (*Universal History*, vol. ii. p. 431.) Lastly, Guizot says, ‘The Inquisition was at first more political than religious, and destined rather for the maintenance of order, than the

defence of faith.' L' Inquisition fut d'abord plus politique que religieuse, et destinée à maintenir l'ordre plutet, qu' à défendre la foi.—(*Cours d' Histoire Moderne.*)

“First, if we wish to form a correct estimate of the Spanish Inquisition, we must judge it not according to the maxims of the nineteenth century, but according to those of the age in which it sprang up. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the principle *cujus est regio, illius et religio*, (and this was the basis of Spain's State-Inquisition,) was everywhere in full force, and in Protestant States, was, to say the least, as severely applied, as in Spain.

“Secondly, the penal code of those times was much bloodier, than that of the present age. We are now amazed at the severity of the so-called Carolina—a criminal judicature established by Charles V., in the year 1532; and yet this was a mitigation of the law prevalent in the fifteenth century. But even the Carolina (in the 106 section) annexes to religious offences blasphemy against God, for example, and the Blessed Virgin, the penalty of death; and in the 116 section, Sodomites are threatened with the punishment of fire. The same severity do we find in the chastisement of purely civil offences; the coiner, for instance, is by the 3 section, to be burned; and every repetition of theft to be punished with death.—(See the 159 and 162 sections.) In like manner, in France, formerly the slightest offence against the safety of public high-ways, was visited with capital punishment.

“Thirdly, in judging of the Inquisition, we are not to overlook the fact that capital punishment, on account of heresy, was, in former times, common to all countries, and to all religious communions. Of this Michael Servetus is an example, who, at Calvin's instigation, suffered at Geneva, on the 27th of October, 1553, on the charge of heresy, a painful and lingering death by fire. Even the 'mild' Melancthon, in a letter addressed to Calvin, approved and lauded this proceeding. And besides Servetus, many others, like Valentine Gentilis, Bolsec, Carlstadt, Gr̃et, Castalio, and the Councillor Ameaux, were taught by imprisonment, exile, and death, that among Protestants no milder Inquisition prevailed than in Spain. Nay, so late as the year 1724, a young soldier at Reaensburg, in Holstein, for the offence of having made a league with the devil, was, by a royal indulgence, punished merely with decapitation. And at Bern, in the year 1753, a fanatic, Jerome Kohler, was, under the charge of 'blasphemy,' strangled and burned.

“Fourthly, the so-called witches and magicians constitute a very considerable portion of the victims of the Inquisition; and it is needless to say that these unfortunate creatures sustained no less bloody persecution in Germany than in Spain, and on the part of Protestants not less so than that of Catholics. Nay, in the year 1781, the Spanish Inquisition pronounced its last sentence of death; and one year later, (1782,) a Calvinistic tribunal, in the Canton of Glarus, burned a witch.

“Fifthly, the Spanish Inquisition has been often held up as the product of *Rome's* religious despotism; but people have overlooked the fact that it was precisely the Popes who were the least favourable to this institution, and on most occasions sought to set limits to its jurisdiction. Of the efforts of Pope Sixtus IV. in this regard we have already spoken. It was Rome that, against the will of Ferdinand the Catholic, and Charles V., obtained that those prosecuted by the Inquisition might appeal to the Pope. Repeatedly, too, have the Popes exhorted the Inquisitors to mildness, striven to save the property of those sentenced only to lighter punishments, as well as for the children of the condemned; took many cases out of the hands of the Inquisitors, and evoked them to Rome; quashed many sentences of the Holy Office, and laid many of its officials under excommunication, as for instance Leo X, in 1519, excommunicated the Inquisitors of Toledo. Besides Leo X., Gregory XIII. sought to mitigate the rigours of this tribunal; and Paul III. bitterly complained of the Spanish State-Inquisition, and protected those who sought to prevent its introduction into Naples.

“Sixthly, that in the Holy Office the *torture* was applied, is true; but all secular tribunals of the time made use of it; and when in these it fell into disuse, it was abandoned by the Inquisition also. On the whole, the Inquisition, in despite of all its severity, was, in the treatment of prisoners and of the condemned, milder than other judicatures of the time, whether in Catholic or Protestant states; its prisons were roomier and healthier, and in very rare cases only were manacles and fetters applied: and even the use of torture was more restricted than elsewhere, and in each trial was not to be resorted to more than *once*.

“Seventhly, it is common enough to regard the Inquisition as a great institute for imprisoning men, whose polypus arms would, on the very slightest suspicion, grasp its unfortunate victim. But this was not the case. 1. Every tribunal of the Inquisition opened its proceedings with the promulgation of a period of grace, and issued a public proclamation, that whoever was conscious of apostacy from the faith, but within the prescribed term, would voluntarily surrender himself, and do penance, should be graciously absolved, and released from all severer penalties. These terms of grace were frequently renewed and prolonged. 2. The issue of orders for imprisonment was subjected to many restrictions and reservations. 3. No one could be imprisoned if his offence were not placed beyond a doubt by adequate proofs. 4. It was only when the members of the subordinate tribunals of Inquisition were unanimous, that they could order an imprisonment; otherwise such an order could be pronounced only by the supreme Council of the Holy Office. 5. Whether an expression denounced contained anything heretical, was a question that could be decided only by the so-called *Qualifiers*,” that is to say, theologians that took no part in the Inquisition.

“Eighthly, the trial must take place in the presence of two Priests:

that were not unconnected with the Inquisition, and who, in their character of Scabini, had to prevent ill-treatment and tyranny towards prisoners. The statutes expressly require that the accused should be treated with great kindness, and be constantly allowed to sit. It was only while the acts of accusation were read the prisoner was to stand up. The statutes moreover command that the accuser should be as much distrusted as the accused, and that the judges must carefully eschew beforehand all partisanship. Every accused man must be allowed an advocate. The accuser must take an oath that he was animated by no private hatred; and false accusers were very severely punished. The protocols must be twice read to the prisoner, and twice acknowledged by him, before they were considered valid. Moreover, the Inquisitors were commanded to be careful and vigilant in the reception of everything that could conduce to the defence of the prisoner. That the accusers and witnesses were not named to the accused is true; but for this there was a good reason, which Rauke has rightly appreciated, when he says, (*loc. cit.*, p. 247,) 'this concealment of witnesses and accusers was introduced, in order to protect them from the persecutions of rich and powerful culprits.' And even later, when it became usual to name the witnesses, their names were withheld in those cases where the accused was a Count, a Duke, a Bishop, or a Prelate. Further, the prisoner could, beforehand, declare that this or that person was his personal enemy, and then this individual could not be employed as a witness. Lastly, the accused, in disproof of his guilt, could call a number of witnesses, and these, if necessary, must be fetched from America.

"Ninthly, every sentence pronounced by a provincial tribunal of Inquisition was subject to the revision and sanction of the Supreme Court, the Grand-Inquisitor, and his Council; and it was only by the confirmation imparted by the latter, the decision obtained legal force. But even the Grand-Inquisitor, before he gave his confirmation to the sentence, must solicit the suffrage of a number of Jurists, *Consultors*, or Advocates, who were not officials of the Inquisition. Further, the accused could *abhor*, as was the saying, or protest against all the judges of a provincial tribunal; and the Supreme Council was then obliged to appoint others. If there was no confession of guilt on the part of the prisoner, conviction was a work of uncommon difficulty.

"Tenthly, fearful is the notion which we form of an *Auto da Fé* (*actus fidei*—act of faith), as if it were nought else but a prodigious fire and a colossal pit, around which every quarter of a year Spaniards sit like cannibals, to take delight in the burning and roasting of some hundred culprits. But I may be allowed to assert, that in the first place, the *Auto da Fé* did not consist in burning and killing, but partly in the *acquittal* of those falsely accused, partly in the reconciliation of the contrite and penitent with the Church; and there were many *Autos da Fé*, wherein nothing was burned but

a wax-light, borne by the penitent as a token of the rekindled light of faith. Llorente, for example, relates in proof of the great zeal of the Inquisition of an Auto-da-fé at Toledo, on the 12th of February, 1486, in which not fewer than 750 culprits were punished. Now, among all these, not a single individual was executed, and their punishment was nothing more than a public ecclesiastical penance. A second grand Auto-da-fé took place again on the 2nd April of the same year, 'with nine hundred victims,' and of these nine hundred, *not a single one* was punished with death. Of all the trials of the Inquisition, which Llorente has recorded, but very few terminated with the death of the guilty : and no one will suppose that Llorente sought out the very mildest cases, and strove to conceal the severer ones. On the contrary, it is his well known purpose to depict the Inquisition in as frightful colours as possible. From all that has been said, however, it is clear wherefore the Spanish people, as Llorente himself confesses, saw in the Autos-da-fé rather acts of *grace* than of *cruelty*, and wherefore persons of all sexes and conditions, men and women of the highest birth took part in such occurrences.

"After the reconciliation of the penitent had been accomplished, the obstinate heretics, and those whose offences were partly of a civil nature, were delivered over to the secular arm.

"Eleventhly, even those most severely punished, and doomed to execution, were far from being all heretics. On the contrary, the Inquisition punished sodomites and polygamists ; and of the latter description of persons, there were from the example of the Moors not a few in Spain. Even the ordinary *fornicator* fell under the competence of the Inquisition, when he had seduced a virgin by the assertion, that the matter was not sinful ; and in like manner the clergyman and the monk who married, whether he concealed his state of life, and so deceived a woman, or deluded her by the pretence, that even as a clergyman, he might marry. The same is to be said of all confessors, who seduced their female penitents : *ecclesiastics*, who dissuaded the women with whom they sinned from going to confession ; *laymen*, who exercised ecclesiastical functions ; *deacons*, who heard confessions ; and every one who falsely gave himself out as a Commissioner of the Inquisition. Further, *sacrilege*, *blasphemy*, *usury*, *even murder* and *rebellion*, when they had reference to this tribunal, fell under its jurisdiction. The offences of its servants also, were within its competence, and especially those guilty of an illicit connexion with the female prisoners, were punished with death. Even smugglers, who in time of war delivered their horses and ammunition to the enemy, and lastly, a number of witches, magicians, preparers of love-potions, false and hypocritical saints, and in general, all who wished to turn to their own profit the superstition of the people, were subject to the adjudication of the Holy Office. Whoever will call to mind the number of witches alone that were burned in Germany, will not be surprized that in

the three hundred and thirty years of its existence, the Spanish Inquisition should, according to the statement of Llorente, have condemned thirty thousand heretics, witches, magicians, polygamists, smugglers and others, to death. Yet, Llorente is very inaccurate in his statement of numbers; and many of his reckonings are decidedly wrong; as for instance, when he asserts, as we have above seen, that in the year 1481, about two thousand persons had been executed. (*Hefele's Cardinal Ximenes*. p. 346,).....

“Lastly, we often hear it said, that the Inquisition crushed the intellect of the Spanish nation, and its love and cultivation of science; and this is regarded but a natural and necessary result. But as to the testimony of history in this matter, the writers who make this accusation, seem to trouble themselves little. It was precisely in the period when the Inquisition first rose, the sciences began again to flourish in Spain. A great number of schools and universities were erected: the art of printing was introduced, and the classical studies especially, were prosecuted with great ardour. The *Belles Lettres* and every species of poetry were cultivated—celebrated scholars were invited from foreign parts; the nobility again acquired a taste for learning, and far greater literary activity and energy prevailed in Spain at that time, than at the present day. I am far from wishing to ascribe to the Inquisition these fair productions of literature, but I think I may venture to assert, that this Institution had not the effect of a savage tempest, sweeping away all the blossoms of science. It was precisely the most brilliant epoch of Spanish literature, stretching from the close of the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century, that included the period of the Inquisition's greatest power. All the most celebrated writers of Spain then lived, and their works were printed with the license of the Inquisition. Cervantes, Lopez de Vega, and Calderon, as well as the great Spanish historians, Pulgar, Zurita, and Mariana, belonged to this period. In his second book, Llorente cites one hundred and eighteen men of learning, who were cited before the Inquisition; but even he is obliged to confess, that not a hair of their head was touched. In confirmation of this, we may assert that the greatest scholars of Spain have even judged favourably of the Inquisition; above all, Zurita, renowned for his liberal views, the philologist Peter Martyr, and the learned Jerome Blancas.

“After all these observations I must aver, that I am far from wishing to apologise for the Inquisition in itself. On the contrary, I deny the right of the secular power to fetter the conscience, and am heartily averse to all religious coercion on the part of the State, whether it proceed from a *Torquemada* in a Dominican habit, or from a Bureaucrat in a state uniform. But I wished to show that the Inquisition was not the horrible institution, that ignorance and party-spirit would fain represent.”—p. 653—6. No. 55. *Kirchen-Lexicon*.

There is also a most admirable article in the same Encyclopædia by Dr. Döllinger, which, though only forty pages in length, contains more interesting and important matter in it, than long biographers published respecting the celebrated Reformer. Dr. Jarcke inserted several years ago in the *Historisch-politische Blätter* a most able article on the psychology of Luther, wherein he showed how his doctrine of justification had grown out of the peculiar mood and constitution of his mind. Luther early evinced the wayward fancies and sickly exaggerations of the heretical spirit. Of the infinite love and mercy of the Almighty, he could with difficulty form an idea, but the awful notion of his justice was ever present to his mind. Thus, because a youthful companion had been struck down by lightning at his side, he took a vow to dedicate himself to the monastic state—a vow which against the advice of his father, as well as his own feelings, he persisted in fulfilling. The attractive image of his crucified Redeemer, he would instinctively turn from in fear; and when at Rome he wished his mother dead, that he might be the means of praying her out of purgatory.

The circumstances which facilitated the religious enterprise of Luther, are powerfully depicted in the following passage.

“The progress of the new tenets was not arrested by the circumstance, that their author was for a short time withdrawn from the eyes of men; for the fire of his doctrine had been cast into the dry bushes, whereof there was no lack in Germany; and so, sometimes in one place, sometimes in another, the flames burst forth. It was a spectacle which kept all minds in suspense—a contrast which gained for him and for his cause the sympathies of all better men. On one side, there was a whole host of prelates, ecclesiastical dignitaries and beneficiaries, over-abounding in worldly wealth, and who led a life of ease, little caring about the wants and the decline of religion, and looking on in indolent repose on the stormy assaults which were being made on the Church. On the other side stood a simple Augustinian monk, neither possessing nor seeking after those things which the others had in such abundance, but who fought with weapons that the others could not command,—with intellect, with captivating eloquence, with theological learning, with firm courage and unshaken confidence, with a glow of enthusiasm, with the energy of a will called to rule over others, and with the most tenacious perseverant industry. Germany was then a virgin soil, whereon no journalism, no literature of pamphlets had been planted. Little or nothing of importance had yet been written on public matters affecting the whole community, and questions of higher interest on other topics did not then occupy the public mind. Hence the feelings of men in all classes of society were more susceptible of this religious excitement; and the people, as yet unaccustomed to pompous declamations and rhetorical exaggerations, were the more ready to believe on his word a man, who as a priest and divinity professor at an university, preferred, at his

personal risk, and with, in general, such little contradiction, the most formidable charges against the Church. And these accusations, these references to a doctrine hitherto wickedly suppressed and cancelled, which were pronounced in language of such exquisite force, were accompanied with such constant appeals to Christ and the gospel, and interwoven with apocalyptic images applied to the Papacy and the whole state of the Church, and calculated powerfully to work on the imagination. The writings which now for the first time discussed the whole ecclesiastical system and its abuses, were on one hand, interwoven with scriptural words, sayings, and ideas, and on the other hand, were composed by an artful demagogue, well conscious of his purpose, and knowing perfectly the weaknesses of the national character; and thus were alike calculated to be read out in public houses and in the streets as from the pulpit.

“More powerful still than these external causes of success were the internal ones inherent in the very system of the Reformer. These were sweet, flattering, consoling doctrines, which for two years, and still more in the subsequent period, had been proclaimed to the people from so many pulpits, in so many songs, and in countless writings;—the doctrines, to wit, of justification without any self-preparation, and by the mere imputation of the sufferings and merits of Christ, of the immediate assurance of the state of grace and felicity to be obtained by a single act of faith; the dogma, further, that good works are excluded from all influence on the present righteousness and future happiness of man, and that every christian is in possession of a mere putative righteousness, obtained without trouble by a single act of faith. And to this we must add the new christian liberty, which, as the self-constituted advocate of pretended rights trampled under foot in the Church, Luther so energetically proclaimed,—the liberty, namely, to rise superior to the laws and ordinances of the Church; not to fast, not to confess, and so forth, or to do this and the like only at the suggestions of one’s own fancy. ‘Oh! what glorious preaching was that!’ exclaimed Wicelius later, ‘no more fasting, no more praying, no more confessing, no more sacrifice and alms-deeds.’ * * * *

“But the new gospel not only promised a far easier and more certain acquisition of spiritual and future goods, but it opened, especially to princes, nobles, and municipal magistrates, alluring prospects for the obtaining of earthly possessions. Very many among them were deeply involved, and saw in ecclesiastical property a fund from which they could pay their debts; and the confiscation of episcopal possessions furnished the princes, more especially, with the wished-for means for rounding off their states, and for consolidating and extending their territorial power.

“Lastly, in the deadly struggle which he waged against the Church, Luther had two powerful classes of men for his confederates. The one consisted of the Humanists, Philologists, and more learned school-

masters, who had issued from the school of Erasmus, and in the following year from that of Melancthon; men who felt a hearty dislike for the clergy, who were hitherto so powerful, and in possession of all the more lucrative places, and to whom they mostly felt their superiority in learning. These men now eagerly assisted in stirring up the distrust and aversion of the people against the priestly order. All these must have regarded Luther as one of their own body, and as a promoter of the pursuits as well as interests of their class, especially as he deduced the downfall of pure doctrine from the neglect of the original languages of scripture, the Greek and Hebrew tongues, and promised to rebuild his Church on the basis of philosophy. The other class was far more numerous, and included the rising generation, the academic youth, and the young men who had just entered on the business of life. All these admired and revered in Luther the hero of the day—the most imposing character that Germany could then exhibit,—the man who wielded the sword of eloquence, and with whom none of his German adversaries could cope,—who, in fine, represented a new and vigorous cause—that of progress and enlightenment, while the Catholic Church and her defenders appeared as the representatives of all that was obsolete and reactionary, though such things were then designated by other names.”—(Kirchen-Lexicon, p. 659-60. No. 69.)

The article winds up with a most masterly characteristic of the German Heresiarch.

“Often it was the melancholy result of his doctrine which passed like warning phantoms before his conscience—the rupture of the Church, one and united before him—the harvest of discord, that had sprung up in his own religious community—the immorality everywhere apparent—the false security nurtured by his new dogma of Justification—the disappearance of all more earnest religiousness;—and moreover, the depressing consciousness more than once expressed by him, that since his separation from the Church, he had himself morally degenerated, and become more tepid. So he acknowledged, for instance: ‘I must confess, for my part, and doubtless others must confess the same, that I fail in the zeal and earnestness which now more than ever I ought to have, and am much more negligent than formerly under the Popedom; and there is nowhere such earnestness in the Gospel as formerly we saw among Monks and Churchmen.’ All these self-reproaches and thoughts, with the ulterior consequences they involved, he sought to hush and banish from his mind by the notion that they were suggestions of the devil, who sought thereby to lead him astray, and drive him to despair. Hence in his writings, and especially in his letters and confidential communications, the frequent occurrence of such expressions as that ‘he was in the hands of the devil,’ that Satan had transformed himself into Christ, ‘and that he, Luther, with all his knowledge of Scripture, could not stand up against him, and that he must pass whole nights in wrestling with

Satan, who often in disputation pressed him so hard, that sweat-drops of anguish ran down him.' In all this Luther sought to gratify his self-love, and console himself with the fancy that the devil had invented for him especially great and extraordinary temptations, whereof his adversaries, the Papists, knew nothing; and from which even the Fathers of the Church had been exempt. Compared with these assaults, the ordinary temptations to carnal sins and the like were mere trifles. * * * *

"From all his hyperbolical expressions, and paradoxical descriptions, thus much is clear, that it was the reproaches of his own conscience, and doubts in the soundness of his religious system, especially his doctrine of justification, that he would fain to himself as well as others, represent as peculiar artifices of Satan. They were temptations such as every sincere and earnest christian has to encounter; but with this great difference, that he is not responsible for all that lay to the charge of Luther; and that a Christian resting on the foundation of the Church, can far more easily overcome such doubts and temptations to unbelief, because his faith is upheld by the testimony and authority of the whole Church. * * * *

"As a polemic, and an author of theological, and especially popular controversial writings, Luther united to an undeniably great dialectic and rhetorical talent, an unscrupulousness such as has rarely been paralleled in this department of literature. It is one of his most usual artifices to disfigure a doctrine or an institution by the most absurd caricature, and then forgetting that what he combated was in this shape a mere phantom of his own tortured imagination, to indulge in a strain of prolix censure. Too often he sinks to the tone of a spiritual charlatan, and indulges in hyperbolical phrases and hollow exaggerations. When he seizes a theological question, he perplexes it, often intentionally and studiedly, and mutilates and distorts the reasons of his opponents, till they can be no longer recognized. But in despite of these defects, which render the perusal of his writings so wearying and repulsive an occupation, we still feel that he possessed, in a marvellous degree, the gift of popular eloquence; and that his democratic appeals were based on a most careful and accurate knowledge of all the weaknesses of the national character of the Germans.

"The manner, too, in which he treated the persons of his opponents, is really without example. Never is it pitying love, which hating the error, strives to win back the deluded; but it is rancour, hate, defiance, and contemptuous scorn, whence issue, as from an unfailing source, a torrent of invectives, and often of the coarsest personalities."

After stating that it is utterly untrue that this tone of abuse was prevalent in those times, the author continues:

"Further, in no other writer, as in Luther, do we find such enthusiasm for the inexhaustible wealth and divine character of Holy Writ, coupled with such violent perversion of the sacred text.

His attempt to expunge St. James's Epistle from the Scriptural Canon, the contemptuous language he applied to that portion of Holy Writ, are well known.....He had indeed only the choice either of entirely rejecting that epistle, or of resorting to those violent modes of interpretation practised by later protestant theologians, if he wished to set aside the marked discrepancy between the doctrine of that sacred document and his own theory of justification. Why he resorted not to the latter expedient, but to the former, is not clear. Conscientiousness in the explication of Holy Writ, and awe for the simple clearness of the sacred text, were certainly not the motives that determined his course in this instance, for the most arbitrary and palpably false interpretations were quite ordinary occurrences in his polemical writings. It is scarcely possible to carry this system further than he has done in his writings, for instance, against Erasmus, and in the passages cited even by Planck. If his false explanations most frequently occur by his fastening on Holy Writ his own peculiar notions, which, according to his own avowal, he had arrived at, not by a calm unprejudiced study of the Bible, but in a painful state of mental distraction and anguish of conscience, he will sometimes go a step farther in the way of arbitrary interpretation, and dress up the text, which he wishes to handle for polemical purposes, partly by means of mistranslation, partly by interpolation. When all this will not suffice, he will then oppose Scripture and Christ against each other, as for instance in the following passage: 'Thou, Papist, defendest thyself much with scripture, which yet is a bond-slave to Christ; I will not let myself be baffled thereby. I take my stand upon Christ, who is the right Lord and emperor over scripture. I care not about all the texts of scripture, even were you to cite more against me: for I have on my side the Master and Lord of scripture, with whom I hold, well knowing He will not lie, nor deceive me; and I will rather give unto Him the honour, and believe, than by all these texts let myself be moved one hair's breadth.' It would happen at times that a passage of the Bible, too plainly opposed to one of his favourite doctrines, cost him anxious hours; but at last he would tranquillize his exegetical conscience with the notion that this disquiet was only a temptation of the devil, who wished to lead him astray by texts of scripture, and drive him to despair. Thus did he do with the passage in 1, Tim. c. 5, 12.

"With these few traits in the sketch of the Reformer, we must rest satisfied. We must not, however, omit to mention, that from the year 1520, he put forth and circulated among the people, assertions respecting the sexual relations, marriage, and celibacy, which according to the testimonies of contemporaries, exerted in the remotest circles a very pernicious influence. Since the foundation of the Christian Church, he has been the first to assert the doctrine that man is the slave of an irresistible natural impulse, and

that the precept to marry is not only one obligatory on every individual, but it is of even a more stringent character than those commandments of the Decalogue, which forbid adultery and murder. In a sermon delivered in the year 1522, upon marriage, he put forth statements, and permitted rights, from which the natural conscience of a heathen would have revolted. Even the license to bigamy, which he granted to the Landgrave Philip, was only the result of an opinion, perfectly accordant with his whole religious system indeed—that even for Christians there was no precept of monogamy.”—p. 675-7.

A voluminous work like this, cannot be dismissed with one or two extracts. We shall cite the two following passages from Dr. Dollinger's sketch of Bossuet.

“Towards the Jansenists,” says he, “Bossuet observed great forbearance. Their principal theologian, Arnauld, was his personal friend, and composed some of his writings, especially his apology for the Catholics, and a work against Mallebranche, at his desire. Bossuet saw in this man, who was doubtless one of the most brilliant stars among the theologians of the seventeenth century, the victorious defender of the Catholic Church and Catholic doctrine against Calvinism; and being himself a rigid Augustinian, he judged the relation of Arnauld and his friends to the Papal See with the more indulgence, as it was only after Bossuet's death the Jansenistical party openly took up a schismatical position. Yet at an earlier period of his life, in the funeral oration, for instance, on Father Burgoing and Dr. Cornet, Bossuet had expressed himself against Jansenism in sharp terms. Afterwards on the well-known distinction *juris et facti*, he appears to have entertained an opinion partially favourable to the view held by the Jansenists. In his letter addressen to the Nuns of Port Royal, at the instance of Pérefixe, archbishop of Paris, he asserted that, ‘a pious submission’ to the judgment of the Church relatively to dogmatic facts, (in allusion to the heretical or orthodox character of the ‘*Augustinus*’ of Jansenius,) would suffice. His biographer, Cardinal Bausset, has not rightly understood this letter. But towards the end of his life, he modified this opinion, and declared in his last work on the ‘authority of ecclesiastical decisions,’ that every believer is bound to give to the judgment of the Church, even upon dogmatic facts, a perfect and unqualified internal approval (persuasion entiere et absolue dans l'interieur), and thus rejected in the most distinct manner the so-called ‘respectful silence,’ *silence respectueuse*, in favour whereof forty Doctors of Theology had then pronounced an opinion. In general, Bossuet most decidedly disapproved of the subterfuges resorted to by Arnauld, the four Jansenistical bishops, and the nuns of Port Royal, in order to justify their subscription to the Papal formulary, and their simultaneous adhesion to the doctrine of Jansenius. That the well-known five propositions really contained the sense of Jansenius's

work, and were, so to speak, the soul of that body, 'no one,' said Bossuet, 'who attentively perused the work, could for a moment doubt. Moreover, much in his posthumous writings appears to have been suppressed by his Jansenistical editors. We know, at least, that they suppressed a panegyric of his on St. Ignatius Loyola, and a writing upon the formulary of Pope Alexander VII., subscription to which had been ordained by Rome.

"Quesnel's work upon the New Testament, which was afterwards condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus*, Bossuet had ten years before approved, and had composed a preface, which was to be prefixed to a new, but *improved* edition of that work, warmly patronized as it was by Noailles, archbishop of Paris. But Bossuet perceived that the book needed great and essential *ameliorations*, called the archbishop's attention to a number of passages needing correction, and as the latter would not recommend an alteration in these passages, he withdrew his preface, which appeared long after his death under the title, prefixed by a Jansenistical hand, 'Justification des Reflexions Morales.' Later, Bossuet often declared, the book was so infected with Jansenism, as to be incapable of correction."—*Kirchen Lexicon*, vol. ii. p. 126.

Bossuet's perfect orthodoxy in this matter, and his hostility to Jansenism were well known; but we have never seen so full and satisfactory a vindication of the great theologian on this point, as is here given.

Again, on the subject of Gallicanism; it is easy for us who have witnessed the evil results that have flowed from it—and how it has been a weapon in the hands of Jansenism for evading the decisions of the Holy See, and an instrument in the hands of Catholic and Protestant governments for encroaching on the spiritual rights of the Church; it is easy for us, too, who have witnessed the successive repudiation, though not condemnation of the Gallican doctrines by Rome, to discern and lament the mistake of Bossuet. But we must place ourselves in the position of this great man, antecedent to our experience, and remember the opinions in which he had been educated (though then the Sorbonne was not near so unanimous on these doctrines, as Dr. Döllinger's language would seem to imply); and we shall then form a juster appreciation of his language and facts.

"The assembly of the French clergy of 1682, and Bossuet's position in it," says Dr. Döllinger, "has been very differently judged. The Gallicanism of that period, such as it was, enunciated by the assembly of 1682, consisted in a body of doctrines formed out of various views and interests. In the first place, a certain doctrinal tradition lay at the bottom of it—a tradition which, in France, rested on the decrees of the council of Constance, and still more on those of the assembly at Bourges, and the so-called Pragmatic Sanction, and which, as a system, had, since then, without intermission, been taught in the Sorbonne, to which Bossuet was in-

debted for his theological education. To this we must add the almost unconditional devotion of the higher clergy to the crown, fostered and confirmed as that feeling was by the almost idolatrous worship, which the whole nation paid to the king, and which, under Lewis XIV., had attained its acme. This enthusiastic feeling from which, according to St. Simon's remark, no one could entirely escape free, was the more likely to influence the clergy, as Rome by the Concordat of 1517, and by the immense Church-patronage which it thereby placed in the hands of the French kings, had linked the hopes, interests, and secular advancement of the priesthood, with the throne, and thus assisted in forming a powerful court clergy. Lastly, in the development of Gallicanism, the Parliaments, especially that of Paris, had their share. These corporations wished to domineer over the Church, to rule it according to their own traditional principles, and make it an instrument for the promotion of their own corporate and family interests; but, under an energetic absolute monarch like Lewis XIV., they could not accomplish their purpose, which they succeeded in doing only under his feeble successor, Lewis XV. With this third species of Gallicanism Bossuet would have nothing to do; but he had already by education imbibed the Gallican principles of the Sorbonne, and his political views as to the absolute power and inviolable claims of royalty did the rest.

“At that period in the contest with the Holy See respecting the ‘*regalia*,’ the majority of French bishops took the side of the king. Several of the prelates, and especially the bishop of Tournai, were disposed to push matters to extremes, and to reduce the papal rights (as was at a later period attempted by Febronius) within the narrowest limits. So it was, at all events, the high authority of Bossuet which prevented this symbol of Gallicanism—the four articles—from being framed in too offensive a form. In his sermon, too, on the ‘unity of the Church,’ which he delivered on the opening of the assembly, he set forth pure Catholic principles with that energy, and that splendour of theological eloquence peculiar to himself, and which, in Rome, met with the approval of the pope; while the later Jansenists, like Maultrot, asserts that this discourse is full of exaggerations, and is an arsenal for the Ultramontanes. Hence it was Bossuet who engaged the whole assembly to recognize an indefectibility in the Roman See, while the infallibility of the pope *ex cathedra* was rejected by it. The liberties of the Gallican Church, said Bossuet later, he wished to set forth in the *declaration* of 1682, as they were understood not by the Magistrates, but by the bishops: and as regards the authority of the Holy See, he desired so to explain it, that only what was calculated to inspire alarm should disappear, and this sacred power, without losing any of its prerogatives, might appear amiable even in the eyes of heretics and its other enemies. The large Latin work which he composed for the defence of the four articles, some (Sourdi, for instance,)

have, without adequate grounds, suspected to be spurious. It is unquestionably the work of Bossuet, though he was far from having the intention of committing it in this shape to the press; but, on the contrary, in the last years of his life, he wished, in consequence of the reconciliation that took place under Innocent XII., to submit it to a comprehensive revision. In the treatise which he prefixed to it, and which appeared only in the year 1745, he expressly declares, come what may of the declaration of the four articles, it was not these, but the ancient doctrine of the University of Paris, that it was the object of his work to defend. These extensive changes, however, which Bossuet proposed introducing into his work, were not accomplished, or were, perhaps, set aside by his editors after his death."—*Kirchen Lexicon*. Vol. ii. p. 127-8.

We cannot withhold the expression of our admiration of this inimitable *resumé*. While Dr. Döllinger, as an Ultramontane divine, upholds his principles in their fullest strictness, he yet, from his good sense and good feeling, as well as ample historical learning, is able to make full allowance for the position which the great Bishop of Meaux took in the theological dispute of 1682.

(4.) *Versuch einer Geschichte der Biblischen Offenbarung*. [History of Scriptural Revelation. An Introductory Essay to the Old and New Testament.] By DR. DANIEL HANEBERG, Professor of Theology, and Oriental Languages at the University of Munich. 8vo. Ratisbon, 1850.

Although we had originally intended to confine ourselves to the German serial publications, we cannot close without introducing to the reader's notice, a work of a different class, which was published in the course of the past year—Dr. Haneberg's History of Scriptural Revelation. From the strong tinge of what we are apt to call *Germanism* which runs through it, it can scarcely ever be popular among English readers. But at home it has created so extraordinary a sensation, that we are induced to append a brief notice of it, as one of the most remarkable books that has appeared in Germany for a long time. It is distinguished, not only for its great erudition and critical acumen, but for elevation of thought, warmth of piety, and elegance of diction. Its object is not only to establish the external evidences of revelation, but to explain its import, trace its progress and development, and move its inward congruity and harmony. Want of space, however, forbids us to make more than two extracts.

The first of these regards a point which, from its novelty, cannot fail to prove interesting—the Mosaic Genealogy of nations. We should premise that the author makes use of the most recent historical researches on all matters bearing, more or less directly, on sacred history.

“Providence, moreover, ordained that in the Mosaic Record

(Gen. c. x) should be preserved a genealogical table of all the nations sprung from Noah. This genealogy is, as it were, an imperishable document of the common origin of all the nations of the earth. Though even as yet, we cannot entirely comprehend it, still what we can understand affords us a warrant, that this genealogical table was drawn up by an eye-witness of the first origin of nations, and thus is either the fruit of an immediate inspiration of God, or the work of a contemporary of the first builders of Babel. This genealogical table sets forth an affinity between nations, the knowledge whereof antiquity could not possibly have arrived at, either by research or reflection. Even the Greek and Romans, with all their experience and intellectual culture, could not have divined, that they were more nearly akin to the Aarii (the Persians) and the Germans, than to the Syrians. Madai, Javan, and Gower, are according to the genealogical table kinsmen. Thus that the Aarii, Ionians, and Germans, are of a common origin—this most brilliant result of modern researches in comparative philology and ethnography, is found already recorded in the Mosaic narrative. The confidence which is hereby awakened, bids us in respect to the less clear and intelligible names in this Genealogy, wait for new confirmations to the sacred record, so soon as the sciences of geography and ethnography, particularly in Asia and Africa, shall have made further acquisitions. At all events, this genealogical table is a witness for the original equality of all nations. It reminds them that all the races of the earth are children of one holy patriarch—the priest, the prophet, the prince, and lawgiver, Noah. This memorial is the more important, as it is introductory to a section in the history of Revelation, which seems to throw all the nations into the shade, and make out one family as an object of exclusive favour.”—History of Revelation, p. 37—8.

In allusion to the Mosaic genealogy of nations, the illustrious Görres told the writer of this Review some years ago, that in the philosophy of history he was engaged on, he would prove the marvellous historical accuracy of that primitive title-deed of the human race. This task he has partly achieved in the interesting treatise entitled, “*The sons of Japhet and their Exodus from Armenia*,” 1845, which was one of his latest productions.

Our second extract is from Dr. Haueberg’s considerations, which are equally ingenious and pious, on the Symbolism of the Mosaic worship.

“The destination of one special place for sacrifice was too clearly ordained in the Mosaic Law, and the unity of the nation in the exercise of its religion was too clearly connected with the unity of its place of worship, to allow of the toleration of several places at the same time.

“Yet to be a bond of religious union was not the only destination of the tabernacle, and of the temple, which sprang out of it. The

regulations as to space, and the vessels to be employed, are so accurate, so minute, so immediately derived from God, that we are compelled to look for a *meaning* in them. By its *significancy* this holy structure exercised as well a spiritual and comprehensive influence, as by its exclusive singleness it seemed to limit all religious actions to one spot, and so to fetter them to the earth. If we would gather as follows the simple sense from the figure of the tabernacle, it would go in its typical character far beyond the bounds of the Old Testament, and speak in mute signs the whole destination of man, together with the means vouchsafed by God for the attainment thereof.

“In the inmost sanctuary failed the light of the sun, as well as all artificial light. Here was only the spiritual light of thought in the tables of the law as well as the supernatural splendour of the Shechina, over the ark of the covenant. Here was the miraculous manna-bread, and the equally miraculous flowering rod of Aaron. This part of the structure, accordingly, represented the higher world of spirits, whence all miraculous power descends, and to which man is called by grace and faith. The forms of cherubim over the holy ark with their four faces seemed to say: ‘Man must bring together the kingdom of grosser matter, as well as vegetable and animal domains, and hallow, by exalting them to the supernatural world.’

“In the Sanctuary, where were the table of show-bread, the seven-branched candlestick, and the golden altar of incense, was typified all that man must go through before he can attain to his final term in the kingdom of illumination. He must detach himself from ordinary life, as this space of the tabernacle is detached; he must partake of the illumination and confirmation of grace, signified by the show-bread; and he must exercise himself in glad *worship*, for this is symbolized in the altar of incense.

“Yet though at particular hours man may rise in contemplation and prayer above the ordinary course of life, still, the reality of a fallen state, with all its thousand memorials of sin and imperfection still remains. Hence in the court there is a laver of purification, and an altar, partly for bloody expiation, partly for the consumption of those meats which man offers up in order to confess, to chasten, and to heal his distempered concupiscence.

“Thus the Sanctuary represents the three actual stages in the religious progress of man during his present life. The Court, with the altar of burnt offerings, symbolizes penance; the foremost sanctuary, with the golden altar of incense, the life of contemplation and exercise in prayer; and lastly, the Holy of Holies, the high state of union with God.

“But as even this state is subject to severe trials, so once in the year the Holy of Holies was sprinkled with blood. And as a life of contemplation is often visited with penitential sorrows, so the blood of many sin-offerings was shed on the altar of incense. On the

other hand, there were also, in the outer court, and even before it, offerings eaten,—the signs of a joyous intercourse with God by means of flesh and blood, as even in the penitential life divine consolations are not wanting.”—History of Revelation, p. 108-9.

With this interesting extract we must, for the present take our leave. It may be necessary, however to remind the reader, that the few works which we have been able to notice are brought forward, not merely for themselves, and for the valuable information which they contain, but rather as illustrating the activity, the fertility, and the enterprise by which the Catholic literature of Germany is distinguished. We preferred, in the first instance, to enable each one to judge for himself of the merit of these great and prominent publications. We might easily have added, had space permitted, still more striking evidence of this activity in the periodical publications with which all the great Catholic towns abound. Of these we have spoken in a former paper; and it is enough to add here, that they all continued to maintain the well merited reputation to which, on that occasion, we bore so willing a witness. The great Quarterly Journal of Tübingen, (*Theologisches Quartal-Schrift*,) and the bi-Monthly Journal of Munich, (*Historische-Politische-Blätter*,) never, since their first establishment, have exhibited greater power, or more solid erudition than in the present year.

As conveying a just idea, therefore, of the character and tone of Catholic Literature in Germany, it has seemed better to confine our notice to a few works of the class already described. Hereafter we shall take care to publish, for the information of our German scholars, a full and detailed catalogue of all the works of merit which have appeared of late years in Catholic Germany.

J. B. Robertson (Proof)

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*Bertha; a Romance of the Dark Ages.* BY WILLIAM BERNARD MAC CABE. 3 vols. 8vo. London: Newby, 1851.

The “Historical Novel” has long been a most powerful instrument in the hands of those who seek to guide public opinion, or at least to influence or modify its tendencies. It is impossible to overrate the efficiency of such an instrument in an age of cheap literature and universal reading,

like the present. It is equally impossible to shut our eyes to a painful consciousness of the indifference with which the Catholic body has abandoned it, without a struggle, to hands which have only employed it for the purposes of open hostility or covert attack. All our own most distinguished historical novelists, with a few qualified exceptions, all the foreign authors whom it has been possible to press into service, will be found to have availed themselves of every privilege of their art, so as to represent the Catholic religion, its doctrines, its ministers, and its members, in the least favourable light of which they are susceptible. And as if in total unconsciousness of the advantage thus relinquished, no effort has been made upon our side to neutralize these evils, by supplying an antidote in our own literature.

The volumes now before us may be regarded as a first instalment of this important and indispensable work; and Mr. Mac Cabe has chosen his theme with a boldness which does credit not alone to his high Catholic spirit, but to his power of appreciating the true spirit of Catholic history. To vindicate the memory of the hated Hildebrand, and the usages of the despised Dark Ages; to place in its true light the whole history of a calumniated period; is an undertaking, the very boldness of which is a guarantee for the sincerity with which it is executed, and which should conciliate the sympathy of every honest and candid mind. The particular theme, too, which he has selected from this period—that which is commonly regarded with the greatest amount of prejudice—viz., the contest of Hildebrand with the Emperor Henry, lend an additional value to Mr. Mac Cabe's work, as illustrating the difficulties of mediæval history.

To the readers of this journal it is unnecessary to say, that Mr. Mac Cabe's previous studies, and his familiarity with the original chroniclers of the time, had evidently fitted him for the antiquarian portion of his task. Indeed, it is easy to see that this learning which pervades his work is not the result of special preparation, that it is not "got up" for the purpose, but is the natural and spontaneous outpouring of a well stored and highly cultivated mind.

The name of Mr. Mac Cabe's romance will in great measure explain its subject. It is founded upon the story of the attempted divorce of Bertha, the injured queen of Henry IV. of Germany. But the romance owes most of its interest to the fortunes of the subordinate actors in the

plot, and especially of a noble Saxon maiden, Beatrice, the object of the unlawful passion of the tyrant Henry, and of her lover, Count Magnus, the very ideal of a mediæval hero. We shall not anticipate the pleasure of a perusal by any analysis of the plot. Some of its details, are, perhaps, a little over-wrought and unnatural, but it is well contrived as a means of illustrating the peculiarities of the age. There is hardly a character in the social life of the mediæval period of which it does not contain some specimen; kings, statesmen, courtiers, bravoës, soldiers, churchmen, nobles and peasants, serfs and freemen. Nor can it be said that the author paints with a partial pencil. He has exposed with unsparing candour all the vices of the time, even those which a Catholic might feel the greatest temptation to palliate or to conceal. The avarice and ambition which had corrupted the State-Church of the German empire, are represented in their darkest colours in the pages of Bertha; but the contrast which they present to the generosity, the devotedness and zeal of the true servants of the Church, deprives the sketch of the objectionable character which, in the pages of anti-catholic novelists, it too frequently possesses.

We shall content ourselves with two extracts, as specimens of the manner in which Mr. Mac Cabe has executed his task. The first is his description of the Emperor himself, attended by two of those ill-starred councillors, by whose cruelty, ambition, and unscrupulousness, his fortunes throughout life were marred.

“There sat in an apartment, lofty, magnificently furnished, yet gloomy—for it was lighted but by two long, narrow slits in a thick wall—three men, as different in appearance, as they were in years from each other. The first was a meagre, frail looking old man, with white hair, thin nose, peaked chin, and in his small grey eyes that anxious, wavering look, which denoted that he was eager for the acquisition of wealth, and of a timid disposition. This old man wore the magnificent vestments of a Prince-Archbishop. He sat before a table, on which there were rich wines and a profusion of dried fruits, but his goblet filled to the brim, and the fruits that lay heaped before him, showed that he had not yet partaken of any portion of the feast to which he had been invited as a guest. At the table, and sitting opposite to him, was a man about five-and-forty years of age, low sized and thick set, with huge broad shoulders, and a hand so large, that the capacious goblet he held, seemed to be hidden within the cavity of the palm, rather than grasped by

him. The low forehead, and the short flat nose, as well as the gaping mouth, were scarcely discernible amid the mass of fiery red hair that covered his face, and gave him the semblance of a wild beast, rather than a human being. He sat and fed, or rather munched like a hog, and swallowed fast, one after the other, large goblets of the odorous old Rhenish wine. Between these two men sat—and with his back turned to the window, so that the beams of the red-setting sun seemed to bestow upon his features whenever he turned to his guests, a roseate hue—a young man, richly endowed with all the graces of youth. His hair, which was the colour of the finest flax, and of the polished smoothness of satin, fell in long ringlets upon his shoulders. His forehead was fair, broad, and majestic; his eyes of violet blue, seemed to beam with softness and the most tender affection; his nose straight, his chin round, his cheeks still bearing that peachy delicacy, which comes with boyhood, and always disappears in the first few years of manhood; his mouth, shaded by a slight moustache, and decorated with pearly teeth, might, from its rich and coral lips, be mistaken for that of a woman, but that sometimes, when it was intended to express a smile, it was seen, as if in despite of himself, to curl into a sneer, the malice of which was unmistakeable. To this face was to be added, all the advantages of a commanding person, so tall, and yet so graceful as to render that young man, even in the midst of the tall men of Germany, one remarkable for his height and dignity. This noble, this handsome, this truly royal looking young man, was Henry IV., King of Germany, the son of the Emperor, Henry III., and the Empress Agnes, the daughter of William, Duke of Aquitaine. The old man, who sat at his right-hand, was Sigefrid, Archbishop of Mayence, and the middle-aged man on his left, Count Diedrich of Treves."

As a pendant to this interesting description, we shall also transcribe the sketch of Henry's mother, the celebrated Empress Agnes, and of his beautiful but injured wife, the heroine of the tale, Bertha.

"I could not but recognise in the elder female some of the features of Henry, with the exception of the eyes and the mouth. There was the same high, commanding brow, the same straight nose, the same rounded chin, and the same awe-inspiring look. These were the resemblances between the two: but the dissimilarity between the woman and the man were still greater: instead of the flaxen locks of Henry, the hair of the female had become white as the drifted snow; instead of his laughing, red, rosy lips, the lips of the female were thin: and care had wrinkled the corners of the mouth, and affliction had set his seal upon it, as if a smile could now find no resting-place there; instead, too, of the peachy cheek of Henry, the cheeks of the female were of a deadly

paleness—so ghastly white, that the blood seemed never to have suffused them, and they were like the forehead, crossed and crossed again with deep lines, as if the vigils of the mourner had been broken in upon constantly by new affliction, and unlooked-for griefs. The face was that of a very old woman, which seemed to have been placed upon a person, that, in its erect position, and its rounded outlines did not seem to have reached, much less to have passed, the middle period of life.

“This was the Empress Agnes, the mother of King Henry.

“Her companion was young—very young—it would seem difficult to decide, upon first looking at her, whether she was sixteen or twenty years of age; for her figure was so slight, and at the same time so much beneath the middle-size of women, that one would long hesitate to say, that she could, by possibility, be older than sixteen, if there were not in the chastened eye, the grave look, and the pensive gesture in her movements, somewhat to demonstrate that more than the sorrows that vex the heart of a girl of sixteen, had found a resting-place in her bosom. She was of Italy, and there was no mistaking the place of her birth in her rich brown skin, her pearly teeth, her pouting mouth, her Roman nose, her jet black eyes, and her hair, that in the intensity of its blackness, gave forth a blueish hue. This beautiful and delicate young creature, on whose arm the Empress leant, now looked at Beatrice with an interest—an intensity of interest, which none but a wife can feel, when gazing on a female, who has unwillingly won, or unconsciously attracted the admiration of a husband. It was Queen Bertha, the wife of Henry, who knew that the lovely Beatrice was an unwilling captive in the power of her husband. Her features expressed what was passing in her heart—profound pity and irrepressible admiration—the first for the situation of Beatrice, the other for her beauty.”

With these extracts we take our leave of “Bertha.” They will be found a sufficient commendation. Nor do we think it necessary to say a word in order to urge upon our readers the duty, on grounds entirely independent of the merits of the work, of encouraging this first effort to redeem our literature from the disgrace which has so long hung over it. It is, after all, in this very department that the fiercest battle must be fought for our principles, our doctrines, and the fair memory of our greatest men.

II.—*The Irish Annual Miscellany.* By the REV. PATRICK MURRAY, D. D. Vol. II. Dublin: Bellew, 1851.

Those unhappy necessities of space which a quarterly reviewer so often has occasion to deplore, have compelled us to defer our notice of this admirable volume, until a time

when our judgments has, doubtless, been anticipated, by almost every reader. Far less varied in its contents than the volume of the last year, The "Irish Annual Miscellany" for 1851, is, nevertheless, in many respects, a more valuable contribution to our literature. Indeed, the exceeding importance of the subjects, and the elaborate minuteness with which they are treated in all their details, almost remove the two essays which compose the present "Miscellany" out of the rank of periodical literature altogether. The style of both is so condensed, the matter so copious and varied, the thoughts so pregnant and suggestive, that each might easily have been expanded into an independent treatise.

The volume is nearly equally divided between two essays, the first on "Miracles," the second on "Education, considered with Reference to the Interests of Religion and the Rights of the State and of the Church."

To attempt any examination, however slight, of either, would carry us far beyond the space even now at our command. In the first essay, the subject of Miracles is considered chiefly in its bearing upon revealed religion; but there is no topic, whether philosophical or theological, connected with these as the nature and definition of miracles, the certainty of their existence, the evidence by which they are established, their continuance in the Church, &c.—which is not fully considered; and so successfully has the author combined the strictest technical accuracy with that lucid and popular style which characterizes all his publications, that his work must prove equally attractive to professional and non-professional readers.

The essay on Education is written with singular calmness, moderation, and good taste; and it has the rare merit, especially in a matter which has been the subject of a discussion so protracted and so angry, of examining, fully and unreservedly, every important general principle involved in the controversy, and yet avoiding all just ground of offence to the honest advocates of either opinion.

To the readers of this journal it is unnecessary to add, that both essays display all that brilliancy and vigour of thought, that lucid order, that rare faculty of analysis and illustration, and above all, that manly and earnest tone, which they have so often had occasion to admire in the writings of the author.

III.—*The Lamp. A weekly Catholic Journal of Literature, Science, The Fine Arts, &c.*, Devoted to the religious, moral, physical, and domestic improvement of the industrious classes. Bradley, York, and Derby,

We have allowed this excellent periodical to remain unnoticed during the first months of its literary life, in order that we might be enabled to speak, with more confidence, of its merits, and of its prospects of success. We have watched it, nevertheless with no little anxiety; and the more so, because with its failure or its success, we felt assured that the hopes of a cheap Catholic literature for the working classes were in a great measure identified. It is with no ordinary pleasure, therefore, that we have seen it safely reach the termination of its first volume, and, what is more gratifying, that we have marked the progressive improvement which it has continued to exhibit. We can hardly doubt any longer the result of the experiment. "The Lamp" is destined, we trust, to form for many a year to come, the companion and the instructor of the humble catholic fireside.

Its plan is admirably suited to secure this result. The judicious admixture of entertainment and instruction which it contains, and the excellent taste with which even the driest, and in themselves most unattractive, subjects are treated, have in a great measure overcome what has been the greatest obstacle to the permanent popularity and usefulness of such Catholic periodicals; and we can hardly entertain a doubt that it is destined to prove, under Providence, a powerful instrument of the social and religious regeneration of our hitherto uninstructed and neglected poor.

IV.—*Romish Sacraments and the Confessional, as now taught and practised in the English Church; and, The Duty of the Church at the Present Crisis.* Two Sermons, by the REV. HENRY HUGHES, M. A. London; Rivington, 1850.

Mr. Hughes's Sermons, as will be gathered from their title, are directed against the Sacramental theories and practices introduced into the Anglican Church by the Tractarian movement, and carried to their full development under the auspices of Dr. Pusey. We have spoken elsewhere on this subject. The sermons are chiefly valuable for the facts which they embody; and, although the practical interest of the subject has, for the present, well-nigh ceased, Mr. Hughes's facts are well deserving of attention as materials for its history.

INDEX TO VOLUME THIRTY.

- Abelard, Peter*, 311—his death and character, 315.
Ages, middle or dark, what duration assigned to them, 279.
Albert Magnus, account of him, 324.
Appleyard, Mr., his work on the Greek Church, 24—his views on Church government, 26—on the conduct of the Popes, 30.
Apsley-house, site of, 37.
Aquinas, Thomas de, 323, 327—his works, 329.
Aristotle, when translated, 308—purified by St. Thomas, 328.
Arius, his opinions, 31.
Arnold, Dr., his opinion concerning images, 29.
Art, different schools of, 2—their purpose in the Church, 6.
Bacon, Roger, 323.
Benediction, the rite of, 21.—as practised in France and Belgium, 22.
Bennett, Rev. Mr., on the sign of the Cross, 149.
Bermoudsey, 65.
Berthold, Archbishop of Mentz, 80.
Bibles, copies extant named by Mabillon, 297.
Bishops, their city residences, 46.
Boethius, 307.
Bonald, M. de, 379.
Bonaventure, St., 327—his works, 329.
Bonns Abbot, Robertson's calumny against him, 293.
Books, French notice of, 255.
Brucker, his testimony in favour of the monks, 285.
Buddhism, 434.
Bureaucracy, 403.
Burke, Edmund, 374.
Calvinism, its political tendencies, 91.
Catholic Committee, desire the appointment of Bishops, 181.
Catholicism in Ceylon, its introduction there, 412—and progress under the Portuguese, 413—persecuted by the Dutch, 416—preferred by the people of Ceylon, 417—its progress under persecution, 418.
Cæsar, Julius, 440—his conquest of the Helvetians, 430—war in Gaul, *ibid.*
Charles Vth, Emperor, his faith in the Roman Church, 83.
 — Duke, son of Gustavus Wasa, 75—wrests the throne of Sweden from Sigismund, 76.
Charlemagne, the great, 300—academies he opened, 301.
Cheapside, 61.
Church, the Catholic, her characters of witness and teacher, 3—chooses different instruments, 4—cannot afford to lose time in her great work, 14—injurious effect of nationalism on the unity of, 27.
 — Great liberty she allows in politics, 374.
 — Her functions during the middle ages, 291.
Church, Greek, oppressed by the State, 25—parallel between its history and that of the Anglican Church, 28.
 — St. Paul's, 58.
 — Of England, lamentable condition after the Reformation, 210—strife of parties up to the present time, 223—without schools in which to train her clergy, 226.
Clarendon House, 39.
Clarke, Mr. Roehfort, his absurd dislike of pictures, 455.
Clemangis, his pamphlet, 282.
Clubs, 39.
Commerce, Street, value and classification of it, 491.
Commissioners, royal, for the reform of the Universities, under Henry VIII., 213—under Edward, *ibid.*—under Mary, 215—and Elizabeth, *ibid.*
Costermongers, account by Mr. Mayhew, 487—their honesty, 52—morality, 504—literature, 508—politics, 510—law, 512—religion, 514.
Covent-Garden, 48.
Crime, chiefly punished in the lower orders, 486.
Cross, sign of the, 117—frequent use of it, 118—its universality, 120—analogies between the ancient and modern use of it, 127—effects ascribed to the use of it, 140.
Cunningham, Mr., his account of London, 27.
Curt von Burgsdorf, 94.
Dainties, prepared and sold in streets, 496.
Degrees, Academical, 318.
Delancey, a persecutor of supposed witches, 363.
Devotion, two schools of, represented by Mr. Pugin and the Oratorians and Jesuits, 10—to our B. Lady explained, 172.
Dialectics, of what use to religion, 304—use made of them against the faith, 310.
Druids the, their influence, 441.
Durham letter, 113.
Dutch the, their mode of converting, 418—failure of their attempt to christianize Ceylon, 424.
Education of Catholic Church students, 234.
Ely Place, 47.
England, greatness of, 249—a model of internal liberty, 405—spurious imitations of her constitution, 406.
Englishmen, character of 15.
Episcopate, ancient English, extinguished, 208.
Examination voluntary, in theology, 242.
Family the, first germ of all society, 593.
Fish, trade in, 492, 493—value and quantity used of, *ibid.*
Flowers, general love of, 498—value of, 499.
France, her ancient government, 407.
Friars, Franciscan, 63.
Game, consumption of, 496.
Gaufridy put to death for witchcraft, 362.
Gauls the, their habits, 411—fully equal to the Germans, 442—perpetually in motion, 444—their victories, 445.
Gerbert, Abbot, his works, 295.
German Books, notices of, 532.
Germany, state of, during the 16th century, 78.
Gentz, Baron Von, 377.

- Gfærer* M., his history of Gustavus Adolphus, 71—his theories upon Church reform, 83—his inconsistencies concerning the Jesuits, 86—account of them, 87—his opinion of the Calvinists, 92—description of the Protestant courts, 93—his comparison of Catholics with Protestants, 96.
- Government*, civil, its origin, 390—of ancient France, 407.
- Grandier* Urbain, put to death for witchcraft, 364.
- Green-stuff*, valuable when sold in streets, 501.
- Gustavus* Adolphus, his education, 77—invades Germany, 98—his reasons for not marching to Vienna, 103—seizes Erfurt, 104—conditions he offers for peace, 105—character of the war in Bavaria, 107—his conduct at Munich, 108—endeavours to be acknowledged emperor, 111.
- Wasa, his cruelty and ambition, 73—introduction of the reformed faith, 75.
- Hallam*, Mr., greatly over rated as a historian, 280—asserts that the monks preserved Literature, 283.
- Haller*, Albert von, 382.
- Helvetii*, the—their emigration, 446—difficulties of their march, 447—their defeat, 450.
- Henoticon*, the, 27.
- Henry* VIII. oppresses the Universities, 213.
- Heresies* derived from the writings of Plato and Aristotle, 303-316.
- Heresy* of the Manichæans, 316.
- Hermannus*, 308.
- Hierarchy*, Catholic, earlier history of, 177—greatly preferred then by the Government party, 186—desired by the Catholic laity in 1805-1808—whether necessary to ask Lord John's sanction, 191.
- establishment of in North America, 191.
- Hippisley*, Sir John Cox, his account of the government of the Catholic Church in England, 183—mistake therein, 185.
- History*, in the league against truth, 112.
- Horses*, value of when dead, 497.
- Huber*, his account of the English Universities, 216-219, 221-222.
- Iconoclasm*, 453.
- Images*, veneration of 174.
- apology for the use of, 457.
- Insanity*, forms that it takes, 335.
- Irish*, ancient. their superiority in learning, 286.
- Irishmen*, anecdote of two. 300.
- Jameson's*, Mrs., the principles of her two works on art, 461—her version of the legends of the saints not always correct, 463—arrangement of her first work on Legends and Legendary Art, 473—extract from, 474—her account of one subject, 476—gives too much prominence to the Artistic view of legends, 477—her "Legends of Monastic Orders," 478—legend of St. Francis, *ibid*—her account of Fra Angelico, 431.
- Jarcke*, Dr. Charles Earnest, 383.
- Jesus* combined all ecclesiastical characters, 5—labours of the society of, 8—secret of their influence, 9—inconsistent charges against them, 86.
- Jon* of Arc accused of witchcraft, 354.
- John*, son of Gustavus Wasa, 75—his red book, *ibid*.
- Knut*, Archbishop of Upsala, his martyrdom, 74.
- Law*, Canon, 206.
- Civil, by which the ecclesiastical changes in England were brought about, 208.
- Constitutional, the study of it necessary, 371.
- Leubuscher*, writer upon witchcraft, 334.
- Lincoln's* Inn Fields, 43.
- Lombard*, Peter, 318—his works, 320.
- London*, deficient in relics of the past, 35—monastic character of before the Reformation, 62, its remembrances, 37.
- transformations it has undergone and is undergoing, 67.
- Ludgate* hill, 55—and its neighbourhood, 56.
- Luther*, his political doctrines, 81.
- Mayhew*, Mr., his researches amongst the poor. 487—his classification of them, 487—account of their honesty, 502—morality, 504—literature, 508—politics, 510—law, 512—religion, 514.
- Maistre*, Count de, 377.
- Manuscripts*, ancient, of the Middle Ages, 299.
- Maximilian*, the Duke, 105—his embarrassing position, 109.
- Merivale*, Mr., his Roman history, 437—deficient in original references, *ibid*—political mistakes, 438—his account of the Gaulish populations, 441—inaccuracies, 442—mistaken in his theory that nations are always in a state of progress, 451.
- Minister*, Anglican, as he leaves the University, 211—at his ordination, 212—his utter ignorance of theology and discipline, 243.
- Minorities*, the, 63.
- Miraculous* events as easily received in the primitive Church, as in the present day, 464—as proved in a part of their literature, 466.
- Missionaries*, Protestant, in Ceylon, their want of success, 424.
- Missions*, Catholic and Protestant in Ceylon, compared, 427.
- Monks*, services they rendered to France, 279—were not the causes of the decline of literature in the Middle Ages, 2-3—testimony rendered to them by Brucker, 285—their conduct to their servants, 292—labours in transcribing, 293—not merely religious works, 295—eminent scholars amongst them, 307.
- Nationalism*, its injurious effect upon the Church, 27.
- Nobility*, 401.
- Oldbert*, Abbot, 294.
- Oatory*, congregations of the, 9—their devotional exercises, 16 estimation in which it is held at Rome, 20.
- Othlonus*, a monk, his labours, 294.
- Oxford*, University of, 215.
- Park*, the, 39, St. James', 41.
- Passion* of our Lord, Catholic devotion to it, 171.
- Paul's* Cross, 56.
- Philothens*, by Theodoret, 467—miracles recorded in it, 468—and visions, 471.
- Phillip* Neri, St. 9.
- Piccadilly*, 38—streets adjoining it, 39.
- Poor* the, injustice to them, 487—Mr. Mayhew's researches among them, *ibid*.
- Popes*, the, their conduct, 30.

- Poverty*, the fate of it in England, 485—gradations it goes through in capitals, *ibid.*
- Power*, political, a subject of legitimate ownership, 398—example, 400.
- Proletarianism*, 485.
- Property*, anterior to civil law, 388.
- Pugin*, Mr. 1
— standard to which all Catholic practices must return, 13—how far possible, *ibid.*
- Pullus*, Cardinal, his works, 322.
- Pusey*, Dr. his system, 15.
— Dr. course proposed by him in the controversy about Baptism, 153—controversy with Mr. Dodsworth, 154—his reference to the Fathers, 156—his defence of himself concerning confession, 153—concerning the Blessed Eucharist, 162—and circulating Catholic books, 168, his objection to the veneration of images, 174.
- Queen*, the, whether or not in fact the fountain of all ecclesiastical honour, 202.
- Republic*, Roman, the history of it instructive, 436.
- Riculpius*, Bishop, his pastoral letter, 302.
- Russell*, Lord John, concerning the establishment of the hierarchy, 190—whether he could have consented to it, 200.
- Saints*, a new class arose about the time of the Reformation, 7—of the saints of the Society of Jesus, 8.
- St. Sulpice*, seminary of, course of education there, 234—of Theology, 245.
- Saracens*, comment upon Aristotle, 308.
- Schlegel*, F. 381.
- School*, derivation of the word, 299.
- Schwarzemberg*, Count of, his policy, 100.
- Scottus*, John Erigena, 289.
- Signs* in London, 66.
- Simon Magus*, reality of the legend concerning him, 477.
- Soldan*, writer upon witchcraft, 334.
- Spre*, Frederick, evidences concerning witches, 347—account of his life, 366—his work against the persecution of witches, 367.
- Spring Gardens*, 43.
- State*, the, considered as a Corporation, 381—physiology of, 382—mistaken notion concerning the origin of a state, 391—of the monarchial, 393—military, 394—Theocratic, *ibid.*—the republic, 395—error in a bureaucratic state, 403.
- States-Constitution*, 401.
- States-general* in ancient France, 407.
- Strand*, 43—sites adjoining, 43.
- Summenræder*, Peter James, bishop of Westeræs, his martyrdom, 74.
- Symbols*, 475—of the Pelican, *ibid.*
- Temple gardens*, 53.
- Tenant*, Sir Emerson, his work on Ceylon, 410—attempts to account for the rapid progress of the Catholic faith, 415—compares the Catholic religion and Buddhism, 420—admits the good conduct of the Catholics, 422—astonished that the protestants do not succeed, 427—the fact explained, 429—*anecdote*, 430.
- Titles*, territorial of Bishops, 204.
- Theology*, impossible that it could exist after the Elizabethan University reform, 218—220—can never exist save under a suitable authority, 221—further reasons for the absence in University education of all Theology, 240—especially moral Theology, 243—course of it given at St. Sulpice, 245—method of teaching, 303.
- Tortures*, 346.
- Triumvirate*, Roman, 439.
- United Brethren*, their Church Government, 203.
- Universities*, Commission for examining them, 208—change produced on the character of their studies by the change of religion, 209—their previous history, *ibid.*—and studies, 211—subject to the Holy See, *ibid.*—their height of intellectual activity, 212—and decline, *ibid.*—oppressed by Henry VIII., 213—results of the Reformation upon the morals of, 215—state of study, 217—up to the present day, 222—at the present time, 225—effects of the education they give upon Church students, 226—compared with the training of Catholic Schools, 234—knowledge of Divinity required at the University for Church ministers, 238—examination of students, 241—merits of their teaching, 248—their doctrines, 251.
- University of Paris*, 210.
- Vegetables*, consumption of, 404.
- Vespers*, whether or not a popular service, 12, 23.
- Vicars Apostolic*, first appointment of them, 176—increase of their number, 179—their appointment not acceptable to the Clergy, 180.
- Waldenses*, whether witchcraft really did exist among them, 353.
- War*, of the Thirty Years', in Germany, 69—new works giving an account of it, 71—its results, 113.
- Weier*, his evidence concerning witchcraft, 355.
- Wesley*, his methods with the people, 19.
- Whitefriars*, 53.
- William*, Abbot of Kirscham, 197.
- Wiseman*, Cardinal, his communications with Lord Stanley, 197.
- Witchcraft*, its history yet to be written, 331.—what degree of reality in it, 333—gave a character to insanity, 336—*anecdote*, 337—trials to which those accused of it were subjected, 341—tortures, 345—manner in which confessions were extorted, 349.
— Universal terror excited by the idea of it, 355—believed in by the chief Reformers, 358—the idea of it arising from excitement of mind, 359—diminished when disregarded, 360—*anecdote*, *ibid.*—a priest accused and tortured, 362—gradual decline in the mania, 369.
- Witches*, more mercifully dealt with by the Inquisition than the secular tribunals, 356.
- Xavier*, St. Francis, his conversion of the Singalese Buddhists, 412.
- Zeno*, the Emperor, 27.