

NEWRY, Dec. 5.—A man named Murphy was found dead this morning on the road at Deumhill, about four miles from here. Death is supposed to have resulted from exposure and destitution.

THE SUPPOSED MURDER IN NEWRY.—The adjourned inquest on John Digney, who is supposed to have been murdered near this town on the night of the 29th ult., when returning home in company with a man named John Murtagh was held on yesterday, and was again adjourned until Tuesday next, the 8th inst. The medical evidence is conclusive that death resulted from injuries to the brain inflicted by another, and circumstantial evidence appears strong against Murtagh, who is in custody. Both men were in a state of excessive intoxication when they were quarrelling, and there can be little doubt that it was not a premeditated murder.

A petition will be presented in a few days against the return of Mr Devereux for Wexford, on the ground of informality, and a special case submitted to the Court of Common Pleas for its opinion. The point arises out of the retirement of Mr Motie after a show of hands in his favor, and a poll demanded, which was not opened, but Mr Devereux declared duly elected.

The Corporation of Cork have resolved to memorialise the Government for a commission of inquiry respecting the firing on the people out of the house of Mr Richardson, the gunmaker, on the night of the borough election. They are very much dissatisfied with the conduct of the magistrates in refusing to take information and send the case for trial.

THE REV. W. MATRIN. We have received a correspondence in which Mr Robinson, of Cabra Parade, Piliborough, calls the attention of the Rev Mr Matrin to the phrase—'Qualification of Dissenters, Roman Catholics, atheists, and other enemies of the Church of Christ,' alleged to have been used by the rev. gentleman at the other evening in the course of a lecture delivered by him. The Rev Mr Matrin, in reply to Mr Robinson's inquiry, states that he used no such language, and that he could not have used it, as I believe both Dissenters and Roman Catholics to be themselves members of the Church of Christ.—Freeman's Journal.

During the process of clearing away weeds, etc., in the ancient churchyard at Trim a few days ago, a tombstone, no less than 360 years old, was come upon, which has attracted much interest amongst antiquarians. It bears the following inscription: 'Ejus Jacet Johannes Ward, decretorum doctor, istius ecclesie alim rector, obiit xvi. Feb. Anno Domini MDVIII.' The peculiar duties of John Ward as 'decretorum doctor' in connection with the Trim Parish Church appears to be a puzzle to all the parties who viewed the stone.

LOUTH ELECTION.—Mr Fortescue having accepted the office of Chief Secretary for Ireland, will have to come to Louth to be re-elected. We understand that the conservatives would be disposed to oppose him, if they had the power, but it is stated that there will not be a contest.

The notorious 'Captain' P. O'Brien, who succeeded some time ago in effecting his escape from Mallow gaol, where he had been committed on a charge of stealing a gun from the residence of Mr Justice, of Mount Justice county of Cork, has been found in the neighborhood of Kentuck, and has been securely lodged in the local bridewell. O'Brien owes his arrest to his having resumed his old practices. He had gone on Friday night last to a house in the neighbourhood of Moll Carthy's bridge and carried away a gun, and by the description given of him by the victim of his degradation the police recognized O'Brien and proceeded to hunt him up. It appears that he had also taken unauthorized possession of a horse from a man named Beckley, and started on horseback in the direction of Masha Mountains. Two constables having got on his track, succeeded in coming up with him. O'Brien on seeing the constables endeavored to escape across country, but neither he nor the animal appeared to be accustomed to that method of progression. He was, therefore, compelled to succumb to the police, who removed him to the cart in which he had been travelling. A crowd collected, and O'Brien seeing this appealed to them to rescue him, saying that he was 'Captain P. O'Brien of the Fenian army,' and a relative of O'Brien the Manchester martyr. The bystanders were only kept in check by the results attitude assumed by the constables, one of whom—Constable Quinn—stood up in the cart and warned the people that he would fire on any man who should attempt to rescue the prisoner, who continued to struggle desperately with the constable. The crowd gradually fell to the rear, and O'Brien finding that there was no chance of active intervention on his behalf, ceased to struggle with the police. He was taken to Rathcoole police station, and subsequently conveyed to Kantuck.—[Times Cor.]

O. M. O'KEEFE IN WORKING.—On yesterday week Mr Hoey paid a visit to this prison, and had an interview with the prisoner O. M. O'Keefe. He is in tolerably good health. His employment is different from what he was engaged upon last summer. He was then a bricklayer's labourer. He is now at a somewhat more congenial labour for a literary man—doing some small prison clerkship. He does not complain much, except of the extreme cold he feels, for he is not allowed any fire where his labours are carried on. He was anxious to know if there was any movement out of doors on his and his fellow-prisoners' behalf, and he wonders that he has been detained so long a prisoner, seeing, as he remarks, that he was nowise mixed up in the Fenian organisation, but merely a literary contributor to the Irish People. He is, of course, sensible that the unfortunate letter which he wrote, and which was found upon Mr Luby at the time of his arrest, was strong evidence against him; and as excitement and prejudice ran high at the time of his trial, it went far in convicting him. Notwithstanding poor O'Keefe's imprisonment he is still full of literary speculation, and he would gladly accept his pardon on condition of emigrating to America. Many matters were spoken of at the interview, but as they related to matters personal to the prisoner and his affairs, there is no need at present in making them public.—Universal News.

WATCH THE IRISH MEMBERS.—The Irish elections are all ended, and the country sinks down into apathy, as if it had accomplished all that was necessary for it to perform. The elector thinks when he has given his vote, and aided in returning the best of the candidates before him, that his labour is at an end. Such may be his idea, but we and others are of a different opinion. We think it is now after the elections, that his real work begins, and if he neglects to perform it, the man he has sent into the political field to do his bidding may become a lazy, indolent or careless workman; and instead of performing what he promised, he may commence to violate his pledges, and begin to spoil the business he was sent to perform. When a farmer hires men to cut his corn, he does not leave them to do as they please. He stands near them, or sends his steward to observe how they do their work, and if they act contrary to their agreement they are sent about their business. In the same manner the Irish people should look at how their members may act in London. They should ascertain how they vote; how they perform their promises; whether they commence to quarrel with each other; whether any of them are anxious to become the slaves of the minister; allowing him to treat Ireland as it has been always treated; and whether they are resolved to hurl him from office if he shows symptoms of leaving the wrongs of their country unpunished. It would be worth while appointing one or two sterling men in London to keep a sharp eye on our representatives, and send weekly or fortnightly reports of their doings to some Dublin journal. Knowing that they were watched by faithful Irish sentinels, who would perform their duties with strict fidelity, most of them, we believe, would

take care not to earn the censure of their constituents. These sentinels are absolutely necessary, because many of our members may prove unable to withstand the allurement of the parties who will best them in the modern Babylon, whose wealth and grandeur abound, and where an Irish representative may make his fortune, like William Keogh, by proving false to his country. In O'Connell's day there were no such Irish officers, if we may call them so, necessary in London. The great leader himself performed the duty of inspecting the conduct of the Irish members, and if one of them became recreant, his conduct was soon reported to his constituents, and at the next election he was discarded; dismissed from his public service, and permitted to stop at home to take care of his private affairs. It was an unpleasant duty for O'Connell to discharge, but he performed it faithfully; and it produced a salutary effect on those trimmers who desired to barter the rights of their country for place, pension or paltry honours. No honest Irish member should feel offended by his conduct being watched. We are all the better of having an 'eye over us'; for most men are weak, and if they are not afraid of punishment they may fall into bad habits.—How often have we seen Irish representatives, when they feared no reproof, acting contrary to their pledges and in direct opposition to the interests of Ireland? Indeed it may be truly said, that but for the conduct of the men we have sent to parliament for the past twenty years, Ireland would have got the most of her rights before this day. We tell the electors of Ireland, then, that they have not done the entire of their duty by sending a number of men to the English parliament. They have to watch these men; to reprove their errors; to remind them occasionally of their pledges and promises; to urge them on to resolute labour for their country's welfare. This course alone will keep the Irish members in the proper path; but to leave them in London for years without a word of reproof, if they deserve it; or the slightest caution to beware of committing a mistake, is just the way to allow them to fall into evil habits; to become corrupt; and, consequently, to have Irish freedom imposed on to the highest bidder. There should be no more such neglect of Ireland's interests by the Irish constituencies. They have done much during the late elections; but they are required to warn their members to perform their duties to their country like faithful and honest men.—[Dundalk Democrat.]

The legal appointments of the new Government, as regards Ireland, are very freely canvassed by the papers. Whig organs are of course, in a state of ecstatic jubilation and the Tory ones in a severely critical mood. The Observer—which is supposed to be Mr Gladstone's organ, writing of the appointment of Mr. O'Hagan to the chancery, in a strain of warm approval—takes a sly fling at Judge Keogh. He says:—'The appointment of the Chief Baron, Chief Justice Monaghan, Judge Fitzgerald, or Judge Keogh, would be a little more than a shufflings of the judicial cards, and, in the case of the last named gentleman, would be very decidedly unpopular. From which, we trust, the eminent judge will take to heart the lesson, that in doing his work for the British Government in Ireland, it is just possible to go too far—so far as to offend even the delicate susceptibilities of its supporters at the press. The Tory journals regard Judge O'Hagan's elevation with ill-concealed aversion. They throw out dark hints that 'the new rule of Ireland' is to be one of 'foreign spiritual domination'; and that, in fact, Cardinal Cullen and Chancellor O'Hagan are to be the real rulers of the country. It is worthy of note, also, that Mr. Keogh's appointment, as Solicitor-General, is hailed by whig and Tory alike with unbounded approbation. Even the Mail says for him that, 'he is not believed to be a mere lay Roman agent.' And from the Freeman to the Cork Southern Reporter, the Whig organs rejoice at the step in advance which his appointment against Ireland has earned him from an English Government. In fact, the 'miserable man' is no fool, he can be an 'Ultramontane' or as 'Liberal' as any man when occasion requires it. He is a lawyer, whose conscience as well as his abilities, is for hire, and he can talk over the Mail man, and gammon poor old Dr. Hally with equal facility. Surely, none so fit as he therefore, to serve the British Government in Ireland.—Irishman.

The Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland has pronounced upon the political situation and issued a manifesto embodying its views. A meeting was held in the Orange-hall, York street, on the 9th and 10th ult. and the result of their important deliberations was the adoption of a series of resolutions and an address to the members. The resolutions declared their opinion that the Act of Union is the charter of the rights of Ireland; that the disestablishment and disendowment of the Established Church would be a direct violation of it, and would annihilate, cancel, and render void every article thereof; that the Union could only be maintained hereafter by physical force; and, what is a more formidable consideration, that 'as it is by virtue of the third article of that Act that the Imperial Parliament is constituted and invested with legislative authority, upon the cancelling of that Act their functions as a Parliament would be extinguished.' They further announce that, having regard to the Coronation Oath, they 'hold that any attempt to pass an Act of Parliament to disestablish or disendow the Irish Church to which the Sovereign cannot assent is an act of disloyalty to the Crown, and as such ought to be resisted by all loyal subjects.' The last resolution fully crowns the series. It is characteristic and reassuring:—'Resolved.—That in the event of our beloved Monarch being placed in the trying and difficult position of being called upon to refuse assent to any measure brought before her, we hereby pledge ourselves to afford to Her Majesty every aid and support in our power.' The address which is appended to the resolutions informs the brethren that we are in most critical times, that from the revolution the Protestant religion and liberties of the country were never surrounded with such perils arising from the rapid advance of Popery.' The relations of Church and State and voluntarism and disestablishment are only minor questions; the ascendancy of Papal power in this country which lies under death is far graver. The Grand Lodge deplore the fact that this question was not clearly seen during the late election, or the result would have been different. The priests saw it, and labored by every means to effect their object in which they have been aided by Protestant apathy, blindness, and disunion. The consequences to be expected are 'the exclusion of all true Protestants from place and power, and the bringing of the judicial Bench, the executive government, and the magistracy of Ireland under the management and control of the Court of Rome.' A sample of what is to follow may be seen in the appointment of the Chancellor, between whom and Cardinal Cullen intimate and confidential relations are known to exist. What higher authority can there be for such a statement than the Grand Orange Lodge? What body more likely to be informed on such a delicate subject? They regard this appointment as a direct insult to the feelings of Protestants, and they complain that true Protestants—who never before were claimed as true Protestants—have been passed over. They further account for the increase of power to Mr. Gladstone by the irritation produced in the minds of many of their brethren by the 'one-sided and merciless administration of an unjust law.' Then comes the moral. They 'trust and hope that the eyes of all may be opened so that no Protestant may again fall into such an error, and they counsel the brethren in the meantime to avoid all disunion, to recruit their ranks, and especially to keep within the law, however unjust.' The address concludes with a pious exhortation to put their trust in God, without, however, the practical hint about their powder, which formed so suitable a sequel to the advice of their favorite hero. It is signed with due formality by the illustrations name of 'Enniskillen':—Oor: of Times.

GREATER BRITAIN.
LONDON, Dec. 30.—The new House of Commons met yesterday for preliminary business only. The ministers who were re-elected took the oath of office. Bills were issued for elections to fill the vacant seats, after which the House adjourned until the 16th of February.

When Mr. Bright went to Windsor to take the oath of office, Her Majesty showed her delicate consideration for the great commoner in a very marked way. She sent Mr. Helps, the Clerk to the Privy Council, to assure Mr. Bright, if it was more agreeable to his feelings to omit the ceremony of kneeling or kissing hands, he was quite at liberty to do so.—Mr. Bright availed himself of this considerate permission, and was very kindly and cordially received by Her Majesty, who took occasion in the most marked manner to express her gratification at meeting him.

GOLD IN SUTHERLAND.—No small sensation has been created throughout the eastern district of Sutherland within the last few days by a report that gold had been found in Kildonan Strath, and though it has not yet so affected the public mind as to lead to a 'rush to the diggings' it has raised sufficient interest to justify such an amount of 'prospecting' as will put an end very soon to all doubt on the subject. Meantime, it has been established beyond doubt that gold is to be found there, and the only question for solution is as to the quantity. We believe that, in addition to gold, there has been detected the presence of scarcely less precious minerals in the same locality, and that a very decided impression prevails that considerable quantities of both descriptions may be obtained. No time will be lost in testing the matter. Meantime, the fact of gold being in Kildonan is established by the successful search of several persons, and the report of mineralogists as to the quality of the ore.—Northern Signal.

Lieutenant Colonel Brockman has addressed a letter to the Editor of the Rock appealing for contributions to a fund to be raised for the purpose of remunerating Mr. Murphy for his past services and of enabling him to carry on his future labors in the defence of Protestantism.

The Church News (Protestant) says:—In case of the disestablishment and disendowment of the National Establishment, the Church must infallibly break up. Catholics, mis-called 'Evangelicals,' and Stanleyites will soon separate and take different directions. Instead of Corporate Reunion there will be innumerable individual secessions, leaving only a State sect, infidel in its essence and contemptible in its accidents.

We congratulate the kingdom of Scotland upon the choice which the Sovereign Pontiff has made for the first Archbishop in North Britain since the Reformation. The Holy See chooses its men for its most important and trustworthy positions with peculiar tact and instinct. In Scotland there is a large Irish, as well as a large and increasing Scottish Catholic population. Mr. Eyre is neither a Scotchman nor an Irishman. He is an Englishman of an ancient and honorable Catholic stock, dating from the reign of Edward IV. He is about fifty years of age. He is the third son of Count Eyre, and was educated at Ushaw College. But, though an Englishman, he is connected with Ireland by having become the trusted and well-proved friend and pastor of a large Irish population in New-Castle and its neighbourhood; and, through a long residence in the North of England, not far from the border, he has been brought into a closer acquaintance with, and interest in, the Scottish people than could have been acquired by any one who had lived further removed from the Tweed, whether in England or in Ireland. It is not for a journalist to commend the powers of administration, the zeal for education, prudence, and devotedness which characterize any person who is nominated to judge in Israel; but no one can have travelled in the diocese of Hexham without having heard these qualifications identified with the name of Mr. Charles Eyre, pastor of Newcastle.—[Tablet.]

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge—one of the largest and, perhaps, one of the most representative Societies of the Church of England—on Tuesday refused, by a substantial majority, to identify itself with either of the combatants now at war within the Diocese of Natal. Such a result is rendered the more satisfactory and significant by the circumstances under which it was obtained. If the feelings of the conflicting parties were not fully expressed it is no fault of those who were yesterday present in Freemasons' Hall. The speakers more than once designated their Society as a venerable association, but it is questionable whether any one who attended yesterday would have recognized the description. It is true there was an Archbishop in the chair, bishops, Peers, and Archdeacons on the platform, and grave clergymen and laymen in the body of the meeting. Their presence, however, seemed to inspire no veneration in the assemblage itself. Except at a hustings when nobody expects to be heard, and the only object of each party in the crowd is to hoot down the opposing speakers, such a scene as that of yesterday afternoon can hardly have been witnessed. There is indeed, this defect the comparison, that the confusion at the hustings is generally good-humored, whereas the tumult of yesterday displayed an amount of excitement and passion which must have been seen to be believed. Clerical and respectable looking gentlemen exchanged face to face epithets and accusations which, in former days would have led to very serious consequences. For the first hour it seemed doubtful whether the business could proceed at all. Though the hall was already overcrowded, there were numbers of eager members outside, who did their best by shouts, and even by hammering at the doors, to prevent anything being heard or done in their absence. When the meeting had at last wearied itself by ineffectual clamor, five speakers were partially heard, and the Archbishop finally succeeded by exemplary patience in letting it be known what was the issue submitted to the vote. The manner, indeed, in which the last speaker was received was discreditable to a society of clergymen and gentlemen. Dr. Miller of Greenwich, a member of the Standing Committee, rose for a few words of reply after the speakers to the Amendment had been heard. The partisans of the Bishop of Capetown instantly raised a storm of furious noise, and continued them without intermission for some ten minutes. They shouted, they hissed they yelled, they stamped; Dr. Miller essayed to leave the room, the Archbishop threatened to leave the chair, and Lord Harrowby vainly appealed for fair play by mute gesticulation. When a vote had at length been taken, Archdeacon Denison characteristically refused to believe that he had been beaten, and, in a spirit which the majority very naturally resented, professed to doubt whether the sense of the meeting had really been expressed. Another stormy scene succeeded; but the majority properly refused to allow their decision to be eluded, and by overwhelming numbers supported the conclusion which was finally obtained.—Times.

AN ANGLICAN LEGACY.—The late Dr. Longley, who occupied the see of Canterbury, and was much esteemed by members of the Establishment, has bequeathed to his clergy his matured opinions on the subjects which now agitate them. They relate chiefly to Ritualism and cognate topics. We take them from the Guardian, which prints them in extenso, and seems to think them creditable to the judgment of the deceased prelate. Yet they are as antagonistic to High Church views, and as deeply tainted with heresy, as anything which has proceeded of late from similar sources. Anglican Episcopal foundations usually pour out muddy streams, at which a Christian would find it difficult to stake his thirst; but we have rarely tasted one of more nauseous flavour than this.

Why Ritualists should think they have been let by the substitution of Dr. Tait for Dr. Longley, we do not understand. Here are some specimens of Dr. Longley's sympathy with Ritualists and their doctrines. If each of them, he says, 'may change custom and ritual according to his own private opinion,' which he reproaches them with doing, 'anarchy will necessarily be the fruit.' The Ritualists will probably reply that their anarchy is as lawful as other people's anarchy. But Dr. Longley tells them that 700 Anglican bishops 'have acquiesced in an interpretation of the rubric adverse to their views,' a statement which they will find it more difficult to answer. He calls them also 'a noisy but not a very numerous section of our Church,' a sentence of which the first clause seems to us deficient in politeness, and the second in accuracy. And then he comes to their doctrines. Among the practices inconsistent with the principles of the English Church, the late Archbishop of Canterbury considers 'a ritual confession the most offensive,' a decision which must be very embarrassing to the clergy who accept it, as a divinely instituted. The Ritualist, he adds, 'wishes to substitute the Mass for the communion, the obvious aim of our Reformers having been to substitute the Communion for the Mass.' Here he is as right in his facts as he is wrong in his doctrine. 'The Church of England,' he continues, in language which might excite astonishment if any statement of an Anglican prelate could do so, 'admits of considerable latitude'—in what our reader suppose? In vestments and ceremonies? No, but—in the views which may be taken 'of that most mysterious of all mysteries, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.' And then he proceeds to show that her members may believe whatever they like about it, provided they do not believe the truth. For they must (1) deny any presence of 'the Natural Body,' (2) refuse all adoration, and (3) reject the notion of its being a sacrifice or satisfaction for sin. As to the language of the Fathers, who unfortunately taught the Catholic doctrine,—well, 'they used' words poured forth under the influence of excitement; 'an ingenious thought, which, as everybody perceives, reduces patristic tradition to its true value. Finally, 'the Romish notion' of the Christian Sacrifice, which no one will accuse poor Dr. Longley of favouring, 'entailed the use of the terms altar,' a term, as he judiciously adds, which 'appears nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer, and was no doubt omitted, lest any countenance should be given to the sacrificial view.' With this observation of their late Primate we leave the subject to the meditation of our Anglican friends.—[Tablet.]

The Catholic vote contributed to place Mr. Gladstone in his present position: shall we have reason to regret it? The Liberal party is very strong, too strong if they are disposed to make a bad use of their power. We can only infer what they are likely to do by considering the character of their chiefs. Mr. Gladstone is not, we imagine, a revolutionist. He had and probably still has, strong religious convictions. Such a man, if true to his own instincts, can neither countenance secession and impiety abroad, nor godless education at home; and these are the two evils which menace society at the present moment. But his party may run ahead of him, and he may be compelled to follow. In that case, we may look out for chaos. Lord Chelmsford, again, is an avowed conservative rather than a democrat and like Mr. Guizot, would probably oppose on political grounds any attack on the Pontifical throne. Lord Granville is not likely, we presume, to forget the traditions of his order, nor to sow in other lands the seeds of confusion which would be sure to produce an evil crop in his own. Mr. Lowe was conspicuous during the last session for resisting the irruption of the masses into the sphere of public affairs. Let us find what comfort we can in these facts. They hardly suffice to encourage confidence, but they do not forbid hope. The days are evil, and we can only wait and watch. We heartily supported the Liberals at the recent election, because the rival party announced their determination to maintain in a Catholic country the hateful ascendancy of a Protestant minority. Mr. Disraeli left us no choice. He told us plainly, 'I mean to be unjust.' It was as if he had said, 'I do not count upon your votes,' and we took him at his word. Let his party renounce all complicity with Italian and other revolutionists; let them set their faces against the project of a national system of secular education which would carry the nation back to paganism; and they will find that we have made no league with the Liberals, but reserve our respect for those, whether Liberal or Tory, who hold at least some of the articles of our political creed, and can help us most effectually in neutralizing the evils which we cannot successfully oppose without their aid, and which they cannot resist for an hour without ours.—[Tablet.]

THE STATE CHURCH CLERGY AS POLITICIANS.—The Pall Mall Gazette regards the clergy as peculiarly unfortunate in their general advocacy of political questions. Speaking from the experience of the last sixty years one cannot but see that every measure which they have zealously supported has proved a failure; every step in politics which they have strongly opposed has succeeded; every statesman whom they have worshipped has abandoned them; every proceeding which they have denounced after their peculiar fashion, not as a mere error, but a crime, has succeeded, and nobody seemed one penny the wiser. They attack manfully, as a body by the best of kings, George the Fourth; and his memory now speaks for itself. They opposed as a body the Roman Catholic relief measures, one after another, with far more energy than they now display in favour of the Irish Church. They opposed all relaxations of the laws against Dissenters. They opposed (that is, the great majority of them, although some sort of denial of this has been recently attempted) the repeal of the corn laws and other free-trade movements. They supported church rates to the last. Generally speaking, those who have taken part in the contest at all have consistently opposed every successive extension of the parliamentary suffrage. In short, their entire political history is one of zealous or desperate adherence to unsuccessful causes. And now, whenever we are informed that the clergy as a body are in favour of this or that political opinion, we have a pretty safe prognostic the opinion in question is destined to defeat.

THE CHURCH IN THE AUCTION-ROOM.—On Tuesday last, while High Church and Low Church were fiercely struggling for the mastery in Freemasons' Hall, a yet more suggestive display might have been witnessed at the auction-rooms of Messrs Debenham and Storr, in Covent-garden, where any person tolerably familiar with the sights of the French capital might, without any great stretch of the imagination, have fancied himself in the midst of that singular and unique collection of antiquarian shreds and patches, of historic odds and ends, the Cluny Museum. The walls of the well-known auction-room were covered with a multitude of ecclesiastical vestments and other personal paraphernalia of every conceivable description, shape, material, and colour. Rich banners of silk or velvet, profusely emblazoned with gold or silver ornaments, were suspended from the ceiling, while the numerous shelves were crowded with rolls of costly cloth of gold, brocade, silk and satin damask, brocade, moire antiques, lace, fine linen, velvets, and other expensive fabrics. There was a vast array of chasubles, cope stoles, tunics, crosses, altar-cloths, mitres, chalice covers, dorsals, humeral veils, and other articles used in connexion with the gorgeous rites and ceremonies to which the Ritualists are so partial. Seldom has such a dazzling blaze of gold and silver been witnessed within the walls of an auction-room. Certainly the clerical element was conspicuous principally by its absence, the Jews having the field pretty much to themselves, although it is difficult to guess what possible use they could make of their purchases, unless they recold the same for exportation, or for conversion into theatrical properties during the coming pantomimic season. Judging from the prices realized, ecclesiastical

vestments of the true ritualistic fashion are not greatly in demand in this country. A chasuble, stole, and maniple beautifully embroidered in white, moire antique, and lined with crimson set, was sold for 20s. Another purchaser obtained for 25s. a rich set of priest's vestments, of the form used in the 15th century, made of gold brocade satin damask perfectly new and splendidly woven, with numerous figures of saints, trimmed with thick silk lace, and lined with crimson silk. A magnificent cope, the body formed of fine cloth of gold, richly brocaded, and bordered with silk lace, lined with crimson silk, the hood being ornamented with the lamb in silver embroidery, and decorated with massive silken fringe, brought only two guineas. A richly-worked and bordered violet satin damask chasuble stole, and maniple, lined with silk, realized 10s. The unmade-up materials were disposed of at correspondingly cheap rates, a piece of fine cloth of gold, perfectly new, bringing only 5s. 6d. per yard; other pieces selling as low as half-a-crown. Ten pieces of richly figured silk for stoles, together with three cloth of gold chalice covers, produced 13s. Among the remaining lots of which there were a goodly number were to be found a rich profusion of linen vestments, satin banners, specimens of silk bordering, crimson silk-velvet capes, white silk chalice veils, palli, offertory bags, surplices, bands for dalmatics, velvet altar-cloths, crimson and white dorsals, rich crimson and gold silk-damask vestments, elaborately carved oaken altar chair, carved oak inkstands, velvet book covers, embroidered pocket, and the like, few of which realized more than the cost of the mere materials.—Express.

THE REFORMERS.—In January, 1835, Richard Harrell Froude (the real author of the still existing Anglican movement) wrote home from Barbadoes to John Henry Newman, then a fellow of Oriel College, and commented *ad more* upon Lord Macaulay's well known articles in the Edinburgh Review. 'How beautifully they have shown up Luther, Melancthon, and Co.!' What good genius has possessed them to do our dirty work? The same 'good genius,' we are glad to say, has obtained a most useful place on the staff of the Saturday Review. A late number has an article headed 'Dr William Barlow.' The writer says:—'For such as have not even heard of the (Nag's Head) controversy, we may observe that Barlow was the principal consecrator of Archbishop Parker from whom all the bishops of the English Establishment derive their orders.' The Saturday Review has to do with the character of the man, not with the evidence of his consecration.' On this it says:—'We gladly admit that the character of the English clergy of the present day is for the most part unimpeachable. But, unfortunately, as much as this can be said of the character of their predecessors of the sixteenth century. We leave it to Lord Shaftesbury to fix the date of the Blessed Reformation, but whatever date should be agreed upon, the character of the Reformation will not be effected by it; and certainly, in face of the facts that can be proved against Poynter, Cramer, Barlow, Bale, and others, no one will be inclined to grudge the laity of that time the consolation which must have been conveyed to them by the assuring words of the 26th Article, that they might profane use the ministry of evil men, both in hearing the word and receiving of the sacraments. We can only express our wonder that the suggestion of the rest of the article became such a dead letter. It would have been better for the Church of Edward VI.'s time to see nothing new of Elizabeth's reign, if inquiry had really been sometimes made of evil ministers, especially bishops, in order that, being found guilty, they might by just judgment be deposed.' Perhaps, of all the bishops who were created from the date of 1533 to the end of Edward VI.'s reign, Barlow is entitled to the palm for object serenity. He seems to have been a mere weathered oak, changing sides perpetually, and always using the most violent language against those who differed from him. It then traces him, first as an Augustinian monk, next as a favourer of the Protestant doctrine, who 'went to Germany that he might have the opportunity of hearing Luther Melancthon, Ecolamadius, and others.' He published a 'Dialogue describing the Original Ground of these Lutheran Factions,' either just before, or, as seems more probable, just after. This is what, among a vast amount of abuse of the reformers he says:—'The people must first and most busy to praise of the gospel be as great users, deceivers of their neighbors, blasphemers, swearers, evil speakers and given to all vices as deeply as ever they were. Since the time of this new contentious learning the dread of God is greatly quenched, and charitable compassion sore abated. The Saturday Review continues:—'The next thing we hear of Barlow is his adoption, or re-adoption, of Lutheran opinions, and his being retained in the service of Anne Bolern to help in bribing the French doctors to pronounce for the divorce. In this capacity he was sent to Paris in 1530, and in the following year was rewarded by his patroness applying to Archbishop Warham for the valuable rectory of Sandridge, in Kent. His promotion was now rapid. The King, Anne Bolern, and Cromwell were quite sure of that man, who had sold himself to them, body and soul, to do their pleasure. However, he ventured to advocate the marriage of the clergy, which, says our contemporary, is—'The best evidence that now exists for his marriage with the woman with whom he cohabited while he was bishop of St David's and whom afterwards in Edward VI.'s reign he acknowledged as his wife. History has not informed us of the precautions taken for the concealment of Mrs Barlow during the reign of Henry VIII. . . . Whatever defence may be set up for Cranmer for having married at least once after he had been made a priest, no such plea can be alleged on behalf of Dr. William Barlow, who had been an Augustinian monk, and had therefore taken the vow of celibacy. In all other respects he stood by Cranmer, who stood by the king in all points of controversy, and was quite ready to concur with his metropolitan in suggesting to Henry that he might consecrate bishops and ordain priests if he should feel himself called upon to do so by the inspiration of God. The Saturday Review thinks this a proof that he had himself been in some way consecrated. Perhaps so; but an argument is not very strong which assumes that there must have been some bounds to the impudence of these gentlemen, the Anglican reformers. After he had 'pillaged the episcopal residence' at St. David's, and 'alienated the property of the see for his own private advantage,' he was translated to Wells, where he made an attempt to get the revenues of the deanery into his own hands, which seems to have failed. Those were merry days for reformers,—but unluckily Edward died.—'At the accession of Mary he republished his early work against the Lutherans, but it does not appear to have answered his purpose, for he resigned his bishopric, and attempted to run away. Less successful than Poynter of Winchester, he was caught, and imprisoned in the Tower with about eighty others. It is said, though it is difficult to believe, that all of these, except two, refused to recant on Gardiner's offering them absolution. However this may have been, no one will be surprised that Barlow was one of the two. He, and a presbytery of his Church named Ordamer, recanted their opinions. The latter, to his credit, retracted his recantation, and was burned as a heretic, leaving the Bishop of Bath and Wells alone in his glory. He again sided on the principle that he that fights and runs away will live to fight another day. He had not the option which his friend Scory, another of Parker's consecrators, had, whether he would part from his wife and his opinions, or be deprived of his bishopric; for Scory was of the senior, whereas Barlow had been of the regular, clergy. Barlow's submission was sufficiently humiliating. But we have not room for it. The Saturday Review concludes:—'No one would describe Wolsey, Gardiner, or Bonner as being exemplary characters; but they would appear as paragons of virtue if compared with Cranmer, Poynter and Barlow.'