

"Thou lovest their bragged poetry, and villainous antiquities; and art known to keep in thy train a scoundrel harper, who sings thee to sleep at night with tales of burnings and rapine, done by their outlaw chiefs upon the honest subjects of the crown."

A PAGE OF IRISH HISTORY.

The MacCarthys of Glencarraig. By D. MacCarthy (Glas). Wm. Pollard, 68 North street, Exeter. This book is an interesting and useful contribution to our genealogical literature. Though it professes to treat in the Clan MacCarthy of one sept only, namely that of Glencarraig, still it gives incidentally a great deal of information with regard to the other septs and to the remarkable characters of the clan; but it did nothing more than clear up the genealogy of the MacCarthys of Glencarraig, which, notwithstanding the efforts of some of the best of our genealogists, had been long involved in obscurity and confusion, it would have done good service, and for that alone, would have been entitled to a hearty welcome. The late Dr. O'Donovan, who had few equals as an Irish antiquary and genealogist, has left us in the appendix to the third volume of his edition of the Four Masters, a pedigree of the MacCarthys of Glencarraig. Notwithstanding his great research and ability it is not going too far to say of this particular pedigree that it is confused, unconnected, fragmentary, and erroneous, and yet he had all the sources of information possessed by the present author, except one, which one, however, is of the most important character. He had the genealogies of MacFirbis, the Carew Pedigrees in the Lambeth Library, the pedigrees of Collins of Moyross, and also the one drawn up by the heralds for MacCarthy Reagh on his emigration to France; but he wanted one, which is supplied in the present book, which renders every thing easy and intelligible, and the authenticity of which cannot be questioned, as it is official. The pedigree referred to is that drawn in 1715 for Cormac (Glas) by the Athlone herald, and fortunately discovered by the author.

and was the first Count MacCarthy Reagh. The second son of the Count was the Abbe MacCarthy. It is to be regretted that our author did not give the descent of this family to the present day. The present Count MacCarthy Reagh is the principal of the clan, and is a Catholic. We have also in the appendix a short notice of the MacCarthys MacFinnin; and all our regret is that it is so short. This branch of the MacCarthys, located in Ardully Castle, near Kenmare, derive their descent from Dermot of Tralee, who was the younger son of Donal Roe, Prince of Desmond. This family lost their property in the Williamite confiscations. The most remarkable members of it were Dermot of Tralee, slain by Maurice, fourth Lord Kerry, on the bench of justice, before the judge; and, in long generations after, Donal MacFinnin, the heroic defender of the bridge of Slane at the Boyne. The descent from Donal of Slane to the present day is complete, but between him and Dermot of Tralee, there are but a few of the many generations given. Among the remaining MacCarthy families treated in this book is one with a curious Irish title, namely, the MacCarthys of Mounse Abbey. The head of this family was called the Master of Mounse, or, as the Irish styled him, "Maister-na-Mouna." We know of no similar title in any Irish family excepting one, and that was the family of Browns of Camus, the head of which was called "the Master of Awnay." In Scotland the eldest sons of barons are called "Masters." Sir Cormac MacTadg received a grant of the Preceptory of Mounse, which formerly belonged to the Knights Templars. It was afterwards bestowed on the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, and was finally suppressed at the Reformation. Sir Cormac conveyed this Preceptory and its lands to his legitimate son, Donagh MacCormac. This gentleman was the first "Maister-na-Mouna," and the head of the MacCarthys of Mounse Abbey and Courtbrack. The last "Maister-na-Mouna," Eugene MacCarthy, died in 1790, and was buried in Killeen Abbey. Colonel Beamish is the present proprietor of Mounse Abbey. The Toghers estate of Jeremy MacCarthy was given to the Shuldams. Jeremy and his son, Felim, were both attainted, but Jeremy's daughter, Elizabeth, was married to Edmund Shuldam, Crown Solicitor for the county of Cork. On this gentleman the estates were conferred, and from him descend the Shuldams of Dunmanway. In these records of Glencarraig and Muskerry there is one subject which has a special interest, and which MacCarthy (Glas) has hardly touched on, and that is the abandonment of the Catholic faith by any of the members of the clan. No doubt, the MacCarthys were truly devoted to their Fatherland, and likewise to their faith, and to their credit be it said that very few of the MacCarthys are to be found on the list of the convert rolls, or, as they should be called, the pervert rolls. Their registration would not prove them genuine Protestants, because it is beyond question that many who lived and died Catholics had themselves registered as Protestants in order to save their estates for their families; but upon this registry of Protestants there are very few MacCarthys. There are two of the Lyrdane family—the first, Charles MacCarthy, of Rathduff, in 1719, and the second, who is referred to by MacCarthy (Glas), was Charles of Lyrdane, in 1769. The present representative of this line is a Protestant. The house of Carrignavar deserted the faith towards the end of the eighteenth century. No Carrignavar MacCarthy appears on the convert list, which ceased about 1775. In 1737 three of the Kerry MacCarthys appear on the list—Randall MacCarthy, Ballycarbery, county Kerry, gentleman; Darby MacCarthy, of Killeman, county Kerry, gentleman; and Denis MacCarthy, of Slaney, gentleman. There are three or four others who are not of much note. The late Sir Charles MacCarthy (Glas) was a Protestant. In order to give an instance of our author's manner we selected his description of Cormac (Glas), otherwise Charles of Lorraine, and also his account of Donogh Oge, the outlaw, but space does not permit their insertion. Neither does it allow us to touch on the social position of the MacCarthys abroad during the 18th century. The ladies either went into the convents or became pensioners on the county of the King of France, or of the Court nobles, or of the dignitaries of the Church, while the men were officers in the army, struggling for increased rank and pay, and ready for the field when it was required. It is a sad story, and the true picture of those times, so humiliating to the proud and brave exiles, we nowhere see better than in the documentary collection of M. de la Ponce. In the next edition of this book it would supply a grant what if there were an index of names, and not merely of chapters, as it would facilitate reference very much, and make the information of the book very accessible. In our opinion it would be also a great improvement if there were inserted genealogical charts or maps of the line of Glencarraig, with its subdivisions, of MacCarthy Reagh's family, and of the MacFinnins. By this means the mind would take in at a glance the descent of the chiefs, and see how they stood with regard to each other, instead of having to study and remember them from chapter to chapter. The table of descent given in the appendix is of little use for this purpose. The insertion of maps would also add very much to the book; for example, it would fix the district in the mind had we a map of the district of Glencarraig, with the ruins of Toghers and the site of Dunmanway Castle marked upon it. Besides Glencarraig, it would be useful to have maps of Muskerry, with Blarney and Shandon, and of MacCarthy Reagh's country, with Killebrannigan and other castles. Sections of the Ordnance map of Cork would serve for this purpose. On the whole, this book is an admirable contribution to our genealogical information, and is really valuable and useful. It is a varied and picturesque story of the Clan MacCarthy, full of incident, interest, and adventure, and reflecting very fairly our national life and manners. It were greatly to be wished that every Irish gentleman of Celtic lineage would have the cultivated taste of MacCarthy (Glas), and would bring, like him, his ability, industry, and resources to the elucidation of the ancient annals of his clan.—Dublin Freeman's Journal.

monstrous to have allowed the hundredth anniversary of his birth to approach without making some effort, however inadequate, to signalize to the whole world our sense of the grandeur of his career, and of the greatness of our obligation to him, as his co-religionist, and most of us, the vast majority of us, as his own countrymen. But for the almost superhuman labors of this one man, of this truly great man, of this grandest of all Irishmen, we should probably have remained, to this day, the political Pariahs among the subjects of the Crown. UNDER GOD, he was the one who, by his indomitable perseverance, by his burning eloquence, by his resolute will, by all the forces of his heroic nature, secured in perpetuity to all the Catholics owing allegiance to the sceptre of England, their political emancipation. A century ago—on Sunday, the 6th of August, 1775 (this year the day will fall on a Friday)—there was born into the world at Kerry, in Ireland, one who was to secure to himself what has been finely called the ocumenical title of the Liberator of his race, of the Liberator of the Catholics scattered over all parts of the British Empire. When he first gave the signal, which he first uttered the watchword of emancipation—it was in 1800 that he delivered his first speech in Dublin, it was upon the very eve of the dawning of the new century—he was a young man of five-and-twenty. Ireland, the Catholics of Ireland, and of the Empire, were still sunk, as they had been sunk for the better part of three hundred years, in the depth of political bondage. "It is a happy day," ENCLINED LACORDAIRE, when in 1847, he was pronouncing the funeral panegyric of the Liberator from the pulpit of Notre Dame, "It is a happy day when a woman brings forth her first-born into the world; it is a happy day when the captive sees again the full light of heaven; it is a happy day when the exile returns to his country; but none of these delights—the greatest which man enjoys—approaches or equals the thrilling of a people who, after long centuries, hears, for the first time, human and divine language in the plenitude of their liberty; and Ireland owed that inexpressible joy to this young man of five-and-twenty, whose name was DANIEL O'CONNELL. He had to go on speaking for thirty years before, at the close of that long interval, during which his courage never once faltered, the barriers which divided the Catholics of the Empire from participation in the rights secured by the Constitution to all the other free citizens of the Crown crumbled away at last in his voice, as the walls of Jericho had crumbled away before the trumpets of the Israelites. During the first ten years of the century he was preparing himself for the work of emancipation. During the next twenty years he was, by herculean labors, accomplishing it. And at the end of those ten, twenty, thirty years there came for him, at last, the memorable day when he could speak of himself without pride, when others, could say of him, quite truly, that he was the uncrowned monarch of Ireland. "It is a great thing," as has been said, "to become the chief of a party; the creation of a party is a masterpiece of power and skill; and yet the leader of a party is nothing in comparison with the man who has become the moral leader of a nation, and who holds it under his laws, without army, without police, without tribunals, without any other resource than his genius and devotedness." That is precisely what O'Connell did for years and years. He was her Liberator. HE WAS HER MORAL RULER. He had given up his career, he had devoted the whole of his splendid powers to the advocacy of her cause and of her rights—powers that, if he had been a selfish man, might have won for him, with ease, wealth, and titles, and dignities. The least she could do was to pour into the hands of her Liberator her spontaneous tribute, to give him herself with all her love and all her allegiance. And this she did with her whole heart. In return for this unmeasured loyalty to him, as the greatest and the truest patriot any race ever had, O'Connell strove, during the whole of the remainder of his life, to secure the perfecting, so far as might be any way possible, of the political institutions, and of the political situation of his country in the enjoyment of the rights of citizenship which he had been the one, first of all, to secure to her Catholic population. According to his judgment, this perfecting of the great work for the superstructure of which he had been the one, single-handed, to dig out and build up the foundations, was only to be accomplished adequately and effectively by means of a Repeal of the Union—just as now—days, according to the judgment of the vast majority of the body of the electors, the surest method of realizing the same object is by securing the recognition of the principle of Home Rule. CALL O'CONNELL MISTAKEN, IF YOU WILL, as you may deem the Home Rulers of to-day, in their turn, also, mistaken—but at least (as they are in theirs) he was honest, he was truthful, he was consistent in his convictions. And in his resolute pursuance of his purpose, when other men must, under a restless impulse, have been tempted into treason, he was as trusty and loyal a subject of the Crown of these realms as ever trod the soil of Ireland. Nevertheless, in spite of that unswerving honor, and of that unblemished loyalty, he was, by what was afterwards acknowledged to be a cruel failure of justice, tried and condemned for sedition, sentenced to fine and imprisonment, and had that shameful sentence actually carried out in his regard! And the Liberator of Ireland—at the beck of whose finger the whole of its population, from Cork to Donegal, from Antrim to Kerry, might, at any moment, had he so pleased, have been in a flame of insurrection—was actually subjected to the ignominy of personal confinement within the walls of a public jail. The House of Lords reversed the unjust sentence, it is true. The wrong was so far repaired. But it had previously been perpetrated. And by the ignominy of it the noble spirit of Ireland visibly from that very time, and it was not long afterwards, while on his way to the Eternal City, to fall as an old man at the feet of Pope Pius IX, that he breathed his last, eight and twenty years ago, at Genoa, leaving his heart and his body to Ireland, and his memory to the gratitude of all the English-speaking Catholics in both hemispheres. It is in the fulness of our sense of this inexhaustible debt of gratitude, that the Catholics of England are looking forward, now, with eager and loving sympathy, to the celebration by Ireland on Friday, the next sixth of August, of her Liberator's of our Liberator's, Centenary. CIVIL MARRIAGE. Within a century this new cloak for sin has been fashioned, and it is easily recognized as one of the monster offspring of the French Revolution of 1789. It undoubtedly originated in the new theory that the state as such was to take no cognizance of religion. We can understand, and in our circumstances approve, of separation of church and state. If there was but one church acknowledged by all, there would be no need of making any distinction between church and religion. They are in reality one, yet men have chosen to make the distinction; and as faithfulness to the convictions of conscience is the basis of all religion, so it has been found unwise and unjust to force on any one any outward form of religion, which outward form receives the name of the church. It is to be sincerely deplored that the rejection of the outward form, appointed by Christ, that is, of the one true, visible church, has brought, as was to be expected, the rejection of the super-

natural religion which it embodied. This was the main feature of that fearful upheaval of society known as the French Revolution, in which men's passions were aroused to overthrow, under pretext of reverencing abuse of authority, the surest defence of civil society, which is religion, and more markedly still, religion made visible in the church. The new principles sought at once to corrupt the fountain-head of society, viz., the family, and proffered the emancipation of marriage from the control of religion. Never before in the annals of the human race was marriage wilfully freed from its sanction. Even among pagan nations it was ever reputed most proper that this first beginning of society should receive its blessing. There is no nation whose history does not show a desire to have a religious rite to sanction this union of man and woman for the propagation of the race. Of course it was always recognized that the consent of the parties was the essence of the contract; which, however, has always been considered of a peculiarly distinct character from any other contract. The marriage contract is concerned with persons as its object; other contracts, with material things. These may be limited as to time or use; but the marriage contract is, from its very nature, perpetual, and no limitation can be given to its binding force in its essential character, as long as the contracting parties live. Hence, whether by instinct or by tradition handed down from the origin of the human race, a religious blessing has been invoked on this most important of all contracts for the well-being of society. We do not say that this contract requires this condition for its validity; but that it was the universal sentiment and practice that a special calling of Heaven's sanction was all-important to impress on men's minds the speciality and particularity of this contract as distinct from all others. Even Protestantism, to whose charge may justly be laid the rejection of very many principles sanctioned by the law of nature, and confirmed by the universal traditions of all people, even when denying the Christian doctrine and tradition, that Christ had raised the marriage contract to the dignity of a sacrament, did not dare at once to withdraw it from the domain of religion. The first so-called reformers still recommended and supposed that a religious ceremony was most appropriate to give it in the eyes of the peoples its proper position. Unfortunately, the principle that quickly dominated the Protestant sects, that the outward form of religion depended on the pleasure or will of the peoples, led speedily to the other principle that the government representing the people had the right to lay down laws for the religious practices of the people, whose religion was to be regulated by its chosen representatives. This logically brought the acts under state control, and the marriage ceremony was also considered as depending upon the state in all respects. When at last the French Revolution started the principle that the state was to have naught to do with religion, the principle was also started that there was a distinction between the civil contract of marriage and marriage as a sacrament. This distinction was utterly new to Catholic ears, which had ever known that the marriage contract itself was inseparable from the sacrament, being, in fact, the form and matter of the sacrament. Protestants were not so surprised at the new doctrine, as having rejected the idea of its being a sacrament, they gradually took up and developed the principle uttered by Calvin, that, after all, "if marriage came from God, so did agriculture and the art of tailoring;" and thence came the consequence, that as these were subject to state control, so no good reason could be adduced why the former should not be equally regulated by it. Nowadays, however, it is accepted—even where the majority of the people are still Catholic—almost universally by rulers of Christian society, the axiom that there can be a civil marriage distinct from the marriage which is a sacrament. Catholics, of course, can never admit such a distinction. They know from the teachings of the infallible Church that the marriage contract among Christians itself is a sacrament; that where there is a valid contract of marriage between validly baptized persons, there is a sacrament; where there is no sacrament there is, among validly baptized persons, no valid marriage. For her subjects, the Church has a right from our Lord to impose the conditions for the validity of the marriage contract. Her laws bind even those that may proclaim their desire to depart from her, because there is no authority by which they may exempt themselves from "hearing the Church." To those who are bred from infancy in heresy, where there is even a probability of good faith, we have good reason to believe that the Church does not wish to have all her laws to extend, lest dreadful evils should be thereby produced, to which no remedy is at hand on account of their supposed invincible ignorance. This ignorance would not be sufficient reason for the non-extension of her laws to individual Catholics (though, of course, invincible ignorance excuses from guilt); but the declarations of Benedict XIV. and Pius VII., as of other Pontiffs, incline us to the firm belief that such is the intention of the Church in her dealings with large bodies of persons deprived by heresy of communion with the body of the Church, where the probability of good faith may be had, and where practically great irremediable evils would flow from the extension to them of the binding force of certain of her laws. Of course, we know the principle that radically they are under the Church's authority when baptized. Among nations where there is right of citizenship, a citizen may renounce his rights in one country and be naturalized in another, being exempted from his former allegiance and protected in newly-acquired rights by the new authority to which he subjects himself. Christ made subjects of his Church all those who are baptized, but made no allowance for their secession or rebellion, nor allowed any other society to exempt from allegiance to her. Any one belonging to her who should not bear the Church should be treated a heathen and as a publican, as worthy, in other words, of reprobation. No one knows better than holy Church that invincible ignorance excuses from the observance of a law, and where there is such ignorance she does not deny that there may be inward righteousness rendering these ignorant ones even acceptable to God. Where there is a probability of such ignorance, otherwise known as good faith, she deals leniently, and to avoid greater evils, has shown that she does not extend to them the binding force of many of her laws. The evil consequences of the introduction of civil marriage reach even our society here, of course, in great measure, through the perversity of our Government. Civil laws cannot make a valid marriage declared null and void by the Church. A marriage attempted between cousins, or between a Catholic and an unbaptized person, without the requisite Church dispensation, is null before the Church and God, though the state may declare it valid. This will explain also an anomaly that is seen at times. Parties even married before a priest who was not aware of their being any impediment invalidating their marriage, have afterwards found out that a marriage never really existed between them, and have used their freedom to marry again. Where the state has not taken cognizance of the laws and authority of the Church, it has been invoked to grant a divorce, not really recognizing any right in the state to grant a divorce, but to avoid the civil consequences of the apparent marriage, or, at least in case they should wish to marry, their action might be declared by the state to be bigamy. Of course the loose ideas that are prevalent about marriage in the laws of almost all countries, bring

O'CONNELL'S CENTENARY.

Under the above heading, the London Weekly Register, which is, we believe, with its new directorate, the organ of the English hierarchy, pays a magnificent tribute to the memory of O'Connell, which we transfer to our columns. No event in modern times appears to have actively and permanently stirred the heart of the Irish nation as much as the great fact of O'Connell's career. A great patriot, bold as the boldest, brave as the bravest, he was a man of great faith, he was a great Catholic. Out of that grew his wondrous fame, for he had a heart as large and generous as is the charity of the Church he loved. We take, as evidence of his power, the following language from a journal which speaks for a people not of his race nor of his blood, in order to show what manner of man he was.— Everything is now in course of active preparation in Ireland for the celebration, with all befitting splendor and solemnity, of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of the immortal Liberator. Here, for once, is a centenary that a nation has reason to commemorate with the utmost possible rejoicing. As a rule, the celebrations of anniversaries of this kind in honor of great men are little less, to our thinking, than meaningless absurdities. IN THE INSTANCE OF O'CONNELL, however, the Catholic population of Ireland, the Catholics throughout England, throughout Scotland, throughout the whole British Empire, have such reason to regard his memory with love, gratitude, and admiration, that it would have been simply