

According to the testimony even of du Boullay and of Crévier the historians of the University, its course of instruction was then in a feeble condition. Studies were almost utterly neglected; and, what was still more disastrous, the looseness of morals among the young people of the schools was only equalled by the absurdity of their ideas and the impiety of their doctrines.

The colleges of the Jesuits were freely opened to all; and along with a taste for literature, reestablished a zeal for faith and for the practice of a Christian life; and we can say of those teachers what Voltaire said of Father Porée, they "had the merit of making their disciples love literature and virtue."

But the League was formed. That great movement, which was legitimate in itself, since its aim was to defend the religion of the great mass of Frenchmen against a few fanatics, brought many ills and excesses in its train. Relying upon history, we can point to the conduct of the Company of Jesus as a model of prudence in that delicate conjuncture.

Its members admitted the correctness of the principles of the League, which was simply a resistance of the national Catholicity to a Protestant invasion, but at the same time it strove to calm the effervescence of passion and to reconcile interests. Far from meddling in the struggles of political parties, they were, from the beginning to the end, the apostles and mediators of peace. Outside of Paris their action was of little importance, for the fifty cities which adhered to the League contained not one house of the Jesuits. In Paris, Father Pignat displayed great devotion, but it was altogether platonic and had not even the encouragement of possible success. His efforts were lost, as was to be expected amid the noise of the tempest, while the fury of the sixteen which he had undertaken to control to the best of his ability, in spite of him, increased in madness, although he did succeed in moderating it more than once at the risk of his liberty and even of his life; but other members of the Society, accepting a more useful mission, undertook to arrange conferences looking to peace with the Sovereign Pontiff.

At the height of the excitement in Paris, a few preachers, carried away by their zeal, departed from the reserve imposed upon them by their institute; but they were soon recalled to themselves by the energetic measures of the general, Claude Aquaviva. "Tell the king," he wrote to the provincial of France, "how strongly the Constitutions forbid us to take part in temporal affairs."

More than that, he remonstrated very firmly with Sixtus V. who was passionately partial to the League, on the necessary neutrality of the Order.

But the conversion of Henry IV. to Catholicity removed the need of the League. Bellarmine, who was then at Paris, being questioned as to the lawfulness of a near surrender of the Capital to the king, replied, (against the opinion of the University) that it was lawful to lay aside arms," and that it was "a duty to cease to struggle when there was no longer an object." At the same time, the Jesuits in Rome were labouring to bring about a reconciliation between the king of France and the Church. It is a remarkable thing that the most active and devoted of these benevolent negotiators were an Italian, Father Possevin; a Spaniard, Cardinal Toledo; and two Frenchmen, unjustly banished by the Parliament, Fathers Commolet and Guéret.

Béarnias was not ungrateful. "My cousin," wrote Henry IV. to Cardinal Toledo, "I know that after God and our Holy Father, it is to the integrity of your conscience that I owe the absolution" (that is, the removal of the excommunication,) "which it has pleased His Holiness to decree in my favour."

This moderate conduct of the Jesuits, joined to great zeal for the integrity of the faith, was not calculated to disarm the hatred that surrounded them. Better things had been expected from them; the Parliament and the University were unanimously disappointed.

Soon the confidence with which the Holy See, the episcopate and the Catholic people lavished upon them, all united to exasperate the envy of their numerous enemies. The same fanatics who had armed Poltrot, the murderer of the Duke de Guise, and Clément, the assassin of Henry III., thought to involve the Jesuits in the punishment of Chastel.

It was not easy to do this, on account of the evidence of facts, the public esteem, and the acknowledged sympathy of the king; but public esteem is liable to waver, and the king had a great deal to do. Besides, that epoch offers astonishing examples of parliamentary intrigue.

John Chastel had during ten years followed the course of the University; he was studying law there under Marcellus at the time when he made the attempt on Henry IV. But, formerly, he had attended the College of Clermont for a few months as an extern pupil, and this sorry detail served as a point of departure for an accusation. But how develop it? The Parliament attended to that. Something else was needful, to be sure, but as the Parliament was not exacting, it was satisfied with the few months' externate. "Huguenots and libertines," says the historian Duplex, "launched a thousand execrations, curses, and imprecations against the Jesuits; but neither proof nor presumption against them could be forced from the assassin's mouth by the agony of torture." L'Etoile, an enemy of the Jesuits, Sully likewise, as well as de Thou, Mathieu, Cayet, the *Mémoires de la Ligue*, and all the chroniclers, unanimously acknowledge that "Chastel execrated the Jesuits, and to his last breath declared them unjustly suspected."

Nevertheless, during those months of the externate, the Jesuits might have taught Chastel, in addition to the art of assassination, that of silence. Besides, why so many roundabout ways? "If it is not thou, it is thy brother," the "Jesuits must have been guilty," and the Parliament disgraced itself, for the first time, by creating a precedent for the great iniquity of the XVIIIth century.

The Parliament condemned in spite of every appearance and in spite of common sense. That great body, so often worthy of the respect of history, listening only to its blind passion, did not hesitate at the most hateful of crimes, *judicial assassination*. An inoffensive old man, who, it is likely, had never seen Chastel, Father Guignard, was living buried in his books in the library of the college. He was arrested, condemned, and hanged in the place de Grève, and the only

crime he was guilty of, says L'Etoile, was, "having been born at an unlucky hour."

But what was the excuse for this summary judgment and cruel sentence?

"Because," replies Hurault de Chiverny, chancellor of France, in his "Mémoires d'Etat," "the enemies of the Jesuits found, or perhaps supposed that there were certain private writings concerning the death of the late King Henry III. in Guignard's room." Now, "the judges who condemned him," adds L'Etoile, "were mostly those who had assisted at the decrees of judgment pronounced against the late king in the year 1539" (that was five years before), which is a strange thing."

Strange indeed, and almost incredible, if we were speaking of anything else but the condemnation of a Jesuit.

We have preferred to quote writers and chroniclers inimical to the Jesuits, and this was natural; not one honourable writer has failed to condemn this act of repulsive iniquity, but it is curious to study these facts in the books of modern "Liberalism." I have a work of the kind, called popular, under my eyes, one that enjoys an enviable notoriety with certain people; it is the "Histoire de Paris," by Dulaure, and it excites my wonder. This Dulaure is not really a bad man; he would have been better pleased if they had not hanged Father Guignard, and above all, if they had not burned his body and scattered his ashes to the wind, which he thinks unnecessary; he has a trifle of pity for those poor ashes, while he insults the man, and mildly chides the Parliament.

But he heartily and openly detests the Jesuits! Considering the chaplet of unblushing calumnies he weaves against the Jesuits in regard to this hideous murder of a Jesuit, it seems as though his greatest grievance with the Parliament was that it had left so many Jesuits alive.

His paragraph referring to the decree condemning ALL JESUITS as corruptors of youth, as disturbers of the public peace, etc., to leave Paris within three days, is full of joy, and he gives a good many pages to the description of the grotesque column, "a monument to commemorate the disgrace of the Jesuits." This column would rather have perpetuated the infamy of the Parliament had not Henry IV., out of consideration for his amiable presidents and counsellors, thrown it down and swept it away.\* At the same time that the excellent Dulaure good-naturedly scolds the judicial assassins of Father Guignard, who, after all, was only one Jesuit, he approves of the exile of five hundred Jesuits, who, perhaps, have not poisoned Henry IV., but who, undoubtedly would poison him as they had poisoned Henry III!

For Ravallac was a Jesuit, as Jacques Clément was a Jesuit, as all the assassins of kings, from Brutus to Damiens, have been Jesuits. All this is hummed in a sleepy tone to a false air, badly imitated from Béranger.

The blockhead Dulaure lived just before the time of "enlightened" liberalism; in his day there was only the liberalism of mud. Every well brought-up *bourgeois* peacefully helped himself to his meal of Jesuit as was proper, and after finishing Father Guignard, would add with the malicious smile of the Voltaires of Yvetot: "If Henry IV. had not petted the Jesuits, there were ten thousand who would have stabbed him by turns. It's a well-known fact!"

Ah! to be sure; hurrah for light! Of course I have no desire to deprive people of so much "enlightenment" of their Dulaures!

(To be continued.)

\* This recalls the monument erected in London in memory of the great fire in 1666, and the inscription on which charged that dreadful calamity upon the "Pupils." This monument was allowed to remain until the intelligence of our own times spurred the slander and ordered its removal.—(Translator.)

## LOUGH DERG AND ITS PILGRIMAGES.

THE oldest existing institution of the Irish Church is the Pilgrimage of St. Patrick's Purgatory. It forms a connecting link between the days of St. Patrick and the present day. Its penitential exercises are most singular, have always been regulated and conducted by the ecclesiastical authorities, and, moreover, have scarcely ever been interrupted for any notable time. The lake is situated about four miles from the Bay of Donegal, and about ten miles from the town itself; it is approached by three routes, the principal of which is that from Pettigo, which place is easily reached by train, cars being in waiting to convey the pilgrims to the lake, and a ferry boat, appropriately named the St. Patrick, plying between the shore and station island, where the devotional exercises are performed.

The time for performing the pilgrimage is from the 1st July till 15th August. It lasts, according to modern custom, three days, although many persons remain for six, or even nine. Each day three stations are performed, the day beginning with prayers and Mass in the Church of St. Patrick, and closing with a sermon and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Each station consists, besides the visit to the Blessed Sacrament, of 97 Paters, 160 Aves and 29 Credos, and, at the end of the day, five decades of the Rosary are said; but some persons, who follow the old practice, add to these several other devotions; in every case the penitent makes the circuit of the churches and "Saints' Beds" while reciting his prayers, and, as a rigorous fast upon one meal of meagre food is observed during the whole time, it will be seen that the pilgrimage to Lough Derg is no light matter. But the most singular part of it is the vigil "in prison," i.e., St. Patrick's Church, which now takes the place of the ancient purgatorial cave, a whole night being spent there in reciting Rosaries, making the Stations of the Cross, etc., previous to Confession and reception of Holy Communion. Pilgrims are also forbidden to take intoxicating drinks on the island, or within three miles of it, or to carry away pebbles or water from the lake, lest they should attach undue value to these things.—Exchange.