

tent judges, was regarded as a very easy one. We were a few and feeble folk only, of island repute, without soldiers, ships or sailors, or so nearly so as to be of no account. However, what we had was of the best material in men, if the most meagre in ships and other equipage, and it is pleasant to think of England's heroes of martyrs of those days, by whose valor and steadfastness the nation was saved, and by whose fidelity to the principles of Christianity and the Reformation it began to revive and live, expand in breadth and grow up to power and wealth.

We are the children of the Reformation, and our grand heritage of religious liberty and unparalleled civil freedom have been bequeathed to us by men who endured hardship in a good and glorious cause.

"THE SUBJECT OF OUR PRESENT LECTURE FORMS ONE OF THE GREATEST EPOCHS IN OUR HISTORY, IF NOT THE GREATEST OF ALL.—The means combined against us were all that the subtlest intellect could contrive, all that the greatest and wealthiest of nations and princes could command and combine, and all that the most famous of generals and renowned of commanders could execute.

The three principal actors were the Pope of Rome, Pius V; Phillip II, King of Spain; and Elizabeth Queen of England; and if we examine the motives and principles by which these various parties were moved and actuated we cannot, I think, fail to be both interested and profited.

We will begin with Elizabeth, whose character has been variously described, one party making it very black and worthless, the other both good and great. If we listen to the first we must accept the description of a bold horse-woman, with a harsh, man-like voice, a good shot, a graceful dancer, and a vain, passionate, frivolous woman, as a full portraiture. We regard this as both very defective and cruelly unjust. She was a skillful musician and an accomplished scholar. Reading Demosthenes as a daily exercise, she could bandy pedantry with an astute vice-chancellor; she spoke Italian and French as fluently as her own mother tongue; she could talk poetry with Spencer and philosophy with Bruno—she could discuss euphonism with Lyly or enjoy the chivalry of Essex; she could talk of the last fashions with the ladies of the household, of course she would not have been woman otherwise; or pore with Cecil over despatches and the treasury books; she could track traitors with Walsingham or discuss with Bishop Parker the knottiest points of abstruse doctrine, or calculate with Frobisher, the famous navigator, the best chances of a North-west passage. Her grand versatility and many-sidedness of mind enabled her to understand every phase of the intellectual movements of the day. It is, however, her moral temper which is hardest to understand, and the strange contrasts of it often remind us that she was the daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, and her temper was often as contradictory as the mixed blood that flowed in her veins. She inherited her father's frank, manly, hearty address, and her mother's love of applause and free intercourse. Her imperious will, her pride, her terrible outbursts of passion came to her with her tender blood. From the same source came also her dauntless courage and her amazing self-confidence. This woman would rate great nobles as if they were school-boys. How often did she meet the insolence of Essex with a box on the ears, and, worse than that, we regret to say, she would sometimes break into the gravest deliberation of her ministers to swear at them like a fish-wife. It was no wonder the statesmen she outwitted and sometimes befooled held her to the last to be little more than a vain, frivolous woman, or that Phillip of Spain "wondered how a wanton could hold in check the policy of the Escorial."

They did not, however, see all of Elizabeth. The wilfulness of her father and the triviality of her mother played on the surface only. Under-