

Whether it be not impious to suppose that God has pledged himself to impart, by inevitable necessity, the gift of the "Holy Ghost" to an unholy man—merely on the performance of external rites, and to qualify him for the performance of the functions of a purely moral institute, though still morally unfit? We can understand, it may be said, how, by the overruling Providence of God, a bad man preaching the truth may do some good, if the hearer (a rare case) has both sense and honesty to separate truth from him who propounds it. But if he be ignorant of the truth, and preach "pernicious error," (as thousands so ordained have done,) we cannot conceive how his preaching can have the effect of truth, simply because he is "commissioned." Yet this, no less an authority than Mr. Melville asserts, in language as plain as the doctrine itself is mystical.*

In like manner, if it be supposed that the sacraments are only external signs of affecting and momentous truths, and that the benefit derived from them still depends on the moral and spiritual dispositions of the recipient, we can understand that they may be beneficial, even when he who administers them may be a bad man. In both the above cases, however, as the effect is a moral one, that effect will be proportionably diminished by the conviction of the worthlessness of the officiating priest. This necessarily results from the laws of our moral nature. It is impossible to get the generality of men to revere that which their teachers practically despise; to obey precepts rather than imitate example. As all history shows, it is impossible long to maintain religion when the priest is himself irreligious. But that, by a divinely ordained necessity, some preternatural efficacy, itself certified by no evidence either of sense, or consciousness, is conveyed through the minister merely because he has been episcopally ordained, (however wicked or worthless he may be,) and which is withheld when that ordination is wanting, (however worthy and holy he may be) who can really believe? Nothing but the most express revelation, or the most undeniable effects, could attest it. And both the one and the other the advocates of the dogma are avowedly unable to indicate.

At these, and all other arguments, the supporter of the doctrine only shakes his head in awful warning, proclaims his horror of "rationalistic" presumption, and asserts, that by implicit faith alone can it be received. In this we believe him.

But is it, can it be true, that Christians will be content to receive these strange conclusions? Are they willing to sacrifice even charity itself to an absurdity? Powerful as are the arguments on all hands against this paradox, none is so powerful with us as this. The advocates of the Oxford system, when they are destitute of arguments, (which may be represented as their ordinary condition,) are fond of appealing to our moral feelings; if we do not know, they tell us that we may feel the truth of a certain conclusion. Without being, we trust, in the same miserable destitution of argument, we would fearlessly adopt their course on the present occasion. We feel that if there were nothing else to say, there is no proposition in Mathematics more certain, than that a dogma which consigns the Lutheran, the Scottish, and indeed the whole reformed Non-Episcopal clergy to contempt, however holy; and which necessarily authenticates the claims of every Episcopal Priest, however unholy—must be utterly alien from the spirit of the institute of the New Testament.

2. Equally extravagant are the notions entertained by this School on the subject of the Sacraments. With them, they are not simply expressive rites, symbolical of religious doctrines, and capable of awakening religious emotion through the medium of the senses and the imagination;—they are themselves the *media* of a "supernatural grace,"—exclusively communicated, however, through the Episcopally-ordained minister. This supernatural influence is supposed to be conveyed, in every case, in which secret infidelity or open vice offers no obstruction on the part of the subject of the rite. It is supposed to be actually conveyed, therefore, in every case of infant baptism, (the subject being there incapable of offering any obstruction,) and to involve that stupendous and mysterious change, called in Scripture "regeneration;" and which surely ought to imply, if we consider either the meaning of the term, or the nature of the institute, a moral revolution equivalent to an absolute subjection of the law of Christianity. In the eucharist it is supposed that infidelity or unworthiness in the recipient may obstruct the "preternatural grace," which nevertheless is, as it were, flowing through the priest, and permeating the elements. Such a state of mind may operate as a sort of non-conductor to the ethereal and subtle influence. Meantime, it is most strange that this "preternatural grace," which is represented as so scrupulous, has no objection to reside with the Priest, and act in and by him, even though he should be, morally, ten thousand times worse than those to whom the rite is administered!

The doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," is indeed held by many men who are far from approving of the Oxford movement. With the peculiar, yet, we must be permitted to think, consistent audacity of the new School, its advocates have carried it out to its uttermost extravagance.

It probably will not be doing injustice to the generality of the disciples of this School, (though they do not conceal that there are some differences,) if we further state that their sentiments on the subject of the Sacraments are pretty generally represented by those of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman. The former contends that not only is the dread mysterious change called "regeneration," effected in every case of baptism rightly administered; but that there is no certain hope of the pardon of sin wilfully committed after it; and that he who has once so sinned, must live in perpetual and trembling doubt of his final safety. If so, one would think, that as Scripture assu-

* Mr. Melville expressly affirms, "If, whensoever the minister is himself deficient and untaught, so that his sermons exhibit a *wrong system of doctrine*, you will not allow that Christ's Church may be profited by the ordinance of preaching; you clearly argue that Christ has given up his office, and that he can no longer be styled, "the minister of the true Tabernacle;" when every thing seems against the true followers of Christ, so that, on a *casual calculation*, you would suppose the services of the Church stripped of all efficacy; then, by acting faith on the head of the ministry, they are instructed and nourished, though, IN THE MAIN, the given lesson be FALSEHOOD, and the proffered sustenance little better than POISON.

† "The Church," he says, "has no second baptism to give, and so she cannot pronounce him (who sins after baptism) altogether free from his past sins. There are but two periods of absolute cleansing, baptism and the day of judgment."—Letter to Bishop of Oxford, p. 93, 4th edition.)

‡ "After having been washed once for all in Christ's blood, we again sin, there is no more such complete absorption in this life—no restoration to the same undisturbed security in which God had by baptism placed us."—(See also Tract No. 59, p. 46)

redly has no express command on the subject, these men would be disposed to postpone the rite of baptism to a late period; instead of administering it to those who as yet have no sins to repent of, and leaving them to sin (as they assuredly must) with the knowledge that the only plenary antidote was improvidently wasted before they were permitted to have a voice in the matter. One cannot wonder that if this doctrine be true, thousands in the much admired Church of the age of Chrysostom and Ambrose, should have thriftily put off the performance of this wonder-working rite to the very last extremity. Only think of the system: A child is baptized when a few days old; he commits a mortal sin when he is (say) sixteen years of age; he lives to ninety; and with the New Testament and its numberless promises in his hand, he is to spend nearly eighty years in perplexity and anguish, and die in doubt at last, though truly penitent, devout, and consistent; because somebody applied the baptismal water before he had any voice in the proceeding! But further, as all have committed sin after baptism, all are in the same predicament, and can entertain but a trembling hope of heaven! Can Christian men and women believe this hideous system to belong to the Gospel?

The difficulties of this subject have constrained Dr. Pusey to make the convenient Romish distinction between *venial* and *mortal* sins; although in the case of those who have committed "mortal" sin after baptism, he has not been able to hit upon a method half so sure and satisfactory as the "penances," and "indulgences" of Rome. In fact, Dr. Pusey does not see his way clear to any remedy. The doubt and the anguish are part of "the bitterness of ancient medicine."

Again, with their peculiar views of the exclusive prerogatives of the episcopally-ordained Priest, they deny the validity of all baptism but their own; and in defiance of the law of their own Church, and of decency, charity and common sense, often refuse to inter an infant who has not passed under their own patent process of regeneration. The consequence is, that they throw doubt (and many of them do not scruple to avow it) on the final state of the myriads of unbaptized infants. Whether they are, as some of the Fathers believed, neither happy nor miserable—consigned to a state of joyless apathy, or condemned to eternal suffering—we are all, it seems, in the dark. We may hope the best, but that is all the comfort that can be given us. To a Christian contemplating this world of sorrow, it has ever been one of the most delightful sources of consolation, that the decree which involved even infancy in the sentence of death, has converted a great part of the primeval curse into a blessing and has peopled heaven with myriads of immortals, who, after one brief pang of unremembered sorrow, have laid down for ever the burdens of humanity. It has been the dear belief of the Christian mother, that the provisions of the great spiritual economy are extended to the infant whom she brought forth in sorrow, and whom she committed to the dust with a sorrow still deeper; that he will assuredly welcome her to the gates of Paradise, arrayed in celestial beauty, and radiant with a cherub's smile. But all these gloriously sustaining hopes must be overcast in order to keep the mystical power of "regeneration" exclusively in the hands of the Episcopal Clergy. All charity, all decency, all humanity, as well as common sense, are to be outraged, rather than the power of conferring some inconceivable "nonentity" should be abandoned.

As to the Eucharist; if the doctrine of the Oxford School, especially according to the latest "development," be any thing less mysterious or more intelligible than the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation, we confess we cannot perceive it. That there is some great ineffable change wrought by the formulas of consecration, we are expressly told, but what, is not explained;

On the alleged mysterious efficacy attending the administration of the Sacrament at the hand of the privileged priesthood, (what their personal character is, it appears, little matters,) similar observations may be made as upon the mysterious "gift" handed down in ordination from hand to hand? What is it? Is it any thing which can be distinguished from a nonentity—seeing that it is not cognizable by sense, consciousness, or experience? Take baptismal regeneration, for example. What is imparted—what effected? If any change be produced, it surely ought to be stupendous, in order to justify the application of such a term; and it surely ought to be moral, for moral excellence is the design of the whole institute. Yet we look in vain for any such effects, or rather for any effects at all. Millions of the infants thus annually regenerated, present in all respects just the very same qualities—physical and moral—with those who have not been subjected to the process.

* "What the distinction between lesser and greater, *venial* and *mortal* sins? or if *mortal* sins be "sins against the Decalogue," as St. Augustine says, are they only the highest degrees of those sins, or are they the lower also? This question, as it is a very distressing one, I would gladly answer if I could or dared. But as with regard to the sin against the Holy Ghost, so here, also, Scripture is silent. I certainly, much as I have laboured, have not yet been able to decide any thing. Perhaps it is therefore concealed, lest man's anxiety to hold onward to the avoiding of all sin should wax cold. But now, since the degree of *venial* iniquity, [what is *venial* iniquity?] if perceived in, is unknown, the eagerness to make progress by more instant continuance in prayer is quickened, and the carefulness to make holy friends of the mammon of unrighteousness is not desisted."—Pusey, cited by M'Ilvaine. See also Letter to Bishop of Oxford, p. 83, 4th edition.

† "But I will rather suggest the consideration of the vastness of the power claimed by the Church—a power which places it almost on a level with God himself—the power of forgiving sins by wiping them out in baptism—of transferring souls from Hell to Heaven, without admitting a doubt of it, as when 'baptized infants,' it is said, 'dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.'"—Sewell's *Christian Morals*, p. 274.

‡ See Mr. Newman on Art XXVIII., Number Ninety. "As regards the Holy Communion," says even Mr. Gladstone, "our Church . . . does not feel that the solemn words of the holy institution of the Eucharist are adequately, that is, scripturally, represented by any explanation which resolves them into mere figure; and she fears lest the faithful be thus defrauded of their consolation, and of their spiritual food."—Gladstone's *Church Principles*, p. 161.

Again—"There is no one passage in the New Testament which alludes to the Eucharist at all, which is otherwise than most naturally consistent (to say the least) with the idea of its mysterious and miraculous character."—*British Critic*, July 1842, p. 73.

Again—"What is the meaning of the popular phrase, 'the age of miracles'? Is there all the difference, or, indeed, any thing more than the difference between things seen and unseen, (a difference worth nothing in faith's estimate)—between healing the sick and converting the soul—raising man's natural body and raising him in baptism from the death of sin? Is the wonder wrought at the marriage of Cana a miracle, and the change which the holy elements undergo, as consecrated by the priest, and received by the faithful, no miracle simply because the one was perceptible to the natural eye, while the other is discerned by the spiritual alone?"—*British Critic*, vol. xvii. pp. 259, 260.

This transcends all. We always thought that the very essence of a miracle consisted in its appealing to the senses of those in whose presence it is wrought. "It is wrought in their presence," virtually says this writer, "and is as wonderful a miracle as raising the dead, only you cannot see it—a difference worth nothing in faith's estimate." For similar doctrine see Tract 85, p. 95.

Visibly do they grow up, neither wiser, nor holier, nor better than the less fortunate infant who has been subjected to the unavailing baptism of the Presbyterian minister; or to no baptism at all. Here an amazing spiritual revolution, to describe which metaphor and hyperbole are exhausted, is supposed to be effected, which yet leaves absolutely no traces behind it—whether physical or moral. Nothing less than Omnipotence is introduced to effect that, of which, when effected, we have not the slightest evidence that it has been effected!

(To be continued.)

Punch.

THE UNCLÉS OF ENGLAND

Perhaps of all the varieties of relationship into which mankind is divided, none claims our gratitude or obtains our interest so freely as Our Uncles. They may be truly said to represent the benevolence of the country; for it is the business of their lives to lend. They amass wealth with no other object than to distribute it amongst their fellow creatures in small loans, provided the security be good. Theirs is the delightful privilege of helping the needy and succouring the distressed, at the rate of twenty per cent. per annum. They set up tabernacles in bye-places to do "good by stealth;" and—when the interest they take in, or rather from, the objects of their benevolence is too excessive to be hidden from the magistracy and the people—they "blush to find it fame." They are, in truth, a shrinking, modest, and—judge from the frequency with which they give up business and live in the country—a retiring race. They tremble lest their good deeds should be blazoned too openly; and, with a delicate regard to the feelings of the poor, screen their necessities from public gaze by inviting them to bolt themselves into small temporary habitations.

In this free, merry, and happy land, the Uncles are numerous, though their nephews predominate; for it is a law of nature that cozeners should be fewer than cousins. The Uncles of England are in fact the active agents of a grand system of Nepotism: they allure all sorts and conditions of men into the bonds of relationship, and are ever anxious to provide, that is to do for them. The deed of family contract generally consists of a diminutive paste-board indenture, and the ceremony observed is nearly the same as that anciently followed in love-plights; only instead of a coin being severed the card is cut in half, each party keeping a moiety. By this affecting formula the pledge is taken, and the pledger taken in—amongst the large family of those who have so often occasion to speak in affectionate terms of "My Uncle." And no wonder! for his first act is to provide you with a little ready-money.

Nor does his friendly care end here: his regard for your welfare is almost paternal. He checks extravagance, and enforces economy; he takes care of your little superfluities, relieves your wife of the bother of locking up her jewels, and puts by your clothes in the neatest manner, so that you may not wear the nap off.

The manifold obligations I am under to my own private and particular Uncle here, inspired me with the following poetical tribute to the virtues of the entire race. I honour and esteem them. They have been liberal relatives to myself and wife. But for them, we should have often gone without wine with our dinner, and been obliged to stay away from many an evening party for the want of means to pay the hackney-coachman. Thank Heaven! in this favoured country, while one has a spare coat or a superfluous snuff-box, one need never want a sovereign to spend, or an Uncle to lend it.

MY UNCLE.

Who, by a transmutation bold,
Turns clothes or watches, new and old,
Or any other goods, to gold?—
My Uncle!

Who, by a duplication rare,
Makes Hunger's chattels (scant and bare)
Produce first cash, and then good fare?—
My Uncle!

Who, when my credit got quite low,
Handed me cash on Jane's *trousseau*,
And lent a suite of paste for show?—
My Uncle!

Who caused her silks our mouths to fill,
And made my full-dress shirt with frill
Discharge a fortnight's butcher's bill?—
My Uncle!

When creditors, a ruthless crew,
Had "small accounts just coming due,"
Who stopped their clamorous tongues? Why you,
My Uncle!

And when attorneys round me pressed
With writs of judgment and arrest,
Who set for weeks their quills at rest?—
My Uncle!

Who lent us hundreds three and four,
And kindly kept our plate secure,
When we commenced our foreign tour?
My Uncle!

PUNCH'S NOY'S MAXIMS.

48. *Consuetudo est altera lex. Custom is another law.*—Custom has the force of law; and it has been wisely said that the law is a very awkward customer. Custom reconciles us to law, as the eels are said to be reconciled to being skinned, when they are used to it. Plowden says that the common-law is all founded on common use; but we say, that some of these common uses are uncommonly useless. Different places and manners have different customs, and of course different manners; but in some places, where custom is very strict, the law loses its manners altogether.

49. *Exceptio semper ultimo ponenda est. The exception is always placed at the end.*—This maxim applies to deeds, where what is to be excepted must come at last; but if it were necessary to add to law proceedings whatever is exceptional, there would sometime be no end to them.

50. *Dona clandestina sunt semper suspiciosa. Clandestine gifts are always suspicious.*—Thus, if the lady's-maid on the stage tries to give a note to the walking-gentleman behind the old man's back, it is a *clandestinum donum*, and consequently *suspiciosum* in the eyes of the audience. When A. B. sends five pounds clandestinely to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, we may fairly suspect A. B. of having swindled the revenue at some former period.

51. *Arbitramentum æquum tridit cuique suum. Arbitration awards to each person his right.*—This maxim can only be true on the supposition that "Whatever is, is right;" for if the arbitrator does not happen to give a just award, it can only be right because it is right: or rather, because the law says it is. It sometimes happens that everybody gets his right awarded to him but the arbitrator himself, who, having had the trouble of the arbitration, finds that the parties won't take up his award, and he consequently gets nothing. The arbitrator, notwithstanding his name, has nothing arbitrary about him, but must submit to be done without having the smallest remedy.

The Drama.

The DRAMA has this week been presented to us in a new and perfectly original form. A gentleman under the attractive style and title of Mr. H. Kemble, from the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, advertised his intention to entertain the nobility and gentry of Sydney with his first great and unequalled undertaking, of performing (without the assistance of a second person) the whole of Shakespeare's tragedy (and without the slightest curtailment) of KING RICHARD III. In which the *dramatis personæ*, consisting of nineteen different characters, would be sustained entirely by himself!

What was here promised, Mr. H. Kemble has performed. The City Theatre was the happy locality whereon this *nonpariel* performance was achieved. Various were the speculations as to what would be Mr. Kemble's *modus operandi*, but all these conjectures were disappointed. And we much regret our utter inability to gratify the curious by describing with anything approaching to fidelity, the process of this great feat, its varied peculiarities, inconceivable grimaces, and numerous comical conceits arising therefrom. It can be likened to nothing but itself. The costume was equally unique. Gloucester's Duke made his *début* in a black dress coat, waistcoat, and pantaloons, silk stockings and pumps; a narrow-brimmed gossamer, and a fancy opera-tie, worn à la Byron. Added to which, by way of giving something like a military cast to the affair, was a stage-smuggler's belt round the waist, and a very long drum-major-looking sword. The primitive workman-like appearance of the attendant is also entitled to notice.

As we have said, to particularise is out of the question: but we cannot withhold our special admiration of the violent death and rapid resurrection of *Richard*, as also of the combat between himself and *Richmond*.

As respects any dramatic family likeness between the Mr. H. Kemble now before us and his celebrated histrionic ancestor, we are disposed to think that it goes very little further than the patronymic.

It must, however, be cheerfully acknowledged that this gentleman has amply redeemed his pledge. He undertook to give an *unparalleled entertainment*, and we feel assured that every person present will admit that it was one. As an effort of memory it was indeed wonderful, for the whole play was recited almost *letter-perfect*. And for all this astonishing exhibition, Mr. Kemble has the proud, the enviable distinction, of being enabled to say, "alone I did it!!!"

Memoranda of Men and Things.

FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

The *Siccle* has a long article on the state of crime in England and France, as shown by the returns of the two countries. The writer says that the increase of crimes and offences in Great Britain was, between the years 1835 and 1842, when it was more remarkable than at any other period, 50 per cent.; but comparing the number of accused in 1844 with that in 1835, he finds the increase to be 26 per cent. This is certainly a sad state of things, and we are not surprised that our contemporary should attribute it in a great measure to the influence of poverty in the masses of the labouring population; but in speaking of the increase of crime that of population should not be overlooked. The latter did not reach 26 per cent., in the period alluded to, but we believe it was nearly equal to half that amount. The writer observes that in England in 1840 that female offenders amounted to 23-7 of the total number, and adds that such is the proportion at the present time. The English writers on statistics, says he, conclude that females who have once erred are not so easily brought back to honest habits as men; but, according to him, this is not the case in France. It is the case in all countries, he adds, where habit rather than principle is the basis of probity. This is not very clearly expressed. As far as education goes there ought to be more principle in the females of England than in those of this country, for education is more general there than it is here. But we are not prepared to declare that education in England amongst the lower classes is what it ought to be. They are indeed taught religion and morality at an early age, but the mode of teaching is not such as to leave any very lasting impression. One of the great evils in the education of the lower classes in England is the low rate at which the teachers are paid. It cannot be expected that men who are paid for this duty at a lower rate than daily labourers can be well fitted for the occupation. They may be able to teach according to certain rules laid down for national schools, but for the cultivation of mind it is necessary that there should be mind of a superior calibre in those who teach, and this, as a general rule, is far from being the case. We have, for instance, seen in a Manchester paper an advertisement from the directors and guardians of a parochial workhouse, requiring a light porter and a schoolmaster, the former with £20 a year and his board, and the latter £10, and we fear that this is but too common an estimate of the respective value of body and mind. It is hardly to be expected that the education of the poor in England should be a good one when teachers are remunerated on such a scale, for what man fitted for the task of tuition would accept an office to which such a mark of degradation is attached? The real cause of the greater proportion of crime in the English women of the labouring class, as compared with the same class in France, arises, we have no doubt, from the habits of sobriety of the French women. This is habit, not principle. Girls at school in France are not cautioned against drunkenness; it is unnecessary, for the habits of those with whom they will have to associate when they are women are sober, and corruption in this respect is not feared. In concluding his article, the writer of the *Siccle* says—"England, with a population which is equal to half that of France, has each year 90,000 persons accused of crime, whereas we have only 60,000. If comparisons of this nature had a scientific rigour, I should say that for one crime committed in France, three are committed in England; but I prefer, in so grave a question, the view of humanity to that of national feeling. The sores of our neighbours do not console one for the wounds of civilization." We approve of the sentiment here expressed, but we think the writer has greatly exaggerated the proportion of crime in the two States.—*Galignani's Messenger*.

THE LATE MRS. LAWRENCE'S WILL.

Mrs. Lawrence was the daughter of Mr. William Lawrence, of Kirkby Fleetham, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, and granddaughter of the late Mr. William Aislabie, of Studley Royal, to whose estates she succeeded in 1808, on the death of her aunt, Mrs. Allanson, widow of Charles Allanson, of Bramham Biggin. Mrs. Lawrence was born at Kensington on the 18th of February, 1761, and died at Studley-park on the 30th of July, 1845. By her will she gives her estates at Studley, Fountain's Ripon, Lindrick, Littlethorpe-with-Whitcliffe, Aldfield, and places south of the river Ure, to the Earl de Grey, except Kirkby Malzeard, the moors of Fountain's Earth and Hackfall, which are given to the Earl of

Ripon. To the latter nobleman she also gives her estates in the neighbourhood of Ripon, north of the river Ure, including Hutton Conwre, Sharrow, Copt Hewick, &c. To each of these noblemen the property is limited for life, and then to go to Lord Goderich, son of the Earl of Ripon, and, in default of issue here, to the family of the Wallers. Her estates in Leicestershire she gives to Sir Cornwallis Ricketts; her estates at Kirkby Fleetham and Clint to Mr. Waller. Probate of the will and codicil of this lady was granted by the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, on the 18th ult. to the Right Hon. Sir Lancelot Shadwell, the Vice-Chancellor of England, one of the executors. No executors are named in the will, but in the codicil Earl de Grey, the Vice-Chancellor, and the Rev. T. Bowdler are appointed. The property has been sworn under £300,000 within the province of Canterbury. The will and codicil contain bequests of legacies and annuities to nearly eighty persons. Among the principal legatees are—Rev. T. Bowdler, £20,000; Rev. James Charnock, £15,000; the Vice-Chancellor, £15,000, and a life interest in £10,000; St. Vincent Ricketts, £20,000; Stephen Waller, £10,000; Robert Waller, £7000; the children of Sir W. Young, £10,000; Miss Rebecca Charnock, £7000; Miss Charnock, £2000; Rev. John Charnock, £6000; to the family of the Robsons of Holtby, £9000; to her steward, Mr. Morton, £1000; to her physician, Dr. Timm, £1000; the Ripon Diocesan Church Building Society, £5000; the Rev. Robt. Poole, £1000; Miss Booth, £1000; Miss Kelly, £1000; Rev. J. Clarke, in trust for his family, £2000. The following charities are also benefited to the amount of £1000 each:—York Lunatic Asylum, Middlesex Hospital, Clergy Orphan Society, Leeds Hospital, Ripon Dispensary, Harrogate Bath Hospital, Ripon Church Building Society; £30 is bequeathed to the poor of Kirkby, and nineteen guineas to the poor of Studley. Earl de Grey is named residuary legatee. All the pecuniary legacies are charged upon her funded property. She also gives annuities to her domestic servants, according to their length of service, varying from £10 to £70 a year.—*Leeds Mercury*.

CAUSE OF IRISH MISERY—CHARACTER OF THE IRISH.

The *Times* Commissioner, writing from Galway, makes the following striking remarks:—

I have never concealed the virtues of the Celtic race, which now chiefly populates Galway. Their capacity of long endurance, their easy tractability of disposition, and their contentment with almost any lot, are virtues which the English people have not. The Englishman is patient, forbearing; but he will not endure—he is tractable only so long as he is well used, and I never yet met with a contented Englishman. But it is these very qualities of the people, not virtues, which make England what she is. Her people will endure no oppression, no injustice; treat them ill and they are turbulent, and every man is always striving up the ladder for the step above him, urging on for something he does not possess. And it is the very virtues of the poor Celtic peasant which tend to his deterioration and wretchedness. He endures oppression, and he has therefore been oppressed and hardly used; his easy tractability of disposition has been taken advantage of; he has been put upon, screwed down without compunction, because it was found he would bear it. His contentment has made him rest satisfied with shelter and a turf fire, and potatoes and water to live upon. He rests content and satisfied with the very worst house, and clothes, and food, is happy so long as he can get them, and strives for nothing better. Yet it is his worst misfortune to have that contented disposition, which one almost envies, that can make him feel "as happy as a prince if he can get but potatoes and buttermilk." It is impossible for a man so constituted to rise unless he is forced and urged upwards. He has no volition; he is contented as he is. What contented man ever attempted anything great—anything which required labor, exertion, risk, or anxious thought? Why should he? He is satisfied as he is—he desires nothing better—he has no motive to attempt anything. * * *

I had the opportunity the other day of visiting the estate of Lord Wallscourt, near this town, a nobleman who has made great sacrifices and exertions to improve his tenants. Still, with every advantage of nature round him—abundance of fish of every kind, oysters, and muscles; manure, seaweed, calcareous sea-sand, marl, peat, and black mud sea deposit—he complains that he cannot get his tenants to exert themselves beyond their half-acre of potatoes, and he has the greatest difficulty to prevent them underletting their land in Conacre at £4 or £5 the acre, which he lets to them for 30s., if they have any land beyond what is absolutely necessary for them to grow their potatoes. He built a very neat cottage as a model, intending to have them on his estate. For five years no tenant would go into it, and the reason assigned was that, "Sure it would be mighty cold, and my Lord would be expecting them to keep it too clean." A tenant's son, who had married and had no cottage, applied to him for some land and a cottage, and Lord Wallscourt offered him this neat two-storey slated cottage, and the man agreed to live in it at last, because "Sure it was better than nothing at all." I went to see the family in this cottage. An English peasant's wife would have been proud to have it as clean as hands could make it. In one room a pile of turf was in the corner, the floor was filthy, the woman was squatted with her children before the fire, and the pig in the middle of them, whilst another room at the back of the house, where the turf and the pig (if it must dwell in the house) might have been put was empty. The man (and it was the best feature I saw) seemed ashamed of his dirty disorderly wife, when Lord Wallscourt, in a tone of mortification, pointed out these things, he kicked out the pig.

How certainly does all this prove that the poor, uneducated, contented Irish peasant must not only be taught civilised habits, but forced into them: example alone will not do; nor will teaching alone do. This is the duty of the landlords to see effected, but above all it is the duty of the Government to insure it being effected.

The commissioners appointed to inquire into the condition of the poorer classes in Ireland, in their third report, state with truth that, "Those who are uncivilised cannot civilise themselves; it requires external aid to enable them to improve." They thus speak of the Irish, even when residing in Great Britain:—

"Everything connected with the state of the Irish in Great Britain shows that their mode of life is very slowly and very slightly improved, unless some civilising influence descends upon them from above—some external moving force independent of their own volition, as of masters, employers, superintendents, education, municipal regulations, &c. Wherever they are untouched by any influence of this kind, they appear for the most part either to remain the same, or even to deteriorate, whatever may be the amount of their earnings."

The italics are not mine, but the commissioners', and express their conviction of the truth and importance of this sentence. At the hazard of being made the object of the womanish railings of some vanity-wounded and silly "patriot," I would urge my conviction from all I have seen of the truth of this report.

The people must be taught, and led, and encouraged—nay,

forced on to do that which will benefit themselves. A more tractable race, or a harder working race, where you lead them, put them to work, and offer them an immediate inducement to work, you cannot have. But if you expect from them independent volition, where no one has gone before, or enterprise of any kind, you will fail. There is no town in the united kingdom where energy and enterprise, and attention to any trade whatever, would be more certain to realise a fortune. Eleven years ago there was scarcely a pig to be bought in the market at Galway, and no bacon was cured here. An Englishman named Greaves thought there was an opening, and commenced buying pigs and curing them in connexion with his shop in New Street, Covent Garden, in London. He established his son here, who, though quite a young man, has created a trade, and now kills and cures 1000 pigs a week. Any shop well managed, any hotel well managed, any business whatever well managed, with the energy and attention which Englishmen commonly devote to their business, would insure to any man a fortune in Galway. Yet the majority of the inhabitants are Repealers, and great talkers about misgovernment; they abuse and vilify England and English connexion, boast how mighty well they would manage Irish affairs in a Parliament on College Green, and neglect their own business to their hearts' content. Englishmen built them a town which they have suffered to decay; Englishmen got rich, and purchased estates, where they grow poor; but the English inhabitants attended to their business, were enterprising and industrious, the present inhabitants of Galway prefer vain-glorious talk about the phantom Repeal, and look on every substantial and fair advantage within their grasp with apathetic indifference. This general fault is the true cause of more than half the misery under which Ireland labours.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS.

A circumstance of a rather curious nature, and very significant of a struggle between the spirit of freedom inherent in the press itself, and the power that fetters it—to come at no distant day,—has recently taken place in Copenhagen. A few months ago, when the King of Prussia arrived in the port of that city, and just as he was about to step into the boat which was to take him ashore, some sparks, escaping from the chimney of the steamer, set fire to the flag that bore the royal arms of Prussia, and consumed it. This trifling incident a Copenhagen journal, called *Fædrelandet* (The Country), made the ground of an article wherein the editor, Mr. John Henry Goedwad, predicted the approaching fall of absolute royalty in Prussia, and indulged in certain pleasantries at the cost of King Frederick William's religious and political opinions. For this offence against the royal guest, the Government ordered the prosecution of the editor; and the Correctional Tribunal condemned him to certain penalties, including a fine of 2000 rix-dollars (about £200), and the payment of the costs, amounting to about £80 more:—a sentence which was, on appeal, confirmed by the Royal Court of Copenhagen and the Supreme Court of the Kingdom successively. On default of payment, the Government made a seizure in Mr. Goedwad's house, and advertised his library for sale by auction on a given day. Early in the morning of that day, the place of sale was filled to overflowing; and the first volume put up was a Danish translation of La Rochefoucauld's *Maxims*,—a small pamphlet offered at the price of sixteen skillings, about ninepence. But scarcely had the biddings reached a few pence more, ere a voice from the midst of the crowd exclaimed, "I bid 3000 rix-dollars for it" (£300); and an elderly gentleman, stepping out, handed over the sum in bank notes. The treasury agent declared the Government demand satisfied; and the sale was abruptly closed, amid the plaudits of the spectators. The purchaser is a merchant in Copenhagen, named Falkenbjerg; and the Society for Promoting the Freedom of the Press has unanimously elected him an honorary member, and sent his diploma, enclosed in a box of silver-gilt, by a deputation of its body.—*Athenæum*.

Miscellanea.

A BUTLER.—The butler of a lady at the West End lately requested that she would look out for another, as he was about to retire from "service." Being pressed for his reason, he said, "Why, ma'am, I have been rather fortunate in railways; I have made £4000." "But how could you make so much?" "Why, ma'am, I dates my letter from your house, and it being a very swelly situation, I gets my shares; for, if they makes inquiries, you know, ma'am, I answers them myself."

MACHINE FOR TAKING SOUNDINGS.—What is, at all events, a very ingenious contrivance for taking soundings at sea has lately been discovered by a Mr. Richard Wing. It is the application of electric magnetism to this purpose. To describe the shape or appearance or detailed peculiarities of the instrument to be employed is very difficult indeed. No written description, even with cuts or diagrams, would convey a perfect notion of it, and the instrument must be seen to be fairly appreciated. It is not cumbersome or expensive, being made of wooden bars about two feet long, in which the apparatus is placed. It is to be used in conjunction with a sustaining galvanic battery and an electro-magnetic bell. There are conducting wires &c. The instrument is to be suspended by a strong line over the side of the vessel at any required depth, say 30 fathoms. The moment the instrument touches the bottom sufficiently to cause it to incline to an angle of 22 degrees, indication is given by the ringing of a bell in any part of the ship most eligible for placing it. The great difficulty of ascertaining depths by the sounding lead in great depths of water and in strong currents would, it is asserted, be remedied by this invention, for the moment the machine from being perpendicular in the water fell horizontally, indication would be given. As far as a judgment can be formed from the inspection of this model, and without having seen it in actual operation on shipboard, it certainly presents claims, if not to patronage, at least to a fair trial of its merits. It is a thing in which many thousands of persons are interested, and nautical men more particularly. It would perhaps be the best plan for the inventor to place it for inspection in some public institution, where it will have a fair chance of meeting the eyes of scientific men and competent judges. The notice of these classes of persons should certainly be drawn to it.

NEW HORSE SHOE.—A simple but most ingenious invention has been laid before us; says the *United Service Gazette*, in the shape of an improvement in the horse-shoe. It is that of making that part of the shoe which is now solid, concave; by which the foot is enabled to take a grip, which with the ordinary shoe is impossible. The principle is, in fact, that of the fluted skate; and whilst the shoe is, of course, lighter than when manufactured on the usual principle, it is equivalent in slippery weather, or on wood pavement, to one that is roughed. The concavity runs entirely round the shoe, having a strong rim in front, equal in thickness to the hoof of the horse's foot, and another at the back of half that thickness. This mode of formation, whilst it involves the use of a smaller quantity of iron, and consequently less weight, gives a far greater purchase, and is much more in accordance with the nature, form, and texture of the horse's foot. By preventing the necessity of turning up the shoe behind, it places the foot in a