

tal, to friend, to foe, to scoff, was almost too sublime for the pulpit—so few are the minds ‘wound to the height of that great argument.’ ”

He contrasts them also in their deaths.

“When Luther had seen the first sittings of the Council of Trent (having previously swept from the confessions of the Protestants all those temperate clauses which Melancton had introduced, in the distant hope of some accommodation) he poured forth many a mad manifesto, and many a desperate volley of declamation, against that learned and venerable Christian assembly. He wrote, he spoke, he gesticulated, he raved, he barked—like that dog which he loved to represent himself, and then suddenly, in 1546, he fell ill, and slept in the spirit in which he had lived.

“Just ten years afterwards, when Don Ignatius de Loyola had seen his establishments and lieutenantancies arise in Constantinople, in Jerusalem (where the Provincial of the Franciscans had once forbidden him to dwell) in the Isle of Cyprus, in America, and in various places far and near, his eye was grown less bright, and his brave heart throbbed more feebly than of yore. He had seen laynez, the glory of his order, sway the Council of Trent by the authority of genius, of learning, and of virtue. He had seen his society respected, honoured, venerated, exalted in every land and in every clime. He had beheld many triumphs in his old age crown the many labours of his youth; but his eyes were now drowsy with the approach of the last sleep. Many fatigues and many ailments were preying relentlessly upon Ignatius de Loyola. It was a Friday, the last day of July, in the year 1556, when in the capital of the Christian world, about an hour before sunrise, the noble Spaniard, who was stretched upon a bed of anguish, pronounced the name of Jesus, and died as he had lived.”

How were they respectively estimated by their immediate disciples?—

“Among the most remarkable features of the sixteenth century are the respective sentiments which the followers of Ignatius and of Luther evinced towards their two leaders. Luther was styled in express terms, ‘a worse Pope,’ by his pious disciples; and he returned the compliment by informing that they were in-devilled, per-devilled, and trans-devilled; thereby proving that he was indeed a worse Pope, inasmuch as no pontifical censure ever said so much, or spoke so coarsely.

“On the other hand Ignatius was regarded as a saint even during life, by his pure and zealous spiritual children; while the feelings with which they viewed his death lay too deep for tears, and were too holy for despondency.

“On the morning when he expired, people stopped each other in the streets, in the public places, in the state chambers of the great, in the hospital, in the lazaret house, to announce in mournful accents that ‘the saint was dead!’ Where could he cease who should undertake to give an adequate account of the attestations which spontaneously arose concerning the merits and the virtues of Don Ignatius de Loyola?

“We dwell with complacency near the death-bed of a man like Loyola, because we know that it was but the gate of an immortal life; a life into which many of his associates entered like their leaders. Aloysius de Gonzaga—with the blood of a prince in his veins and the character of an angel in his soul—Francis Borgia, Francis Xavier, and another Francis, led a band sacred indeed, and not scanty, up the steep and narrow way.”

In their works, too, the Catholic and Protestant Reformers might be no less strongly contrasted. We must find space on some future occasion for the able description here given of the spiritual exercises, “the mould out of which these men were cast, and out of which they came with the startling and giant proportions which distinguished them from the other characters of the sixteenth century,” and passing over the able defence of the name of the society, proceed to its composition:—

“Holiness and purity of life have distinguished the Society of Jesus in an eminent degree; while a bold, flexible and tenacious intellect—bold in its conceptions, flexible in its choice of means, and most tenacious in its purpose—has, if possible, as signally marked out that society.

“Their generals and chief officers are, and always have been, very eminent characters; prudent, but with more boldness than the men of the world usually possess; of the coolest and clearest heads, yet with hearts to which hardness has never been imputed; to be implicitly relied on in business, which they generally transact in a large spirit, the opposite of the pennywise spirit. Under these admirable leaders, in the high cause of virtue, on the arduous battle grounds of morality, of purity, and of order, both civil and religious, moves the great army of the Jesuits—not in numbers but in efficacy, great; persuasive preachers; well-mannered, yet truly hard-working missionaries; men of letters of a pure, yet not cold taste; men of science of an eager, yet not dreamy devotion to study; men of the world, yet not worldly. Such are the Jesuits.”

The author defends the Jesuits from the ordinary charge against them that they are intriguers.

“Once more,” he asks, “what have they to intrigue for? Is it in order to induce some prodigal son to return to his father? Is it in order to