

tion? It is not inquisitiveness that prompts me; nay, but the wish that you may also enjoy some pleasures yet in a happy home, in the circle of your family. Knight Gessler, have you forgotten entirely your poor but loving wife? Could you take the innocent one, whom you cast unjustly from your heart, to love and cherish her? Oh tell me! I long to hear an honest, decisive answer."

The knight could restrain his subdued feelings no longer and broke out into convulsive tears:

"Woman, woman," he exclaimed, "with this question you have touched all the chords of my heart! Could I take her back to me? Gertrude, I only entertain this wish in my life—to see her again; to ask forgiveness at her feet; to recover my child, my only, innocent daughter! This wish, this hope penetrates my soul, since I have found in true penitence the way of a better life."

"Your child? Edetrudis' daughter," asked the witch, "is it then not true, as they said, that she had found an early grave in the watery depths of the Danube?"

"No," replied the knight, and tears of shame and remorse nearly choked his words. "I, inhuman brute, had her stolen from a loving mother, because I despised both, wife and child, with an infernal hatred. In truth, I had formed my plan of murder, but the Fish Wit was more merciful and sold the poor wail to a gipsy woman, God only knows where these long years have brought her. Perhaps she is dead, or begging for her daily bread at the houses of inhospitable people. Should the great happiness be mine to find my Edetrudis again, I may yet hope to behold Johanna.—The All Merciful often sends to those who repent and lead a better life the fullest cup of bliss. But no, it is impossible! I do not think that such a lot will be mine."

Old Trude could not restrain her feelings any longer and she gave free vent to a stream of tears. Then to hide from the knights the deep emotions of her heart, she stepped behind the hut, knelt down, rang her hands and prayed with a joyful longing. The mailed knights appeared at a loss to account for this strange and unaccountable behavior of the witch.

In the meantime the servant maid of Hans Netter had ascended Okhill and, after gazing with a great surprise at the handsome knights, inquired for old Trude. When Gertrude heard her name pronounced she made her appearance and asked the maid her wish. "Please, ma'am, would you be kind enough to follow me; an old harper is lying sick at Master Netter's house; he needs immediate help. Come to see him and God will reward you."

The old woman needed not to be asked twice, but taking her medicines immediately she hurried to the knights and said:

"Please to excuse me, till I return. My Christian duty calls me from here immediately. I shall return as soon as possible." But her Otto she consoled especially: "While I am gone, my boy, think of the days of your youth, which you passed in and near this hut. Take good care till I am back. Old Trude must bring help to the house of Hans Netter, or if too late, at least consolation, if human life can do no further good."

And with agile steps, such as appeared very strange in an old woman, she followed the servant down the hill and was soon lost to the sight of the knights.

(CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT.)

THE BISHOP OF SALFORD AND DR. FRASER.

GREGORY THE GREAT AND PIUS IX.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY TRIUMPHANTLY MAINTAINED.

An immense congregation assembled on Sunday, 28th June, at the Cathedral Church of St. John, Salford, to hear the second sermon of the Lord Bishop of the diocese on the fallacious statements put forward by Dr. Fraser, the Protestant Bishop of Manchester. The collection was in aid of the funds of the schools attached to St. John's.

Taking for his text the words:—"Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church. Peter I love thee more than these? Feed my sheep. Feed my sheep, feed my lambs. Peter confirm thy brethren. Peter to thee do I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." His Lordship said that the next day, Monday, being the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, it was but fitting that he should speak that morning upon the prerogative held by St. Peter, upon his primacy or supremacy which he transmitted to his successors and which must remain in his See, the See of Rome, until the end of time. The supremacy of St. Peter, or the Papal Supremacy, did not mean that St. Peter or his successors were superior in orders to the Apostles or to the bishops. The successors to St. Peter had no supremacy in orders over the bishops of the Universal Church. What was meant by supremacy and jurisdiction was simply that Peter and his successors had received from Christ jurisdiction or authority which was superior to that possessed by any of their brethren. It was given to St. Peter in order that the Christian society formed by our Divine Lord, should be maintained in unity to the end of time. The second reason it was given was this, not only that the Christian Church should remain as one, but that the faith and truths revealed by Christ to the world should be preserved unto the end of time. In support of the doctrine of supremacy the rev. preacher quoted from the writings of St. Cyprian and St. Jerome, and contended, that there was no doubt difficulties might be raised against every doctrine, and the fact that objections might be raised was no proof whatever against the truth of the doctrine. Were not objections raised against the immortality of the soul, the doctrine of the Trinity, of the personality of God and the incarnation of God, and indeed to every other doctrine held by Christians? And therefore they were not to be afraid when difficulties and objections were brought against the Catholic Church. She could answer them and she did answer them from time to time, and that solemnly by statements made by the Sovereign Pontiff *ex cathedra*, and by the decrees of the General Councils and by theologians. It had been said that the doctrine of the Papal supremacy had been derived, not from Peter, but from the fact that Rome was the imperial city. It had also been said that if the maxims and principles of one of the great successors of St. Peter had been followed perhaps there would have been no Reformation in England. It had been suggested that St. Gregory the Great did not hold the doctrine of Papal supremacy, and they sought to prove that assertion by saying that St. Gregory objected to the title of "Universal Bishop." Now it was quite true that St. Gregory did object to the title; he looked upon it as being contrary to the faith; he

looked upon it as a title that would bring about schisms. He refused to admit it in the Patriarch of Constantinople, and declined to accept it himself.—Let them see what was the history of that title, which at the time created in the East so great a scandal, and which had been used by controversialists ever since in this country. The title of "Universal Bishop" was first made use of about 150 years before the time of St. Gregory the Great. It was applied to the Patriarch of Alexandria, and later on John, Patriarch of Constantinople, not only usurped the title, but under virtue of it summoned together what he called a General Council. He considered himself "Universal Bishop," and arrogated to himself the right of convoking a General Council. How was this met? Not by St. Gregory, but by his predecessor Pope Pelagius II. He wrote a letter to the Council which began in these words:—"Pelagius, to our beloved brethren, all the bishops who have been convoked by illicit summons from John of Constantinople," and went on to say that "the right of convoking the General Council was the privilege of the episcopal See of Blessed Peter." And after the Council had met Pope Pelagius declared its acts null and void, and himself as supreme over the whole, even of the Eastern Church. St. Gregory the Great's objection to the title of "Universal Bishop" was first, that it was against the faith, and secondly, he felt that if the Patriarch of Constantinople were to call himself "Universal" meaning thereby to have exercised universal jurisdiction, there would be in the church two patriarchs, two bishops exercising universal authority, namely, the Pope of Rome, the successor to St. Peter, and the Patriarch of Constantinople. Now, two "universal bishops" could not exist together, for that would imply division and disunion; so when the title was offered to the Pope, they peremptorily refused to accept it. So St. Gregory, following the example of his predecessors, refused to accept it, and from that it had been argued that he did not admit the Papal supremacy. Let them see whether that was true: let them see what was the teaching of his predecessors. His Lordship then quoted from the writings of Pope St. Anastasius, who lived in 399; Pope Innocent I., who lived in 410; St. Boniface, who lived in 419, and who, writing to the bishops assembled at Thessaly, said, "The institution of the Universal Church takes its beginning from the honour bestowed on Blessed Peter, in whom its government and headship reside. It is, therefore, certain that this Church is to the Churches spread all over the whole earth as a head to its own members, and from which Church whatsoever has cut himself off, becomes an alien to the Christian religion." Let him ask if Pius IX. ever said anything stronger than that? Then there was St. Celestine who gave power to St. Cyril to excommunicate and depose Nestorius, who was afflicting the people of Constantinople with heresy. Again, there was St. Sixtus III., and St. Leo, who lived in 440, and excommunicated Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and this he did in presence of the General Council at Chalcedon, and not himself personally, but by two legates. And what had Dioscorus done? He had communicated with a heretic who had been excommunicated by the Pope, and had refused to read a letter sent by the Pope; and refusing to submit to the Pope, the Pope exercised his supremacy in presence of the General Council through his legates, and deposed Dioscorus. And he did this in virtue of being head of the Universal Church and invested with the dignity of the Blessed Peter. The answer of the fathers at the General Council was, "Peter has spoken by Leo," and when writing to the Emperor at Constantinople they said, "Christ, through the admirable Leo, pointed out the way; as he made use of the wisdom of Peter, so has he used the wisdom of Leo." The same Fathers, writing to Leo himself, called him "The constituted interpreter to all of the Blessed Peter," they said he presided over them "as the head over the members," and, again, that to him "is committed by the Lord the custody of the vineyard." This was the testimony of the General Council as to the supremacy of the Pope. Well, this being the doctrine of the predecessors of St. Gregory the Great, was it likely that St. Gregory would hold a very different doctrine? Were they called upon to look upon St. Gregory as the Reformer of the Church of Rome? They were told that St. Gregory held no such doctrine as the supremacy of the Pope. He certainly maintained the doctrine which he had received from his predecessors, and the testimony to that doctrine he had just recited. But what did St. Gregory himself say about his own supremacy? They knew that he had discarded the title of universal bishop, and condemned it. Writing to Eulogius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who had given him the title of universal, and had called his suggestions "commands," St. Gregory upbraided his correspondent for giving him that title, and told him that his (St. Gregory's) suggestions were not to be treated as commands. But he said, "I have been greatly pleased with what you have written in your letter about the See of St. Peter, saying that Peter still continues in the person of his successors." In other letters St. Gregory was constantly speaking of the Roman See in these words, "the Apostolic See," "the head of all the churches," and he called it elsewhere "the head of the fold," and he said also in his correspondence that his solitude was constantly for all the churches of the world. Again, writing to the Emperor, who exercised great power, he did not diminish his own power, but he wrote as of a thing well-known to everybody, "to all who know the Gospel it is manifest that the charge of the whole Church was entrusted by the voice of the Lord to the holy apostle Peter, chief of all the apostles." His doctrine, therefore, was based, not upon the seat of the see in the Imperial city, but upon the Gospel. He said that all the patriarchs of the world were subject to him, and speaking to the Patriarch of Constantinople, in which city the Emperor resided, these were his words, "Concerning the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See?" and again he said, "if any fault be found with the bishops, I know not what bishop is not subject to the Apostolic See, but when no fault requires it all are equal according to the laws of humility." "Was not this a claim to supremacy? Was not this the exercise of authority and jurisdiction? These were the very words of Gregory the Great, and yet they were told that if his maxims had been followed out perhaps the Reformation in England would not have been necessary. Though St. Gregory was a man full of humility and gentleness, willing to yield where he could for the sake of charity, when his authority had been disputed at a city called Salona, he wrote at once to his legate there, "You know how I feel this. I who am ready to die rather than see the Church of the Blessed Apostle lowered in my days. You know my character. I suffered patiently for a long time, but when I am once determined to bear it no longer I readily confront all dangers." In these words of Gregory the Great they saw that he, like all his predecessors, claimed that Papal supremacy, which was held and maintained by the Pope and by Catholics at the present day. St. Gregory's acts were in conformity with his letters. He exercised, during the thirteen years he reigned as Pope, jurisdiction over the Universal Church. In England how much were we indebted to him? Before he was made Pope, he started to come to preach the Gospel to the Anglo-Saxons, but he was brought back by the people of Rome. As soon as he became Pope, he sent St. Augustine, a monk, and a number of other monks to England, to preach the Gospel and to establish the faith. He looked upon England in that respect as subject to his jurisdiction. He told Augustine to found twelve bishoprics; and this was precisely what his successor, Pope Pius IX., did twenty years ago—he founded an archbishopric and twelve bishoprics in England. St. Gregory told Augustine not to pull down the temples of the pagans but to destroy the

majority—for example, at Belfast, where they are two to one; at Lurgan and Portadown, where they are three to one—there is a shameful contrast. In constituencies where the Catholics form the majority, Protestants are frequently elected to Corporations, to Boards of Guardians, to Parliament. In constituencies where Protestants are the majority, Catholics are never elected. It is in Protestant England where the Catholics, who number probably over three millions, have not a single parliamentary representative, though a tolerant spirit is exhibited in electing about a score of Jews to represent their community of perhaps a hundred thousand souls.

Against any "grievous domination of Catholic sentiment" the Irish Protestants may feel secure if they use their common sense in considering their numbers, their wealth, the *prestige* given them by their past ascendancy, their nearness to Protestant England, and the fundamental article in the proposed Home Rule constitution in their favor. Persecution in Ireland has always been of Catholics—never by them. And now on the continent it is only Catholics who are being persecuted, and nowhere Protestants.

I am, sir, your obedient servant.

JOHN MARTIN.

Mr. Martin has also addressed the following letter to the editor of the *Dublin Irish Times*:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS, July 4.

Sir—The recent Home Rule debate is the first regular engagement of the parliamentary campaign which we have entered upon with the two great objects of recovering our National Parliament, and of obtaining an honorable reconciliation with England. I ask leave to offer some remarks upon the circumstances in which this debate has been held, upon its general character, and upon the indications it affords as to the probable course and result of our parliamentary action.

The debate was held under conditions very unfavorable for the Irish side. As a matter of course the Irish representatives had to contend against a vast superiority of numbers. In the London House of Commons we are on ground where our antagonists are at home, and which (as has been well said) has long been carefully surveyed and laid out by them to secure our perpetual defeat. Not many of us had much previous acquaintance with parliamentary action, and, as a party, we had only a few months' training to bring us into proper discipline. As to the main body of us, our strength was nothing, except the righteousness of our cause and our loyalty to our country. But we had for a leader a man of genius—eloquent, well acquainted with his subject, skilled in parliamentary tactics, inspired by passionate love of his own people, and by earnest friendship for the English.

On the English side were leaders of several different parties, all of them masters in Parliamentary tactics, and in the arts and tricks of parliamentary debates, while their followers were excellent in the pride of their country's domination over Ireland, and confident in their superiority of number, and in the *prestige* of uniform success. The English profited by the lateness of the period in the session at which the Home Rule debate came on. This gave them a plausible excuse, in the "pressure of the public business of the country"—that is, of England—for granting no longer time than two days for the debate. Now, nine days were devoted to the Repeal debate of forty years ago (when only thirty seven Irish members had been elected as Nationalists); and nine days might have been well spent on this occasion, in allowing a full and fair discussion. I may state that, of the two days given to this Home Rule debate, by far the greater portion of the time was appropriated by our antagonists; while our spokesmen took care to close the debate by two speeches of their most skillful men (Mr. Lowe and Mr. Disraeli)—speeches to which the impatience of the majority prevented us from replying.

In my opinion it would be an easy task to refute the arguments put forth in the speeches of Messrs. Lowe and Disraeli, as well as to refute all the other arguments employed by opponents of Home Rule throughout the debate. But the fact that the House did not allow a reply to those clever speeches whose drift was to cast ridicule upon the Irish National cause and upon its advocates, probably lost us some English votes in the division. I think, too, that our cause suffered in the estimation of Englishmen disposed to give it fair consideration, owing to the success of the English speakers in seeming to *put us upon our defence*, instead of laboring to explain and justify England's conduct towards us. It was the case over again of the wolf and the lamb of 230p.

Under all the circumstances, I regard the result of the first Parliamentary trial of the Home Rule party as very encouraging. Fifty three Irish members voted, and three paired in favor of the motion. Thirty-six Irish members voted, but none paired) against the motion. Thus we had a majority of twenty among the ninety-two Irish representatives who voted or paired. Notwithstanding the evil effects on English minds caused by the unwarmed speech of Mr. Lowe and Mr. Disraeli, ten English members, including some of the ablest and most respectable members for Great Britain, voted, and one paired, in favor of the motion. Sixty-seven votes recorded for Home Rule in a house of 529 members (tellers and pairs included), I consider a very encouraging first vote upon our question. Of the few Irish representatives who, on this occasion, spoke against Home Rule for their country, some expressed themselves as furious factionists, while the only able speeches delivered by Irish members in behalf of the English side were one inspired by personal spite, and one which evinced the mental struggle in a Protestant, educated in anti-English ideas, but feeling it a duty to inquire fairly into his country's national question. I think Dr. Smyth is in a fair way of converting himself to Home Rule. I hope his example will lead other Northern Protestants of the educated classes to inquire for themselves into the facts of the Irish National question. If they will sincerely and seriously entertain that question, nothing more is needed to make them become Home Rulers.

But the first triumph of our cause in this Parliament can only come through the effects of proceedings outside the House. Ireland has now for the first time since the Union, power in her own hands to elect real representatives—representatives of what has always since that disastrous event been the general opinion and wish of the country. We have not indeed so extended a franchise as our English "follow-subjects." Only one in twenty-five of our population is a parliamentary elector; while one in eleven is an elector in England. But one small electoral body of only 223,000 voters—such is the prevalence of the national sentiment in Ireland—is able to return a great majority of Home Rulers to Parliament. Provided that all persons rated to the amount required for the parliamentary franchise be registered in all the Irish constituencies, I think we may add certainly twelve, and perhaps six more, to the present fifty-nine Home Rule seats. If we could obtain such an extension of the franchise as prevails in England, I think we should have more than eighty Home Rule representatives. With such a pronouncement of Ireland's national wish there would soon be a general feeling among the English members that the interests of "the Empire" (by which they mean England) rendered a friendly agreement with Ireland necessary, and when they examine into our proposal and find it so very moderate as regards our own rights and so very safe as regards their "Empire," I think we shall obtain a majority of English votes in favor of Home Rule.—This happy end of our misery and England's shame may be all the sooner and all the surer accomplished, if the Irish people at home will steadily support the Home Rule movement, and the Irish abroad ex-

hibit their sympathy with it. We will need to be patient and courageous. We have a cause for sake of which our people have made many and terrible sacrifices. Long endurance in this national movement on which we have lately entered, may prove to be needed, but the object is worth long endurance. And our object—our glorious and sacred object—will be attained the sooner, if our people will prove to the world that they are resolved never to give up their national cause, never to cease from vigorous and national efforts in its favor, but to work and wait until they succeed.—I am, sir, sincerely yours,

JOHN MARTIN.

THE LATE HOME RULE DEBATE.

Looked at as a whole, the Irish people have good reason to be satisfied with the great Home Rule debate and with the division by which it closed. The case of Ireland was laid before the Imperial Parliament with an earnestness, a moderation, and a fullness worthy of the vital importance of the issue, and of the illustrious assembly which the orators addressed. Between the Irish and English people there intervenes a vast wall of misunderstanding, misconception, and suspicion. That wall has been a building for seven miserable centuries; it cannot be removed in an hour, but this week it has been shaken to its foundations by the battering rams of Truth. If the balance of numbers lay against Home Rule, the balance of logic and reason was with it. Mr. Butt poured into the enemy a rhetorical broadside, the effect of which will not soon be forgotten. Notably telling were those passages in his speech in which he reviewed the short but glorious history of Irish nationality, the history of that memorable period of eighteen years, in which Irish liberty, Irish literature, Irish art, Irish commerce, flamed by the healthy glow of national freedom, blazed into such an effulgence of glory and prosperity. Mr. John George McCarthy enriched the discussion with a powerful speech, strengthened by the teachings of those historical examples of which the hon. member has been so diligent and so successful a student. Mr. McCarthy Downing, with characteristic acumen, distinguished between the Scotch Union—a solemn treaty, adopted with the consent of the Scotch nation, and in which the rights and privileges of that nation were carefully guarded—and the Irish Union, won by a combination of force and fraud at which history stands aghast and cynicism itself does not dare to justify. Speeches such as these, and those delivered by The O'Conor Don, Sir C. O'Loughlin, Colonel White, and other honorable members, contrast most favorably with the utterances on the opposite side. The glittering rhetoric of Professor Smyth, the fervent zeal of The O'Donoghue, were but poor bucklers for the opposition to Home Rule. As for the Ministry, Sir Michael H. Brench—again adopting the roll of *enfant terrible*—summoned up imaginary menaces to meet them with counter threats. Ireland can afford to despise these threats, but vapourings is a dialectic weapon which ill befits a man holding so delicate and so important a post as the Chief Secretaryship for Ireland. The Prime Minister appeared in his old role of the jester, but we believe that Home Rule is too healthy a plant to be blasted by Sir Michael Brench's bluster or Mr. Disraeli's badinage. Passing from the debate to the division, it would show a singular want of acquaintance with political history if we were to allow ourselves to be alarmed by the fact that on the first occasion on which the subject of Home Rule was fairly raised before the House of Commons it was defeated by a majority of 458 to 61. Why, almost every one of the great reforms which are now immutable portions of our Constitution have, on their first introduction to Parliamentary notice, met with hostile votes even more crushing than that recorded yesterday morning. Let us take a few examples. In 1806 Catholic Emancipation had been for a long time before the public. It was supported by some of the greatest men in both Houses of Parliament; by Pitt and Fox, by Holland and Grey. Yet in 1806 a motion in favour of Catholic Emancipation was rejected in the Lords by 178 to 49, and in the Commons by 336 to 124. Twenty years afterwards the most powerful Minister who has ever ruled in Britain—the Iron Duke—the hero of a hundred fights, was compelled to throw open the gates of the Constitution to the Catholic subjects of the King. Let us take a more striking example. In 1851 Mr. Lambton moved a resolution in the House of Commons in favor of Parliamentary Reform. Only 43 votes were given in support of his proposition. Ten years afterwards popular indignation swept away the whole fabric of rotten boroughs and purchased seats. When George Grote commenced his agitation for the Ballot he met in the House of Commons with defeats utter, crushing, complete. He retired disgusted from Parliament to become the historian of Greece. And yet it was given to him, before his pure and useful life was closed, to see the system of secret voting established in Great Britain. On the 13th of May, 1810, Mr. Parnell moved a resolution for a select committee to inquire into the Irish Tithes question. He was, of course, defeated, only 50 members voting with him. Honorable members who took part in that discussion lived to see the Irish Tithes not only inquired into but abolished. We need scarcely say that the great principles which underlie the Church and Land Acts were, when they first appeared in the Parliamentary arena, opposed by majorities larger than that yesterday morning polled against Home Rule. We see no reason to be in the least cast down by either debate or division. If the spirits of the just made perfect derive pleasure from the contemplation of terrene events, with what joy must our great Tribune contemplate the debates and the division—a debate opened by the Socrates of the City Hall discussion—a division in which the Home Rule vote was swelled by many English members, and was almost twice as numerous as the largest cast in the palmiest days of Repeal.—*Dublin Freeman*.

"THE O'DONOGHUE"—A PEN PORTRAIT.  
(From the *Louisville Catholic Advocate*.)

Who has not heard of William Cobbett, the author of the "History of the Reformation?" One of the clever things he said was to forestall to the Irish in 1826. "In twenty years the potato will become effects in your Island." Like Casanova, he was not listened to; but the very year his prophecy fell due the people beheld with disgust how the potato was more than effects. Another clever saying of his was to O'Connell on his entrance into Parliament: "Dan, see that your wings do not get scorched." There is warning in the words to all public men. Cobbett had been a private soldier, and rose, not in the army list, but to be one of the foremost men in Great Britain, and to take his place among the senators of the land. Here he was surrounded with genius, rank, culture, wealth, refinement, all of which had been brought to bear like so much temptation on the incorruptible man of the people. Unlike the moth that flies in narrowing circles around the candle till it gets sucked into the little maelstrom of light, Cobbett saw the danger; and, in turn, put O'Connell on his guard. O'Connell heeded the warning. Not so his kinsman, The O'Donoghue, who, thirty years after, entered Parliament with a prospect before him such as few young men have had. He was then the best looking officer at Aldershot, and few cared to joke him on his Kerry extraction. His maiden speech was a splendid success. Even the Prince of Wales came down to the House to hear him. He made some clever hits while yet he "met them warm and young" with all his truth about him. He next attracted the public notice by challenging Sir Robert Peel, then the Secretary for Ireland. Peel showed the "white feather." Then old Palmerston got around The O'Donoghue; explanations followed; Pam got Peel out of the clutches of the Irish fire-