

to confuse the first principles of right and wrong. Nor again has any question been raised touching the validity of Orders in the Church of England.

To write or speak about either one or other of these things—as if they were the matter in hand—is only to confuse men's minds.

The matter in hand is this: The Church Catholic says that the imposition of the Bishop's hands is necessary to the validity of Holy Orders.

The Archbishop of Canterbury says it is not. The Archbishop is not content to speak for himself, but implicates all the Clergy of the Church of England—save some two Bishops and some three hundred Clergy—in his heresy.

Upon this, all that the English Churchman has to suggest is that five or six Bishops and some five hundred Clergymen do make a Protest.

Allow me to say that this is really a little too bad.

Very faithfully yours,

GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON.

We do not know what constitutes "a pinch," in Mr. Denison's opinion, but our impression is that we have been in, and felt, most of the real "pinches" which have come upon the Church during the last nine years, and that we have suggested, or advocated, some tolerably decisive acts. Excess, rather than moderation, or defect, in this way, would probably be assigned as our characteristic by a large body of Churchmen. And as to "not knowing our own mind," we apprehend that, in like manner, we should be charged with stating our opinions, convictions, and feelings, too plainly and strongly. But this by the way. We pass on to Mr. Denison's more serious and definite statements.

First, he says we have nothing to do with Mr. Gawthorn, except to avoid his practices, and that heretical and schismatical position in which he has placed himself; and in this we are at one with Mr. Denison. Secondly, he says the validity of Orders in the Church of England has nothing to do with the matter: and in this also we agree. But statements have been put forth which we understand to take quite the reverse view of this, and our article, to which Mr. Denison refers, was intended, partly, to meet such statements. Some writers have distinctly maintained that the Archbishop of Canterbury has in effect, asserted that our Ordination Services are a solemn mockery. Mr. Denison must be aware of this.

But we come to what Mr. Denison holds to be "the matter in hand"—viz., that the Archbishop of Canterbury has said that "that the imposition of the Bishop's hands is not necessary to the validity of Holy Orders." Here we differ in our facts. It might be thought uncharitable if we said that we deny this; but we do say that we are unable to extract any such plain definite statement as this from the letter of the Primate; and Mr. Denison himself will admit that such a statement ought not to be charged upon an Archbishop of the Church upon mere inference, nor without the plainest and most unequivocal evidence. Mr. Denison talks of the Archbishop's "heresy." Surely, then, he must be able to produce the actual words in which that heresy is definitely expressed, and the distinct avowal by the Archbishop that he holds the heresy. Can Mr. Denison do this? If he can, he is right and we are wrong; and we shall not shrink from acknowledging this when we have the necessary proof before us.

With regard to our suggestions that a few of the Bishops, and a proportion of the Clergy, should protest against the opinions that the Archbishop was supposed to have attributed to them—for we must persist in maintaining the manifest ambiguity of his language—we must remind Mr. Denison that we proposed this simply as a positive "demonstration" that the Archbishop was wrong in his estimate of the number of the Bishops and Clergy who held the opinions which he attributed to them. His Grace stated that he considered that hardly "two Bishops on the Bench," or "one Clergyman in fifty," denied the opinions in question. If, then, six Bishops, and two Clergymen in fifty, repudiated those opinions, that would prove the Archbishop to be mistaken; and this was all that was absolutely required. There is no occasion to have recourse to an ocean when a river will suffice. There is no occasion for a noisy public agitation, when a quiet statement, and private application, will procure all that is necessary. The well-known Declaration on the Royal Supremacy was signed by about two thousand Clergy; and we presume that at least ninety-nine out of a hundred of those who signed it, and many others who did not sign it, would join in any Declaration that set forth the necessity of Episcopal ordination, if they were applied to. Why then agitate for that which might be obtained sufficiently by less objectionable means?

In concluding our observations upon this subject, we desire to express very briefly, and very earnestly, our conviction, that in the present state of the Church of England, any public agitation of a question between her members which is likely to employ much of the time, attention, and energies of her Clergy, is very deeply to be deplored, and, as far as possible, to be avoided. For many years we have all been agitating and contending for the revival of the Faith and Practice of the Church, as set forth in her Formularies. Much, we thankfully acknowledge, has been rescued and revived—far more than has been diligently and faithfully used. Let this be our present—we had almost said our exclusive—aim, for the next few years. Let our Schools and Parishes show that we have not fought for mere fighting's sake, but for the means to an end—which end we are now quietly, but earnestly and resolutely, pursuing and gaining. Let our "Parochial Work" show forth our Principles. We have untiringly and unceasingly proclaimed and maintained our Theory throughout the length and breadth of the land. Let us in untiring and unceasingly exhibit our Practice—in promoting the honour and glory of God, and the temporal and spiritual welfare of man. There are, we fear, some parishes in which the zeal and orthodoxy of the Priest are more notorious and evident than the care and watchfulness of the Pastor—his contention for the Faith more patent than his earnestness and love for the souls committed to his charge. "Brethren, these things ought not so to be." "This ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone."

From our English Files.

CHARACTERISTIC HOAX.

In speaking of those who have left the English Church for the Anglo-Roman Schism, we have frequently expressed our conviction that a candid examination of the character and conduct of such as have subsequently appeared before the public would lead to the conclusion that "Secession to Rome" causes a intellectual deterioration in the religious, moral, and intellectual qualities of the seceders—that they say things, and do things, which they would not have said or done while they were members of the English

Church—at least, not until they had begun to "Romanize"—and that these sayings and doings are not only inconsistent with the principles and practices of the English Church, but with those of every community which duly values Christian integrity, candour, guilelessness, honesty, reverence, honour, manly intellect, and good taste.

Nor can we be surprised at this when we consider the history of Roman corruptions and controversies—those which "we have heard with our ears," and those which "our fathers have declared unto us." In most of them there is a manifest absence of fair dealing and common sense; and, however much inclined some amongst us may be to imagine that the case which we are about to introduce to our readers is an extreme one, truth compels us to express our belief that the disgraceful conduct and trickery of the individual "convert" concerned in it might be abundantly justified upon the recognized principles of even "Saints" of the Roman Church.

With these brief remarks, we beg to lay before our readers the following correspondence and observations from the *Morning Chronicle* of Tuesday last:—

A "CONVERT" TO ROMANISM.

Elsewhere we introduce, at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, a "psychological curiosity" to our readers—one Mr. William Rees Francis Gawthorn. It is a name to dwell on, like that of Miss Carolina Whilhelmina Amelia Skeggs, of the immortal novel. Gawthorn, that polyonymous man, is also polymorphous; like the great Indian deities, he has many avatars:—"I am myself a convert from dissent to the Established Church." He might have added, "I am myself a [Roman] Catholic."—I am Mr. William Rees, I am Mr. William Francis—I am Mr. W. R. Francis Gawthorn. I am a single gentleman trisected—I am as many-named as a Hymn of Calimachus—as many-formed as Proteus himself. I am one only in my desire to bring converts to the Church of Rome; for this I lie—for this I assume false characters—for this I write under what is worse than a fictitious name—and for the good of the souls of others I care not what wickedness I perpetrate myself. I am willing to go to hell myself, so that I can get others to take what I deem the road to heaven." A man of this kind we call a psychological curiosity—an ethical monster.

Last week a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury appeared in our columns, expressing his Grace's views—views which he also assumed to be those of all the Bishops but one, and of all the Clergy except two in a hundred—with respect to un-ordained preachers. That letter has, to say the least of it, excited a sensation—a sensation of a very mingled character, which we are not going at present to enlarge upon. How was it written—to whom was it addressed—how came it into print? These questions are asked in every quarter. We answer thus:—One Gawthorn, two or three months ago, writes to the Archbishop of Canterbury, under what is of course a false name—that of his baptism only—as "W. Francis," and under a false character. Gawthorn, being a Roman Catholic, describes himself as a Church-of-England man rescued from Dissent—what truth there was in this statement only makes it a more wicked lie—but with kindly feelings towards foreign Protestants; and he affects to be deeply grieved at a certain condemnation of their orders, emanating from the Bishop of London. Mixed with this fiction is much ultra-Protestant gabble; but the point of the letter is to ask the Archbishop's opinion on the question of the validity of the orders of un-ordained persons. A more clumsy hoax we have seldom seen; and one would have thought that a very slight amount of penetration would have detected something wrong in a letter of this kind. However, the Archbishop fell into this coarsely baited trap, and indited the famous letter which has already been made public. Gawthorn then, with consummate impudence, drops the mask. Incomparable liar as he is, at the very moment of convicting himself of a whole round of mendacity, he declares that all that he said in his note was strictly true—insults the Archbishop to his face—tells him for what purpose he wrote, viz., to extract a letter damaging to the Church of England, which truly enough it was—boasts of his hypocrisy, simulation, and deceit—and triumphantly concludes with stating that all through the matter he had been acting under advice.

Armed with this Archiepiscopal rescript—obtained under false pretences, and marked "private"—Gawthorn, of course, immediately violates the unhappy confidence which had been placed in him. Anxious for the conversion of everybody, he shows the letter to everybody—amongst others to Mr. Cyril Page, who instantly denounces the scoundrel, and shows that it was an old trick of his; that it was Gawthorn's rule, all the time being a Roman Catholic, to act the aggrieved Church-of-England man, and to write to the Bishops under a false name—in one proved case, under that of "W. Rees"—getting High Churchmen into trouble and rebuke, in order that, through their disgust, he "might hasten the conversion of those who profess High Church principles to the Catholic Church."

This whole correspondence has been in our possession for six or seven weeks. For obvious reasons, such as duty towards the Church of England and its Primate, we did not choose to make public this grievous scandal. Gawthorn, however, published it in a Roman Catholic paper, from which it was transferred to the columns of some of our daily contemporaries. From this source, and not from information afforded by us, it came before our well-known and able Correspondent, "D. C. L.," and elicited from him a severe censure; but not till it was *publici juris*, and had already been before the world for a considerable time, did it appear in any shape in the *Morning Chronicle*. At the Archbishop's request, we print the whole correspondence between him and Gawthorn; and in order that this fellow's character may be thoroughly known, we append some additions which have long been known to us.

As to this miserable creature, Gawthorn, it is a waste of words to describe his conduct in the transaction. A more base and revolting fraud—a more complete negation of every moral principle, the lie being varied with every circumstance of degrading hypocrisy—it were impossible to conceive. The wildest fiction that ever attributed any conceivable violation of truth and decency to the pattern-monster which is nicknamed a Jesuit, never exagitated anything half so detestable as this fact which is now before us—a fact which has serious bearings, far wider than the detection of Gawthorn. We shall not be urged by our indignation to accuse the Roman Catholic Church of the sin which has been displayed by its proselyte; but there is no denying that a systematic disregard of truth is the popular charge against a whole religious system, and this is a case which must go far, unless disavowed, towards accrediting and enforcing the popular estimate. This is no theory of the economy, no mere instance of the *disciplina arcani*, no esoteric doctrine from Escobar—but a

solid substantial fact, performed here, in this living England, in the month of July last past. The perpetrator of this incredible wickedness boasts of it—defends it on moral, and religious, and pointedly Roman Catholic principles—and one Roman Catholic publication has already come forward, week after week, to take part with Gawthorn, and is prepared if, as may reasonably be expected, he is hunted out of society as a common pest and nuisance, to welcome him into the expansive ranks of Roman Catholic confessorship, as suffering for conscience sake. It is painfully noticeable also that Gawthorn suggests that, throughout this black transaction, he has acted under the cognizance, if not the direction, of "others who are better able to judge" of its morality—plainly alluding to spiritual directors. If Roman Catholics of authority, if those who have the care of souls, permit this case to proceed unnoticed—if they fail, not only to disavow Gawthorn, but to visit him with the most severe Ecclesiastical censure—then we must say advisedly that no condemnation can be too strong, no vituperation too severe, for a system which permits this.

Not to punish Gawthorn is to adopt him and his code of morals. Here is a case of forgery, lying, slander, violation of confidence, false-witness, hypocrisy; all done under the guise of religion, by a pretended religious person, for an assumed and proclaimed religious end. If a Church is to be propagated by such means as this, society is justified in rising as one man to expel from its bosom those who can accredit such monstrous immorality. And at the present juncture it were impossible to conceive a proceeding more fatal to the Roman Catholic Church, and to its hopes of converting England.

We cannot afford, however, to permit the whole scandal of what has taken place pass off in indignation against Gawthorn. This unhappy transaction does seriously incultate others, whose share in it we would willingly pass over. We admit to the full the disgraceful artifice under which the Archbishop's letter was obtained; we acknowledge its private purpose; we remember its "private" superscription; we make all allowance for one holding his Grace's sentiments, writing unguardedly and in haste, and even in good faith, to rescue one whom he thought likely to leave the Church of England. But the fact that his Grace wrote at all in reply to such a letter exposes not only lamentable weakness of character, but a dangerous habit of another sort; it shows that Bishops do attend to what practically amounts to an anonymous letter—that they, without inquiry, listen to silly title-tattle and scandal—that they dash off, without a moment's thought, what may, as in this case, damage the faith and destroy the confidence of thousands. All this we say upon the mere fact of the Archbishop replying to "Mr. Francis"—even supposing that his letter was genuine, and every word in it true.

Much more—and what is more painful to add—must be said of what the Archbishop wrote. *Litera scripta manet*: the Primate's letter was extorted by fraud and villany, but Gawthorn's share in this matter does not alter the character of that document. His Grace wrote what he felt; and first it is obvious to ask, what right had Dr. Sumner to make himself the mouthpiece of the English Bishops? As to the Colonial Bishops, Lambeth, of course, does not recognize them—they are not "the bench." But have twenty-four Bishops ever accredited the Archbishop to deliver their sentiments for them in reply to every anonymous scribbler from Holywell-street? Great and grievous wrong has been done to the Church of England by its Primate taking upon himself to express, in a very delicate matter, the sentiments of others, of which he was absolutely and entirely ignorant. The Archbishop has maligned others, while expressing a sentiment that is in itself defensible. Something else remains to be said. If the Archbishop's own estimate of his own position is true—which we emphatically deny—we must say that the Church of England, at least so far as its "bench" goes, is a grave and patent injustice. If Episcopal ordination or consecration does not make his Grace and the English Clergy something other than these "wanting the imposition of Episcopal hands," then we observe that his Grace, and his primacy, and his metropolitan claims—Lambeth, Addington, and £15,000 a year, are a very heavy price to pay for an office which has the same calling, neither more nor less, as that of the humblest preacher in the humblest conventicle. It is a growing custom, with many Bishops, on every possible occasion to disavow High Churchmanship, and to prosecute and proscriber High Churchmen. But sure we are of this—that High Church principles alone can defend the existing fact of the English Episcopate. When those principles are expelled from the Church, the very first victims will be and ought to be, the Bishops themselves. If the Bishops are resolved to act as their friends seem disposed to threaten us with their acting, we must bid them—and we do so in a very different spirit from that in which those memorable words were once used—"to set their houses in order."

Unmixed satisfaction with this miserable affair can be felt only by those who hate and vilify all Churches. As regards the Roman Catholics, until denounced and disavowed, it implicates Gawthorn's co-religionists in the charge of contemning the commonest rules of honesty and morality. As regards ourselves, until denounced and disavowed, it implicates the Church of England in falseness to her own principles, and in a total disregard of the essence of a Church, as distinct from a religious society of yesterday. We have only to add, with respect to the chief agent in this wretched transaction, that we should place more confidence in the lowest pickpocket in Field-lane, than in Mr. Wm. Rees Francis Gawthorn.—*Chronicle*.

ANOTHER GREAT EXHIBITION.—An industrial exhibition is to be held in the Government Domain, Sydney, in October. It is to include products from Australia, the neighbouring countries, and in the islands of the Pacific.

The Duke of Wellington has lately given striking proofs of his vigorous condition, which have astonished very much younger men. A few days ago he started early for Bangor, walked through the Britannia tubular bridge, returning outside the structure—a service of no uncommon peril—and then came back to town to dinner. His Grace proceeds to Strathfieldsaye in a few days to receive some friends for the shooting season.—*United Service Gazette*.

Whilst Viscount Strathallan was on Friday week showing his son the working of the steam mill recently erected on his home farm, his arm was caught by the wheels, and so severely lacerated, that it was found necessary to have it amputated above the elbow.

DEATH OF DR. OKEN.—We have just received intelligence of the death of the famous naturalist, Dr. Lorenze Oken, whose theory of the cranial homologues effected a revolution in philosophical anatomy, and led the way to the admirable researches of our Owen.—

Latterly he was professor of natural history at the University of Zurich, in which city he died a few days since, at the advanced age of 73 years.—*Literary Gazette*.

MILTON'S DAUGHTERS.—The Chetham Society has published documents, showing that Milton's eldest daughter, Anne, could not write; that his second daughter, Mary, could not spell; and that his third daughter, Deborah, was much in the same condition, though it has been often said that she was her father's amanuensis, and that she read to him in Hebrew, Greek, and Italian, without understanding a word of any of the languages.

A PROLIFIC VILLAGE.—The *Newcastle Courant* says—"In a small village in Cleveland, the Clergyman has been blessed with 16 children; the clerk, 19; and the sexton 14."

In France, nearly all the General Councils have declared in favour of the revision of the Constitution. It seems pretty clear that the Prince de Joinville will be a candidate for the Presidency next year, if he meets with sufficient encouragement. Such a step would not tend to the advantage of the Count de Paris, but we fancy the Prince cares little for any one's interest but his own. 176 persons have been arrested in Paris, of whom 150 were Germans. This has tended to make the Government unpopular, as these arrests are supposed to have taken place at the instigation of Austria.

Accounts from the Cape are unsatisfactory, but the arrival of the troops sent to the aid of Sir Harry Smith will probably change the aspect of affairs.

Emigration from Ireland continues at a great rate. Every one is anxious to leave this country of misrule and bloodshed. If the Roman Catholics are in such a great majority in Ireland, and their Clergy have such great influence, how comes it to pass that they have allowed the country to get into its present wretched state? Either their power is not so great as has been represented, or they have exerted it for bad purposes.

There is no doubt that the Duke of Norfolk has conformed to the Church of England. The folly of the Romish Bishops in resisting the law, and the extravagances of the recent converts, are supposed to have been the cause of this secession from the Papal ranks. His Grace, with his Duchess, and their daughter, received the Holy Communion on Sunday last, in Arundel Church. Other Roman Catholics are expected to follow his Grace's example.

ALTAR DENUNCIATIONS.—The Rev. William Digby a beneficed clergyman of the Established Church, residing in the county of Longford, states, in a letter to the *Evening Mail*, that in consequence of his expostulations with some of the peasantry for taking part in a procession in honour of the Feast of the Assumption, or, as it is called, "Lady day in harvest," he was on the following Sunday, to use his own words,—"Cursed in the chapel, together with all belonging to me, by the priest, who, in a very excited state, as I have been informed, expressed his surprise, that such a person as I should have been permitted so long to remain in the parish! This denunciation from the altar has been followed up last night by several notices having been put up, which were found by the police this morning, threatening with death any person who should work for me, and signed, "Molly Maguire." As yet no violence has ensued, and notwithstanding this notice, I had a large number of reapers most of them Roman Catholics, working for me to day."—*London Patriot*.

It is rumoured, we fancy without warrant, that Sir Geo. Gray will be made Speaker next Parliament, and that Lord Clarendon is going to the House Office.

The Hon. H. M. Nelson, son of Viscount Nelson, and grand nephew of the illustrious founder of the name and title, has entered the service as a cadet in Nelson's own flag-ship, the victory.

A child named Ellen Purvis died a few days since at Stretchworth, Cambridgeshire, in consequence of having pricked herself with a needle, a piece of which ultimately penetrated her heart.

ROMANTIC MARRIAGE.—The *Aberdeen Journal* mentions the case of a beautiful Greek girl, who, having been purchased by an English gentleman (whose family is known to our contemporary) during the struggles between the Greeks and Turks, was brought up and educated as one of his own children, and has recently become the wife of his son.

NECESSITY THE MOTHER OF INVENTION.—John Carter, an Essex man, who, falling from a tree, injured his spine just below the neck, was paralyzed completely from the shoulder downwards. The muscular power of the neck remained, and no permanent harm was done to the skull; but below and beyond this he was unable to lift a limb or stir a muscle. Of course under these circumstances, he was obliged to lie on his back day and night, with little or no occupation or amusement. But reading one day in a tract lent to his wife that a woman who had lost the use of her limbs was taught in a Liverpool asylum to draw with a pencil held in her mouth, he tried to do the same: and in a short time it became evident that he possessed an extraordinary artistic faculty. He died a short time ago.

ULTRAMONTANE REVELATIONS.—On Saturday morning the *Tablet*, in a third edition, gives the fullest prominence to the following revelations with respect to an alleged change in the Ministerial mind touching the policy of interference with the episcopal violation of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. The statement must, of course, be received, with all the caution due to its authority.—"We are informed on what should be very good authority that a letter has been received at the Castle from Lord John Russell intimating that it is not the intention of the Government to institute any prosecution against the offending bishops; that in the opinion of the Whiggish Cabinet, and of the writer, the whole business has been already carried too far; and that it is desirable to endeavour to allay the excitement rather than increase and aggravate it. They have done their best to excite a commotion and to trample down the church, but they find it too strong for their purpose, and they are fain to proclaim an amnesty to their intended victims in the hope that their intended victims will extend an amnesty to them.— Happily this base calculation will turn out as false as that which preceded it. No catholic in his senses will trust the Whigs henceforward."

THE FRUITS OF CRIME.—The *Leinster Express* states that an English gentleman who had lodged the large sum of £62,000 with his agent for the purpose of purchasing property in this country under the Encumbered Estates Court has backed out of his intention and declined to invest the money thus on account of Mr. White's murder.

It is stated in the *Bulletin de Paris*, that both the French and English Governments are "watchfully observing the large purchases of arms and accoutrements now making by Russia."