religion. If we thought otherwise, we should hold all other advantages to be dearly bought.

We have thus endeavoured to examine by the light of experience the actual results of the Act of 1870. That these results are so perfect as to prevent all necessity and all desire of further progress, it would be absurd to contend; that the great good actually effected has been bought at the price of some losses, we frankly confess. But, except in Utopia, men must be content with a balance of results; and against both the party of reaction, and the party of headlong innovation, we assert fearlessly that the Act has proved its necessity, and that it is every day showing more distinctly its very effective power for good. We claim for its author public gratitude; we claim for his work time, scope, and opportunity.

ART. IX.—1. *Les Miracles de La Salette et de Lourdes.* Par le Docteur BARBASTE. Paris: 1873.

2. *Examen Médical des Miracles de Lourdes.* Par le Docteur D. DIDAY. Paris: 1873.

3. *Life of Blessed Margaret Mary: with some Account of the Devotion to the Sacred Heart.* By the Rev. GEORGE TICKELL, of the Society of Jesus. London: 1869.

4. *The Divine Glory of the Sacred Heart.* By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. London: 1873.

SEVERAL years ago we brought to the notice of our readers the religious extravagances, then as yet novelties, which were in course of performance in France at the 'Holy 'Mountain of La Salette.'* We described the famous appearance of the Blessed Virgin to the two children Maximin and Mélanie; the words of prophetic warning which she was pleased to utter and they were commissioned to communicate; and, moreover, the untoward controversy which the phenomenon had excited among the clergy and pious laity of Grenoble, and the gradual pressure under which—as usual in such cases—the sceptical element had given way before the credulous. Miracles discarded of course from the beginning by the faithless half of France, and only received with hesitation or ill-concealed reluctance by most of the faithful, rapidly made their way into the popular creed through the influence of partisanship. 'Practically,' we said, 'in the

* Edin. Review, vol. cvi. p. 4.

'Manuals of Devotion before us, and by the authority of 'Romish priests and bishops, the worship of our Lady of 'Salette is raised to the height of the most elevated offices of 'religion. Nor can we doubt that the effect of this depraved 'propensity for spurious miracles and sham revelations is 'deeply injurious to the sanctity of that faith in which all 'Christians have a common interest.'

Scarcely had the excitement provoked by the events of La Salette begun to subside, when the supernaturalist party dealt a new and still heavier blow to their adversaries by what was called the 'Miracle of Lourdes.' That wild, striking spot, with its historical old castle, which occupies the outlet, into the plains of Gascony, of a savage gorge leading from the Pyrenees, became the scene of a new apparition of the Virgin. Bernadette Soubirous, a poor girl of fourteen, while picking up dry wood at a spot in the neighbourhood, beheld a beautiful lady, robed in white with a blue sash. The vision was several times repeated. On one occasion, answering the reiterated questions of the child, the celestial visitor condescended to say to her, 'I am the Immaculate Conception.' On another, she invited the girl to 'drink at a fountain.' The child, perceiving no fountain, scraped away some earth with her hands. A little water filtered through the orifice. It increased gradually in volume, became perfectly clear, and now yields 100,000 litres in twenty-four hours; supplying to the faithful we know not how many millions of bottles, which are in large demand for the purpose of effecting supernatural cures. In 1862 the Bishop of Tarbes, 'pronouncing judgment on the apparition 'which has shown itself in the grotto at Lourdes,' declared that 'the Immaculate Mary, Mother of God, has really 'appeared to Bernadette Soubirous, on the 11th of February, '1858, and following days, eighteen times in all; that this 'apparition assumes all the characteristics of truth; and that 'the faithful are authorised (sont fondés) to believe it certain.' In the same mandement the Bishop authorises, in his diocese, the worship* (culte) of Notre Dame de Lourdes; and—last, not least—announcing his intention to erect a sanctuary over the grotto, appeals to the liberality of the priesthood and the faithful in France and abroad. 'Within a very limited space 'of time' (so we are informed by M. le Docteur Barbaste, a

* We are, of course, aware of the modified meaning of the word 'culte' in these cases, and of the difference between Latria and Dulia; but our Protestant tongue is so poor in language fit to express these distinctions, that we must be excused for employing the popular and obvious English expression to avoid circumlocution.

very zealous believer), 'the devotion of Lourdes has attracted 'more than 100,000 visitors. On the 6th of October' (the day of the famous pilgrimage so largely advertised in our newspapers), 'there were counted among these visitors eight 'bishops and sixteen deputies.'

Of course the famous new 'devotion' has not established itself without the usual amount of not very edifying controversy between the credulous and incredulous; chiefly represented by priests on one side, doctors on the other, and journalists on both. One incident in the dispute is of rather a comical nature, and is thus reported by Dr. Barbaste. It appears that M. le Docteur Voisin, of the Hospice de la Salpétrière at Paris, had made the following declaration at a medical conference: 'That the miracle of Lourdes has been 'affirmed on the credit of a child subject to hallucinations, 'who has since been kept shut up in the Ursuline convent at 'Nevers.' A certain M. Artus takes fire at this audacious assertion, and proposes a resort to a test of truth which we have not often seen applied in religious polemics. 'I have 'given,' he says, 'a challenge to the public on the subject of 'the events at Lourdes; and have offered to bet a minimum 'sum of 10,000 francs, deposited by me with M. Turquet, 'notary at Paris, against anyone who should pretend to 'demonstrate the falsehood of any two, only, of the miracles 'recounted by M. Henri Laserre, in his book entitled "Notre '"Dame de Lourdes." And I have accepted for judges the 'most eminent members of the Institute.' No one, according to M. Barbaste, has taken up the glove; and he triumphs accordingly. It is possible the doctors, with professional caution, recognised the proverbial difficulty of winning a wager by proving a negative.

Whatever Dr. Barbaste's tests of the efficacy of physical cures may be, his definition of supernatural manifestations is at all events comprehensive enough. 'Sensorial hallucination,' he tells us, 'may exist without any trace of madness. Those 'affected by it reason justly on all points, even on that which 'affects them, and of which they recognise the falsehood. Hal-'lucination is often the privilege of *les natures d'élite*; it forms 'part of the attendance on genius. To see things which do 'not exist, to see imaginary beings, is the characteristic of a 'deranged understanding. But to see supernatural beings and 'converse with them, does not, in my view, constitute madness. 'It would be necessary, first to prove that a supernatural 'order of beings does not exist, and [or?] that no communica-'tion is possible between human beings and that order.'

Reasoning which of course establishes, incontrovertibly, that no one can have a right to pronounce anyone else mad for seeing things not seen to himself, however extravagantly absurd such visions may be, inasmuch as no one can possibly disprove their possibility. As Dr. Johnson was reported, in Peter Pindar's clever parody, to have said, in coarser language than we can reproduce, of witches, 'nought proves their nonexistence.' To all this—and it does in truth constitute the staple of the whole argument in favour of modern supernatural manifestations, from the miracles of La Salette down to table-rapping, which are instilled into our capacity for belief at the present day—the only possible answer is to be silent and leave common sense to achieve its slow victory. 'E pur si muove.' There are those who believe, with Buckle and Lecky, that a violent recrudescence, so to speak, of any particular superstitious belief, and a sudden and striking multiplication of the popular evidence in favour of it, are signs that it is on the eve of extinction. Never were so many notorious witches, in judicial and clerical opinion, as in the middle of the seventeenth century; fifty years later there was not one left. In like manner, thinkers of this rationalistic turn of mind believe that the mania for recent miracles, prophecies, and the pilgrimages and observances consequent thereupon, having now attained its extreme of paroxysm, will melt away suddenly, not gradually, and leave not a trace behind. We cannot look so far into the future as to form a judgment on such probabilities. All we can say is, that if the excessive multiplication of prodigies does presage their disappearance, then those of the Church of Rome are certainly foredoomed. The 'devotions' of La Salette and Lourdes are only specimens on a large scale of what is now proceeding and developing in hundreds of less celebrated sanctuaries all over France, and, though in a less conspicuous degree, in Western Germany, Belgium, and wherever priesthood is powerful and controversy at the same time vehement. There is a general sameness about the particulars of these multiplied manifestations which renders it difficult to select any characteristic features. But two things may be pretty equally predicated of all. They abound in prophetic revelations and in miraculous cures; but the revelations never disclose anything which seems to require revelation to attest it; the cures are always confined to the classes of diseases in which deception is easy or natural causes easily adducible, or else they are of so stupendous an order as to defy criticism. We have before us a list of 'miracles' obtained by the intercession of Notre Dame des Lumières, a

Madonna of great popularity at Marseilles, which a newspaper of the city professes to have copied, *verbatim et literatim*, from the original in that church. It comprises—

Dead brought to life .	19	Paralytics . .	153
Blind restored to sight .	187	Cases of hernia .	187
Deaf and dumb cured .	125	Cases of fever .	137
Cripples cured . .	136	Divers sicknesses	210

Now it need hardly be said that a single case, well authenticated, of an amputated limb restored would be worth more, as matter of evidence, than hundreds of such instances as these taken together. But this simple, obvious, and convincing kind of miraculous cure is precisely that of which no example is ever offered us. A pregnant truth, if we would but attend to it. But those who disbelieve in existing miraculous agencies do not require it. Those who do, are long past caring for it. A remark which, we fear, is of equal force as regards the facts and speculations which we wish in this article to communicate, concerning one of the most popular and high class 'devotions' of the present day—that which inspired the recent pilgrimage to Paray-le-Monial.

Everyone remembers the interest which this curious manifestation of mediæval tendencies in an age like ours excited only a few months ago. The railway carriages which conveyed the pilgrims were thronged with three very different classes of votaries: with the really devout, who had addicted themselves in earnest to that 'culte' of the Sacred Heart of Jesus which has acquired such predominance during the present century, and of which the original well-spring oozed gradually from the soil at Paray-le-Monial, like the sacred fountain of Lourdes; with the curious, busy, half-serious mob who followed the fashion from mere love of excitement, and in order 'to 'say that they were there;' and lastly, with political zealots, or schemers, who were anxious to make political capital of the occurrence. The little town of Paray-le-Monial—said, traditionally, to have lost all its commerce and industry by the expulsion of its Protestants after the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and to have taken monasticism in exchange—towards which their course was directed, is placed amidst local associations well calculated to stimulate both the political and the spiritual fervour of the disciples. The seignorial castles of the Bourbonnais—the cradles of the house which still affects to rule France by divine right—flank it on the one side. On the other, just over the bleak ridges of the Charolais, lies Cluny, the ancient metropolis of the Benedictines, in its secluded valley. Within an easy distance is Lyons,

the modern head-quarters and workshop of French Catholic devotion. And it does so happen—though we mention this only in passing, as our concern is not with politics—that the worship of the Sacred Heart, whatever it may have been besides, has been from the outset associated with high-flown legitimist notions in Church and State. It was started in the seventeenth century by the Jesuits and their courtly supporters; treated with suspicion or aversion by the 'Opposition' in general; by Jansenists, Parliaments, and Bishops of the old-fashioned Gallican type. When the Revolution approached, the 'Sacred Heart' became a rallying signal of Royalism. The brave Vendeans marched against the Republican cannon under its insignia. When their leader Charette was taken and carried to trial, he 'wore a heart of Jesus em-'broidered on his dress.' The Restoration made of it a political emblem more than ever. There is a story in M. Lemontey's history of the Regency (a work to which we shall have to direct more particular attention presently) which we can only present subject to the obscurity in which that author himself leaves it. The Jesuitical party, he says, 'fabricated and 'made public, through the most popular newspapers, pretended 'writings of Louis XVI., in which he protested against 'different acts of his reign, and proceeded to devote himself 'and his kingdom to the Sacred Heart.' The following is part of a declaration thus attributed to Louis XVI., but so evidently a gross invention that it is difficult to conceive what purpose could have been served by promulgating it:—

'1. I solemnly promise to take, within the interval of a year, counting from the day of my deliverance, both with the Pope and with the bishops of my kingdom, all measures necessary for establishing, with due observation of canonical forms, a solemn feast in honour of the Sacred Heart of Jesus; which shall be celebrated for ever throughout the whole of France, the first Friday after the octave of the Holy Sacrament, and always followed by a general procession, in reparation of the outrages and profanations committed in our holy temples during the recent troubles by schismatics, heretics, and bad Christians. . . . .

'2. To go in person, within three months, counted from the day of my deliverance, to the church of Notre Dame at Paris, or any other principal church of the place where I may happen to be; and to pronounce there, on a Sunday or feast day, at the foot of the high altar, after the offering of the Mass, and between the hands of the celebrant, a solemn act of consecration of my person, my family, and my kingdom, to the Sacred Heart of Jesus; with the promise to give to all my subjects an example of the worship (culte) and devotion which are due to that adorable Heart.' (Lemontey, *Œuvres*, vii. 446.)

Our present concern, however, with the Devotion of the Sacred Heart does not relate, as we have said, to its political significance, whatever that may be. We must deal with another, and to millions of devout believers a more important feature of the subject. We pursue our quotations from M. Lemontey, premising, in justice, that he writes as an unbeliever and an enemy. M. de Belsunce, of whom he speaks, is the famous Bishop of Marseilles, renowned for his self-devotion at the time of the Great Plague of that city, the last notorious visitation of that disease in Western Europe, but not less distinguished (according to Saint-Simon and others of the anti-Jesuit party) for his credulity and fanaticism than for his Christian courage. He was the first ecclesiastic of rank who patronised, in a public manner, the revelations of Margaret Marie Alacoque.

'In order to appreciate the motives which engaged M. de Belsunce to consecrate his diocese to the Heart of Jesus, it is necessary to know the origin of this mystical devotion, of which some of the details are not wanting in singularity. The first person who conceived the idea of rendering worship to that part of the human body in which the Word became incarnate, was an Armenian sectary, the famous Godwin, chaplain and confidential agent of Cromwell, and President of Magdalen College at Oxford. Some of the fanatics with whom England then abounded mingled this novelty with their other superstitions. It is known that the Stuarts brought back with them an escort of Jesuits, whose evil counsels were the principal cause of their ruin. Among these monks was a certain Father La Colombière, confessor of the Duchess of York, and as great an intriguer as that celebrated Queen of St. Germain's. He heard the invention of Godwin spoken of, and saw at a glance the use which might be made of this coarse image (grossière) fit to captivate the senses of the multitude. He determined to introduce it into France, where he made frequent journeys for the interests of his Society. The Jesuits, accustomed to make themselves popular all over the world by borrowing rites from any quarter, set themselves to propagate this novelty, in spite of its heterodox origin.' (Lemontey, *Œuvres*, vol. vii. p. 443.)

'According to the testimony of English writers,' adds M. Lemontey, 'this figurative worship originated in the brutal 'superstition of some partisans of the regicide Cromwell; and 'I am not surprised at it.'

We have sought in vain, for our own part, for the 'English 'writers' to whom M. Lemontey avows himself indebted for this suggestion. But we find that a German man of letters—Theodore Wenzelburger, in a paper contributed to the periodical 'Unsere Zeit' of the 15th November last, on the subject of the 'Sacred Heart,' has the following notice of

the claims of the divine whom he—like Lemontey—calls 'Godwin.'*

'Godwin himself wrote an essay on the subject, which seems to have attracted some attention, since soon after its appearance it was translated into German at Heidelberg. The mysticism of Godwin had no further consequences for Protestantism; for since, in his conception, the Heart of Jesus had much more of symbolical than of realistic meaning, no further consequences could be deduced from it. But the thought of Godwin was destined to reappear in another place, in a far more realistic and more comprehensible fashion.'

These are very imperfect indications, but they may be pursued much further. The comparison between Puritan and Jesuit mysticism, to which our attention is thus directed, is extremely curious, and, as will be seen, suggestive, to say the least, of a strange connexion between the extravagances of opposite creeds, and of a very 'heterodox' origin (to use M. Lemontey's own words) for the most fashionable devotion of modern Romanism. Into this intricate question in the history of religious revivals we propose now to institute a somewhat closer inquiry.

For the outlines of the subject with which we have to deal we chiefly rely on the most modern English publication to which it has given rise: the 'Life of Blessed Margaret Mary, 'with some account of the Devotion of the "Sacred Heart," 'by Father George Tickell.' It is of course a compilation from older authorities. The beatified nun of Paray-le-Monial, 'the depositary of the treasure of the Sacred Heart,' was born in 1647, entered Paray-le-Monial as a daughter of the Visitation of the Holy Mary in 1671, and died there in 1690, after twenty years of a life of extreme mortification and asceticism. During these years, and particularly in the earlier part of them, she received those impressions—supernatural revelations, or visionary delusions, as they are severally judged by friends or enemies—which have rendered her name famous throughout the Catholic world. We refrain from entering into the well-known details respecting them, as this is not necessary for our immediate purpose, and as we might inflict, most unwillingly, unnecessary pain on readers who cannot without sensitiveness witness the handling of such topics by the indifferent or hostile. Suffice it to say that she was favoured by repeated appearances of the Virgin, ordering her

* We understand that articles to somewhat similar effect have appeared in a Swiss newspaper, the 'Journal de Genève;' but have not been able to meet with them.

to urge on mankind the special worship of the Sacred Heart of her Son. She died in repute of sanctity. The first 'miracle' wrought through her intercession (the cure of a paralysed inmate of the convent) occurred in 1713. In 1715, the Bishop of Autun, at the solicitations of the Superior of her convent, caused a process of inquiry to be instituted into her life and miraculous exhibitions of power. 'Owing, however,' (says Father Tickell) 'to the absorbing character of 'the public events which affected so closely the interests of the 'Church at this time, springing from Jansenism, the false 'philosophy of the period, and the Revolution, the cause re-'mained for some time suspended at the first stage.' We have seen already that this is a somewhat superficial way of putting the case: that, in point of fact, the honours claimed for Margaret Mary became the cause of vehement polemics in the French Church; that they gave origin, as it were, to a separate chapter in the great quarrel of pro-Jesuits and anti-Jesuits. This dispute was terminated, so far as the Catholic community is concerned—as so many other 'burning' questions have been for the present terminated—by the decision of the present Pope. In 1856 the long-contested 'beatification' of Sister Margaret Mary took place; and the office and Mass of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, already instituted in some localities, was finally extended to the world by Pius IX. in 1854. Rome has spoken.

To return now to M. Lemontey's singular statement as to the foreign Puritan element which he alleges to have been imported at the commencement into this great Catholic worship. It will be observed at once, by anyone at all familiar with the subject, that the statement in question is very careless and full of errors. There could not be a greater mistake than to suppose that either 'le fameux Godwin,' or Father de la Colombière, or Marie Alacoque, was the first who 'invented' the practice of directing thought in prayer to the 'Sacred Heart of Jesus.' The writings of fathers, and schoolmen, and ecstatic divines are full of allusions, more or less metaphorical, more or less expressive of substantial belief, to this peculiar form of pious meditation as a stimulant to religious fervour. St. Francis de Sales is said to have many passages allusive to it in his manuscript remains. He founded an establishment of 'Filles du Sacré Cœur de 'Jésus.' One Father Eudes (1643) had already established at Caen a congregation devoted to the 'Sacred Heart of Jesus and 'Mary.' In ages long preceding, St. Bernard, or the author of the anonymous work on the 'Passion' which is attributed to him, had made mention of devotion to the same mystical

object. 'St. Clara, St. Matilda, St. Catherine of Siena, St. 'Theresa, these illustrious lovers of Jesus Christ, whose pious 'thoughts on this subject have been collected, have known, 'celebrated, loved, the attractions of the Heart of their 'heavenly Husband.' So we are informed by the Discourse, prefixed to that strange work, 'The Memoir of Marguérite 'Marie Alacoque,' by Languet, Bishop of Soissons,* to which we shall have occasion more particularly to refer. Nay, even the celebrated vision in which Marie Alacoque beheld the Sacred Heart in the bosom of Our Lord burning as a furnace, into which He moved the heart of his worshipper, 'which seemed 'as a small atom on fire in that furnace'—a vision which the Church of Rome has all but authenticated—seems a repetition of a rhapsodical passage in the Sermons of St. Bernardin of Siena. So far from the revelations of Marie Alacoque having any character of originality, it will probably occur to the impartial student of them that, as is the case with so many other stories of miraculous and prophetic interpositions, the wonder, humanly speaking, is that Divine Providence should have judged it meet to reveal in supernatural ways facts or suggestions already well known and familiar; that Marie Alacoque should have been authorised to impart to mankind, with all the apparatus of revelation, the duty of certain religious observances which had already been devised and recommended by other devout servants of God, through their own unassisted (or not miraculously assisted) imagination. If it is the Divine pleasure to vouchsafe fresh revelations to mankind, those revelations will be assuredly made without reference to our earthly notions of what may or may not require such revelation. We are not judges of the 'dignus vindice nodus.' It might be the Divine pleasure to make known to us in this way the truths of arithmetic, just as well as the deepest secrets of futurity. To make the apparent importance of a revelation the test of its truth is to trespass wilfully within the confines of the Unknowable. The specialty of Mary Alacoque is, not that she discovered, or diffused, a novel devotion, but that she emphasized it; that it assumed under her hands, or those of

* This work excited a good deal of scandal, on account of its extravagance, and even the most zealous advocates of 'the Devotion' at the present day are shy of referring to it. In the new 'Biographie 'Universelle' it is suggested that the real author was Father de la Colombière himself; but this is difficult to believe, especially as it contains an account of his own death at Paray-le-Monial. Languet de Gergy was a Member of the French Academy, and a good French writer.

the Jesuits of whom she was the mouthpiece, a novel, more precise, more realistic, as our German critic calls it, more—to a sober worshipper—'anthropomorphic' form.

Thus far, as we have said, M. Lemontey is in error; and it must be added, that his account of 'le fameux Godwin,' and also of Father de la Colombière, is full of equally careless mistakes. Nevertheless, it is founded on truth, and truth of a very singular description.

'Le fameux Godwin,' is Dr. Thomas Goodwin, chaplain (for a short time) to Oliver Cromwell, and made by him President of Magdalen College, Oxford. By 'Armenian' we suppose Arminian is meant, but in truth he was a supralapsarian Calvinist. This divine, once a great man and then a great 'nominis 'umbra' in the religious world, and not yet quite forgotten in it, was also a man of considerable mark in the ecclesiastical politics of his day. He took a prominent part (along with Owen) in the 'Savoy Confession,' the foundation of the Congregational or Independent polity. But he was better known for the highwrought enthusiasm—or fanaticism—which characterised his preaching, and to some extent his demeanour. Burnet, in his 'History of his own Time,' tells the following story respecting him:—

'Tillotson told me that a week after Cromwell's death, he being by accident at Whitehall, and hearing that there was to be a fast that day in the household, he out of curiosity went into the presence-chamber where it was held. On the one side of a table Richard, with the rest of Cromwell's family, was placed, and six of the preachers were on the other side. Thomas Goodwin, Owen, Carryl, and Sterry, were of the number. There he heard a great deal of strange stuff, enough to disgust a man for ever of that enthusiastic boldness. God was, as it were, reproached with Cromwell's services, and challenged for taking him away so soon. Goodwin, who had pretended to assure them in a prayer that he was not to die, which was but a very few minutes before he expired, had now the impudence to say to God, "Thou hast deceived "us! and we were deceived!"'

Or as South, in relating the same anecdote, more pointedly gives the phrase—'Lord, thou hast lied unto us; yea, thou 'hast lied unto us.'

Calamy ('Account,' ii. 60) has the following passage respecting him:

'In 1639 he (Goodwin) went over into Holland, and became pastor of a church in the city of Arnheim. He returned thence into England again at the beginning of the Long Parliament, and assumed the charge of a church in London, and one of the Assembly of Divines. He was one of the favourites of Oliver Cromwell, who made him President of Magdalen College in Oxford, and one of the triers of

ministers. . . . He was removed from his Presidentship quickly after the King's return in 1660, and afterwards retired to London, where he continued the exercise of his ministry as long as he lived. He was a very considerable scholar, and an eminent divine; and had a very happy faculty in descanting upon Scripture, so as to bring forth surprising remarks, which yet generally tended to illustration. He died February 23, 1679, aged eighty years.'

'Scriptis in re theologicâ quamplurimis orbi notus,' says the entry of his death in the register of the University; rather a significant description for our present purpose.

A strange instance of this faculty of interposing 'surprising,' not to say profane, remarks, in his religious oratory, is mentioned by his biographer, 'Thankful Owen,' in the life prefixed to the fifth volume of Goodwin's works. 'I am going,' he said to his friends, when about to die, 'to those three 'Persons with whom I have had communion. They have 'taken me. I did not take them.' It should be added, in order to complete this introduction to the part attributed to Goodwin in the popular Devotion of the Sacred Heart, that he was a man of more various learning than was usually found among divines of his persuasion. He was (according to his biographer) not only much read in the Fathers, but also in the schoolmen; though we do not find, in the list given of works which he had studied, any names of writers of the devotional or ascetic order.

Thomas Goodwin's works are very voluminous, extending to five volumes in folio—religious treatises, preached or only printed. Their style is sometimes elevated, always enthusiastic, often mystical. His English composition is good, and very free from the obscurity which disfigures so much of the Puritan sermonising of that age; but (unfortunately) by no means free from that diffuseness which is the other pervading sin of his fellows in general. None of his publications seems to have attained so much popularity as the treatise entitled 'The Heart of Christ in Heaven towards Sinners on Earth;' first printed in 1643, several times reprinted, and still surviving, inasmuch as it reappeared in a recent volume of Ward's 'Standard Divines.' How full it is of the peculiar tone and turns of sentiment which are embodied in modern volumes of Roman Catholic devotion on the 'Heart of Jesus' will, we imagine, appear from the passages which we shall cite. But it is, perhaps, of more importance to remark, that the leading thought—the 'motive' as artists would term it—of the whole performance, to be collected out of a great profuseness of fluent metaphor, seems to be the following: that the Humanity of

Jesus, still subsisting after his Ascension, is the proper subject not only of pious meditation, but of feelings at least akin to adoration, for us, his human brothers and fellow-sufferers, left to await His second coming here; that His Heart, the symbol at once and real expression of that humanity, feels for us and sympathises with us still, and should be ever present in our thoughts during our deepest and closest communion with Him and His Father.

Now if we have rightly stated, or rather indicated, this leading thought of Dr. Goodwin's treatise, it will be seen at once why the idea should have occurred to M. Lemontey, or those whom he quotes, that we have here the immediate origin of the now celebrated Devotion which came to the light—or rather struggled into it through much discountenance and many a difficulty—in France in the eighteenth century. In fact, those leaders of the Church who have taken into favour, and at the same time tried to tone down, the rhapsodical utterances of Marie Alacoque and her earliest interpreters, have come very nearly back to the somewhat less objective, though still highly 'sensuous,' language of the old Puritan.

'The scope and tendency of such devotion,' says Goodwin, 'will be this: To hearten and encourage believers to come more boldly unto the throne of grace, unto such a Saviour and High Priest, when they shall know how sweetly and tenderly His Heart, though He is now in His glory, is inclined towards them, and so to remove that great stone of stumbling which we meet with (and yet lyeth unseen) in the thoughts of men in the way to faith, that Christ being now absent, and withal exalted to so high and infinite a distance of glory, as to be at God's right hand, they therefore cannot tell how to come to treat with Him about their salvation so freely, and with that hopefulness to obtain, as those poor sinners did who were here on earth with Him.'

. . . . . .

'Even in Christ's human nature, though glorified, affections of pity and compassion are true and real, and not metaphorically attributed unto Him, as they are unto God; and also more near and like unto ours here, than those of the angels are; even affections proper to man's nature, and truly human. . . . His taking our nature *at first*, clothed with frailties, and living in this world as we, this hath for ever fitted His Heart by experience to be in our very hearts and bosoms. . . . . Yea, His Heart was made more tender in all sorts of affections than any of ours, even as it was in love and pity; and this made Him a "man of sorrows," and that more than any other man was or shall be.

'When He was to assume a human nature He is brought in saying (Heb. x.), "A body hast thou fitted me," that is, a human nature, fitted, as in other things, so in the temper of it, for the Godhead to work and show His perfection in best. And, as He took a human nature on purpose to be a merciful High Priest, as Heb. ii. 14, so such

a human nature, and of so special a temper and frame, as might be more merciful than all men or angels, His human nature was "made "without hands," that is, was not of the ordinary make that other men's hearts were of, though for that matter the same, yet not for the frame of His spirit. It was a Heart bespoke for on purpose to be made a vessel, or rather fountain of mercy, wide and capable enough to be so extended as to take in and give forth to us again all God's manifestative mercies, that is, all the mercies God intended to manifest to His elect; and therefore Christ's Heart had naturally in the temper of it more pity than all men and angels' have, as through which the mercies of the Great God are to be dispensed unto us, and this Heart of His to be the instrument of them.'

We have extracted these passages almost at random. There are some hundred pages of similar spiritual rhapsody: nor is it easy to select where the style is so uniformly prolix and diffusive. But they will serve for our purpose, which is that of comparison with others from repertories of modern Catholic religious language, such as has been indulged in habitually since the Devotion of Paray-le-Monial began and fructified. We quote without intentional disrespect, for the purpose only of our argument.

'"In symbolicâ Cordis imagine," says Pius VI., "immensam cari-"tatem effusumque amorem Divi Redemptoris nostri meditamur "atque veneramur." Pius VII., in his letter to the Bishop of Pistoia, "says that the substance of the devotion consists in the thought and "veneration of the unbounded love of our Divine Redeemer under the "symbol of His sacred Heart. . . ."

'The material or sensible object of the devotion is the pure and living Heart of our Lord. "This we learn (says Father Gallifet) from "the words of the revelation in which our Divine Lord Himself, in "establishing the devotion, made known His will to Blessed Margaret "Mary. . . ." "It is evident," says Father Gallifet, "that our Lord "here speaks of His Heart, not in a figurative, but in a true and real "sense, as it is a part of His sacred body. The same, also, is the line "of argument advanced by the Postulator of the Cause under Pope "Clement XIII. . . The reason why the Sacred Heart should have been "proposed as an object had been given by the Postulant of the Cause "in 1697, under Pope Innocent XII., drawn from the necessity felt by "our nature for some sensible object in the exercise of devotion; nor "could any more suitable object be found to awaken divine love in "our hearts than the Sacred Heart of our Divine Lord."' (*Father Tickell*, p. 365.)

Compare these expressions, again, with a well-known passage in the devout meditations of Marie Alacoque herself—or of that spiritual director of hers of whom we shall have to speak presently. It was in 1674 that Margaret Mary Alacoque, according to her own account, began to be favoured with

the special visions which have since made her name famous throughout the Catholic world.

'Our Lord (says her biographer), began now to manifest to her in a more special manner the precious treasure of His Sacred Heart, which she was to make known and communicate to others. The following (she says) as it seems to me, is the way in which the thing occurred. Jesus said to me, "My Divine Heart is so full of love for men, and for "you in particular, that being unable to contain within itself the "flames of its burning charity, It must needs spread them abroad by "your means, and manifest itself to them, to enrich them with the "treasures It contains. I discover to you the price of these treasures. "They contain graces of sanctification and salvation necessary to draw "them from the abyss of perdition."'

The same year (1674) she had a vision of our Saviour's Heart, enriched by the instruments of His passion.

'These instruments signified, as my Divine Master gave me to understand, that it was the unbounded love which He had for men that had been the source of all His sufferings; that from the first moment of His incarnation all these torments had been present to Him, and that from the first moment the Cross had been, so to say, planted in His Heart; that from that moment He accepted all the pains and humiliations which His Sacred Humanity was to suffer. . . . He gave me to understand afterwards that it was the great desire He had to be perfectly loved by men that had made Him form the design of disclosing to them His Heart, and of giving them in these latter times this last effort of His love, by proposing to them an object and a means so calculated to engage them to love Him, and love Him solidly, opening to them all the treasures of love, mercy, and grace, of sanctification and salvation, which it contains, in order that all who should wish to pay and procure for Him all the honour and love which they can, might be enriched in profusion with the divine treasures of which It is the fruitful and inexhaustible source.'

Compare also a quotation from a sermon of De la Colombière himself, preached in St. James' Chapel, extracted by Father Tickell (p. 160). And let us now—to complete our catena of comparisons—examine the latest utterance of Archbishop Manning, in his latest pamphlet on the 'Divine Glory 'of the Sacred Heart,' preached on Rosary Sunday, 1873. His office—like that of the Pope whose interpreter he is—was to rationalise, to a certain extent, so to speak, the language of the new Devotion, 'come from whence it may,' he cautiously says, 'and I know not from whence it came,' and modify it into a shape which English reticence in Divine matters might more easily tolerate.

'The divine worship and glory of the Sacred Heart is the test of our true faith in the doctrine of the Incarnation. Any man who denies this, even a shadow of its perfect truth—any man who, by

subtle distinctions, attempts to deprive the Sacred Heart of divine worship and glory, thereby convicts himself of heresy. . . . And do not think that this is a heresy of the imagination, verbal and unreal. No, it is here, floating about in the air we breathe. . . The Jansenists, two centuries ago, set the example on the *first rise* of the Devotion of the Sacred Heart. For manifold errors they were condemned by the Bull Unigenitus, and exist no longer. Afterwards the Synod of Pistoia, following in their footsteps, accused those who adored the Sacred Heart of separating the human nature of Jesus from the divine. They, too, were condemned by the Bull Auctorem Fidei, for uttering on this head an opinion "false, scandalous, and injurious to "those who adore the Sacred Heart of Jesus."'

Thus far, then, our object has been to point out the curious and close similarity which exists, not only in point of high-flown expressions, but in respect of the very elements and principles of the Devotion, between the so-called revelations of Margaret Mary Alacoque and the treatise of our contemporary Cromwellian divine. We have endeavoured to do this, not only by reference to the mere rhapsodical expressions attributed (by her biographer) to the romantic nun, but to the more measured diction in which popes, archbishops, and others, have since thought proper to reclothe those rhapsodies. And we can only, in conclusion, earnestly recommend our readers, if they take any interest in the subject, to pursue the comparison for themselves; for the question of 'plagiarism' is not to be judged of by mere extracts. That question is, whether (as M. Lemontey affirms) the language of the Devotion was partly drawn from what would seem a very alien source—the devotional work of Thomas Goodwin. If internal evidence makes this probable, how will it agree with external? In order to approximate to an answer, it becomes necessary to refer to the part which Father Claude de la Colombière, of the Order of Jesus—the 'Director' for four of the most important years of her life, of the nun Alacoque—bore in those proceedings which ended in the dissemination and exaltation of the 'Latria' of the Sacred Heart throughout Catholic Christendom. If we have to devote a considerable space to a personage of no very high personal qualifications or historical importance, it is on account of the special part which he played in the initiation of usages and sentiments which have taken so strong a hold on the multitude of his fellow-believers.

Father Claude de la Colombière was a young gentleman of good family, devoted to the service of the Order of Jesuits of which he was a member. 'He was,' says our authority, Father Tickell, 'highly distinguished by natural gifts, but yet more

'especially by his zeal and piety. His sermons, as they are 'handed down to us, are distinguished by high spirituality and 'depth of thought.' We would not dispute with our reverend author on a subject so far more within his cognisance than ours, but so far as we have ourselves studied the spiritual eloquence of Father de la Colombière, it would appear to us less remarkable for 'spirituality' than for considerable force of style in the expression of sentiments of a somewhat ordinary description. His sermons are, in truth, generally deficient in the mystical element: not often highflown or passionate, or even striking. But they are oratorical. He was a master of his native language, the noblest pulpit language of Europe. The French—methodical in their classification of spiritual, as of all other, literature—rank him among preachers of the 'second order.' 'Il semblait,' says a panegyrist, 'ne pouvoir écrire ses pensées, 'sans les exprimer avec élégance, et sans leur donner cet 'arrangement que produit toujours un esprit maître de ses 'idées; jamais en parlant il ne lui échappait d'expression 'qui fut tant soit peu défectueuse, ou qui ne fut pas à sa place. 'On peut dire que, pour le temps qu'il a vécu, il était un des 'hommes du royaume qui entendait le mieux notre langue.'

In 1674, Father de la Colombière was sent to Paray-le-Monial as 'Superior of the Residence established there by 'the Fathers of the Society of Jesus.' At this time Margaret Marie Alacoque was a nun of the Order of the Visitation in their little convent at Paray, to which she had been admitted in her twenty-third year, on the Feast of St. Mary Magdalen of the Pazzi, in 1671. 'It numbered thirty-three 'choir sisters, three lay sisters, and three novices.'

And now the singular relations between the new Director and the enthusiastic penitent commenced. We refer those who are anxious to investigate them to the pages of Father Tickell. It is an unpleasant part of the office laid on anyone who is anxious for the mere sake of truth to investigate female pretensions to miraculous gifts, that it is difficult to do so without giving some occasion for sneers and for misrepresentation. Suffice it for our part to have repudiated at once and for all purposes any such unworthy insinuations. Either Marguerite Marie Alacoque was what her Church has pronounced her, by a 'Beatification' of which the process was prolonged from 1836 to 1864—a Sibyl and a Prophetess, a chosen vessel for the announcement of truths, certainly not very novel, but regarded by the world to which she belonged as very edifying—or she was a hysterical young woman, subject to 'hallucinations,' a dreamer of dreams, but with a heart devoted to the service of

God as she understood it, and as her Director represented it. The very simplicity, and total absence of reticence with which she gives vent to her sentiments respecting him, the beloved guide of her conscience, are sufficient to exonerate her from any suspicion of ignoble motive. According to her own account (it is very important, however, to remember that it is only assumed by her devotees to be her own, having been compiled, if we understand the narrative aright, from her confidential statements to Father Rolin, who began to be her Director only in 1685),

'De la Colombière, having occasion to give an exhortation to the community, was struck with the appearance of Margaret Mary, and inquired of the Reverend Mother de Saumaise who that young religious was. . . . On being informed, he told the Mother Superior that she was a chosen soul. Mother de Saumaise shortly afterwards sent for Father de la Colombière, and desired Margaret Mary to lay open her mind to him. Margaret Mary went as she was desired, though with a feeling of extreme repugnance. This she expressed to Father de la Colombière on seeing him. He replied that he was "very glad to have "given her an opportunity of making a sacrifice to God." "Then, "without pain or trouble," she says, "I opened my heart to him, and "discovered to him the bottom of my soul, good and bad alike." She received from him in return great consolation. He assured her that she had nothing to fear in the guidance of the Spirit which acted in her, as long as it did not withdraw her from obedience; that she ought to follow His movements and abandon herself wholly to His will, to be sacrificed and immolated according to His good pleasure. "He expressed "his admiration," she says, "at the goodness of God, in not having been "repelled by so much resistance on my part. He taught me to value "the gifts of God, and to receive with respect and humility the frequent "communications and familiar converse with which He favoured me; "adding, that I ought to be employed in constant thanksgiving for such "great goodness."' (*Life*, p. 146.)

Anyone accustomed to the details of similar histories will have no difficulty in imagining how the ascendancy of the Director grew and expanded in the ready mind of the eager recipient. He became her adviser, friend, consoler, her pattern in prayer and adoration; and, finally, his figure mingled in the details of her mysterious visions.

'One day, as Father de la Colombière was saying mass in the church of the monastery, upon Margaret Mary approaching to receive Holy Communion, our Lord showed her His Sacred Heart as a burning furnace. She saw, at the same time, *two* hearts on the point of uniting themselves to it, and being absorbed, as it were, in it. She heard also at the same time the words, "It is thus that my pure love unites these "three hearts for ever." The third heart—it need not be said—was that of the earthly object of her devout affection. "Our Lord wished

" that we should be as brother and sister, sharing equally in spiritual " goods."'

Of course the spiritual fervour of the favoured nun for her Director, and the return which it met with in his partiality, did not pass, in a little community of women, without the special accompaniments of envy, jealousy, and suspicion, which usually attend such cases. Thus much we learn from the very naïve picture of the interior of Paray-le-Monial drawn by Marie's first biographer, Monsignor Languet; her later eulogists, whose compilations are now in fashion, seem much more reticent on this part of the subject. The Bishop informs us, in plain language, that the Sister

'had to pay very dearly for the consolation which she had experienced in the counsels of Father de la Colombière. . . . The father had his own share in this trouble. Their conversations in the confessional were at one time frequent, and occasionally long; and both were accordingly loudly blamed. They said of St. Marguerite that she wanted to deceive this holy man, as she had deceived so many others; that she only aimed at authorising her hypocrisy by the approval of this servant of God. Others said of the father that he was not less visionary than his penitent; that it was a weakness in him to amuse himself so long with a woman of so little force of mind or ability.'

Of course, as usual in such stories, the innocence and simplicity of the object of such calumnies prevailed at last. But this apparently did not take place until after Father de la Colombière's removal from the scene of action.

That event happened in 1676, when the Father, in obedience to the commands of his Order, was sent to England to occupy the post of chaplain to Mary of Modena, then Duchess of York. He received from Margaret Mary, according to her biographers, some notes of instruction, which served to guide him in the important work on which he was entering. And he seems to have maintained such correspondence with her as he could. The post which he assumed, says Father Tickell, was 'eminently perilous.' 'We know 'what penalties were attached to the crime of being a Catholic, 'and yet more a Jesuit.' This is mere pious exaggeration. In 1677, no foreign Catholic, not even a Jesuit, least of all one attached to the Court, was in any danger from the penal law in England. Father de la Colombière not only preached continually for two years without interruption, in the chapel of the Duchess of York, but he was constantly busy—as he himself tells us—in the work of converting the heretics. This information is conveyed to us in the singular 'Journal of his 'Retreat' in 1677, made public after his death—recently

edited, separately from other compilations, by Archbishop Manning.

'Finishing this Retreat, full of confidence in the mercy of my God, I made it a law to myself to procure by all possible means the execution of what was prescribed to me by my Divine Master, in procuring the accomplishment of His desires touching the devotion which He has suggested to a person to whom He communicates Himself very confidentially (that is, Marie Alacoque, according to her biographer), and in whose behalf He has deigned to employ my weakness. *I have already inspired it to many persons in England.*'

The character of the devotion which he thus 'inspired' may be inferred from another passage in the same 'Retreat,' to be compared with those illustrative of the same devotion in other writers, which we have already given. And we once more entreat similar comparison with the expressions of Goodwin.

'I make this offering in honour of that Divine Heart, which is the abode of all virtues, the source of all benediction, and the safe retreat of all holy souls. The principal virtues which I ought thus to honour are, first, the most ardent love of our Divine Lord for God His Father, together with His most profound reverence and incomparable humility; secondly, His infinite patience in suffering; His extreme sorrow and contrition for the sins which He had taken upon Himself, thus uniting the most tender filial confidence with the shame and confusion of the most grievous sinner; thirdly, His most keen compassion for our miseries, and His unbounded love for us, notwithstanding all these miseries, and notwithstanding the intensity of all these feelings. . . . That Heart is still the same, ever burning with love to men, ever open to shed down upon them every kind of grace and benediction, ever touched by a sense of our ills, ever eager to impart to us a share of its treasures, and to give us itself; ever ready to receive us, and to be to us a shelter, a dwelling-place, a paradise even here below. In return for this, He finds nothing in the heart of men but hardness, forgetfulness, contempt, and ingratitude. He loves, and is not loved. . . . In reparation, O most adorable and loving Heart of my most loving Jesus, and to avoid, as far as possible, a like misfortune, I offer to Thee my heart, with every movement of which it is capable. I give myself wholly to Thee, and from this hour I protest, as I believe in all sincerity, that I desire to forget myself and all that belongs to myself, in order to remove every hindrance to my entrance into that Divine Heart, which, in Thy goodness, Thou dost open unto me, and into which I desire to enter, to live and die there with Thy most faithful servants, all inflamed and consumed with Thy love.'

Of De la Colombière's conduct during his residence of two years in England, the little we have on record is conveyed by Jesuit writers, in the usual sugared style of their professional hagiology. Though of course in almost daily communication

with the Duke of York and his household, his humility was such that 'he never looked the Duke or Duchess in the face,' and left the Court without acquiring an accurate knowledge of their persons. His tribulations in this land of heresy are made the most of; but it is consoling to observe that among the worst of them is noted his suffering under English cookery. 'Quelque répugnance qu'il eût pour les mets dont usent les 'Anglais, et quoiqu'il eût à souffrir dans l'usage qu'il en 'faisait, il ne voulait jamais qu'on lui en servît d'autres!' Le pauvre homme! One accomplishment of a courtly preacher of the day he certainly possessed—that of harmonious flattery. The following is an extract from one of his sermons, preached in the Duchess's chapel, informing his hearers that the great Louis Quatorze had honoured the Blessed Virgin by condescending to wear her 'scapular':—

'Notre invincible monarque, qui, dès les premières années de son règne, a surpassé toutes les espérances de ses sujets, toute la gloire de ses ancêtres, qui se surpasse aujourd'hui lui-même, et qui étonne l'univers par des prodiges de conduite et de valeur, ce grand monarque s'est mis depuis longtems sous la protection de Marie en recevant son saint habit. Cette protection le fortifie au milieu de tant de fatigues, le conserve parmi des périls qui font frémir toute la France, lorsqu'elle-même, sous sa conduite, fait frémir toute l'Europe.'*

The Father continued, as we have said, for nearly two years to execute these functions in England. Then—in the autumn of 1678—the 'Popish Plot' burst like a thunderbolt on the nation. The populace was panic-stricken and bloodthirsty. It became necessary for those who preserved common sense and humanity to protect, as far as they could, at least the persons of those strangers who were thus imperilled. Parliament ordered the foreign priests out of the country. An exception was made for those in the service of the Crown. But this exception was not extended to the servants of the Duke of York, of which the latter, in his Memoirs, makes a great grievance.

'The factious party (he says) petitioned the King to put the penal laws into execution; which they pressed with that violence as he thought it necessary to yield a little to the current, and issued out a proclamation for banishing priests, &c.; on which occasion the Duke met with a sensible mortification from a hand that he did not expect it: for when it was moved in Council that the Duchess's priests ought to

* The date of this sermon would seem pretty nearly to synchronise with that of the reconciliation between the pious monarch and Madame de Montespan, so inimitably described by Madame de Caylus: 'Bossuet 'voulait les convertir: il ne réussit qu'à les raccommoder.'

be excepted as well as the Queen's and those of foreign ministers, it was absolutely refused as a privilege too great for a subject; but, as an expedient, proposed inserting them in the Queen's list. But Her Majesty, though the Duke and King himself desired it, would not consent.'

The biographers of De la Colombière make the most of this incident. It is a singular weakness of Jesuit writers—having as noble an army of brave and devoted men to enrol in their annals as history can show—that they cannot be content without ascribing the honours of martyrdom or confessorship to very insignificant candidates of their fraternity.

'He remained (says Father Tickell) for *several months* in prison, when, according to the petition of the Lords to His Majesty, he was banished out of the kingdom. Thus, a martyr only in desire, Father de la Colombière was forced, after witnessing the glorious death of his brethren, to abandon the fruits of his labour and tears. . . . It was in the beginning of 1679 that he returned to France, his health broken by his labours, the hardships of his prison, and the sufferings he had been forced to witness.'

All this is mere rhetoric, addressed, no doubt, to congenial readers. Father Claude suffered no imprisonment and witnessed no deaths. The truth is plainly told by Lingard (November, 1678).

'At this time Luzancy (a subordinate informer, afterwards eclipsed by Titus Oates) appeared again upon the scene. . . . He had already expelled from England St. Germain, almoner to the Duchess of York; he now expelled La Colombière, successor to St. Germain. Having composed a memorial for Du Vicquier, a Frenchman, he introduced him, first to the Bishop of London, and then to the Lord Chancellor. La Colombière was immediately arrested, and committed on the 16th of November. The former accused him at the bar of the House of Lords of having said that the King was a Catholic at heart, and that the power of the Parliament would not last for ever; of having perverted Protestants, and sent missionaries to Virginia.* The Lords noted that these were matters of dangerous consequence, and on the 21st addressed the King to send Colombière out of the kingdom.'

We may reasonably infer, in the then state of men's minds, that his expulsion followed without delay: and in point of fact

---

* This was a ticklish point just then with suspicious Protestants. Lord Baltimore, in Maryland, had conceded full liberty to Papists. Governor Berkeley, in Virginia, a highflying old Tory, if not himself a Catholic, had incurred popular hostility by his repression of the 'Bacon insurrection,' and his sanguinary executions. 'The old fool,' said the kind-hearted Charles II., with truth, 'has taken away more 'lives in that naked country than I for the murder of my father.' (*Bancroft.*)

he was at Paris some time before the 18th of January. The 'several months of imprisonment' are therefore simply mythical.

Soon after his arrival in France, the Father revisited Paray-le-Monial, where he found things in an admirable state, but 'saw Sister Alacoque only once' in his stay of eight days: returned there once more, as soon as he could get leave of absence from certain duties to which he had been appointed at Lyons; and died at Paray on the 15th February, 1682. 'On trouva dans sa succession,' says M. Lemontey, 'un petit 'écrit pour l'établissement de la dévotion au Sacré Cœur, et 'un portrait assez bizarre du Cœur de Jésus Christ, qu'il 'avait fait peindre dans des dimensions gigantesques.'

And now that we have completed the memorial of his brief career, we return to the question raised by the assertion of M. Lemontey and his (unfortunately) unnamed English authorities, that De la Colombière, under the disguise of Alacoque, was the true importer—not producer—of the devotion of the Sacred Heart, and that he derived it from the 'invention' of the 'famous Goodwin.'

Certainly, if he did not, the coincidence is a strange one. We have seen that fervid, and to ordinary sense presumptuous, expressions respecting the honour and attachment due to the Heart of our Saviour had been common enough in the Church for centuries before the 'revelations' at Paray-le-Monial. But these never assumed so technical, anthropomorphic a shape—we use once more the word consecrated by old controversy—as they suddenly did, in the middle of the seventeenth century, in the utterances of De la Colombière; assuming, for our purpose, that the latter and Mary Alacoque are substantially the same. And whatever difference may be traced between him and Goodwin amounts to no more than this, that the Romanist—according to the genius of his faith—relies more on mere sensible objects for the illustration of his chosen Devotion than the Puritan.

Now De la Colombière's main business in England was, as he informs us himself and as his enemies declared, the conversion of heretics: specially, of course, in London and about the Court. Nothing more natural than that he should have been brought into contact with the writings, if not with the person, of the popular religious writer Goodwin, who was still alive at that time and pursuing his ministry in London. And every student of ecclesiastical history is thoroughly aware of the readiness of the Jesuits to appropriate, and adopt, any specialties of heretical, or even pagan, devotion which they

could turn to account for what they deemed a good purpose. The Father would only be adopting, in England, the practices —some call them the stratagems—for which Francis Xavier has obtained unlimited honours, and for which his Order was praised by some and reproached by others throughout the regions of their wide conquests in Asia and America.

Of course these suggestions will pass for nothing, or be received with closed ears, by the returned pilgrims from Paray-le-Monial and those who sympathised with them. The Pope, by the act of beatification, has established the claim of Margaret Alacoque to have been a chosen instrument for communicating to the world a renovated, if not absolutely novel, 'devotion,' and to criticise her, as we might an ordinary enthusiast, on the ground of want of originality, is, in the eyes of her devotees, mere idle fault-finding. But there are others, not prepared to treat her narratives as absolutely within the limits of inspiration, who may nevertheless plead a shrewd objection to the theory of her connexion, through Mary of Modena's chaplain, with Oliver Cromwell's chaplain. They may point to the circumstance that, in the received accounts of her earthly career, the solemn revelations which she received, the visions which were vouchsafed to her, the conception at least of her schemes for establishing and propagating the 'culte' of the Sacred Heart, would seem to have preceded the mission of De la Colombière to London. We find at least no evidence—though M. Lemontey seems to imagine that such is traceable—of his having been in England on any previous occasion. And it is scarcely probable that any knowledge of Goodwin's work could have reached him before his arrival there. We should be driven, therefore, on this reasoning, to the conclusion that there was a mere casual, though very strange, coincidence between the two.

But to such reasoning there is a very pregnant reply. The dates of the nun's visions, and of her intimations respecting them to others—as well as those of the corresponding development of the Devotion by Father de la Colombière himself—are in truth entirely vague and unsettled. Margaret Mary kept no diary; nor did the Father. They noted, but did not chronicle, their spiritual experiences. If those of the nun were in truth dictated to her by the Jesuit when and where he pleased, as Lemontey supposes, the objection raises, of course, no real difficulty. But even if her own, what is their value as to details of fact? Margaret Mary, we believe, left no writing at all: De la Colombière none touching his biography except incidentally. The records of the former's life and conversation were

collected, as we have said, by Father Rolin, who did not assume the office of her director until 1685. The slight existing notices of De la Colombière's doings in England are contained, so far as we know, in a few pages of meditations made during his spiritual retreats, and committed to paper—or, at all events, to the press—after his decease. To piece these together, as they have been pieced, seems like the work of the 'arrangers' of the Iliad. And therefore, without imputing to the compilers of these scanty memoirs any design to defraud the ghost of Thomas Goodwin, of whom they had probably never heard, it seems evident that the loose and incoherent character of their workmanship precludes the omission from being employed as a serious argument against his claims to have originated the glories of the great 'Devotion.'

Such is the conclusion to which a careful, and, as we believe, dispassionate examination of these strange and ambiguous records of a special inspiration, or of superstition, fanaticism, or trickery, must of necessity lead us. If Marie Alacoque was, as the Pope makes her, a divinely chosen vessel for the communication of His will to mankind in the same sense as the Apostles were of old, there is nothing further to be said. If she was not—if she was a mere human agent—then the conjecture of M. Lemontey, and his anonymous English authorities, is probably the reasonable one. She was set in motion by Father de la Colombière, and the Father devised the shape and metaphorical language of the religious movement which he instituted under her name mainly from the volume of the Puritan Goodwin, with which, as we have seen, he had all the probabilities which juxtaposition can give of becoming familiar. In fact, his task (if this supposition be correct) was little more than to give the additional body colouring, which Romanism imparts and admits, to the vigorous but less definite outlines traced by the Calvinist. However this may be, the fact remains that the Devotion, thus questionably instituted, gains strength and popularity every day, and the grand manifestations of lofty religious eloquence—the spirit of Pascal, and Bossuet, and Fénelon, and those who in their several tasks and several generations have endeavoured to establish a harmony between the truths revealed by God and the truths conquered by severe and pious application of the faculties of man—have grown pale before it. To this we have come at last. The fires of almost extinct belief, rekindled by M. de Maistre, and Montalembert, and Lamennais, and Lacordaire—those 'thoughts which wandered through eternity,' clothed in language which to many a seeking soul seemed to approach

more nearly to the inspired than any uttered by man not so favoured from above—all have burnt out. And we see what has arisen in place of them. It may be, as some think, the destiny of Catholicism to sicken and die under this baleful influence of recrudescent superstition: but do matters stand much better with its opponents? Protestantism, in France, is very powerful just now, not so much from its numbers, as from the virtues, intelligence, and high training of its professors, and from the increasing influence of those who gradually find refuge within it from the puerilities and extravagances, both of fashionable and of vulgar Romanism. But French Protestantism is itself sick at heart, for the time at all events, of that inveterate division between orthodoxy and Liberalism which rends her synods asunder. And the other great rival of the day—Infidelity, or Voltairianism, or whatever she may be called—shows no sign of profiting by the extravagances of the one belief, or the divisions of the other. She brings forth no 'things new and old' from her exhausted stores. Her recent leaders either sink into a kind of hopeless and heartless Nihilism, or diverge into strange and lawless fanaticisms which are repudiated by society no less than by religion. It is a melancholy retrospect—a still more melancholy prospect: and not for France only, which, with whatever special differences of habits of mind and of genius, is an epitome of the civilised world. But those whose eyes look the most firmly and resolutely into the abyss believe that they discern, in the general and marked desire for religious convictions, such as seems everywhere to lie at the bottom of the conflicting currents which agitate the surface of serious thoughts, a guide, uncertain and tottering as its progress may as yet be, towards the other side of chaos.

ART. X.—*Inaugural Address and Speeches of the Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli, M.P., Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow, delivered November* 1873.

DURING the past autumn all the minor and some of the major prophets have been exercising their vocation with that activity which in their case always signalises the period of leisure. Even the marsh of political stagnation is sometimes vocal; and this year, the party which inhabits that unsavoury swamp has croaked an unusual chorus of jubilation over the decline and fall of the Gladstone Administration:—'The 'vessel is among the breakers, and spectators are scarcely at