

different order from the knowledge of the creature, so, in like manner, metaphysical science is in a different order from physical, physics from history, history from ethics. You will soon break up into fragments the whole circle of secular knowledge, if you begin the mutilation with Divine.

"I have been speaking simply of natural theology; my argument, of course, is stronger when I go on to revelation. Let the doctrine of the Incarnation be true; is it not at once of the nature of an historical fact, and of a metaphysical! Let it be true that there are angels; how is this not a point of knowledge in the same sense as the naturalist's asseveration, that there are myriads of living things on the point of a needle? That the earth is to be burned by fire, is, if true, as large a fact as that huge monster once played amid its depths; that Antichrist is to come, is as categorical a heading to a chapter of history as that Nero or Julian was Emperor of Rome; that a Divine influence moves the will, is a subject of thought not more mysterious than the effect of volition on the animal frame.

"I do not see how it is possible for a philosophical mind, first, to believe these religious facts to be true; next, to consent to put them aside; and, thirdly, in spite of this, to go on to profess to be teaching all the while *de omni scibili*.

"If, then, you sacrifice this teaching, it must be because you do not believe anything can certainly be known about God, else it would be far too important to be excluded. And in fact it came to this with consistent minds, whilst there were actual tendencies in the same direction in all Protestantism. The idea of Faith being "an intellectual act, its object truth, and its result knowledge," lingered in the Established Church; but the general tendencies of Protestantism were to make religion consist in the feelings, in the sentiments, not in any certain knowledge about God. Consequently, if they believed that religion was only a feeling, and that nothing could be known about it, then they would be consistent in excluding it from an institution of universal knowledge. It would, in that case, of course be as absurd to demand a chair for religion, as to demand one for fine feeling, for honor, gratitude, or any other sentiment—proposals which would be simply unmeaning."

Dr. Newman proceeded to illustrate this by four examples, taken respectively from Lord Brougham's discourse before the University of Glasgow in 1825; a report lately presented to government by one of her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools; the prayer delivered at the opening of the London University by the Protestant Bishop of Durham; and finally, by the Epicurean doctrine concerning God, and nature, as set forth by the infidel Hume, whose views were in fact the final and logical expression of all those which would exclude theology from university education. From these illustrations we will select that which refers to the report by the inspector of education, though indeed they are all alike interesting and important to the argument:—

"I open the minutes of the Committee of Council on Education for the years 1849-50, presented to both houses of parliament by command of her Majesty, and I find one of her Majesty's inspectors of schools, at p. 469 of the second volume, dividing the topics usually embraced in the better class of primary schools into four:—the knowledge of signs, as reading and writing; of facts, as geography and astronomy; of relations and laws, as mathematics; and, lastly, sentiment, such as poetry and music. Now, on first catching this division, it occurred to me to ask myself, before ascertaining the writer's own resolution of the matter, under which of these four heads fell religion, or whether it fell under any of them. Did he put it aside as a thing too delicate and sacred to be enumerated with earthly studies? or did he distinctly contemplate it when he made his division? Anyhow, I could really find a place for it under the first head, or the second, or the third; for it has to do with facts, since it tells of the self-subsisting; it has to do with relations, for it tells of the Creator; it has to do with signs, for it tells of the due manner of speaking of Him. There was just one head of the division to which I could not refer it—viz., to sentiment; for, I suppose, music and poetry, which are the writer's own examples of sentiment, have not much to do with truth, which is the sole object of religion. Judge, then, my surprise, gentlemen, when I found the fourth was the very head selected by the writer of the report in question, as the special receptacle of religious topics. "The inculcation of sentiment," he says, "embraces reading in its highest sense, poetry, music, together with moral and religious education." What can be clearer than that, in this writer's idea (whom I am far from introducing for his own sake, because I have no wish to hurt the feelings of a gentleman, who is but exerting himself zealously in the discharge of anxious duties; I do but introduce him as an illustration of the wide-spreading school of thought to which he belongs); what, I say, can more clearly prove, than a candid avowal like this, that, in the view of that school, religion is not knowledge, has nothing whatever to do with knowledge, and is excluded from a university course of instruction, not simply because the exclusion cannot be helped, from political or social obstacles, but because it has no business there at all, because it is to be considered a mere taste, sentiment, opinion, and nothing more? The writer avows this conclusion himself, in the explanation into which he presently enters, in which he says: "According to the classification proposed, the essential idea of all religious education will consist in the direct cultivation of the feelings." Here is Lutheranism sublimated into philosophy; what we contemplate, what we aim at, when we give a religious education, is, not to impart any knowledge whatever, but to satisfy anyhow desires which will arise after the Unseen in spite of us, to provide the mind with a means of self-command,

to impress on it the beautiful ideas which Saints and sages have struck out, to embellish it with the bright hues of a celestial piety, to teach it the poetry of devotion, the music of well-ordered affections, and the luxury of doing good. The soul comes forth from her bower, for the adoration of the lecture-room and the saloon; like the first woman, in the poet's description—

Grace is in all her steps, Heaven in her eye,
In every gesture dignity and love.

"As for the intellect, on the other hand, its exercise is only indirect in religious education, as being an instrument in a moral work (true or false, it matters little, or rather anything must be true, which is capable of reaching the end proposed); or again, as the unavoidable attendant on moral impressions, from the constitution of the human mind, but varying with the peculiarities of the individual. Something like this seems to be the writer's meaning, but we need not pry into its finer issues in order to gain a distinct view of its general bearing; and taking it, as I think we fairly may take it, as a specimen of the philosophy of the day, as adopted by those who are not conscientious unbelievers, or open scoffers, I consider it amply explains how it comes to pass that the day's philosophy sets up a system of universal knowledge, and teaches of plants, and earths, and creeping things, and beasts, and gases, and about the crust of the earth, and the changes of the atmosphere, about sun, moon, and stars, about man and his doings, about the history of the world, about sensation, memory, and the passions, about duty, about cause and effect, about all things imaginable except one—and that is, about Him that made all things, about God. I say the reason is plain, because they consider knowledge, as regards the creature, illimitable, but impossible or hopeless as regards the Creator."

We must pass over a splendid passage in which Dr. Newman explained briefly and summarily, but in a most striking manner, the idea attached by the Catholic religion to the word "God," and showed the difference between that idea and the loose and vague notions which are entertained by the supporters of mixed education.

Dr. Newman concluded in the following words—
"If God is more than nature, theology claims a place among the sciences; but, on the other hand, if you are not sure of this, how do you differ from Hume or Epicurus?"

"I end then as I began: either there is no God, or that is no university which ignores Him. And since a God there is, I charge the mixed education of the day with an unphilosophical exclusiveness, and I demand the emancipation of theology. In my next discourse it will be my object to show that its omission from the list of recognised sciences is not only indefensible in itself, but prejudicial to all the rest."

LECTURE ON NUNNERIES.

BY HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WISEMAN.
(From the Dublin Telegraph.)

Cardinal Wiseman delivered a lecture at Bath, on Sunday evening last, on "Convents or Nunneries," in answer to a lecture recently delivered in that city by the Rev. Hobart Seymour.

The admission was by ticket, half-a-crown each; but notwithstanding this, such was the anxiety to secure places, that the doors were besieged a full hour before the time announced for the commencement of the lecture, and the pressure to obtain admission was very great.

His Eminence entered the chapel, preceded and followed by some of the officials of the place, soon after seven o'clock, and took his seat in a chair placed for him in front of the high altar. After a few sentences from the Liturgy had been chanted, the Cardinal advanced a few paces and commenced—"In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." The exordium of his address he delivered standing. When he addressed himself to the matter of Mr. Seymour's pamphlet, he took his seat in the chair, and remained sitting until the close of his lecture, which occupied nearly two hours and a quarter in the delivery.

The appended abstract is rather a description than a report of what his Eminence said:—

After a brief exordium, in which he spoke of the dark clouds that were at present lowering over the Catholic Church of this country, and of the fresh "aggressions" with which each day it was assailed, and after bespeaking a judgment based upon truth in all the controversies between the two systems, his Eminence proceeded to explain, briefly his reason for having ventured to call the meeting together. A short time ago he had received a lecture purporting to have been delivered in this city. He should at once have cast it aside into the heap of similar productions which daily reached him, if he had not been about to visit this neighborhood, and if it had not struck him that he might make use of the opportunity to inquire into some of the facts touched on in this strange effusion; and if it should please God to give him the means, and health, and leisure, that he might do some good by meeting, what at the first casual and transient glance he saw it contained, some empty, baseless, and groundless declamations, distorted facts and sinful fictions—statements without authority, or statements for which the authority has been sought in vain. He spoke as one in the presence of God; and solemnly in His presence did he say that he would not utter one word of the truth of which he was not thoroughly convinced, nor bring forward one fact of which he could not produce the vouchers, and with the greatest pleasure put in the power of any person of credit and honor the means of verifying every word he said.

If they were to believe the statements of those who are now popularly declaiming against nunneries, they would come to the conclusion that they were communities of persons who could have no possible bond whatever which in this world held people together—no common interests, affections, or principles; they would suppose that these persons lived together in great unhappiness, and that there was a peculiar kind of pleasure, on the part of those who had the direction of these establishments, in inflicting misery upon those who were placed within their power; they would have to believe that after this system had gone on for hundreds of years, the storm of revolution had broken up these establishments and sent the nuns scattered

through the country, and yet, after the storm had subsided, that these persecuted victims had returned to the old scenes of their miseries, had sought to reconstruct the ruins of their cells, and to end their days in the spot where they had been the victims of unheard of barbarities. Surely there was something strange and contradictory in this: did they ever hear of prisoners who had been released returning to the scene of their captivity, and striving to reconstruct their cells and restore themselves to their ancient fetters? But this was so with these religious establishments—they grew up again and prospered where they had been only a few short years before utterly destroyed.

In answer to the assertion that the conventual life was a compulsory life, the Cardinal cited the example of establishments in Rome, where ladies belonging to the most exalted rank lived in community; their convent presented the same terrible exterior aspect of lofty walls, barred gates, and grated windows, as other nunneries, and yet these high-born dames took no religious vows, and were accessible at all times to their friends. As another example that the conventual life was not enforced unwillingly upon the inmates, he might mention that at a not distant period the revolutionary government of Spain had not only suppressed all the convents of that country, but took away their property, though not without making provision for the nuns; they were allowed a pension of eight pence a day if they remained in their convents, and ten pence if they left their convent and went to live in the world; not a nun deserted her convent and accepted the larger pension. If he were asked what was the security that the life of a convent was not one of restraint, and of cruelty, he would answer, the security that the Catholics were men, that they were human beings, that they shared the ordinary feelings and affections of their race, and that their natural instincts taught them to protect their own daughters from violence and oppression in any shape. For God's sake, what interest could he, as a bishop or priest of the Catholic Church, have in seeing thirty or forty unhappy people imprisoned together within the walls of a convent? Yet more than this: if they denied the Catholics the influences of the ordinary feelings of human nature, they would not deny that they were devoted to their Church, that they carried their reverence and attachment to her and dread of her authorities to what Protestants called excess; well, the Church herself, by her greatest authority, that of a general council, the Council of Trent, denounced excommunication against any one who by art, or violence, or authority, induced a female to enter a convent against her will—against any one who gave her the veil, received her vows, or assisted at the ceremony. And did they believe that he, or any Catholic priest, would bring upon his head the excommunication of a general council?

His Eminence then described what Protestants were usually kept in the dark, about the way in which females were admitted into religious houses. They were, on the first application, admitted in the form of a postulant; in this state they neither wore the religious dress, nor attended the offices, and were there rather as visitors than in any other character. When the time of probation—not less than six months—had expired—and up to that time she was at perfect liberty to go forth—there is a secret ballot among all the members of the community, whether she shall be admitted as their companion for life. At this period, fully one-half of the postulants leave or are rejected. If she is then admitted by the votes of the community, the bishop goes, either in person, or by deputy, to see the novice alone, to ascertain if she is acting from her own free choice, or if any violence has been used to constrain her; and it is explained to her that the Church will protect her if she has been induced to go thus far against her will. After this, she receives the religious dress in part, and is instructed in the duties of her office. She remains a novice in some establishments one year, in some two, in others four. During this period, also, the aspirant is perfectly free, and can order the gates to be opened, and go forth at any time. And again, before the last solemn form of vows is administered, she is examined once before, balloted for once more, and her will searched into in every possible way.

But they had been told of dreadful instances to prove that young girls were forced into these establishments; and here began the disagreeable portion of his task. They were told in this lecture (holding the Rev. Hobart Seymour's pamphlet in his hand) that a person high in authority in the Catholic Church, whose duties led him to accompany the Cardinal Vicar in his visitations of the nunneries, had told the writer that to his certain knowledge the majority of the nuns of Rome died before the age of twenty-five of madness. Now, two Catholic gentlemen of position in this city had waited on the author to procure from him his authority for that statement, but without success; and he might say at once here, that all the anecdotes given in that book were given upon hearsay evidence, or upon authority which the writer declined to give up. For himself, he believed this story to be a pure untruth—he meant as to the source from which it came—as to the fact, he hesitated not to pronounce it an untruth at once. The excuse given for not yielding up his authority for the statement was, that his informant might get into trouble at Rome—might be imprisoned, perhaps, without a trial; but he (the Cardinal), if he would only substantiate his statement, promised that he should do so without the smallest danger—he would be bound to any amount that not a hair of his head should be injured. But, he was sorry to say, he did not believe such a statement had ever been made; it might be a misconception from ignorance of the language of the country, or for some other cause, but he should refuse to believe it until the means of verifying it were produced, and he denied any man the power or authority to make statements without giving the accused the means of verifying them.

Of other instances cited in the pamphlet of Mr. Seymour—the story of the novice who had stabbed herself and died at the foot of her father, and of the nun who rushed from her convent and drowned herself in the Tiber—the Cardinal repeated the same assertion; they were without authority, or at all events the author had declined to give up his authority for those stories when applied to, to name the convent where the event took place, and had contented himself with saying that the occurrences were the general talk of Rome.

Of the cited examples of "deported" nuns, they had in like manner sought in vain of the writer of the pamphlet for a verification of his statements; and of deportation generally he would only entreat them to make the inquiry whether the nuns who went abroad were of full age, and did so by their own consent; if this were so, what was to prevent their going to an affiliated establishment on the Continent, if they

thought fit? There were but few convents in this country, in fact only two or three, what were affiliations of convents in France. All the rest were perfectly independent. But if a nun chose to join one of the affiliated houses, she was quite aware that she should go to any of the institutions to which it might be desirable to send her. There was no hardship in this: it was one of the conditions upon which they were received into the community.

The daughters of Protestant clergymen had been spoken of as having been inveigled into these asylums; but how many of these had first been driven out of their homes by their parents? He could bring instances, recent instances, and name names—to any person of sufficient honor and integrity to warrant his intrusting them with so delicate a matter—of young ladies, the daughters of Protestant clergymen, having been driven from their homes into the streets in a winter night, and who had taken shelter with the sisterhoods of these communities, and subsequently been provided for. He had letters, too, from Protestant fathers, offering to settle pensions on their daughters on the one condition of their going into a nunnery; so that it was not the Catholics alone, but the Protestants also, who might be charged with endeavoring to force women into convents. One of the cases to which he had referred as recent, had occurred no later than yesterday, and in a neighboring country.

The Cardinal then combated what he described as the "extreme inconsistency and looseness" of Mr. Seymour's statements. The passage descriptive of the "Grand Inquisitor at Rome" was a very striking picture; it required but one feature—the truth. The individual there described had nothing to do with the Inquisition at all—and the Grand Inquisition had no place at all in the Papal procession, and never appeared there; the person described was merely the Master of the Sacred Palace. And then the description of what had been seen when the doors of the Inquisition had been thrown open after the late revolution, and the evidence there discovered of "the sacrificial villainies of Rome"—why everybody in Rome knew that the whole scene was prepared by the revolutionary party. Those who entered the Inquisition on the first day saw none of those things; but then the doors were sedulously closed against the public for three days, and when they were re-admitted all those instruments of torture, those ghastly evidences of crime, were exposed to view. Why nobody in Rome believed now but that the whole thing was prepared; and as for the dead bodies, it was proved, by the most convincing antiquarian and other evidence, that the bones found belonged to a cemetery which had occupied the spot before the Inquisition existed. And was it fair, now, to bring forward as a fact what every intelligent person in Rome knew to be a cruel imposture?

As to the right demanded to enter these establishments at any time, he put it to the feelings of English gentlemen and ladies whether they would suffer such a thing in their own houses? Why, then, should the feelings of respectable ladies, living in places they themselves had purchased, be outraged by the prying intrusions of country magistrates and hunting squires?

It was obvious that the intention of the lecturer was to convey, that what was said of the nunneries of the Continent, was by implication to be understood also of those of this country. The very demand for legislative interference, the threat of appeal to the Queen as a woman, proved this uncontestedly; and yet, when the author was called upon by a Catholic gentleman of high family, who had female relatives in these establishments, and whose honor he felt to be compromised by these insinuations, he had declared that he meant to insinuate nothing against the religious communities of this country, and that he only spoke against the system.

The charge that when nuns entered these establishments they lost their own names and could never more be traced by the world, was almost too absurd for refutation. It was not true; in many of these communities the name was always retained, and in all, the postulate and novice retained their own names until they took the final vows, and, of course, everybody in the convent knew who they were.

Reading then the passage from Mr. Seymour's lecture descriptive of the suppression of nunneries in Milan by the Government, and declaratory of the existence of a law against their re-establishment; detailing, too, the author's visit in the autumn of last year to the last lingering relic of the nunneries, in which he found two old women, all that remained of the nuns of Milan, the Cardinal said, now this was a definite statement, the result of personal examination, and clearly intended to rest upon the credibility of the author. They would understand by that statement that the present Government of Milan had suppressed the nunneries, that there now existed there a law against their re-establishment, that there were only two nuns now left in that city, and that, perhaps, even these were now dead. They would suppose, moreover, that the suppression of these institutions, and the law against their re-establishment, had been approved by the Church, for "the established Church of the country" was spoken of in a way to lead to the presumption that it had stood quietly by and consented to such an arrangement. Now, in answer to all this, he would just give them a few facts. He would give them a list of the convents at this moment existing at Milan, with the names of the streets in which they were situated. His Eminence then read, from a written paper, the names and local situations of the houses belonging to three cloistered orders and three non-cloistered; of the former there were four, of the latter eight; twelve convents now existing and flourishing at Milan at the date of his communication from that city, April 21, 1852. Moreover, it was said in the pamphlet that there were no religious houses in the whole district of Milan. The fact was, in addition to those he had enumerated within the walls of the city, there were five others in the neighborhood, making altogether seventeen in a town in which it was stated there was not a single one. Now, what was the story about these two old women? The suppression of the religious orders did undoubtedly take place, but it was in 1810, and by Napoleon. Was it fair to represent that as the act of the Church and the Government of Milan? All the convents were suppressed except one; but the sixteen others he had named sprung up since that time in that city of Liberal opinions. But Napoleon had provided a home for those nuns who had nowhere else to go to; and it might have been that it was the last of these that the author had met with; but the difficulty even here was, that whereas he describes what he saw as happening in the autumn of last year, it was a fact that the building to which the nuns had been removed by Napoleon had ever since 1848 been occupied as a barrack.