

total rejection of Christ's mediatorial work and a renunciation of Gospel ordinances, but by a pretty general substitution of them for Christ?

In the above remarks, I have spoken of principles, not persons; the creed of a party, not the errors of individuals. "In omnibus caritas."

As good Christians, may love to Jehovah-Jesus be our only enthusiasm;—as good colonial subjects, may loyalty to our patriot sovereign, the Queen of queens, be our only idolatry;—as good Catholics, may our common motto ever be "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism;" and grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

H. B. W.

Stony Creek, Dec. 23, 1870.

#### LEGACIES.

To the Editor of the Church Observer.

SIR,—In my humble opinion, the richest legacy that one can bestow upon their sons and daughters is a sound education. With your kind permission I beg to offer for the consideration of your readers the following remarks upon this subject, with a sincere hope that its discussion may be productive of good.

We boast of many noble institutions which have been erected in this city for the education of our boys and girls; but, admirable as they all are admitted to be as day schools, it cannot be denied that a great want is still universally felt to exist in this community. I allude to the need of a Protestant institution for the education of young ladies. When parents or guardians are remonstrated with for their inconsistency in sending their daughters to Roman Catholic convent schools for education, they very justly reply, "Provide us with Protestant institutions and we will send our daughters there." Point to Mrs. So-and-so's academy, and the reply comes, "We cannot afford to pay the high fees demanded by that lady—our daughters receive as good an education at the convent for one half the amount." Tell them that the religious opinions of their children will be tampered with at convents, and they will assure you there is no danger of their daughters being influenced in any way—their principles are too well fixed, &c. What a delusion! Aside from the religious influence which is brought to bear upon the minds of pupils at these convents, I was struck with the absurdity of a general order, said to have been issued last week to the "Superieures," by the Roman Catholic Bishop of this diocese, "that none of the inmates thereof, whether Protestant or Roman, should be permitted to spend the Christmas holidays with their parents, but must remain in the institutions, and take part in the 'special services' that were to be held for the purpose of invoking Divine aid for the reinstating of the Pope on his throne!" But, to return to my subject. In order to obtain the erection of a Protestant institution for the education of young ladies, I propose, by united action of all Protestant denominations in this city, to raise the sum of at least fifty thousand dollars, with which to erect a building to accommodate five hundred boarding pupils. This amount, I consider, would be ample, if judiciously handled, to pay for ground and building—careful estimates having demonstrated this fact. At a charge of one hundred and thirty dollars a year per pupil, a thorough first class education could be given, besides board and lodging.

One method of raising the money would be by voluntary subscriptions; another by giving scholarships on a sliding scale; another by borrowing on security of the property—say at six per cent. interest,—to pay off the loan in ten years. The latter plan I look upon as the most feasible, and offer the following figures as proof:—

Say 400 boarders at \$130 each .....	\$52,000
Cost of boarding (including teachers and servants) .....	\$36,000
Interest on \$50,000 at 6 per c. ....	3,000
Sinking fund at 10 p. c. p. an. ....	5,000
Incidentals and repairs .....	2,000
	—\$52,000

Hoping to hear something on this subject either from yourself or from some able correspondent, I remain, dear sir, yours truly,

Montreal, Dec. 26, 1870.

T. R. J.

#### THE LAME-ONE (LAYMAN) AND CHEERYBLES.

To the Editor of the Church Observer:

SIR,—With your permission I wish to say a few words on the subject of a letter, signed "Layman," commenting upon the entertainment which took place at the Cathedral school-room on the evening of Monday, December 19. The extract to which I particularly wish to allude appeared in the columns of your paper, of December 21st, and ran as follows:—

"As I entered, a benevolent-looking gentleman, who, from his appearance, might have been one of the Cheeryble Brothers, was mounting the platform, and announced that he would read a selection from *Martin Chuzzlewit*. I have not made the works of this author my resource either for literary food or literary entertainment, and I cannot, therefore, give you chapter and verse for the passage. It seemed to be an interview between some punch-imbibing beadle or undertaker and his family, and Mrs. Sairey Gamp, a monthly nurse, whose duties made it necessary that she should have her porter 'reg'lar.' The conversation on the occasion was of that edifying description which might be expected from such a person. The boisterous laughs of the punch-imbibing character were very well rendered, but the remain-

der of the passage was given in the style of any ordinary good reader."

Now, sir, it does not often—even at Christmastide—fall to the lot of one individual to be the happy recipient of so large an amount of evidently sincere flattery as is conveyed in the above extract.

We are pronounced "benevolent-looking," "a good reader," and, lastly, we are compared to two of the most worthy and admirable characters in modern fiction—"the brothers Cheeryble."

We make no allusion to the good or bad taste of the writer in dealing in personalities, because, in the first place, we do not think him to be possessed of sufficient delicacy of mind to understand us; and, secondly, because we feel that we have to thank "Layman" for excellent testimonials furnished on very short notice, no matter how different his intention in writing.

"Layman" has drawn our portrait "benevolence," "Cheerybleness," and all complete. We do not object—far from it!—the result being so eminently satisfactory, and no charge made. Still, we never asked "Layman" to take it, and, therefore, feel sure that he will not object to our taking a fancy sketch of himself as he appeared to our mind's eye as we concluded the perusal of his letter to the *Church Observer*; the more so, as we shall confine ourselves to nearly the same points as those upon which he has remarked on us,—and no charge.

And first, touching appearance: Never having, to our own knowledge, set eyes upon "Layman," it would be, to the last degree, presumptuous on our part to assert positively that he is not "benevolent-looking." Let us hope for the best. But if he is—why, then, his letter sadly belie his looks!

Of "Layman's" reading we have had no opportunity of judging. Of his good taste in the exercise of the kindred accomplishment, however, perhaps the less said the better. It is Christmas, and we do not wish to be severe!

And to whom shall we compare him? We cast our eyes down "Layman's" letter, and (comparing very small things with great) viewing the paltry spitefulness of the man more than defeated by the imbecility of his pen, we are reminded of the prophet of old, who, with a heart filled with curses and bitterness, had yet only fair words and blessings on his lips. In the foreground towers the majestic form of Balaam, while with drooping crest and dangling rein, cropping sedately the herbage of that holy sod, stands "Layman's" lineal progenitor. Literally, a "speaking likeness."

Yours, &c.

"BENEVOLENT CHEERYBLES."

#### THE JEWS IN ROME.

##### A CHAPTER OF PAPAL INTOLERANCE.

Some Romish journals recently hinted that the present "situation" in the Eternal City had been brought about by the Jews. The reactionary power of human nature is well ascertained. And it would not be surprising if a race so notoriously maltreated by the Papacy, as the Roman Jews, should turn the tables on His Holiness now. It has become the custom of such unscrupulous apologists of Roman usages as Archbishop Manning, and the *Catholic World*, of New York, to assert that the Papal government has been remarkable for its equity and toleration. The *Civiltà Cattolica*, by the convenient process of ignoring everything, has frequently boasted of this. The condition of the Israelite colony of the Ghetto will show, that wherever Rome has the power, she is selfish and arbitrary. The late Vatican Synod has only converted her worst features into articles of faith,—making persecution and intolerance necessary to the salvation of a devout Romanist—a circumstance calculated to excite distrust between them and their Protestant fellow citizens. (Vide canons *De Fide*, vi. and xii.) The bishops are placed in an anomalous position. If they obey the new decrees, they violate the constitution—both English and American. If they disobey them, they violate their consecration oath. Let such men as Father Bottalla and M. Veillot attempt to re-write history if they will; their task must be incomplete and abortive. The testimony of ages is complete as to the noted unkindness of the Papacy. The Jews illustrate it fully. When the Popes succeeded the Cæsars, they emulated their worst acts toward this outcast people. By the Aurelian Council (A.D. 540) the Jews were prohibited from holding intercourse with Christians in holy week. The Lateran Council of Innocent III. decreed that they should wear certain badges, that they might be shunned and avoided, They

had been formerly compelled to sacrifice to the Emperors, and for them. The Popes changed this usage into simple homage. Upon the installation of the Pope, a deputation of Roman Jews was obliged to present themselves to the Pope, on the way of his triumphal procession, singing songs in his praise, and carrying on their shoulders a copy of the Pentateuch, written on parchment and bound in gold. On their knees they presented it to him, beseeching his protection. The Pope took the book, read a few words of it, and then putting it behind him, said, "We affirm the law, but we curse the Hebrew people and their exposition of it!" The spot on which this homage was generally offered was at the Bridge of Hadrian,—the second destroyer of Jerusalem. The ill-treatment which the Jews experienced at the hands of the mob became ultimately so excessive that, in 1484, Innocent VIII. received them in the enclosure of the Castle St. Angelo. At the accession of Leo X., the Jews stood before the door of the Castle St. Angelo, on a wooden scaffold, covered with gold brocade and silken carpets, and bearing eight burning wax tapers. When the Pope rode by on his white palfrey, they held up the tables of the law, of the law, and were cursed in the usual manner. Subsequent Popes, such as Gregory XIV. compelled them to decorate, with their richest tapestries and embroideries, the detested Arch of Titus, built to commemorate their own degradation and the destruction of the Holy City. These tapestries bear upon a gold ground, embroidered emblems designated by the Pope, with Latin texts taken from the Old and New Testaments. The Scriptural are confusedly interwoven with Pagan emblems, sometimes very absurd. Apollo, Moses, Minerva, the Virgin, Popes, &c., group amicably together to illustrate scriptural texts. In the 13th century, Innocent III. re-enacted the decrees of the Council ordering the Jews to wear ignominious badges, and from this time forward, for two centuries, they were ruthlessly oppressed. John XII. in 1316, prohibited the use of the Talmud, and ordered it to be publicly burnt. In 1421 Eugenius IV. banned them from the city, forbade them to hold any public office, and decreed that their testimony should not avail in any court of justice against that of a Christian. Besides loading them with taxes, he first conceived the happy thought of making their degradation subservient to the festivities of the Carnival. With this view, he mulcted them of an annual fine of 1130 scudi (gold dollars) in order to defray its expenses. From this day forwards, one of the principal amusements of the Carnival was to maltreat the Jews. The sport proved so excellent that Cardinals and Monsignors freely took part in it. In 1468, Paul II. ordained the races of this wretched people, in the Corso, and gave form and law to the cruelty of the mob. The programme of ignominy was this: First, a body of Jewish elders preceded the cavalcade of the senators who opened the Carnival. They were then obliged to run races every day. The course was a mile in length, and amid the howls and shrieks of the delighted bystanders, who showered upon them as they passed the most insulting and disgraceful epithets, the poor old Jews stumbled along the crowded Corso. In 1668, Clement IX. absolved the Jews from this, on payment of a tax of 300 scudi and the furnishing of prizes for the races. On the first Sunday of the Carnival (last in Epiphany), a deputation of the chiefs of the Jews went bareheaded to the Palace of the Capitol, where were the conservators of the Roman Senate. Here they threw themselves on their knees, presenting bouquets of flowers and 20 scudi, which they prayed him to apply to the decoration of the balcony of the Roman Senators. Then they proceeded to the Senator, and, kneeling, besought his permission to remain in the Ghetto during the ensuing year. The Senator replied, after a formula, that though they were not acceptable to Rome, yet that out of pity, they would be allowed to remain. In 1655, Paul IV. was made Pope. To him the Christians owed the Inquisition and the Index; the Jews, the revocation of every privilege. By the Bull *cum nimis absurdum*, Jewish physicians were prohibited from practising; they were disabled from carrying on any trade or handicraft; from the purchase and sale of merchandize; heavy tributes were imposed upon them; and they were prohibited from all commerce with Christians. They were compelled to wear as a badge, the

men a yellow hat, the women a yellow veil. They were assigned certain limits for habitation, in the most unhealthy part of the city. On one occasion, when the Tiber inundated that quarter, they petitioned to come out; and were told that "water could not hurt them." In addition to these outrages, the Inquisition did its holy office upon them. The Bull of Caraffa was confirmed by Paul V., and the gates of Ghetto were ordered to be closed at the *Ave Maria*, after which no one could pass in or out. They were confined to one description of trade by Innocent VIII., "stracci, ferracci," old clothes, and old iron. Benedict XIV. in 1749, allowed them to sell new cloth. But they cannot to this day acquire and hold land. The Church, by its edicts, utterly demoralized them, and left them no reputable means of living. The curse re-acted. They took to questionable methods of securing their livelihood, and in turn demoralized their persecutors. The women go about sewing and mending old and new clothes. The men go about the streets by day, buying cast off garments and rags, or any depreciated article on which the owner wishes to raise money. By night, with their basket on their back and a lantern in their hand, they rake over the refuse heaps in the streets, picking out from them bits of broken glass, rags, and paper. So contaminating is the locality of the Ghetto, that every ecclesiastic, as he hastily passes through it, recites the *Credo* and crosses himself. The author of *Stato vero degli Ebrei in Roma*, estimates the tribute exacted from them in five years to have amounted to 79,470 scudi. In 1846, the Jews experienced a gleam of sunshine from the accession of Pius IX.: they were exempted from compulsory attendance at Mass in the church of St. Angelo in Pesceira, &c. But on the return of His Holiness from Gaeta, the old tyrannical regime was reinstated. Though the rights of the Jews were not formally repealed, they were silently withdrawn and so obstructed as to become inoperative. Many of the richest Jews left the city. In 1842 there were 12,700 Jews in the Pontifical States. In 1853 the number was reduced to 9237. Their present treatment is shameful, intolerant and unchristian. They are branded with ignominy, oppressed by taxes, and reduced to poverty by laws which belong to barbarous ages. Shut up in the Ghetto, and forced to earn a miserable livelihood by the meanest traffic, they are then scorned as a filthy and dishonest people. Forbidden to raise their heads, the church that has crushed them under its decrees, points at them the finger of scorn because they creep and crawl beneath their burdens. The favours granted them are hypocritical and visionary—the injuries alone are real. They are prohibited from holding any civil, political or military office, and from the exercise of any profession or trade of public credit, such as that of advocate, notary, attorney, librarian, goldsmith, manufacturer, smith, stone-cutter, and the like. The public schools and gymnasias are all closed to them, and all institutions of beneficence and charity, such as hospitals and houses of refuge, and this, notwithstanding that they are founded and maintained by taxation weighing as heavily on the Jew as on any other citizen. In the courts of justice they are placed under a special law. Their testimony is not admitted in civil questions, and all notarial acts and papers signed by them as witnesses are declared null. In criminal cases they may testify, but however rich, honourable, or virtuous, their word could not counterbalance that of the vilest Catholic. They must have a special passport to travel within the Roman States, and wherever they go, the bishop or inquisitor can arbitrarily expel them at any moment. Their stay in each place is limited by these functionaries, and they pay a fine for the privilege. They are at once imprisoned if they overstay it. Their family rights are shamefully violated. A baptism effected upon a child, before he is of age to be conscious of its importance, is sufficient to entitle the church to take it from its parents, and to prohibit all future intercourse. Any Jew who becomes a Christian is maintained ever after by a tax levied on his former co-religionists. A Jewish father and husband is not recognized as such on becoming a Christian. He has no right to live with his family. The Canonical law orders every convert to Christianity to make an offer to the church of his or her relations; and if in such cases the relatives refuse to become Christians, they are released on payment of a fine. Edmond About tells a droll