

STUDY

By the Rev. Fr. Ed. Dawson, F. R. S. C., on Richard II., King of England, in Scotland.

Read before the Royal Society of Canada, at its Annual Meeting, May, 1885.

The evidence which goes to show that Richard II., after his deposition and imprisonment, escaped from prison and found his way to Scotland, where he was entertained for many years in royal style at the court of the King of Scotland, Robert III., and afterwards at that of the Regent of that kingdom, the celebrated Duke of Albany, is of so convincing a nature that it can only be overturned by absolute proof that Richard was murdered, or that he died in prison. Bower, an ancient and authentic contemporary historian, states that Richard II. escaped from Pontefract castle, and succeeded in reaching the Scottish Isles; that, when travelling in disguise through those remote parts, he was accidentally recognized and discovered when sitting in the kitchen of Donald, Lord of the Isles, by a jester who had been educated at the court of King Richard. Bower also says that the Lord of the Isles sent him from his mansion of Dunaverly in Cantyre, under the charge of Lord Montgomery, to Robert III., King of Scotland, with whom, as long as the Scottish monarch lived, he was maintained as became his rank; and, after the death of this king, the royal fugitive was delivered to the Duke of Albany, then Regent of Scotland, and was by him honorably treated. Bower concludes this passage by stating that Richard at length died in the Castle of Stirling, and was buried in the church of the Preaching Friars, on the north side of the altar (Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii., p. 427. "Isto modo Rex, etc.") The same author, when speaking of the devastations committed by Richard II. in his expedition into Scotland, alludes, in equally positive terms, and almost in the same words, to his subsequent escape into that country, and his being discovered by Donald of the Isles. (Fordun a Goodal, vol. ii., p. 402. "Unde ad id deventum est, etc.") It will be observed that Bower, the learned continuator of Fordun, who is entitled to the highest credit as regards the events of his own time, and which came under his personal observation, expresses no doubt, as to the identity of King Richard. Bower's testimony is wonderfully corroborated by that of another original contemporary writer of great value—Andrew Winton. His testimony cannot be considered as having been borrowed from Bower, as it is well-known that his chronicle was completed before the history of Bower was begun. Winton states very plainly that after Richard's deposition by Henry IV., he was confined in the Tower of London. "They then, he continued, brought him to Pontefract, where he was delivered to two gentlemen of rank and reputation, named Swinburn and Waterton, who felt compassion for him, and spread a report of the king's death, after which there arose a rumor that King Richard was still alive." Our author then says that he will tell how this report arose, as he heard, although he possessed no information as to the manner in which the king effected his escape from Pontefract. "But," he proceeds, "at this time a poor traveller appeared in the Outer Isles of Scotland, and it happened that he was met by a lady of the family of Bissett, a daughter of an Irish Lord, who was wedded to the brother of the Lord of the Isles. She had before seen the King in Ireland, and she immediately declared to her husband that this traveller was King Richard, upon which he called him and enquired whether this were true; but he denied it, and would not admit that it was so. However, they sent this person to the Lord Montgomery in haste, and afterwards he was kept by Robert III., King of Scotland. Then he was held for some time by the Lord of Cumberland, and lastly, delivered to the Duke of Albany, the Regent of Scotland, who kept him for a long time after this." Winton was Prior of Lochleven—at the time of Richard's appearance—and had the best opportunities of informing himself of the truth of the story. In this connection Winton mentions two circumstances which do not appear in any other author. The first is Richard's denial that he was the king, when he was discovered by Donald of the Isles. Did an impostor ever deny that he was the party he wished to be taken for? Such denial was quite natural on the part of a fallen and fugitive king, especially as the prince, whose hospitality he sought, was in close alliance with Henry the IV. Besides, is it not well-known that, before leaving England, Richard had been compelled to say "Farewell, King?" It was true, then, to assert that he was not King Richard; and it must be observed that he did not affirm that he was not the person who had been King Richard. The second circumstance mentioned by Winton, and particularly deserving of attention, is that at Pontefract Richard was delivered to two gentlemen, who were known to be honorable and trustworthy, Swinburn and Waterton. This disposes of the Sir Piers Exton story, which is, besides by universal consent, discarded from the field of history. The mention of this circumstance shows, moreover, that Winton had access to authentic sources of information. There is every proof, also, that Bower had never seen Winton's chronicle when he wrote his

additions to Fordun. There could be no collusion, therefore, between the two authors when they concur in giving narratives substantially the same. The account of Bower is, indeed, more particular and positive. But it will be recollected that he wrote twenty years after the appearance of Winton's chronicle, in the reign of James II., when no fear of the Regent Albany could influence him, and time had been given him for the complete discovery and investigation of the truth.

Additional proof is found in an ancient manuscript, entitled "Extracta ex Chronicis Scotia," which is carefully preserved in the Advocates' Library at Edinburgh. This history must have been written after the time of Fordun and prior to the date of Bower's continuation. It very strikingly corroborates the accounts of Bower and Winton. At folio 254 there occurs the following passage: "Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland, with his nephew, Henry the younger, and many others of the prelates and nobles of England, who fled from the face of Henry IV., came into Scotland to King Richard, at this time an exile, but well treated by the Governor." The same manuscript briefly but positively confirms Bower's account of the death of Richard, and, what is particularly valuable, adds the epitaph which was inscribed over his tomb: "Richard the Second, King of England, died in the Castle of Stirling on the feast of St. Lucy the Virgin, on the north side of the High Altar of the Preaching Friars—above whose royal image, there painted, it is thus written: "Angliis Ricardus jacet hic Rex ipse sepultus. Lonestate quem Dux deiecit arte, mota prodicione, Predicione potens, sceptrum politur iniquo. Supplicium luti hunc spatus omnegenus. Ricardum inferis hunc Scotia sustulit annis, Qui Castrum Striveling vite peragisti iter, Anno Millesimo quatercento quoque deno Et nono Christi, regis finis fuit iste."

This monument and the Dominican Church which contained it have long ceased to exist. But they were still entire in the time of Boetius. This author alludes to the inscription over Richard's tomb as being visible when he wrote. The clear and positive statements of these respectable contemporary writers are surely of great weight. On the other hand, the accounts by English historians of the reputed death of King Richard are exceedingly vague and contradictory, while the reports of his escape are frequent. The preponderance of historical authority, therefore, is in favor of considering the mysterious person, so long entertained and treated as a king at the Court of Scotland, not as an impostor, but as the true King Richard who had fled from the face of his usurping cousin, Henry the IV.

Let us now consider documents that are of unquestionable authenticity—the public or, as they are called, the chamberlain accounts of Scotland. They contain the accounts of the great Chamberlain and other Ministers of the Crown during the government of the Duke of Albany. The first is found at the end of the accounts for the year 1408. It is as follows: "Be it remembered, also, that our Lord, the Duke, governor of the kingdom, has not received any allowance or credit for the expenses of King Richard, incurred during the period of the death of his brother, our Lord the King of good memory, last deceased." A memorandum, in the same words, is inserted at the termination of the chamberlain accounts for the year 1415; and finally, at the conclusion of the 1417, there occurs this passage: "Be it remembered that the Lord Governor has not received any allowance for the expenses and burdens which he sustained for the custody of King Richard of England, from the time of the death of the late king, his brother of good memory, being a period of eleven years, which expenses the lords, auditors of accounts, estimate, at the least, to have amounted annually to the sum of a hundred marks, which for the past years makes in all seven hundred and thirty-three pounds, six shillings and eight pence." Nothing could be more satisfactory than the discovery of such records. They establish upon direct and unquestionable authentic evidence that the narrative of Bower and Winton is substantially true, and leave no cause to suspect the fact so often and so positively asserted during the reigns of Henry the IV. and Henry the V., that Richard II. had escaped into Scotland and lived there for many years after his reputed death in England. "That an impostor," wisely observes Mr. Tytler, "should, as we learn from Winton, deny that he was the king, or that in the face of this denial, a poor maniac should be supported at great expense and detained for more than eleven years at the Scottish Court, seems to me so extravagant a supposition that I do not envy the task of any one who undertakes to support it."

NO PROOF OF THE CONTRARY. No English writer of the time has left any distinct record to the effect that Richard II. died or was murdered in Pontefract Castle. The best historians give accounts that are vague and inconsistent with each other, and often such as can be proved by unexceptionable evidence to be false. English writers, despairing of being able to clear up the difficulty, the mysterious fate of Richard having baffled all their erudition and acuteness, have left the question, as to the manner of his death, in the same mass of obscurity and contradiction in which they found it. But, are they not all agreed that he died in England? This is far from being the case. Many in England, who had access to the best sources of information, entertained the belief that Richard had escaped and was living, almost immediately after he had been imprisoned at Pontefract, and before there was time to have communication with Scotland. Not long after Richard had been secretly conveyed to Pontefract, and previously to his reported death, the Earls of Kent, Salisbury and Huntingdon, formed a conspiracy against Henry IV.; along with them were the Bishop of Carlisle and the Abbot of Westminster, together with numerous persons of inferior rank. They purposed holding a tournament at Windsor, at which they intended to murder Henry and restore Richard. Henry got word of their designs from one of the conspirators and removed to London: The party, thus baffled, repaired to Sunning, near Reading, where Richard's youthful Queen only, in her ninth year, resided. The Earl of Kent, here addressing the friends and attendants of the Queen, informed them that Henry of Lancaster had fled to the Tower of London, and that they were now proceeding to meet King Richard, their lawful Prince. There were many in this conspiracy who could not be mistaken as to the fact of Richard's escape. Henry himself appears to have been convinced of it. When preparing to meet the conspirators, he was reproached by the Earl of Warwick for his lenity, which had brought him into such danger. In reply, the king vindicated himself for his past conduct, and added that "if he should meet Richard now one of them should die." He did not believe, therefore, that it was the body of King Richard over which he held a solemn funeral service at St. Paul's. What a mockery was not this same funeral service! It was had recourse to by Henry in order to still the rumors which prevailed in London, that King Richard had escaped from prison and was alive. It may have had a momentary effect on the Londoners who were permitted to view only the funeral car, which was covered with a black pall. But Henry himself, accompanied by several members of the royal family, officiated as chief pall-bearer. This, of course, sufficed, at the moment, for the satisfaction of his loyal people. History, however, could not be so deceived. Only a few were privileged to look within the pall, and that hurriedly. Then what was to be seen? Only the face from the lower part of the forehead to the chin. Why was not the head gear so arranged as to show the bright gold-colored hair of King Richard? This would so far have proved the presence of his real body, and if the necessary preparations had been made for enshrining it, as was fitting, in his mausoleum at Westminster, further and conclusive proofs, in the event of its being the true body, would undoubtedly have come to light. But, the pretended body, instead of being deposited in the splendid tomb which King Richard had prepared for himself in the great historical Abbey, was hurried away to an obscure place, called Langley, in Hertfordshire, and there interred, in great secrecy, and without any funeral pomp, there being none of the nobility present, nor any concourse of people.

Neither this mock funeral service nor the extreme severity with which Henry punished all who dared say that Richard was not dead, could shake the belief of the English people. This belief ceased not to disturb the state during the reigns of Henry IV. and Henry V. Conspiracy after conspiracy was undertaken for the purpose of restoring Richard, who was understood to be alive in Scotland. Some, whose courage exceeded their prudence, hesitated not loudly and publicly to declare this fact. Among these a Priest of Ware, in consequence of affirming that Richard would soon come from Scotland to claim his rights, was drawn and quartered. Eight Franciscan Friars were hanged at London for the same offence. One of these, a Doctor of Divinity, having been more bold and obstinate in maintaining his loyalty, was executed in the habit of his order. The brethren of this order had several convents in Scotland, and frequently visited that country. Some of them had probably seen the deposed monarch, or had certain proof that he was an exile in Scotland. Walter de Baldoek was hanged for publishing the same story. Sir Roger de Clarendon, a natural son of the Black Prince, and one of the gentlemen of the bed-chamber to Richard II., along with his armour-bearer and Page, was condemned and executed for making the same declaration. Searle, who had been a gentleman of the bed-chamber to Richard II., returning from a journey to Scotland, positively asserted that he had been with Richard, from whom he brought letters and communications under his privy seal, to his friends in England. (Walsingham.) Maud, the aged Countess of Oxford, a person from her great age, not likely to engage in any

undertaking without sufficient grounds, caused it to be published throughout Essex by her friends and domestics, that King Richard was alive and would soon come back to recover and assert his former rank. Many of the most powerful men of that country were induced to believe what she stated, and that the report was daily brought from Scotland, that Richard had found an asylum in that country, and only waited for a convenient time when, with the strong assistance of the French and Scots, he might recover the kingdom. The testimony of the high-minded and honorable Lord Cobham is too valuable to be passed over. It shows what was thought among the English nobility concerning King Richard. This celebrated nobleman was burnt, ostensibly for heresy, as he was a supporter of the Lollards or Wickliffites, on the 25th of December, 1417. When seized, and brought before his judges to stand his trial, he declined the authority of the court. Being asked his reason, he replied that "he could acknowledge no judge amongst them, so long as his Liege Lord, King Richard, was alive in Scotland." Having so answered, no further evidence was required, and he was at once drawn, suspended over fire and burnt to death. This cruel murder was, of course, laid to the charge of heresy, whilst the true cause was Cobham's recognition of King Richard. The testimony of such a man, solemnly uttered in the face of death, is of the highest importance. He had always borne an unblemished character for truth and integrity. He had sat in Parliament and held high office in the reigns of Richard, Henry IV. and Henry V. He was sheriff of Herefordshire, in the 8th year of Henry IV., and, as a Peer, was summoned to Parliament in the 11th, 12th and 13th years of that king's reign, and in the first of Henry V. All this is mentioned in order to show that he could not have been ignorant of the measures adopted by Henry IV. to persuade the people of England that King Richard was dead. His evidence, therefore, must be considered as above suspicion—absolutely unexceptionable.

King Henry's own testimony is deserving of some attention. No one knew better that King Richard was living. When it was proposed to make a treaty with Scotland, and a commission was issued for this purpose, there was no question of inserting an article regarding the delivery of the person who was said to be King Richard at the Scottish Court, although Henry was perfectly aware of his existence, as shown by his proclamation of 5th June, 1402. His reign was frequently disturbed, his life and throne endangered by conspiracies got up in the name of the real or pretended Richard. Is it to be supposed that Henry would not have insisted on an impostor being given up to him? The sagacious Henry VII., tired not in his exertions to have Perkin Warbeck delivered to him by the king of Scotland, Henry the Fourth, no less politic than his successor, would also have insisted on an impostor being surrendered. But he knew that there was no impostor, and understood full well that Richard was less dangerous at the Court of the Scottish King and Regent than he would have been in England.

THE BELIEF IN FRANCE. King Henry at first persuaded Charles VI., a weak-minded Prince, that Richard was dead. The French, however, by the year 1404, discovered that their King's royal son-in-law was still living. "The French," says Walsingham, an English writer, "at the same time came to the Isle of Wight with a large fleet, and sent some of their men ashore, who demanded supplies from the islanders in the name of King Richard and Isabella." In 1405 Creton, who wrote the "metric history of the deposition of King Richard II.," addressed to him, in his exile, an epistle, which begins with these words: "Ainsi comme vraye amour requiert, a tres noble Prince et vraye Catholique, Richard d'Engleterre, Je, Creton, ton liege serviteur, te renvoye cette Epistre." This author also visited the deposed King at the Royal Palace of Stirling, Scotland, on the part of his consort, Isabella of France. This was not all. M. Creton wrote a ballad, in which occur the following lines:

"O vous, seigneurs de sang Royal de France, Mettez la main aux armes, virement. Et vous avez certaine connoissance Du Roi qui a tant souffert de tourment Par faulx Anglois qui traitement Lui ont tollu la domination, Et puis de mort fait condemnation. Mais Dieu qui est le vray juge es saintz cieulx Lui a sauve la vie. Main et tars Chacun le dit par tnt, jeunes et vieulx, C'est d'Albion le noble roi, Richard."

English historians are at last giving indications that they are adopting the true view as regards King Richard's survival. Knight, in his history of England, condescends to discuss the subject, and refers approvingly to the very useful annals of England, "wherein," he adds, "this belief is fully acquiesced in."

We cannot fail to remark, in the fate of King Richard a wonderful instance of that retributive justice of which history presents so many examples. Richard, in the days of his power, unjustly deprived the Duke of Lancaster of his rich patrimony. There comes a new shuffle of the cards of destiny. Henry of Lancaster is raised to the pinnacle of human greatness, whilst the magnificent Richard, the splendor of whose reign was likened to that of Solomon, was reduced to the condition of a wandering

mendicant. Such an appalling reverse of fortune is well calculated to recall the admonition of the ancient sages. *Discite justitiam moniti et non temere divos; or the more solemn warning of our sacred books: Nunc reges intelligite; erudimini qui judicatis terram.* It is no less matter for reflection that the royal heir of the mighty monarch, Edward III., who had labored so long and persistently, but in vain, to annex the realm of Scotland to the English Crown, and who had himself appeared in that country at the head of a powerful army, should have sought refuge and hospitality from the people he had wronged and portions of whose land his soldiers had devastated. It is highly creditable to that people, and marks the advanced state of civilization that existed in their country four hundred and eighty-five years ago, that they sought no other revenge than that of treating their guest and former enemy with the utmost kindness.

Such an appalling reverse of fortune is well calculated to recall the admonition of the ancient sages. *Discite justitiam moniti et non temere divos; or the more solemn warning of our sacred books: Nunc reges intelligite; erudimini qui judicatis terram.*

It is no less matter for reflection that the royal heir of the mighty monarch, Edward III., who had labored so long and persistently, but in vain, to annex the realm of Scotland to the English Crown, and who had himself appeared in that country at the head of a powerful army, should have sought refuge and hospitality from the people he had wronged and portions of whose land his soldiers had devastated. It is highly creditable to that people, and marks the advanced state of civilization that existed in their country four hundred and eighty-five years ago, that they sought no other revenge than that of treating their guest and former enemy with the utmost kindness.

Preaching and Prayer.

A LEGEND.

The monk was preaching; 't'rough his earnest word. From the abundance of his heart he spoke. And the flames spread—in every soul that heard. Borrow and love and good resolve awoke: The poor lay brother, ignorant and old. Thank'd God that he had heard such words of gold. "Still let the glory, Lord, be Thine alone," So prayed the monk; his heart absorbed in praise; "Thine be the glory, O my hands and feet, Thy harvest ripen'd in Thy mercy's rays. It was Thy blessing, Lord, that made my word Bring light and love to every soul and heart." "Oh, Lord, I thank Thee that my feeble strength Has been so blest; that sinful hearts and cold Were melted at my pleading—knew at length How sweet Thy service and how safe Thy fold; While souls that loved Thee saw before them rise Still nobler heights of loving sacrifice." So prayed the monk; when suddenly he heard An angel speak thus—"Know, oh, my son, Thy words had all been vain, but hearts were stirred. And saints were edified and sinners won By his, the poor lay brother's, humble aid Who sat upon the pulpit stair and prayed." —A. A. P. in London Lamp.

SOME SCOTTISH CATHOLIC ANTIQUES.

Before the so-called Reformation there was a Priory of Canons Regulars at Monymusk, which the Forbes family secured; they built the present house out of the remains, about a quarter of a mile eastward. Of the venerable priory, formerly a Culdee house, not one vestige remains except a cairn of stones to mark the locality. The parish church is entire, but the chancel is roofless. The western tower arch, and the chancel arch remain, apparently of the twelfth century. The south side wall has been rebuilt. It has been quite possible to restore on the old lines both walls and roof. In the seventeenth century Monymusk House and village are mentioned in the life of Father Archangel Leslie, the Scotch Capuchin, and whether or no we may credit the compilation of Rinnieini, Archbishop of Fermo, one thing is noteworthy, that the description of the library in the upper story, which he and his mother turned into a chapel, is perfectly correct. The library is now exactly as there described—and the old Catholic reliques in it. The effect of seeing an organ at one end, and the statue of Our Lady at the other, rather startled the writer, when, a quarter of a century ago, he found his way upstairs guided by the book written by the Archbishop of Fermo. There are various other Catholic antiques in the room besides, now all carefully restored.

The statue of Our Lady is three feet ten inches high, including the base, and appears to be either Spanish or Flemish. Mr. E. Waterton, the author of *Mariana Britannica*, says it is Spanish, seventeenth century. To me it seems of Flemish, seventeenth century style. The statue is carved out of solid oak, exquisitely finished and richly decorated. The face are enamel, the cherub's wings in the rainbow tints. The outer robe of Our Lady is "olive blue," and the under robe is of red, gold, and gold, and the under robe is of red, red collar and gold. The gilding is all in lines, not leaf, and the effect is most delicate and harmonious. The crescent moon is gilt polished. There has been an aureole, for which a spike hole is made on the top of the head. The back of the statue is equally as well finished as the front. The drapery folds are very rich, and to the mind of the writer, certainly point to an older date than 1670 or 1680, as Mr. Waterton seems to fix it. Anyhow, and wherever it came from, it has a history if one could only know it and it is one of the few, if not the only, ancient statue of Our Lady in Scotland.

The carved wood bust is also colored to life, or rather death, and is considered to be either work. Terrible in its reality. Its history is unknown, said to be Spanish, and thought to represent the head of a female martyr, just expiring. The eyes are glass, and the left pupil is "dead" though life still lingers in the right one. It is difficult to imagine why such a work was made, unless as the head of a dressed figure laid on a tomb. The other Catholic pictures at Monymusk include a very curious picture of Our Lady, half embroidered, half painted, though that is scarcely an exact description; and a magnificent huge panel of St. Cecilia and other saints. It was purchased abroad, and seems identical with the well-known engraving. The collection of rare paintings is unique in this part of the country. Under the eighteenth century paneling of the dining-room a whole series of most curious decorations and armorial bearings of the Forbes family has been discovered. They are in dark olive tints of distemper and in a very rich cinque cento style. It would seem, from what appears at Monymusk, and also in a curious old house in the school-hill Aberdeen (now, alas, doomed to needless destruction by the owner and his architect, who ought to have known better) that the Scotch pepper-box "tourelles" were continued into the rooms and projected into the upper corners. The circular projection being continued inside as well as outside, the effect in carved stone is very good, and the rich band of color "fetches up" the stonework in the dining-room at Monymusk. The old statue and bust have been admirably photographed by Mr. Craigen, 16 George street, Aberdeen.

Catholic Columbian.

Man is a law unto himself, and his heart is the tablet on which the divine finger has traced the indelible characters that give him the consciousness of his existence. Why he forgets this, and spends his whole possession striving to impress himself and his fellows that he is the shuttle-cock of a grovelling instinct, is from the fact of its every-day occurrence, a mystery without novelty—a paradox without application. The rational creature—man—dies at his birth; inclination supplants law, and gratification, blinding reason, leads him out of himself so far that the thought of return becomes appalling, and, in consequence, is seldom entertained.

The Mountain Mass

A LEGEND OF MUMSKY.

The beautiful mountain call from Carr Thierna, the chief of County Cork, in the face and long chain of hills which run southern side of the Blackwater.

Where Corrin rears his giant head O'er Fear Munghe Feine's plain And Alban Mior's the silver winds onward to the main, A faithful few, in troublous days Had met for sacrifice and praise.

Their altar was a moss-grown mound Upon the mountain-side, Their temple roof the sky alone, The round the round the round The rustling pine trees sang in a Tone—'tis Corrin's death.

There is on Corrin's head-clad hill A cairn of lofty height, Whom piled up perchance to slay, As were sleepers round about, Who fell, as patriot knights, To save his lands from Odin's theft.

Upon this cairn a peasant stood To guard the kneeling folk From those who urged through wood With oath and wild halloo, Their human ban-dogs to the feast The death and torture of a priest.

Full many a scene in many a day My eyes have seen well, And more more calmly, sweetly, Than that from Corrin fell; Hills, vale and stream, and tower, The cloud-capped Gaities kiss the

The weary watcher sat him down To tell his beads and pray; And when the morning dawned around, Well had he kept that day; If that lone watch were strictly kept, A lay brother, ignorant and old.

The Mass was said, the three-fold Blessing of the Three, Of Father, Son and Spirit spoken; And over the altar, as the priest The priest and people pray that they May come, and persecution cease.

Even while they kneel, a serried Host of green Corrin's side They halt, the host of green Corrin is given far and wide. The priest, they hear, the host of green Corrin is given far and wide. With human forms convulsed in

Like startled deer the peasants run Through gorse and fern and brake, And have the host of green Corrin is given far and wide. The priest secured, they will not turn, The priest secured, they will not turn, The priest secured, they will not turn.

But he, the watchman? Well, I know his name was well, Save that he never more was seen, In haste from Monymusk fled, But of Mononia's children told Of him who slept on Corrin Fell.

IN CAPTIVITY WITH THE

Frightful Sufferings of Priests

THRILLING NARRATIVE OF FATHER

From the Daily News Military

dent.

When at Wady Halfa I received from the Italian chief of the priests of the Italian who were prisoners at El-Obeid. He had several times been means of escaping, but refused himself of them, replying to him that if he escaped alone he was murdered.

I have received from Father Bononi, chief of the Latin Mission in Africa, with a heart full of God who had so far passed through perils, great and terrible, since he fled from the foudit city of Berse, long my prison. Al behind—and my heart was sore.

Three friends—Giuseppe Orw, Austrian, subject of the Kingdom of Italy, Reginaldo, and Giuseppe Regagnato was a layman who was our mission. Perhaps I may say how it was that I came to be in it was once first parish priest in the diocese of Verona, and in 1871 the mission of Central Africa, at Khartoum in 1874. I was first in Korfoum, then at Gebel Nubi, 1876 superior at El Obeid, from 79 superior at Gebel Nubi, and to 1881 General Vicar of Bishn Camboni at Khartoum, and the Superior of the mission in the Nubi. In May, 1882, I was in Balim, central of mission, Nabuni when surrounded by 17th September, and was made as well as all the missionaries soldiers. I was present at the Obeid, which surrendered 17th 1883, when all the prisoners there were made prisoners of war. Mahdi marched upon Khartoum with twelve European survivors of the mission.

THE PRIEST, THREE NUNS, and CATECHIST DIED OF STARVATION and had treatment. I, with composed of Padre Yusef Obeylan called Giuseppe Regagnato, Gabriel Madiani, and three nuns, established a Gebel Deli, three days' journey. We now established at Obeid, a priest was at the head of the mission, and five sisters were laymen and five sisters. time, it will be remembered, under command of Yusef Pasha marching to the relief of Obeid, bilated. The soldiers had found on the previous day's march following arriving at the next wells they so great that they at once broke rank and rushed to them, who were in ambush and slaughtered. After this success the Mahdi played siege to Obeid. He first called Mek Omar to attack the city. This man had orders to put up a sword; not one was to escape a hand, however, an insufficient for simply eat down before the Mahdi, that thousands of Arab their way to help him. Day their number increased. At the to our misfortune, the officer of the Egyptian troops, and all his were there to protect us, d Mahomet Achmet. The soldiers and ammunition the zarbas, and deliberately we the Arabs. Our situation was perate—hopeless. So we deted offer to surrender on condition should be spared, and that be allowed to proceed to Egypt. These terms were grate became prisoners. We were