



Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



PRESENTED BY

The Rev. Mr. Joel Schevers

BX 945 .P3 1886 v.5  
Parsons, Reuben, 1841-1906.  
Studies in church history

*Wm. H. Dancy*



STUDIES  
IN  
CHURCH HISTORY

BY  
REV. REUBEN PARSONS, D. D.

---

VOL. V  
CENTURY XIX. (Part I).

---

THIRD EDITION

“That a theologian should be well versed in history, is shown by the fate of those who, through ignorance of history, have fallen into error. . . . . Whenever we theologians preach, argue, or explain Holy Writ, we enter the domain of history.”—

MELCHIOR CANUS, *Loc. Theol.*, B. XI., c. ii.

JOHN JOSEPH McVEY  
PHILADELPHIA

1909

Imprimatur :

✠ MICHAEL AUGUSTINUS,

*Archiepiscopus Neo-Eboracensis.*

---

COPYRIGHT, 1898,  
JOHN JOSEPH McVEY

---

# STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS VII.

On Dec. 30, 1797, two days after the death of General Duphot, a catastrophe which promised to entail the most serious consequences on the government of the Pope-King (1), Pope Pius VI. issued the Consistorial Bull (2) *Christi Ecclesiae regendae munus*, providing for the contingencies which would probably occur, if, as seemed probable, he should die in a foreign land, and if the members of the Sacred College should be dispersed (3): "We wish and command that after the demise of the Sovereign Pontiffs (4), such of the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church as are present at the time shall assemble immediately. They will then examine the situation, and determine whether the Conclave shall be held in the customary place, or whether it be preferable to not fix on any place for the assembly. They will also determine whether the entrance into Conclave shall be hastened or deferred. All will obey the voice of the majority." When Pius VI. had been dragged from Rome by the troops of the One and Indivisible French Republic, and the cardinals had fled to various hospitable countries, this Bull was regarded as insufficient; and accordingly, the Pontiff issued from Florence, on Nov. 13, 1798, the Constitution *Quum nos superiori anno*, whereby the following dispositions were promulgated. Derogating from the Constitutions of his prede-

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 573.

(2) So termed because it was signed by all the cardinals present in the Consistory.

(3) These measures were supposed not to be divulged; but the *Nouveliste Politique* of Paris, in its issue of the iv. Messidor, An vi. (July 2, 1798), gave a synopsis of the Bull.

(4) The Latin text of the Bull uses the plural; and so does Baldassari in his Italian translation. It would seem, therefore, that Pius VI. anticipated a prolonged exile of the Papacy from its legitimate seat.

cessors, His Holiness dispensed the cardinals from all the usual formalities of a Conclave which do not involve the validity of an election. Reflecting on the peculiar circumstances of his situation, the Pontiff abolished the law which prohibited their Emmences from debating, during the life of a Pope, on their future choice of his successor ; he expressly allowed them to come to an agreement as to everything pertaining to the imminent Conclave, enjoining on them, however, not to publish, before they really met for the election, the name of the cardinal on whose elevation they might have agreed. The essentials for a valid election were declared to be those which had hitherto obtained ; the liberty of the cardinals was to be beyond question, and two thirds of the votes would be necessary for a choice. The right and duty of electing the new Pontiff was to belong to the most numerous body of cardinals residing, at the time of the death of Pius VI., in the dominions of some Catholic prince, and to such other cardinals as would join them. Immediately after the demise of His Holiness would have become a matter of certainty, the dean of the Sacred College was to indicate the time and place for the Conclave, and to summon the cardinals to it ; however, if the cardinal-dean should not be, at that time, in the Catholic country wherein the largest number of cardinals was found, the convocation to the Conclave was to be issued by that one of their Emmences who was the most exalted in dignity. That provisions such as these were necessary for the peace of the Church, must be evident to him who remembers that the emissaries of the French Directory had been preaching in Rome the alleged right of the parish-priests, in conjunction with the people of the Eternal City, to elect the successor of Pius VI.; and that the same principle was advanced with much acrimony by the Constitutional clergy of France. The government of the French Republic had resolved on an attempt to prevent any election of a new Pope ; and in case of failure to impede the Conclave, it had taken measures for the election of one in whom it hoped to find a docile instrument of its policy. Cretineau-Joly, in his French translation of the *Memoires* of Cardinal Consalvi, asserts that Bona-

parte did not pay any attention to the Conclave which elected Pius VII. (1). But it is certain that Bonaparte occupied himself with this Conclave not only while it was being held, and while he was First Consul, but also at as early a date as 1797, when he was commander of the Army in Italy. Writing from Mombello to the Directory on May 26, 1797, he said: "The Pope, citizens-directors, is still unwell. I beg you to send me new powers in reference to the Conclave, so that when it becomes necessary, I may communicate them to the French minister in Rome. We have the right to exclude one cardinal; and that one should be Albani, if he is pushed forward" (2). And on Sept. 29 of the same year, Bonaparte wrote to his brother, Joseph, then ambassador to the Holy See: "If the Pope dies, *you must do all that is possible to prevent the election of another one, and to effect a revolution. . . .* If it is impossible to prevent the election of another Pope, do not permit Cardinal Albani to be named. You must not merely exercise the right of exclusion (in regard to Albani); you must threaten the cardinals, declaring that I will march immediately on Rome" (3). Bonaparte was then encamped at Passeriano. And would Cretineau Joly have us believe that when Bonaparte was all-powerful and all-directing as First Consul, he was unaware that on Feb. 18, 1800, while the Conclave of Venice was still debating, Talleyrand communicated the following diplomatic note to Muzquiz, the Spanish ambassador in Paris? "I deem it necessary, M. l'Ambassadeur, to present to you some reflections on an imminent event which will interest both Spain and the French Republic in many ways. An election of a successor to Pius VI. is being made in Venice under the absolute influence of the House of Austria,

(1) See his Note in his Vol. i., p. 270. (2) *Correspondence of Napoleon I.*, III., 65.

(3) Albani, a nephew of Clement XI., had for many years been hostile to all French influence in the Eternal City. In the Conclave of 1775, this hostility had led to an altercation between him and Cardinal de Bernis, who was then also French ambassador to the Holy See. Lifting his biretta from his head, Albani remarked to the Frenchman: "This biretta was not given to me by a courtesan" -- an allusion to the indebtedness of his adversary to the Pompadour. When the revolution of 1789 showed its true colors, Albani used every influence at his command to prevent the spread of its principles in Italy. Therefore it was that Berthier, after his subversion of the pontifical government, in 1798, sequestered all the possessions of the Albani family, among which were the immense treasures of art and literature of the Villa Albani, which were sent to Paris.

and by cardinals who are from countries now ruled by that dynasty (1). Many circumstances combine to render this election illegitimate. It is easy and scarcely necessary to recount here all the reasons which, according to principles which are of sacred authority in this matter, nullify the proceedings of this Conclave. These are the absence of cardinals representing all the Catholic powers; the influence exerted by one alone of those powers; the participation of the two non-Catholic governments of London and St. Petersburg (2); the manifest neglect of the usages and forms hitherto observed in all the Conclaves which have been held in Rome. . . . When the election is completed, undoubtedly it will be communicated to the king of Spain. *The first Consul orders me, M. l'Ambassadeur, to signify to you his opinion that it will be for the interest of the two countries, and in accordance with the obligations which unite them, if His Catholic Majesty refuses to recognize this election*" (3). We may note that the enterprise of Talleyrand, or rather that of Bonaparte, his master, was fruitless; for on March 15, the prime-minister of Spain, Urquijo, wrote to Muzquiz that the election at Venice was proceeding freely and regularly, and that a Spanish cardinal, who had received the instructions of His Catholic Majesty, was one of the electors. "There-

(1) Here the perspicacious Talleyrand erred egregiously. Albani was a Roman. The Duke of York (Henry IX. of England), or as he was more ecclesiastically styled, the Cardinal of York, was a Roman by birth, but always insisted on his English nationality. Antonelli was a pontifical subject, being a native of Sinigaglia. Mattei was a Roman. Carafa di Trajetto was a Neapolitan. Zelada was a Roman, though of Spanish origin. Caccagnini was a Ferrarese, and therefore a papal subject. Archetti, although a native of Brescia in Lombardy, was bishop of Ascoli, a papal city. Doria was a Genoese. Borgia was a native of Velletri, in the Papal States. Caprara was a Bolognese, and therefore a papal subject. Pignatelli was a Neapolitan. Roverella was a Ferrarese. Somaglia was a Piacentino, and therefore a Parmesan. Antonio Doria was a Genoese. Braschi was from Cesena, a papal city. Manry was a Frenchman. Honorati was from the papal town of Jesi. Gioannetti was a Bolognese. Gerdil was a Savoyard, and therefore a subject of the king of Sardinia. Chiaramonti was from Cesena. Lorenzana was a Spaniard. De Pretis was a Piedmontese. Ruffo was a Neapolitan. Therefore, of the thirty-five cardinals in the Conclave of Venice, *twenty-four were subjects of no one of the branches of the House of Austria*. Of the eleven who were subjects of either the Austrian, Tuscan, or Modenese Hapsburgs, ten were Italians, and therefore not apt to favor unduly the desires of the Viennese court. One alone, Herzan de Harras, could be said to be devoted to the Hapsburgs; and he was a Bohemian.

(2) This assertion was a downright lie.

(3) See the valuable collection by Count Boulay de la Meurthe, entitled: *Documents Concerning the Negotiations for the Concordat of 1801, and Concerning Other Relations of France with the Holy See in 1800 and 1801*. Vol. 1., p. 2. Paris, 1835.

fore," added the minister, "in conscience and as a matter of good policy, the king cannot avoid a recognition of the Pontiff who will be elected."

Pope Pius VI. having died in his prison at Valence on Aug. 29, 1799, the Catholic world was brought face to face with that question which it had anticipated during the previous two years—where was the Conclave to be held? It might be held in Rome; for the Coalition of 1799, aided by the absence of Bonaparte in Egypt, had momentarily checked the triumphs of the French Republic in Italy, and a Neapolitan army had taken possession of the pontifical capital. At first it seemed that Rome would indeed be chosen as the place for the election; for since France had withdrawn from the Catholic concert in Europe, her olden position of pre-eminence in that concert seemed to have devolved upon the Holy Roman Emperor. And Thugut, the imperial Minister for Foreign Affairs, was favorable to the selection of the Eternal City. However, Francis II. declared that the condition of the papal capital was not as yet sufficiently settled to warrant the Sacred College in proceeding thither; and when Ruffo, the papal nuncio at Vienna, proposed to Thugut that Padua should have the honor of the Conclave, he learned that His Majesty had decided to offer the Benedictine monastery of St. George in Venice for the momentous event (1). The Queen of the Adriatic then harbored more members of the Sacred College than were to be found in any one Catholic state; therefore, by accepting the invitation of the emperor, even though it was prompted by interested motives, their Eminences obeyed the commands of Pius VI. The particulars of this interesting Conclave of Venice, as recorded by the Chevalier Artaud de Montor (2), who had enjoyed the confidence of many of the electors, will undoubtedly satisfy the ordinary reader. The accomplished diplomat was firmly convinced that he had said the last word concerning the election of Pius VII.; he ventured to say: "In order to tell all the truth in regard to the Conclave of 1800,

(1) Letter of Ruffo to Cardinal Antonelli, Sept. 24, 1799.—See also Mgr. Ricard's *Diplomatic Correspondence and Unedited Memoires of Cardinal Maury*. Vol. 1., pp. 202, 203, 220.

(2) *History of Pope Pius VII.* Paris, 1836.

it was necessary to speak of it as we have spoken." Nevertheless, the work of Artaud had scarcely appeared, when its exactness, in very many points, was impeached by Baldassari (1), one of the fellow-prisoners of Pius VI., and a prelate whose acquaintance with the papal court rendered him more authoritative than the French *chargé d'affaires*. The conclusions of Baldassari were adopted by Moroni (2). However, more light on the proceedings of the Venetian Conclave was still desired by those who take interest in questions of this nature; and the demand was almost completely satisfied when Cretineau-Joly published his translation of the *Memoires* of Cardinal Consalvi (3). Additional information has been furnished recently by Mgr. Ricard in his publication of the literary remains of Cardinal Maury (4); and now the patient labors of an enterprising Jesuit, Charles Van Duerm, have presented the student of ecclesiastical history with a mass of pertinent documents drawn from the Imperial Archives of Vienna (5). Referring the ambitious reader to these sources of more detailed information, we proceed to a succinct narration of the proceedings in the Conclave of 1800. Thirty-five cardinals took part in this election, unavoidable circumstances having prevented the attendance of the eleven other members of the Sacred College (6). The Conclave began on Dec. 1, 1799; and from the first day it was evident

(1) *Narrative of the Misfortunes and Sufferings of the Glorious Pope Pius VI.* vol. ii., p. 407-421 (Edit. Rom. 1889, vol. v., of the *Collection of Historico-Polemical Works*).

(2) *Dictionary of Historico-Ecclesiastical Erudition.* Articles *Pius VII., Albani, Braschi, Consalvi, Pacca, etc.*

(3) *Memoires of Cardinal Consalvi, With An Introduction and Notes.* Paris, 1864. The Italian original has never been published; why, we cannot tell.

(4) *Diplomatic Correspondence and Unedited Memoires of Cardinal Maury* 141le, 1891.

(5) *Some More Light on the Conclave of Venice, and on the Commencement of the Pontificate of Pius VII.* Paris, 1896. Both Cardinal Consalvi and Cardinal Maury, and after them Count d'Haussonville (*The Roman Church and the First Empire*, Paris, 1869), find much fault with the conduct of Herzan de Harras, who was the mouthpiece of the emperor, Francis II., in the Conclave. An unprejudiced inspection of the documents revealed by Van Duerm proves that, whatever may have been the personal inclinations of Francis II., the spirit of Kaunitz, that spirit which animated nearly every one of the Holy Roman Emperors of the German line, still survived in Vienna in 1800, and hoped to make capital out of the troubles of the Holy See.

(6) These absentees were the Italians: Gallo, Rannuzzi, and Zurla; the Frenchmen: La Rochefoucauld, Rohan, Montmorency-Laval; the Spaniards: Mendoza, Sentmanat; the Hungarian: Bathyanyi; the Austrian (Tridentine): Migazzi; and the German: Franckenberg.

that the imperialist influences in the Conclave were to be directed toward the election of Alexander Mattei, archbishop of Ferrara. Mattei was a perfect model of episcopal virtue; but not for that reason had he obtained the preference of the imperial cabinet. He had been one of the papal signatories of the Treaty of Tolentino, by which instrument the Holy See had been forced to cede the three Legations to the conquering French. These Legations were now in the possession of the Austrians; and the cabinet of Vienna had not the slightest inclination to restore them to the Pontiff. Consalvi shows us how the imperial selection of Mattei as a preferred candidate had been determined by the Austrian greed for ecclesiastical territory: "It must be remembered that the object of the Viennese court, in this election of a new Pope, was to secure for itself, as far as possible, the tranquil possession of the three Legations, which its troops had recently occupied, after the retreat of the French. Concerning this intention of Austria, there were not only the clearest indications, but proofs the most evident and decisive. In order to attain its object, the imperial court wished for a Pope who would confirm in its favor the cession which had been imposed on Pius VI., or at least for a Pope who would not oppose its retention of the provinces when things came to be settled. . . . Remembering that Cardinal Mattei had negotiated and signed the Treaty of Tolentino, the Austrian cabinet imagined that he, less than any other, would attack the instrument, and reduce it to nothing. Supposing that Mattei would condescend to its desires, the court of Vienna tried to advance his candidature, to the exclusion of all others" (1). The manœuvres of the Austrian cabinet are clearly betrayed in the instruction which the emperor gave to his representative in the Conclave, Cardinal Herzan, on Nov. 26, 1799: "We, Francis II., by the Grace of God Emperor-elect of the Romans, ever August; King in Germany; King of Hungary, of Bohemia, of Dalmatia, of Croatia, of Slavonia, of Galicia, of Lodomeria, and of Jerusalem; Archduke of Austria, etc. Secret instruction in reference to the future pontifical election, given to His Eminence the Father in God, Francis,

(1) *Loc. cit.*, vol. i., p. 238.

of the Holy Roman Church Cardinal Herzan, of the Holy Roman Empire Count de Harras, Grand-Cross of the Royal Hungarian Order of St. Stephen, Our Active Privy Councillor, and Bishop-elect of Stein. . . . We oppose most seriously the election of any cardinal from the dominions of Spain, Sardinia, Naples, or Genoa ; or of any cardinal who has given proofs of devotion to the interests of any one of the three crowns here mentioned. . . . We extend our exception to all cardinals of French origin, and to all those who have shown any disposition to espouse the cause of France. . . . In a most special manner we formally and absolutely exclude the cardinals Gerdil, Caprara, Antonelli, Maury, and those of the Doria family. . . . Our paternal heart discerns only two cardinals whose qualifications promise a capability to encounter present difficulties ; it is our duty to name them, and we enjoin on the cardinal ( Herzan ) to display the greatest activity in their favor. In the first place stands Cardinal Mattei, in whom we place more confidence than in any other. We cannot understand how the cardinals could at all reasonably oppose his election. However, if in the course of the Conclave it shall be seen that all our endeavors for the election of Mattei will have been vain, then we inform the cardinal (Herzan) provisorially and confidentially that our second choice is solely Cardinal Valenti (Gonzaga).” Such were the instructions with which Herzan entered the Conclave ; and on Dec. 14, Cardinal Maury wrote to Louis XVIII., then at Mittau : “ When he entered the Conclave, Cardinal Herzan told us that the emperor, since he was master of Italy, wanted a Pope who would suit him. However, we may regard as certain that the king of Naples will oppose the election of an imperial subject, and that he would not restore, at least immediately, the city of Rome to such a Pope.” It would seem that the Austrian cabinet was not averse to a project similar to that which Napoleon afterward devised in his own interests. Maury adds that “ It is even feared that the new Pope, like the duke of Modena, *will be asked to accept, in exchange for his dominions, some compensation in Germany, whither the Holy See would be transferred.*” However, the imperial agent failed to obtain for

his candidate more votes than were cast by the cardinals who followed the leadership of Antonelli. They numbered thirteen; while the twenty-two followers of Braschi, during nearly two months, continually voted for Bellisomi, bishop of Cesena. Then a change was operated in the views of some of the electors; and there appeared a probability of the election of the celebrated Barnabite, Gerdil (1). But this pre-eminently learned and virtuous cardinal was one of those whom the German emperor had "formally and absolutely" excluded; therefore Herzan pronounced his "exclusion," although by so doing the Bohemian lost the opportunity of thereafter protesting against the election of one who might be much more obnoxious to his master. Then two of the Antonelli party announced their intention of joining the ranks of Braschi—a procedure which would have given to Bellisomi the necessary two thirds. Unable to exercise the imperial right of "exclusion" a second time, Herzan urged that since the Conclave was being held in the dominions of the Holy Roman Emperor, it might be well to discover the sentiments of that sovereign, before the electors emitted their definitive votes. Their Eminences deemed it proper to concede this matter of courtesy, and a special courier departed for Vienna. A month passed before the imperial reply was received; and in that space of time an influential prelate, one who was not a member of the Sacred College, destroyed the prospects of both Mattei and Bellisomi, and procured the adhesion of all the cardinals to the candidacy of one whom his enlightened zeal had pronounced

(1) "A scholar of the first rank in nearly every field which is cultivated by the human intellect; a prelate who was worthy of the first ages of the Church; Gerdil was, in these latter days, one of those men who have been the most useful to religion. Ever attentive to this grand object; familiar with no places but his study and his oratory; he preserved his peace of mind amid the storms which agitated his old age. . . . The characteristic of all his works is forceful reasoning, united with wisdom and moderation. Cardinal Gerdil presses his adversaries persistently; but nothing offensive is uttered by him. Ordinarily it is from their own writings that he obtains the weapons with which to combat them. One perceives that it is truth that he seeks, the truth of which he is the champion; it is error alone, not an individual, that he attacks. The most distinguished scholars, even those whose opinions he rejected, deemed his friendship an honor; and all rendered justice to his merit, his modesty, and his knowledge. He astonished all by his immense erudition, and by an extraordinary memory which he preserved to the end. He was so penetrated by Holy Writ, by a knowledge of the Fathers and of the Councils, that he spoke their language admirably and without effort." (MICHAUD; *Biography*, art. *Gerdil*.)

to be the man of the hour. This prelate was Hercules Consalvi, one of the two secretaries of the Conclave, and one of the most striking figures of the Napoleonic period of history (1). The predilections of this statesman were in favor of Cardinal Gregorio Barnaba Chiaramonti, a member of the Benedictine Order, and bishop of Imola. Having triumphed with great difficulty over the diffidence of his favorite, Consalvi gained for him the promises of nineteen votes; and shortly afterward he was assured of the adhesion of the cardinals who followed the lead of Cardinal Maury. On March 14, the election was consummated; every vote, excepting his own, having been cast for Chiaramonti. The new Pontiff assumed the name of Pius VII.

Gregorio Barnaba Chiaramonti was born at Cesena in 1742. Following the example of his mother, who became a Carmelite after the death of her husband, the young Gregorio devoted himself to the monastic life, and when sixteen years

(1) The first Napoleon was pre-eminently a judge of men, and he declared that the magnetic influence exercised by Consalvi merited for him the designation of "Siren of Rome." Born in the Eternal City on June 8, 1757, of an honorable family of Pisan origin, Hercules Consalvi was left an orphan, at the age of nine, to the guardianship of Cardinal Negroni. His first studies were made in the College of Urbino; but while yet a boy he attracted the attention of the cardinal-duke of York, bishop of Frascati, who took him under his affectionate supervision, and transferred him to the new institution which he had opened in his episcopal city. Having finished his course of theology at the extraordinarily early age of eighteen, he was admitted to the Academy for Noble Ecclesiastics at Rome, where he went through a further course of six years, enjoying, among other advantages, the study of history under the guidance of the celebrated Zaccaria. In 1782 he was appointed private chamberlain to the Pope; but his first step in the administrative career was taken in 1786, when he became a municipal judge—*ponente del buon governo*. He was also made secretary of the Ospizio di San Michele,—that immense establishment on the right bank of the Tiber, at once an orphan asylum, a protectory, and a technical and art school, which the Popes have rendered the wonder and edification of the world. He was thirty-four years old when he was assigned to an auditorship of the *Ruota*, a position which agreed with his studious tastes, and which, as it entailed a residence of only five months in the year, enabled him to satisfy his inclination for travel. His new office drew him considerably into society; and the most select *salons* of Rome soon resounded with anecdotes of his tact and exquisite delicacy. One instance of this latter quality, so advantageous to a diplomat, merits remembrance. Among the numerous *émigrés* whom the late French Revolution had forced to seek the hospitality of the Father of the Faithful, were the Princesses Adelaide and Victoire, aunts of King Louis XVI. One evening at a *conversazione* some indiscreet royalist, having detailed the news of a victory of the Austrians over the troops of the Republic, dilated with glee upon the losses of the latter. Consalvi interrupted him with: "A moment, sir! You forget that you speak in the presence of French ladies." The wave of the triumphant French Revolution threatened to engulf the States of the Church, and Pope Pius VI. anxiously sought for men who were capable of withstanding the storm. Republican emissaries were openly at work, and the maintenance of order in Rome was an arduous task. Consalvi was intrusted with the directorship of the military commission, which corresponded to the Ministry of War in other countries; and so well did he fulfil his duty, that the French Government, having no confidence in their being able to provoke an insurrection

of age, donned the cowl of St. Benedict. In the course of time Dom Gregorio became professor of theology, and finally abbot in the monastery of St. Calixtus at Rome. Pius VI. made him bishop of Tivoli; and in 1785 he was transferred to Imola, and enrolled in the Sacred College. In the early part of 1798 Cardinal Chiaramonti published a homily which he had delivered in his cathedral on the previous Christmas Day. This discourse was decidedly democratic in tone; and in later years revolutionary publicists, following the lead of the infamous Gregoire, who translated it and published it with numerous virulent commentaries, upbraided Pius VII. with an abandonment of his olden principles. Artaud expresses the opinion that Chiaramonti wrote only a portion of the crimiinated homily; the author-diplomat opines that some of the prelate's *entourage* afterward added to it the passages which certain critics have deemed objectionable. The opinion of Artaud is pure conjecture; and he does not attempt to furnish any reasons for it. Nor will the

against the Pope-King, impudently invaded the Pontifical territory. The disastrous treaty of Tolentino was the consequence of this sacrilege and violation of international law. In a few months the French Directory, under the pretext of avenging the death of General Duphot, killed in a riot provoked by himself, sent an army under Berthier to proclaim the Roman Republic. The Pontiff was dragged from his capital. Consalvi, warned by a friendly Jacobin, could have escaped; but, disdainng flight, he was imprisoned in Sant' Angelo, and his property was sequestered. After a long detention, the apostles of liberty condemned him to deportation to Cayenne, that living tomb to which they were wont to consign such ecclesiastics as they did not dare to guillotine. The intercession of some friends, however, prevented the enforcement of this sentence; and the seven Consuls of the Roman Republic decreed that Consalvi should be mounted on an ass, paraded through the streets of Rome, and flogged at stated intervals for the delectation of the populace. The commander of the French garrison possessed sufficient good sense, if he were actuated by no better motive, to ignore this decree of "commutation"; but, although he allowed the prelate to depart from Rome in a carriage, he compelled the driver to keep, throughout the entire journey to Naples, in the immediate company of eighteen galley slaves; and the refined gentleman was forced to share the meals of these presumed wretches, or starve. At Naples he was allowed to embark for Leghorn; and in due time he arrived at Florence, where he received the affectionate and grateful blessing of Pius VI., then confined in the Chartreuse of that city. He was next transferred by his persecutors to Venice, where he learned that his already sequestered property had been confiscated, as that of an enemy of the state. Pope Pius VI. died at Valence, on August 29, 1799; and, as it had done often before, has done in our day, and will do many a time before the sounding of the judgment trumpet, infidelity, backed by schism and heresy, pronounced the Papacy dead at last. But soon the foes of the Revolution triumphed for a moment, Italy breathed more freely, and Providence convened the Conclave at Venice. From this event dates the preponderating influence in the temporal, and to a great extent in the spiritual, affairs of the Papacy, exercised by Consalvi to the end of his life. Unanimously chosen as secretary of the Conclave, probably the most important one of modern times, he had abundant opportunity, and even need, of displaying the consummate tact which ever distinguished him in an eminent body, of whose members tact is the ordinary characteristic.

reader feel compelled to relieve the eminent writer of the homily from any part of the responsibility of its authorship, if he examines carefully the passages over which the revolutionists gloated. In the beginning of the discourse the prelate spends some time in showing how revealed religion manifests their true duties to men. Then he undertakes to prove that docility to the teachings of religion can alone render men happy under that democratic form of government, which has been established for more than a year (since the Treaty of Tolentino, ratified by Pius VI.) in the province of Imola. And then the preacher continues: "A democratic form of government is not opposed to the maxims which we have set forth. That form is not opposed by the Gospels; on the contrary, it requires all those sublime virtues which are inculcated only in the school of Jesus Christ—virtues which, if practiced by you religiously, will procure happiness for you, and glory and splendor for our republic. Let the solid foundation of our democracy be that virtue which leads man toward perfection, directing him toward his real end!" What is there in this passage which could justify Artaud in believing that in penning it "the *co-opérateurs du cardinal* forgot the rules of common sense"? The French royalist was a devout Catholic; but in forming this judgment he closed his eyes to the writings of Catholic theologians on the origin and forms of civil government. Nor could Gregoire, the apostate Conventional, justly derive from this teaching any support for his misnamed republicanism. Cardinal Chiaramonti found the Cisalpine Republic in *de facto* and in *de jure* possession of the province of Imola; and although in his heart he yearned for the day when the Pope-King would recover the entire Patrimony of St. Peter, he realized that it was his duty to procure the happiness of his people by explaining to them the nature and object of civil government. This homily was well known to the cardinals who met in Conclave in Venice; and the fact that all of them agreed as to the piety, prudence, and learning of Chiaramonti, is proof that neither Gregoire nor Artaud has properly presented the meaning of the document.

When the German emperor learned that his efforts in favor of Mattei had been useless, and that Chiaramonti, of whom his imperial penetration had taken no cognizance, had been elected, he vented his disappointment by declining to be officially represented at the ensuing coronation of His Holiness (1). It was because of this petty and boorish conduct of His Imperial and Apostolic Majesty that Pius VII. was crowned in the church of the monastery of St. George, and not in the Basilica of St. Mark. Francis II., who was soon to consent, at the bidding of his French conqueror, to the dissolution of the German Empire, even tried to force one of his subjects on the Pope as secretary of state. Pius VII. simply replied that as the Holy See had been robbed of its territories, he had no need of a prime-minister; a pro-secretary would suffice. That official he then proclaimed in the person of Consalvi; and in the following August, a month after his entrance into his capital, he enrolled the prelate in the Sacred College, and made him prime-minister. The task of the new head of the Papal cabinet was not an easy one: there was no army, no organization, no money. To be sure, on the day when he embarked at Pesaro, Pius VII. had learned that the Austrians, just beaten at Marengo on June 14, 1800, had lost the Legations; and at Foligno, they had surrendered a part of his dominions. But the greater part of the Patrimony of St. Peter was in the hands of strangers; and the Neapolitans, who had replaced the French in the Eternal City, showed no inclination to fulfil their promise to evacuate it. As in our day, the new minister could count neither on the Roman people nor on the Catholic powers; and neither could he rely much upon the support of the Pontiff, in enforcing the measures he felt to be necessary for the introduction of durable reforms, and for the triumph of his ameliorating projects. The gentle character of Pius VII. would tolerate nothing that savored of severity. But our limits will not allow us to dwell upon Consalvi's administration of the temporal sovereignty of the Papal States. In a paper which the great minister left for the guidance of Leo XII., he says: "Your Holiness

(1) See the letter of Cardinal Berzan to Thugut, March 22, 1800.

knows that nothing is more difficult than the science of government. I acquired it only after committing many mistakes. Mistakes instruct us. The greatest of all faults is to talk too much ; but one must tell the truth. The habitual life of nearly all courts is a continual lie. A lie on the part of Rome would ruin an entire pontificate ; a new Pope would become an instant necessity." Providence had reserved for Cardinal Consalvi a more lasting title to glory than that attainable by the successful government of a little state. More than any one man, far more than Bonaparte, to whom so many ascribe undue credit for so doing, he was to contribute to the re-establishment of religion in France ; and that work he was to effect by the conclusion of the Concordat. Bonaparte risked the failure of the project by his autocratic demands ; Consalvi insured it by his prudence and firmness. French imperialists are too much given to compare Bonaparte to Clovis and Charlemagne, in this matter of the Concordat. When, on June 5, 1800, Bonaparte delivered his famous allocution (so it was styled in the printed version, distributed among the clergy of Italy) to the parish priests of Milan, an address in which he duplicated that diplomacy already displayed to the Egyptian Mohammedans (1), he did not dare proclaim himself as the sole cause of the return of France to the Catholic worship. He merely said that he had "contributed *beaucoup*." The Catholic clergy of France, as a body, had not been derelict to their duty during the storms of the Revolution ; they had kept up the sacred fires, and had not awaited a Concordat to continue their mission. Bonaparte did not rebuild the demolished altars ; these were already rebuilt. It is certain that at the period when the negotiations for the Concordat were going on, the Catholic worship had been resumed in forty thousand communes. As to Bonaparte's sincerity and single-mindedness in this matter, if he proposed to gratify the clergy, it was for the purpose of using them. He had said to Bourrienne, the comrade of his boyhood : " You will see how I shall make use of

(1) Because of that diplomacy, men applied to him the verse of Voltaire :

" *J'eusse été, près du Gange, esclave des faux dieux,  
Chrétienne dans Paris, Musulmane en ces lieux.*"

the priests." And to Lafayette, who foresaw his designs, and asked him whether the signing of the Concordat was not a prelude to his coronation, he replied: "We shall see; we shall see."

The Revolution of 1789 had not only destroyed the civil order of the olden *régime*, but had overthrown the constitution of the Church, and had impelled a part of the clergy and people into schism. The exiled bishops and priests were the rightful pastors of the desolate churches; but the Constitutionals—that is, such clergymen as had adhered to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, imposed by the National Assembly on July 12, 1790, and condemned by the Pope—were in possession, and would not yield (1). All efforts to establish the worship of the Goddess of Reason had failed, and for ten years the religious question had been acrimoniously debated. Bonaparte had realized, for some time, the necessity of restoring religious tranquillity to France; but he had been thwarted by the Directory. When that body succumbed, more to popular contempt than to the young general's grenadiers, he was free to act. Accordingly, after the decisive victory of Marengo, Bonaparte wrote to Cardinal Martiniana, bishop of Vercelli, that he "desired to be on good terms with the Pope; and to arrange for the speedy restoration of religion in all the states subject to the Republic." Soon afterward he dispatched the reformed revolutionist, Cacault, as *chargé d'affaires* at Rome, with instructions to "treat the Pope as though he had two hundred thousand soldiers under arms." Pius VII. immediately appointed Mgr. Spina, archbishop of Corinth, and the theologian Caselli, to arrange the articles of a Concordat with the Abbé Bernier, a priest who enjoyed the esteem of the First Consul. But there were many obstacles in the way. Any transaction with the Roman Pontiff was obnoxious to unfrocked ecclesiastics like Talleyrand and Sieyès; to infidel scientists like Lalande and Monge; and to irreligious soldiers like Augereau, Massena, and Bernadotte. Then there were the Constitutional clergy, who announced a National Council for the spring of the following

(1) See our Vol. iv., ch. 23.

year. And not the least difficulty was that caused by the numerous legitimate bishops, whose resignation was demanded by the Pontiff as a concession to the government. This concession was refused by some, who contended that the Pope betrayed the Church of Christ if he absolved the sacrilegious robbers who had desolated their dioceses. Finally, there was the impetuous nature of the autocrat, who could ill brook the time-honored and generally necessary slowness in decision which is so characteristic of the *Curia Romana*. One day Cacault rushed in upon Consalvi, and breathlessly informed him that Bonaparte had written that if the affair was not consummated in the manner desired by him, within five days, all negotiation would cease. "Now I realize very well," said Cacault, who desired with all the enthusiasm of a convert the conclusion of a Concordat, "that you cannot sign so important a document without deliberation. I see but one thing for you to do: start at once for Paris. The consul will talk with a sensible cardinal, and between you the Concordat will be arranged (1). If you do not go, I must disrupt our relations; and Murat, who is now at Florence, will march on Rome. Go, and we shall bring Paris to her senses." The prelate and the *chargé* left Rome in the same carriage; and the saddening spectacle of profaned churches and monasteries, which met their eyes all along their route, made Consalvi feel how wise was Pius VII. when he insisted that his representative, while remaining inflexible in matters of dogma, should yield in every possible question of discipline, when such acquiescence proved essential to the conclusion of the Concordat.

(1) Thiers asserts that Consalvi, very unlike the old cardinals, was very partial to France; and that he foresaw in Bonaparte, just returned from Egypt, a future champion of the Church. The truth is that Consalvi did not judge France by the revolutionary exploits of her agents and soldiers. His insinuating disposition, his noble and affable manners, had made him friends in his jailers of Castel Sant' Angelo and Terracina. While condemning their principles, he admired these agents of an impious government, who generally manifested consideration for the victims of the Directory. For more than a hundred years the Bourbons of Spain and of Naples had tired themselves in afflicting the Popes; Austria, with the quasi-heretical laws of Joseph II., had unsettled religion in Germany, the Low Countries, and Tuscany. For such ungenerous Catholics was France, then, who, at least, did not play the hypocrite, to be forgotten? Her wicked government would fall; but the nation would remain, and it ought not to be sacrificed for the others.

Bonaparte received Consalvi with all due honor, and with sincere pleasure; but there was an evident determination, on the part of the consul, to hurry the business through in five days. Five drafts of an agreement had already been rejected by the Holy See, and a sixth was now tendered to the prelate; but its phraseology was too ambiguous for the precise and prescient jurisprudence of Papal Rome. Another thing Consalvi soon realized. Of all his court, Bonaparte was nearly alone in wishing for peace with the Holy See; the ambitious consul was constantly told that the signing of a Concordat would be the signal for the return of the Bourbons. But Consalvi did not lose hope. Writing to Cardinal Doria, his substitute in the premiership, he said: "You should be here to understand matters. These men are capable of anything. We three [Spina, Caselli, and himself] perspire blood and water, but we shall never abandon what is essential." After many conferences of the plenipotentiaries, in which twenty-five days were consumed, a Concordat was finally arranged, and July 13 was assigned for affixing the signatures. When the time arrived, Consalvi, as a matter of course, took up the document and read it for himself. What was his surprise and indignation on discovering that a substitution for the paper agreed upon had been effected! He quietly laid the parchment back on the table, declaring that he would not sign it. The text had been vitiated: it now contained several conditions, especially some concerning the marriage of priests, and the still unsold confiscated property of the Church, which the Pontiff had always refused to concede. Whether Bonaparte himself had laid a trap for Consalvi is disputed; many authors accuse him and Bernier of the trick; but others opine that it was devised in the ministerial bureaux. Joseph Bonaparte, first French commissary, threatened the cardinal with the anger of his brother, and insisted that it was now too late to withdraw: the signature had been already announced in the official journal, and the promulgation was to ensue at a state-banquet on the next day. For nineteen hours the discussion went on, but Consalvi was indomitable. How easy it would have been to procure the original

Concordat, and sign it! The suspicion that Bonaparte himself was the originator of the substitution, is certainly strengthened by the fact that when, at mid-day of July 14, Joseph Bonaparte carried to his brother a copy of the only agreement which Consalvi would sign, the furious autocrat tore it to pieces. All this because of the unwillingness of the son of the Revolution to concede full freedom of worship to the children of the Church. Consalvi could not well avoid the state-dinner of that memorable occasion. No sooner did the eye of Bonaparte fall upon him, as he entered the hall, than the following tirade, uttered in a furious tone, saluted the ears of the company: "Very well, my Lord Cardinal! You have resolved to end our negotiations. So be it, then! I have no need of the Pope. If Henry VIII., who had not the twentieth of my power, succeeded in changing the religion of his country, rest assured that I can, and will, do the same; and in changing the religion of France, I shall do so in nearly all Europe—wherever, that is, my influence reaches. Rome will realize her losses, and will weep over them; but then it will be too late. You may go, my Lord; that is all the good you can do now. When shall you depart?"—"After dinner, General," calmly returned Consalvi. The coolness of the prelate astonished Bonaparte, and he regarded Consalvi fixedly for a moment. The latter tells us that he profited by the consular stupor to declare that he could not exceed his instructions, nor trample on the maxims professed by the Holy See. The consul now somewhat modified his truculent mien, but continued with a series of menaces. After dinner he returned to the charge, but finally said: "Well, to show the world that it is not I who wish to end the negotiations, I authorize the commission to meet again to-morrow; but it is for the last time." Accordingly the plenipotentiaries re-assembled, and the draft proposed by Consalvi was adopted. The Concordat was signed on July 15, 1801.

The chief obstacle to an agreement had been the article regarding the publicity of Catholic worship. The government admitted this publicity in principle, but it insisted on

the declaratory article's stating that the exercise of the Catholic worship would be granted, conformably to the regulations of the police. Consalvi would sign, only on condition that it was stated that the police regulations would be put forth only when the public peace was involved. Bonaparte did not wish to concede this modification of his right to interfere in matters ecclesiastical; it might prove an obstacle to the success of those "Organic Articles" which he was thinking of adding to the Concordat. Then Consalvi said: "If you are in good faith, in affirming that the government wishes to subject the Catholic worship to police regulation, only in the interest of public tranquillity, why not say so in the article itself? There must be hidden reasons for this restriction, which is designedly left vague and undefined; and I have reason to fear lest the government may intend to try to subject the Church to its will." Bonaparte accepted the essential addition, but, as the event proved, he was only biding his time. The famous instrument of 1801 has been variously judged, even in our day. When it was first enforced, the infidel and constitutional parties were profoundly irritated. The royalists murmured, to say the least; just as in our day, the ultra among them could not tolerate anything approaching a reconciliation between the Church—which they regarded as exclusively their own, both to patronize and to persecute—and the republicans. And how many good Catholics merited their name of "irreconcilables"—*intransigeants*,—thinking of the new compromise with trembling suspicion, as though it were a compact between virtue and vice! But the immense majority of the French people were transported with joy, when there loomed up a prospect of exemption from the excesses of the last ten years. Cardinal Consalvi could not but congratulate himself on the happy result of his mission. In a letter to Cardinal Doria he wrote: "Amid all these griefs, I must tell Your Eminence that the foreign representatives, as well as all well-instructed persons, regard the conclusion of the Concordat as a real miracle. As for myself, I can scarcely believe that the affair is finished." The value of the Concordat of 1801 was evinced in later times, when very different men from its

framers attempted to "reform" it. While Consalvi was at London and at Vienna, Louis XVIII. tried to procure a change in this instrument. He was incited to this endeavor by the old legitimist bishops who had not resigned at the request of the Pope. Consalvi detected the snare, and avoided it. After stormy negotiations, two successive Concordats (August, 1816; and June, 1817) were tried; and in the end the instrument of 1801 was again put in force (1819).

This celebrated document was couched in the following terms: "The government of the French Republic recognizes the Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Religion as the religion of the great majority of the French. His Holiness equally recognizes that the same Religion has received, and now still expects, the greatest good and the greatest splendor from the restoration of the Catholic worship in France, and from its special profession by the Consuls of the Republic. Therefore, after this mutual recognition, they have agreed on the following for the good of religion, and for the maintenance of internal tranquillity: Art. I. The Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Religion shall be professed freely in France; its cult shall be public, in conformity with such police regulations as the government may deem necessary for public tranquillity. II. The Holy See, together with the government, will prescribe new boundaries for the French dioceses. III. His Holiness will declare to the titulars of French bishoprics that he confidently expects from them, for the sake of peace and unity, sacrifices of every nature, even that of their dioceses. If, after this exhortation, they refuse to make the sacrifice demanded for the weal of the Church (a refusal which His Holiness does not anticipate), provision for the government of the bishoprics newly circumscribed shall be named in the following manner. IV. The First Consul of the Republic will nominate, within three months after the publication of the Bull of His Holiness, to the archdioceses and dioceses of the new circumscription; His Holiness will confer the canonical institution, in accordance with the forms established for France before the change of government. V. Nominations to bishoprics which become vacant hereafter will be made by the First Consul, and the

Holy See will confer the canonical institution, in conformity with the preceding article. VI. The bishops, before entering upon their functions, will take, directly before the First Consul, the oath of fidelity which was customary before the change of government, viz. : 'I swear, and promise to God, upon the Holy Gospels, to be obedient and faithful to the government established by the Constitution of the French Republic. I also promise to have no understanding, to assist at no meeting, to have no part in any league, either at home or abroad, which may be contrary to the public tranquillity ; and if, in my diocese or elsewhere, I learn that any conspiracy against the state is being formed, I shall make it known to the government.' VII. The ecclesiastics of the second order will take the same oath in the hands of the civil authorities designated by the government. VIII. In all the Catholic churches of France the following formula of prayer shall be recited at the end of divine service : '*Domine, salvam fac Rempublicam ; Domine, salvos fac Consules !*' IX. The bishops will establish new boundaries for the parishes of their dioceses, which boundaries shall not be effective until the government approves them. X. The bishops will appoint the parish priests ; but they must choose persons satisfactory to the government. XI. The bishops may have Chapters for their cathedrals, and seminaries for their dioceses ; but the government does not oblige itself to endow them. XII. All the metropolitan, cathedral, parochial, and other churches, which have not been confiscated, and which are necessary to religion, shall be placed at the disposition of the bishops. XIII. For the sake of peace, and for the sake of a happy restoration of the Catholic Religion, His Holiness declares that neither he nor his successors will in any way trouble those who have acquired confiscated church property ; and that therefore the right to such property now rests secure in their hands, or in those of their representatives. XIV. The government will provide proper revenues for the bishops and pastors whose dioceses and parishes will be included within the new boundaries (1).

(1) This concession of the government was no favor ; it was but a small instalment of justice, since the entire amount accorded for the expenses of divine worship represented a

XV. The government will take measures to the end that Catholics, when they so desire, may endow their churches. XVI. His Holiness recognizes in the First Consul of the French Republic the same rights and prerogatives which the olden government enjoyed. XVII. The contracting parties agree that in case any one of the successors of the present First Consul should not be a Catholic, a new Concordat shall determine as to his enjoyment of the rights and prerogatives above mentioned, and in the matter of the nomination of bishops."

The signing of the Concordat, followed by Bonaparte's many acts of justice toward the hitherto persecuted Church of France, inspired Pius VII. with a most cordial affection for the First Consul; and Consalvi, who never trusted implicitly in the sincerity of that personage, found it no easy task to moderate the impulses of his master. The perspicacious secretary heartily lauded Bonaparte for his restitution of the confiscated churches, for his promise (afterward fulfilled) to recall the Sisters of Charity, for his protection of the many French missionaries in foreign lands, and for his dismissal of very many of the Constitutional clergy. But all of the Constitutionals were not deprived of their usurped offices. Writing to his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, archbishop of Lyons, Bonaparte had dared to order: "You must dexterously, but surely, give places to as many Constitutionals as possible; and you must assure yourself well of the sympathy of that party. You need not hide from yourself the fact that this question of Constitutionals and non-Constitutionals is merely a political one for us leaders, although many priests call it a religious one . . . . You will displease me infinitely, and you will injure the state greatly, if you hurt the feelings of the Constitutionals." And we read in a letter to Portalis: "I forward you a note on the bishop of Rennes, which has been sent to me by the inspector of police. I wish you to write to him to the effect that he has been guilty of displacing a Constitutional priest; and that

trivial interest on the amount which the state had stolen from the Church. Hence the absurdity of styling the French clergy a *salaried* body. The only *salaried* ministers of religion in France are those of the few Protestants and Jews; for their property was not stolen by the Revolution.

it is my will that such work stop at once" (1). Facts like these prevented Consalvi from experiencing much surprise when Bonaparte, taking malicious advantage of the clause in the Concordat which declared that the Catholic worship should be public "in conformity with such police regulations as the government may deem necessary for public tranquillity," caused the Corps Législatif to adopt, and ordered to be annexed to the Concordat, a series of articles which had never been even mentioned during the negotiations, and which were veritable attacks on the rights of the Church. These famous *Organic Articles* were seventy-seven in number; but a citation of only a few will suffice for our purpose. "I. No Bull, Brief, Rescript, decree, mandate, provision, signature making provision, or any other (document) expedited by the court of Rome, even though they concern private individuals, can be received, published, printed, or otherwise put in force, without the authorization of the government. II. No person styling himself a nuncio, a legate, a vicar, or a commissary Apostolic, or one who uses any other determining title, can exercise on French soil or elsewhere any power in regard to the affairs of the French Church, without the same authorization. III. The decrees of foreign Synods, even those of General Councils, cannot be published in France before the government has examined their form, and their conformity with the laws, rights, and privileges of the French Republic. IV. No national or metropolitan Council, no diocesan Synod, no deliberative Assembly, can be held without the express permission of the government. VI. Recourse to the Council of State shall be had in every case of abuse on the part of superiors or other ecclesiastical persons. The following are cases of abuse: Usurpation of power, or excess in its use; violation of the laws and regulations of the Republic; violation of the rules which are consecrated by the Canons received in France; any attack on the liberties, privileges, and customs of the French Church; and every undertaking or proceeding which, in the exercise of religion, might compromise the honor of citizens, trouble

(1) See also the Letters numbered 6,121, 6,122, 6,136, 6,214, in the *Correspondence of Napoleon I.*, Vol. vii.

their consciences, or which might degenerate into an oppression of them, or become a public scandal. XII. Bishops shall be permitted to join to their names the title of *Citizen* or *Monsieur*; all other designations are forbidden. XIII. The bishops shall nominate and instal the pastors; but, nevertheless, they must not publish these appointments or grant the canonical institution, until the nomination shall have been approved by the First Consul. XXVI. The bishops shall not ordain any ecclesiastic who does not prove that he possesses property producing a revenue of at least three hundred francs, who has not attained the age of twenty-five years, or who does not possess the qualities required by the Canons received in France. The bishops will ordain no persons whose names have not been submitted to the government, and approved by it. XXXVI. During the vacancy of a see, the government of the diocese will devolve on the metropolitan, and in his absence, on the senior of the suffragan bishops. The vicar-general of the (vacant) diocese will continue to exercise his function until the new bishop is installed. XLIII. All ecclesiastics will dress in French style (*à la Française*), and in black. In addition to this costume, the bishops may wear the pectoral cross and violet stockings. LII. In their instructions, the pastors must not find any fault, direct or indirect, with persons or with forms of worship which are authorized by the state." It is evident that these surreptitious additions to the Concordat were simply a bone thrown to the dog of the Revolution. Cardinal Caprara, who had recently been appointed legate *a latere* in Paris, immediately protested to Talleyrand against the date and method of publication of the articles, both date and method leading the unwary to suppose that the venomous additions were natural corollaries of the Concordat. Of course, Thiers insists that the Organic Articles formed, for the French government, "a matter purely domestic, which needed not to be submitted to the Holy See." But are not the imprescriptible rights of the Church involved in ordinances which presume to determine the discipline of the clergy, the rights and duties of bishops, the relations of bishops with the Roman Pontiff, and the manner in which bishops are to exer-

cise their jurisdiction? Consalvi well declared that such provisions nearly pulled down the edifice which he had so laboriously constructed. In a Consistory held on May 24, 1802, Pius VII. announced that he had demanded the abrogation or modification of articles which had been joined to the Concordat without his sanction, and which were opposed to the discipline of the Church. Consalvi tells that in 1804, before Pius VII. would accede to the request of Napoleon for imperial consecration at the pontifical hands, a promise to revoke the obnoxious ordinances was made as a condition *sine qua non*; but the pledge remained void of effect. Repeatedly during his pontificate Pius VII. insisted on the fulfilment of that promise; but not until 1817, when he made a new Concordat with Louis XVIII., were his desires satisfied. Then this apposite clause was inserted in the new instrument: "The Organic Articles which were prepared without the knowledge of His Holiness, and published without his consent, are abrogated, so far as they contain anything contrary to the doctrine and laws of the Church" (1). Fortunately, these Articles did not effect as much harm as they threatened; many of them soon fell into disuse, and Napoleon's own good sense corrected the others (2).

(1) Speaking of the first three articles, Cardinal Caprara says: "The first attacks the freedom of ecclesiastical teaching in its source; the second attacks it in its agents. The first puts obstacles to the publication of truth; the second impedes the apostolate of those who are entrusted with that publication. The third tends to sacrifice Religion, the work of God Himself, to the ever imperfect and often unjust works of men."

(2) When Napoleon was at St. Helena, he perhaps revealed to Count de Montholon the state of his mind toward the Church in 1801, when he said: "Men would scarcely believe the extent of the resistance which I had to meet when I restored Catholicism (in France). I had great difficulty in inducing the Council of State to receive the Concordat; many who yielded were then plotting to evade it. They said to each other: 'Let us become Protestants; then the Concordat will not affect us.' It is certain that in the disorder of that time, amid the ruins which I found around me, I could have chosen between Catholicism and Protestantism; it is also true that the inclinations of the moment cried for the latter. But, besides my real devotion to the religion of my ancestors, there were most powerful motives to influence my decision. What had I to gain by proclaiming Protestantism in France? There would have been two great parties, and I wished for only one. I would have revived the horrors of the 'wars of religion.' The Catholics and Protestants would have torn each other to pieces, and would have destroyed France, and rendered her the slave of Europe; whereas my ambition was to make her Europe's mistress. With the aid of Catholicism I was much more sure of attaining my grand desires. Outside of France, Catholicism rendered me sure of the Pope's aid; and with my influences and armies in Italy, I did not despair of obtaining, sooner or later, the direction of the Pope." *Mémoires for the History of France under Napoleon, Written at St. Helena under His Dictation by the Count de Montholon.* Paris, 1835.

On Aug. 15, 1801, Pope Pius VII. issued the Bull *Ecclesia Dei*, whereby he ratified the Concordat with France; and on the same day he addressed to the French bishops a Brief, in which he called upon them, in the interest of peace and of ecclesiastical unity, to resign their dioceses, imitating the noble spirit of the thirty prelates who, in 1791, had tendered their resignations to his predecessor (1). "We are compelled," said the Pontiff, "by the exigencies of the day which exercise their violence even upon us, to inform you that your written replies must be sent to us within ten days, and that these replies must be absolute and not procrastinating. If we do not receive such replies as we desire, we shall perforce regard you as having refused to comply with our demand" (2). At this time, out of the hundred and thirty-five dioceses of the France of 1789, fifty-one had become vacant by the deaths of their bishops. Talleyrand of Autun, Savines of Viviers, and Jarente of Orleans, were regarded as having renounced their mitres. Of the remaining eighty-one prelates, forty-five readily acceded to the wishes of the Pontiff; some of the others demanded time for reflection, and some refused positively to resign. Then, by an act of his plenitude of power, one which is without parallel in history, Pope Pius VII. abolished all the episcopal sees then existing in France, creating, in their places, sixty new ones. This radical transformation was decreed in the Bull *Qui Christi Domini*, issued on Nov. 29, 1801; and shortly afterward Bonaparte nominated the new bishops, and the Pontiff confirmed the selections. The recalcitrant prelates sent many complaints to Rome, insisting that they were victims of injustice, and lamenting the conduct of the Holy See in allowing bishops to swear fidelity to the First Consul. Indeed, these prelates were as much exercised, because of the Pontiff's apparent contempt of the rights of the Bourbons, as because of their own removal from office. These episcopal reclamations were generally respectful in tone; but many of the priestly foes of the Concordat not only declared that the bishops

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 610.

(2) Bonaparte had made these resignations a condition *sine qua non* of the restoration of religion in France.

who had resigned were excommunicated because of "heresy," but they even stigmatized Pius VII. as involved in the same censure. The Abbé Gaschet dared to assert: "There is no doubt that Pius VII. is, in the strict sense of the term, a schismatic, and an abettor of heresy and of apostasy. He has lost all the honor of the priesthood, all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all right to the obedience of the faithful. It would be blasphemous to mention his name in the Canon of the Mass." Cardinal Pacca tells us that many priests of the school of Gaschet imitated the ancient Donatists in their declaration that they were the sole Catholics in the world, the Roman Pontiff and the rest of the Church having plunged into schism (1). Influenced by the declamations of Gaschet and a few other semi-lunatics, by the protests of some of the bishops who would not resign their sees, and by the nomination of twelve Constitutionals to as many of the new dioceses, certain priests formed a new "Church," which came to be known as the "Anti-Concordatary Church," and also as the "Little Church," or "Sect of the Illuminated." Only one bishop, Mgr. de Thémînes, who had been ordinary of Blois, joined this band of fanatics; and he soon became reconciled to the Holy See (2).

When, in the early part of 1804, Pius VII. learned that Bonaparte had resolved on the establishment of an imperial form of government in France, and that the French people apparently welcomed the imminent change, he manifested his satisfaction by these words, written by Consalvi to Caprara, the papal legate in Paris: "This grand event, so glorious for the First Consul, which will consolidate the peace of the French nation, and therefore that of Europe, proves the foresight and wisdom of that nation, preferring a monarchical to the infinitely less durable elective system of government. . . . The Holy Father feels a joy which is beyond expression." A few days after the legate had received this

(1) *Memoires*, vol. 1., p. 178.

(2) The "Little Church," like all other schismatic organizations, was soon afflicted by radical dissensions, and became subdivided into four "churches." One of these sects still subsists in the diocese of Poitiers, having no hierarchy; being governed by a layman, who styles himself the prophet, Elias, and says that he was sanctified in his mother's womb. RIVAUD; *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iii., p. 359. Paris, 1883.

letter, Bonaparte informed him that it was his wish, and that of the French nation, that the work of the Concordat should be completed by the pontifical consecration of the new sovereign. Circumstances, he added, prevented him from imitating Charlemagne, who had gone to Rome for his imperial crown; therefore he would entreat the Pontiff to journey to Paris, being satisfied that the condescension of His Holiness would redound to the great benefit of religion. Pius VII. hesitated to grant the request of the all-powerful son of the Revolution. Certainly a refusal would be pardoned neither by the young conqueror who had done so much for the restoration of Catholic worship in his country, nor by that French nation which had recently been endeavoring to obliterate the horrid traces of its temporary insanity. But on the other hand, were the Pope to consecrate Bonaparte as emperor, he would deal a mortal blow to the Bourbons; he would offend nearly the whole of European society, which abhorred everything which recalled the revolutionary storm from which it had almost miraculously escaped; he would seem to recognize those Organic Articles which he had condemned, and to pardon those Constitutionals who had not yet submitted to the Holy See. Consalvi came to the aid of the Pontiff. "Who knows," he asked His Holiness, "whether this all-powerful soldier will not yet restore to the Holy See all that once belonged to it; and whether Your Holiness will not obtain from him the abolition of the measures which now restrict the action of the Church? The Protestants, philosophists, and revolutionists are all enraged because of this prospective consecration; and that fact demonstrates that it will be a good thing for religion." After four months of negotiations, our Pontiff resolved to gratify the First Consul; and he started on his journey on Nov. 2, 1804. When he arrived in France, his reception by the masses of the people caused him to wonder whether he was indeed in the midst of a nation which, only five years previously, had remained apparently indifferent while its rulers so cruelly persecuted his venerable predecessor. Secular historians will furnish the reader with the particulars of the consecration of the General Bonaparte, whom the world was

ever afterward to know as Napoleon. A few days after the ceremony, the Holy Father made a formal demand for the abolition of the Organic Articles, as well as of several other obnoxious statutes; but the emperor answered only with empty words. Perceiving that a longer stay in France would be of no avail, the Pontiff signified to Napoleon that he was about to return to the Eternal City. He was not surprised—for he had foreseen the probability of such a result of his journey—but he was inexpressibly pained, when he learned that his imperial host had formed the design of retaining the Head of the Church in France. “The Pope would never reveal,” says Artaud, “the name of the high official who hinted to him that he should dwell in Avignon; that he should accept a papal palace on the lands of the archbishop of Paris; and that there should be established around his residence a privileged quarter like that at Constantinople, in which only the ambassadors accredited to the Pontiff could reside. . . . The diplomatic body in Rome heard of this project; in my innocence I did not credit it. But the insinuations were repeated with such assurance, that the Pope deemed it proper to remark, in the presence of that certain high official: ‘It is said that they wish to retain us in France. Well, if they deprive us of our liberty, we have guarded against that calamity. Before we departed from Rome, we signed a formal act of abdication, to be valid in case of our imprisonment. That document is far from the power of the French. Cardinal Pignatelli now has charge of it in Palermo; and when he learns that the design now meditated has been actuated, the French will have in their hands merely the poor monk, Barnaba Chiaramonti.’” Pius VII. was allowed to return to his capital.

A few years after his coronation, while the great uncrowned was meditating, one day at St. Helena, on the stupendous events of his meteoric career, he remarked: “One cannot lie in the bed of a king without catching the madness of royalty: I became a madman.” And, indeed, the heir of the Revolution had scarcely donned the imperial purple when he evinced such a taste for despotic methods as would justify this fantasy. The Holy See, possessing but

little brute force, was naturally among the first to feel the effects of this tendency. In 1805, six months after Pius VII. had returned to Rome, the French suddenly seized on Ancona; and when the Pontiff demanded a reason for this violation of the law of nations, he was told that the French emperor was by virtue of his office the protector of the Holy See, and was therefore bound to prevent "the desecration of Ancona by Greeks and Mussulmans." The imperial troops also took possession of Benevento and of Ponte Corvo, the pretext being that those duchies were a cause of dispute between the Roman and Neapolitan courts. Then Napoleon insisted that the Sovereign Pontiff should adhere to that "Continental System" which had been introduced for the injury of English commerce; the emperor demanded the closing of all the papal ports to English ships. Napoleon even called on the Father of Christendom to enter into an offensive and defensive alliance with the French empire; that is, to recognize as enemies of the Holy See all those against whom the emperor might wage either a just or an unjust war. Napoleon was not entirely ignorant of ecclesiastical history, for his early military and civil education at Brienne had been imparted by the Friars Minims; but he showed bad faith when he justified his last demand by the fact that certain Popes had entered into leagues for purposes of war, and had willingly embarked in military enterprises. It was an easy task for Consalvi to show that these Pontiffs had joined such or such a league, or entered on such or such a war, "because of some given and transient necessity"; and that they had never bound themselves blindly to any permanent alliance. These Pontiffs, taking part in a particular war, or entering into some particular league, because of the circumstances of the time, had been able to form judgments as to the justice of those wars or alliances; whereas the Napoleonic idea, being one of a permanent league, allowed to the Holy See no possibility of acting according to the justice or injustice of the enterprises which it would be bound to undertake. The Pope, added Consalvi, had very good reason to fear that he would find himself, were he to accede to the Napoleonic demand, an abettor of undue ambition and of

mere greed of conquest. Again, remarked the cardinal-secretary, the principle animating the cited leagues and wars was not that which Napoleon wished the Pontiff to recognize; namely, one of vassalage and feudal subjection to "*a new and pretended Charlemagne*," a personage very different from the king of the Franks, whom the Roman Pontiff made the first Holy Roman Emperor (1). Finally, argued His Eminence, while we admit that certain Popes acted in the manner alleged by Napoleon, we do not assert that such acts were always worthy of praise. Who of us, asked Consalvi, is unacquainted with the reproaches which politicians have heaped on those Popes because of those same actions? Was it not worse than illogical to offer the course of those Pontiffs as a model for that of Pius VII., after having so often, and sometimes unjustly, declaimed against it? But absurd as was the insistence of the emperor, still more absurd, concluded the cardinal, was the *raison d'être* for it which His Majesty presumed to advance—that the French sovereign, as successor of Charlemagne, was emperor of Rome. Such, in brief, was the reply of Pius VII., as expressed by his secretary of state, to pretensions more worthy of a German emperor than of any one who occupied the throne—albeit debased—of St. Louis. And in order to show that his resistance was not a mere matter of verbosity, the Pontiff refused to expel from Rome, at the command of Napoleon, the king of Sardinia, Victor Emmanuel I, who had thrown himself on the hospitality of the Father of Christendom. "Rome is the refuge of fallen grandeurs," wrote Consalvi to Talleyrand, "and she will never surrender that glorious privilege."

The anger of Napoleon was greatly aggravated by the refusal of the Holy See to countenance the union of the emperor's brother, Jerome, already married to an American Protestant woman, with a German candidate for worldly honor—a refusal concerning which we shall speak at some length in the following chapter. Cardinal Fesch, maternal uncle to Napoleon, was replaced as ambassador at Rome by

(1) For a refutation of the theory of the Pope's subjection in temporals to the successors of Charlemagne, a theory which Napoleon condescended to borrow from the impudent assumptions of certain mediæval German emperors, see our Vol. ii., p. 27. *et seqq.*

Alquier, an "unreformed revolutionist," a regicide, and a man ready for any evil work. Even this violent partisan was forced to admit, in a letter to Talleyrand, that he found Consalvi "reasonable and conciliating, whenever there was no pretext for theological discussion." It happened, however, that there were too many of these "pretexts"; and hence one day Alquier, exceedingly proud of the mission, read to His Eminence an imperial dispatch which ran: "Tell Consalvi that I am at his heels [*je le talonne*]; and that nothing done by him fails to reach my ears." At length Napoleon insisted that Consalvi should resign; and the prelate felt that it might be to the interest of the Church if he were to comply. Addressing the Pontiff, he compared himself to Jonah, and urged: "It appears that I am the cause of this tempest now raging against the Church. Throw me into the sea." And as Pius could not willingly separate from so faithful a servant, the secretary pleaded: "You have been obliged to refuse so many of the emperor's requests that it might be well to grant this one, in which neither the faith of the Church nor the dignity of the Holy See is involved." The resignation was accepted on June 17, 1806, but Pius VII. never gave to the successors of Consalvi any other title than that of pro-secretaries of state. The ex-minister left the Quirinal, then the pontifical residence, for his beloved Ospizio di San Michele, the direction of which he resumed. Just before laying down his portfolio, Consalvi, foreseeing the imminent catastrophe, had written, with his own hand, a protest to be sent to all the European powers on the day when Napoleon would steal the Pope's temporal crown. He had also ordered the preparation of a Bull of Excommunication against all the invaders of the papal dominions. These documents were soon put to use. General Miollis (1) led a French division into the capital of Christendom on Feb. 2, 1808; and on May 17, 1809, an imperial edict declared the Papal States annexed to the French Empire, the usurper having informed the world that

(1) This general was a brother of Charles de Miollis, the bishop of Digne whom Victor Hugo so absurdly travestied in the picture of "Myriel" in his novel, *Les Misérables*. See our opposite article, entitled *The Bishop of Digne in Fact and in Fiction*, in the *Ac Maria*, Vol. xlvii.

“Charlemagne, his august predecessor, had conferred those territories on the bishops of Rome as fiefs; that Rome had never ceased to be part of the empire of Charlemagne; that the union of the two powers (spiritual and royal), in the person of the Head of the Church, had been a continual source of discord; that therefore he (Napoleon) now annexed the states of the Pope to his own, according to the Pontiff a revenue of two millions of francs.” Pius VII. protested vigorously against both the temporal and spiritual usurpations of Napoleon; and finally, on June 10, 1809, he promulgated a Bull of Excommunication against “the authors, abettors, and executors of all the injustices recently committed against the Holy See.” His Holiness recapitulated the crimes of the French government against his person and his office; but it is not true that, as we often read, “Napoleon was the last person excommunicated *by name*” by the Roman Pontiff. Not once does the name of the emperor occur in the decree; not once is he specially indicated as one of the “authors, abettors, and executors” (1). The seizure of the pontifical person was now a matter of course for the sons of the Revolution. Acting under instructions from the emperor, Murat, who was then seated on the usurped throne of Naples, ordered Miollis to undertake the disgraceful task; and that officer entrusted it to his subordinate, General Radet. On July 7, 1809, an hour before sunrise, Radet stationed troops at every exit from the pontifical

(1) After a careful but calm enumeration of all the reasons for the decree, the Pontiff proceeds: “Wherefore, by the authority of the Omnipotent God, of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and our own, we declare that all the heretofore indicated, as well as those who have commanded them, as also their abettors and counsellors, and all others who have prepared the above crimes or who have themselves committed them, have incurred the greater excommunication and other censures and ecclesiastical punishments inflicted by the holy Canons, by the Apostolic Constitutions, and especially by the decrees of General Councils, notably of that of Trent (*Sess. xxii., ch. 4, De Reform.*); and if it be necessary, we again excommunicate and anathematize them.” Then, lest the royalists might take advantage of the Catholic principle, so universally held in the Age of Faith, that an excommunicated prince could not govern a Christian people; lest the Bourbonists, a very large portion of the French nation, should precipitate the land into another ocean of blood; the Pope added: “However, although we are forced to unsheathe the sword of severity of the Church, we do not forget that here on earth, despite our unworthiness, we hold the place of Him who, when He exercises His justice, still remembers His mercy. Therefore, addressing ourselves to our own subjects and to all Christian people, we wish and we command, by virtue of holy obedience, that no person dare to inflict any damage or prejudice on those whom this decree concerns, or on their goods, rights, or prerogatives, under pretext of this present decree.”

palace; then ascending to the private apartments of His Holiness, he managed, though pale and trembling, to announce to the Pontiff that he was commissioned to obtain an immediate renunciation of the papal temporal sovereignty. "We cannot renounce," replied the Pope, "what does not belong to us. The temporal dominion of the Popedom belongs to the Roman Church; we merely administrate it." Accompanied only by Cardinal Pacca, the chief pastor of the Church was then led to a carriage; the door was locked, and surrounded by a squadron of dragoons, the prisoners of the great Napoleon were hurried toward France. Between them, the Pope and the cardinal had forty cents in their pockets when they left Rome. At Florence, the Pope was deprived of the companionship of Pacca. At Turin, the illustrious captive was attacked by sickness; but, nevertheless, the journey was continued until, having crossed Mt. Cenis, a short stop was made at Grenoble. Here the prefect, in whose mansion His Holiness was lodged, was obliged to throw open his gardens to the thousands who besought the papal benediction; but the bishop of the diocese was not allowed to communicate with his chief superior. From Grenoble the Pope was transferred to Savona. During his detention in this city, he was allowed to communicate with no person, save in the presence of governmental witnesses.

After the seizure of the Pontiff, all the cardinals then in Rome, among them Consalvi, had been summoned to Paris, where Napoleon fancied he could subdue them to his will. Consalvi refused to leave the papal capital without a papal command; and it required force to lead him to the presence of Napoleon. He had aged somewhat in appearance since his last meeting with his foe, and the latter might have properly attributed much of the change to the imperial conduct. Willing to be gracious, the monarch advanced toward his compulsory guest, saying: "Why, Cardinal Consalvi, you have grown thin! I would scarcely have known you."—"Yes, Sire," replied His Eminence, "the years pass; ten have elapsed since I had the honor of saluting Your Majesty."—"True," returned Napoleon, "ten years since you came for the Concordat. We drew it up in this very room, and it has

vanished in smoke ; Rome ruined everything. But I must admit that I made a mistake when I deprived you of your portfolio. If you had remained Minister, things would have turned out differently." Consalvi could not allow this insinuation to pass unrebuked, and he remarked : " If I had retained my portfolio, Sire, I would have continued to perform my duty." And the conscientious prelate soon gave a proof that he was still ready to fulfil his obligations at any cost. He so influenced his brethren of the Sacred College that they declared that while separated from their head, the Sovereign Pontiff, they would not deliberate, or take any part in the affairs of the Church. This action was a blow to Napoleon, who, holding the Pope a prisoner at Savona, trusted to be able to ignore the Pontifical authority, "*se passer du Pape*"; and, with the aid of a complacent Sacred College, to supply all episcopal vacancies as he listed. In fine, Napoleon had hoped to find a docile instrument of his tyranny in the Church of France. The so-called marriage, the real concubinage, of the autocrat with the daughter of the Austrian sovereign, brought matters to a crisis. In his pretended divorce from his legitimate wife, Josephine, Napoleon had indeed "dispensed with the Pope." But Consalvi and twelve other cardinals refused to so far recognize the legality of the union with the Austrian archduchess as to be present at the ceremony. Had it not been for the moderating counsels of Fouché, the furious sovereign would have ordered out a platoon, and caused Consalvi to be summarily shot. But he was fain to content himself with depriving the audacious cardinals of the pensions which he had allowed them in the place of their confiscated revenues, and with forbidding their wearing the insignia of their office ; hence their designation of "black cardinals." Consalvi was conducted to Reims, where he resided for three years, subjected to police surveillance, but devoting his time to his *Memoirs*. He managed, somehow, to communicate with the outside world, probably with the aid of the young priest Bernetti, afterward cardinal and secretary of state ; and he conceived and initiated a plan to deliver his venerable sovereign from captivity. An English frigate was tendered, and entered the waters of Savona ;

but the design transpiring, Pius VII. was transferred to Fontainebleau. The Pontiff was still at Savona, however, when Napoleon endeavored to obtain the sanction of the French clergy for his design to govern the French Church without the intervention of the Holy See. At this time the fortunes of Napoleon were at their height; the glory of no human potentate had ever equalled that which encompassed him; with one exception, all the powers of Europe bowed at his nod. That one exception was the venerable prisoner of Savona, the earthly Head of Christ's Church. Napoleon had feigned to laugh at the excommunication; writing from Dresden to his stepson, when he had begun to anticipate such a sentence, he had said: "They would denounce me to Christendom. So ridiculous an idea can emanate only from a profound ignorance of the day in which we live; the idea is a thousand years out of date. . . . Would he place my throne under an interdict; would he excommunicate me? *Does he suppose that then the muskets will fall from the hands of my soldiers?*" (1). Less than three years after that excommunication, the baffled sovereign beheld that spectacle which had appeared to be an impossibility; during his retreat from Moscow, he saw the muskets drop from the benumbed hands of his brave grenadiers, not in isolated instances, but in the case of entire regiments at a time. But no worldly-wise person in Europe would have dreamed, in 1811, that the Napoleonic drama was nearing its end; and the spirit of the world found it quite appropriate that an endeavor to bend the will of a Roman Pontiff should be put forth by him who could coolly send word to three kings in his antechamber that they should wait until he was ready to see them (2). From the day of his deprivation of liberty, Pius VII. had refused to grant the canonical confirmation and institution to any persons nominated by the French emperor for the mitre. When, because of just and important reasons, the Holy See

(1) Letter of Napoleon to Eugene de Beauharnais, then Viceroy of Italy, July 22, 1807.

(2) Napoleon had entered on a consultation with the famous Sulpician, M. Emery, whom he greatly esteemed, when the door of the apartment was thrown open, and a chamberlain announced: "Their Majesties, the Kings of Holland, Bavaria, and Wurtemberg!" The emperor exclaimed in a loud voice which was plainly heard by the monarchs who were on the point of entering: "Let them wait!" ARTAUD; *loc cit.*, Vol. ii., ch. 37.

adopts this measure, it wishes, observes Cardinal Pacca, to manifest its indignation because of the conduct which has driven it to such an extreme ; it does holy violence to the government and people concerned, so that they may repent of their crimes, and pause in their illegitimate and often sacrilegious enterprises (1). Napoleon fancied that he could provide for the necessities of the French Church, and thus escape the indignation of that powerful Catholic party which was his sole reliance in face of the revolutionary factions, by appealing to the French Church itself, many of the most eminent leaders of which were his own appointees and partisans. Therefore he appointed a commission to devise ways and means for an obviation of the inconveniences caused by the "obstinaey of the Pope." The members of this commission were Cardinals Maury and Fesch ; the archbishop of Tours ; the bishops of Vercelli, Evreux, Treves, Nantes ; the Barnabite general, Fontana ; and the superior of Saint-Sulpice, the Abbé Emery. Fontana participated only in the first sessions. The commission debated during many days ; and finally reported to the emperor that it had arrived at the following conclusions : I. When actuated merely by temporal motives, the Pope cannot refuse attention to spiritual matters. II. In regard to the nominations of cardinals, and in regard to other prerogatives of sovereigns, the emperor could claim for himself all the rights attached to the sovereignties of the countries which he had subjugated. III. The emperor and his ministers had not acted in any way contrary to the Concordat. IV. The emperor was not to be blamed for the religious innovations which the Pontiff had charged to him ; the invasion of the Papal States, etc. (the seizure of the Pope, of course, included), were merely temporal matters, which ought not to be confounded with spiritual ones. V. As to the means for procuring a canonical institution of bishops, it would be well to have the opinion of a National Council. (Napoleon said that this reply was evasive ; and he demanded a categorical answer as to the rights of a National Council in the premises. Then the commission reported that "the National Council might

(1) PACCA : *Memoires*, Vol. i., p. 289.

opine that, in the present urgent circumstances, the institution might be accorded by the metropolitan or by the senior suffragan.") VI. As to the disorder prevalent in the dioceses of the German provinces which Napoleon had subjugated, a Concordat would probably remedy them. VII. The excommunication of the emperor was "null and void, since it had been launched in the defense of temporal interests." Protest- ing against this view of the excommunicating power, Emery showed that it implied an accusation against many General Councils, notably against the Council of Trent; and in his excitement the Sulpician declared that "he would immediately become a Protestant," if it could be proved that the Church did not possess a power which it had so constantly exercised. He also insisted that the preservation of the temporal dominion of the Holy See is not a thing apart from spiritual interests; since the independence of the Roman Pontiff is secured by that dominion. Picot well says of the report of this commission that its general tenor and its flatteries of Napoleon astonish and afflict us, when we consider that its ecclesiastical framers might have acquired great glory by a strong support of the claims of the imprisoned Pontiff.

Pius VII. soon manifested his judgment on the report of the Napoleonic commission. In a Brief to Cardinal Maury, dated Nov. 5, 1810, he expressed his astonishment at the cardinal's acceptance of the nomination to the archdiocese of Paris (1); and he called on His Eminence to renounce the promotion at once, under pain of prosecution according to the Canons. On Dec. 2, the Pontiff sent a Brief to the vicar-capitular of Florence, forbidding the clergy of that diocese to admit in any way the authority of the bishop of Nancy, whom the emperor had set over them. The Chapter and all the Florentine clergy cheerfully obeyed. The firmness of Pius VII. entailed new persecutions upon him. On Jan. 7, 1811, his modest apartment was searched most minutely; his writing desk was rifled, and all its contents, even his Breviary, were sent to Paris. The same treatment was ex-

(1) Cardinal Fesch had refused to gratify his imperial nephew by accepting the nomination.

perienched by all the members of his little household. From that day he was allowed to have no writing materials whatever. He was even deprived of his confessor and his chamberlain. On the 14th, the prefect of the department received orders to write to his prisoner the following letter: "The undersigned, in accordance with commands emanating from His Imperial and Royal Majesty, Napoleon, Emperor of the French, King of Italy, Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine, etc., notifies Pope Pius VII. that he is forbidden to communicate with any church of the empire, or with any subject of the emperor, under pain of disobedience on his part and on their part; that he, who preaches rebellion and has a heart filled with gall, has ceased to be the organ of the Catholic Church; that since nothing can render him wise, he shall see that His Majesty is sufficiently powerful to do what his predecessors did, that is, to depose a Pope"(1). His Holiness was also notified that thenceforth His Imperial Majesty would allow for his sustentation, and that of his few attendants, only the sum of fifty cents (*cinque paoli*) per day for each individual; but this contemptible puerility lasted only two weeks, as Napoleon could not endure the shame of knowing that the people of Savona were sending, every day, donations of food to his prisoners. If the emperor had hoped that Pius VII. would succumb to these and similar petty trials, he was disappointed; for the venerable Pontiff gave no sign of discouragement. A new session of the commission was now ordered, two other members being added to it—Cardinal Caselli, bishop of Parma, and Mgr. de Pradt, archbishop of Malines. They were asked to solve these difficulties: I. Since there is at present no communication between the Pope and the subjects of the emperor, to whom shall the latter apply, when they desire dispensations such as the Holy See was wont to accord? II. When the Pope refuses persistently to grant Bulls of Investiture to bishops nominated by the emperor, what legitimate means can be adopted to procure the canonical institution of those prelates? To the first question the commission replied that when the faithful desired dispensations in matters of daily

(1) ARTAUD; *loc. cit.*, Vol. iii., ch. 1.

necessity, but which did not concern the general administration of the Church or its internal discipline, they might recur to their ordinaries. The second difficulty was solved by a suggestion that His Majesty might add to the Concordat a clause establishing that, if the Pontiff did not grant the institution within a given period, the right of institution would devolve on the Provincial Councils. It would be advisable, however, subjoined the commission, to refer these matters to a National Council before acting upon them. This report was presented to the emperor during a solemn audience at the Tuileries on March 30, 1811. Napoleon opened the audience with one of those violent outbursts with which he frequently affected sincere indignation—a fury which was very often merely theatrical. With one exception, the members of the commission remained mute when the tirade was finished. When the octogenarian, Abbé Emery, saw that no cardinal, no bishop, offered to brave the autocrat by a defense of the imprisoned Head of the Church, he calmly arose and said: “Sire, I can hold but one view of this matter, and it is that which is presented in the *Catechism* which is taught, *by your orders*, in all our churches. To the question ‘Who is the Pope?’ this answer is given: ‘He is the Head of the Church, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, to whom all Christians owe obedience.’ Now, I ask whether a body can dispense with its head, with that person to whom, by divine law, it owes obedience? *We are compelled*, here in France, to uphold the Four Articles of the Declaration of 1682; but that doctrine ought to be received in its entirety. You will perceive that the preface to that Declaration declares that the Pope is the Head of the Church, to whom all Christians owe obedience; and furthermore you will see that the preface subjoins that the Four Articles were decreed, not so much to limit the power of the Pope, as to prevent men from not recognizing in him what is essential (to his office).” Then, after a minute explanation of the Four Articles, the abbé concluded with the declaration that *the projected National Council would be of no authority whatever, if it were held without the sanction of the Pope*. Evidently ill at ease, Napoleon now observed: “Well, I shall not deny the spiritual

power of the Pope, since he received that from Jesus Christ ; but it was Charlemagne, not Christ, who gave the temporal power to him (1), and I, as successor to Charlemagne, now deprive him of it, because he knows not how to use it, and because it impedes him in the exercise of his spiritual functions." Emery rejoined : " Your Majesty respects the great Bossuet, and is frequently pleased to quote him. . . . In his *Defense of the Declaration*, Bossuet says : ' We know well that the Roman Pontiffs have received by the concession of kings (2), and that they now possess legitimately, certain properties, rights, and principalities (*imperium*). We know that these possessions, being dedicated to God, are so sacred that they cannot, without sacrilege, be invaded, stolen, or given to seculars. The sovereignty of the city of Rome and of other districts has been granted to the Apostolic See, in order that said See may be free in the exercise of its authority throughout the world. Because of this fact we congratulate not only the Apostolic See, but the Universal Church ; and we pray, with our entire hearts, that in every sense this sacred principality may remain secure ' "(3). Certain members of the commission begged Napoleon to pardon the injudiciousness of the abbé ; he was in his dotage, etc. The emperor replied : " I am not at all offended by the conduct of the Abbé Emery. He talks like a man who has a grasp of his subject." Dismissing the commissioners, Napoleon paid special attention only to Emery. " This incident," writes Cardinal Pacea, " confirmed me in my opinion that Bonaparte would not have become a persecutor of the Church, if he had found, in the beginning, more firmness and courage in the French bishops, and less condescension in the court of Rome " (4).

On June 17, 1811, a so-called National Council of the French Empire met in the cathedral of Notre Dame de Paris, under the presidency of Cardinal Fesch ; and His Eminence

(1) For proof that the Roman Pontiff was a temporal sovereign long before the advent of Charlemagne, see our Vol. i., ch. 40.

(2) Here the Eagle of Meaux errs. The original source of the Papal dominion in the Roman States was no concession of sovereigns, but the will of the populations of those states, who had been abandoned by the Constantinopolitan emperors. See *ubi supra*.

(3) *Defense of the Declaration*, bk. 1, sect. 10, ch. 16. (4) *Memoires*, Vol. t., p. 214.

courageously began the conciliar proceedings by pronouncing the customary oath: "I swear and promise true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, etc." The address of the synodals to the emperor, which had been composed by the bishop of Nantes, proved to be so sycophantic that very many of the prelates voted against its adoption, unless the objectionable passages were omitted. Napoleon refused to receive the corrected compliments, and ordered the assembly to proceed to the business for which it had been convoked. A commission of twelve members was then appointed to prepare a report concerning the "proper" means of supplying a deficiency of Papal Bulls of Investiture. After many debates, Cardinal Fesch was requested by the commission to inform the emperor that it was the opinion of the Council that a deputation should wait upon the Pontiff, and beg His Holiness to provide for the needs of the churches of the empire. Napoleon replied that if the Council did not perform its duty immediately, he would dissolve it, and then compel the metropolitans to institute the bishops; he also insisted on the preparation, then and there, of a decree which the commission afterward presented to the synodals as "an extreme condescension of the emperor, a benefit which they should hasten to welcome." When this decree was read in the Council, several bishops declared that they would not sign it. Then Napoleon arrested and sent to the fortress of Vincennes the chief opponents of his measure, the bishops of Troyes, Tournay, and Gand; and he threatened to incarcerate also the archbishop of Bordeaux. Several of the synodals braved the imperial anger by returning to their dioceses. Thiers ascribes to Cardinal Maury the invention of the plan now adopted by Napoleon to gain his point (1). One by one, the prelates were summoned to the residence of the Minister of Worship, and there subjected to either seduction or intimidation (2). The governmental

(1) *History of the Consulate and the Empire*. Vol. xlii., p. 174. Paris, 1845-65.

(2) One of the prelates who resisted all the efforts of both the Minister and Napoleon was the bishop of Digne, the "Myriel" of Hugo's *Miserables*, of whom we have already spoken. Hugo says that "Myriel" attended at only one session; that, "being a bishop of a mountain diocese, and being accustomed to contact with nature in all simplicity and severity, he seemed to bring among these eminent personages certain ideas which changed

machinery having accomplished its utmost, the Council met in "general congregation" on Aug. 5, and a large majority voted for a decree such as the emperor had demanded. It was provided that no see should remain vacant for more than a year; that the emperor should be *besought* to continue to provide for vacancies as the Concordat prescribed, and that his nominees should ask His Holiness for the canonical institution; that the Pontiff should grant that institution within six months after reception of the request; that in the case of a bishop, if the Pope did not grant the Bull of institution within six months, the metropolitan, and in that prelate's absence, the senior suffragan, should effect the institution; that if the case were one of a metropolitan, the senior suffragan should act; and finally, that the decree should be submitted to His Holiness, together with a prayer for his approbation of it, the Council being convinced that "it alone could put an end to the woes of the churches of France and of Italy." Hefele asserts that only one synodal, Droste-Vischering, a Rhenish prelate, raised his voice against this decree (1); but the German historian is contradicted by the Acts of the Council, which record the dissentient votes of the archbishop of Bordeaux, and of the bishops of Vannes, Saint-Brieuc, Soissons, Amiens, Angers, Limoges, Agen, Mende, Namur, Digne, and Grenoble. As deputies of the Council, charged with the task of procuring the pontifical assent to its decree, Napoleon chose the archbishops of

the character of the assembly. He soon returned to D.; and when he was questioned as to the speedy departure, he answered: "I tired them; I brought with me an outside atmosphere; I was like an open door to them." The truth is that Mgr. de Miollis attended all the sessions of the Council; his name is found on the rolls of all of these, and of all the special conferences. It is true that he was an *intransigent*, always pronouncing for the prerogatives of the Apostolic See. When the Minister of Worship, Bigot de Préameneu, endeavored to conquer his resistance to the imperial pretensions by citing the submission of "many distinguished bishops," Miollis remarked: "I understand you, M. le Ministre; and precisely because Providence has given more talent to others than to me, I consider myself obliged to make the best possible use of the little that I possess." Napoleon himself exerted all his wiles, and put forth innumerable sophistries, to gain the vote of the simple-minded prelate; but just when he was flattering himself that he had prevailed, Miollis declared that he wanted time for reflection. "I have never yet come to an important decision without previous prayer to the Holy Ghost." The emperor told him to give his answer on the following day; and when the time arrived Napoleon sarcastically asked what the Holy Ghost had said. The reply was: "Not one word, Sire, of all those which your Majesty pronounced yesterday." Of course Hugo suppressed these facts.

(1) Thus in the *Church Lexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, art. *Pius VII.*

Tours, Pavia, and Malines; and the bishops of Faenza, Piacenza, Feltre, Evreux, Nantes, and Treves. His Majesty deemed it prudent to join some of the cardinals to this deputa- tion; and strange to say, he selected five of his "red" Eminences, Roverella, Ruffo, Doria, Dugnani, and Bayane—men whose records would scarcely influence the Pontiff in favor of the cause that they espoused. The details of the meeting of these prelates with the prisoner of Savona are unknown to this day; but there is reason to believe that we must regard as authentic the approbation of the Conciliar decree which, on their return to Paris, the deputies presented to their imperial master. In reference to this approbation, extorted from the betrayed and suffering Pontiff, Cardinal Pacca remarks: "If I had not discovered, among the documents entrusted by the Pope to us at Fontainebleau, the minute of this Brief (*Ex quo*), I would not have credited its existence; or at least I would not have believed that it was couched in the terms which are given in the *Fragments Regarding the Ecclesiastical History of the First Years of the Nineteenth Century*, written by M. de Barral, nephew of the archbishop of Tours." Napoleon had conquered in the first stage of the game which had for its stake the enslavement of the French Church. Great, therefore, was the astonishment of the prelates who had compromised with their consciences, when they were informed that His Majesty refused to accept the Brief for which he had so persistently labored. Publicists differ as to the reasons for this imperial inconsistency. It is not improbable that Napoleon felt that, were he to accept the pontifical concession, he would be obliged, in common decency, to restore the successor of St. Peter to his capital and to liberty—a procedure which would have been equivalent to a renunciation of his dream of a Napoleonic Western Empire. The bishops were ordered to return to their dioceses, and an end was put to an assembly which had been thoroughly illegitimate, and which, among all modern ecclesiastical reunions, most perfectly resembles the so-called councils of the Arian or schismatic Byzantine emperors.

On June 9, 1812, our Pontiff was informed by his jailers

that he was to be immediately transferred to Fontainebleau. Some authors opine that Napoleon feared that during his imminent Russian expedition, an English squadron might deliver his prisoner from Savona; others more reasonably suppose that the autocrat imagined that by bringing Pius VII. under the direct influence of his magnetic personality, he could more readily obtain what was then his principal desire, the papal abdication of the kingship of the Roman States. When the guards had conducted the Pope as far as Mt. Cenis, he was found to be so seriously ill, that word was sent to the French authorities of Turin, with request for orders as to what was to be done. The reply was to the effect that the commands of the emperor were to be obeyed. Meanwhile the Holy Viaticum had been administered to His Holiness, and in his carriage; for the reader must know that during this journey of eleven days, the venerable prisoner was not once allowed to leave the vehicle. Fontainebleau was reached on June 20; and the Pontiff was put to bed, where he remained during several weeks, hovering between life and death. After his disastrous campaign in Russia, Napoleon went to Fontainebleau; and he succeeded in wrenching from the weakness of the suffering Pontiff, then without other advisers than the "red" cardinals, a signature to a draft for a new Concordat. The circumstances which preceded this signature, accorded on Jan. 25, 1813, are unknown; but the Pontiff ever afterward declared that when Cardinal Doria handed him the pen, His Eminence and the other "red" cardinals assured him that the document contained "only simple preliminaries, which would remain secret until, in a meeting of all the cardinals, it should be decided how to put them in force." The Pope also declared that it was untrue that, as was then said, and as is still often asserted, the infuriated emperor struck the Vicar of Christ (1). By the instrument signed at Fontainebleau, among other things which were redolent of the "Civil Constitution of the Clergy," Pius VII. agreed to reside wherever the emperor would indicate; thus tacitly abdicating his temporal throne. The wily monarch published what he

(1) PACCA; *Memoires*, pt. ii., ch. 13.

chose to style a new Concordat on Feb. 13; and it was immediately registered as a law of the empire. But Providence had decreed that this document was not to trammel the independence of the Holy See. Napoleon had promised to free the cardinals and other ecclesiastics who were confined in the prisons of Fenestrelles, Pignerol, Capraja, and other fortresses; and although he broke his word in the case of the bishops and simple priests, he liberated the cardinals. Consalvi arrived at Fontainebleau on Feb. 18. As we have seen, Pius VII. had intended, when signing the draft of Jan. 25, that a condition *sine qua non* of its validity was to be its approval by all the cardinals united in Consistory. Consalvi soon found that their Eminences differed in judgment as to the pretended Concordat, but his own opinion was at once delivered in these words: "Holy Father, a cloud may obscure the light of the sun, but the sun does not hence become a cloud. For the honor of the Church, this instrument, extorted from Your Holiness by violence, must be disavowed." This judgment was then unanimously adopted. Consalvi and Pacca were delegated to draw up a disavowal, to be forwarded to Napoleon. When the monarch received this missive, he trampled it under foot and exclaimed: "Things will never be settled until I have cut off the heads of some of these priests!" But he merely tried fresh negotiations, which dragged their weary length along until Pius VII. declared that he would give the matter no further consideration until he found himself in Rome. And that day came. On January 22, 1814, Napoleon allowed the Pontiff to return to Rome. Consalvi, however, was conducted by the police to Beziers to be interned; but before separating from his venerable master, he wrote out instructions for those cardinals who remained in Paris. They were prohibited, in the most positive manner, to enter upon any negotiation in reference to any arrangement with the Holy See. Nevertheless, in February Napoleon tried his hand once again; but in three months he abdicated the throne in that same chateau where he had so shamefully treated the Vicar of Christ (1).

(1) "History does not accept that humanitarian Napoleon and that sentimental Cæsar

Pius VII. re-entered his capital on May 24, 1814. Murat, the soldier whose fortune Napoleon had made, and to whom he had given his sister Caroline in marriage, had basely joined the allied enemies of his benefactor, and had invaded the States of the Church. Napoleon preferred to see those States in the hands of the Pontiff, their legitimate sovereign, rather than in those of an ambitious traitor; therefore, he allowed his illustrious captive to leave the soil of France. The spirit which animated Pius VII. when he entered the Eternal City, which had become demoralized under the rule of the sons of the Revolution, may be illustrated by an incident which happened during his journey. While resting at Cesena, he was told that Murat, who was still king of Naples, and whose soldiers were occupying several of the papal provinces, was in the neighborhood, and would gladly be honored with an audience. The request was granted; and when the first compliments had been exchanged, Murat expressed his surprise at the Pope's intention of proceeding to Rome. The spirit of the Romans, he said, was averse to a rule by ecclesiastics. And in order to convince the Pontiff that he spoke the truth, he showed to His Holiness a petition (men said that it had been solicited by himself) which was signed by many Roman patricians and landowners, urging Murat to use his influence with the allied sovereigns to procure the government of Rome by some secular prince. The Pope took the document; but without reading it, he threw it into the brazier which was warming the room, and remarked: "Now nothing prevents our going to Rome." We may here note that on the day after our Pontiff had re-entered the Quirinal Palace, from which the

which some have tried to impose upon it. So far as genius is concerned, Napoleon stands forth as the great contemporary figure, as warrior and as organizer. At the close of the French Revolution, which had produced only chaos, he intuitively discerned the two needs of society—namely, religion and administration. With the intelligence which perceives he united the will which executes, when it is aided by circumstances. He also possessed military genius, and that helped him to hide his despotism under the mantle of glory. To three sides of his nature—a knowledge of civil and political affairs, a will, and military genius—he owed his fourteen years of reign. He fell, through an abuse of the principle of his rule, which was the omnipotence of one will imposing itself on every person and every thing. This principle was irresistible so long as circumstances favored it; but it failed in an impossible duel with contrary circumstances, partly through his own fault, and partly through the natural course of events." (Alfred Nettement, cited by E. d'Argill, in his *Centennial of 1789*. Paris, 1889.)

children of the Revolution had dragged him, nearly five years previously, one of the patrician signers of this petition threw himself at the feet of His Holiness, and begged pardon for his treason. The gentle Pontiff replied: "Well, well! Do you think that we ourselves find in our conduct no fault for which we ought to be blamed?" Just before he entered his capital, Pius VII. named Consalvi plenipotentiary to all the courts of Europe. Talleyrand, who had presented him to the First Consul, now introduced him to Louis XVIII. The great object of the prelate was to obtain the restoration of the States of the Church in their pristine integrity. This was no easy task; for the weaker governments could scarcely trust to equitable treatment when so many vultures were disputing over the remains of the Colossus. England had her eye on the Low Countries, Russia claimed Poland, Prussia coveted Saxony, while the ravenous stomach of Austria yearned for nearly all, if not all, of Italy. France, of course, could only remain silent. In this emergency, Consalvi resolved to claim the support of that Protestant kingdom, the protection of whose subjects had brought upon the Holy See its chief persecution. He went to London, and so charmed the prince-regent, that when the English plenipotentiaries were starting for the Congress of Vienna, they were told to support all the demands of the papal representative; for they would be just ones. Before his departure from London, Consalvi, in the name of Pope Pius VII., requested the emancipation of the British Catholics. He arrived at Vienna on July 20, strong in the support of the English representatives, and in the good-will of Alexander of Russia, which the friendship of the prince-regent had procured for him. On November 19, the Legations, Benevento, and Pontecorvo, were restored to the Holy See; but the royal participants in the Congress impudently, if solicitously, impressed upon the pontifical government the necessity of introducing reforms such as not one of them dreamed of adopting in his own dominions. At this Congress Consalvi gained one of his most notable diplomatic triumphs. To avoid all rivalries, he said, among the mutually jealous great powers, he suggested that precedency should be accorded to the

papal ambassador whenever the diplomatic body met. The Pope, he argued, represents one of the weakest temporal powers, but the strongest moral one of all. In the name of England, Wellington agreed. Prussia objected; but the czar interfered, saying: "The Pope is the head of the largest body of Christians existing, while in a political sense he is neutral. If I had the honor of meeting him in an assembly of sovereigns, I would ask for no other presiding officer than the Holy Father; my ambassadors will treat his nuncios as I would treat his person." This settled the matter; and to this day the provision for a nuncio's precedency is one of the few ordinances of the Congress of Vienna which are still respected by the cabinets of Europe. But Consalvi entertained very little confidence in the permanently healing qualities of the Congress. Listen to the following avowal: "I have heard the most sinister predictions from the lips of my colleagues in the Congress. The powers hope to dominate the Revolution by compression, or by reducing it to silence; and, nevertheless, the Revolution lifts its head at the very table of this body. We are trying, by dint of sheer force and money, to bolster up an old edifice which is crumbling before our eyes; and we never dream of rebuilding it in a solid fashion—a thing which would be, perhaps, less expensive, and certainly more durable." The bass-relief on the beautiful monument to Consalvi in the Roman Church of St. Mary of the Martyrs, once the Pantheon of Agrippa, represents the return of the great diplomat from the Congress of Vienna, and his presentation to the Pontiff-King of the provinces wrested from his sway eighteen years previously. But it would have been impossible for the artist to picture, within the compass of a single monument, all that Consalvi effected toward the restoration of her olden lustre to Rome. Under the withering touch of that movement which, according to its frenzied advocates, was to entail the very culmination of prosperity, the capital of the Christian world had seen grass growing in the Square of St. Peter's. Consalvi, restored to the secretaryship of state, resolved to renew the olden traditions, and to surround the Apostolic Chair with all the glories of the sciences and the arts. He

initiated immense works, destined to replace the spoliations of the modern Vandals, and put forth every effort to effect the restitution of the treasures of art which the Gallic conqueror had stolen for the adornment of the Louvre,—a task, however, in which he was not entirely successful. He encouraged and protected the greatest of modern sculptors, Canova, and the Danish Thorwaldsen, who finally executed his monument; the young and struggling musician, Rossini; Cimarosa in his decline; the Englishman Lawrence, whom George IV. had sent to paint his portrait; Bernetti and Angelo Mai, who afterward continued his policy. He was the friend of Humboldt and of Niebuhr; but he knew how to do the honors of the capital to kings and princes, and the festivities with which he welcomed them were among the most splendid of the day.

Just as Pius VII. had refused to acquiesce in the demand of Bonaparte to expel the king of Sardinia from Rome, so did he refuse the repeated interpellations of the allied sovereigns for the withdrawal of the papal hospitality from the Bonaparte family, who had taken refuge with the Apostolic See after the ruin of their head. The Pontiff even interested himself in the lot of the captive of St. Helena. Hearken to the following letter to Consalvi: “The mother and family of Napoleon appeal to our mercy and generosity, and we deem it just to respond. We are sure that you will cheerfully comply with our injunction to write, in our name, to the allied monarchs, and especially to the prince-regent [of England], who has given us so many proofs of esteem. He is your good and dear friend, and we expect you to ask him to lighten the sufferings of such a banishment. It would be an extraordinary joy to our heart to have contributed to lessen the torments of Napoleon. He can no longer be a danger to any one; and we wish him to be an occasion of remorse to no one.” Such, also, were the sentiments of Consalvi; and the man who would have shot him had the benefit of his intercession at London, Paris, and Vienna. When the mother of Napoleon learned, through Cardinal Fesch, of the efforts of Consalvi on behalf of her son, she wrote to His Eminence: “The sole consolation left me is the knowl-

edge that the Holy Father forgets the past, and remembers only his affection for all belonging to me. We can find no refuge save under the pontifical government; and our gratitude is commensurate with the benefit. I speak in the name of my entire family of proscribed ones; and, above all, for him who is now slowly dying on a desert rock. His Holiness and Your Eminence are the only persons in Europe who try to soften his fate" (1).

The return of Pope Pius VII. to the capital of his temporal dominions, and, therefore, to his normal position of spiritual independence, was the signal to innumerable bishops throughout Christendom for so many petitions for the restoration of the Society of Jesus. Already, in 1801, our Pontiff had permitted a canonical establishment of the Society in Russia, conferring on its members in that empire all of their olden powers and privileges. And in 1804 he had extended this concession to the kingdom of Naples, hearkening to the prayer of that same Ferdinand who, in 1767, had so heartily entered into the Masonico-Jansenist conspiracy against those religions. Cardinal Pacca finds in the restoration of the celebrated Society by Pius VII., and in his own prominent connection with that restoration, a wonderful

(1) Consalvi was indefatigable in labor. Even when at the height of his honors and fame, he never worked less than fifteen hours a day. He was often reproached with his intimacy with schismatics and Protestants. Once Pius VII., commenting on his having tamed the ferocious Lutheran, Niebuhr, remarked: "That is one of our dear Consalvi's greatest miracles." He was very forgiving, but he was never weak. One day, when he was being beset by a multitude of office-seekers, pension and sinecure hunters, and others of that ilk, he discerned among them certain olden revolutionists of the direst and bloodiest stamp. "I am surprised to see you here," he said.—"But we have been amnestied," was the cool reply.—"True," returned the Minister, with a dismissing gesture, "the Holy Father was willing to pardon you, but not to reward you." One of his recreations was the cultivation of flowers, to which he was passionately attached. The Duke of Orleans, afterward King Louis Philippe, wishing to testify his gratitude for some favor received, Talleyrand told him: "If you wish to please him, send him some flowers." He detested any approach to ostentation. George IV. having sent him a piece of the finest Indian cashmere, woven expressly for the purpose, his valet managed, unknown to the prelate, to have a soutane made of the elegant material, and to get his master into it on the occasion of a solemn function. As usual, too preoccupied to notice his costume, he set out for the ceremony, and his gorgeous raiment received admiring attention. He retired at once to his apartments, doffed the precious robe, and sent it as a gift to an impoverished country church. The powers of Consalvi as secretary of state expired, of course, with Pope Pius VII.; and then his own fast-failing health warned him to prepare to follow the master he had so faithfully served. He retired to his villa at Porto d'Anzio, and returned again to Rome only to attend to the magnificent tomb which he erected to the late Pontiff with the fruits of his economies. He went to his reward on January 24, 1824.

illustration of the difference between the ways of Providence and the theories of men: "The young Benedictine, Chiaramonti, studied under professors who were hostile to the Jesuits; and from them he imbibed doctrines the very opposite to those defended by the Society. Now everyone knows how deep is the impression produced by the studies of our youth. As for myself, I had been inspired, when a young man, with sentiments of aversion, and I may say of fanatical hatred, for the illustrious Society. For instance, there was placed in my hands, with an order to make extracts from it, the famous *Provincial Letters*, both in French and in Latin, together with those notes by Wendrok (Nicole), which were far more abominable than the text. They gave me also the *Practical Morality of the Jesuits* by Arnauld, and similar works, which I credited in good faith. At that time who would have believed that the Benedictine, Barnaba Chiaramonti, having become Pope, would, immediately after the subsiding of a fearful tempest, re-establish that Society throughout the Catholic world; and that I would be the one to prepare the way for this new triumph, receiving from the Pope the duty of executing his sovereign orders? Having been a witness of those two memorable events, the suppression and the restoration of the Society of Jesus, I could appreciate the difference between the impressions produced by each of them" (1). Then the cardinal enters into the details of the resurrection of the Society on Aug. 7, 1814; and he declares that he wishes to avail himself of the opportunity "to leave in his writings a solemn retraction of the imprudent outbursts of his youth against a Society which has merited so well of the Church of Jesus Christ." The rehabilitating Bull *Sollicitudo Omnium Ecclesiarum* was placed by Pius VII. himself in the hands of Panizoni, the provincial of the Jesuits in Italy and vicar-general of the Society. On May 29, 1815, King Ferdinand VII. of Spain repaired, to some extent, the harm which his grandfather, Charles III., had inflicted on the Society; he invited the Jesuits to return to Spain, and restored to them all their property which had not been sold. In France, however,

(1) *Memoirs*, pt. iii., ch. 8.

although Talleyrand advised Louis XVIII. to recall the Society as an efficacious support of the recently restored monarchy, either the king's philosophistic prejudices or his fear of the mob led him to withhold all governmental cognizance of the Bull *Sollicitudo*. In practice this reticence of the civil authorities interfered but little with the good which the Jesuits now resumed in France; the king did not extend to them his royal invitation to return to their work in his kingdom, but the Constitution left them at liberty to so return. Article V. of the *Charte* conceded to the Church, just as it allowed to Judaism and to the innumerable sects of Protestantism, full liberty of action in everything pertaining to the spiritual order, and in accordance with her own rules. Therefore, since the Pope had numbered the Society of Jesus among the Religious Orders, its members, albeit merely auxiliary priests in the eyes of the civil law, were able to enter legally into France.

Pope Pius VII. laid down his burden of over twenty-three years of pontificate on April 20, 1823. The pre-eminent characteristic of this Pontiff was indicated by Cardinal Pacca, when that minister and friend applied to him the words with which Holy Writ describes the legislator of Sinai—"He was the mildest of men." But although gentleness was his predominating trait, so much so that, with the sole exception of Pius IX., no modern Pope so filled with love of him all who held personal relations with him, he was not weak. In his charming and valuable reminiscences of the four pontificates which he had accurately and even critically studied, Cardinal Wiseman said: "The government of the Pope was vigorous and decided, because he knew better than most princes how to choose his minister, and, once chosen, how to give him his confidence. If this work were a history, it would be easy to give proof of this truly sovereign instinct. It may be sufficient to say, that no one could have served him more wisely, at the critical moment when his misfortunes commenced, than their historian, Cardinal Pacca; none could have guided the helm of his shattered vessel more skilfully or more firmly than the great statesman, Consalvi. It was in that middle space between these two ministers—

when no longer, indeed, a monarch, but a captive—when bereft of all advice and sympathy, but pressed on close by those who, themselves probably deceived, thoroughly deceived him—that he committed the one error of his life and pontificate, in 1813. For there came to him men ‘of the seed of Aaron,’ who could not be expected to mislead him, themselves free and moving in the business of the world, who showed him, through the loop-holes of his prison, that world from which he was shut out, as though agitated on its surface, and to its lowest depths, through his unbendingness; the Church torn to schism, and religion weakened to destruction, from what they termed his obstinacy. He who had but prayed and bent his neck to suffering was made to appear in his own eyes a harsh and cruel master, who would rather see all perish, than loose his grasp on unrelenting, but impotent, jurisdiction. He yielded for a moment of conscientious alarm; he consented, though conditionally, under false, but virtuous impressions, to the terms proposed to him for a new Concordat. But no sooner had his upright and humble mind discovered the error, than it nobly and successfully repaired it. He would have no help from others in this work; he would let no man risk peace or comfort by assisting him. He would be his own secretary; wrote, corrected, and transcribed the necessary documents; recovered his bright serenity, his sweet smile, and unruffled peace by his humble candor; and rose higher in the esteem and love of all who knew him, from the depth of the self-abasement into which he nobly descended” (1). Alluding to the justice and true liberalism of this Pontiff’s reign over his temporal subjects, after his restoration, the same calm and judicious authority says: “Had Pius VII. re-enacted the laws (framed by the foreign usurpers) under which his subjects had groaned as under an oppression, and re-established the republic which they still detested as a usurpation; had he acted in the teeth of all Europe, in spite of every principle which guided its sovereigns and statesmen in his restoration; had he even thereby risked for himself another catastrophe, and for Italy another war; there might nowadays be many

(1) *The Last Four Popes*, ch. 4. London, 1858.

who would extol him as a hero, and almost deify him as a man beyond and above his age. Had he acted so, however, at that time, he would have been ridiculed, deserted, and abused by all parties, whig or tory, conservative or radical, as a fanatic, an unseasonable phenomenon, a man behind the age, which had outgrown revolutionary fancies ; in fine, a dotard who had better have been translated from the cell of a prison to that of an asylum, than restored from exile to a throne. We doubt if even the sorry compliment of a newspaper paragraph would have been paid him for his pains. He was restored, as Pope, to the temporal government of the portion of Italy held by his predecessors, without share in the warlike achievements of other princes, without a claim to the prizes of their victories. He was restored concurrently by Protestant and Catholic Powers, with the applause of the civilized world, and amidst the acclamations of joy, or rather in accordance with the longings, of his own subjects. He was restored on the principle which formed the basis of all restorations at the time, that Europe, so long convulsed and so long unsettled, should return to the normal state from which she had been wrenched. Empires were restored as empires, kingdoms resettled as kingdoms, grand-duchies as grand-duchies, republics as republics. And so the Pope was given back to Rome, to rule as Popes had done, by a system exceptional, and in a form the loss of which experience had proved to be hurtful. The independence of the Pope, that is, the combination in one of spiritual rule over the whole Catholic Church with a temporal limited sovereignty, had been sensibly demonstrated to be an important element in the re-adjustment of Europe. The evils resulting from the subjection of the common Father of the Faithful to one of his more powerful children, had been universally felt ; and the continuation of such an irregular condition by a peaceful subjugation of the ecclesiastical to any lay power, would have been only providing for the habitual derangement of religious action."

## CHAPTER II.

## THE PRETENDED DIVORCES OF NAPOLEON AND JEROME BONAPARTE.\*

In a pamphlet which he issued in 1887, Prince Jerome Napoleon, the illegitimate son of the Napoleonic king of Westphalia by a daughter of the king of Wurtemberg, found fault with the Austrian diplomat, Prince Metternich, because of an assertion by that generally circumspect personage to the effect that the great Napoleon had never been united sacramentally to Josephine. The Austrian had even dared to say that Cardinal Consalvi himself had admitted to him that *the Roman Pontiff, Pius. VII., had sanctioned the concubinary status of Napoleon and Josephine*, by the very fact that he had admitted the latter to a share in the imperial consecration. It was quite natural that Metternich, merely as a politician, should wish such to have been the case; under no other supposition could he uphold the honor of Maria Louisa and of her family. If Josephine was ever sacramentally united to Napoleon, the proud Hapsburgs had simply handed over one of their daughters to be the concubine of the "Corsican adventurer"; as Catholics, the imperial family of Austria were compelled to acknowledge this degradation of their escutcheon; therefore the Germanic imperialism of the Viennese chancellor impelled his presumed Catholic conscience to pronounce an abominable lie, and to insult the memory of one of the holiest successors of St. Peter. It shall be our present task to show that Prince Napoleon was in the right when he replied to Metternich that Napoleon and Josephine, "who had been only civilly married in the time of the Directory, were united religiously by Cardinal Fesch, in order to satisfy the scruples of Josephine, in the evening preceding the consecration, and in the presence of Talleyrand and Berthier, in the chapel of the Tuileries. I know this from the traditions of my family" (1).

Whether because they really ignored the circumstances of

(\*) The first part of this chapter appeared as an article in the *Ave Maria*, Vol. xxxii.

(1) *Napoleon and His Detractors*.

Napoleon's marriage and divorce, or because they dared not reveal displeasing details, the memoirists of the First Empire—such as Bourrienne, Marco Saint-Hilaire, Lorient, Gallois, the Continuator of Anquetil—have given us either travestied information or none at all. Thiers and d'Haussonville afterward narrated a part of the story. But in 1839 M. d'Avannes, vice-president of the tribunal of Evreux, while preparing his *Sketches of Navarre*, and wishing to give some place to Josephine, who had received the ancient kingdom as a kind of appanage, asked permission to consult the documents concerning our subject which were guarded in the archives of the Ministry of Justice. He was allowed to investigate, but not to copy them. In this emergency he had recourse to the friendly offices of the Abbé Rudemare, who had been promoter of the diocese of Paris under the empire; and who, more liberal than the state authorities, was able to furnish the investigator with even more information than that hidden in the archives. Add to this source the narration of Rudemare himself, as given among the "justificative pieces" in the *History of Cardinal Fesch*, by Lyonnet, and you have the means whereby to construct the entire history of the Napoleonic matrimonial complication.

When Napoleon married Josephine de Beauharnais, on March 9, 1796, it was a purely civil ceremony which, in accordance with the spirit and law of the Revolution, united the pair. At that time the most hellish spirit of the Revolution had subsided, and it would not have been difficult to find a priest to bless their nuptials; indeed, during the worst days of the Terror few good Catholics entered the matrimonial life under the sole auspices of the State, dangerous though their fidelity generally proved. Josephine passed for a virtuous woman, and even showed a certain amount of religious devotion; on her part, therefore, this neglect may have been a mere worldly weakness. But there is good reason for supposing that Bonaparte was actuated, if not from the very day of his betrothal, at least from a period shortly posterior to it, by a design to provide himself with a loophole for escape from what might possibly become an inconvenient burden. In vain did Josephine beg for a relig-

ious authorization of their union; this proved to be one of the few matters in which her influence over Napoleon was null. Eight years passed, and the time came for the coronation of Bonaparte as Emperor of the French. Pope Pius VII. came to Paris for the great ceremony, and Josephine succumbed to the influence of that mysterious prestige which ever surrounds the Vicar of Christ. Her soul was in agony. Could she bear to submit her head to the blessing of the Supreme Pontiff of that Church whose laws she was defying? Could she dare to receive an almost sacramental consecration while living in the bonds of sin? And then there flashed into her mind the prospect of being able to finally dissipate the cloud which had so long hung over her otherwise happy life. Her purely civil marriage might be annulled by the powerful wish of that ambitious husband, whose dearest hopes her continued childlessness so terribly thwarted; but would even Bonaparte succeed, where Philip Augustus had failed, in procuring the dissolution of a Christian matrimony? She had already told Bourrienne that from the day when Napoleon commenced to plot for the imperial crown, she had felt herself lost; but now she could put an end to this anguish. She would avow her trouble to the Pontiff himself.

Trembling with emotion and shame, she made her avowal on December 1, the day before that appointed for the coronation. The Pontiff was thunderstruck. In common with all of Josephine's friends—nay, with all France—he had believed her marriage to have been sanctioned by the Church. His answer was full of tenderness for the weeping woman, and of consideration for the unscrupulous man who would have deceived him, while it manifested the tact of the priest and the Pontiff. Canonically, the situation of the emperor did not concern him; that was an affair to be arranged between the potentate's conscience and himself. But now that he, the Pontiff, knew the state of affairs, he could not, much as he lamented the fact, admit the empress to a share in the consecration, unless she were first united to Napoleon before a priest. When Napoleon was informed of Josephine's action and of the Pontifical decision, his rage was terrific; but

what could he do? Proceed with his own consecration, and ignore the rights of Josephine? The scandal was not to be thought of; and the displeasure of the Pontiff, whose friendship he sadly needed, was not to be unnecessarily incurred. But one course was open to the schemer: to consent to the proposed nuptial benediction, and to devise some means for its nullification. According to the Canon Law, no Christian matrimony is valid unless performed in the presence of the pastor of one of the contracting parties; clandestine matrimony, such as, although illicit, the Church declares to be valid in most of the States of the American Union, and in other lands where the Tridentine decree on matrimony was never promulgated, is not recognized by the Church in France. Here, then, the astute Bonaparte imagined that his security was found. His union with Josephine should be contracted without the presence of the parish-priest or of witnesses; there was no time for the one, and necessary secrecy precluded the attendance of the others, as he told his uncle, Cardinal Fesch, on whose assistance and devotion he relied in his dilemma. At first Fesch refused to countenance what he rightly asserted would be a mere mockery of a religious solemnization, and of no validity; but he yielded sufficiently to propose recurring to the Pope for the powers necessary for his own assumption of the office of the *curé* of the Tuileries, and for the dispensation with witnesses. Can it be possible that Napoleon did not perceive that this action of his uncle promised to destroy his own hopes? Did he not realize that by recurring to the Pontiff, the source of Canon Law, for a dispensation from the provisions of that Law, he was cutting from under his feet the only ground on which he could securely stand, and on occupying which he had just resolved? The comedy which he had been enacting from the day of his marriage, which he was now developing for the illusion of Josephine, of the Church of France, of his future empress, of the august house of Hapsburg, was certainly threatened with collapse. At any rate, the cardinal proceeded to the apartments of Pius VII., and at once broached the subject of his quandary. "Most Holy Father, it may be that in the exercise of my duties in this matter, I shall need all the powers of

your Holiness.”—“Very well,” replied the Pontiff; “I accord them all.”

Here, then, is the solution of the entire question as to the religious marriage of Napoleon and Josephine, and consequently of the question of the validity of the pretended divorce by an incompetent ecclesiastical tribunal. With the action of the civil tribunals we, of course, having nothing to do. The sole ground for the acquiescence of the diocesan tribunal of Paris in the imperial demands was the non-fulfilment, at the religious marriage, of the conditions prescribed as essential by the Canon Law. But the Roman Pontiff had dispensed with these conditions in this particular case; he had derogated, in favor of Napoleon and Josephine, from the obligatory force of those conditions, just as he does in every case of clandestine matrimony, not otherwise illegitimate, celebrated in these United States and in other countries where the Tridentine decree was not promulgated. As soon as he had received full power to act in the premises, Cardinal Fesch betook himself to the apartments of the empress, and there married the imperial couple. Whether there were any witnesses or not to the ceremony appears to be doubtful. Capefigue, following Portalis, names that personage and Duroc. Thiers at first mentioned Talleyrand and Berthier; and then, on the testimony of certain original documents, denied their presence. The depositions of Talleyrand and Berthier before the “officiality” say nothing of their presence; but of course it was to the interest of their master that they should hide whatever would strengthen the validity of the religious ceremony. Just before the coronation Pope Pius asked Cardinal Fesch whether he had conferred the nuptial benediction. “Yes,” was the laconic reply. Two days afterward Josephine asked the cardinal to give her a certificate of the marriage; and although he at first demurred, for fear of offending the emperor, he yielded to her entreaties so far as to hand her a paper, the exact contents of which have never been made known. It was in 1809, after the treaty of Vienna, that Napoleon first opened his mind clearly to Cambacérès, arch-chancellor of the empire, on the matter of the divorce. A

*senatus-consultus* was immediately promulgated (December 16), proclaiming the dissolution of the emperor's civil marriage. Napoleon had flattered himself that the religious marriage would give him no trouble whatever; it was a secret shared only by the cardinal, his uncle, Josephine, and himself. But when he learned that Fesch had indiscreetly mentioned the ceremony to Cambacérès, and that he had even given a certificate to Josephine, Napoleon found himself compelled to seek from the ecclesiastical authorities a declaration of the nullity of his union. Ignoring the existence of the Pope, the proper judge in the matrimonial causes of sovereigns, recourse was had to the diocesan tribunal of Paris (not to a reunion of bishops, as Thiers would have us believe),—a body established to judge of similar causes between private individuals, and one composed of the appellant's subjects. On December 22, 1809, the Abbé Rudemare, diocesan promoter of Paris; his colleague, M. Corpet; and the two officials, MM. Lejeas and Boisleve; were summoned to a conference with Cambacérès. "The emperor," said Cambacérès, "cannot abandon the hope of leaving behind him an heir who will assure the tranquillity, glory, and integrity of the empire which he has founded. He intends to marry again, and he desires to espouse a Catholic. Hence his union with the empress Josephine must be annulled, and he wishes to submit the case to the diocesan tribunal."

"But, my lord," returned Rudemare, "such a cause as this is reserved, if not by law, at least by custom, to the Sovereign Pontiff."

"I am not authorized to recur to Rome," replied the arch-chancellor.

"You need not go to Rome; the Pope is at Savona," said the promoter.

"I am not told to treat with him," answered Cambacérès; "and it is impossible to do so under present circumstances."

"There are several cardinals, my lord, in Paris; why not submit this affair to them?"

"They have no jurisdiction, M. l'Abbé," returned the imperial confidant.

“But, at least,” insisted the promoter, “we have here a commission of cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, assembled for affairs of the Church.”

“They do not constitute a tribunal,” said Cambacérés; “whereas the ‘officiality’ is one formed for the cognizance of these very causes.”

“Yes, prince,” returned the abbé; “but only for those of private individuals. The dignity of the parties here concerned prevents our tribunal from regarding itself as competent in the premises.”

“What!” exclaimed the archchancellor. “Do you mean to say that His Majesty has no right to present himself before a tribunal established for his subjects, and composed of his subjects? Who contests his right?”

“He may present himself,” acknowledged the promoter; “but such a course would be so contrary to custom that we could not assume the responsibility of acting as his judges unless the episcopal commission decided in favor of our competency. Although disposed to prove our devotion to His Majesty in every possible way, we must take every means to shield our own responsibility, and to insure the repose of our consciences. In undertaking this case we become a spectacle for angels and men.”

“But this affair must remain secret,” said Cambacérés; “all the documents shall be deposited in the cabinet of the emperor. At any rate, the Minister of Worship will see that you receive the approbation that you desire.”

The motives for the nullification of the religious marriage having been submitted to the diocesan tribunal, the promoter exclaimed: “But we all thought, as did indeed the whole empire, that the marriage of Their Majesties had been celebrated in 1796 with all the canonical forms.”

“That is a mistake,” observed Cambacérés. “Foreseeing what has now happened, His Majesty would never receive the nuptial benediction. But on Saturday, December 1, 1804, tired of the entreaties of the empress, he told Cardinal Fesch to give the nuptial blessing; and it was given in the apartments of the empress, without any witnesses, and without the presence of the *curé*.”

“Prince,” asked the abbé, “where is the record of this marriage?”

“There is none,” replied the archchancellor, who knew that Josephine had a certificate of the marriage, if indeed the imperial familiars had not found means to destroy it.

“This affair,” remarked the promoter, “providing, of course, that our competence is assured, must be conducted precisely as though it were the case of one of His Majesty’s subjects.”

“What! Follow mere forms? They take too much time. I have been a lawyer, and I know.”

“That may be,” returned Rudemare; “but forms often lead us to a knowledge of the truth; and, besides, we cannot ignore them without risk of nullifying our proceedings. However, there is no reason why this second question should not also be submitted to the episcopal commission.”

On January 1, Napoleon obtained from seven prelates, who had no authority whatever in the premises, a declaration that the diocesan tribunal was competent to decide his matrimonial cause. These prelates were the very same who afterward pronounced the excommunication of Bonaparte null, “because it had been launched in defence of temporal interests”; and who added to the sufferings of the august prisoner of Savona by threatening, in the name of the church of France, to provide for its necessities if he did not yield to the schismatic demands of Bonaparte. They were Cardinal Maury, Cardinal Caselli, bishop of Parma; de Barral, archbishop of Tours; Canaveri, bishop of Vercelli; Bourlier of Evreux; Manet of Treves; and Duvoisin of Nantes. In accordance with the tenor of this declaration, the tribunal of Paris listened, on January 6, to the attestations, signed and sealed, of Cardinal Fesch, Talleyrand, Berthier, and Duroc, to the effect that the canonical conditions had not been observed in the religious marriage of the emperor, and that His Majesty had intentionally arranged this neglect; for he could not dream, they said, of binding himself irrevocably in this matter at the moment when he was founding a new empire. On January 9, the tribunal heard a development of the further

motive for dissolution which had been hinted in this last clause. Napoleon, the master of Europe, *had been constrained* in the exercise of his free will. He had not consented to the marriage. The official Peter Boisleve then delivered judgment in favor of the imperial postulant, but with the important reservation that the decision was pronounced by him because of the difficulty of recurring to the Supreme Pontiff, to whom such a case should by right have been referred. The promoter having appealed to the metropolitan "officiality," its members confirmed the decision already given, but referred the affair for final adjudication to the primatial tribunal of Lyons. However, it was an easy matter to ignore the responsibility thus thrust upon this higher court; the archbishop of Lyons was Cardinal Fesch.

Such is the history of one of the most solemn burlesques of justice ever perpetrated by a human tribunal. An incompetent court, listening to testimony evidently false as well as interested, and ignoring the manifest suppression of what would have given another aspect to the cause, slavishly bent to the will of an autocrat, and passed over as never having occurred a marriage sanctioned by the Vicar of Christ; and, turning to the civil union which the Church had never recognized, pronounced the contracting parties free to enter upon new nuptials. Had Josephine resisted the imperial will—had she performed her duty as wife and woman, and carried her case before its proper judge,—her rights would have been proclaimed, even though the brute force of her husband might have forced her to yield her place to another. But she never appealed; sure of her husband's invincible determination to repudiate her, she perforce found consolation in an empty title and in a magnificent establishment. It has been asserted that Josephine was cognizant of reasons for preservation of silence; it has been declared that there was a real, though secret, impediment, which invalidated her union with Napoleon, and of which the Viennese court was informed during the negotiations for the hand of Maria Louisa. So say Thiers and Rohrbacher. But this impediment could not have subsisted. The existence of Eugene and Hortense, taken in conjunction with Josephine's own frequent anticipations,

as evidenced by her letters to her husband and her friends, forbid such a supposition.

We would remark in conclusion that the term "divorce" should not be used in treating of this case. When concubinaries are separated, they are not divorced; they are simply declared not bound to each other. Here a sycophantic tribunal denied the existence of the religious marriage, and of course it could not recognize the civil union. In this state of affairs it pronounced the parties free from matrimonial obligations. A divorce, properly so called—that is, the dissolution of an existing tie (*quoad vinculum*)—cannot be and never has been granted by the Holy See in the case of *consummated* Christian matrimony; and history tells of no ecclesiastical tribunal in the Latin Church, whether competent or incompetent, legitimate or illegitimate, pretending to accord such a separation. As for the contrary course of the Uniates of the Greek and of the Greco-Slavonic Rites (1), an obstinacy truly Oriental, but which the Holy See has never punished with excommunication, we can only say with the judicious Perrone—*ipsi viderint*, and that "the Church has tolerated their action, just as she tolerates other sinners" (2). For an instance of the inflexibility of the Holy See in this regard, even in the case of the mighty ones of the earth, the mind of Josephine needed not to travel back many centuries; she did not need to search outside the annals of her husband's immediate family. The case of Jerome Bonaparte and his Baltimorean Protestant spouse was of recent date.

In the year 1803, while Napoleon was still First Consul of France, but was already preparing his way to the imperial throne, Jerome, his youngest brother and a lieutenant in the navy, visited the United States. The boy of nineteen became infatuated with a Miss Elizabeth Patterson, the daughter of an Irish Protestant merchant in Baltimore; a marriage was arranged, in spite of the protests of M. Pichon, the French *chargé d'affaires*: and the ceremony was performed by Mgr. Carroll, bishop of Baltimore. The Patterson family had been notified by the French representative that the union

(1) See our Vol. iii., p. 520.

(2) *Lectures. Treatise On Marriage*, ch. 2, prop. 4, no. 148.

would be invalid in the eyes of the French civil law ; firstly because Jerome was a minor, and his mother, the surviving parent, had not given her consent ; and secondly, because no military officer of France could marry without the consent of his government. When Napoleon received the news of this marriage, he was deep in the preparations for his approaching coronation ; already he had, in his mind, placed his brothers and sisters on various thrones of Europe, as fancied security for the perpetuity of his glory. He declared immediately that he would never recognize "Miss Patterson" as one of his family ; and on March 21, 1805, an imperial decree "nullifying" her marriage was issued. A few weeks afterward, the emperor wrote to his mother : "Mons. Jerome Buonaparte has arrived at Lisbon, with the woman with whom he lives. I have ordered this prodigal son to proceed to Milan, passing through Perpignan, Toulouse, Grenoble, and Turin. I have informed him that, if he diverged from that road, he would be arrested. Miss Patterson, who lives with him, has taken the precaution of bringing her brother with her. I have given orders that she is to be sent back to America. If she were to evade the orders I have given, and come to Bordeaux or Paris, she would be brought back to Amsterdam, and put on board the first American vessel. I shall treat this young man severely if he shows himself unworthy of the name he bears, during the only interview I shall grant him, and if he persists in carrying on this *liaison*. If he shows no inclination to wash away the dishonor with which he has stained my name by forsaking his country's flag on land and sea, for the sake of a wretched woman, I will cast him off forever. I may make him an example which will teach young soldiers the sacredness of their duty, and the enormity of the crime they commit when they forsake their flag for a woman." The time had not yet arrived, when Napoleon would pretend that he could "do without the Pope" ; therefore, on May 24 of the same year, he wrote to His Holiness : "I have often spoken to Your Holiness concerning a brother of mine, then a lad of nineteen, whom I had sent to America on a frigate, and who, after a sojourn of a month in those parts, and in spite

of his being a minor, married in Baltimore a Protestant daughter of a merchant. He has just returned, and he realizes the entire extent of his delinquency. I have sent Miss Patterson, his so-called wife, back to America. According to our laws, the marriage is invalid. A Spanish priest was so far forgetful of his duty as to give the nuptial benediction (1). I wish for a Bull from Your Holiness annulling the marriage. I send Your Holiness several memorandums, one by Cardinal Caselli, which will greatly enlighten Your Holiness. It would be easy for me to have the marriage annulled, as the Gallican Church recognizes (declares) the non-validity of such marriages. But it would be better effected at Rome, were it only to serve as an example to members of reigning houses who contract marriage with Protestants. I would urge great secrecy in this proceeding on Your Holiness. Only when I learn that you consent to this step, shall I cause the marriage to be civilly annulled. It is important, even in France, that no Protestant girl should be so nearly related to me. It is dangerous that a minor of nineteen years of age, of distinguished position, should be exposed to so great a temptation, contrary to civil laws, and to every sort of propriety. Meanwhile, I pray that God may preserve you many years, Most Holy Father, to the government of our Mother, Holy Church. Your devoted Son, NAPOLEON."

That the Pontiff wished Napoleon to see that he had taken time for the examination of a matter which a tyro in theology would have settled as soon as it was placed before him, is evident from the date of the pontifical reply, June 27. His Holiness begins by informing the emperor that he has so well complied with the imperial request for secrecy, that he has

(1) It is absurd to suppose that Napoleon, having talked with Jerome on the matter, did not know that Bishop Carroll, an American, had blessed the marriage. But probably the schemer thought to diminish the *a priori* evidence for the validity of the ceremony which would necessarily attach to the fact that a bishop, who presumably knew his theology and his duty, had officiated. Probably also Napoleon eagerly availed himself of the report that had indeed been current in Europe, to the effect that the Patterson marriage had been celebrated by a Spanish ecclesiastic; but he should have known that the Holy See would soon learn the truth, if indeed it was not already acquainted with the details of the affair. The report as to the intervention of a Spanish priest, originated from the fact that the Marquis de Casa-Irujo, Spanish Minister to the United States, had been very officious in arranging the marriage.

reserved entirely to himself the consideration of a question which custom would have laid before a Congregation of Cardinals. The reply is lengthy; but the reader will not suffer if we present it almost in its entirety, since it is an authoritative explanation of the Catholic doctrine on the indissolubility of matrimony, even when one of the contracting parties is a Protestant. "Among all the reasons which have been advanced by Your Majesty, or which we can imagine, there is not one that would justify us in pronouncing the nullity of the said marriage. Each of the three memorials transmitted by Your Majesty is based on principles which are contradicted by the principles of the others; therefore these memorials destroy each other. The first, laying aside the other diriment impediments, contends that only two apply to the present case: the difference of religion (*disparitas cultus*) of the contracting parties, and the absence of the pastor from the celebration of the marriage. The second rejects these impediments; but alleges two others in the absence of the consent of the mother and relatives of the groom who is a minor, and in the allegation of a rape (*raptus*) which is indicated by the word 'seduction.' The third does not agree with the second; and adduces as the sole reason of nullity the absence of the consent of the pastor of the groom, a consent which is declared to have been necessary, since the groom had not changed his domicile, and since the Council of Trent prescribed the consent of the parish-priest as absolutely necessary in marriages. An analysis of these contrary opinions shows that four impediments are alleged; but having examined these separately, we could not find one which, in accordance with the principles of the Church, would authorize us to pronounce this consummated marriage null. In the first place, the difference of religion, which the Church regards as a diriment (invalidating) impediment, is not verified when both of the contracting parties are baptized, even though one of them may not be in the Catholic communion. This impediment exists only in a union contracted between a Christian and an infidel (or an unbaptized Protestant). The Church *abhors* marriages between Catholics and (baptized) Protestants; but

she recognizes them as valid. In the second place, it is not correct to say that the laws of France pronounce null, so far as the *Sacrament* of Matrimony is concerned, those marriages which minors contract without the consent of their parents or guardians. In 1629 the French lay legislative body itself, in reply to the representations of the General Assembly of the Clergy, declared that in their nullification of those marriages the legislators had intended to affect only the civil consequences of the unions, and that the lay judges could give no other interpretation to the law. Louis XIII., the author of this declaration, knew well that the secular power could not institute any impediments which would nullify matrimony as a Sacrament. The Church disapproves of marriages contracted without the consent of the parents or guardians; but she has always, and notably in the Council of Trent, insisted on their validity. In the third place, it is equally contrary to the laws of the Church to pronounce the nullity of this marriage because of a 'rape' (*raptus*) or 'seduction.' The impediment of 'rape' exists only when a marriage is contracted between the ravisher and the ravished before the latter has been set at liberty. Now, since there was no ravishment in the case in question, that which the memorial terms a 'rape' or 'seduction' is really the absence of the parental consent, which cannot be adduced as invalidating the marriage. Let us now consider the fourth impediment which is alleged to exist; namely, the absence of the parish-priest. This impediment was established by the Council of Trent. But it can be found only in those countries where the famous decree of the Council, *De Reformatione Matrimonii*, Ch. I., Sect. 24, has been published; and even in those countries, it subsists only in regard to those persons for whom it was intended. We have taken every care to discover whether the aforesaid decree was ever published in Baltimore; and for the purpose of this investigation we have caused careful search to be made in the archives of the Propaganda and of the Inquisition, archives which would certainly contain a record of any such publication. We have found no trace of any such record; but, on the contrary, we have found indications, especially a de-

cree of a Synod which was convoked by the present bishop of Baltimore, which show that the publication in question was never made. What is more, it may be well supposed, that said publication would not have been made in a country, the government of which is heretical. After this investigation of fact, we proceeded to consider whether the absence of the parish-priest militated for the nullity of this marriage; and we became convinced that it furnished no ground for an invalidation. There is no such ground because of the domicile of the groom; for even though he retained his domicile in a land where the Tridentine decree on matrimony had been promulgated, it is an incontestable maxim that, for the validity of a marriage, the domicile of only one of the contracting parties needs to be considered, especially when neither one of the parties has changed his or her domicile with intent to defraud. It is certain, therefore, that since in this case the laws of the domicile of the bride were observed, it was not necessary to act in conformity with the laws of the domicile of the groom, where the marriage was not celebrated. . . . Your Majesty will understand that, guided by the information that has thus far reached us, it is not in our power to pronounce this marriage null. If, besides the circumstances already alleged, there should be discovered any others which would indicate the presence of an invalidating impediment, then we might fortify our judgment with that proof, and give another decision, one also consonant with the laws of the Church, which we can never disobey by declaring invalid a marriage which, according to the word of God, no human power can dissolve."

It is not strange that when Napoleon resolved to divorce Josephine, he determined to effect his purpose without the aid of the author of this letter. Meanwhile, he succeeded, with very little effort, in bending Jerome to his will. The young man was of very different mould from Lucien, who, after having contributed more than any other person to the rise of Napoleon, took the road of exile rather than discard his legitimate wife (1). Napoleon carved out of subjugated

(1) Lucien bought the town and territory of Canino, near Viterbo and the Pope erected the estate into a principality in his favor, he doing homage for the fief on Sept. 2, 1814. A:

Prussia a kingdom for complacent Jerome; and a German Protestant princess was but too willing to usurp the place of the American wife. When Pius VII. was informed of this adulterous proceeding, he wrote to Napoleon: "We still hope that our examination of the reasons adduced for a nullification of the prince's first marriage will be followed by a presentation of other and just reasons which may have justified the ceremony, of which Your Majesty has just informed us. This hope sustains us in the anguish which we must feel when we remember all that we have already written to Your Majesty, after mature consideration, concerning this affair." Of course, this observation of the Pontiff was a mere formality, a piece of diplomatic courtesy; every probable and improbable reason for an invalidation of Jerome's union with Miss Patterson had already been advanced, and had been found groundless by the highest tribunal of the Catholic Church, the divinely-constituted guardian of Christian Matrimony.

Rome this sole uncrowned of the Bonaparte brothers found happiness in liberty, his domestic circle, and in a real and enthusiastic love of art and literature. The emperor often tempted him to discard his wife, and to marry into some royal family. He spurned even the project of a marriage of his daughter (by his first wife) with the heir to the Spanish throne; still more easily he declined a throne for himself. Among the recently published (1897) letters of Napoleon, there is one written in 1807 to his brother Joseph, then king of Naples, in which the emperor suggests that, if Lucien will submit to be divorced, and will then marry a princess, he may retain his present wife as a mistress: "I saw Lucien at Mantua. I had several hours' conversation with him. I must tell you that I am prepared to restore his rights as a French prince, and recognize all his daughters as my nieces. Only he must begin by annulling his marriage with Mme. Jouberton, either by divorcing her, or in any other way. This being done, all his children will be provided for. If Mile. Jouberton really is in an interesting condition at this present time, and bears a daughter, I see no objection to the adoption of the child. If it is a boy, it may be considered as Lucien's son, but not born in open wedlock. And I am willing to enable this child to inherit the outside sovereignty I may confer on his father, independently of the rank to which his father may be raised by the general policy of Empire, but not to allow this son any pretension to succeed his father in his own real rank, nor to be called to the succession of the French Empire. You will see that I have exhausted every means in my power to recall Lucien, who is still in his first youth, to the employment of his talents in my service and that of his country. I do not see what he can now allege against this course. His children's interest is protected; thus I have provided for everything. Once Lucien has divorced Mme. Jouberton and has been raised to a great position at Naples or elsewhere, if he chooses to recall her and live with her, not as with a princess who is his wife, but in any intimacy he chooses, I shall make no difficulty, for the political aspect is all I care for. Apart from that I have no desire to run counter to his tastes and passions." The firmness of Lucien so enraged Napoleon that in Sept., 1810, he wrote to the chancellor of the Senate: "I write this letter to inform you that the name of M. Lucien Buonaparte is no longer to appear on the list of Senators. He has been absent five years from the territories of the empire, and, when Rome was added to these, he left this country to cross the seas, and retired to America. He has thus resigned his Senatorial duties and dignity. As President

## CHAPTER III.

THE STRUGGLE OF POLISH CATHOLICITY WITH RUSSIAN  
"ORTHODOXY." \*

Just as to the sword of France the Europe of the early Middle Age owed its escape from imminent Mussulman domination, so does modern Europe owe to Poland the fact that it is not to-day either Turkish or Muscovite. Few publicists of the nineteenth century, that century of superficialities which is ever prone to ignore all that is truly grand, care to remember this fact; and still fewer ever note that the Holy See—always ready to perpetuate a nation's title to the grati-

of the Senate, we are bound to consider this resignation complete. When the will of the French nation raised us to the imperial throne, we had a right to the co-operation of all those, who, like him, owed us a special duty. . . . Whereas our brothers were raised by us to a rank befitting their birth and the interests of our crown, he remained a private individual. When, in later times, we had to overcome great perils, and struggle with all Europe leagued against us, his duty should have recalled him to our side, and we had a right to claim the services of the talents heaven had given him. He has always been deaf to our call, and he has sought refuge at last outside the empire, under the protection of powers which he knew had but scant affection for our throne, and has thus made his renunciation of his duty to ourselves, the Senate, and his country more utterly irrevocable. He had asked the Minister of Police for passports for himself and the object of his guilty passion, and he has gone far from the empire, which he had no right to leave without special authority. It is necessary to the peace and tranquillity of the State that he should not only cease to be a member of any political body in France, but that neither he nor his children should ever return to our empire." The passport here mentioned had been demanded by Lucien for a trip to America. He embarked, but was captured by an English cruiser, and was taken as a prisoner to England, where he remained until the first fall of Napoleon in 1814. When about to return to Rome, Lucien wrote to Pope Pius VII.: "Permit me, Holy Father, to congratulate Your Holiness from the depth of my heart on your happy though tardy deliverance, a consummation for which we never ceased to pray most earnestly from the moment when persecution deprived us of the refuge which your paternal protection had enabled us to enjoy. . . . Although we have been unjustly persecuted by the emperor, nevertheless, the lightnings of heaven which have struck him affect me deeply. Now, for the first time in ten years, I feel that Napoleon is again my brother. I forgive him, I pity him, and I pray that he may finally return to the bosom of the Church, and thus regain his claims to the mercy of the Father of Mercies, and to the prayers of His vicar. . . . On the point of departing from this fortunate England, where I have passed a long but mild and honorable captivity, I beg Your Holiness to accord to me, to my wife, and to our children, that apostolic benediction which we hope to receive very soon in person, when we prostrate ourselves at your holy feet." Notwithstanding his unjust and cruel treatment by Napoleon, the prince of Canino took part in the Hundred Days' struggle whereby the emperor endeavored to restore his fallen fortunes. After Waterloo, he advised Napoleon to dissolve the Chamber, and to continue the war against allied Europe, but, perhaps foolishly, his advice was not followed.

\* This chapter appeared in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vols. xxii. and xxlii.

tude of Christendom—conferred on the Polish kingdom, almost from its inception, the designation of "Most Orthodox," just as it had rewarded the zeal of the first French monarch with the style of "Most Christian." It was only during the reign of Boleslas the Great (992-1025) that the work of converting the Poles was terminated. Christianity had been brought into Eastern Poland during the latter part of the ninth century by Bulgaro-Greek monks, sent by St. Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, the victim of Photius (1). These missionaries introduced the Slavo-Greek rite into Moravia, whence they passed into Chrobatia (Western Galicia), and shortly afterward their disciples introduced the same liturgy among the Poles along the Dnieper. The Latin rite was propagated among the Poles along the Oder and the Vistula toward the end of the tenth century, having come into Poland with the Czeck (Bohemian) princess, Dombrowska, when she espoused the duke, Mieczyslas I., the first Christian prince of the country. For many years the religion of the Poles was a mixture of Christianity and idolatry; but Boleslas witnessed the disappearance of the last remnant of paganism. Boleslas was one of the greatest princes of the Middle Age, whether he be regarded as warrior, legislator, or administrator; in fact, he was the Polish Charlemagne. He guaranteed his people against the onslaughts of their Russian, Bohemian, and German neighbors by subduing Chrobatia, Silesia, and Pomerania, and incorporating them into the new kingdom of Poland, which came into existence in the year 1000, when the emperor Otho III. crowned Boleslas at Guiesen, expressly avowing that Poland should never owe any vassalage to the Germanic empire. A few years only passed, and Boleslas had extended his dominions from the Dnieper to the Elbe. Boleslas was not satisfied with his coronation at the hands of Otho III., even though that monarch was the Holy Roman Emperor; he again and again despatched embassies to Rome, soliciting royal consecration from the Head of the Church. But as all these messengers were captured by the Germans, with whom after the death of Otho III. the Poles were continually at war, Bo-

(1) See our Vol. ii., p. 50.

leslas received the royal unction from his own bishops toward the end of his life. Boleslas II., the third successor of the great Boleslas, lost the royal dignity because of his crimes. With his own hand he murdered at the altar the holy bishop of Cracow, Stanislaus, who had reproved him for his immoralities. Excommunicated and deposed by Pope St. Gregory VII., he died miserably in Hungary; and as the Pontiff had reduced Poland to the rank of a duchy, in order to teach other monarchs a lesson, there were no more kings of Poland during the next two hundred and forty years. Then Pope John XXII. yielded to the prayers of the nation, and allowed Duke Ladislas Loketek to don the royal crown.

From the reign of Boleslas the Great to the crime of 1772, the chivalry of Poland repelled ninety-one Tartar invasions, any one of which, if successful, would have at least jeopardized the existence of European civilization. For many centuries that chivalry was the sole barrier of Europe against the triumph of Muscovite ambition; and the reason of the Polish success is to be found, not in the unquestionable valor of the Polish heart, not in any solidity of the government which directed that valor, but in the religious tie which bound the Poles together—the only tie which this restive people have ever regarded as unbreakable. This is the most salient fact in all Polish history. The political constitution of Poland was the most faulty in Christendom, probably in the world; and precisely because of that constitution, her history is that of an almost continual civil war—a condition of things which in any other land would have rendered foreign invasion synonymous with national ruin. But so long as the religious tie remained, Poland could have a hundred thousand masters in the persons of her fractious nobles; the entire *people* could be serfs; and there would be but one law and one country for every Polander. For many centuries the battle-hymn of this warlike race was a beautiful canticle in honor of Our Lady, which had been composed by the martyr St. Adalbert, the first apostle of Northern Poland; and to mention only one of the many customs which show how the Catholic spirit was identified with Polish patriotism, what a lesson the Polish boy received when, while assisting at Mass, he noticed that at the

reading of the Gospel every noble drew his sword half-way out of the scabbard, in sign of his sworn devotion to the faith, even unto death. The enemies of Poland, both Prussian and Muscovite, fully realized that in that devoted land the names of Catholicism and country invoke each other; that, as the idea has been well expressed by Poland's latest panegyrist, "from St. Adalbert to Mgr. Felinski, these words have one and the same sound. Not one step can be taken against the national liberty without treading on the corpse of a bishop; and never is religious liberty demanded, without a simultaneous effort for the national independence. Only this close connection between the principles of faith and Polish nationality can explain the otherwise inexplicable resistance of Poland to all the political combinations, and to all the onslaughts, which to this day have tended to reduce her to the condition of a simple province of the Russian empire. The political hostility is nothing when compared to the violent antipathy which the difference of religion induces in the two peoples—an antipathy which renders a fusion impossible, unless at the price of a veritable metamorphosis of conscience, that is, of a sincere conversion of Russia herself. For we must remember that if the national spirit of Poland, such as ten centuries of history have made it, is absolutely antipathetic to any assimilation with Russia, just so the national spirit of Russia, such as schism has made it, is no less incompatible with Polish civilization. This fact politicians refuse obstinately to acknowledge; and, therefore, no progress is made in the ways of a diplomacy which is indifferent to the demands of a people's conscience, and which is blinded by rationalistic impiety" (1). In fact, the crime of 1772 had scarcely been consummated, when Catharine II. realized that there can be no medium between an absolute dependence of the Church on the State and an absolute distinction of the two powers; that if Poland was to continue subject to Russia, either Poland should become schismatic, or Russia should become Catholic; that, therefore, all the Russian promises concerning religious toleration in Poland should be trampled under foot.

(1) LESŒUR: *The Catholic Church in Poland under the Russian Government*, Vol. I., p. 14. Paris, 1876.

Before we approach the main subject of this dissertation, the persecutions visited on Catholic Poland by "Orthodox" Russia, we must ask the reader to remember that originally the Muscovite schismatic bishops enjoyed a quasi-independence, since they depended from the distant patriarch of Constantinople. But when the patriarch, Jeremiah II., sold the patriarchal dignity to the metropolitan of Moscow in 1588, the Russian prelates became mere instruments of the czar. It was not the simoniacal Jeremiah who gave the investiture to the new patriarch, but the grand-duke of Moscovy himself in these words: "Most worthy patriarch, father of all the fathers, first of all the bishops of Russia, I give thee precedence over all the bishops; I give thee the right to wear the patriarchal mantle, the cap of a bishop, and the great mitre; and I order that thou be recognized and honored as a patriarch, and the brother of all the patriarchs" (1). The principle here implied has been ever recognized by the schismatics of Russia. The author of the *Life of St. Josaphat* cites the following declaration of a Bulgarian archbishop: "The emperor is placed over all the churches. He is, and he is styled, the prince of wisdom; and consequently he presides over synods, and gives force to their decisions; he deposes the ministers of the Church; he prescribes the rule of life for the ministers of the altar; he even sanctions the judgments of the bishops. In fine, in one word, *in everything except the power to sacrifice, the emperor exercises publicly all the pontifical functions; and he does so legitimately and canonically*" (2). The name of this Bulgarian prelate was Demetrius Chomatenus; and his decision is given at length by Lequien, in his *Oriens Christianus*. The bloody Ivan IV., surnamed the Terrible, was very fond of exhibiting himself pontifically. "Ivan believed that kings are also pontiffs in their own states, and often he officiated pontifically with exemplary devotion. He used to prepare himself for these pontifical functions by a retreat in the monastery of Alexan-

(1) THEINER; *Vicissitudes of the Two Rites*, Vol. i., p. 18. Paris, 1843.

(2) GUEPIN; *St. Josaphat Kuneewicz, Archbishop of Polock, Martyr for Catholic Unity, and Martyr of the United Greek Church in Poland*, Vol. i., p. 44. Paris, 1874.

rowa" (1). The East was always prone to recognize the right of the emperors to interfere in the things of the sanctuary. In the days of St. Athanasius we find the same forces at work which we now discern in Russia; an emperor grasping the crozier, servile schismatic bishops, and resisting Roman Pontiffs. In 355, at the Council of Milan, the emperor Constantius, tempting the bishops to condemn St. Athanasius, said: "*My will ought to be a law of the Church for you; such is the power the bishops of Syria recognize in me. Obey, therefore, or go into exile.*" However, neither Constantius nor any other Arian emperor ever attempted such usurpation as the schismatic, or rather heretical so-called "Orthodox" Church condones in the Russian czar of our day. By the institution of the Holy Synod, Peter the Great became the sole effective patriarch in his dominions, the real guide of consciences; and this power has been exercised ever since, whether by the prostituted Catharine II., or by the maniac Paul, or by the cruel Nicholas, or by the comparatively decent latest emperors. By its very constitution this Holy Synod is completely dependent on the czar, and its president is ordinarily a soldier. This tribunal is really the chief engine of the imperial machinery; the most powerful instrument wielded by the Russian police. As an instance of the way in which religion is made a mere instrument of Russian statecraft, we may adduce the formal obligation laid upon confessors, under pain of death, to reveal to the government any conspiracy which may come to their knowledge in the tribunal of penance (2). It certainly seems strange that the prelates who sit in the Holy Synod, who term themselves the successors of Sts. Athanasius and John Damascene, can take this oath when they assume office: "I profess and swear that the supreme judge of this Synod is the most clement emperor of all Russia." The newspapers of Russia regard the slavery of the Holy Synod as a matter of course and an excellent thing. When Protasoff, a colonel of hussars,

(1) IVAN IVANOVICH; *Memoir on the Reign of Peter the Great*, Vol. 1., p. 180. The Hague, 1725.

(2) TONDINI; *The Pope of Rome and the Popes of the Orthodox Church*, p. 166. Paris, 1874.

and president of the Synod, died in 1860, the very orthodox journal, the *Nord*, of February 2d, thus eulogized him: "He was in fact, if not in name, the head of the Orthodox Russian Church. With his firm and energetic will he knew how to gain victory over the retrograde tendencies of the elder clergy. By means of the Synod, of which he was the veritable head, he distributed the bishoprics among the young and civilized clergy, he reorganized completely the system of education in the seminaries and academies," etc. With a colonel of hussars at its head it is no wonder that the Russian Church began to exhibit a "young and civilized clergy" impregnated with anti-Christian rationalism. Tolstoy, the successor of this Tartar rough-rider, was not a colonel; but although a mere lay civilian, he was able to prosecute the work of "civilization" among his subjects.

Attention should be paid also to a point which, when not understood, is apt to induce confusion in the mind of the tyro who starts on an investigation into the ecclesiastical condition of Eastern Europe. We have observed that a portion of Poland received Christianity from missionaries who, although in communion with Rome (for the schism had not yet been effected), belonged to the Greek rite; that is, who, while in strict subjection to the Roman Pontiff, used the Greek liturgy in the Mass, and followed a discipline which differed from that of Rome in several unessential points, as, for instance, in the matter of the celibacy of the secular clergy. So long as the patriarchate of Constantinople continued in the Roman obedience, there was no friction between the Poles of the Latin and those of the Greco-Slavonic rite, nor was there any immediately after Cerularius withdrew the peoples of his immediate jurisdiction from the unity of the Church (y. 1054), for it is certain that it was only at the beginning of the thirteenth century that the Greek Schism prevailed in the Muscovite and contiguous regions. But when that Schism attacked the eastern provinces of Poland, the Latin Poles began to look askance at their brethren of the Greco-Slavonic rite, even when these latter were as devotedly Roman as themselves. In the minds of the Latins the Greek and its derivative rites began to be synonymous with schism

and heresy, and in the course of time this feeling was intensified, especially after the collapse of the reunion which had been proclaimed by the General Council of Florence in 1439, and which had been announced at Moscow by the patriarch Isidore. In 1595, several Polish schismatic dioceses, nearly all Ruthenian, returned to the fold *en masse*, having become disgusted with the exactions of the patriarchs of Constantinople and Moscow (1). Unfortunately, the converts did not experience at the hands of the Polish senate and aristocracy—all the members of which bodies were of the Latin rite—the consideration which they deserved; even the Latin clergy were more or less suspicious of a rite which seemed to render the Ruthenians akin to the schismatics. Both laity and clergy were less wise than the Holy See, which has ever strenuously defended the attachment of the orientals to their ancient rites, and has wished to perpetuate those rites as living testimonies to the Apostolicity of Roman doctrine. The result of this coolness toward the United Greeks was the gradual passage of all the Ruthenian nobility to the Latin rite, so that at the time of the partition of Poland the United Greek rite had come to be regarded as peculiar to the serfs, and therefore did not enjoy that perfect equality with the Latin before the law to which it had a right. However, the Poles had never persecuted either the United Greeks or the schismatics, as is asserted by Golovine, Dimitri Tolstoy and other "orthodox" writers, in an endeavor to justify the bloody deeds of the children of the Holy Synod in Poland. In spite of the repugnance of both the nobility and the serfs for everything which smacked of Constantinople or Moscow, the Polish kings allowed a schismatic hierarchy to subsist among the Ruthenians at the side of the Greek United. The schismatic University of Kiev was endowed by Ladislas IV. in 1645 with immense wealth, and he established in it a complete printing-plant. John Casimir, who was a cardinal before he became king, allowed the schismatic metropolitan of Kiev to place himself under the juris-

(1) Rahoeza, primate of Kiev, had convoked all his suffragans to a council in Brzesc, and there they proclaimed their submission to the Holy See. These bishops were those of Kiev, Wladimir and Brzesc, Luck and Ostrog, Polock and Witepsk, Przemysl and Sambor, Leopold, Chelm and Belz, and Pinsk and Turov.

diction of the patriarch of Moscow. This toleration did not injure the Catholic cause in Poland. It was only when Poland was dismembered that the steady progress of the United Greeks was reversed; then, indeed, had not some of the United Greek dioceses fallen to the share of Austria, nearly every vestige of Ruthenian Catholicism would have vanished (1).

At the time of the first partition of Poland between Russia, Austria, and Prussia (August 5, 1772), the doomed kingdom had eighteen millions of inhabitants, of whom twelve millions were Catholics, about three millions were "Orthodox" schismatics, about one million Protestants, and the remainder either Jews or Mussulmans. In the supplementary treaty between the royal brigands, which was dated September 18, 1773, the Russian empress promised full toleration to her new subjects of the Catholic faith; but the Poles had not forgotten the words with which Catharine had despatched her Zaporogue Cossacks into Poland in 1768: "We have ordered Maximilian Zelezniak, colonel of the Zaporogues, to lead his men, together with the Cossacks of the Don, into Poland; and with the grace of God to destroy all the Poles and Jews who are traitors to our holy religion—those miserable assassins, men of perfidy, audacious violators of every law, who protect the false religion of the Jews and oppress a faithful and innocent people. We order that this invasion into Poland destroy forever their name and race." The Poles remembered that these Zaporogues, under the guidance of

(1) Whenever the student faces a question involving the relations between the Holy See and any of the oriental Christian peoples, or any of the Christian peoples who have derived their rites from the East, he must bear in mind one eloquent fact: Many years before the separation of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate from the centre of unity the orientals had begun to think more of their rites than of dogmas, and since the religious idea was with them the idea of country, their peculiar rites became, perhaps more than did their dogmas of faith, their symbols of nationality. Very easily, therefore, they began to regard peoples of different rites from their own as both heretics and political enemies. In illustration of what is more interesting to us—their proneness to think more of rite than of dogma—we shall cite a couple of cases. When Michael Cerularius separated definitively his patriarchate from the Chair of Peter, he assigned as his chief reasons the use of unleavened bread by the Latins as matter of the Eucharist, their use of *lactinia* in Lent, their suppression of the *Aboluita* during that season. The great reformer and robber of the Muscovite Church, Ivan the Terrible, in an edict of 1551, ordered his subjects to credit the following absurdity: "Among all the customs of heretics none is so condemnable as that of shaving the beard. (Peter the Great, another Head of the Russian Church, thought differently.) The effusion of all a martyr's blood would not atone for this crime."

their "popes," had slaughtered 200,000 defenceless victims of both sexes and of every age (1), and therefore they were not astounded when, the ink of the treaty of toleration being scarcely dry, out of 1,900 churches which the United Greeks possessed in Ukraine, more than 1,200 were handed over to the schismatics, their priests being persecuted and sometimes tortured until they signed promises of fidelity to the Church of Holy Russia. Facts like these had been sufficiently eloquent to justify the words of Maria Teresa: "It is very embarrassing to negotiate with the czarina, because she promises mountains and wonders, and then orders her ministers and generals to do the contrary of what she promised, as we have seen too frequently in the matter of the persecutions visited by the Russians on the persons and churches of the United Greeks" (2). Such facts, however, had caused Voltaire to write to the "Semiramis of the North" that happy indeed would be the man who would write her history (December 3, 1771); and, again, those words which would be blasphemous if their author had not been animated, in all probability, by the spirit of *opera bouffe*: "I have only a little of the breath of life left in me; but while dying I shall use it to invoke you as a saint, certainly the greatest saint ever produced by the North" (July 13, 1772). But the twenty years that intervened between the first and second partitions of Poland were years of calm for her Catholics, when compared with the sufferings which the "divine" czarina inflicted on them after the latter robbery. By the treaty of Grodno, concluded in 1793, Prussia obtained a compensation for her Rhenish provinces, just subjugated by France, in the acquisition of all that is now the province of Posen, while Russia received half of Lithuania, together with all Vollandia, Podolia, and Polish Ukraine. Again Catharine II. promised perfect toleration to "the Roman Catholic religion of *both rites*"; but immediately after the signing of the treaty she convoked an assembly of "Orthodox" prelates at St. Petersburg for the purpose of devising sure means for the severance of the Uniates from the Roman communion. That plan

(1) The Russian official reports spoke of 50,000.

(2) THEINER; *Pontificate of Clement XIV.*, Vol. II., p. 437.

seemed most feasible which was devised by Eugene Bulgari, a native of Corfu, whose philosophic sympathies had won for him the friendship of the Prussian Frederick II., and whom that prince had recommended to the notice of the czarina. By the advice of Bulgari, an establishment of "missionaries," richly endowed, was founded in the newly-acquired provinces, and placed under the charge of a bishop named Sadkowski. This apostle of "Orthodoxy" announced his arrival to his new flock by a violent pastoral against all communion with Rome, in which he promised great rewards to the Uniates who would join the Church of Holy Russia, and soon afterward bands of soldiers, each accompanied by one or more Russian popes, began the work of "conversion." Every Ruthenian priest who remained faithful to the Chair of Peter was either thrust into prison or was banished; and ere long there were few Uniates, publicly known as such, in the dioceses of the Ukraine or in those of Luck, Wladimir, Chelm in Volhynia, or Kamieniec in Podolia. Only in the diocese of Polock did the "Orthodox" missionaries meet with many failures; for there the civil authorities proved less docile instruments of the czarina than their colleagues—a fact which would have entailed their ruin, had not Catharine died in 1796.

No narrative of the relations between Catharine II. and her Catholic subjects would be complete without some account of the too famous Siestrzencewicz. This unfortunate personage was born in 1731 of Calvinist parents; and after some studies in Germany and England, undertaken with a view of becoming a Protestant minister, he suddenly entered the Prussian army as an officer. He soon abandoned the service of the Brandenburgers for that of Poland; and he had attained the rank of captain, when he resigned and became a tutor for the children of Prince Radziwill. Perceiving a chance of obtaining the hand of a wealthy lady, he abjured Protestantism; but the chance having disappeared, he followed the advice of the Uniate bishop of Wilna, and received Holy Orders in 1763. When the first partition of Poland took place, the bishop of Wilna, who had the utmost confidence in Siestrzencewicz, desired to have him as a suf-

fragan, charged with the administration of that part of the diocese which had been annexed to Russia. At this time the Latin Catholics of White Russia had no bishop of their own rite; they were under the jurisdiction of the Uniate bishops of Wilna, Livonia, and Smolensk. But scarcely had Catharine taken possession of the country, when, on September 14, 1772, she announced that the Latins would soon receive at her hands a bishop for themselves; but in fact another ukase soon informed all the Latins of the Russian Empire, whether they were Poles or not, that Her Majesty's solicitude for their spiritual welfare had prompted her to place them under the episcopal care of Siestrzencewicz. This imperial appointment was, of course, null in the eyes of Garampi, the papal nuncio at Warsaw; but this prelate devised a means of preserving the dignity of the Holy See, while at the same time he obviated the anger which, were Catharine thwarted, would be visited on her Catholic subjects. He ordered the United Greek bishops of Wilna, Livonia, and Smolensk, to delegate to Siestrzencewicz their own jurisdiction over the Latins of White Russia, while he conferred upon him spiritual faculties for the other Latins of the empire. In 1776 a new nuncio, Archetti, arrived in Warsaw; and he at once realized that one bishop was not adequate to the needs of all the Latins in Russia. He found, however, that Catharine was determined to allow only two Catholic bishops in her entire empire—one Latin, and one United Greek. In 1779, wishing to reward Siestrzencewicz for having helped her in snubbing the court of Spain, (1) she announced him as archbishop of Mohilew, and demanded the pallium for him from the Holy See. On September 6, 1780, the Pontiff wrote to the empress trying to dissuade her from the contemplated promotion; and Catharine replied, reiterating her demand, and promising that if it were granted, she would

(1) The reader must know that Catharine had refused to allow the promulgation, in her dominions, of the Brief whereby Pope Clement XIV. had suppressed the Society of Jesus, on July 21, 1773; and that the Jesuits in Russia had continued in the exercise of their rite. (See our Vol. iv., p. 492). Very soon, Siestrzencewicz, who had hitherto been hostile to the Jesuits, manifested great affection for them, in order to please his imperial protectress. He issued an order, authorizing the Jesuits of White Russia to open a novitiate in Polotzk. This action greatly disturbed Pope Pius VI.; for the Spanish court was as indignant as the Muscovite autocrat was elated.

indeed protect her Catholic subjects. The Pope considered the matter during ten months; and finally, in October, 1780, he consented to erect Mohilew into a metropolitan see, but he refused to grant the pallium to Siestrzenczewicz. Two years of fruitless negotiation now passed; and one day Count Stackelberg waited on Archetti, and read to him, in accordance with Catharine's commands, a letter which he had just received from her. In this document, dated November 15, 1782, Catharine impudently declared that if the Roman Pontiff exercised any authority in Russia, it was by her favor; and that if her demands were not satisfied immediately, she would suppress the Catholic worship in every quarter of her dominions. Of course the Pontiff yielded; the debated point was not an essential one, and there was a question of the salvation of souls. On January 11, 1783, Pius VI. wrote to Catharine that for the sake of religion he would forget the injuries which the Holy See had received from Siestrzenczewicz, and would make that prelate metropolitan of Mohilew. In order, however, that Catholic discipline might be thoroughly observed, he would appoint as nuncio to St. Petersburg the present nuncio at Warsaw, Mgr. Archetti. In the beginning of the following July Archetti arrived in the Russian capital, and was received by the empress in full court.

When his nunciature had terminated, Archetti, then enrolled in the Sacred College, published a very interesting narrative of his experiences. There is one episode in this story which the theological tyro, as well as the student of history, will read with profit. From the very commencement of his nunciature, Archetti was desirous of conversing with some of the schismatic prelates on the subject of reunion. At last the desired opportunity presented itself. An imperial princess, a granddaughter of Catharine, had come into the world; and her baptism being, of course, a matter of state ceremony, all the foreign ambassadors were invited to be present. After the function, Archetti saluted the archbishop of Novgorod with great urbanity, and the Russian prelate manifested much pleasure at the meeting. Thus encouraged, the nuncio visited the archbishop a few days

afterward, at his residence in the magnificent monastery of Alexander Newski. The conversation which ensued is well worth the reader's attention. A century has elapsed since it was held; and when we read it, we imagine that we are listening to an exchange of views between a Catholic and a Russian "Orthodox" clergyman of to-day. The first subject mooted by the Russian prelate was, quite naturally, one of a trivial nature—namely, the difference between the vestments worn by the Oriental and the Western clergy. Archetti remarked that this diversity was of no moment, providing the same faith were held; St. Paul tells us (*Eph.*, iv., 5) that the faith is one, because God is one. The archbishop replied that nearly all Christians agree as to what is necessary for salvation. They admit, said he, that there is but one God; that His Son became man to deliver us from the slavery of Satan; that Christ gave us the means whereby to recover God's grace. If they dispute on other points, that matters little. The Russian prelate did not realize, of course, the thorough Protestantism of this sentiment; for, much as the schismatics hate Catholicism, they despise Protestantism. The nuncio, however, insisted that many other points enter into Christian faith, for Jesus taught many others; and He commanded His Apostles and their successors to teach, unto the end of time, all that He had taught them. Those who receive only such doctrines as they themselves regard as necessary for salvation, do not, as a rule, preserve the true faith even within these narrow limits. A Socinian, for instance, who denies the Divinity of Christ, attacks the dogma of the Incarnation. And is the Incarnation respected by the Lutherans and Calvinists, who entertain so many false ideas concerning its effects, and as to the Sacraments which have it for a source? In religion, just as in other bodies of doctrine, the various parts are all linked together. Here Archetti took occasion to say that when enumerating the articles necessary for salvation, the archbishop had omitted that of there being only one Church, not many, in which to attain heaven. For the Scriptures tell us (*Eph.*, v., 25) that Christ loved His *Church*, not His *churches*; that for *her*, not for *them*, He suffered. It was *the Church* that He

wished to be Immaculate (*Ib.* 27); *the* Church that was to be the column of truth (*I. Tim.*, iii., 15). And how often we read that *the* Church is the House of God, a fold, a family; and that there is but one Shepherd! Therefore, observed the nuncio, the Roman Pontiffs deserve all praise for having constantly labored to put an end to schism. The archbishop then remarked that there was, after all, but very little difference between the Orthodox and the Roman Church. The chief point, and the one most strenuously contested, concerned the manner of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. As to that controversy, his own opinion was that it was very obscure; in fact, it far exceeded the grasp of human intelligence. Would it not be better, therefore, to confine all remarks upon it to what we read of it in the Scripture? There we are told, indeed, that the Son sends the Holy Ghost (*John*, xv., 26; *Luke*, xxiv., 49); but only of the Father is it said that the Spirit of Truth "proceeds" from Him (*John*, *Ib.*). The archbishop, therefore, could not but hold that the Latins acted "rashly" when they inserted the clause *Filioque* ("and from the Son") in the *Creed*. To this Archetti returned that His Grace of Novgorod could not have forgotten that the Arians used to contend that the Son ought not to be styled "Consubstantial," because nowhere in Scripture could that word be found. And, nevertheless, SS. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and other Oriental Fathers firmly resisted the attempt to keep the term out of the *Creed*. Therefore, he (Archetti) would now say what these Fathers then said: that the Pontiffs had the right—nay, it was their duty—to bring to the light what was hidden in the Scriptures; to explain it by the use of words best adapted to that purpose. If the sense of such words is contained in the Scriptures, what matters it if the doctrine is not found expressed in the same syllables and letters? Against new heresies, as St. Hilary teaches, we are often compelled to adopt new words. The nuncio, then, was forced to conclude that since the Scriptures show that the Holy Ghost proceeds also from the Son, and since the ancient Fathers openly taught that doctrine, the Latins should not be reproved for employing a formula which

would inculcate a doctrine concerning the nature of God that would be based, not on mere vague opinion, but on determined principles. And oh! sighed Archetti, would that there could be peace between the two Churches! He would willingly die, if that would effect union. To this aspiration of the nuncio the archbishop replied that a reunion was too great a work for any one man, no matter how excellent and holy, to effect. And, then, again, we should reflect, he observed, that there is no church which is not divided. Look at the Russian, the Lutheran, the Calvinistic bodies! Even the Latins have not escaped; for even at that time the Jansenists were giving great trouble to Rome. To this sophistical remark Archetti returned that the Church of Christ is not and cannot be divided. As to the Latins, they were all of one mind. All hearkened to and believed the words of the Gospel as announced by the successors of that Peter to whom Christ entrusted that function. "As to the Jansenists, they are no more members of the Church than were the followers of Simon Magus, of Menander, and of so many other heresiarchs. The Church is no less one even though heresies come out from her. The unity of the Church is effected by the union of the bishops and their flocks with their head, the Roman Pontiff, whom Christ made His Vicar on earth." But Christ has no need of a vicar, retorted the Russian prelate. "Christ is God, and His power is infinite. He confided the care of His Church to all the Apostles." Nevertheless, the archbishop declared that he admitted that the Most Holy Pope, as he always styled the Supreme Pontiff, was head of his Church. But so also was every bishop in his own sphere. To this remark the nuncio urged that neither had Christ any need of apostles or of bishops to govern the Church. However, he continued, *the question is not as to what our Lord might have done, but as to what He really did and instituted.* Now, we know that He did institute Apostles, bishops, and priests: but we also know that it was to Peter alone that He gave the task of feeding His sheep (*John*, xxi., 15-17), and of confirming his brethren (*Luke*, xxii., 32). Finally, if the various churches are not united under one head, if each church has its bishop for

that head, where is the unity of the Universal Church?

When the Holy See consented to make Siestrzencewicz archbishop of Mohilew, it assigned a coadjutor to him in the person of Benislawski, an ex-Jesuit; and this appointment proved providential, for in later days the coadjutor often neutralized the evil influence of his superior. In the ukase whereby Catharine "erected" the archbishopric of Mohilew, we read two articles which fully illustrate the pretensions which she advanced, and which the Russian government of to-day advances, to a right of interference in the religious affairs of even the Catholic dioceses of the empire. "Art. 12. The archbishop is commanded to send to the court a detailed account of the state of all his religions; he will describe those who teach the young, those who aid the sick and poor, and who thus merit the protection of the government; he will also make known those who pass their time in idleness, and are of no use to their fellow-men. Art. 13. *The reception of Bulls and Briefs from the Pope is prohibited.* Such Bulls and Briefs are to be sent immediately to the Senate, which body, after it has seen that they contain nothing contrary to the laws of the land or to the power which God has given to the monarch, will communicate them to the throne, and wait for permission to publish them." Siestrzencewicz complied with these and similar demands; and therefore it is natural that the apologists of the Russian Establishment should laud him, as does Dimitri Tolstoy, procurator-general of the Holy Synod under Alexander II., when, in his *History of Roman Catholicism in Russia* (1864), he represents the courtier-prelate as sharing the glory of Catharine II. in laboring for "the reformation and civilization of the Catholic clergy," rendered hitherto so vile and barbarous by the influence of Rome. Tolstoy says that "to the great astonishment of the Latin fanatics, Siestrzencewicz never veiled his sympathies for a wise civilization; and this was so strange in the eyes of his brethren, that they could explain it only by the supposition that he had secretly apostatized from the Roman communion, for, according to them, intellect and science are incompatible with faith." This judgment of a Muscovite on the countrymen and fellow-clerics of Copernicus may cause a smile; but one is dis-

gusted when the practical head of the Russian Church asserts that "this enlightened bishop was capable of appreciating the eminent sovereign, and of *seconding her benevolent intentions for the good of her Roman Catholic subjects.*" Count Joseph de Maistre had come to know Siestrzencewicz well, during the years that he spent in St. Petersburg as the ambassador of the king of Sardinia; and in 1819, seven years before the death of the prelate, he wrote, in his letter on *The Condition of Christianity in Europe*, the following estimate of the character of Catharine's adjutant in the religious campaign against the Poles: "There is at present in Russia a very fanatical personage who could not be found in any other time or country. He is the archbishop of Mohilew, the Catholic primate of all the Russias, who was a Protestant and an officer of cavalry before he became a bishop. He is an instrument in the hands of our enemies, and a thousand times more dangerous than if he were a Protestant by profession. His servility would disgust a *noble* government, one for which mere obedience suffices. He is always ready to contradict, and even to defy the Holy See, because he knows that he will always be sustained. It was he who, one day as the emperor passed, cried out: 'Behold my Pope!' The witnesses of this admirable profession of faith are still living in St. Petersburg. In one of his pastorals this strange bishop presumed to falsify a text of the Council of Trent, and also a passage from a letter of Pope Pius VI. Because of this double *mistake*, if that word suffices, the reigning Pontiff (Pius VII.) could not avoid sending to him a Brief of reprobation, ordering him to retract; but he, knowing that he would be upheld, laughed at the Brief, and made no retraction." Tolstoy reproduces a long memorial by Siestrzencewicz on *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the Empire*, from which we take the following passage as illustrative of the prelate's appreciation of Canon Law, and of his conception of the proper relations between Church and State: "In return for the daily bread which nourishes him (Catharine paid *him* 60,000 roubles a year), and because of the security allowed him in the empire, an ecclesiastic owes obedience and fidelity to the sovereign. He is not obliged to know all the laws, but only

those which concern him, and which regard the maintenance of the Church and the clergy. Consequently, the Canon Law must be taught in the seminary, *within the limits which will be prescribed by the sovereign.*" The reader will take notice that this last clause is italicized, not by us, but by the procurator-general of the Holy Synod; and he quite properly asked for special attention to it, for it is an epitome of his hero's entire episcopal teaching. In this memorial there is another passage which also merits italicization, and chiefly because it sounds like an excerpt from Voltaire. Just as Tolstoy contends that "in the schools of the Latins the intellect is purposely obscured," so Siestrzencewicz emits this raving: "In our day, *when men so justly complain of the decadence and corruption of the monastic classes, and when scarcely any one thinks of some way of rendering them useful to the country, Providence has designed that in the Golden Age of Russia, Catharine the Immortal should make them benefit her other subjects.*" It is no wonder that Catharine found in Siestrzencewicz an accomplice in all her schemes for the reduction of the Latin Catholics to servitude, for the absorption of the Uniates by the "Orthodox" Church, and for the utter annihilation of the pontifical authority in her dominions.

Throughout his work Dimitri Tolstoy shows us that he cares more for the fancied interests of his imperial master than he cares for the real rights of conscience; and that his inveterate prejudices, nourished in the darkness of schism, dread the light of historical truth. The following passage is interesting, both because of its naive admissions and because of the inconsistency of which it is redolent: "By the first partition, in 1772, Russia acquired White Russia, which formed only a part of the diocese of Wilna. The first act of the Russian government was to guarantee freedom of worship in those provinces, *and to organize the hierarchical administration of the Roman Church.* . . . Far from attacking the dogmas and rites of the Latin population of White Russia, Catharine, on the contrary, strengthened them by the institution of a hierarchy; *but she refused to recognize the right of Rome, under pretext of religion, to have anything to do with the*

*discipline of the Latin Church in her empire.* Following the example of the principal states of the Roman communion, she ordered, in 1772, that no Bull or Brief from the court of Rome, no commands of foreign ecclesiastical authorities, should be published in White Russia without the permission of the governor-general and the sovereign sanction. *This important measure, which utterly reversed the relations of the Polish higher clergy with the government and with the court of Rome, which hitherto had ruled absolutely through its nuncio at Warsaw, became a fundamental law of the empire.* This law was always confirmed by all the successors of Catharine, despite certain variations in the administration of the Church. *It exists at present, and it is to be hoped that it will never be changed in the future.*" According to Tolstoy, therefore, Catharine is to be praised for a spirit of toleration, when she violated her solemn promise to that effect by "reorganizing the hierarchical administration of the Roman Church"; when she effected this "reorganization" in such a manner that she "utterly reversed the relations of the Polish higher clergy with the court of Rome"; when she absolutely severed the tie of obedience and respect which bound her Catholic subjects to the earthly head of their Church; when she took as her guides the philosophistic, Febronian and Josephistic (nominally Catholic) statesmen, whose maxims the Church condemned. This conduct of Catharine, according to Tolstoy, was "not an attack on the dogmas and rites" of Catholics, but rather a "strengthening" of them; and, nevertheless, Tolstoy knew that the supremacy of the Pope—and, consequently, his right to command in matters of discipline, just as in matters of faith—forms part of Catholic dogma. But Tolstoy held a brief as an advocate of the State Church of Russia. And he was faithful to his commission, when, with an audacity which has been rarely equalled, he declared: "We should not forget that the regeneration of the Catholic Church in Russia, whose decadence was so manifest at the end of the last century, was inaugurated by a sovereign who did not belong to that Church." Tolstoy proclaims the name of this murderous and ostentatiously lubricious woman as "venerable"; but Catholics remember that when she left the em-

braces of her latest paramour for those of death—a death which reminds us of that of Arius—she could reflect that since the Treaty of Grodno, signed three years previously, she had forced four-fifths of her Uniate subjects into the ranks of “Orthodoxy.” She had strangled their faith as remorselessly as she had strangled her imperial husband; and the hundreds who had perished on the scaffold or under the knout, the fourteen thousand who were undergoing a living death in Siberia, the other thousands whose noses and ears were cut off after they had been deprived of their flocks—their sole means of subsistence—would scarcely have termed her “venerable.”

Paul I., the successor of Catharine II., rided the administration of nearly all the creatures of his abominable mother; but among the few who succeeded in retaining their positions was the infamous Siestrzencewicz. Paul would have enforced the provisions for toleration which Catharine had signed and then ignored, had he not been influenced by the wily prelate, who hoped to secure for himself a patriarchate under the ægis of the civil power. When Paul requested and obtained from Pope Pius VI. the residence of a papal nuncio in his capital, Siestrzencewicz used every means to thwart that prelate, and finally procured his dismissal. He then drew up a series of regulations for the government of the Catholics in the empire, which rendered him, under the czar, their absolute master. Thus, every appeal from an episcopal decision was to be addressed to the Catholic Department of the College of Justice, and the president of this tribunal was Siestrzencewicz himself. For a time the Catholics breathed more freely, when Paul, heeding the complaints of the Jesuits, deprived His Grace of Mohilew of the presidency in the College, and conferred it on his coadjutor, Benislowski. But with the accession of Alexander I. to the throne, Siestrzencewicz returned to power. By a ukase of November 1, 1801, the Catholic Department of the College of Justice gave place to a Catholic College, which, sitting at St. Petersburg, was to be for all the Catholics in Russia what the Holy Synod was in regard to the schismatics. In the formation of this new tribunal

Siestrzencewicz carefully ignored all who had any reputation for morality or honor. One of the members was his brother, a Protestant, and of very evil repute; another, a notoriously dissolute monk, apostatized and "married" soon after his appointment. However, in spite of the all but openly schismatic tendencies of their primate, the Catholics of Russia complained but little during the reign of Alexander I. So far as his surroundings would permit, this czar ever manifested a sincere desire to respect the religious convictions of those whom his "popes" represented as the most dangerous enemies of his empire; and it is not strange that during the last years of his life there were rumors of his conversion, and that when he died (in 1825) these rumors attained greater consistency (1).

The great work which Catharine II. had initiated, the destruction of the Greek Uniate Church, had been interrupted by the comparatively tolerant reigns of Paul I. and Alexander I.; but it was resumed by Nicholas I., and with similar but more cunningly-devised means. Catharine began the work with the aid of that Siestrzencewicz whom De Maistre rightly termed "a Protestant in disguise;" and Nicholas

(1) Gagarin, an erudite Russian Jesuit whose writings on the ecclesiastical affairs of his country are rightly regarded as authoritative by the most judicial minds of our day, thus alludes to this matter in his *Catholic Tendencies of Russian Society* (Paris, 1860): "In the circle of intimates surrounding Alexander I. there was a zealous Catholic, General Michaud, who had undertaken the task of converting him, and had labored indefatigably. He was the possessor of very important documents which would have shed much light on this question. He placed these papers in the hands of the bishop of Cuneo in Piedmont; and after his death, at his express request his brother sent them to the czar Nicholas. Persons who were most trustworthy, and whom I believe to have been well-informed, declared that the documents reached the hands of Nicholas on the very day when that emperor received the Allocution which Gregory XVI. had pronounced on July 22, 1842. Moroni, in his *Dictionary*, at the article *Russia*, enters into interesting details concerning this subject; and he says that he received them from Pope Gregory XVI. himself. According to this recital, General Michaud waited on Pope Leo XII., in order to inform him as to the good dispositions of Alexander I., and to beg him to send to Russia a priest who enjoyed his full confidence, who would receive the abjuration of the czar. Leo XII. designated, at first, Mauro Capellari, abbot of the Camaldulense in Rome (afterward Pope Gregory XVI.); and when the monk declined the mission, it was entrusted to Orioli, a Franciscan (afterward a cardinal). Orioli was on the point of departure, when it was learned in Rome that Alexander I. was dead. I do not give this story as an historical document, or the fact as demonstrated; but one must regard the narrative as important. Its value is based on the testimony of three men: Pope Leo XII., Mauro Capellari, afterward Gregory XVI.; and Moroni, who insists that he reduced the recital to writing on the very day that the Pope had pronounced it. If we consider the numerous other evidences which prove the Catholic tendencies of Alexander I. during the last years of his life, . . . we must admit that Catholicism had produced a profound impression on his mind."

finished it with the aid of another Uniate traitor, Siemaszko. The plan which Siemaszko, then an assessor in the Catholic College of which we have spoken, submitted to Nicholas, has been revealed in our day by Moroschkine, a Russian schismatic priest (1), and it refutes completely the assertions of Tolstoy and other official "Orthodox" writers that in the contest between Catholicism and "Orthodoxy," it was the former that first assumed the aggressive by troubling the peace of the latter. "*The Empress Catharine*, writes Siemaszko to Nicholas, "*did not hesitate to proclaim aloud that it was her intention to extirpate the Union in the annexed provinces. With this idea, firstly, she enfeebled the action, without suppressing it, of the ecclesiastical authority of the United Greeks, and secondly, she prevented the clergy and nobility of the Latin rite from exercising any influence on the consciences of the Catholics of the Slavonic rite. When, in 1794, the Synod received an order to publish an appeal to the people in the newly-acquired provinces, it was exhorted them to embrace Orthodoxy. Her Majesty, on her side, ordered the governor, Toutolmine, to assist the Synod. She recommended him to watch carefully, lest any proprietor or employee, ecclesiastical or civil, of either one of the rites of the Catholic religion, should dare offer the least opposition to those who might wish to embrace Orthodoxy. She added that the slightest attempt at such a thing, being a hostility to the dominant religion, and contrary to her formal desires, would be considered a capital crime, to be brought before the tribunals, and involving a confiscation of property until the judicial decision should be rendered. This menace, joined to the state of siege in which the provinces then were, produced its effect. Very soon Orthodox dioceses arose in the government of Minsk, and, above all, in Volhynia and Podolia.*" This passage needs no comment; but mark how Siemaszko admits that after the death of Catharine, "conversions to Orthodoxy" almost ceased. "*After the death of the empress, the vigilance of the authorities being relaxed, a*

(1) In an article entitled *The Reunion of the Union*, in the *European Messenger*, of St. Petersburg, 1872, cited by Father Martinov, S. J., in his work, *The Plan for the Abolition of the United Greek Church*. Paris, 1878.

great reaction occurred. . . . *The conversions of the Uniates to the dominant Church ceased, while returns to the Latin rite were numerous. From that time there was no instance of an entire parish, or even of part of one, going over to the Russian Church, but there were many instances of the contrary. . . . From time to time entire communities passed to the Uniates, leaving empty churches to the Russo-Greek clergy.*" This avowal of Siemaszko scarcely accords with the claims of Tolstoy, or with the impudent assertion of Catharine, that "the Uniates awaited a propitious occasion that they might return to a Church which they had abandoned with regret, and only in order to escape persecution" (1). The plan of Siemaszko for the wholesale perversion of the Uniates embraced four points: Firstly, a United Greek College was to be established; that is, instead of the United Greek Section in that Catholic College which managed the religious affairs of the Russian Catholics, there would be instituted a distinct College, the mission of which would be to guard against the introduction of any new features in the United Greek rite, and to watch over the exact observance of all its ancient features. Secondly, the number of Uniate dioceses was to be diminished, and only *reliable* men (that is, men of the stamp of Siemaszko) were to be placed over them. Thirdly, the ecclesiastical schools of the Uniates were to be so guarded that it would be impossible for their students to ever hold the slightest communication with those who followed the Latin rite. Fourthly, and above all, insisted Siemaszko, in order to prevent conversions from "Orthodoxy" to Catholicism, the monks of the order of St. Basil should be reduced in number, and those allowed to subsist should be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of their provincials. In accordance with this plan, Nicholas I. promulgated, on April 22, 1828, that ukase which Pope Gregory XVI., in his Allocution of July 22, 1842, described as having, by its institution of the United Greek College, "imposed on the bishops, in the exercise of their authority, a nearly absolute subjection to the Russian government."

(1) In her letter to Stackelberg, her ambassador to the Roman court, November 4, 1782. The context of the letter shows that its lies were intended for the ears of Pope Pius VI.

After the establishment of this governmental bureau, other persecuting enactments appeared as its logical consequences. The bishops and superiors of religious houses were forbidden to exercise any supervision over the education of the secular or regular clergy. Episcopal sees were systematically left vacant, or filled by either incapable or unworthy persons. The property of convents and monasteries was repeatedly sequestered. Thousands of children were deported to the interior of Russia, to be trained in the maxims of "Orthodoxy." Siberia was the destination of anyone who endeavored to convert an "Orthodox" person to Catholicism. All children born of mixed marriages were to be raised in the National Church. Mixed marriages were regarded as null, unless celebrated before an "Orthodox" pastor. No Catholic priest could hear the confession of a person who was unknown to him, nor could he administer the Holy Eucharist to such a person. Such was the legislation which, crowned by the apostasy of three bishops in 1839, brought almost total ruin upon the Ruthenian Church.

In 1830 Siemaszko was appointed suffragan to the metropolitan of Lithuania, who consented to the governmental action, only because the ambitious prelate swore to beseech the Pontiff to grant the canonical institution. It may be superfluous to remark that the oath was broken. An apostate provincial of the Basilian monks, and a few other corrupt Uniates, were found to be willing to accept mitres in return for the sacrifice of their apostolic liberty; and the work of robbing the Ruthenians of their most precious treasure proceeded with rapidity. Like all other schisms and heresies, the "Orthodox" Church waded in the blood of Catholic martyrs ere it triumphed in White Russia. Our limits allow us to cite only a few of the more prominent illustrations of the fidelity of the Ruthenians to the Chair of Peter. In April, 1834, fifty-four priests of the district of Novogrodek handed to Siemaszko a firm protest against his innovations. The wretch proceeded to violence; a few yielded, but the majority set out on the weary march for Siberia. One of the accomplices of this Polish Cranmer, Luziński, bishop of Polotsk, made a number of his clergy

drunk, and then wheedled from them a renunciation of the Roman communion. When the priests of the districts of Drisna and Lepel heard of this proceeding, they protested before God and man; then the imperial authorities transferred their churches to the schismatics. The district of Witepsk had for many years been attended by the Lazarists; but these devoted sons of St. Vincent de Paul had been banished in 1822. Shortly after the Easter of 1835, an imperial commissioner, accompanied by a company of soldiers, entered the church, and informed the people that it was the will of their father, the czar, that they should embrace his religion. When they refused, the military fell on them; many expired in the house of God, but many others fled to a neighboring pond, which was covered by a thin coating of ice. The commissioner ordered them to yield, but they replied that they would die rather than abandon the Catholic religion. Then the soldiers broke the ice; some of the unfortunates swam to the shore, but twenty-two found their martyrs' crowns in their watery graves. At Starosiel, a military colony, the commander informed his men, one day, that the czar had determined that they should adore his God. The simple-minded Poles replied that they did adore the same Christ, the Redeemer, whom the czar adored. "That is not enough," retorted the general; "you must adore God according to the regulations—in the manner decreed by the czar." The puzzled men exclaimed that Christ had not instituted the czar as Chief Pastor for His flock. "I know nothing about that," returned the commander, "nor do I wish to know anything about it. I know only my orders. Obey!" Most of the soldiers declared that they would die sooner than abandon their religion; whereupon the "Orthodox" ones fell upon them with clubs and swords, and another band of martyrs ascended to heaven. After seven years of persecution of this sort, Siemaszko could boast that in White Russia and Lithuania eight hundred and eighty-six parishes had passed from the obedience of the Vicar of Christ to that of the czar of Russia; and then he and Luzienski ordered their clergy to sign *An Act of Union With the Russian Church*. In the province of Mohilew every priest spurned

the document, and one hundred and sixty of them were sent to Siberia, where most of them died. In 1838 the Uniate bishop of Brest joined Siemaszko and Luzienski at Polotsk ; and having signed the *Act of Union*, they endeavored to procure the adhesion of the venerable metropolitan, Bullhak, to whom Siemaszko was coadjutor. The czar tried in vain to bribe Bullhak with the *cordon* of St. Andrew, a decoration which was given only to princes of the blood, and with a promise of the see of St. Petersburg. When Siemaszko dangled this latter bait before his eyes, the old man asked : "You offer me the highest dignity in the Russian Church ; but who will give me eternal salvation, if I violate my conscience ?" And he immediately drew up an act of solemn protestation against the proceedings of his suffragans. That same night, Bloudow, minister of the interior, entered the bed-room of the archbishop, unannounced, and ordered him, in the name of the czar, to sign the *Act of Union*. The prelate calmly replied : "No human power shall induce me to proclaim my separation from the Universal Church—from Christ Himself. If others do so, and the government publishes their apostasy, I, at least, solemnly protest against their conduct." Siemaszko advised the czar to proceed to extremes, but Nicholas reflected that Bullhak was revered by schismatics as well as by Catholics, and he preferred to allow a natural death, which could not be far distant, to free him from the last firm support of the Ruthenian Church. The prelate went to his reward at the close of that year ; and then the czar gave him a gorgeous funeral, in order that the people might believe the government's assertion that he had finally entered the State Church of Holy Russia. On February 24, 1839, the three episcopal apostates published their *Act of Union*. It was received benignly by Colonel Protasoff, the head of the Holy Synod ; and from that day the apologists of the czarate have continually asserted, and Russian school children have been continually taught, that during the reign of the ever-memorable (*nezabvennyy*) Czar Nicholas I., nearly two millions of Ruthenians "returned" to the Orthodox Church spontaneously and gratefully.

The Polish Catholics of the Latin rite had their share of

suffering during the reign of Nicholas I. as well as those of the Greek rite. The suppression of all the religious orders, announced in 1828, was effected in 1832. The incumbent of the metropolitan see of Mohilew, Cieciszowski, a most worthy man, a living contradiction of his predecessor, Siestrzencewicz, was prevented by the infirmities of age from administering the diocese; and when his auxiliary, Szyt, showed that his attachment to the Holy See was invincible, he was deported into the depths of Russia. When the see became vacant, Nicholas named for it the bishop of Kamieniec, Paulowski, who had been so subservient to His Majesty as to order his clergy to observe the ukase of March 28, 1836, which forbade the priests of the Latin rite to administer the Sacraments to the Uniates. In 1841 Pope Gregory XVI. deemed it wise to grant a Brief for the canonical institution of Paulowski; and for this act he has been blamed by many Catholic publicists, notably by the generally judicious French historian, Rohrbacher. Certainly appearances were against the venerable Pontiff, when many devoted children of the Holy See, regarding things from a lower standpoint than that which he occupied, insinuated that his invincible opposition to all revolutionary manœuvres had rendered him an unwitting accomplice of the Russian persecutor. But listen to the apostolic simplicity and vigor with which Gregory XVI. explained his position in his Allocution to the Sacred College, delivered on July 22, 1842: "He whose unworthy vicar on earth we are, knows well that from the moment of our elevation to the Supreme Pontificate, we have neglected nothing which zeal and solicitude could suggest as remedies for the ever-increasing evils of the day. But what has been the result of all our labors? Facts, and very recent ones, tell us too plainly. . . . The public has no knowledge of all that we have done, unceasingly and determinedly, in order to protect and defend, in all the regions subjected to the Russian domination, the inviolable rights of the Catholic Church. All this has been unknown, especially in those regions; and it has come to pass, for the increase of our grief, that among the faithful dwelling there in such great numbers, the enemies of the Holy See, with that hereditary deceit

(*avita fraude*) which distinguishes them, have spread the report that we, forgetful of our sacred ministry, have ignored the misfortunes which have overwhelmed those peoples, and that thus we have almost abandoned the cause of the Catholic religion. So far has this matter been carried, that we have become almost a stumbling-block for a considerable portion of the flock of our Lord. . . . Since such is the state of things, we owe to God, to religion, and to ourselves, that we repel even the suspicion of so grievous a delinquency. With this object, we have ordered that there be given to each one of you, Venerable Brothers, a complete exposition of all that we have done in behalf of the Catholic Church in the empire of Russia. Thus it will be made plain to all the faithful, throughout the world, that we have been in no way neglectful of our Apostolic duties."

The publication of this exposition, which was a precise and thoroughly substantiated arraignment of the Russian government before the bar of Christianity and civilization, was a fearful blow for Nicholas I. One of his greatest anxieties had been caused by the fear lest his imitations of Nero and Diocletian should become known in Western Europe. He had succeeded in hiding them, thanks to the complicity of his Protestantizing brother-in-law, the king of Prussia; thanks also to the minister of Austria, that Metternich who rivalled even Nicholas in hatred of every true independence of thought; but thanks, above all, to the interested silence of nearly the entire press of Europe, which, in the hands of Freemasons and Jews, never condemned any injuries done to Catholics, just as to-day it says nothing when Cossacks bayonet the infants of Polish Catholics, while it wails through many columns of exaggerations on the woes which Eastern schismatics have brought upon themselves at the hands of the Turks. The language of the papal secretary of state was calm and dignified; but it carried conviction to the heart of every reader. Nicholas thought it would be a grand stroke of policy were he to show the world that he did not hesitate to justify himself in the very face of his accuser. We do not know the details of that interview which Pope Gregory XVI. granted to his Russian

Majesty in December, 1845. In his *Last Four Popes*, Cardinal Wiseman says: "What were the emperor's intentions, what his ideas, what his desires in coming to Rome, and having necessarily a personal meeting with the Pope, it is impossible to conjecture. Did he hope to overcome him by his splendid presence, truly majestic, soldier-like, and imperial? Or to cajole and win him by soothing speeches and insincere promises? Or to gain the interpretative approval of silence and forbearance? One must conjecture in vain. Certain it is that he came, he saw, and conquered not. It has been already mentioned that the subject and particulars of the conference were never revealed by its only witness at Rome. The Pope's own account was brief, simple, and full of conscious power: 'I said to him all that the Holy Ghost dictated to me.' And that he had not spoken vainly, with words that had beaten the air, but that their strokes had been well placed and driven home, there was evidence otherwise recorded. An English gentleman was in some part of the palace through which the imperial visitor passed as he returned from his interview, and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand as it was from statue-like features, stately frame, and martial bearing; free and at his ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of anterooms, the imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, 'with plumes unruffled, and with eye unquenched,' in all the glory of pinions which no flight had ever wearied, of beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again, with head uncovered, and hair, if it can be said of man, dishevelled; haggard and pale, looking as though in an hour he had passed through the condensation of a protracted fever; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsaluting. He waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court, and hurried away from the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, 'from his nest among the stars,' his feathers crumpled, and his eye quelled, by a power till then despised."

Probably it was this event which induced Nicholas to enter into a Concordat with the Holy See in 1847, and to consent to satisfy a few of the claims of the Pontiff. Thus, in Article 12 it was stipulated that the czar would appoint no Catholic bishop without a previous understanding with the Pope; in Article 13 the bishop was recognized as the sole judge of ecclesiastical matters in his diocese, and he was to appoint all the members of his council; in Article 21 the bishop was allowed to supervise the instruction of the ecclesiastical students in his seminary, and he was permitted to select the professors of theology from among the members of the priesthood; and in Article 21 private individuals who wished to spend their own money in defraying the expenses of Catholic worship were graciously allowed to do so, without fear of governmental interference. But at the moment that this "ever-memorable" head of Russian "Orthodoxy" was doling out his pitiful measure of justice to his Polish subjects in that Concordat which was designed to blind the eyes of Western Europe, he promulgated a code of criminal procedure which was almost worthy of Elizabeth of England. By Article 184 of this code any person who found fault with the "Orthodox" religion lost his civil rights and was doomed to forced labor for six or eight years, while six months or a year of imprisonment awaited him who did not denounce the person whom he had heard pronouncing such sentiments. By Article 187 the commission of this "crime" by writing or printing was punished, in the persons of author or printer, by deportation to Siberia. By Article 193 any persuasion to abandon the Church of the State entailed deportation to Tomsk or Tobolsk; any such persuasion, if savoring of "violence," was to be punished by deportation to Siberia. And the reader will please note that the deprivation of civil rights, as well as the condemnation to Siberia, entailed also a scourging with the knout, which consisted of from eighty to two hundred blows. Of course it is unnecessary to state that the imperial framer of this code did not observe the provisions of the Concordat, trivial though they were.

When Alexander II. succeeded his father, Nicholas I., in

1855, the similarity of his name, and a general belief that his nature was gentle, led the Poles to believe that his reign would be no more oppressive to them than that of his uncle. But in May, 1856, the future emancipator of the Russian serfs thus addressed the Polish nobility in Warsaw: "I bear you all in my heart, just as I bear the Finlanders and all other Russian subjects; but I intend to maintain the state of affairs which my father established. Therefore, cherish no reveries! I shall know how to restrain those who may continue to indulge in dreams. *The happiness of Poland depends on its entire fusion with the rest of my empire. What my father did was well done, and I shall uphold it; my reign will be the continuation of his.*" Alexander II., however, wished to present an appearance of being willing to satisfy the "legitimate" reclamations of the Holy See. One of his first acts, therefore, was the appointment of a committee, consisting of Nesselrode, Bludoff, the two Kisseleffs, Lanskoï, and the Poles, Turknul and Hubé, who were ordered to consider the demands which the Roman Pontiff had continued to make, ever since the government of Nicholas I. had signed the Concordat of 1847. We shall notice only a few of these demands, and the treatment which the ostensibly conciliatory committee accorded to them. The first point will scarcely be understood by the Catholic reader. Just as the Holy Synod of the "Orthodox" Church is governed by the czar through the secular procurator-general whom he appoints, so the government of St. Petersburg had for many years attempted to manipulate each Catholic bishop by means of a secretary for his council whom it commissioned, and who was not only a secular, but often a schismatic. To the protest of the Pope against this absurd and outrageous practice the committee replied: "After a minute examination of this matter, the committee finds that our government, *basing its action on the recognized right of all European governments to control the actions of the Catholic Church in their states (jus inspectionis)*, can, without fear of contradiction, whenever it deems the procedure necessary, appoint its delegates to watch the Catholic consistories, lest they adopt any measures contrary to the existing laws of the

empire. If the court of Rome opposes this action, it is not befitting for our government to renounce its prerogatives." To the pontifical demand that when Catholics wished to contract mixed marriages, they should be allowed to recur to their own episcopal tribunals, it was replied that such a pretension could not be entertained, *since the spiritual tribunals of the "Orthodox" Church alone had jurisdiction over the two communions.* With some consistency, therefore, the committee reported against granting the papal demand that the czar should withdraw the ukase of 1842, whereby it had been declared that no mixed marriage was valid unless contracted before an "Orthodox" priest. Quite naturally the committee contemned the Pope's insistence that Holy Russia should do what no modern government has yet done, that is, that she should restore the property which she had stolen from the Church. Of course the very "Orthodox" committee did not agree with the Pontiff when he said that apostate Uniates ought not to experience governmental restraint when they wished to return to the Catholic fold. Neither could the committee perceive any reasonableness in the papal wish that the spiritual wants of the still subsisting United Greeks should be satisfied by Latin bishops, when the government refused to allow them bishops of their own rite. By adopting the advice of this committee, Alexander II. showed how sincere had been the liberal promises which he had made when he mounted the throne; and by this entrance into the way marked out by Catharine II., and so persistently followed by Nicholas I., he deliberately challenged the patience of Poland. Neither the scope of our work nor our limits permit us to detail the terrible events of the Polish insurrection of 1863, but a few words in illustration of its immediate causes will be pertinent to our present subject.

And here let us notice at once an accusation which was brought at that time against the Polish clergy by their "Orthodox" oppressors, and which has been too often repeated by ill-informed publicists in Western Christendom. The Polish clergy were and are styled revolutionists; and, quite reasonably, the European revolutionism of our day is malodorous to Catholic nostrils. *If there was then, or is now, any de-*

*fiency of proper spirit in the Polish priesthood, that deficiency exists because the Russian government has for more than a century systematically endeavored to demoralize that priesthood. It has deprived the Polish clergy of every source of instruction and piety, so far as human power could deprive it, by furnishing it with unworthy bishops in too many instances; by suppressing seminaries and religious orders, and by the corrupt maxims which Russian professors have taught to Polish youth.* But it remains to be proved that the Polish clergy have ever knowingly played the game of the Masonic Lodges. The first politico-religious manifestation of 1861 was made in Warsaw. On February 25, 1839, the Poles had defeated the Russians at the gates of Praga, one of the suburbs of the capital; and on the anniversary an immense multitude, headed by many priests, who surrounded the national banner, proceeded to the site to offer prayers for the dead. On the way all chanted the popular and patriotic hymn *Święty Boże*, which, as a rule, the Poles never sang in the streets unless in time of epidemic or other public calamity (1). The service on the place of battle had nearly terminated, when Colonel Trepow, the chief of police, arrived with two squadrons of mounted gendarmes. Twice the inoffensive and still praying multitude were charged, and more than forty were either mortally or seriously wounded. On February 27th a funeral service was to be celebrated in the church of the Carmelites for Zawisza, one of the victims of Russian tyranny; and as the procession was nearing the church, Trepow attacked it with two squadrons of dragoons. The Poles held their ground, and another procession, issuing from the church of the Bernardines, distracted the attention of the Cossacks. Wheeling

(1) The hymn is as follows: "Holy God, Powerful God, have mercy on us! From pest fire, and war, Lord, deliver us! From sudden and unprovided death, Lord, deliver us! Sinners that we are, we beseech thee, O Lord, to deign to govern and exalt Thy Holy Church! Vouchsafe to render our country to us! Deign to dispose us unto true repentance! Jesus, Jesus, have mercy on us! Holy Virgin Mary, Queen of Poland, pray for us!" Hymns in the vernacular have a prominent place in the liturgy of the Poles of the Latin rite. The custom of congregational singing in Polish was introduced in the sixteenth century, in order to combat the influence of the Reformers, who were striving to abolish the Latin liturgy. There is no choir, in our sense of the term, in a Polish church. The organist intones the first words of the *Kyrie, Gloria, Credo*, etc., in Polish, and the congregation chant the remainder. After each parochial Mass the *Święty Boże* precedes the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

about, the soldiers of Holy Russia fell upon the latter body, forced it back into the church, and galloped after it to the very foot of the altar. Meanwhile the first procession had tried to enter the hall of the Agricultural Society, intending to protest against the sacrilegious violence of the oppressor before the distinguished men who formed that patriotic and philanthropic body, and who were then in session. The president of the Society, Count Andrew Zamoyski, true to his programme of abstention from anything which might serve as an excuse for governmental interference with the beneficent work of his organization, declared the session closed. The members retired, but as they reached the street the soldiers were ordered to fire, and five victims fell dead, and more than sixty were wounded. On October 15th, the anniversary of the death of Kosciuszko, a requiem was being held in each parish church of Warsaw, when each was surrounded by soldiers, and an order that none of the suppliants should be allowed egress was issued. During seventeen hours the congregations were thus confined, and when, at four in the morning of the 16th, the military entered the sanctuaries, it was for the purpose of dragging more than two thousand innocents to the citadel (1). The resignation of the people of Warsaw during these days of outrage approached the sublime. So funereal was the aspect of the city, that the Russians might have thought their triumph already assured, had not one venerable man raised his voice of protestation in the name of religion and of humanity. With the courage of a Roman martyr defying a proconsul to do his worst, Bialobrzanski, the administrator of the diocese (Archbishop Fialkowski had died on September 25th), handed to the governor

(1) One of the victims of Cossack brutality on this occasion was an Englishman named G. Mitchell, and he wrote several letters to Earl Russell on the matter, from which we take the following passage: "Who could imagine that the Christian governor of a Christian city would order his Asiatic hordes of hideous savages to trample under their feet a Christian population, an inoffensive people, because it had entered or approached the house of God? When the Russian troops forcibly entered the churches, they found kneeling women in the first rows, and behind them were the kneeling men. The women were beaten, and the men were thrown to the floor and trampled under foot. In front of the church of the Bernardines, in the Fanbourg of Cracow, Captain Taraskewicz was seen lashing with his whip the women who were trying to escape from the Cossacks by fleeing into the church, and he ordered his men to do the same. . . . After these outrages the churches were despoiled of every object on which the soldiers could lay hands."—*The Events in Warsaw on October 15, 1861.* Paris, 1862.

a document in which, after an allusion to the desecration of the churches, he said: "These deeds are a disgrace to the soldiers of a civilized government, and make one believe that the days of Attila have returned. But since such are the facts, and since the soldiers menace an unarmed people with their bayonets, I am obliged, in conformity with the mind of the Church, to take measures which will make this justly indignant people realize deeply the barbarity of the outrages which have been perpetrated. I therefore order that all the churches of Warsaw be closed, and I prohibit all services in them. What will be the consequence of this shutting-off from all religious consolation a people who are already so profoundly irritated? I know not; but I do know that nothing can now renew the ties between governed and governing which have been so often and so cruelly broken." In spite of every threat of the government, the order of the administrator was obeyed by the clergy, and the people began to kneel in prayer before the doors which Muscovite cruelty had closed against them. Then a governmental decree forbade all public praying, under pain of the knout and imprisonment; and on November 12th the heroic administrator was thrust into the citadel, the ordinary torments of political prisoners being increased in his case by his being deprived of the consolation of his Breviary (1). His sufferings were of short duration; for since he would not resign his office, and the Chapter would not elect another administrator, he was condemned to death in the following December. Alexander II., now nominated for the see of Warsaw a priest in whom he fancied that he could discern one who would be, if not an instrument of Russia, at least an advocate of a policy of *laissez aller*. Felinski had been one of the few Polish clergymen who blamed Bialobrziski for closing the churches; and since he had resided outside of Poland for many years, and had judged of matters by official journals and documents, he had come to believe that the conduct of the Polish clergy had not always been noted for prudence. But Mgr. Felinski had scarcely taken possession of his see, when he proved to the czar and to the world that he was of the material which fur-

(1) *Ami de la Religion*, January 8, 1862

nishes to the Church her Athanasii and her Chrysostoms. At the beginning of May, 1862, the people of Warsaw having signified their intention to honor the Queen of Heaven, in that month which is specially devoted to her praises, by illuminations around all of her statues, the government ordered the archbishop to forbid such demonstrations, declaring also that all ecclesiastics who contravened the wishes of the czar in the matter "would be arrested and summarily punished." Felinski replied to this insolent command on May 5th, insisting that "it was for the ecclesiastical authorities to superintend the churches," and that "an order to publish police regulations to his flock was an outrage on his episcopal dignity." During the next few days many of the churches were invaded by the police, and in each several worshippers were arrested, in accordance with the formal orders of the chief of police, Pilsudski, to make at least five arrests in each church every evening. In the meantime the archbishop had left the capital for a visitation to a part of his diocese without the permission of the government. Luders, the governor-general, telegraphed several times to the audacious prelate, ordering him to return; but Felinski replied each time that his work was not yet accomplished. These few facts will give an idea of the state of men's minds when, on January 15, 1863, the Russian government began to enforce the law of conscription, and thus precipitated the great insurrection. On May 5th the Grand Duke Constantine, then governor-general, sent for the archbishop, and ordered him to forbid the procession of the coming Feast of Corpus Christi. When the prelate refused, Constantine threatened to place soldiers at the door of every church; then the contributing processions would be unable to join in one grand function. Felinski replied: "Very well, Your Highness. Then I, with the crucifix in my hand, shall be the first to go out of my church; I shall offer my breast to your bayonets, and men will know whether it is Your Highness or I to whom the religious war will be due." The procession took place. In the beginning of June the archbishop was asked by Constantine to degrade from the priesthood a Capuchin named Konarski, who had been condemned to death *by the grand-duke himself*, for having offici-

ated as chaplain in the insurgent army of Langiewicz. The archbishop denied that any secular tribunal could condemn an ecclesiastic to degradation; as for the present case, he knew of no reason why such a sentence should be pronounced. On June 14th Mgr. Felinski was arrested, and soon afterward interned in Jaroslaw.

While persecution was thus raging in the kingdom of Poland, properly so-called, the emissaries of the "mild" Alexander II. were carrying fire and sword into the olden Polish provinces beyond the Bug, *viz.*, Lithuania and the Ruthenian countries. The instrument chosen by the cabinet of St. Petersburg to stamp out the insurrection in these regions was Michael Mourawieff, a wealthy scion of a family which has ever been distinguished for its hatred of everything Polish and Catholic, and a veritable representative of the spirit of Old Russia (1). The powers given to Mourawieff exceeded any given to any general in modern times, unless we except those accorded in 1861 to the generals of the Italian revolution in the matter of repressing all Neapolitan devotion to Francis II., the legitimate monarch of the

(1) Mourawieff prided himself on being a freethinker. After the deportation of the bishop of Wilna, the administrator of the diocese, Bowkiewicz, had occasion to confer with the general. The discussion was fruitless, and Mourawieff remarked: "You people are ever talking about God. Now, here I am seventy years old, and I have never seen such a person." The priest replied: "Probably Your Excellency will never see Him." (REGNAULT: *Mourawieff and the Archives of Czarism*, p. 37. Paris, 1863.) The party of Old Russia, of which Mourawieff was a good exponent, underwent a transformation after the emancipation of the serfs. Under the influence of Michael Katkoff, editor of the *Gazette of Moscow*, it became a party of Young Russia. What does Young Russia desire? The *Journal of Paris*, on March 27, 1868, thus answers the question: "A political organization like this: At the summit of the edifice an all-powerful czar, beneath him a hierarchy of functionaries, whose mission it would be to execute the orders of the emperor, and at the bottom an innumerable multitude, among whom there would reign equality, where the citizens would be all confused in a kind of communistic promiscuousness which Young Russia regards as democracy. All this obtained, the religion of Slavism would be pushed to fanaticism, and there would flourish a love of domination without limits and the blindest devotion to the will of the czar, the lord and father of all the Russians. This singular political system has recruited a considerable number of adherents; it is pre-eminently the *National Party*. There is to be no more influence from without; everything is to be for Russia and through Russia. To-day there still remain in the higher government circles traces of the olden German influence; all these must be made to disappear. Panslavism is a mission, and all who try to thwart it must be thrust aside; if they resist, they must be crushed. There are to be no more embarrassments; no such thing as Poland, with that phantom of independence which has hitherto been permitted to be. Panslavism is to know no obstacles, such as treaties and the respect due to them. . . . Russia represents the principle of nationalities (as advocated by Cavour); she is to deliver the Slavs of Austria and Turkey."

Two Sicilies. Thus, we read: "His Excellency will employ the most energetic measures against all whom he *supposes* to be favorable to the rebellion; he will take such measures as he may deem advisable against *suspects*. His Excellency will use every means to instruct the peasants as to the czar's paternal intentions in their regard, and *he will represent to them that the land-owners are their enemies and oppressors*. If His Excellency deems it wise, he will furnish arms to such peasants as are attached to the czar and to Russia. *His Excellency will show the greatest possible severity toward the Catholic clergy, they being the instigators of the present rebellion*. He will cause a list of the suspected priests to be prepared, and he will proceed against these with the utmost energy. His Excellency will shoot immediately all rebel leaders who fall into his hands, and will take proper measures in regard to all other prisoners. When circumstances demand, His Excellency will proceed against families who may have relatives in the insurgent ranks. In fine, *His Excellency will adopt every means that he may deem conducive to immediate pacification*, His Majesty having deigned to confer all powers upon him." Between June 8th and December 28th of 1863 Mourawieff either hung or shot eleven priests in Lithuania, while many scores of other priests were deported. In 1864 he closed twenty-four churches; in 1865, twenty-six; in 1867, one hundred and forty. Every Catholic land-owner and every Catholic ecclesiastic who had been allowed to remain in Lithuania was mulcted to the extent of more than a half of his revenues. In January, 1865, Mourawieff expelled all the female religious from Lithuania, not even excepting the Sisters of Charity. On September 14th Kauffmann, the successor of Mourawieff, presided at the inauguration, in Wilna, of an "Orthodox" church and two chapels which had been founded by his predecessor. On the following day the official *Courier of Wilna* published the sermon which signalized this triumph of the czarate. "What do these monuments mean? They signify that not a stone will remain above another in all the cities of this land when Russia yields it to another. . . . On this occasion it is impossible not to glori-

fy the late ruler of this region, the virtuous and wise Mourawieff, *who came among us like another Archangel Michael, clothed in divine panoply, the cross on his breast, and beatitude on his forehead and lips, an olive-branch in one hand, and a flaming sword in the other. . . .* We see with joy this country throwing off the rags and dirt of its deplorable past, as every part of it enters more determinedly into the living and potent organism of the Russian Empire. . . . A few more efforts, a few more enterprises, a little more time and patience, and on the brow of this country will be inscribed 'Holy and Orthodox Russia.' " And a few days afterward Kauffmann thus addressed a deputation of the Lithuanian gentry: "The severe regulations of the last few years will be maintained until I am convinced that you are thorough Russians, that you march in the way that is marked out for you by the law, and that you do so sincerely." In plain language, Kauffmann signified the resolve of his government that the Catholics of Lithuania, like those of the other Polish provinces, and like those of the kingdom itself, were to deny their faith and their fatherland, unless they were ready for penury and deportation, and, in case of resistance, for the scaffold. When the marshal of the nobility, Krzywicki, at the head of a deputation of Lithuanian magnates, waited upon him in Wilna, the representative of the czar said: "There is no pardon, even for those who have been condemned only to internment, *so long as Polonism and Catholicism are not totally extirpated, so long as there remains one Catholic church in the land. Reconciliation with the government and fidelity to the throne consist in the embrace of Orthodoxy by all, without exception.* Let the obstinate in their faith depart; for, gentlemen, I tell you again that no Catholic shall remain here, especially among the land-owners." The determination here indicated was rendered manifest on January 8, 1866 (O. S., December 27, 1865), by the following imperial decree published in the *Gazette of the Senate*: "Considering that in the nine governments of the West, the inhabitants of which are generally Little Russians and White Russians, and partly Lithuanians and Samogitians, the population of Polish origin is comparatively small; and consid-

ering that this Polish population, composed generally of seignorial proprietors and of the middle class, impresses upon the country a Polish character—thus preventing the non-Polish inhabitants from progressing and profiting by the numerous reforms which His Imperial Majesty has granted to his other subjects; and considering that the strength of this class consists in the possession of property after the fashion of a close corporation, which admits none of any other nationality, especially none of the Russian nationality; His Majesty, the Emperor, orders as follows: While awaiting a definitive organization of the governments in the West by a sufficient increase of Russian land-owners in those regions, no persons of Polish origin shall be allowed to acquire seignorial lands in the nine governments of the West. . . . Land-owners who have been exiled from the provinces of the West may, within the next two years, sell their estates in those provinces to persons of Russian origin *who profess either the Orthodox or Protestant religion*" (1).

Many indeed were the protests of Pius IX. in favor of persecuted Poland. We cite only the following passage from his Allocution in the Consistory of April 27, 1864: "The blood of the weak and the innocent cries to the throne of the Eternal for vengeance on those who have shed it. Poor Poland! I would have wished not to speak of this matter before the next Consistory; but I have feared that were I to keep silence any longer, I would draw upon myself the punishment which the prophet announces as awaiting those who allow iniquity to be committed. No! I wish not to be compelled to cry, when I stand before the Eternal Judge, '*Vae mihi, quia tacui!*' I feel myself inspired to condemn that sovereign whose name I do not now pronounce because I shall mention it in another discourse; of that sovereign whose immense empire reaches to the pole. This potentate, who styles himself falsely an Eastern Catholic, but who is merely a schismatic cut off from the True Church, persecutes and kills his Catholic subjects, and by his cruelty

(1) The Paris *Monde* of January 24, 1866, states that at that time in White Russia and in Lithuania there were 21,000 Catholic land-owners to 1,600 who were either Orthodox or Protestants. In Volhynia and Podolia the proportion of Catholics was larger; in the sole district of Berditcheff there were 244 Catholics to 4 Orthodox.

he has forced them to insurrection. Under the pretext of repressing this insurrection, he extirpates Catholicism, he deports entire populations to the regions of ice where they are deprived of all religious consolation, and he replaces them with schismatic adventurers. He tears priests from their flocks and exiles them, condemning them to forced labor, and to other degrading punishments. Happy are those priests who have been able to flee, and are now wanderers in strange lands! This potentate, heterodox and schismatic though he is, arrogates to himself a power which even the Vicar of Jesus Christ does not possess. He pretends to depose a bishop whom we have canonically instituted. Insane man! He forgets that a Catholic bishop, whether on his throne or in the catacombs, is ever the same, and that his character is indelible. Let no man say that we foment European revolution, when we raise our voice against these iniquities. We know how to distinguish between socialistic revolution and the struggle of a nation which fights for its independence and for its religious faith. In stigmatizing the persecutors of the Catholic religion, we fulfil our sacred duty. We give our Apostolic benediction to all who pray for Poland to-day. Let us all pray for her!" Even the enemies of the Papacy admired this protest of "the old man of the Vatican." One of the foremost leaders of the Italian Unitarian movement, Brofferio, said in the Italian parliament on May 7th, "Behold an old man, tired, sick, without an army or any resources, and on the brink of the grave. He anathematizes a potentate who slaughters a people. I am agitated throughout my entire being. I fancy that I am living in the days of Gregory VII. I bow my head, and I applaud."

On December 27, 1866, Meyendorf, *chargé d'affaires* at the papal court, was received in audience by Pope Pius IX. The pontiff protested against the persecutions in Poland and the western provinces of the empire. Especially he complained of the exile of Mgr. Felinski; of the imprisonment of that prelate's vicar, and of the vexations visited on the faithful Chapter of Warsaw. The envoy had the audacity to contest the exactness of the Pope's information

concerning events which were but too notorious ; and when subterfuge failed him, he contended that the unfortunate Catholics would have suffered nothing, had they imitated the Protestants, and sided with the government of the czar during the insurrection. Finally, the foolish and sublimely impudent envoy remarked that, after all the Russian sovereign ought not to have been surprised at the revolt of the Catholics, since Catholicism and revolution are one and the same thing—" *giacchè il Cattolismo vale lo stesso che la rivoluzione.*" It is possible that this outrage was premeditated ; but whether it was designed at St. Petersburg or conceived in a muddy brain which knew nothing of diplomacy, the Pontiff could not ignore it. "You may go," he replied. "I must believe, Monsieur, that your emperor is not aware of all the miseries which caused Poland to groan. Therefore I respect your emperor ; but I cannot say the same of his representative when he insults me in my own house, and when, in my person, he insults all the faithful, of whom I am the head." The Russian government never disavowed this act of its agent, and diplomatic relations between it and the Holy See now ceased. It was at this time that Cardinal Antonelli published his official *Exposition, Accompanied by Documents of the Continual Endeavors of the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX., To Remedy the Sufferings of the Catholic Church in Russia and in Poland.* Concluding the touching narrative, His Eminence says : "The Holy Father had signed a Concordat, and he could never procure its execution. He has protested, but has received no satisfaction. Frequently he has raised his voice in public Consistories, but there has been no reduction of severity in the measures adopted. Finally he invoked directly the justice of the emperor, but in vain has he awaited a consoling reply. There remains for the Holy See, therefore, no other course for its justification than that of publishing the documents which will show how solicitous it has been in regard to this cherished portion of the flock of Jesus Christ. The picture presented is painful indeed ; one needs only to glance at it in order to be convinced of the desolation to which the laws and acts of the imperial government have reduced the

Church of Poland. We behold pastors snatched from their flocks, or despoiled of their authority; the priests either proscribed or prevented from exercising their ecclesiastical ministry; the religions expelled and reduced to indigence; the Uniate Greeks drawn violently into schism; the Latins seduced or deprived of religious aid; sacred worship suspended, the churches being either desecrated or given over to non-Catholic services; the property of the Church stolen, the hierarchy abolished, religious and secular education contaminated, schism propagated; and, finally, every means destroyed whereby the Supreme Pastor might succor, teach, or console so large a number of his oppressed children." In an attempt to counteract the impression produced by this *Exposition*, Prince Gortchakoff sent to each diplomatic agent of Russia in foreign countries a *Memorandum* which seems to have been designed to flatter the Muscovite arrogance rather than to convince Christendom, for it coolly contradicts the facts of history, and is often gratuitously insulting to the Sovereign Pontiff.

We have alluded to the establishment, in 1801, of a "Catholic College" which, sitting at St. Petersburg, was to be for all the Catholics of the Russian Empire that which the Holy Synod was in regard to the schismatics. From the day when the infamous Siestrzencewicz was appointed by Alexander I. to the first presidency of this misnamed "Catholic" tribunal, it had constantly shown itself a perfidious and powerful engine for the destruction of all ecclesiastical independence. Count Dimitri Tolstoy, in that travesty of a "History of Roman Catholicism in Russia" (1864) of which we have already given some choice morsels to the reader, transcribes the memorial in which Siestrzencewicz explained the principles which were to guide this "Catholic College" in its mediatory relations between the czar and the faithful whom it was designed to betray. According to the traitor of Mohilew, the czar, "as the anointed of the Lord, enjoys the supremacy over all the Churches and over all the bodies of Christian clergy in his empire"; as to the Catholic Church, *the czar grants to it a dependence on the Pope, "as far as dogmas are concerned: but in re-*

gard to matters of discipline and internal government, *the czar entrusts them to diocesan bishops who are his subjects, and under conditions hereafter specified.*" Then the Catholics of Russia were told that in the primitive Church, "before the Popes had usurped jurisdiction over the bishops," the archbishops were wont to convoke, twice a year, "councils or congregations" for the consideration of *dogmatic* or disciplinary questions; and that now "such a congregation was to sit permanently at St. Petersburg, the emperor naming as its members such of the Catholic clergy *as it would please him to choose.*" Furthermore, just as the most mighty and most clement czar was the "supreme judge" over the Holy Synod, so in the new "Catholic College" that gracious autocrat was to have his representative. "A *secular* procurator will preside for the emperor, and will forbid all resolutions and decrees which *he may deem* dangerous; all which may be contrary to the imperial rights or to the laws of the country" (1). Shortly after the presentation of this memorial, His Grace of Mohilew addressed to the czar another, entitled "The Election of Popes," in which he feigned to discern a necessity, on the part of His Majesty, of putting an end to papal usurpation. Tolstoy relies on the ravings of Siestrzencewicz as proofs that "The consent of the Roman court to the consecration of a bishop is merely a sign of ecclesiastical unity; but the administrative authority in a diocese is that of the local bishop, *so far as the laws of the state permit it.*" And Tolstoy adds that several other memorials of Siestrzencewicz were merely developments of the same convictions, "sustained by most positive proofs" against the claim of the papal nuncio to a jurisdiction over the Russian Catholic clergy. The archbishop of Mohilew insisted, says the apologist of the Holy Synod, not only that all papal Bulls should be submitted to governmental approval, but also that the Pope should not presume to send any decree into the Russian Empire, unless said decree had been requested by a metropolitan who had been authorized by the czar to ask for it. Dimitri Tolstoy, being the imperial procurator of the Holy Synod, *i. e.*, to all intents

(1) ТОЛСТОУ, *loc. cit.*, Vol. ii., pp. 436 and 439.

and purposes the Russian Supreme Pontiff, was presumably an educated man; and, nevertheless, he attempted to justify the course of Siestrzenecwicz by this effusion: "History shows us a much more striking instance of a limitation of the papal authority by Catholic ecclesiastics. There exists to our day in Holland and in the Catholic (*sic*) Church of Utrecht (1), the bishops of which, although they remain entirely faithful to the dogmas of the Roman Church, and although they acknowledge the Pope as the Head of the Church, do not tolerate, on his part, any direct interference in the discipline and organization of the clergy, and consecrate their own bishops according to the rules of the primitive Church, without any request for his authorization" (2). It may be possible, on the score of crass ignorance of history, to excuse the procurator of the Holy Synod when he finds in the schismatic conventicle of Utrecht any more Catholicity than he would discern in the English Establishment, or in the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland; but charity does not bid us excuse his wilful blindness to the salient fact that the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff is a dogma of Catholic faith, and that the right of "direct interference in the discipline and organization of the clergy" is necessarily included in that supremacy.

The ukase of Alexander I. establishing this "Roman Catholic College" is simply an abridgment of all the tyrannical laws by which Catharine II. endeavored to reduce the Catholic Church of both the Latin and the Uniate Rite to the level of the State "Orthodox" Establishment (3). The Roman Pontiff was to be absolutely ignored, not only in the selection of the members of the new tribunal, but also in every decree which it might issue. The archbishop of Mohilew was declared to be, *ex officio*, its president; each of the Catholic dioceses of Russia was to be represented in it by a prelate or a canon, chosen by the Cathedral Chapter, but confirmed by the czar. In the third Article of the ukase the

(1) See our Vol. iv., ch. 14.

(2) *Loc. cit.*, p. 120.

(3) The entire ukase is given by Szantyr, in his *Collection of Information Concerning the Catholic Religion in the Russian Empire, and Especially in the Annexed Polish Provinces*. Paris, 1847. See also Thelner's *Vicissitudes of the Catholic Church of Both Rites*, Vol. ii. Paris, 1843.

members were enjoined to proceed according to the ecclesiastical canons, "but to observe strictly all the imperial prohibitions concerning every foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction and communication, preserving, in accordance with their sworn allegiance, all the rights of the autocracy and the imperial statutes." The fourth Article assigned to the College the right and obligation of deciding, *in last appeal*, all applications for divorce. And lest there might be some doubt as to the determination of the czarate to assimilate the condition of the Russian and Polish Catholics to that of the schismatics, the eighth Article prescribed that the Catholic College should be unable to decide definitely in any matter without the consent of the "directing Senate" of St. Petersburg; that the College should always "observe the rules prescribed by the General Regulation" (1). We have seen, when treating of the course of Nicholas I. towards his Catholic subjects, how that monarch, after his interview with Pope Gregory XVI., showed some little velleity to grant an almost indiscernible modicum of satisfaction to the pontifical claims; but even in that petty instalment of justice, which was quickly neutralized by new enactments of his persecuting spirit, no change was effected in the attributions of the "Catholic College" of St. Petersburg. After the rupture of diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Alexander II., which, as we have seen, was entailed by an insult offered by a Russian ambassador to Pius IX. in his own palace of the Vatican, there appeared an imperial ukase (May 22, 1867), in which the jurisdiction of the "Catholic College" was minutely explained, and which terminated in these words: "All persons guilty of holding with the Pope of Rome and his government any relations other than those

(1) This "General Regulation" had been devised by that Peter who is termed "the Great." Peter had abolished all the "chancelleries of state," bodies equivalent to the "ministries of state" in other countries, and he had replaced their titulars by so many "Colleges" or Councils. Each one of these "Colleges" was ordered to follow the prescriptions of a General Regulation; and when Peter abolished the patriarchate of Moscow in all but in name, he established an ecclesiastical "College" which he afterward designated as the "Holy Synod," subjecting it to the same Regulation. It is evident that Peter saw no difference between the administration of ecclesiastical affairs and that of war, secular justice, or finance; and to the same level Siestrzencewicz endeavored to reduce the Church whose rights he had sworn to defend. See Tondini's *The Ecclesiastical Regulation by Peter the Great*, p. 3.

hereby allowed (that is, under a special and apposite imperial permission), and all persons who illegally receive from the Pope, or from his government, or from any foreign ecclesiastic, any Bulls, Briefs, or other instructions or decisions, without having sent them to the local government or to the Minister of the Interior, shall suffer the punishments prescribed by the special law on this matter" (1).

The Holy See was informed of this ukase, not by the Russian government, but by Staniewski, the administrator of the diocese of Mohilew; and this unworthy ecclesiastic, following in the traces of Siestrzenecwicz, dared to tell the Pontiff that the Catholic bishops of the Russian empire had received the document with gratitude and reverence; that the "Catholic College" was revered by all honest Russian and Polish Catholics. His Holiness immediately issued an Encyclical, in which he drew the attention of all the bishops of the world to a decree which "trampled on the natural rights of man by its violation of the rights of conscience"; and on Jan. 3, 1868, Cardinal Antonelli called on Staniewski to repair the scandal which he had given, and to seek for absolution from the censures which he had incurred. His Eminence declared that were the Pontiff to recognize in the "Catholic College" a right to determine what affairs should be referred to the Holy See, he would confer his own primacy on that tribunal; that, furthermore, no lay authority, and especially no schismatical or heretical authority, could decree anything concerning purely ecclesiastical matters. The cardinal-secretary expressed his astonishment on learning that "a Catholic bishop could so far debase himself before a schismatical government as to accept voluntarily so pernicious a law; that a Catholic bishop could join other Catholics in forming a tribunal which had been designed for the ruin of religion; that a Catholic bishop could even preside over that tribunal, and thus become the enforcer of such a law." When Staniewski, on the part of the Russian government, ordered the Polish bishops to send delegates to the "Catholic College," some of them—the Papal condemnation of the tribunal not having yet reached them—thought that the gravity of the circum-

(1) *Journal of St. Petersburg*, cited by *Le Monde*, August 11, 1867.

stances might justify them in relying on the ulterior ratification of their submission by the Holy See. Among these compromisers were Lubienski, bishop of Augustovo, and Sosnowski, administrator of Lublin. Others, however, like Vincent Popiel, bishop of Plock, whom the reader must not confound with Marcellus Popiel, the wretched apostate bishop of Chelm, whom we shall soon introduce to his notice, replied resolutely that they would not obey the imperial command. Then Count Berg, lieutenant for the czar in Poland, summoned the intrepid Popiel to Warsaw, and bade him remember that although he was a bishop, he owed compliance to every order of the czar. "In affairs ecclesiastical," returned the prelate, "I owe no obedience to His Majesty. As a Catholic bishop, I owe obedience to only one human being—His Holiness, the Pope. You are a Russian general. What answer would you give to him who would tempt you from your allegiance? You would reply: 'Never.' Such is my answer now. They may dispose of my person as they see fit" (1). The indomitable man was immediately deported to Novgorod (2). Lubienski soon repented of his deference to the Muscovite demands, and in a long and eloquent letter to Count Berg (3) he described the perplexities of his conscience during the short period when he had endeavored to reconcile his episcopal duty with his devotion to the czar (4). He concluded with these words: "When I look back on all the circumstances which should have enlightened me much sooner, I recognize perforce an exceptional grace of God in the opportunity to confess my error, and to repair it as far as possible, which He has accorded to me. . . . I declare by these presents that, considering the imperial decree which endowed the Roman Catholic College of St. Petersburg with

(1) *Gazette of Augsburg*, October, 1868.

(2) Alexander III. allowed him to return to Poland. In 1875 he was transferred to Wladislav, and in 1883 he was promoted to Warsaw, where he still edifies the Poles by an evident readiness to suffer for the faith, if necessary, just as in his younger days.

(3) Published in the *Czas* of June 24, 1869, and reproduced by the *Dugodnik Katolicki* of Grodzisk (Posen), July, 1869.

(4) "Lubienski had rendered himself an object of suspicion to his compatriots, because of the extreme zeal with which he sacrificed, ostensibly at least, the most legitimate demands of Polish patriotism, in order to exhibit the fidelity of a Russian subject—as though he wished thereby to purchase the right of remaining an irreproachable bishop,"—LESCŒUR, *The Church in Poland*, bk. iii., ch. i. Paris, 1876.

the right to inspect letters directed to the Holy Father by the bishops, and to decide as to whether those letters should be transmitted; and considering that the said College has for its president a bishop who has incurred canonical censures; therefore I can take no part in the composition or in the acts of the said College. What is more, I declare that by my convocation of the Chapter of Sejn for the purpose of electing a delegate to the said College, and by my order to the Abbé Andrzejewski to proceed to St. Petersburg in order to occupy a position in the said College, I committed a culpable action which has been reprobated by the supreme authority of the Church, and which, therefore, I also now reprobate. I beg Your Excellency to communicate this my declaration to His Imperial Majesty, to whose profound wisdom and generous justice I have the happiness of committing myself with all submission, in everything which is just that he may deign to command." The deportation of Mgr. Popiel had already indicated how much consideration the "generous justice" of Alexander II. would accord to Mgr. Lubienski. On March 31, 1869, at two o'clock in the morning, he was arrested in his palace, and a few hours afterward a detachment of police escorted him on the road toward Perm, in the depths of Russia. Great was the grief of Lubienski's diocesans; but in a few days their sorrow became horror. Their bishop had died on the road. Had he been murdered by the oppressors? He had been a healthy man, and had lived only forty-three years. Men recalled the similarly suspicious circumstances of the recent death of Mgr. Kalinski, the Uniate bishop of Chelm, and they formed their conclusions. The last days of Lubienski proved the fallaciousness of his theory that by force of sincerity and virtue, toleration might be wrung from the schismatic autocracy; that, as he expressed the idea, there is no invincible antagonism between the Pole and the Russian; that "the two peoples were made to understand each other, and that a Pole always agrees with a Russian better than with a German." The holy prelate's philosophy was that of the Polish proverb: "So long as the world is the world, a Pole will not be a brother to a German"; but his Pan-Slavist as-

pirations will never be satisfied until the standard-bearer of Slavism shall have returned to the fold of religious unity. The noble conduct of Mgr. Lubienski was imitated by Mgr. Sosnowski, the administrator of the diocese of Lublin; but more fortunate, in a worldly sense, than Lubienski, the administrator escaped from Poland.

The children of the Holy Synod are wont to justify their efforts to Russify the Poles by the fact that, many centuries ago, Poland subjugated many Russian provinces, and imposed upon them the Polish religion, language, and laws. But the reader must know that this "Polonization," concerning which the Muscovites find it convenient to complain, was neither a violent nor a sudden process; it was the work of four or five centuries, and the sword of persecution never aided it. On the other hand, the Russification of Poland is the very quintessence of violence, and its advocates endeavor to accomplish it without delay. Again, the much decried Polonization of Western Russia was an endowment of barbarians with that civilization which the best minds, even among Russian schismatics, would like to see the portion of millions of Russians to-day; whereas, the Russification of Poland signifies the degradation of a Catholic civilization by the introduction of a truly oriental autocracy and a servile Byzantine ecclesiasticism. The Russification of the Poles had been prosecuted, of course, with more or less energy ever since the commission of the crime of 1782; but it was reserved for the reign of the emancipator of the serfs to systematize the iniquity. By the advice of Nicholas Milutine, a brother of Dimitri Milutine, the Minister of War, Alexander II. decreed the compulsory use of the Russian language in all the Polish tribunals and schools, in private life, and even in the sanctuary. In order to arrive more easily at this end, the persecutors confiscated the estates of great numbers of Polish nobles and other Polish land-owners, and sold them to "Orthodox" Russians or German Protestants (1). The few Polish landlords who were spared found that by a ukase of December 10, 1865, they were forbidden to sell or lease their lands to other than "Orthodox" Russians; and lest they might

(1) MARTINOW; *The Russian Language in Catholic Worship*. Lyons, 1874.

find means of evading this prohibition, no sale or lease was to be held as valid unless it had been sanctioned by the governor-general of the province. The same ukase deprived Catholics of the right of bequeathing landed property to persons not their natural heirs. No Catholic could hold a position under the government; he could not be even an employee of a railroad. The chief means, however, of this Russification was to be the pretended conversion to "Orthodoxy" of those Uniates who had escaped from the persecution of Siemaszko in 1839 by their passage to the Latin rite. Under the supervision of Kauffmann, that German convert to "Orthodoxy" whom we have met as the successor of the atheistic Mourawieff as governor of Lithuania, the days of Siemaszko seemed to have returned.

One of the most zealous apostles of "Orthodoxy," although he proclaimed openly that money would make of him either a Turk or a Jew, was Prince Chowanski. This officer once reproached an assemblage of peasants with being remiss in their duty to pray for the czar; and when he was told that they always fulfilled that duty, both in church and at home, he asked for a demonstration of their veracity on the spot. The unsuspecting rustics dropped on their knees; and Chowanski, as though to increase the solemnity of the occasion, caused a lighted candle to be placed in the hands of each one. When the prayer had been recited, the military missionary congratulated his astounded hearers on their voluntary conversion to the religion of Holy Russia. In vain the peasants cried that they would die sooner than abandon the Catholic faith; they were told that they had become "Orthodox" by the very fact of praying while holding candles which had been blessed by "Orthodox" priests. An adjutant then registered all the names of the "converts," and the poor creatures were ordered to proceed to the schismatic church, there to seal their recantation of the errors of Popery by Holy Communion. With blows of clubs and threats of the bayonet they were driven to the schismatic altar, a "pope" administered the Blessed Sacrament to them; and the unfortunates found themselves and their children enrolled on the official registers of the State Church, and subject, if they

dared to protest, to the punishments which "Orthodoxy" visits on apostates. Similar scenes were multiplied throughout Lithuania; and when Alexander II. visited Wilna, he replied to a deputation of his victims who besought him to allow them to follow the dictates of their consciences: "I shall never authorize a return to the Catholic Church on the part of those who have once embraced Orthodoxy." We have alluded to the punishments with which "Orthodoxy" visits what it feigns to regard as "apostasy." Our limits forbid many illustrations of this phase of the policy of Russification; we shall notice only the case of Mary Denisow, which greatly agitated the Poles in 1869. This girl, born of Catholic parents in the department of Grodno, in 1848, and baptized in the Catholic Church, was forcibly "re-baptized" by an "Orthodox" priest when she was six months old, during the absence of her mother, and in spite of the protests of her dying father. According to the Russian law, therefore, the baby Mary had "embraced Orthodoxy," and the Catholic mother was bound by the same law to train her as a schismatic. However, Mme. Denisow succeeded in sending her child to a convent in Nice, where she remained until she reached womanhood. Returning to her native land, Mary married a Catholic named Kleczewski, in June, 1867. A child was born of this marriage in February, 1868, and was duly baptized by a Catholic priest. On the day after this baptism Kleczewski was summoned to the office of the chief of police, and questioned as to how he had dared to espouse an "Orthodox" woman, and as to how he had dared to have the offspring of that "Orthodox" woman baptized according to the Catholic rite. The trembling man was told to choose between Siberia on the one hand, and on the other a re-marriage to Mary in an "Orthodox" church, accompanied by the obligation to educate his present child and all future offspring in the religion of Holy Russia. If he refused to comply with the law, not only would he be sent to Siberia, but he would also know that his babe had been taken from its mother and was being raised in the asylum of illegitimate children. Kleczewski succeeded in having the case carried to the courts, but the decision was that "the said Mary

*Denisow, cohabiting with Kleczewski*, should be confined in a Russian convent; the child to be *re-baptized*, with new name and surname, and to be consigned to a House of Refuge." Before the sentence could be executed, the little family had crossed the frontier (1). It is not surprising that under pressure like this of the Kleczewski family there were many instances of Polish nobles and gentlemen succumbing to Russification during the reign of Alexander II. The most notable of these apostates were Bielnicki, marshal of the nobility of Troki; Prince Bronislas Drucki Lubecki; the two brothers Mirski, and Prince Nicholas Radziwill. In justice to Radziwill, however, we must record that at the time of his defection he was more than half demented. In 1867 he wrote to the czar offering to "embrace Orthodoxy," on condition that he were allowed to repudiate his wife, and to marry, at the same time, two daughters of a certain schismatic priest. Lax as is the practice of the "Orthodox" Church in the matter of divorce, Alexander II. and his Holy Synod found this application rather extravagant; and a government officer was instructed to subject the amorous prince to a medical examination. The physician testified that Radziwill was crazy; but, nevertheless, the representative of the czar pronounced the unfortunate duly enrolled in the State Church of Holy Russia (2).

In the estimation of the "Orthodox" clergy, the chief glory of the reign of Alexander II. was not the emancipation of the serfs, but rather the delivery of the Uniate Greeks of Russian Poland from the "thralldom" of Rome, and their subjection to that instrument of czarocracy, the Holy Synod. Although officially destroyed in the ancient Polish provinces since 1839, the United Greek rite still subsisted in 1866 in the "kingdom of Poland," being concentrated in the diocese of Chelm, the sole Uniate diocese which "Orthodox" persecution had spared. This diocese had a population of about 250,000 Uniate Ruthenians, who lived in such a state of intermixture with the same number of Polish Latin Catholics that in many of the villages the two parochial churches were

(1) *The Długobór: Katolicki* of Grodzisk, January 1, 1869.

(2) See the *Journal of Posen*, May 5, 1871, and August 13, 1872.

attended indiscriminately by persons of either rite. In 1865, two years after the insurrection, a deputation from all the communes of Poland having waited on the czar at St. Petersburg to thank him for his release of the peasants from certain burdens, the Ruthenian delegates availed themselves of the occasion to entreat His Majesty to leave them their religion. Alexander replied: "*I give you my imperial word that your religion shall not be touched.*" And, nevertheless, in less than a year from that time, the compulsory transformation of the Uniate diocese of Chelm into a schismatic one had been begun. This "gentle" Alexander II. commenced with the schools. He pretended to regard the kingdom of Poland as divided into four nationalities: Polish, Lithuanian, Ruthenian, and German. In order to prevent the children of the Ruthenians (all Uniates) from frequenting the "Polish" schools, as the Russians termed those in which were any Catholics of the Latin rite, special institutions were established for them; and when the parents asked why their little ones should be forced to learn the Russian language, when their prayer-books were all couched in Polish, the government introduced Russian into the churches, and consequently into the prayer-books. Kalinski, the bishop of Chelm, resisted; but he was arrested, and ostensibly deported to Wiatka. Nothing more was ever heard of this episcopal "rebel"; the Russian authorities said that he had died on the journey, but his children (he was a widower when he became a bishop) could never learn where the death had occurred. After the disappearance of Kalinski, the government gave the administratorship of the diocese to a canon named Wojcicki, who reorganized the consistories, appointing to them a number of schismatics and several apostate priests from Galicia. Circulars were sent by Wojcicki to all the parish priests, recommending the introduction of many schismatical usages, and the suppression of many Catholic rites which he pronounced redolent of "Latinism." The Ruthenians were told that the matters at issue concerned their nationality, not their religion. The same insidious method was pursued by Kuziemski, a Gallician whom the czar nominated in 1868 to the see of Chelm, and whom the Holy See preconized, since hitherto

he had enjoyed an excellent reputation. But the event proved that when the Russian government selected Kuziemski as successor to Kalinski, it had perceived an instrument for its own purposes in his weakness of character.

There was another motive for the Russian selection of Kuziemski. An Austrian subject, and at one time a deputy in the Parliament of Vienna, he was one of the leaders of those Ruthenian priests of Gallicia who, under the name of "St. Georgians" (so called from the titular saint of the United Greek cathedral of Lemberg), posed as defenders of Ruthenian nationality against the Poles, and who feigned to be bulwarks of strength whereby the members of the Oriental rite could resist the alleged attacks on their customs by the enterprising Latins. This party supported an organ entitled the "*Slowo*," a journal which was Catholic only in name, since it openly advocated the establishment of a national church. The reader must remember that the United Greek clergy of Gallicia—married, of course, like the schismatic secular priests—form a hereditary class, and that, therefore, they are completely absorbed in their family interests. Hence is derived their hatred of everything Polish, especially of the Polish nobility, for whom they would substitute themselves; and hence, consequently, comes their distrust, if not hatred, for everything Latin. And here we may remark that it is this caste which disposes of the Ruthenian votes in the Cis-Leithan parliament; and that Russia, interested in a rivalry which existed long before the partition of Poland, encourages that rivalry in a thousand ways, under the very eyes of Austria, which seems to be blind to the lamentable fact. In the Paris "*Monde*" of September 2, 1875, we read an illustration of the strange complicity of the Uniate clergy of Gallicia with the Russian destroyers of the Uniates of the diocese of Chelm. We perceive how Russia, ever since 1830, labored for the perversion of the Catholics of the Greco-Slavonic rite, not only in Gallicia, but even in Hungary and Illyria. While Marcellus Popiel, the famous apostate, was a student in the Uniate College at Vienna, the Russian ambassador, Raiewski, cultivated most intimate relations with all the inmates of that institution. He visited

them for hours at a time, entertained them frequently in his own mansion, and never conversed with them on other than political matters. In 1848 the Austrian government, in order to neutralize the Polish discontent in Galicia, excited the Ruthenian population against the Latin Poles. From that time it was not an extraordinary thing to hear the Ruthenian subjects of His Apostolic Majesty lauding Holy Russia as the mother of their nationality, and acclaiming the Holy Synod as the protectress of their Church. Apostasy was not infrequent on the part of the Austrian Ruthenian priests. In 1874, when the Austrian government so far imitated the German as to persecute the Church with those laws which, after the fashion of *lucus a non lucendo*, were termed "ecclesiastical," the seven Ruthenian priestly deputies (one of them the rector of their seminary) all voted for the enactments. Facts like these cause many acute observers of Polish affairs to believe that most of the Austrian Ruthenian clergy are already Muscovite at heart, and that the people will be drawn quite easily into the schismatic ranks when Russia obtains possession of Eastern Galicia; and the same facts account for the readiness of the Russian government in appointing the Gallician, Kuziemski, to the see of Chelm.

Shortly after his arrival in Chelm, Kuziemski issued a pastoral against what he styled the "Polish propaganda," describing its effects as truly lamentable, since, as he declared, *on a soil essentially Muscovite*, many had ventured to quit the Uniate for the Latin rite; thus denying, moaned the lying sycophant, both their Church and their nationality. The manifesto concluded with the command that *all who had passed to Catholicism*, or who came of parents who had *illegally* changed their *religion*, should return to the *United Greek Church*. Let not the reader fail to note this affectation of a belief that Catholicism and the Latin rite are synonymous—an affectation which is habitual among "Orthodox" Russians, just as among all other Eastern schismatics. When the "Orthodox" Russian uses such language to a United Greek, he (consistently with his system) implies that there is only one true and legitimate Greek rite—namely, that of the Photian or Cerularian schism, of which his Church is the

daughter. But the utterance of such sentiments by Kuziemski, a bishop who called himself a Catholic, is certainly one of the curiosities of religious literature. No wonder that the Uniates discerned in their bishop a future Siemaszko. Great indeed, however, was their surprise on March 18, 1871, when the official journal announced that the ill health of Mgr. Kuziemski had led him to ask His Imperial Majesty to relieve him of his functions, and that he was about to return to Lemberg. The hatred of Kuziemski for the Poles had induced him to follow the suggestions of the Czar to the very point of apostasy; but since he refused to plunge into the abyss, he received his passports. His successor, Marcellus Popiel, was more complacent to Holy Russia. Popiel had been the most zealous of all the supporters of Wojeicki; and at the time when the Vatican Council was about to convene, he had publicly declared that if the papal infallibility were pronounced a matter of faith, he would not accept the definition. Such was the new administrator of Chelm, who was summoned by Count Tolstoy, the procurator-general of the Holy Synod, to a council in St. Petersburg, which the czar had appointed to settle the affairs of the United Greek Church in his dominions. The other members of this council, besides Tolstoy, were Count Schouvaloff and the governors of the departments of Lublin and Siedlcé. The nature of its conclusions is easily perceived in the speech made at a farewell dinner given in Chelm by Kokoszkín, the Russian functionary who had hitherto acted as imperial supervisor over the religious affairs of the Uniates: "The difficult task with which I was entrusted by Count Tolstoy, the Minister of Public Instruction, is ended. . . . The continuation of this mission is confided by the government to the most reverend administrator of the diocese, and to you, honorable gentlemen, who have comprehended the intentions of the government so well. It is true that there are still some fanatical priests in this diocese who do not appreciate the happiness of being definitively united with our holy mother, Russia, and who, therefore, prevent us from uniting ourselves with her; but I trust that they will soon perceive the error into which Polish intrigue has led them. Believe

me, gentlemen, for I am an honest man, . . . and I assure you that no religion is better than the Orthodox Greco-Russian, that no civilization is superior to the Russian, and that there is no happiness so great as that of being a subject of the magnanimous emperor, Alexander II. Reflect well, you gentlemen of Galicia! Do you not know, by your own experience, that I am speaking the truth? I need say nothing concerning the most reverend administrator of the diocese, whose learning and virtues are so well appreciated by *His Excellency the minister* who honors him with his confidence. But you, Father Rector (1), would you have been made a canon by the Austrian government? Would that government have given you the cross which now rests on your noble breast? And you, Father Cybilin, would you have attained your present dignities under that government? No! It is only under a government like ours, under a monarch like ours, that one can hope to be so honored. . . . Although, Gallicians, you may be true representatives of that part of Russia which is oppressed by Austria, I regret that I cannot speak as freely in Lemberg itself, at the side of the worthy Fathers Malinowski, Pawlikow, Pietrusiewicz, and other honorable personages whom I know so well; but let us hope that our desires will soon be satisfied. I offer this toast to the health of His Majesty, the President of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg, who is the *Supreme Head of the Orthodox Greco-Russian Church*." The priests who applauded this speech termed themselves Catholics; but their effrontery was well matched by that of the Russian government, which, generally so severe in its censorship of the press, allowed the effusion of Kokoszkina to be published in "*The Polish Journal*" (December 11, 1872). Here is a high functionary of Russia publicly advancing the pretensions of his autocrat to Austrian Galicia—claims based only on the community of rite followed by the Ruthenians of Russian Poland and by the Ruthenians of Austrian Poland. The czarate must be confident that it has already a number of Austrian Gallicians devoted to itself, a number sufficiently large to encourage it to speedy overt action—a number of

(1) Krynicki, who had been called from Galicia to be the rector of the seminary of Chelm

unworthy priests like those who have been expelled or are voluntary exiles from Gallicia, who have been received into the diocese of Chelm, where, like Popiel and others, they have become or will become canons, pastors, even bishops, replacing the faithful ecclesiastics who are banished from the kingdom when they are not sent to Siberia (1).

In his zeal for the Russification of the Ruthenians, Popiel found that he could not obtain a sufficiency of pliable priests from Gallicia; and therefore his agents looked around for a number of wretches who were willing to enter into Holy Orders as his servants. Such were easily found; but how were they to be ordained? He procured the services of the notorious Sokolski, a Bulgarian who had abjured the Greek Schism, had then been consecrated by Pius IX. himself, and had finally apostatized (2). Popiel caused Sokolski, then residing in Gallicia, to make several visits to Chelm; and each visit was made the occasion of an ordination of several prospective apostates. Popiel was unable to seduce the masses of the laity; but he had much success with the children, who were placed under the tuition of either open or secret schismatics, and were taught the Greco-Russian hymns and Catechism, while nothing was allowed to remind them that the Church of their baptism was a part of the Universal Church which is ruled by the Successor of St. Peter. As we have already observed, not one of the innovations of the

(1) In the Paris *Univers* of April 10, 1875, we read: "If we remember that in Gallicia there are 2,300,000 United Greeks, and in Hungary and Transylvania more than 800,000, we may understand the danger which menaces the Austro-Hungarian Empire, not only from a religious, but from a political point of view. The cause of the evil is found in the miserable temporal condition of the United Greek priests, who are very numerous in Gallicia and Hungary, and are all married and fathers of families. By paying them, the Russian government makes them its instruments."

(2) In 1860 many thousands of Bulgarian schismatics, headed by their pastors, declared their subjection to the Holy See, and besought the Pontiff to give them a bishop. The candidate whom they presented was Joseph Sokolski, an archimandrite of one of their Basilian monasteries, and a person of approved morals and of supposed simplicity of character. In order to demonstrate to the neophytes his paternal interest, Pius IX. raised Sokolski to the episcopate in the Sistine Chapel; and the new bishop departed for Bulgaria laden with costly presents from His Holiness and the Roman patricians, which were intended to adorn the churches of the converts. Sokolski arrived in due time at Constantinople, but then he suddenly disappeared. Rumors reached Rome that he had been kidnapped by Russian emissaries, but it was finally learned that he had succumbed to the temptations of the Russian ambassador, and had returned to the schism. For interesting details concerning Sokolski and the reunion of the Bulgarians, see the Paris *Correspondant*, November 25, 1860.

Russifiers was presented to the people as tending to withdraw them from the communion of Rome; everything was designated as a "purification of the United Greek rite" from the deleterious intermixture of Latin observances. But the eyes of the simple-minded were opened when they saw that sixty-three of their priests preferred imprisonment, or even Siberia, to a connivance with the "purification" (1); when they saw these faithful pastors replaced by vagabond foreigners, whose first thoughts were of Russian gold; when they found themselves threatened with fines and the knout if they entered Latin churches; when they saw the new clergy affecting all the externals of the schismatic "popes," and heard them preaching in Russian. At first the resistance was passive; but when Popiel threw off the mask, it became active, and was frequently signalized by martyrdom. In the beginning of October, 1873, the Holy Synod told Popiel that he was proceeding too slowly; therefore, on the 31st (O. S., 19th) he sent to each one of his deans a copy of a new ritual which was openly schismatical, and he enjoined on each dean to enforce its adoption in all the churches of his deanery on and after January 1, 1874. In this new manual of liturgy, wherever the name of the Roman Pontiff had occurred, it was replaced by the words "the hierarchy." Since all the deans were creatures of Popiel, and since they had already installed men like themselves in nearly all the parishes, the people were dismayed when, on entering their churches at the time appointed for the change, they found themselves confronted by sanctuaries which displayed all the paraphernalia of the schismatic cult. The horrors which now ensued in every part of the vast diocese of Chelm have no parallels in modern history. The rods of the Cossacks and other more refined tortures knew no distinctions of age, sex, or relative debility, as they were applied for the purpose of extorting signatures to a petition addressed to "The Most Clement Czar, The Father Of All The Russians," begging that he would hearken to the "voluntary" prayers of "his

(1) Popiel took care to publish in the official journals that he "had been obliged to remove from their parishes only a few of the clergy for their refusal to obey the orders of the government"; but the journals of Lemberg submitted a list of sixty-three who had been imprisoned or banished in one year

loving Ruthenians," as they besought him "to be admitted to the embrace of the Holy Orthodox Church." Those who scorned this embrace of a daughter of foul schism and heresy received, when the regulations were observed (and they were generally exceeded), fifty lashes of the terrible Cossack *Nahajka*, if they were men; if they were women they were supposed to escape with twenty-five, and the children were deemed worthy of only ten. Mr. Jewell, then Minister of these United States to the Russian court, wrote to Secretary Fish on February 23, 1874, that many of "*the most obstinate and audacious women*" received a hundred lashes; and the callous envoy studiously abstained from stating the number of the "obstinate and audacious" Catholics who died from the effects of those lashes. For details of this persecution we refer the reader to the works of Martinov and Lesceur, which we have already cited, and to the pages of the *Monde* and of the *Univers* for 1874. We shall mention only a few cases in illustration of the eagerness which, according to the Russian official reports, the Uniates manifested for a separation from the Holy See.

In the village of Uscimow an officer named Tur ordered his squadron to drive the inhabitants to the neighboring lake. The unfortunates were pushed into the icy waters, and there compelled to remain for several hours, with only their heads and shoulders unsubmerged. Only when the demon became convinced that he could not obtain their signatures, did he allow them to leave the lake. Colonel Klemenko, governor of the district of Kurnick, and Kalinski, governor of Siedlcé, drove their populations bareheaded into the open fields, when the thermometer indicated a cold of 16 degrees (Reaumur), intending to keep them there until they yielded. The guards were relieved every two hours, while the "voluntary converts" persisted in remaining unconverted. When the persecutors found that their efforts were futile, they pillaged every house in the two districts. At Wlodawa, a captain of Cossacks, one Formin, saw three women die under the lashes of his men. At Pratulin, in the district of Janow, Colonel Stein shot nine of the obstinate to death, and wounded four mortally. Then he drove the inhabitants to witness the ef-

fects of disobedience to the orders of the benign czar. The mother of Onufry Wasyluk, one of the victims, was wailing over his body, when his wife cried out: "Mother, do not weep for your son. I do not weep for the death of my husband, for he is a martyr for the faith." Then the president of the district, Kutantin, thought that he might effect by persuasion what terror could not produce. He tried to bribe a peasant named Pikuta, an old man whose probity and intelligence had made him a power in the district, to persuade the people to become the spiritual subjects of their tender autocrat. Pikuta signified his readiness to address his neighbors, and Kutantin called out to the crowd, "Here is a man whom you love and respect. He will tell you what you ought to do." Pikuta spoke as follows: "You wish me, president, to tell my neighbors how they shall act. I am ready to obey you; but they know already what I would say. There is but one course for all of us—we must remain invincibly attached to our holy faith, come what may." Then the patriarch fell on his knees, and signed to his hearers to imitate him. When all had knelt, he drew from his bosom a crucifix, and pronounced the following oath, the people repeating it after him: "I swear by my grey hairs, by the salvation of my soul, by my hope of seeing God at the moment of my death, that I will never abandon one iota of our faith. The holy martyrs suffered innumerable persecutions for this faith; our brethren have shed their blood for it, and we must imitate them." The soldiers immediately seized the brave old man, and having loaded him with chains, dragged him to prison (1).

Martinov records an instance of a young mother being threatened with Siberia if she would not sign the act of apostasy; and when the officers told her that they would take her babe from her, she blessed the little one and placed it in the arms of one of them, saying: "There it is; God will care for it" (2). In the face of facts like these the official journal of St. Petersburg dared to say, on January 26, 1875, that "the opposition of the Latin Church and the Encyclicals

(1) *The Schism and Its Apostles*, published anonymously at Cracow in 1875, and translated into French for *Le Monde*.

(2) *The Brigandage of Chelm*, in the *Etudes Religieuses* of June, 1875.

of the Pope have had only one result—the *voluntary* conversion of 45 parishes, 26 ecclesiastics, and 50,000 parishioners to the Greek (schismatic) rite." And our Mr. Jewell, the sage diplomat already cited, informed his government that the priests of Chelm, as well as those of Siedleć, had decided "unanimously" to join the Orthodox Church. Mr. Jewell was careful to remark that "probably" this change of religious profession would be attributed to "violence"; and then the oracle emitted this solemn judgment: "It is more likely than an absence of all persecution and the progress of the age have tempered religious *fanaticism*, and prepared the way for more material and more prosaic interests, in this century of ours, *in which Mammon is so powerful*" (1).

The supplication for union with the Church of Holy Russia, which Popiel and his staff of excommunicated and degraded priests addressed to the head of that Church, Alexander II., is an interesting document: "Most August Monarch, Most Merciful Lord! All the ancient Russian Provinces which had fallen under the Polish domination, have had the happiness of re-entering the One, Holy, Orthodox Church. . . . The sole diocese of Chelm experienced the misfortune of remaining longer *under a foreign rule, remaining in union with the Popes of Rome, who, as has been well demonstrated by ancient facts and recent experience, govern the Church in a spirit which is not the spirit of kindness and of love which was taught by Jesus Christ, but rather a spirit which regards neither the temporal happiness nor the eternal salvation of the flock.* The powerful words of Your Imperial Majesty have broken the chains of serfdom which fettered the Russian people, and which were especially heavy in this region, under the influence of men of another religion, who sought to make the Russian population, ever animated by an ardent love for their Russian country, a blind and docile instrument of their political intrigues. The series of governmental measures which followed the emancipation of the peasants, the object of which was the well-being of the people and the clergy, and, above all, the abundant revenues accorded by Your Majesty for the training of all classes in the

(1) We quote from the *Monde* of April 29 1875

*Russian spirit*, have awakened in the populations the sentiment of national and ecclesiastical unity with the rest of Russia which had been suffocated under the *foreign* domination. . . . Firmly convinced of the purity of the dogmas of the Orthodox Church of all the Russias, from the communion of which *we were so long withheld*, and governed by the interests of the flock confided to our care, *and which thinks as we do*, we have resolved to prostrate ourselves at the feet of Your Imperial Majesty, begging you most humbly to assure the happiness of the Russian Uniates in the diocese of Chelm by allowing them to join the Orthodox Church of their ancestors, so that with one heart and one only tongue we may glorify God, and address to Him our prayers, together with the entire Russian people, for your health and welfare, Most Pious Emperor, and for the happiness and prosperity of Russia, the country which is so dear to us." This masterpiece of hypocrisy was soon followed by a *Capitular Act*, in which the "Chapter of Chelm" announced to the faithful subject to it that they were now children of the State Church of Russia; and which, from beginning to end, was redolent of the ideas of Tolstoy, and was frequently a *verbatim* reproduction of the audacious assertions of that minister. The Chapter, or probably Tolstoy writing in the name of that body, begins by giving the simple-minded Ruthenians a lesson in ecclesiastical history. They are told that "it was from the Orient, from the Greek Church, that their Slavic ancestors derived the faith"; but they are not told that when Sts. Cyril and Methodius evangelized the Slavs, and when "Greek priests first preached to *the Russians*," the Greek Church was subject to the Roman Pontiff, just as it had been from the beginning of Christianity. It is asserted that from that time "the Orthodox *Oriental* Faith penetrated to the very foundations of the *national life of Russia*," and thenceforth "*the name of Russia was identified with that of Orthodox*." The conversion of the Ruthenian schismatics in the sixteenth century is ascribed to the "treachery of the bishops, who yielded to Polish pressure, and were *guided by Jesuits who were hardened in intrigue*." The Uniates are informed that "although very able measures were taken to entangle the people

of Western Russia in the nets of the Roman domination and of Polonization, from the first moment of the proclamation of the Union the people perceived that in that Union with Rome there was involved not only a subordination to the bishop of Rome, but an attack on the purity of the Eastern Faith, *and an attack on the foundations of the national life, and on their nationality itself.* The people understood that *the object of the Union was the complete absorption of the Russians, and the destruction of their very name.*" The writer complains that "nearly all the Western Russian nobles had passed to the Latin rite; and that the Polish government, and the party of the Jesuits and of the Polish gentry, used every effort to efface every difference *between Catholicism and the Union.*" And why not? "Uniate" and "Catholic" were synonyms in Poland. However, by "Catholicism" the writer means "Polonism." Very innocently indeed the "Orthodox" apologist says that "when Poland lost her political existence, the Union immediately weakened in the provinces annexed to Russia. During the reign of Catherine II., two millions of Uniates returned to Orthodoxy; and in 1839, under the Emperor Nicholas I., *of blessed memory,* the remaining Uniates in the western provinces, *having declared solemnly that they renounced the Union, were received into the fold of the Orthodox Church. Thus it was with extreme facility that destruction fell on a work which had been accomplished by a double use of force, by a violation of the rights of conscience, and by material oppression.*" The sublime impudence of this passage needs no comment. But the diocese of Chelm was yet to be saved from the cruel Union which caused the Uniates "to manifest toward the Russian population religious intolerance and hostility, in all their force"; and the first measure for its redemption was taken when the "tender" Alexander II. opened rural schools for the children, "*wherein they might be trained in an atmosphere not corrupted by political agitators.*" The next measure, says Popiel or his Mentor, was the establishment of higher schools in which "*the young generation might imbibe the Russian spirit.*" Under the benevolent rule of Alexander II., writes the pen of the Holy Synod, "the Uniate clergy felt the need of examin-

ing more attentively their position in the land, and of understanding better their duties toward their flocks." They resolved to enter the Church of Holy Russia, in spite of the machinations of the Pope, who "legitimated all the alterations and Latino-Polish innovations in the United Greek rite; who showered blessings on the apostates (1) who separated themselves from the Church and the people." And the chief reason why Popiel and his precious "Chapter" could not remain Uniates was found in their unwillingness to place themselves in opposition to the dispositions and measures of the Russian government, "*and even in opposition to that Most August Emperor who had conferred so many favors on them, the humble ministers of the altars.*" Popiel received his thirty pieces of silver in the shape of the "Orthodox" diocese of Lublin, created expressly as a reward for his "apostolic" labors. Thus was consummated the extirpation of the United Greeks in Russian Poland—a work of fraud and violence far more detestable than that of England toward Catholic Ireland; since, before this century, England had never formally promised freedom of conscience to the Irish. In 1773, after the first partition of Poland, that crowned prostitute whom "Orthodox" Russians style "Catharine the Good," stipulated, in the sixth article of the apposite treaty, that "*the Catholic religion, in both rites, shall be maintained in the ceded provinces, and its rights and property shall be respected.*" In 1793, in the treaty for the second partition, the same German Messalina on a Slavic throne promised "*irrevocably for herself, and for her heirs and successors, to maintain perpetually the Roman Catholics of both rites in the unchangeable possession of their prerogatives, properties, and churches, as well as in the free exercise of their worship and discipline, and in all the rights pertaining to the cult of their religion; declaring that neither she nor any of her successors would ever attempt to exercise any sovereign rights in prejudice of the Roman Catholic religion of the two rites.*" Alexander I. ratified the treaties of 1814–15 which were entailed by the Congress of Vienna, and which guaranteed full liberty of worship to the Poles. In 1832 the Russian am-

(1) The "apostates" were those who abandoned the excommunicated Popiel.

bassador to the Vatican communicated to Pope Gregory XVI., by order of Nicholas I., an imperial Organic Statute which guaranteed that "the government of His Majesty would ever show special respect for the religion which was professed by the greater part of its Polish subjects." In 1847 Nicholas I. entered into a new Concordat, which repeated the assurances of 1832. And finally, only ten years before the catastrophe of Chelm, Alexander II. had said to a Ruthenian deputation: "*I give you my imperial word that no one shall touch your religion. I shall not permit it.*"

Justice to Alexander II. demands that we record that during the last days of his reign he manifested a conciliatory tendency toward the Holy See. When Leo XIII. mounted the papal throne in 1878, the absence of diplomatic relations with Russia did not prevent His Holiness from notifying the czar of his elevation. One of this Pontiff's earliest acts was the issue of a powerful Encyclical against Nihilism; and it so pleased Alexander II., that he caused it to be read in all the churches of his empire, despite the signature of "Supreme Pontiff," with which it terminated. The czar even caused his ambassador at Vienna, Prince Oubril, to enter into a comparatively just arrangement with Mgr. Jacobini, the papal nuncio at that capital, concerning the episcopal nominations and Catholic education in Russia; and as a further proof of his good intentions, he sent his sons to the Vatican in December, 1880. But the too usual fate of a monarch of Holy Russia befel Alexander II., ere he was able to prove that his sense of justice toward his Catholic subjects was conceived in other than a spirit of velleity. The first acts of Alexander III. in reference to the Holy See indicated a desire to follow in the later, rather than in the early footsteps of his father. The audience of Prince Oubril with Leo XIII., on April 20, 1881, was marked by every deference on the part of the envoy, and on the following December 24th a draft for a Concordat was signed at the Vatican by Jacobini (then a cardinal) and M. de Giers, the prime-minister of the czar. Then came the Franco-Russian *rapprochement*, and, as a natural consequence (since every Russian coolness toward Berlin means some consideration for the Papacy, and

*vice versa*), closer relations were resumed between the autocratic and the papal courts. M. Iswolski arrived in Rome as Russian ambassador at the Vatican in 1888, shortly after the Treaty of San Stefano, when Alexander III. withdrew from the Triple Alliance which had bound together the cabinets of Vienna, St. Petersburg, and Berlin. But Catholic optimists had forgotten one important personage. Constantine Pobedonostzef, the successor of Tolstoy as procurator of the Holy Synod, was implacably averse to any renunciation of the abuses which are the very life-blood of Russian bureaucrats; and as he had been the chief tutor of Alexander III.—a timid and hesitating man, although physically a giant—his influence over that sovereign was immense. He reminded his former pupil of the principal lesson which he had learned: that official “Orthodoxy” is the symbol and the sole *raison d’être* of Muscovite power and glory; that the entire programme of Russian policy should be based on the principle, “All and everything for *pravoslavié* or Slav “Orthodoxy”; in Russia all interests must yield to those of *pravoslavié*, for there is no *jus contra jus*” (1). Pobedonostzef gained his point, and in certain parts of Poland men soon came to think that Nicholas I. still reigned. The Polish language was absolutely proscribed in all schools; not even among themselves, and during recreation, could students use it. Not only teaching, but also preaching, was to be in Russian, even when the hearers did not understand a word of that language. No Polish Catholic could be employed by the state or by a municipality, even in the most menial capacity; with one stroke of the pen 55,000 Poles, employed on the railroads, were condemned either to apostasy or destitution. In no governmental document, and in no journal or periodical, could the name of Poland occur; the country was to be designated as the “Land of the Vistula.” Children were marched by force from the schools to the schismatic churches. Innumerable Catholic churches were closed or destroyed. Entire villages were proclaimed “Orthodox,” despite the protests of the inhabitants, and exile was the lot of the Catholic priest who dared to administer the Sacra-

(1) VILLEFRANCHE; *Contemporary Russia*, p. 316. Paris, 1895.

ments to those whose names the Holy Synod had placed on its registers. Where neither force, nor knout, nor money availed to crush "Polish obstinacy," Siberia was made the missionary of the State Establishment. In the governments of Vilna and Grodno, where in the olden time all the churches had been Catholic, and in 1863 one-half had become schismatic, in 1893 there were only 292 Catholic churches to 983 schismatic ones. The massacre of Krozé, in the province of Grodno, will serve as an illustration of the methods adopted by the apostles of "Orthodoxy," and of the culpability of the imperial government in the premises. The authorities having closed a parish church as a preliminary measure to its transfer to the state clergy, about a hundred peasants entered the edifice. They were immediately attacked by some Cossacks, and eight were killed, while forty-two were grievously wounded. Fifteen of the women were outraged, and their companions were knouted nearly unto death. When Pope Leo XIII. heard of the matter from unexceptional sources he protested to the czar, and that potentate ordered Prince Cantacuzene to make an investigation. The result was a report to the effect that the Catholics of Krozé, "justly suspected of Polonism, had attacked the imperial soldiers, and had met a deserved punishment." Then the Pontiff sent to Alexander III., by a sure hand, the evidence which had prompted his complaint, remarking, in an autograph letter: "It is evident, Sire, that one of us has been egregiously deceived. Since you are nearer to Krozé than I am, deign to discover, for yourself, which one of us receives misleading reports." The czar made a personal inquiry, and having found that Cantacuzene had hidden the guilt of the authorities of Krozé, he sent for the prince, and it is said that in the height of his indignation he gave the culprit a blow in the face. Be this as it may, Cantacuzene felt that he was disgraced, and on the following day he poisoned himself. Meanwhile the survivors of the massacre were languishing in prison, and it became necessary to try them. Some generous Russian lawyers, who had been edified by their behavior in the jails, volunteered to defend them. Evidence of their innocence was abundant; but, never-

theless, four of the accused were condemned to ten years of hard labor, three to Siberia, and twenty to some months of further imprisonment. The greater and most influential part of the European press, and all of the American secular and Protestant religious journals, entirely ignored this and similar episodes of the reign of Alexander III. ; for the victims were Catholics. The editors, or at least the masters, of the principal continental journals of Europe are nearly all Jews ; and when the " Orthodox " Russians direct their engines of persecution against the usurers of the Hebrew race, we are overwhelmed with columns of pathos. The time was when the Jews of Poland and of Russia sympathized with the Catholic victims of the Photian schismatics ; and this sympathy was natural, the Jews having suffered nearly as much as the Catholics after the partition of Poland, whereas in the ancient Catholic kingdom they had enjoyed extraordinary privileges ; for instance, in the eleventh century they enjoyed the right of imprisoning Christians for debt—a right which, among the Polish Christians, was exercised only by the nobles. In 1334 Casimir the Great pronounced the Jews *idonei et fideles*, and subjected them, just as the nobles were, to the common or territorial law, whereas the Christian burghers were subject to the more irksome Germanic municipal law. This Polish monarch even decreed that the testimony of a Christian should avail nothing against a Jew, unless it were corroborated by that of another Jew ; whereas the oath of a Jew sufficed to convict a Christian of debt, and he could levy on the property of that Christian, if such a course was necessary in order to obtain his money. Even after 1406, when public indignation against Jewish extortions excited a bloody persecution against them, and when many privileges were taken from them, the Jews retained their civil equality with the Christians, and were even allowed to teach in the Polish universities. When the Polish Jews passed under the Russian domination, among other new burdens they incurred that of subjection to military service. It is true that Alexander I. remitted this obligation in the case of all Jews who could pay a fine ; but Nicholas, from a population of two millions of Polish Jews, took twenty thousand for his army,

and many thousands of boys for his navy. This czar tried to subject the Polish Jews to the religious laws of his empire; and he designed to transfer them all in a body, when Russian conquests would have permitted, to some region beyond the Taurus.

When Alexander III. succumbed, in 1894, to the disease which had been the consequence of his attempted assassination in 1888, he was succeeded by his son, Nicholas II. Like those of his father, the first public acts of the young monarch promised a small but still acceptable measure of justice to his Catholic subjects. The victims of Krozé were allowed to return to their homes. General Orowski, the governor of Vilna, was summoned to St. Petersburg, to answer for his course in the fearful episode; but, like Cantacuzene, he cared not to survive his fall, and he blew out his brains in the railway carriage which was bearing him away from the capital. Gourko, the terrible executor of the mandates of Pobiedonostzef in the "Land of the Vistula," was placed on the retired list. Mgr. Vincent Popiel, archbishop of Warsaw, was allowed, together with two other Catholic bishops, to visit Rome—an authorization which had not been accorded during the previous fifty years. But a few days after the removal of Gourko, when the Poles had begun to realize the sweetness of easy breath, it transpired that Nicholas II. had written to him a letter of most affectionate praise—a letter in which the hand of Pobiedonostzef was plainly discerned. The czar lauded the "admirable" conduct of his governor-general; his "conscientious and energetic" method of welding the Polish provinces to the vast empire, "of which they are an integral part"; especially his zeal for the cause of official *pravoslavié*, as manifested by the erection of an "Orthodox" cathedral in the very centre of Warsaw. "By such efficacious means," concluded Nicholas II., "the influence of the Russian Church will be considerably augmented at the western confines of the empire." After the contents of this letter became public property, no surprise was expressed because the new sovereign deferred until after his marriage (November 16, 1894) any judgment in the case of the seminary of Kielecé, which had been closed because

some Polish books had been found in it. For this "crime" all of the professors had been arrested, and some of them had been deported to Siberia. We do not know, as we write these pages, whether any of these "conspirators" were included in the amnesty which, as usual on such occasions, followed the marriage of Nicholas II.; but we do know that since that amnesty very many priests have been exiled for just such "treasons" as they committed. Thus, some months afterward, twenty-four priests were deported; all being condemned to three or five years of exile, and all who were teachers being deprived forever of the right of teaching. In justification of this proceeding there was adduced a note found in a memorandum-book belonging to one of them, showing that they had entered into an agreement to aid each other in the difficulties which the incessant Russian persecutions of the Church would probably entail upon them. At this same time the Paris *Monde*, one of the few (even among Catholic) French journals whose anxiety for the Russian alliance permits them to speak candidly on these matters, narrated how the bishop of Sandomir, returning from a visit to Warsaw, whither he had been summoned to "welcome" the new governor, found a squad of police dragging one of his most worthy associates from the episcopal residence; and how, when the bishop attempted to embrace the unfortunate, he was thrust aside, an order having been issued by the government prohibiting all communication with the arrested. At that time, also, some humble peasants were dragged from the village of Minoga and deported to the depths of Muscovy, their offence having been a propagation of the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus—a devotion which the Russian State Establishment affects to regard as heretical. We hesitate, therefore, to yield credence to the recent reports concerning an intention on the part of Nicholas II. to grant some small measure of justice to his Catholic subjects.

## CHAPTER IV.

## THE MARTYRDOM OF THE NUNS OF MINSK.

Enough has been said in the previous dissertation to enable the reader to determine the sense in which the Russians are justified in terming Nicholas I. "ever-memorable" (*nezabvenny*). But there is recorded one episode of the reign of this czar which is so illustrative of the persecuting spirit of "Holy Russia," so redolent of the barbarism with which six centuries of schism have endowed the masses of the empire, that a special chapter is needed for its proper presentation. We shall condense our narrative from the sworn deposition of the principal sufferer, a deposition made before a commission appointed for the purpose by Pope Gregory XVI. (1). When Nicholas I. ascended the autoeratic throne of All the Russias, nearly all the Catholic convents in his dominions belonged to the Basilian Order (2), and one of the most flourishing was that of Minsk, in Lithuania. During the summer of 1838, Siemaszko, the episcopal apostate whom we have already introduced to the reader, had vainly endeavored to induce these nuns to join the "Orthodox" Church. When his third attempt had failed, he presented himself at the convent, and demanded of the

(1) *The Narrative of Makrina Mieczylawska, Abbess of the Basilianses of Minsk; or A History of a Persecution of Seven Years, Suffered for the Faith.* Brussels, 1846. The commission appointed by Pope Gregory XVI. to take the testimony of the abbess, was composed of Very Rev. Maximilian Ryllo, rector of the Urban College of Propaganda; the Very Rev. Alexander Jelowiecki, rector of the church of St. Claude, Rome; and the Rev. Louis Leitner, theologian of the Propaganda. Their labors began on November 8th, and ended on December 6th, 1845.

(2) The Basilian Order is probably the oldest in the Church, having been founded by St. Basil, bishop of Cesarea, in the fourth century; that is, St. Basil systematized for certain of his disciples a rule which had been followed, for at least two centuries, by many anchorites and cenobites, especially in Egypt. Nearly all the religious in the Orient still follow the rule of St. Basil. In the West this rule became known by the translation made by Rufinus (345-410); but it would seem that the Order was not established in western countries before the year 1057. Pope Gregory XIII. reformed the Order in 1579; and subjected the monasteries of the Italian peninsula, of Sicily, and of Spain, to one superior. It was at this time that Bessarion, a Greek Basilian who had abandoned the Photian schism, and had been made a cardinal, greatly abridged the rules of St. Basil, reducing them to the form in which they are now observed by the Catholic monks. The chief monasteries of the Basilians in the West are that of the Saviour in Messina, and that at Grotta Ferrata, near Rome; in both of which the average tourist is surprised when he hears the monks chanting the Divine Office in the Greek language.

abbess, Makrena, why she had not signed the act of abjuration which he had sent to her. The conversation which ensued was, on the part of the abbess, a series of heroic and apostolic rebukes to the apostate; and on the part of Siemaszko, an alternation of cajoleries and diabolic insults. On the third day after this scene, the wretched prelate, accompanied by the civil governor of Minsk, at the head of a company of soldiers, broke open the doors of the convent at 5 A. M. The nuns were in the act of proceeding to their chapel, and naturally each one started for her cell. But the soldiers barred the way, and at once the frightened creatures grouped themselves around their Mother. Then Siemaszko advanced and asked: "Whither were you going?"—"To the chapel, for meditation," replied the abbess. "Meditation," returned the bishop, with a sneer, and then he added: "By command of His Majesty I accorded you three months for reflection, but I have considered the matter, and have come to the conclusion that delay in action will only render you more obstinate. This present moment, therefore, is the last one you will have for a free choice. Which will you have—the revenues you now enjoy, and greater ones also from our magnanimous sovereign, if you embrace the Orthodox religion, or hard labor in Siberia if you refuse?" To this question the abbess replied: "Hard labor and a hundred Siberias rather than desertion from Jesus Christ and His Vicar!"—"But wait a bit," insisted Siemaszko; "when my rods will have stripped from you the skin with which you were born, you will be more amenable." A cry of indignation burst from all the religious, and one, Sister Wawrzecka, said: "Skin us, cut our flesh from our bones, and then crush those bones; you will find us even then faithful to Christ and the Roman Pontiff." At this the apostate burst into a torrent of blasphemies, and then ordered the soldiers to eject the nuns from the convent. "Blood of a Polish hound," he shrieked; "I will pluck out your tongue." The troops at once obeyed; but as the unfortunate women passed the chapel, the weeping abbess threw herself at the feet, not of the bishop, but of the civil governor, and besought permission to make a farewell visit to the Blessed Sacrament.

In spite of Siemaszko's protests, the governor assented, and the nuns all knelt, for the last time, in what is, to all religious, the dearest spot on earth—their own chapel. Thirty-five thus bent before their Sacramental Lord; thirty-four arose. One, Sister Rosalia Lanszecka, 57 years of age, who had been a religious thirty years, lay dead on the pavement.

When all had been thrust out of the chapel, the abbess again knelt before the governor, and begged that she might be allowed to carry on the road one of the crucifixes belonging to the convent. "It will teach us," she said, "to bear our own cross patiently." Again Siemaszko objected, but the governor yielded. He had already snatched from the hands of one of the nuns a richly ornamented crucifix which contained relics of St. Basil; but he gave to the holy Makrena a heavy processional cross, which she carried on her left shoulder throughout the ensuing march of seven days. As the little band took the road of exile, their orphans and pupils filled the air with lamentations, and many of the more courageous of the townspeople pressed on the wall of soldiers in an endeavor to touch the garments of the confessors of Christ. Bayonets were threatened, and the stocks of muskets were used to keep back the multitude; and after a league of march had been accomplished, the Sisters were chained in couples by both feet and hands. They were driven at the speed of a forced march, and those who sank to the ground, bleeding at nose and mouth, were aroused to some kind of strength with the lash. A sum of money equal to one of our dollars had been given to each nun, and this was to procure her food for a month; the governor promising that they would receive that sum each month. But scarcely were they on the road, when the commanding officer announced himself as their treasurer and provider, and appropriated the thirty-four dollars. During the seven days that the Sisters passed under his care, only once did he buy them any food, and that was a little bread and milk. On the first day these weak women walked forty-five miles, and this rate of travel was nearly always equalled. The nights were passed in the huts of the poorest peasants, and the soldiers, two of whom guarded each nun, allowed merciful hands to

give the fainting victims no article of cooked food. We may easily imagine the state of exhaustion in which they arrived at Witebsk, where they were to be confined for two years. Alas! their troubles had only begun.

At Witebsk there was a convent of Basilianesses, which, like all the houses of that Order in Lithuania, was dedicated to the Holy Trinity. Six months before Siemaszko's schismatic campaign in Minsk, the abbess of this community, an aged woman named Eusebia Tyminska, had undergone an experience similar to that of the Abbess Makrena. Not one of her eighteen subjects proved recreant to their duty and their faith, and all were expelled from their home, though not from the locality. A more exquisite torment than that of territorial exile had been devised for them. They were destined to be the menial servants—hostlers, scullions, farmhands, etc.,—of a community of schismatic nuns, who were transferred from the regions of the Don to occupy this Catholic sanctuary. Most of these so-called religious were widows of Russian soldiers, and utterly wanting in education or in anything even approaching refinement. The eighteen Basilianesses were quartered in a little shed adjoining the convent stables, and before the arrival of the nuns of Minsk, the Abbess Eusebia and four of her subjects had succumbed to fatigue, squalor, cold, blows, and starvation, and had gone to their Spouse in heaven. In her deposition, the Abbess Makrena says of the Black Ladies (*Czernice*, so-called from the color of their robes): "We never saw them at prayer or at work. Their days were devoted to the singing of obscene verses, to mutual recriminations, hair-pullings, etc. After some bloody scenes their *Igumena* or abbess would appear, a kind of crosier in her hand, and after condemning both parties to a number of prostrations before herself, she would pronounce a fine, which was destined for the purchase of brandy, of which all were accustomed to partake, even to drunkenness. Their nightly orgies ended in songs and hurrahs in honor of the Czar Nicholas, and thus these Black Ladies fulfilled their obligation to pray for the sovereign, from whom they derived their support and a pension, each one, of seven roubles a month." With such women for task-mistresses, it is not

strange that the thirteen faithful Basilianesses of Witebsk threw themselves at the feet of the Abbess Makrena, when, with her daughters, she was led to the squalid "community-room." With tears and moans the brave sufferers cried: "We have lost our mother. Adopt us, therefore, Mother, as your children, and together we will render glory to God." The popes (schismatic priests), Black Ladies, and guards immediately heaped blows and curses on their victims, but, nevertheless, said the abbess: "We prayed and wept together, and God consoled us." One of the first proceedings of the new jailers of our heroines was to separate the couples, probably because more labor would therefore be accomplished by their slaves. But chains were retained on the galled feet of the unfortunates, and there they remained during the seven years of the persecution. One of the most painful features of the tasks to which our religious were assigned, was the fact that they were generally supervised by F. Ignatius Michalewicz, a Basilian monk, and once almoner of their convent in Minsk. This wretched man was now a schismatic, and he repeatedly urged the faithful nuns to conform with the imperial decrees. He had been insane, said he, when he had insisted on fidelity to the Holy See; now his eyes were opened. He often beat these frail frames, and even threatened to have them flayed alive. But the nuns merely answered: "We are ready to follow St. Bartholomew, but we will not follow an apostate." The Abbess Makrena thus describes the day's programme: "Before six o'clock we were obliged to have the whole house cleaned and warmed, wood for the day prepared, water drawn and carried, and general order produced to hide the disorders of the previous night. At six we were led to our 'hard labor,' which varied with the seasons. In the beginning we broke stones, and transported the fragments in wheel-barrows to which we were chained. At midday we rested (?) for an hour. From one until night, hard labor. Then we were employed around the house, or in the kitchen, or in the stables. This work finished, we were locked in our shed, where our only furniture was some straw. But we had the cross we had brought from Minsk, and it was our church, our altar, our Master, our Father, our *all!* At its feet we spent the nights in vigil and

in prayer, often taking but two hours of sleep. We always performed at night such exercises of our rule as we could not perform during the day. We always began our prayers prostrate on the earth, with one for the conversion of the Czar Nicholas." The food assigned these weak women was so insufficient in quantity and quality, that hunger drove them, in summer, to search the fields for edible roots and plants, and in winter to purloin the food of the cattle. For this latter action they were often scourged by the Black Ladies, who would say that the food of cattle was too good for such obstinate creatures. Notwithstanding the cold of a Lithuanian winter, our nuns were never allowed any fire or extra clothing, and so their limbs were generally half-frozen and almost useless.

Makrena and her daughters had been at Witebsk about two months when an order arrived from Siemaszko, to the effect that each of them should receive thirty blows of a rod twice a week. Michalewicz increased the number to fifty. These flagellations took place in the courtyard of the convent, in the presence of Michalewicz, of several popes, deacons, and chanters, and of all the Black Ladies, and many of the people. The abbess thus speaks of this flagellation: "On each occasion, I asked for the decree of Siemaszko, and read it aloud to my Sisters. Then, first of all, I prostrated myself to receive the blows. It was not necessary to hold us; we were held down by the Cross of Christ. During the whole torture we seemed to be looking on Our Lord at the pillar, and the sight deprived us of the sensation of pain. We felt but one real agony, and that came from the state of entire nudity to which our tormentors always reduced us. But we joined even that shame to the ignominies endured by Jesus. The scourging over, we intoned the *Te Deum*, and then, without an instant's rest, we were led to our labor. Our path was marked by our blood, and frequently we found on our bodies pieces of flesh which had been detached by the rods. When weakness caused some of us to fall, blows would force them to arise. After one of the whippings, one of our Sisters, Columba Gorska, fainted at her wheelbarrow, but the blows of Michalewicz revived her, and she tried to propel it. At the first step she fell

dead. . . . Two other Sisters, Suzanna Rypinska and Coletta Sielawa, were killed by these scourgings." Sister Baptista Downar was burned alive in a large stove or furnace in which the Black Ladies had shut her, after having sent her in to prepare the fire. Sister Nepomucene Grotoska met her death at the hands of a schismatic abbess, who split her head with a log of wood, because the unfortunate had used a knife to remove some pitch from the floor.

Siemaszko had often rebuked Michalewicz for his continued failure to subdue the "obstinacy" of the Basilianesses; therefore, after they had been at Witebsk about two months, this wretch devised another means of conquering them. Hitherto our Sisters had enjoyed the consolation and encouragement derived from companionship. They were now divided, and located in four different prisons, each one more loathsome than the shed. The abbess and eight of her daughters were thrust into a dark, cold, and damp cave, which "was filled with worms which soon covered them from head to foot, and crawled into their eyes, ears, and mouths." Each party then began a novena to obtain the grace of perseverance. The only food allowed the abbess and her division during the nine days of this trial was found in such remnants of vegetables as had been spared by the worms; the other Sisters received each day half a pound of bran bread and half a pint of water. Every day Michalewicz visited the prisons with an act of abjuration for each Sister to sign, and he tried the old trick of representing to each division that the others had yielded. "Why, then," he would urge, "do you refuse to sign? Come; the other nuns have renounced the Roman Church, and are now content and free; even now they are drinking their coffee. Sign, my children; the coffee awaits you." And then he would turn to the abbess: "Would it not be better, madame, to become an abbess again, rather than be eaten alive by worms?" When the abbess refused, denouncing him as traitor, liar, and apostate, he crammed her mouth full of worms and filth, and retired. At length the martyrs were led out to resume their hard labor.

In the beginning of 1839, Siemaszko resolved to "conse-

crate" the ancient church of Witebsk to the Orthodox worship, and as he insisted on our Basilianesses taking part in the ceremony, they were led before him, and he went through the form of absolving them from their sins. But the abbess cried out: "God will have mercy on our souls without your absolution. Now that you are an apostate, you are no longer our pastor. Think not, then, of our souls, but do think of our bodies, and give us some food, for we are dying of hunger!" But the prelate merely advanced to the door of the church, and ordered the guards to force the nuns to enter. "We resisted with all our might," says the abbess, "and all the Sisters were covered with wounds. In a transport of superhuman strength I exclaimed: 'Sisters, in the name of Jesus Christ, lay your heads under the axe,' and I seized an axe which a frightened laborer had dropped; all my Sisters fell on their knees, and I adjured Siemaszko: 'You have been our pastor; be now our executioner! Like the father of St. Barbe, kill your children! Our heads may roll into your temple; our feet shall not carry us.' With a blow of his fist Siemaszko caused the axe to fall from my hand, and the blade made a deep wound in the foot of Sister Jakubowska. Then the apostate dealt me a fearful blow on the mouth, and knocked out one of my teeth. I took it up and said: 'Take it, monster, and preserve it as a souvenir of the most beautiful act of your life. Place it among those diamonds which cover your stony heart, and it will shine more brilliantly than any of the jewels for which you have sold your soul.' Then Siemaszko fell fainting into the arms of the attending popes, and the nuns were led back to their labor." Michalewicz, who had never been known to drink strong liquor while he was a Catholic, now always carried a flask of brandy in his pocket, and was nearly constantly drunk. One day, after leaving his victims, he fell head-first into a pool, and was drowned.

One morning in the autumn of 1840, two years after their arrival at Witebsk, the Basilianesses were led into the courtyard, where a company of soldiers were drawn up, waiting to conduct them to Polock. As in their previous journey, the nuns were chained in couples, by feet and hands. To add to

their misery, they were not allowed to bring their precious crucifix, being told that they were unworthy to carry it. During a march of two days they would have received many kindnesses from the peasantry, but a wall of bayonets shut off all communication with them. On their arrival at Polock, they were placed in a Basilian convent which, like that of Witebsk, had been given up to popes and Black Ladies. In this prison they found ten Basilianesses, the survivors of the old community of twenty-five; the others had died from the effects of treatment similar to that experienced by our nuns of Minsk, and in a few days two others, who had become crazy, expired in the arms of the abbess. These nuns of Polock, like those of Witebsk, at once seized the opportunity of resuming the practice of obedience, and acknowledged Makrena as their superioress. In a few days the drunken protopope, under whose custody they had been placed, discovered that the townspeople were in the habit of throwing bread to the nuns, and he therefore moved the Black Ladies and their charges to a large convent situated on the brow of a hill at a league's distance. Here the Basilianesses were employed, some in breaking stones (without hammers, but with larger stones), some in levelling a part of the hill on which Siemaszko intended to erect a palace. During the summer of 1841, seventeen of the nuns perished by various accidents, all of which could have been prevented by the popes who supervised the work, but who, when appealed to, only replied: "Let the earth swallow the Polish dogs!" And the Black Ladies applauded the sentiment. During the fall of 1841, Siemaszko again tried in person to induce the Basilianesses to join the schismatics, but with no more success than of old. After one of his useless attempts, he knocked out nine of Makrena's teeth, saying: "I shall teach you who I am; you must know that the Czar and I form one person." Then he exhibited a paper, signed "Nicholas," on which was written: "All that has been done, or will be done, for the advancement of the Orthodox religion, by the arch-arch-archbishop (that is, thrice archbishop—a phrase peculiarly Russian) Siemaszko, I approve, confirm, and declare holy, holy, and very holy; and I command that no one shall dare to resist him in any

way. In case of any opposition, the military authorities will at once comply with any simple requisition of Arch-arch-archbishop Siemaszko for an armed force. I sign this ukase with my own hand." Having read this decree, the brutal prelate again struck the abbess in the face, so injuring the upper cartilage of her nose that she never again spoke distinctly. Then he seized her by the shoulders, threw her to the floor, and trampled upon her. When this interview had terminated, the nuns were scourged, no count being kept of the number of blows, and that night one of the victims died in the arms of the abbess.

During the spring of 1842, one of the nuns, Seraphina Sczberinska, seventy-two years of age, died under the knout, and two others from its effects. The news of these repeated scourgings reached the ears of a Polish lady, the wife of an old general in command of the garrison of Polock, and she begged him to interpose in behalf of the Basilianesses. The couple arrived at the convent just as a scourging was about to take place, and the sight of the preparations caused the lady to faint, whereupon the general rushed on the protopope, Wierowkin, and tearing from his hand Siemaszko's order, he cried: "Wretched pope, are you then the executioner of these innocent women?" The pope answered that he merely obeyed the commands of the arch-arch-archbishop, and then the general declared: "If you do so, I will hang you; and when the Czar hears of my action, he may say that I am crazy, but in the meantime you will assuredly have been hung." The nuns were then led back to prison, and the general gave a hundred roubles to the protopope to buy nourishment for the starving creatures, but all they received out of this fund was a little bread and salt. The scourgings now ceased, and, remarks the abbess, "the general's compassion resulted, undoubtedly, in great good for us, since it became the occasion of still more cruel suffering." Foiled in a measure by the general's interference, the apostate bishop resolved on revenge; and he meditated on a unique and fearful one during a banquet, or rather an orgy, given by the Black Ladies in his honor.

Let the Abbess Makrena describe Siemaszko's attempt:

“He ordered the deacons, the clerks of the church, and all the men in the establishment, to outrage us in the most infamous manner, promising the grade of protopope to all who consummated the crime. . . . Terrible hour—it was a true hell. . . . Who could number the blows, the bites, the lacerations? Who could recount the blasphemies of the persecutors? The aid which we received from our Divine Spouse enraged them, they tore us with their nails, they bit us, and the prison was inundated with our blood. Two of our Sisters were trampled to death, eight had their eyes torn out, and their faces otherwise mutilated. Finally, the monsters, fatigued (and foiled), retired. . . . Then such of us as were able, knelt down, thanking God for this new agony. . . . I had three fearful bites on my arm, my side was opened so as to show the entrails, and my skull was fractured. A third Sister died that night in my arms. . . . Siemaszko departed at once. On the next day, Wierowkin came to remove the corpses, and to send the survivors to their labor. ‘Behold,’ said he, ‘how God punishes your obstinacy in not embracing our religion!’ The Black Ladies also came and blasphemed in the same manner, but not one gave us a drink of water.”

The spring of 1843 had passed, when one morning our martyrs were led to the courtyard, and, chained in couples as during previous journeys, were put on the march with the usual guard. They thought that Siberia was at last their destination, and some cried out: “So much the better—we shall suffer more,” and then they chanted a hymn in honor of St. Michael. But after twelve days of marching, they halted at Miadzioly, a small village in the province of Minsk. Here they were consigned to the guardianship of some Black Ladies, who had taken possession of a Carmelite convent, and were immediately assigned to menial work. In this house were two apostate Basilian monks, who became the cause of an increase in the woes of our nuns, for they would steal the linen put into the wash-tubs, and give it to the Jews for brandy, while the Sisters bore the blame of the loss. There were also two wealthy novices from St. Petersburg, and as the community expected a great addition of revenue on their profession, its grief and indignation were great when

one morning the young ladies announced their immediate departure from the convent. "This is not a religious house," they said, "it is a Siberia. We leave you, and God will punish you." Of course, new tortures were at once applied to our nuns. In the fall of this year Siemaszko again essayed his skill at perversion, but with the old result. In order to tone down, as he expressed his idea, "the accursed Polish blood" of the Basilianesses, he ordered that they should be "bathed" in the lake on the banks of which Miadzioly was situated. With the exception of the eight blind ones, all the nuns were then clothed in sackcloth chemises, which had but one sleeve, which served as a manacle to the two arms thrust into it. With strong ropes around their necks, the victims were then led through the village to the shore. The procession was accompanied by a throng of weeping Jews; and here we must not omit to notice that the abbess makes frequent mention of the sympathy and practical aid which the Jews always extended to our martyrs whenever opportunity allowed. Several small boats were ready, and two men were seated in each. A nun was placed behind each boat, her two tormentors holding the end of the rope which encircled her neck. Then the protopope Skrypin, the superior of the schismatic nuns of Miadzioly, declared: "If you do not embrace our religion, you shall be drowned like so many puppies." The reply was: "We will never abandon Jesus Christ." Then the boats put out into the lake until the water reached the breasts of the victims. Again the same threat and the same answer. A greater depth was now reached, and the poor nuns sank under the surface. Pulled up half-drowned, and half-strangled, the boats returned with them to the shore, where Skrypin repeated his exhortations. Meeting with the old refusal, he cried to the popes: "Drown them!" The Jews wept, the popes laughed, and the Black Ladies, from the upper windows of the convent, clapped their hands with joy. The torture was repeated again and again, the entire "bathing" lasting about three hours. When the half-dead women were forced back to their prisons, many weeping Jews threw provisions to them, but their manacled hands could not gather the needed restoratives. They passed the night in their

icy sacks, and their wounds were terribly aggravated. The second bath was received three days afterward, and so on until six baths had been suffered. In the third, two nuns were drowned; in the fourth, another nun fainted; and in the fifth she also was drowned.

During the following winter, '43-'44, seven of the Basilianesses became utterly helpless. Add to these the eight ones blinded at Polock, and we may judge of the weight of care borne by the few who were comparatively strong. One favor was granted to our Sisters at this time; they were permitted to gather wood from a neighboring forest, and to have a fire. But the snow was deep, their feet were manacled, and the distance to the forest was not slight; hence they could not often avail themselves of the privilege. At the end of the winter of '44-'45, only four nuns were able to be of any use to themselves or the others; but these four continued to knit, whenever opportunity allowed, and exchanged the product of their labors for food secretly brought by the kindly Jews. In March, 1845, the abbess began to wonder whether escape was really an utter impossibility. The unfortunates were hundreds of miles from the frontier, and in the heart of a bleak and hostile land. They were weak, scarcely clothed at all, and absolutely penniless. Makrena consulted with her three daughters, who were as yet in comparatively good health; and they eagerly besought her to watch for an opportunity, and in God's name to make the attempt. It certainly seemed cruel to abandon the blind and infirm Sisters; but if they could only make the civilized world understand what Russia was doing even in this vaunted nineteenth century, would not the condition of these sufferers be at least ameliorated? At any rate, the hope of liberty had taken possession of their souls, and they were soon mastered by it. Providence favored them. On March 29th occurred the feast-day of the protopope Skrypyn, and its usual celebration was a three days' carouse, in which all the popes, deacons, chanters, guards, and Black Ladies participated. On the third day of this year's feast, sodden drunkenness reigned supreme. About midnight the four nuns succeeded in raising a long trunk of a tree, so that one end

rested against the top of the wall surrounding the convent grounds. Up this the abbess climbed, and then found herself about thirty feet above the snow beneath. Making the sign of the cross, she leaped in safety. Sister Eusebia Wawrzecka followed; then Sister Clotilda Konarska, who had lost an eye at Polock. Sister Irene Pomarnaeka did not appear, and the others were trembling with apprehension, when suddenly she jumped to their side, covered with a heavy mantle which she had secured from a sleeping soldier. After brushing off the snow with which they were covered, the nuns repaired to a ruined chapel not far away, and there recited the prayers for the night. They then separated, beseeching Heaven that at least one of them might reach the feet of Christ's Vicar, to lay there the laments of a people martyred for their faith, of a people loudly demanding the return of their pastors who were then, and are in our own day, dying in prison, or groaning amid the snows of Siberia. Whether the three other Sisters eluded the Russian police we know not; but after wandering for three months in the forests of Lithuania, suffering from cold, hunger, and thirst, constantly pursued by soldiers and tracked by dogs, the Abbess Makrena reached the Prussian frontier, and finally knelt at the feet of Pope Gregory XVI. in October, 1845. As for the nuns whom she left at Polock, the abbess afterward learned that two of them died a few days after her flight, and that the others were placed in a hospital after much resistance on the part of Siemaszko, who insisted on their previous reception of the Holy Eucharist at the hands of a schismatic priest. When he failed to obtain this concession, the apostate consented to the removal to the hospital, on condition that no Catholic priest should ever be allowed to see the unfortunates; and this promise was given by the authorities.

## CHAPTER V.

THE EMANCIPATION OF THE CATHOLICS IN THE ENGLISH  
DOMINIONS. DANIEL O'CONNELL.

ON March 25, 1805, when Fox had moved, in the English House of Commons, that a petition for the relief of His Majesty's Catholic subjects should be referred to a Committee of the whole House, Pitt manifested the mind of the royal ministers in these words: "The question ought to be discussed on the ground of expediency alone. . . . I cannot allow that at any time, under any circumstances, or under any possible situation of affairs, it (the abolition of the Penal Laws) ought to be discussed or entertained as a claim or question of right." These sentiments of a truly typical English statesman of modern days, emitted thirty years after his Protestant fellow-countrymen had first begun to debate as to the necessity (not as to the propriety or justice) of removing some of the fetters which their Protestant zeal had rivetted on every Catholic in the British Empire, should be pondered by those innocents who have been led to believe that Catholic Emancipation in the realms of the Supreme Head of the Anglican Church was due to a cessation of treasonable practices on the part of the "massing-priests" and their benighted followers, or to a kindly disposition engendered in the Protestant heart by the presumedly mollifying tendencies of the nineteenth century. Fear, and fear alone, was the actuating motive of every Act of Relief from the Bill of 1774 to the Emancipation of 1829. The threatening attitude of the American colonists produced the Irish Act of 1774. In 1778, the French acknowledged the independence of the revolted colonies, and concluded with them a defensive treaty, which England treated as a declaration of war. Immediately afterward, the first Act relieving the English Catholics was brought into Parliament, and passed without opposition; and the first which repealed any of the Penal Laws against the Catholics of Ireland was also passed in College Green. The next Relief Act was that passed in Ireland, 1782, to conciliate the Catholics in face of a threat-

ened invasion from France. In 1790, when the thunders of the French Revolution were terrifying Europe, an Act was passed to amend a previous Relief Act which had not produced the effect intended; but, as the Protestant Sir Henry Parnell observed: "This common act of justice was not, in any degree, the result of an inclination on the part of the Government to treat the Catholics with more than customary liberality." The revolutionary upheaval in France threatening to involve all other European nations, the English Government realized the necessity of promoting, as far as possible, the union of all Englishmen; and an Act giving a certain amount of relief to English Catholics was passed in 1791. On January 21, 1793, Louis XVI. was executed, and on February 1 the National Convention declared war against England. Of course, Irish soldiers were again needed. Again, a conspiracy with republican tendencies was known to be forming among the Protestants of the North. It was most important to conciliate the Catholics; accordingly, to use the words of Moore, the very same Parliament which in 1792 rejected with scorn the whole petition of the Catholics, in the very next year granted most readily more than they asked for; and the Relief Act of 1793 was passed. Finally, nothing is more certain than that the Emancipation Act of 1829 was passed, as Wellington and Peel both avowed, to prevent a civil war in Ireland. "It cannot be denied that other causes besides fear operated in a certain degree to produce concessions to Catholic claims. The spirit of animosity against us had lessened in the breasts of many; the principle of religious liberty, as it is called, had taken deep root in some master minds, as in those of Burke, Fox, and Canning, and party feeling found the Catholic question a convenient one to bring to the front. But all these motives only brought the Protestant feeling of the country up to a certain point. The history of the Relief Bills clearly shows, that not one of them would have been passed at the time it was passed, if fear of something worse than concessions to Catholics had not driven our oppressors to action" (1).

(1) *The History of Catholic Emancipation and The Progress of The Catholic Church In The British Isles, From 1771 to 1830*, by W. J. Ankerst, S. J. London, 1886.

At the time when the first measure for some slight alleviation of the lot of British Catholics was enacted (1774), the blood of the faithful was not being shed, as in the days of Henry VIII., of Elizabeth, of James I., of Charles I., and of Cromwell. Then priests were not disembowelled alive as of yore, for the crime of saying Mass; then the laity were allowed to live, even though they "traitorously" denied the supremacy of His Majesty in religious matters. But if the Catholic priest and the Catholic layman were allowed to live, their persecutors took good care that life should have few charms for them. In the eleventh year of William III., "of pious and immortal memory," an Act had been passed "for the further preventing the growth of Popery." It was decreed that whoever, after March 25, 1700, should "apprehend a Popish bishop, priest, or Jesuit, and convict him of *saying Mass*, or of exercising his functions within the realm," should "receive of the sheriff of the county for every such conviction the sum of £100, to be paid within four months, upon tendering the judge's certificate of the conviction." If the sheriff made default in payment, he was to forfeit £200. It further enacted that "every Popish bishop, priest, or Jesuit *who should say Mass*, or exercise his function; *every Papist keeping school, educating or boarding youth for that purpose*," should suffer perpetual imprisonment. It enacted that "persons educated in, or professing the Popish religion, who" should "not within six months after they attained the age of eighteen, take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and make the Declaration *In 30 Car. II.*" (1), should "be disabled (but not their heirs or posterity) to inherit or take any lands, tenements, or hereditaments within this kingdom. And during such persons' lives, until they should take the said oath, the next of kin, being a Protestant," should "enjoy his lands," etc., without being accountable for the profits. It further enacted that after April 10, 1700, "every Papist" should be disabled "to purchase lands in this kingdom, or any profits out of

(1) This was the declaration commonly called the "Declaration against Popery." The Act 30 Charles II. cap. 2, was the Act which disabled Catholic peers from sitting and voting in the House of Lords.

the same." Whoever should convict a person *of sending his child or ward "beyond the sea to be educated in Papacy,"* was to receive as a reward the whole penalty of £100, inflicted by the Statute III. of James I. Finally, if the "Popish parents" of Protestant children should refuse them a fitting maintenance, in order to compel them to change their religion, the Act gave the lord-chancellor power to order as he should think proper. That the lives of the Catholic clergy and schoolmasters were passed in continual anxiety because of this "ferocious Act," as it was styled by Edmund Burke, will be readily believed. The reigns of William of Orange and of Anne were signalized by the perpetual imprisonment of innumerable "massing-priests"; and even during the reign of George III., whose personal relations with Catholics were frequently marked by kindness (1), very many clergymen died in prison. Charles Butler tells us, in his *Historical Memoirs*, that he inquired in 1780 "respecting the execution of the Penal Laws against the Catholics, and found that the single house (firm) of Dynely and Ashmall in Gray's Inn had defended more than twenty priests under such prosecutions, and that, greatly to their honor, they had generally defended them gratuitously." As late as 1780, Edmund Burke, in his celebrated speech at Bristol, took occasion to say: "It is about six or seven years since a clergyman of the name of Malony, a man of morals, neither guilty nor accused of anything noxious to the State, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment for exercising the functions of his religion, and after lying in gaol two or three years, was relieved by the mercy of Government from perpetual imprisonment, on condition of perpetual banishment." The last clergyman tried for the heinous offense of celebrating Mass seems to have been Mgr. James Talbot, the coadjutor to the venerable Bishop Challoner, and a scion of the noble House of Shrewsbury. Talbot was prosecuted several times, his last trial taking place in 1771; but fortunately

(1) Butler thought that the personal friendliness of George III. toward many Catholics was caused by his remembrance of the great kindness shown to his father, Prince Frederick of Wales, by the Duke of Norfolk. George III. himself was born in the duke's town-house in St. James's Square.

there were not wanting technicalities which saved him (1).

At the time when English Protestants first began to reflect that perhaps it might be well for the British Empire, if some trivial measure of justice were doled out to their Catholic fellow-subjects, there were in England not more than seventy thousand of the faithful. The axe, the rope, the disembowelling knife, and the spirit of this world (armed with the ostracizing Penal Laws), had done their fell work very thoroughly; accuracy would probably be consulted if the number of English Catholics in 1774 were set down as about sixty thousand. The reader must remember that at that time the great Irish immigration, which was to so richly endow the English Church with numbers, virtue, and even temporal means, had not yet begun; Burke, in the already-quoted speech at Bristol, said that then the Irish in London were less than five thousand, and it is certain that nine tenths of the Irish immigrants of the day were located in the capital. In 1780, Joseph Berington, an excellent au-

(1) Some of the judges were loath to condemn priests for the "crime" of saying Mass. Lord Mansfield, when lord chief justice, put every obstacle in the way of their conviction. "Two things had to be proved: that the accused was a priest, and that he had said Mass. The counsel for the prosecution argued that it was only necessary to prove that he had said Mass; for if he had said Mass he must be a priest, for no one but a priest could say Mass. Lord Mansfield laid it down in his charge to the jury, that each of the two facts—namely, that the accused was a priest, and that he had said Mass—must be supported by independent proof; that the jury must be first satisfied that he was a priest without regarding the fact that he had said Mass. His lordship further observed, that if the jury were to convict a man of being a priest on the ground that it had been sworn he had said Mass, they would run a great risk of convicting an innocent person. He said a man must be better acquainted with the ceremonies of the Mass than most Protestants were, in order to be able to swear that what he had seen was the Mass, and not any other ceremony. And supposing the ceremony to have been correctly performed, even that would not prove the man going through it to be a priest, as it was well known (and Lord Mansfield mentioned a particular case which had actually occurred) that the Mass had been so well imitated by an impostor, that even Catholics themselves had been taken in. His lordship concluded by repeating to the jury that they must have some positive proof that the accused was a priest, such as his ordination papers, or something equally authentic; that that proof neither he, the lord chief justice, nor the jury would ever be able to get. In this way Lord Mansfield obtained the acquittal of Mr. Webb, whose trial we have mentioned above. For this justice to Catholics, Lord Mansfield had his house pillaged, and his own life endangered two years afterwards during the Gordon riots. . . . On one of the occasions when Bishop James Talbot was tried for saying Mass, the following dialogue occurred: Lord Mansfield: "You say this man is a priest?" Informer: "Yes; I saw him say Mass. He had vestments on." Lord Mansfield: "Do not the Catholics say that the Mass essentially consists in certain words?" Informer: "Yes." Lord Mansfield: "Did you hear those words?" Informer: "No; they are said secretly." Lord Mansfield: "How, then, can you swear he said them?" Informer: "Oh, he had vestments on." Lord Mansfield: "If I were to put vestments on, would you say I was a priest?" AMHERST: *loc. cit.*, ch. 2.

thority, speaking of the probable number of the Catholics in his country, said: "From the best information I can procure, their number does not at this day exceed sixty thousand, and this even I suspect to be far beyond the mark." Of this number several thousands were among the working-people of Lancashire and Staffordshire; in London a few of the middle and of the laboring class had preserved their faith; but in the rest of England the light of Catholicism still shone only at the firesides of some half-score of the higher nobility, and among very many of the "county families," who lived in enforced retirement on such remnants of their ancestral estates as had been left by two centuries of enormous fines for their non-attendance at Protestant service, and by the legalized robberies committed by their apostate relatives. The lot of these county families was certainly happy, when compared to that of their fathers and grandfathers; but they were ostracized socially as well as politically, and the law of the realm ever obtruded itself to remind them that the amenities and conveniences of cultured life were only for those who cursed the Pope. Thus, although the law did not forbid a Catholic to own a horse worth more than £5, it empowered any loyal Protestant to tender £5 for the animal, and then, no matter what its value was, and whether the offer was rejected or accepted, to appropriate the prize (1). The social ostracism of the English Catholic gentry at the time of which we treat is bitterly deplored by Charles Butler, whose leniency toward his heretical countrymen was extreme even unto absurdity. "No person," says Butler, "who was not alive in those times, can imagine the depression and humiliation under which the general body of Catholics then labored. Often in early life has the writer heard the ancestors of the Catholic youth of that period tell them, that they could form no idea of the sufferings of the Catholics in the beginning of

(1) The late Charles Thomas Clifford told Father Amherst that his grandfather, Lord Arundel, was riding one day behind four valuable horses, when a Protestant "gentleman" drove up, offered £20 for the animals, unharnessed and drove them away, and left the nobleman sitting in his horseless carriage. About the same time, said Mr. Clifford, an Irish gentleman was made the object of a similar legalized highway-robbery; but before the loyal Protestant thief could present the "legal tender" for the coveted property, the benighted Celtic Papist had shot the horses dead in their traces.

the last century. He, in his turn, can now aver that the present Catholic youth can form no idea of the lamentable state of the Catholics, so lately as in the reign of George II. and the first years of George III. They cannot picture to themselves the harsh, the contemptuous, and the distressing expressions which at that time a Catholic daily heard, even from persons of humanity and good breeding. At a court ball, a Catholic young lady of very high rank, distinguished by character, by beauty, and by the misfortunes of her family, was treated with marked slight by the lord-chamberlain. 'It is very hard,' she exclaimed, 'to be so treated; after all, I was invited!' and burst into tears. They were noticed by Queen Caroline; and, when Her Majesty learnt the cause, there was not a kind, a generous, or a soothing excuse which she did not make to her. While this compassionate gentleness showed the amiable mind of the queen, the unfeeling rudeness of the chamberlain as strongly showed the temper of the times" (1). One of the most painful evils then suffered by English and Irish Catholics was the practical impossibility of obtaining for their children an appropriate education in their native land. All who could afford, by dint of prudent economy, to send their sons to one of the numerous English or Irish colleges on the continent, sent them cheerfully, whether or not the lads were destined to the sacred ministry. Similarly the daughters of the English and Irish Catholic gentry found in foreign convents the religious and polite training which was denied them at home. The names of the English and Irish establishments at Rome, Paris, Lisbon, Salamanca, Douay, and St. Omer, will tell future generations how great was the literary as well as the religious ambition of English and Irish Catholics during the period when the sons of the Reformation would have steeped them in ignorance. "We may fairly say," remarks Amherst, "that schools which gave to the world such men as Alban Butler, Challoner, O'Connell, and Milner, have made their mark in the history of the Church. Those who can remember to have met in their boyhood many of the Catholic gentlemen who had been brought up at St. Omer's and

(1) *Historical Memoirs*, Vol. iii., p. 277.

Douay, must remember also their polished and courtly manners, their taste for literature, and that patriotic and independent tone of mind which they preserved, while living in their country seats under the ban of their own country. The English Catholic ladies of that period had been chiefly educated in those convents abroad, the establishment of which began in the days of Elizabeth. Those who have seen the lists of names preserved in any of those communities which returned to England at the time of the French Revolution, have observed how many young ladies of old English families remained in the houses they were brought up in, to serve God in the religious state. And many Catholic families still remaining, scattered over England, have to thank God that those revered communities sent back to England every year, young maidens who in after life formed as grand a class of Christian mothers as the world has ever seen. We can remember some of them still. What strong faith, what matronly bearing, what a deep sense of the responsibility they felt was upon them, to be the guardians of religion and morals in the Catholic families of England, and that with them rested in great measure the charge of handing down truth and virtue to their posterity!" (1). Our limits preclude our dilating on the melancholy condition of His Britannic Majesty's Catholic subjects at the time of the Emancipation (2). We shall merely add that during the first years of this nineteenth century, men, still in the prime of life, told how they had always carefully bolted the door of the chapel (some secluded loft or attic) when the trembling congregation had assembled for Mass, lest some spy should give evidence against the "massing-priest." To this day in the Baptismal Register of the Church of the Holy Apostles in Norwich, may be seen a flyleaf, on which is written: "A Register of Baptisms copied from Mr. Angier, beginning from September, 1775; no one being kept before, by reason of the Penal Laws."

(1) *Loc. cit.*

(2) The curious reader may consult *A Hundred Years Ago*, published by Washbourne, London, in 1877.

The first indication of any willingness of English Protestants to allow to their Catholic fellow-subjects the enjoyment of much more than the breath of life, and an indication which the beneficiaries observed with astonishment, was the statute (*11 and 12 George III.*) which was enacted in 1771, and entitled: "An Act For The Reclaiming Of Unprofitable Bogs." This brilliant reformatory measure provided that "Papists (in Ireland) might take fifty acres of unprofitable bog for sixty-one years, with *half an acre* of arable land adjoining, provided that it should not be within one mile of a town." Sheil regards this Act as "the first step in the progress of concession" (1). The step was certainly microscopic; but in 1774 the English prime-minister, Lord North, forced the so-called "Irish Parliament," the docile creature of the imperial government, to enact a measure for the relief of the Irish Catholics which was not entirely nugatory. In America the English colonists were defending with increasing boldness the theory of "no taxation without representation"; their respectful remonstrances were giving place to open threats of armed resistance; in fine, the royal ministers could not close their eyes to the fact that they should either abandon their pretensions to a despotic control over His Majesty's lieges beyond the sea—a thing not to be considered, even as a remote possibility—or resign themselves to an expensive and stubborn war with the recalcitrants. For such a war both soldiers and sailors were necessary, and Ireland could furnish more than her reasonable quota of both; for such a war, no hope of success could be entertained, if the ever-smouldering fires of Irish revolt were once fanned into vivid flame by the breath of transatlantic patriotism. Evidently Ireland was to be conciliated, at least to some extent. North introduced two successive Bills of Relief into the Protestant parliamentary body then sitting in Dublin; but probably because the members did not believe that the minister wished to be taken at his word, they refused to accept even the ministerial idea of justice for their Catholic compatriots. Lord North was desperate, and he ordered the semblance of a representative body to throw

(1) *Legal and Political Sketches*, Vol. ii., p. 161.

some bone to the snarling Irish Papists. Such was the origin of the Relief Bill of 1774, which was entitled: "An Act to enable His Majesty's subjects, of whatever persuasion, to testify their allegiance to him" (1). This document is interesting; for the oath which it prescribed was the first proposed by Protestant England to Catholics which was not condemned by the Supreme Pontiff. The Act reads as follows: "Whereas many of His Majesty's subjects in this kingdom" (that is, Ireland) "are desirous to testify their loyalty and allegiance to His Majesty, and their abhorrence of certain doctrines imputed to them, and to remove jealousies which hereby have for a length of time subsisted between them and others of His Majesty's loyal subjects; but *on account of their religious tenets* are, by the laws now in being, prevented from giving public assurances of such allegiance, and of their real principles, and good will, and affection toward their fellow-subjects: in order, therefore, to give such person an opportunity of testifying their allegiance to His Majesty, and good will towards the present constitution of this kingdom, and to promote peace and industry among the inhabitants thereof, be it enacted: By the King's Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in the present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the 1st day of June, 1774, it shall and may be lawful for any person professing the Popish

(1) It has been said that this instalment of consideration was due to the good offices of the Earl of Bristol, who was then the Anglican "bishop" of Derry. The Rev. Thos. England, in his *Life of Father Arthur O'Leary*, writes that the Protestant prelate, while passing through Toulouse in France, was invited to dinner by the superiors of the Irish College in that city. At this dinner the Protestant guest expressed his regret that his kind hosts should be obliged to spend the best part of their lives in a foreign land. But he added, that he could not understand why his countrymen should refuse to the sovereign of their native country that allegiance which they gave to the monarch in whose dominions they were living. This observation drew forth from the hosts a denial of its truth. A long talk ensued, the result of which was that when the Earl of Bristol left the college, he was convinced of the loyalty of the Irish Catholics, and of the falsehood of the gross charges that were made against them. On his return to Ireland, he spread the statement that the Catholics were ready to testify in any reasonable way their loyalty to King George; and this persuasion, concludes Father England, led to the preparation of the Act of 1774. But, as Amherst reflects, while it may be true that the friendly disposition of the Protestant prelate contributed to a willing acceptance of the Act by his co-religionists, there can be no doubt "that the real origin of this first overture to the Catholics was the same that caused all further concessions to us, namely, fear on the part of the English government."

religion to go before the Judges of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, any Justice of the Peace for the county in which he does or shall reside, or before any magistrate of any city or town corporate, wherein he does or shall reside, and there take and subscribe the oath of allegiance and declaration hereinafter mentioned; which oath and declaration such Judges of the King's Bench, Justices of the Peace, and magistrates are required to administer." The reader will perceive that in the preamble of this Act the Protestant official framers naively admit that the English and Irish Catholics are suffering "because of their religious tenets," and not because of their politics, as was to be afterward alleged by such Protestants as were sufficiently gracious to be somewhat ashamed of the Penal Laws enforced by their religious forbears. The gist of the preamble is simply this admission: the Catholics had been charged with disloyalty; and precisely because they were Catholics, they had been forbidden to attempt to disprove the accusation. As to the value of the Act of 1774 and its appreciation by the Irish Catholics, Thomas Moore wrote: "The next great benefit bestowed upon the Catholics was the allowing them to take the Oath of Allegiance; and this kind permission to the victim to come and swear eternal fidelity to his tormentor, though as insulting a piece of mockery as can well be imagined, was received with the warmest gratitude by the Catholics, because it, at least, acknowledged their existence as subjects, and put an end to that lively fiction of the law which would have returned *non est inventus* of two millions of people" (1). In his *Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell*, Fagan says: "Up to 1774, the laws, to use the expression of a zealous lord-chancellor of former days, 'did not presume a Papist to exist in the kingdom; nor could they breathe without the command of Government' (2). At that time the American colonies were beginning to proclaim their wrongs, and were struggling successfully against the arbitrary dictation of England. The British Government, con-

(1) *Memoirs of Captain Rock*.

(2) This sage observation was emitted in 1759. See England's *Life of Arthur O'Leary*, p. 50.

scious that they had no hold on the affections or gratitude of the people of Ireland, deemed it prudent to recognize the Irish Catholics as subjects, without, at the same time, admitting them to the slightest privilege under the laws. They were then for the first time permitted, forsooth, to swear allegiance to the sovereign and become subjects of the Crown; and yet even this paltry enactment, which was deemed an act of grace by the helot Catholics of that day, was not passed without the positive demand of the English Government, so deeply prejudiced at that time were the Irish Parliament and the Protestant party against the great mass of the community. This Act of condescension was passed from dread of American contagion, and without Catholic agitation."

The next instalment of relief was extended to His Britannic Majesty's Catholic subjects in 1778. During the previous three years the American colonies had been in full revolt; France and Spain had recognized their independence of English rule; it was well understood that Russia, Holland, and Denmark, had determined to observe an "armed neutrality" in the conflict; and France was about to send to the seat of war that army which afterward determined at Yorktown the result of the American Revolution. Soldiers were needed sadly; for of the thousands of Germans whom the English government had hired to support the British forces against the American patriots, nearly all had been either killed or captured. Why should England hire more Germans, when better war material was at her command in Ireland? But would the Irish enlist? In their desperation the ministers proposed in the Commons the Relief Bill, *18 Geo. III., Cap. 60*. The introducer, Sir George Saville, said that "one of his principal views was to vindicate the honor and to assert the principles of the Protestant religion, to which all persecution was, *or ought to be* (happy qualification!), wholly adverse." In his speech supporting the bill, Dunning, the solicitor-general, referred to the Act of William III., which it was proposed to repeal in part, in these terms: "Some of its clauses have now ceased to be necessary, and others were at all times a disgrace to humanity. The imprisonment of a popish priest for life, only for officiating in the services of

his religion, was horrible in its nature, and must, to an Englishman, be ever held as infinitely worse than death. Such a law, in time of so great liberality as the present, and when so little was to be apprehended from these people, called loudly for repeal; and he begged to remind the House, *that even then they would not be left at liberty to exercise their functions, but would still, under the restriction of former laws, be liable to a year's imprisonment, and to the punishment of a heavy fine.*" Mr. Dunning concluded, according to the report, by saying: "With respect to the encouragement held out by it" (that is, by the Act) "to those children who were base enough to lay their hands on the estates of their parents, or which debarred a man from the honest acquisition of property, it needed only to be mentioned in order to excite the indignation of the House." When the bill came to its second reading in the House of Lords on May 25, the Protestant incumbent of the see of Peterborough, John Hincheliffe, admitted that "there might be particular circumstances which might make delay inconvenient"; but he felt it to be his duty to remark: "Permit me, my lords, to say that I am not so ignorant of the genius of Popery as not to know it is a very difficult matter to consider its religious principles altogether distinct from that political superstructure which has been raised upon them, and to the support of which, I cannot but fear, that should occasion offer, they might still be made too subservient" (1). Nevertheless, the bill became a law, and another step toward Catholic Emancipation had been taken. Those clauses of the Act of William III. which ordered the prosecution of "bishops, priests, and Jesuits," were repealed; also that clause which subjected any Catholic keeping a school to perpetual imprisonment; and the one which rendered all Catholics incapable of acquiring real estate, giving such property to the nearest Protestant relative. But there still remained on the statute-book other laws which prohibited as criminal the exercise of priestly functions, and the keeping of Catholic schools; the sole relief afforded by the Act of 1778 as to these mat-

(1) Such are the words of the divine, as given in Hansard's *Parliamentary History*, Vol. xix., p. 1142.

ters was the provision that whereas hitherto any informer could prosecute the priest or Catholic teacher, thereafter the prosecution was to be undertaken by the attorney-general; or at least the informer was not to receive any reward. And there still remained the prohibition to send a child to a foreign land for a Catholic education. Butler may well observe that limited indeed were the legal benefits which Catholics derived from the Act of 1778; but he discovered some extra-legal advantages as accruing from the measure: "It shook the general prejudice against them to its centre; it disposed their neighbors to think of them with kindness; it led the public to view the pretensions to further relief with a favorable eye; and it restored to them a thousand indescribable charities in the ordinary intercourse of social life, which they had seldom experienced. No Catholic, who recollects the passing of the bill, will ever forget the general anxiety of the body, while it was in its progress through the Parliament, or the smile and friendly greeting with which his Protestant neighbor met him the day after it had passed into a law" (1). The worthy nephew of Alban Butler was ever on the alert to discover some occasion for a manifestation of his unmerited good feeling toward his heretical and persecuting compatriots; but the Vicars-Apostolic in the kingdom, in their Pastoral Letters to the faithful, issued on the occasion of this instalment of relief, seem to have found in it but little consolation (2).

(1) *Loc. cit.*, Vol. iii., p. 294.

(2) Bishop Challoner, Vicar-Apostolic for the London District; Bishop Hornoyd, V. A. for the Midland District; and Bishop Walton, V. A. for the Northern District; issued this Pastoral:

"DEAR BRETHREN,—The great Apostle St. Paul, writing to his beloved disciple Timothy, and in him instructing all Christian pastors of souls, desires first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings (Eucharists) should be made for all men, for kings and all that are in high station and authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all goodness and chastity. For this is good, saith the Apostle, and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour. It is a duty we owe to our princes by His Divine ordinance, and the very principal part of that honor, which we are to give them, which is so much insisted upon in the Word of God. Wherefore, dear brethren, that both you and we may religiously comply with the most indisputable precept of God's own law, we take this occasion of addressing these lines to you in this public manner, requiring that all and every one of you should offer up your most ardent prayers to the Almighty, for our most gracious Sovereign King George III., and his Royal Consort Queen Charlotte, and all their royal family, and also that in your respective congregations (when you shall be able to meet, without danger to yourselves or your flocks from the many grievous penal laws which stand out

The Act of 1778 did not extend to either Ireland or Scotland; the former country immediately received a similar measure of justice, but the Scotch Presbyterians convinced the royal ministers that they would never tolerate any concessions to the Papists. A solemn fast was proclaimed by the Presbytery of Glasgow; and on Oct. 18, 1778, the Sunday following the appeal to heaven, the fanatics attacked the small congregation of Catholics in the little house that served them for a chapel, razed the building, and pelted the faithful with mud and stones. On Feb. 9, 1779, the same zealots burned the house of a Mr. Bagnal, in which Mass was being celebrated. In Edinburgh, a chapel had been formed out of a room in a house in Leith Wynd; therefore, on Jan. 29, 1779, circulars were distributed throughout the city, calling on every lover of the Kirk to appear at the Leith Wynd on the following evening, for the purpose of "pulling down that pillar of Popery lately erected there." The house was plundered and fired. On the next day the mob plundered another house in Blackfriars' Wynd, in which a chapel had been improvised; and in the evening the children of John Knox were on the point of wreaking their vengeance on Robertson, the celebrated historian, who had evinced some sympathy for the persecuted, when the military restored order. As Amherst reflects: "The animosity of the Scotch against the Church was, and still is, much stronger and deeper than that of the English. By many English Protestants the Church is hated more on political than on religious grounds, though in the minds of the majority there is no doubt a great revulsion from the Church's teaching. But in Scotland the predominating sentiment is undoubtedly a fierce, and, if I may be allowed the expression, a fiendish hatred of the dogmas of the Christian

against the Catholics of this kingdom) you shall recommend the rest of the faithful to offer up also their prayers for the same intentions: this being a duty which by the law of God all Christian people owe to their respective sovereigns."

The Pastoral of Bishop Walmsley, V. A. for the Western District, is of the same negative tone, unless when he betrays the abject downheartedness of his people by telling them that they should pray "because of the *extraordinary favor* newly granted to them by the Act of Parliament"; and when he urges that "the *great humanity of government toward us suggests a propriety of behavior on our part, in using the present indulgence with caution, prudence, and moderation.*"

Church. Hence the riots in Glasgow and Edinburgh were purely directed against the Catholics; it was the property of Catholics only which was destroyed: whereas in London the destruction of Catholic property immediately developed into general licence. Mr. Wilkes, speaking in the House of Commons in the year 1779, on the bill for the relief of Protestant Dissenters, said that "the progress of knowledge in almost every nation had softened the rigor of their laws respecting religious worship, or at least had, in a degree, suspended their execution, Scotland alone excepted" (1). Shortly after the Presbyterian demonstrations on which we have merely touched, Edmund Burke informed the House of Commons that he had a petition to present "from several of His Majesty's Catholic subjects of North Britain." By command of the king, Lord North informed the House that His Majesty, having learned the object of the petition, *recommended* it to the consideration of the members (2). The substance of this petition, the composition of which was probably the work of Burke, was a request for compensation for losses in the Scotch brigandage, and for future protection. The tone of the document is humble even unto abjection. "We are far, very far, from entertaining a resentment against any one whatsoever, or from desiring that any person should be called to account, much less should be punished, for the injury done to us; we forgive from the bottom of our hearts; and should any person be taken into custody, or prosecuted on our account, *if we were worthy to be heard*, we should presume to petition in the most earnest manner for his pardon." The suppliants even protest that, "considering the present flame that is raised" against them, they "cheerfully lay aside all thoughts of asking for any relaxation of" the Penal Laws at that moment. When begging for present and future protection,

(1) HANSARD; *loc. cit.*, Vol. XX., p. 320.

(2) This recommendation by George III. is worthy of the attention of us who have been wont to give that monarch credit for nothing whatever. "With only superficial knowledge," observes Amherst, "a Catholic might be inclined to look unfavourably upon George III., merely because he opposed the final Emancipation Bill; but, as a matter of fact, he was the first to begin and to develop our emancipation, and, up to the point of admitting Catholics into Parliament, he was to us by far the most liberal sovereign, indeed, the only liberal sovereign, who had governed England up to that time."

they say: "We most humbly beg leave to assure this honorable House that this our earnest request for protection is not made without the strongest reason, for the same unprovoked enemies who have hitherto persecuted us in so cruel a manner, far from being satisfied with their late success, have made it a ground for further violence. Those who never threatened us without executing their menaces, have published and dispersed a sort of manifesto, calling upon all orders of people strictly to enforce the execution of the most sanguinary laws upon us, denying the authority of Parliament to repeal those laws, or any other laws made before the Union, threatening the magistrates with the same violence which they have employed against your petitioners, if they do not cause them to be executed; representing those means of banishing and putting to death your petitioners as their rights and privileges, and proposing associations against buying or selling, borrowing or lending, or having any of the ordinary intercourse of society with those of our religion, and threatening to proceed against all who shall refuse to join them in those measures, as if they were Papists; and they have, in their late violent attempts against some of the most respectable characters in the Established Church of Scotland, shown how far they are capable of acting against such as discover any degree of moderation in their sentiments: in a word, nothing can be more deplorable and (without the effectual aid of the Legislature) more hopeless than our condition."

It was during the debate on the petition of the Scotch Catholics that the infamous Lord George Gordon made his first parliamentary speech against concessions to Popery. The sentiments of his second speech, delivered on May 5, were treasonable as well as incendiary; but the House suffered him to continue. However, when he moved that Burke's petition "be thrown over the table," and that "all further proceedings on the said petition be postponed to this day three months," no member saw fit to second the motions. But the comparative liberality of this House was no index of the mind of the English people of that day. The fire started in Scotland had reached London; the capital was ready for the

Gordon Riots. "Of a sudden," writes Lord Stanhope, "like a meteor rising from the foulest marshes, appeared those fearful riots, to which the most rank intolerance gave origin, and Lord George Gordon a name. Then the midnight sky of London was reddened with incendiary fires, and her streets resounded to the cry of an infuriated mob; then our best and wisest statesmen had to tremble, not only for their lives, but for their hearths and homes; then for once in our annals the powers of government and order seemed to quail and succumb before the populace of the capital in arms. . . . It might be said, with but slight exaggeration, that for two days the rabble held dominion in the town. It might be said, in the eloquent words of Gibbon, an eye-witness to these proceedings, that 'forty thousand Puritans, such as they might be in the time of Cromwell, have started out of their graves'" (1). The history of these six fearful days is at the easy command of the serious student; the *Barnaby Rudge* of Dickens will furnish a not very unsatisfactory narrative to those who prefer to derive their history from fiction. Here we shall merely note that the conduct of the Catholic clergy and laity during the Gordon Riots was admirable. In his speech at Bristol, the Protestant but chivalrous Edmund Burke said: "There was one circumstance (justice will not suffer me to pass it over) which, if anything could enforce the reasons I have given, would fully justify the Act of Relief, and render a repeal, or anything like a repeal, unnatural, impossible. It was the behavior of the persecuted Catholics under the acts of violence and brutal insolence which they suffered. I suppose there are not in London less than four or five thousand of that persuasion from my country, who do a great deal of the most laborious work in the metropolis, and they chiefly inhabit those quarters which were the principal theatre of the fury of the bigoted multitude. They are known to be men of strong arms and quick feelings, and more remarkable for a determined resolution than clear ideas or much foresight. But though provoked by everything that can stir the blood of men, their houses and chapels in flames, and with the most atrocious profana-

(1) *History of England*, at year 1780.

tions of everything they hold sacred before their eyes, not a hand was moved to retaliate, or even to defend. Had such a conflict once begun, the rage of their persecutors would have redoubled. Thus, fury increasing by the reverberation of outrages, house being fired for house, and church for chapel, I am convinced that no power under heaven could have prevented a general conflagration; and at this day London would have been a tale. But I am well informed, and the thing speaks it, that their clergy exerted their whole influence to keep their people in such a state of forbearance and quiet as, when I look back, fills me with astonishment; but not with astonishment only. Their merits on that occasion ought not be forgotten; nor will they, when Englishmen come to recollect themselves. I am sure it were far more proper to have called them forth and given them the thanks of both Houses of Parliament, than to have suffered those worthy esqyemen and excellent citizens to be hunted into holes and corners, whilst we are making low-minded inquisitions into the number of their people; as if a tolerating principle was never to prevail, unless we were very sure that only a few could possibly take advantage of it. But, indeed, we are not yet well recovered of our fright. Our reason, I trust, will return with our security; and this unfortunate temper will pass over like a cloud."

The year 1778 saw the passage of an Act for the relief of the Irish Catholics, as well as of another for those of England. By this measure it was enacted that Irish Catholics, provided they took the Oath of Allegiance prescribed by the Act of 1774, might hold leases for nine hundred and ninety-nine years, or "determinable upon any lives, not exceeding five." The lands of Catholics were made transferable and devisable, and Catholics were allowed to hold those lands which might descend or be transferred to them (1). But a radical improvement in the lot of the Irish Catholic was effected in 1782, when the hitherto obtaining penalties were abrogated for such priests as registered their names and residences in the manner prescribed by the Act. Such a favor was not granted to English priests until 1791. And

(1) BUTLER: *Loc. cit.*, Vol. iii., p. 487.

we may imagine the feelings of the Irish when another Act, passed in the same year. 1782, permitted a Catholic to teach. This privilege also was withheld from the English until 1791.

A few words must be devoted now to the organization styled "The Protestant Association," for the formation of which the chief responsibility must be ascribed to John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, and a firebrand whom Dr. Milner, one of the most prominent and interesting figures of that day, unhesitatingly denounced as the chief author of the Gordon Riots (1). Treating of the Act of 1778, Milner says: "Which, however small in itself, was as great as the temper of the times would bear. For now the *green-eyed monster* of religious jealousy, who had so long slept over his unresisting prey, at the first appearance of its escape from his cruel fangs, began to rouse himself to all his native fury. The pulpits of the lower sort, particularly those of John Wesley and his associates, resounded, and the presses of the metropolis groaned, with hypocritical lamentations on the pretended increase of Popery, and the fatal consequences to be apprehended from the late indulgence granted to its professors; a religion which, it was asserted, had slain its thousands by its cruelty, and its tens of thousands by its ignorance. By these and other inflammatory harangues, a society was collected together at the beginning of the ensuing year, 1779, under the title of *The Protestant Association*, professedly instituted on the plan of similar associations in the last century, and particularly on that of the 'Solemn League and Covenant,' which produced the murder of the king, and the subversion of the Constitution. The pretext which was held out to the public . . . was the preservation of the civil constitution and the Protestant religion, by petitioning Parliament for a repeal of the late Act. . . . In the course of the same year, an *appeal from the Protestant Association to the people of England* was published and dispersed all over the kingdom, inviting the people to form similar associations in the different counties. . . . At a general meeting towards the close of that

(1) *An Inquiry Into Certain Vulgar Opinions About Ireland*, Note to Third Letter.

year, it was unanimously resolved that, 'on account of the noble zeal for the Protestant interest, which had distinguished the parliamentary conduct of Lord George Gordon, he should be requested to become the President of the Association.' The 2d of June, in the year 1780, will be ever memorable in the history of this country, for the presentation of the grand petition of the London Associators to the House of Commons by Lord George Gordon" (1). The most direct incentive to the Gordon Riots was Wesley's *Defence Of The Protestant Association*, in which, among many incendiary utterances, the fanatic mouthed this absurdity: "*An open toleration of the Popish religion is inconsistent with the safety of a free people, and a Protestant government. Every convert to Popery is by principle an enemy to the Constitution of this country*" (2). As an immediate preparation for the Gordon Riots, the "pious" founder of Methodism published a tirade, invested with would-be logical forms which would probably captivate the attention of such ignoramuses as deemed themselves capable of pondering a syllogism, whereby he proved, to the satisfaction of the average Protestant (whether of the Establishment or a Dissenter), that "*no government ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.*" Since such were the sentiments and the ignorance—affected or real—of the "gentle and tolerant" Wesley, it is not strange that his followers, far less well-informed than he was, should have ever manifested a senseless rancor against the Catholic Church. It is the fashion, among certain writers of the English Establishment, as well as among others who belong to the American Protestant Episcopal progeny of that Establishment, to regard John Wesley as a well-meaning enthusiast; but he was a veritable firebrand. "One of his first principles," says Amherst, "was no toleration to Catholics; he inculcated it in

(1) *Letters To a Prebendary*, No. vii.

(2) This Wesleyan opinion of the loyalty of Catholic converts was re-echoed by Gladstone in 1874, when, fuming because of the recent definition of Papal infallibility in matters of faith and morals, he audaciously said: "No one can become a convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another." And a century had passed since Edmund Burke felt himself justified in proclaiming: "Our reason, I trust, will return with our security; and this unfortunate temper will pass over like a cloud."

his followers, and he urged it by actual persecution. Hatred of the Church may be said to be almost as much of the essence of Methodism, as hatred of Christianity is of the essence of Mohammedanism. Hence there are very few converts amongst the Methodists. The anti-Catholic riots of 1779 and 1780 were the work almost entirely of Presbyterians and Dissenters; and Presbyterians and Dissenters are to this day the most obstinate maintainers of heresy, and the most determined haters of God's Church. This is shown in England by an extreme unwillingness on the part of Dissenters, especially of the Methodists, to listen to the voice of truth; and it is shown in Scotland, among the Presbyterians, by the instinctive horror which they seem to have of everything Catholic, I might almost say of everything Christian, and the rudeness with which they show it by word, look, and gesture. In the Church of England, *as a Church*, it is impossible, indeed, for a Catholic to see anything respectable; but *amongst the members* of the Church of England there are many who not only lead blameless lives, but are gradually preparing themselves to receive the truth."

In 1791, the storms of the French Revolution having warned the British ministers to procure as much unity as possible among the subjects of His Majesty, the Parliament of England passed a fourth Relief Act which not only contained a considerable measure of justice (albeit presented merely as an *expediency*), but was, in some respects, a better bill than that of the final Emancipation of 1829. The preamble of this Act terms the Catholics "Papists"; but those who were to take the prescribed Oath of Allegiance, one which said nothing concerning royal religious supremacy, were to begin their asseveration with the words, "I do hereby declare that I do profess the Roman Catholic Religion." No person could receive the benefit of the Act, unless he had taken the Oath. Having taken that Oath, one could not be prosecuted for non-attendance at Protestant service, or for being a "Papist," or for saying or hearing Mass, or for being a priest, or for belonging to any religious order, or for performing any rite or observance "of the Popish religion, or maintaining or assisting others therein." But it

was decreed that no religious worship should be held by the "Papists," until the place had been certified by the Quarter Sessions; and that no priest should officiate in that place, until a description of his person had been recorded by the nearest Clerk of the Peace. The benefit of the Act was to be forfeited by any priest who officiated in any place which had a steeple or a bell, such appurtenances being prerogatives of His Majesty's Establishment. The benefit of the Act was to be forfeited also by a priest who officiated at a funeral in any church or churchyard, that is, who would officiate in a once-sacred locality which had been desecrated by sacrilegious theft. The same benefit was forfeited by the priest who should wear the habit of his office, or officiate in any manner, outside of his certified chapel, unless in a private house, where there should not be assembled more than five persons in addition to those of the regular household. Schoolmasters of the "Papist persuasion" could teach, if they had taken the Oath; but no Catholic could teach in any endowed school, notably not in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. It was declared that "nothing in this Act contained should make it lawful to found, endow, or establish any Religious Order or society of persons bound by monastic or religious vows, or to found, endow, or establish any school, academy, or college, by persons professing the Roman Catholic religion within these realms, or the dominions thereunto belonging; and all uses, trusts, and dispositions, whether of real or personal property, which immediately before June 24, 1791, shall be deemed to be superstitious or unlawful, shall continue to be so deemed and taken" (1). The most satisfactory feature of

(1) "In the year 1791, there was, as far as I know, no religious house of men in England. The French Revolution had at that time driven across the Channel the English houses established on the Continent. But there were many men in England belonging to Religious Orders. They were scattered about on various missions. . . . Although by Section XVII. of the Act no Order could be established, the members of Religious Orders then in England were included, and *nominatim* included, in the full benefit of the Act; for Section III., which protects from persecution persons who had taken the Oath, extends to any one "entering or belonging to any ecclesiastical order or community of the Church of Rome. . . . The Act of 1829 contains, as is well known, clauses for providing for the gradual suppression of Religious Orders; but the Act of 1829 goes further than the Act of 1791 and makes a most invidious distinction between the secular and regular clergy then in England: for 'Jesuits,' who had the distinguished honour of being specially named, and members of other religious orders, communities, or societies of the Church of Rome, bound

this Act of 1791 was its enactment that thereafter no one should be summoned to take the Oath of Supremacy whereby His Majesty of England was acknowledged as Head of the Church in England, or to subscribe to the Declaration against Transubstantiation (*25 Charles II.*). Another pleasing item in the Act is the announcement that the statute (*William and Mary, S. I., Cap. IX.*) banishing Papists or reputed Papists from London and Westminster, would no longer apply to such Papists as took the Oath of Allegiance. Perhaps the few Catholic peers of the realm derived some satisfaction from the repeal of the statute (*30 Charles II., S. 2, Ch. I.*) which forbade their entrance into the king's presence, or even into any building where he might be. Catholics of legal and forensic proclivities were certainly gratified by the intelligence that now they could become lawyers, notaries, etc. The Act of 1791 was certainly a boon to the persecuted Catholics of England and Ireland; but not until 1793 did the Catholics of Scotland receive their first instalment of relief. We say that the Act of 1791 was a boon to its beneficiaries; but it must not be forgotten that there were introduced into it, Relief Act though it was, cer-

by monastic or religious vows,' are obliged by the Act of 1829 to register themselves as such. And moreover, whereas the Act of 1791 allowed a man to 'enter an order,' that is, to take the vows of Religion in an Order, the Act of 1829, made any man who should do so liable to banishment, and if he evaded that sentence, to transportation for life. In short, whereas by the Act of 1791, though no one could found or establish an Order, any one might enter an Order; by the Act of 1829, any one entering an Order is punished as a felon. So that the Act of 1829 virtually repealed a portion of the relief which had been granted by the Act of 1791.

Are the Catholics of the United Kingdom generally aware that the great Emancipation Act deprived us of benefits which were granted when the repeal of the old penal laws began; that Religious Orders, before the law, have been since the Emancipation Act, and still are in a worse position than they were in between the years 1791 and 1829?

The attention of the legislature has several times been directed to the clauses of the Emancipation Act against Religious Orders. Some attempts have been made to obtain the repeal of those clauses, though the Catholics of England have never backed up the attempt as they ought to have done. A few years ago the subject was spoken of in the House of Commons, and Lord Beaconsfield, then in the Lower House, opposed the repeal of the clauses against Religious Orders, on the ground that though Jesuits and others were now perfectly harmless, yet they might become dangerous, and it might be as well to hold the clauses over them *in terrorem*. Passing by the expression of unjust suspicion in which we may hope Lord Beaconsfield had too much sense to be sincere, it may fairly be said that whatever may be the opinions of the great "Liberal party," the Conservatives of England, at least, might be well content to allow a man to enter a Religious Order in the year 1880, when William Pitt, the whole bench of Bishops, the Houses of Lords and Commons unanimously, and King George III. himself, were content to allow a man to do so in the year 1791. AMHERST; *loc. cit.*, Vol. i., ch. 6.

tain penal provisions which continued to torment the Catholics until the reign of Victoria (*9 and 10 Vict., Cap. 59*). It was ordered that "no schoolmaster professing the Roman Catholic religion should receive into his school for education the child of any Protestant father." It was declared that nothing contained in the Act "should be construed to give any ease, benefit, or advantage to any person who should by preaching, teaching, or writing, deny or gainsay the oath of allegiance, abjuration, and declaration therein-before mentioned and appointed to be taken as aforesaid, *or the declaration or doctrines therein contained, or any of them.*" The first provision was certainly a galling infringement of the parental rights of a British subject, and must have weighed heavily on the heart of the presumed Catholic mother. The effect of the second provision will be appreciated by the reader if he remembers that in the Oath of Allegiance—that tardily modified Oath which Catholics could conscientiously take, and by the taking of which alone they could profit by the Act—the juror was made to imply that a Catholic was, by force of his religion, addicted to "evasion, equivocation, and mental reservation"; that he might feel justified in evading the obligations of the Oath, because of a presumed "dispensation already granted by the Pope" to commit perjury in the matter at issue. The Act of 1791 declared that its beneficial effects could not be experienced by any one who would presume to defend himself and his religion against these insulting implications.

The passage of the Act of 1791 produced no other effect in Scotland than to render its Protestants more virulent than ever in their hatred of their Catholic fellow-subjects. At this time, there were very few Catholics in the Lowlands of Scotland; in Glasgow, where now there are one hundred and twenty thousand of the faithful, then a few score of the persecuted heard Mass in a private room with fear and trembling. Before the days of men who are still in the prime of life, the Holy Sacrifice was not offered publicly between Edinburgh and Berwick-on-Tweed. In the Highlands, the faith had fared better; nearly all the Macdonalds, Chisholms, and Frasers, as well as several other less important clans,

had been ever loyal to the Cross. The entire number of Catholics in the ancient Northern Kingdom was not more than thirty thousand, when, on April 22, 1793, the lord-advocate of Scotland stated in the House of Commons that "His Majesty's Catholic subjects in Scotland were incapacitated by law from either holding or transmitting landed property, and were liable to other very severe restrictions, which could not *then* be justified by any necessity or expediency." The advocate therefore moved "that leave should be given to bring in a bill to relieve persons professing the Roman Catholic religion from certain penalties and disabilities imposed on them by Acts of Parliament in Scotland, and particularly by an Act of the 8th of King William." On April 23 the advocate continued his speech, insisting that the Roman Catholics of Scotland labored under many hardships, and on account of their faith. "By one law an oath, called a formula or solemn declaration, was imposed upon them, which they could not take without renouncing the religion which they professed; and if they refused to take it, their nearest Protestant relation might deprive them of their estates." The advocate stated that "it was repugnant to justice and humanity that a subject should be deprived of his estate for no other reason than that he professed the religion most agreeable to his judgment and his conscience, or that he should be placed in the wretched situation of holding his estates at the mercy of any Protestant relation who might be profligate enough to strip him of it by enforcing this penal law. The liberality which had induced the House last year, and on a former occasion, to grant relief to the Roman Catholics of England, would, he was persuaded, induce them to extend relief also to the Roman Catholics of Scotland, whose loyalty and conduct gave them an equal claim to the indulgence of the Legislature. He admitted that the particular law to which he referred was too odious to be often carried into execution, but if it was not fit that it should be executed at all, it ought not to be suffered to remain, merely as a temptation to the profligate to strip honest and meritorious people of their property." He said that he was extremely sorry

to inform the committee "that there was, at that moment, a suit actually depending in the courts of law in Scotland founded on this particular statute. A Roman Catholic gentleman, as respectable and amiable in character as any man in this or any other kingdom, was possessed of an estate of £1,000 a year, which had been in his family for at least a century and a half. This gentleman, loved and respected by all who knew him, was now on the point of being stripped of his property by a relation, who could have no other shadow of claim to it than that which he might derive from this penal law, which he was endeavoring to enforce. In the courts as much delay as possible was thrown in the way, but it was to be feared that he must succeed at last, and reduce to beggary a gentleman in every respect a most meritorious subject. If it was too late to save him from such a misfortune, the Legislature, he trusted, would interpose, and take care that he should be the last victim to a cruel law, and that it should never operate in future to the destruction of any other person; for surely it was no longer to be endured that a man should be placed in the horrid situation of either renouncing the religion of his heart, or, by adhering to it conscientiously, forfeit all his worldly substance" (1). Whether or not the Commons felt the force of the advocate's argumentation, their fears of the consequences of the French Revolution were just then at their height, and the Relief Bill for the Scotch Catholics was introduced and passed. The Lords followed suit, and the king signed the Act, to the consternation and fury of the spiritual progeny of John Knox (2).

(1) BUTLER; *Loc. cit.*, Vol. iv., p. 104.

(2) "There can, I think, be no doubt that there is a greater and more deeply rooted hatred of the Church in Scotland, even to this day, than in England. . . . In England, a pseudo-hierarchy, claiming to be descended from the old Catholic hierarchy, has kept up the old form of Church government. The English have acknowledged the authority (?) of bishops and priests, and object only to Catholic bishops and Catholic priests. But the Scotch abolished all episcopal and sacerdotal authority, and therefore speak of bishops and priests with a virus unknown in England; and this virus is so bitter that no social laws of courtesy or good manners can keep it within the bounds of propriety. Besides this, the work of destruction was so completely done at the time of the Reformation, that the Christian feasts which were respected by the Anglicans were abolished by the Scotch. John Knox and his followers knew that to root out everything that was Catholic, they must destroy as far as possible everything that was Christian. And so great was their desire to put an end to everything Catholic, that they determined to obliterate from the minds of Scotch-

The last year of the eighteenth century was signalized by the passage of the Act for the Legislative Union of England and Ireland; and on the first day of the nineteenth century that Act went into effect. In order to render the Irish Catholics favorable to the Union, Pitt had given them to understand that he considered an Act of Relief as a necessary accompaniment of an Act of Union, and, furthermore, he had implicitly averred that he would introduce a bill authorizing the admission of Irish Catholics into Parliament. But when the great minister, after the first meeting of the new Parliament on Jan. 22, 1801, broached the crucial subject in a cabinet council, His Majesty being present, his venturesomeness resulted in a return of the "king's illness," as the periodical insanity of George III. was euphemistically designated by all loyal Englishmen of that day. In his *Life of Pitt*, Lord Stanhope shows that George III. himself ascribed the recurrence of the "illness" to Pitt's proposal of emancipation: "On Friday, the 6th of March, the king . . . was clear and calm in mind. . . . With respect to Mr. Pitt, His Majesty used the following words—'Tell him I am now quite well. . . . But what has he to answer for, who is the cause of my having

men the recollection even of the great feasts of the Church. The feasts of Christmas, Good Friday, Easter, and Whitsuntide were abolished. With the abolition of the feasts, the reality of the mysteries celebrated lost their hold on men's minds; until at this day the words Christmas Day, Good Friday, Easter, and Whitsuntide bring to the minds of Scotchmen, even of educated Scotchmen, no idea whatever in any way connected with religion. In England there is a great deal that is political, as distinguished from dogmatical, in the hatred which is directed against the Church. Although the foundations and the more solid portion of the superstructure of British liberties were laid in Catholic times, the enemy of mankind has succeeded in possessing the English mind with the absurd but most deplorable delusion that the Catholic religion is opposed to the liberties of the people. Hence, all that miserable cant about "popery and slavery" is so constantly uttered, to the unspeakable disgust of all British and Irish Catholics. But in Scotland hatred of doctrine absorbs every other sentiment. Scotch Presbyterians seem to have this hatred always ready for expression. And as they emphatically hate the Catholic Church, so they appear to hate the members of the Church, and especially, of course, the priests of the Church. A Catholic priest cannot walk the streets of a town in Scotland without seeing in the countenances, and sometimes hearing from the mouths, of at least one half of the Scotch people whom he may meet, signs and expressions which convey the idea that they are saying in their hearts what the Pharisees of old cried out against our Lord: "Crucify Him, crucify Him!" The Church would look for its worst enemies amongst those whose religious thoughts were full of sadness and gloom. It is said in Scotland that the ministers who are most followed, are those who show the most cleverness in persuading those who "sit under" them that they form a portion of the elect. But in meeting these saints coming from church on a Sunday, a person might fairly judge by their appearance—awful in every respect—that the minister had undoubtedly convinced them that they were all predestined to eternal loss." AMHERST, *Ubi supra*, p. 276.

been ill at all?' Pitt was deeply affected; and, before Mr. Addington, authorized Dr. Willis to tell His Majesty that during his reign he would never agitate the Catholic question—that is, whether in office or out of office. . . . Dr. Willis, in a letter to Pitt, says: 'I stated to him' (the king) 'what you wished, and what I had a good opportunity of doing; and after saying the kindest things of you, he exclaimed, 'Now my mind will be at rest!' Upon the queen's coming in he told her your message, and he made the same observation upon it.'" Pitt resigned his office of prime-minister, and, to quote the words of Dr. Aikin, "the sole reason assigned by him for resigning the post he had so long held with the applause of a great part of the nation, was his inability to carry the proposed measure in favor of the Catholics; and in a paper circulated in his name throughout Ireland, which he did not disavow, he assured the Catholics that he would do his utmost to establish their cause in the public favor (though he could not concur in a hopeless attempt to force it now), and prepare the way for their finally attaining their object" (1). There has been much diversity of opinion in regard to the real reason for Pitt's resignation of office in 1801. Therry, the friend of Canning, and the editor of that statesman's speeches, says: "Pitt resigned in consequence of his inability to carry a measure of relief, which he had given the Irish every reason to expect as the result of the Union" (2). But Alison opines: "The personal objections of the king to the removal of the Catholic disabilities, to which Mr. Pitt considered himself pledged as a consequence of the Irish Union, afford at least the ostensible reason for the resignation of that minister and his personal adherents, which took place on the 1st of February; the real cause, more probably, was the reluctance of Mr. Pitt to be personally concerned in concluding peace with France, which he saw could not be much longer delayed" (3). But Lord Stanhope believed that Pitt himself assigned the true reason: "It has often been said, both in England and abroad, and even now perhaps the rumor has not wholly died away, that the

(1) *Annals of George III.*, p. 107.(2) *Canning's Speeches*, Vol. v., p. 359(3) *History of Europe*, Epitome, p. 184.

cause assigned by Mr. Pitt was only his ostensible, and not his real motive. It has been asserted that he withdrew from office on account of the difficulties which he experienced or expected in the way of making peace. Lord John Russell and another eminent critic have some years since sufficiently disposed of this hostile allegation. The original documents bearing on the question, some of which have lately come to light, must, I am sure, convince every careful and dispassionate reader that any such idea is entirely unfounded”(1). But whatever was the reason of the great statesman's resignation, the fact was providential for the welfare of the Church in the English dominions. It is certain that if Pitt, at that time, had carried through parliament, and if he had induced George III. to sign, a bill for Catholic Emancipation, or even a partial Relief Bill, the Act would have been loaded with what were termed “securities” for the good behavior of the Catholics, especially those of Ireland. Of no comfort to the Catholics would it have been, to have beheld the fetters of the Penal Laws stricken from their limbs, if immediately they were loaded with the more galling chains of a royal power of “veto” on the appointment of a bishop, and of a clergy salaried by the British government—measures which Pitt, through Lord Castlereagh, had asked the Irish bishops to accept.

The question concerning the feasibility of allowing an heretical government to interfere in the appointment of bishops, the “Veto Question,” as it was termed, agitated the Catholics of the United Kingdom for many years; and its own intrinsic importance, no less than its bearing on the matter of Catholic Emancipation in the English dominions, demands that we accord to it a brief but careful consideration. The scheme of the royal veto, coupled with the idea of a state-supported Catholic clergy, first appears to the attention of an investigator of our day in that famous letter to Lord Kenmare, which the Irish Protestant but just Edmund Burke wrote under the caption of *A Letter To A Peer Of Ireland On The Penal Laws Against Irish Catholics*. From this letter, dated Feb. 21, 1792, we take the following passage: “Be-

(1) *Loc. cit.*, Vol. iii., p. 309.

fore I had written thus far, I heard of a scheme of giving to the Castle the patronage of the presiding members of the Catholic clergy. At first I could scarcely credit it; for I believe it is the first time that the presentation to other people's alms has been desired in any country. If the State provides a suitable maintenance and temporality for the governing members of the Irish Roman Catholic Church, and for the clergy under them, I should think the project, however improper in other respects, to be by no means unjust. But to deprive a poor people, who maintain a second set of clergy out of the miserable remains of what is left after taxing and tithing—to deprive them of the disposition of their own charities among their own communion, would, in my opinion, be an intolerable hardship. Never were the members of one religious sect fit to appoint the pastors to another. Those who have no regard for their welfare, reputation, or internal quiet, will not appoint such as are proper. . . . It is a great deal to suppose that even the present Castle would nominate bishops for the Roman Church of Ireland, with a religious regard for its welfare. Perhaps they cannot, perhaps they dare not, do it. But suppose them to be as well inclined as I know that I am to do the Catholics all kind of justice, I declare I would not, if it were in my power, take that patronage on myself,—I know I ought not to do it." On Jan. 29, 1795, Dr. Hussey, in time first president of Maynooth College, and finally bishop of Waterford, writes to Burke: "Some plan is likely to be thought of by Parliament for the appointment of Catholic bishops. The *election* to rest with the clergy, and the election of one out of three so elected to be in government, or something similar" (1). To this Burke replies on the 24th of February as follows: "This is a great crisis for good or evil. Above all, do not listen to any other mode of appointing your bishops than the present, whatever it is; no other elections than those you have; no Castle choices." The Veto Question next appears in 1799, when Pitt is preparing for the Union. The minister commissioned Castlereagh, the chief secretary to the lord-lieutenant, to

(1) *Correspondence of The Right Hon. E. Burke*, edited by Lord Fitzwilliam, Vol. iv. p. 268.

sound the Irish bishops on the matter. Ten of the then twenty-nine Irish prelates were then in Dublin, having assembled for consideration of the affairs of Maynooth College; and Castlereagh consulted them "on the double plan of a State provision for the Catholic clergy, and of a government interference in the appointment of their successors" (1). So anxious were these ten bishops to obtain Emancipation, that they adopted a series of resolutions indicating a willingness to accept the governmental propositions, *but taking care to refer the matter to the Supreme Pontiff for final adjudication* (2). This not easily excused mistake of ten Irish bishops was the cause of much dissension in the Catholic ranks throughout the United Kingdom. Re-

(1) MILNER; *Supplementary Memoirs*, p. 115.

(2) RESOLUTIONS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC PRELATES IN 1779.

"At a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates, held in Dublin, the 17th, 18th, and 19th of January, 1779, to deliberate on a proposal from Government, of an independent provision for the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland under certain regulations, not incompatible with their doctrine, discipline, or just principles: It was admitted, that a provision through Government for the Roman Catholic clergy of this kingdom, competent and secured, ought to be thankfully accepted. That, in the appointment of the prelates of the Roman Catholic religion to vacant sees within the kingdom, such interference of Government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person appointed is just, and ought to be agreed to. That, to give this principle its full operation, without infringing the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, or diminishing the religious influence, which prelates of that Church ought justly to possess over their respective flocks, the following regulations seem necessary: I. In the vacancy of a see, the clergy of the diocese to recommend, as usual, a candidate to the prelates of the ecclesiastical province, who elect him, or any other they may think more worthy, by a majority of suffrages; in the case of equality of suffrages, the Metropolitan or senior prelate to have a casting vote. II. In the election of a Metropolitan, if the provincial prelates do not agree within two months after the vacancy, the senior prelate shall forthwith invite the surviving Metropolitans to the election, in which each will then have a vote; in the equality of suffrages, the presiding Metropolitan to have a casting vote. III. In these elections, the majority of suffrages must be *ultra medietatem*, as the canons require, or must consist of the suffrage of more than half the electors. IV. The candidates so elected to be presented by the president of the election to Government, which, within one month after such presentation, will transmit the name of the said candidate, if no objection be made against him, for the appointment to the Holy See, or return the said name to the president of the election, for such transmission as may be agreed on. V. If Government have any proper objection against such candidates, the president of the election will be informed thereof within one month after presentation; who in that case will convene the electors to the election of another candidate. *Agreeably to the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, these regulations can have no effect without the sanction of the Holy See, which sanction the Roman Catholic prelates of this kingdom shall, as soon as may be, use their endeavours to procure.* The prelates are satisfied that the nomination of parish priests, with a certificate of their having taken the oath of allegiance, be certified to Government. (Signed) Richard O'Reilly, Edward Dillon, P. J. Plunkett, Daniel Delany, James Caulfield, Thomas Bray, F. Moylan, Edmund French, John Cruise." PLOWDEN; *History of Ireland Since the Union*, Vol. iii., app. no. 2.

ferring the reader to the valuable work of Amherst for details of this lamentable dispute, we would state here that while it is true that some of the "Vetoists" appeared to be willing to make of the English sovereign a virtual head of the Catholic Church in his dominions (in matters of discipline), their opponents, by far the *savior pars* of the Catholic body, made a sad mistake when they charged Bishop Milner (after O'Connell, the foremost standard-bearer of Emancipation) with a willingness to surrender the liberties of the Church. O'Connell was one of these accusers of the zealous prelate; but when undeceived, he apologized handsomely for his rashness. As for the ten Irish bishops who took the first false step toward Emancipation, their mistake was corrected on Sept. 14, 1808, when the entire Irish hierarchy, assembled in Dublin, resolved: "It is the decided opinion of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, here assembled, that it is inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode, hitherto observed, in the nomination of Roman Catholic bishops, which mode, by long experience, has been proved to be unexceptionable, wise, and salutary. Resolved, that the Roman Catholic prelates pledge themselves to adhere to the rule by which they have been hitherto uniformly guided; namely, to recommend to His Holiness only such persons, as candidates for vacant bishoprics, as are of unimpeachable loyalty and peaceable conduct." Milner says, in his account of the meeting, that the prelates "universally regretted that the proposal of Government in 1799, *with which the far greater part of them now became acquainted for the first time*, had been acceded to." Certainly this action of the Irish hierarchy was necessary; for a very large number of the English Catholics had credited the assertion, made by Lord Grenville in the House of Lords, that the Catholics of Ireland declared themselves perfectly willing to accede to the proposal that the Crown should exercise an *effectual negative* in the appointment of bishops. The Veto Question was now laid aside for a time. Had the Vetoists carried their point, the best that the Catholics could have hoped for would have been a Concordat between the Holy See and the British government; and as Father Faber once

remarked, "a Concordat is like a Catacomb." History shows that when the Church once concedes a right to the State, the State is inexorable and tyrannical in its use of the concession. "When an alliance between Church and State," says Amherst, "may be compared to a happy marriage, it is a very pleasant state of things; husband and wife agree perfectly together, and children love father and mother as children ought. But unfortunately an alliance between Church and State, formed by what is commonly called a Concordat, may be compared to a mere *mariage de convenance*, in which the parties are forced together against their will; an unhappy marriage, one that does not turn out well. In the present state of things, the relations between the Church and the State in the United Kingdom cannot be compared to a marriage of any kind. But still the Church and the State on the whole live together on friendly terms: there is even a certain amount of mutual respect; things are going on smoothly. May this long continue; or, rather, I will say, may it continue until the happiest of marriages can be contracted. One word more on this subject. There may be two opinions amongst the Catholics of the United Kingdom on the propriety of beginning diplomatic relations between the Holy Father and the Court of St. James's; there can be but one opinion about a Concordat."

Returning now to the chronological order of our subject, we notice that on May 15, 1804, Pitt resumed office; and that his former experience—the certainty of an attack of insanity befalling his royal master, if the subject of Catholic Emancipation were mentioned—had not been forgotten. Just before he resumed his portfolio, he wrote to Lord Chancellor Eldon a letter which was to be laid before the king, and which contained the following passage: "The state of Ireland and the delicate and difficult questions which may arise respecting the internal condition of that country are scarcely less deserving attention. I need not repeat to your lordship what has long since been known to His Majesty, how fully my own determination has been formed to prevent His Majesty being ever *disquieted* (a euphemism for "rendered insane") for a moment, as far as depends on me, by a renewal

of the proposition which was in question three years ago, respecting the extension of privileges to the Catholics; but I cannot help seeing that, although my conduct under all circumstances is fixed, there may arise moments of difficulty in which, if this country remains divided by powerful parties, the agitation of this question may be productive of great inconvenience and embarrassment. The formation of such a system as I have supposed would, I conceive, among other advantages, effectually remove this source of anxiety, as I certainly can never suppose or wish it to be formed on any other ground but that of all those who might form part of the Administration joining in the same determination with myself, to endeavor to prevent the renewal of any such discussion." Broke-hearted by the result of Napoleon's victory at Austerlitz, the dissolution of the Coalition of which he had been the very life, Pitt died on Jan. 23, 1806. Then followed the "All The Talents" ministry under Lord Grenville (1), the "No Popery" ministry under the Duke of Portland (2), and in 1812 the ministry of Lord Liverpool. Neither the first nor the second of these ministries ventured to aggravate the periodical "illnesses" of George III. by re-opening the Catholic question; but toward the end of 1810 the "illness" became permanent, and the Prince of Wales assumed the regency. Canning, who had refused to support the administration "because the determination remained unaltered in the Cabinet to resist as one man the

(1) The name originated from the stipulation made by Fox, that if he supported Grenville, each member of the cabinet would have to be a man of first-rate talent.

(2) So-called from the "No-Popery" cry which rang throughout England at that time, causing the defeat of nearly every parliamentary candidate who was supposed to be favorable to the Catholic claims. In his *Recollections*, Earl Russell thus speaks of the situation in 1807: "The 'No-Popery' cry of 1807, and the general election of that year, was the proceeding most discreditable to the English people of any that has occurred in my time. Several of the ablest men in Parliament, the chief ornaments of the House of Commons, were obliged to take refuge in small boroughs. Mr. Grey, then Lord Howick, went from Northumberland to Appleby; Mr. Windham went from Norwich to Romney. Mr. Perceval was the author of the 'No-Popery' cry, and did his utmost to arouse the people to religious hatred. The flame did not subside until 1829, when O'Connell agitated the people of Ireland to assemble in their thousands, and impressed upon the Duke of Wellington the fear of civil war." When the noble lord penned these lines, he found it convenient to forget that in 1850, when he was as yet Lord John Russell, the "No-Popery" cry which he then raised because of the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in England by Pope Pius IX. was more virulent and "discreditable to the English people" than any manifestation of Protestant injustice had been since the Gordon Riots.

consideration of the Catholic question" (1), resolved, although he was an obstinate Vetoist, to espouse the cause of Catholic Emancipation. Accordingly, on June 22, 1812, he offered this resolution in the House of Commons: "Resolved, that this House will, early in the next session of Parliament, take into its most serious consideration the state of the laws affecting His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Great Britain and Ireland, with a view to such final and conciliatory adjustment as may be conducive to the peace and strength of the United Kingdom, to the stability of Protestant establishment, and to the general satisfaction and concord of all classes of His Majesty's subjects." The motion was carried, thanks to the extraordinary influence of Canning, by a majority of one hundred and twenty-nine; but when, in the House of Lords, the Marquis of Wellesley made a similar motion, it was defeated by a majority of one. This slight majority for his side of the question horrified Eldon, the lord-chancellor; and Lord Campbell tells us, in his *Life* of the great lawyer, that he was seen to be deeply affected when he announced the division. It is interesting to note that Lord Byron was among the peers who voted for the motion, he having, according to Tom Moore, been summoned from a ball by the opposition "whip." He said: "I was sent for in great haste to a ball, which I confess I quitted somewhat reluctantly, to emancipate five millions of people. I came in late, and did not go immediately into the body of the House, but stood just behind the woolsack. Lord Eldon turned round, and, catching my eye, immediately said to a peer, who had come to him for a few minutes on the woolsack, as is the custom of his friends, 'D—n them! they'll have it now! By —, the vote that has just come in

(1) *Canning's Speeches*, Vol. v., p. 366.—"Canning," says Amherst, "was quite as determined to force on our claims, and to obtain relief, as his great master, William Pitt, had ever been. Unfortunately—but it was not entirely his own fault,—he was a Vetoist, and a Vetoist of the most objectionable kind. He is, however, entitled to the gratitude of Catholics. Though he would have put new chains upon us, they were not chains that he or any Protestants in those days would have objected to if put upon their own Church. And it must be said of Canning, that for many years he exerted all his great powers, his mastery of parliamentary debate, his force of argument, his sparkling wit, and his brilliant eloquence, in order to strike off the old penal chains which still lay heavy upon the Catholics of the United Kingdom. Among the masterpieces of English oratory must always be included Canning's speeches on the Catholic claims."

will give it them!" Lord Campbell, who, quoting from Tom Moore's *Life of Byron*, gives this anecdote in his *Life of Lord Eldon*, adds, that "the noble poet afterwards, in some lines which he wrote as a continuation of the *Devil's Walk*, showed that he had taken a very unfavorable view of the ex-chancellor's feelings and wishes on this subject"—that is, on a supposed intended rising of the Irish (1). Lord Byron knew well that Eldon would have been delighted to see a rising in Ireland, in order that the Irish might be crushed by England. This would have been, in Eldon's judgment, the best means of putting down the cry for emancipation. It is also worthy of note, that among the English high-born of the time who sympathized with the woes of the Catholics was the Princess Charlotte, the heir-presumptive to the crown, who, had death not claimed her before it claimed her father, would have been Queen of England. Writing to Lord Albermarle shortly after the death of Fox, the princess speaks of that statesman's "laudable exertions for universal toleration and comfort to *our unfortunate and grossly abused sister-kingdom*, which, alas! were not crowned with success"; and then she continues: "And this is the man who, after devoting his time, health, and at length life, is called revolutionist. . . . Many there are who say they understand the word toleration. . . . There are dignitaries of the Church who pique themselves on their learning, but do not seem—no more than the temporal peers—to comprehend its meaning; or else they who are to preach meekness and charity would certainly not, I should conceive, seem to rejoice at the sufferings of Ireland, nor utter such virulent protests against their just claims . . . that God that they teach (or at least, feign to do, who enjoins charitableness and forgiveness) is wholly forgotten in their rancorous hatred toward our oppressed and unfortunate people, whose crime is following other ceremonies, not owning these dignitaries, but above all having the name of Irishmen. It is with honest pride, the pride of a true-born English person, that I

(1) "And he saw the fears in Eldon's eyes  
Because the Catholics would not rise,  
In spite of his fears and his prophecies."

avow these sentiments—principles that I am convinced are the only true foundation of this country, and the spirit of the Constitution, *nor shall I be ashamed to broach them before the whole world, should I ever be called upon.* Thank God, there are some young of both sexes, some that I have the happiness to know personally, as well as from report, that feel firm at this state of things, and that are, from their hearts and minds, followers of your late inestimable friend. Happy, thrice happy, will be the moment when the plans Mr. Fox pursued and planned are put into full force; then indeed England will have cause to rejoice, *then she may lift up her head in conscious superiority and pre-eminence.*”

Notwithstanding the defeat of 1812, the Catholics continued to hope; and on April 30, 1813, Grattan introduced into the House of Commons a bill “To provide for the removal of the civil and military disabilities under which His Majesty’s Roman Catholic subjects now labor”—a title which could not have been rendered more precisely indicative of all that the Catholics demanded, for they never asked for more than perfect political equality with other British subjects. When the bill was read for the first time, Canning declared that there was “nothing in it to which he did not most cordially agree”; but he added that “at the same time there were some provisions, not in it, which he desired to introduce.” Here again loomed up the spectre of the Veto. Grattan’s bill would have removed every fetter from the Catholics; but the majority of the members of parliament would consent to merely partial emancipation. The laity might enter parliament; but the English government should have the right of Veto on the appointment of bishops, and should forbid or allow, at its own good pleasure, any relations between those prelates and the Holy See. Canning realized that unless he made some concession to the spirit of rampant Protestant injustice, Grattan’s bill was doomed. The measure for unconditional relief was therefore supplemented by clauses which rendered it a curse instead of a blessing. There were to be appointed certain commissioners, who were to profess the Catholic religion, and to be lay peers of Great Britain and Scotland, possessing a freehold estate of one

thousand pounds a year ; to be filled up from time to time by His Majesty, his heirs, and successors. The commissioners were to take an oath for the faithful discharge of their office and the observance of secrecy, in all matters not thereby required to be disclosed, with power to appoint a secretary with a salary (proposed to be five hundred pounds a year) payable out of the consolidated fund. The secretary was to take an oath similar to that of the commissioner. It was then provided that every person "elected to the discharge of Catholic episcopal functions in Great Britain or Scotland should, previously to the discharge of his office, notify his late election to the secretary ; that the secretary should notify it to his commissioners, and they to the privy council, with a certificate, 'that they did not know or believe anything of the person nominated which tended to impeach his loyalty or peaceable conduct.' Persons obtaining such a certificate were rendered capable of exercising episcopal functions within the United Kingdom ; if they exercised them without a certificate, they were to be considered guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to be sent out of the kingdom." The clauses concerning Ireland provided that the commissioners just mentioned, "with the addition, as to Great Britain, of the lord-chancellor, or lord-keeper, or first commissioner of the great seal for the time being, and of one of His Majesty's principal secretaries of state, being a Protestant, or such other Protestant member of His Majesty's privy council as His Majesty should appoint ; and with a similar addition in respect to Ireland ; and with the further addition, as to Great Britain, of the person then exercising episcopal functions among the Catholics in London,—and in respect to Ireland, of the *titular (sic)* Catholic archbishops of Armagh and Dublin, should be commissioners for the purposes thereafter mentioned." The commissioners thus appointed were to take an oath for the discharge of their office and observance of secrecy, similar to the former ; they were to employ the same secretary ; and three of them were to form a quorum. The bill then ordered that "subjects of His Majesty receiving any Bull, dispensation, or other instrument from the See of Rome, or any person in foreign parts acting under the au-

thority of that See, should, within six weeks, send a copy of it, signed with his name, to the secretary of the commissioners; who should transmit the same to them, but with a proviso, that if the person receiving the same should deliver to the secretary of the commissioners, within the time before prescribed, a writing under his hand, certifying the fact of his having received such a Bull, dispensation, or other instrument, and accompanying his certificate with an oath, declaring that 'it related, wholly and exclusively, to spiritual concerns, and that it did not contain or refer to any matter or thing which did or could, directly or indirectly, affect or interfere with the duty and allegiance which he owed to His Majesty's sacred person and government, or with the temporal, civil, and social rights, properties, or duties of any other of His Majesty's subjects,'—then the commissioners were, in their discretion, to receive such certificate and oath, in lieu of the copy of the Bull, dispensation, or other instrument." Persons conforming to these provisions were to be exempted from all pains and penalties to which they would be liable under the existing statutes; otherwise, they were to be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor, and, in lieu of the pains and penalties under the former statutes, be liable to be sent out of the kingdom. The third set of clauses provided that, within a time to be specified, the commissioners were to meet and appoint their secretary, and give notice of it to His Majesty's principal secretaries of state in Great Britain and Ireland; and the provisions of the Act were to be in force from that time. As soon as the addition of these mischievous clauses to the bill had been made known to Milner, who had been vicar-apostolic of the Midland District since 1803, he bent all his energies to thwart designs which he openly stigmatized as schismatical. Hastening to London, he arrived on May 19, and two days afterward every member of parliament received a printed copy of the *Brief Memorial*, which he had speedily prepared when he found that he could expect no aid from Poynter, the vicar-apostolic of the London District. "I shall be baited like a bull," he says, "but I am ready to encounter the white bears of Hudson's Bay and the kangaroos of Botany Bay,

rather than yield. I would willingly endure all sorts of sufferings for my own sins, but for the sins of the episcopacy I have nothing to answer" (1).

The three other vicars-apostolic had determined to offer no opposition to the actuation of the Vetoistic theories; therefore, on the morning of May 24, on the evening of which day the bill was to be taken up in committee, Milner made a final attempt to convert men whom he rightly regarded as perilously near to schism. He met Bishops Poynter and Collingridge in presence of two Catholic lords and several gentlemen; and, writes Husebeth, "he read three questions from a written paper, as to whether the bill contained anything contrary to Catholic doctrine or discipline; whether a Catholic could be a commissioner under the bill; and whether a vicar-apostolic was not bound to speak out openly in opposition to the bill. The other two bishops refused to answer these questions, 'though I showed,' says Dr. Milner, 'that by doing this they might, through the weight of the company then present, prevent their (the clauses) passing that very night. The conclusion of the conference was, that I answered these questions for myself in the manner that you will suppose, and in the most emphatical terms that occurred to me, and I charged my brethren, before God and the Church, with all the mischief which would arise from the expected Act'" (2). In Milner's own account of this fruitless conference (3), he says that he "maintained as incontestable, that if any two of the company present would go down to the House of Commons, and inform Mr. Grattan that the vicars-apostolic had found clauses in the bill incompatible with the integrity or the safety of the Catholic religion, it would even then be stopped in its progress." But, Milner was constrained to add, "as this was the event which was dreaded by most of the company, much more than the religious evils with which it was pregnant, the writer's protestations and arguments were equally disregarded, and the instrument of schism was left to take its course" (4). However, the

(1) HUSEBETH; *Life of Milner*, p. 231.

(2) *Life of Milner*, p. 233.

(3) *Supplementary Memoirs*, p. 208.

(4) "Milner had done what he could. His own unsupported appeal to Grattan would have been of no avail; for Grattan, Canning, Castlereagh, Ponshonby, and the other friends

Church in England was saved from the miseries which the intrepid Milner foresaw as her portion, if the bill of 1813 were carried; but in the Providence of God she was rescued, not by the zeal of her sons, or by the watchfulness of her Doctors in Israel, but by the bigotry of one of her adversaries. The speaker of the House, Abbot (afterward Lord Colchester), having left the chair because the House had gone into Committee of the Whole, arose and moved that the words in the first clause of the bill, *to sit and vote in either House of Parliament*, should be omitted. The House divided; Abbot gained his point by a majority of four; and the bill was then abandoned. The day on which this great blessing was vouchsafed to the Church in the English dominions is the Feast of Our Lady, the Help of Christians.

The English Vetoists revenged themselves on Milner by expelling him from the Select Committee of the "Catholic Board," a body which was supposed to watch over Catholic interests in the kingdom; but this "Milner baiting," as it was termed at that time, was countenanced by neither the hierarchy nor the greater part of the laity of Catholic Ireland. The majority of the Irish Catholic *aristocracy* indeed joined the greater part of their class in England in the advocacy of Vetoistic principles—in an attempt to propagate in the United Kingdom those ideas which they termed "Cisalpine"

of emancipation, must have looked upon the question of the clauses as a party question amongst Catholics, in which Milner was on one side, and the other bishops and the great bulk of the aristocracy on the other. What were Milner's thoughts and feelings when, after the meeting, he walked back to his lodgings in Titchfield Street? If we may compare the two situations, what would have been the thoughts and feelings of the duke if, on the morning of the 18th of June, 1815, every man under his command had marched off to Brussels, leaving him standing alone facing the French army? And let us remember that Milner loved his duty to the Church, threatened with a schismatical attack, far more even than Wellington loved his duty to England threatened with invasion. Milner was a man with strong feelings, and his suffering must have been acute. But he was also a man of strong convictions, and of a will immovable when he knew he was in the right. Opposition only made him more determined. The words in which Sir Walter sings the praises of the 'evergreen pine' might be applied to Milner:

'Moor'd in the rifted rock,  
Proof to the tempest's shock,  
Firmer he roots him the ruder it blow.'

This disposition in Milner must have greatly helped him through his many battles. And so the sturdy and disappointed bishop went to his home in London that evening, 'the success of the bill, on its third reading, being,' as he tells us, 'as confidently anticipated to take place in the course of a few hours as the rising of the sun the next morning.'" AM-  
■ERST; *loc. cit.*, ch. 20.

in order to manifest their detestation of "Ultramontanism"; but in full sympathy with Milner as the champion of really Catholic principles, and with probably the entire middle class of the English Catholics, were the then five millions of Catholic Irish laymen, headed by their thirty indomitable bishops. On the very day, and as Milner notes in his *Supplementary Memoirs*, at the very hour when a revolutionary minority of misguided English Catholics were trying to disgrace their noblest leader, twenty-seven of the Irish prelates met in Synod in Dublin, and declared that "Certain ecclesiastical clauses or securities contained in the bill are utterly incompatible with the discipline of the Catholic Church," and that they "could not assent to those regulations without incurring the heavy guilt of schism." The vote of approbation was worded as follows:—"Resolved, that the Right Rev. Dr. John Milner, Bishop of Castabala, our vigilant, incorruptible agent (1), the powerful and unwearied champion of the Catholic religion, continues to possess our esteem, our confidence, and our gratitude." On the 15th of June, a large meeting of the Catholics of Dublin was held in that city, and on the motion of O'Connell, who had been for about three years the acknowledged leader of the Irish Catholics, a vote of thanks was passed to Bishop Milner, "for his manly, upright, and conscientious opposition" to the bill. Many other Irish cities and towns sent similar encouragement to him who might have been, with all propriety, designated as the English O'Connell. But the struggle for the preservation of true Catholicism in the United Kingdom had by no means terminated. To some extent, victory had rested on the standard upheld by Milner. But, reflects Amherst, "Those to whom he was opposed were able and determined men. They were not inclined to give up their cause because so far they had not been successful. Milner, on his side, was not a man likely to surrender or to cease fighting. The time had not arrived when a younger man, and a layman, loyal to the Church, was to appear upon the scene, and, with a strong political power to back him, was to force on the question of emancipation freed from con-

(1) For many years Milner had been their authorized agent in London.

ditions which interfered with ecclesiastical discipline. Ten years had to elapse before O'Connell should form his Catholic Association. Milner then was an old man. He had earned his laurels. The strength of his arm was not needed in the fray when, sixteen years after the time I am writing of, the great political Hercules, wielding his gigantic political club, bore down upon bigots and Vetoists, and forced a way for himself and his followers to places from which Catholics had been so long shut out." Until Catholic Emancipation was finally extorted, this question of State interference in purely ecclesiastical affairs continued to agitate the Catholic mind in England and Ireland; but with the definitive abrogation of the Penal Laws in 1829 the hideous spectre vanished, let it be hoped, for all time. When the final measure was introduced by Peel, he gave, wittingly or not, this testimony to the victory which, though won by O'Connell, had been prepared by Bishop Milner: "A veto on the nomination of the Catholic bishops," said Peel, as he is quoted in the *Annual Register* for 1829, "was another security which had been contained in former proposed bills; but that, too, he would give up. His objection to it was, that it would be considered, and not unjustly, as *the commencement of a qualified Establishment with regard to the Roman Catholic Church*. He objected to it, not that he thought this an unreasonable demand on the part of the Crown, but because he thought that, if we had sent to us a list of the names of candidates for the dignity of Catholic bishops in Ireland, it would be extremely difficult to free ourselves from the responsibility that must attach to our choice. We, in fact, would thus be parties to the nomination of Roman Catholic bishops, and would commence a qualified establishment for that Church which, above all things, under existing circumstances, it was desirable to avoid. At once, then, he abandoned the idea of a veto—first, because it afforded no rational security; and in the second place, because objections might *possibly* be made by the Roman Catholics toward our exercise of such a power, which objections it was not worth while to raise." Undoubtedly it was "not worth while" for Peel to risk any ob-

jections to his bill. He had been defeated in the matter of the Veto; and civil war was the alternative, if the bill lacking the provision for a Veto were not carried in that session of parliament.

We now direct the attention of the reader to the progress of Catholic Emancipation in Ireland; and for that purpose we would, in the first place, quote some apposite reflections of Amherst. "Though the history of the emancipation of English Catholics be a matter of more interest, as relating to our immediate home affairs, still what was done in Ireland by her own people toward gaining the freedom of British subjects is of greater importance, because it brought into action a great political power—the only great political power which the Catholics of the British Isles possess. The political power of Ireland is the political power of Catholics in the United Kingdom. An English Catholic has many things to be proud of. There is a great deal in our past history of which we may justly boast. England, as well as Ireland, was at one time entitled to be called, as she was called, an Island of Saints. The history of England, when England was Catholic, though there are many blots upon its leaves, presents many centuries of wisdom and strength in government, of steady progress and persevering energy in its people, and of bravery and glory in war. Though an English Catholic has to lament that brute force drove the Church out of the land, leaving only a handful of members who were to form the stock out of which, in after years, true religion was again to grow, yet he has to rejoice in the fidelity of that handful, and to thank God for the increase He has given in our days. . . . The Catholics of Ireland have much more to boast of than we have. They have preserved the faith as a nation; they possess great political power; they have, by emigrating in large numbers to England, increased the Catholic population, and contributed a large share of whatever importance we may have in this country. In the highest interests which we have in this world, we and the Catholics of Ireland stand on the same ground; we have the same rights to demand, and the same rights to defend when gained. It is our interest to keep up as close a connection

as we can in every respect with Irish Catholics. . . . The power of Ireland is the power of the Catholic Church in the United Kingdom. To keep that power strong ought to be an object in the conduct of every English Catholic ; it is difficult to see how it is not a positive duty. . . . If it were generally known throughout the Empire that English Catholics were faithful to the only power which they possess in Parliament, and that they looked upon the power of Ireland as a man in the midst of a shower of arrows would look upon his shield, English Catholics would be regarded as men of sense, and as men of moral courage, and as such they would be respected. The power of Ireland, too, would be more thought of and brought into account" (1). The source of the power so well recognized in these words was the Catholic Association of 1828 ; but that great engine of political action had its precursors, and the first of these was the movement of the Confederates of 1642. For the purpose of obtaining freedom of conscience, of maintaining the just prerogatives of the crown (violated by the English parliamentarians), and of procuring for the Irish all the privileges enjoyed by the English, a National Association was formed, the members swearing to uphold the free and public exercise of the Catholic worship, as well as to bear true faith and allegiance to King Charles, defending him against all who would endeavor to subvert the royal prerogative, the just powers of parliament, and the real rights of the subject (2). With the triumph of the Cromwellian murderers in Ireland, this confederacy came to an end ; and not until 1727 was there any united action on the part of the Irish Catholics. George I. had just died ; and as it was believed that most of the ferocious Acts of his reign, as well as those of Queen Anne, had been designed to punish the Irish for not having presented loyal addresses to those sovereigns on their accession, a deputation of the principal Catholic families waited on the lords-justices in Dublin Castle, presenting an address which Mitchell terms "humble and congratulatory" (3), and which Sheil stigmatizes as "servile" (4).

(1) *Loc. cit.*, ch. 10.(2) LINGARD ; *History of England*, at year 1642.(3) MITCHELL ; *History of Ireland*, Vol. i., p. 88.(4) SHEIL ; *Legal and Political Sketches*, Vol. ii., p. 159.

Whether or not this document was forwarded to the king is still unknown; what might have been regarded as a reply came very soon in the shape of that statute (*1. Geo. II., Ch. 9, Sec. 7*), which deprived the Irish Catholics of the right of voting for members of Parliament—a right which they had hitherto enjoyed. The next association of Catholics was occasioned in 1728 by the introduction of a bill forbidding Catholics to practise as solicitors. “Several Catholics in Cork and in Dublin,” writes Sheil, “raised a subscription to defray the expense of opposing the bill; and an apostate priest gave information of this conspiracy (for so it was called) to bring in the Pope and the Pretender. The transaction was referred to a committee of the House of Commons, who actually reported that five pounds had been collected, and resolved ‘that it appeared to them, that under pretence of opposing heads of bills, sums of money had been collected and a fund established by the Popish inhabitants of this kingdom, highly detrimental to the Protestant interest’” (1). The reader will have perceived that the combinations just mentioned could not be regarded as organizations; but in 1757 the first step toward real organization was taken by the formation of the first Irish “Catholic Committee.” Mitchell, whose accuracy in stating facts has never been impugned, whatever may be the judgment one may form concerning his political theories, thus describes the act of injustice which gave birth to the Catholic Committee: “A young Catholic girl named O’Toole was importuned by some of her friends to conform to the Established Church; to avoid this persecution, she took refuge in the house of another friend and relative, a Catholic merchant in Dublin, named Saul. Legal proceedings were at once taken against Saul, in the name of a Protestant connection of the young lady. Of course, the trial went against Saul, and on this occasion he was assured from the bench that papists had no rights, inasmuch as ‘the law did not presume a papist to exist in the kingdom; nor could they so much as breathe there without the connivance of Government’” (2). It was in order to protect the Catholics from injustices like that displayed in the Saul

(1) *Loc. cit.*, Vol. ii., p. 159.(2) *History of Ireland*, Vol. i., p. 125.

case, that the Catholic Committee was formed. In 1759 the English Government recognized this body as representing the Irish Catholics; and quite prudently, since, as Theobald Wolfe Tone, as quoted by Sheil, tells us that it was composed of "the bishops, the county gentlemen, and of a certain number of merchants and tradesmen, all resident in Dublin, but named by the Catholics in the different towns corporate to represent them" (1). For many years the committee displayed great vigor. Thus, availing itself of the difficulties into which the revolt of the American colonies had plunged the English government, it extorted several consecutive concessions, until finally it obtained the Act of 1782, which allowed Catholics to buy, sell, and transfer real estate. In 1793 the Committee, under the leadership of John Keogh, obtained the elective franchise for the Irish Catholics, a right which their English brethren did not receive until 1829. Then followed an agitation for the right to sit in Parliament; but this movement was paralyzed by the rising of 1798 and by the Act of Union which followed. In January, 1808, Daniel O'Connell, the future Great Liberator of the Catholics of the United Kingdom, began to take the lead in Irish Catholic affairs. The occasion was furnished by a meeting of the Committee which had been ordered for a consideration of the advisability of an immediate petition to Parliament for the total abrogation of the Penal Laws. The negative was urged by some of their number, supported by the opinion of John Keogh, who was, however, prevented by illness from attending the meeting in person. His object was said to be founded on the idea that it was "beneath the dignity of the Catholic body to petition so repeatedly," and that it would be more advisable for them to remain quiet, watching in "dignified silence" the course of events and the conduct of their parliamentary friends. O'Connell was the principal speaker in opposition to any delay in presenting the petition; he gained his point; and, in the words of O'Rourke, in his *Centenary Life of O'Connell*, "at this meeting, the policy of delay, well meant, no doubt, may be said to have come to

(1) The persons most active in forming this committee were Dr. Curry, the author of the *Historical Review Of The Civil Wars*; Mr. Wyse of Waterford; Charles O'Connor of Balanagure; and Lords Fingall, Taaffe, and Delvin.

an end; and O'Connell's immortal flag, bearing the words 'Agitate! Agitate!' was hoisted, and the nation rallied around it, and fought under it, until it won complete unqualified Emancipation. O'Connell was now the undisputed leader of the Irish people." Mitchell, when speaking of this meeting, says: "O'Connell's influence was, even thus early, very powerful in softening down irritation, soothing jealousies, and inspiring self-abnegation, for the sake of the common cause. It was this great quality, not less than his commanding ability, which made him, soon afterward, the acknowledged head of the Catholic cause." Plowden says: "The meeting was preserved in unanimity by the power of Mr. O'Connell's eloquence." And Sheil, in concluding his notice of Keogh, writes as follows:—"He had been previously defeated in a public assembly by a young barrister, who had begun to make a figure at the Bar, to which he was called in the year 1798, and who, the moment he took part in politics, made a commanding impression. This barrister was Daniel O'Connell, who, in overthrowing the previous leader of the body upon a question connected with the propriety of persevering to petition the Legislature, gave proof of the extraordinary abilities which have been since so successfully developed." In 1810 there was a new organization of the Irish Catholics, under the immediate direction of O'Connell. The organization consisted of permanent boards holding communication with the general committee in Dublin. In the following year, 1811, the Government put down the committee by prosecuting some of the members for a breach of the Convention Act. Shortly after this a "Catholic Board" was established; but that again was suppressed in 1814. But the agitation, says Mitchell, "took the form of Aggregate Meetings, thus avoiding all possibility of incurring the penalties of the Convention Act; while the meetings were even more useful than the Board in arousing the people, diffusing sound information as to their rights and their wrongs, and keeping up a continual public commentary upon current events."

When the final fall of Napoleon had allowed the potentates of Europe to draw free breath, and when, therefore,

there was no more need of Irish soldiers to enable England to perform her part in crushing the "Corsican usurper," the English House of Commons became indifferent to the grievances of their Catholic fellow-subjects; and this callousness endured until 1821, when a majority of six declared in favor of some show of justice. But between 1813, the period which Canning assigned as the abandonment of the Catholic question (1), and the year 1821, when Plunket obtained his majority, the Catholics did not fail to present several petitions for relief to parliament. Meanwhile they were consoled by the knowledge that the Holy See, much as it yearned for their emancipation, would not consent to any such compromise of Catholic interests as the English government, in its most conciliatory moments, sustained by the misguided Vetoists, persistently urged for their acceptance. A brief narrative of the decision pronounced by Pope Pius VII. on this matter of English governmental interference in English and Irish Catholic affairs is necessary. When Napoleon, having left his prison-kingdom of Elba, entered upon his brilliant but unsuccessful campaign for the restoration of the Empire, Murat, whom the allies had allowed to retain the usurped throne of Naples, marched his army toward Rome. Pius VII. fled from his capital, and took up his residence in Genoa, then temporarily garrisoned by England. The Pontiff entered the Ligurian metropolis on April 8; and on April 26 Cardinal Litta, prefect of the Propaganda, in the name of His Holiness, addressed to Bishop Poynter, vicar-apostolic of the London District, a letter which was a complete vindication of the stand taken by Bishop Milner against the Vetoists. It is worthy of note, as Milner himself remarked, that in this letter "no dereliction of principles, or other unworthy concession of Catholic principles to Protestant prejudice, is to be found, although the Pope and cardinals were then completely in the power of the British government." The cardinal-prefect begins by stating that he has been ordered to inform Bishop Poynter of "His Holiness' ideas (2) respecting the conditions

(1) Thus in the House of Commons in 1825.

(2) We use the translation by Charles Butler.

that would be allowed, with a view of enabling the Catholics to obtain from the government the wished-for bill of emancipation. His Holiness, before whom, in compliance with my duty, I have laid the whole transaction, having been again compelled by the present unexpected conjuncture to absent himself from Rome before he was able to finish the examination of that affair, which he had begun a long time since, is unwilling, consistently with his eminent prudence, to pronounce his final sentence concerning a matter of such great moment. He has, however, been pleased to communicate to me his sentiments with regard to the only terms which, *after rejecting all those that have been hitherto proposed* (1), his dear Catholic children of Great Britain may admit with a safe conscience, should the bill of emancipation, as has long been expected, have passed." His Holiness considered that a simple Oath of Allegiance, on the part of a bishop-elect, was sufficient "security" for the English government; but the cardinal says: "Nevertheless, to their more ample satisfaction, His Holiness will feel no hesitation in allowing those to whom it appertains, to present to the king's ministers a list of candidates, in order that if any of them should be obnoxious or suspected, the government may immediately point him out, so as that he may be expunged; care, however, being taken to leave a sufficient number for His Holiness to choose therefrom, individuals whom he may deem best qualified in the Lord for governing the vacant churches."

As to the Vetoistic willingness to allow the government to inspect all correspondence of the bishops with Rome, His Eminence says: "As for the examination of the receipt, to

(1) Although Milner finds no fault with Butler's translation of this letter, it may be observed that the clause "after rejecting all those that have been hitherto proposed" is a minimizing translation of the pontifical *OMNINO rejectis aliis quibuscumque propositis*, which really signifies "absolutely rejecting all other propositions, of every kind whatsoever." Commenting on this condemnatory clause, Milner reminds us that the Pontiff wished to stigmatize Sir John Throckmorton's admission of "a direct appointment by the crown"; also Ponsonby's recognition of a royal "unlimited negative, which would have had the effect of making the king Head of the Catholic Church"; also Charles Butler's scheme of "a lay domination in a divinely constituted Episcopal Church"; also the pet idea of certain Irish Catholics—a "domestic nomination," based on "a Concordat between the Pope and the bishops"; and finally also the concession made by Milner himself—a recognition of a loyal "limited negative, confined to avowed charges of disloyalty or sedition against the candidate."

which I have alluded above, or what is called the *Regium Exequatur*, it cannot even be made a subject of negotiation. For your lordship well knows, that as such a practice must essentially affect the free exercise of that supremacy of the Church which has been given in trust by God, it would assuredly be criminal to permit or transfer it to any lay power, and indeed such a permission has never anywhere been granted." It is true that by this letter Pius VII. did not intend to pronounce "a final sentence . . . in a matter of such great moment"; but certainly the decisions seem to be peremptory, and it is certain that while from that day there have been in parliament several attempts to resuscitate the rejected theories, they have never since been made subjects of negotiation with the Holy See. The prudent economy displayed by the Roman Pontiff in his letter to Bishop Poynter did not satisfy the Irish bishops. The reader must judge whether the bounds of respect were passed by the Irish hierarchy when, in a meeting held in Dublin on Aug. 23, 1815, they adopted these resolutions: "Resolved—That though we sincerely venerate the Supreme Pontiff as Visible Head of the Church, we do not conceive that our apprehensions for the safety of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland can or ought to be removed by any determination of His Holiness adopted, or intended to be adopted, not only without our concurrence, but in direct opposition to our repeated resolutions and the very energetic memorial presented on our behalf, and so ably supported by our deputy, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, who in that quality was more competent to inform His Holiness of the real state and interests of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland than any other with whom he is said to have consulted. . . . Resolved—That a declaration of these our sentiments, respectful, firm, and decided, be transmitted to the Holy See, which, we trust, will engage His Holiness to feel and acknowledge the justness and propriety of this our determination." This document was signed by the four archbishops, by the coadjutors of two of them, and by the warden of Galway. Two prelates, Murray, coadjutor to the archbishop of Dublin, and Bishop Murphy of Cork, were deputed to pro-

ceed to Rome, and to protest against the instructions given by His Holiness through the prefect of Propaganda. In the audience which the Pontiff graciously accorded to them on Nov. 5, 1815, the two deputies patronizingly "conjured the Pope not to sanction any measure destructive to religion" (1). Of course the gentle Pius VII. hearkened patiently to this advice; but its consequence was a letter to the Irish hierarchy confirming the arrangements which he had proposed through Cardinal Litta, and alluding to the Irish protest as having produced in his mind "a deep sense of concern," as well as some "pain." This important letter, which is given in full by Charles Butler (2), is dated from St. Mary Major's, Feb. 1, 1816. We cite only the following passage: "It is unquestionably evident that what we have done" (that is, in the letter of Cardinal Litta) "amounts only to this: we have agreed to act steadily toward the British Government, according to the same rule, useful in itself, founded in prudence, which our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs, even before those times when the nomination of bishops was granted to princes, determined in their wisdom to maintain as effectually as might be; that is, not to promote to vacant sees any persons whom they might know to be displeasing to the powers under whom the dioceses to be administered by them were situated—which rule, far from being considered injurious to the Church, and far from having brought any evil on it, is justly approved of and praised by all." Milner's account of this portion of the letter is as follows:—"His Holiness proves that he has not conferred any power of nomination, presentation, or postulation on the British Government contrary to the terms of the declaration of Benedict XIV., made to the king of Prussia; but that he had barely signified to the prelates themselves how far, and no farther, he was willing to proceed in the event of a complete emancipation taking place, namely, that when they themselves had in each instance made out lists of clergymen qualified in every respect for the episcopal functions and dignity, the civil government, if it suspected the principles of any of them, might object to the promotion of a cer-

(1) HUSENBETH; *Life of Milner*, p. 310.(2) *Historical Memoirs*, Vol. iv., at end.

tain number of them, yet so as to leave a sufficient number of names on the list for the Holy See to exercise its judgment in the appointment of one of them. His Holiness strongly argues that as *all the candidates are to be chosen by the Catholic prelates, and as the ultimate appointment of some one among them in every instance will rest with himself*, there can be no danger of unfit or unworthy candidates being promoted, to the detriment of the Catholic religion" (1). The Irish Catholics took no comfort from this pontifical explanation; and to add to their discontent, came the news that Father Hayes, a Franciscan friar whom they had sent to Rome in 1815 to perorate their cause, had been expelled from the Papal States, without having obtained from the Pope any answer to the Irish "Remonstrance," which, according to his own showing, he had presented in a very unsubmitive manner. In July, 1817, the Irish Catholic Board sent a second Remonstrance to the Holy See, reiterating their supposed grievances, and complaining of the treatment accorded to their delegate by the "political minister," Cardinal Consalvi. On Feb. 21, 1818, Pope Pius VII. replied to this Remonstrance. His Holiness informs the Catholics of Ireland that he did not answer their first letter, firstly, because its tone displeased him; and secondly, because his letter to the bishops, of the 1st of February, 1816, was a sufficient answer to the matters contained in the Remonstrance, and that the prelates could have communicated that answer to the laity. The Pontiff then proceeds to explain to the Irish Catholics the spirit in which any concession would be made to the government as the price of emancipation. All that His Holiness says is in accordance with the letter of Cardinal Litta to Bishop Poynter, and with his own letter to the Irish prelates. His tone is paternal, and the admonition is given in such a way that no offence could be taken in Ireland. His Holiness evidently appreciated the anxiety which the Irish laity showed concerning the Veto. But in the third part of the letter Friar Hayes is denounced in the strongest terms. He is accused of abusing "the hospitality which he enjoyed in Rome"; he is charged with conducting

(1) *Supplementary Memoirs*, p. 238.

himself in a manner "altogether unbecoming a man professing a religious institute"; he is censured for his "arrogance and audacity"; his expulsion from Rome is justified; and the letter concludes by saying: "That same man of whom we speak, since his return to his own country, has not changed his line of conduct; for, in the public journals of the 17th day of last December, printed in Dublin, we have seen a report delivered by him to you, of his proceedings in this city. Like his former writings, it is full of falsehood and calumnies, to which report, therefore, we most unreservedly declare to you that no credit should be attached" (1). Concerning this episode of the struggle for Emancipation, the judicious Amherst makes some very apposite reflections: "When Cardinal Consalvi saw that the Irish, through their deputy in Rome, were strongly opposing any interference whatever on the part of the English Government in the choice of bishops—even that limited interference which had been sanctioned by Pope Pius—His Eminence was naturally extremely annoyed, and was afraid his negotiations with England (for Emancipation) might be injured. The indiscreet conduct of Mr. Hayes afforded Consalvi a plea for demanding the expulsion of his opponent from Rome. . . . There were some Catholics in England who thought that the Irish laity were wrong in sending any remonstrance to the Pope on the subject of the Veto. I judge such to be the case from the perusal of a long article written by Andrews in the *Orthodox Journal*. The ground which Andrews takes is, that the appointment of bishops being a purely ecclesiastical matter, the Irish bishops having addressed the Pope on the subject, and His Holiness having written to them a final reply, it was no business of the laity to interfere. We have seen that Pope Pius tells the Irish laity that they might have been content with the answer he had sent to their bishops. But still, there is nothing in the Pope's words which can be ascribed as anything approaching to severe blame. Nor, indeed, could any impartial person, calmly and sensibly viewing all the circumstances,

(1) *Calumniis referatum, cui propterea nullam esse adhibendam fidem, vobis apertissime declaramus.*

impute positive blame to the action taken by the Irish Catholic Board. Cardinal Consalvi, looking at the Veto question chiefly from a political point of view, may have blamed, and no doubt did in private blame, the conduct of the laity. But in objecting to the Remonstrance, his action in this particular would seem to justify the proceedings of those of whom he complained. The interference of His Eminence in the question can only be justified on the ground that it was one which involved civil and political matter. But if the question of the Veto concerned politics in Rome, it was because it concerned politics in Ireland. Cardinal Litta also may have been a little annoyed that the affair had not been allowed to rest after his last letter to the Irish bishops; but he could hardly have blamed the remonstrants when he saw the action of the political minister, the Hanoverian ambassador (1), and the English and Irish intriguers who were then in Rome. It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, that the letter of Pope Pius should have contained only mild terms in speaking of the interference of the Irish board. The appointment of bishops, though a purely ecclesiastical affair, is one of the greatest political importance to the Irish. It is a vital matter that no right of interference should be conceded to the English government which would prevent the Supreme Pontiff from appointing prelates acceptable to the Irish nation. The Holy Father should not be made in the smallest degree the means of enabling English statesmen to govern Ireland on British and Protestant principles. . . . When everybody else was allowed to talk and intrigue as they pleased, could it have been said that the staunch Irish Catholics, who stood up for the freedom of the Pope, even at the

(1) The reader must know that any minister of England who held political communication with the Vatican, thereby incurred the dreadful penalties of a *præmunire*, and that the English Government, until the death of King William IV., used to transact business with the Roman Court through the Hanoverian ambassador at Rome, the king of England having been, since the accession of George I., also king of Hanover. England stood, in this respect, remarks Amherst, in a very absurd position. "She had been assisting the Pope with troops and ships against Napoleon, and paying court to his ambassador to Paris; but when there was a question of diplomatic communications, she drew herself up and assumed the ridiculously pompous position of the Grand Master of the Templars, in Sir Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*, when Isaac of York presented his petition. The words of Beaumanoir to Conrad may be slightly changed as follows: 'Back, sir! I touch not Papists, save with the rope. Ompteida; take thou the letter from the Pope.'"

sacrifice of their own liberties, were not to interfere, and that they alone were to remain silent and inactive when their opponents were at work? Pope Pius VII. would never have consented to such a proposition. He wished only to chide the Irish Board for a little over-zeal in the cause of the liberties of the Church and of their own" (1).

We have already remarked that King George III., despite his frequent personal relations of kindness with certain Catholics, was prevented from countenancing a total abrogation of the Penal Laws by what he was pleased to term a scruple of conscience. This scruple, which, by the way, had been generated in the royal mind by Lord's Clare and Loughborough (2), had not been shared by the Prince of Wales during the years previous to 1810, when his father's permanent relapse into insanity caused the passage of an Act constituting him regent of the kingdom. But from almost the very day of his assumption of the regency, the future George IV. changed his ostensibly Whig sentiments for those of the Tories; and naturally a change came over his quondam sympathy with the "Catholic claims." Probably the reason for this change of views was indicated by Lord Campbell when he wrote that "The more probable solution (of the problem) was the effect of the possession of royal power, which was supposed to have indisposed His Royal Highness to any concession to the Catholics, or any extension of popular rights, and induced him to look with preference to those who were for carrying the power of the crown to the highest pitch. His Royal Highness, at a subsequent period, certainly manifested an entire change of opinion on the

(1) *Loc. cit.*, Vol. ii., ch. 29.

(2) The Hon. G. T. Kenyon, in his *Life of Lord Kenyon*, says: "Lord Clare, the Irish Chancellor, and it is generally supposed also Lord Loughborough, the English Chancellor, raised the first scruple in the mind of George III. on the subject of emancipation and the coronation oath. Lord Kenyon, the Lord Chief Justice, being asked for his advice by the king, gave it that his oath did not preclude him from signing an Emancipation Act, *if in the opinion of the king such an Act would not destroy or essentially affect the government of the Established Church*. The king was peculiarly susceptible to anything which reflected, or might seem to the world to reflect, on his honor. And thus the idea that any concession to the Catholics would be an infringement of the oath, took so deep a root in an ill-regulated mind, enfeebled by disease, that no argument or persuasion, even from those whose opinions he most valued, could ever afterwards eradicate it. The motives, however mistaken, which guided him, must be universally held in respect, though they will now almost universally be acknowledged to have occasioned most deplorable results."

question of Catholic Emancipation, and showed that he became thoroughly reconciled to his father's high prerogative principles of government; but I am inclined to think that as yet he was actuated only by personal motives" (1). Certainly no one who is acquainted with the private life of this prince can suppose him to have been accessible to religious scruples. As for his coronation oath, if he ever considered the matter seriously, and with a view to justice alone, he realized full well that his own and the Protestant interpretation of that oath rendered the taking and the keeping of it, not the violation of it, a sinful and detestable thing. And what regard for the sanctity of an oath could have been entertained by the man who, for merely political reasons—for the purpose of retaining his right of succession to the crown,—had trampled on his marriage vows by the repudiation of his Catholic wife, Maria Fitz Herbert, a woman, too, whom he seems to have loved, more than he ever loved any one of his innumerable paramours, with such modicum of real affection as his brutal heart was capable of cherishing? No respect for an oath troubled this man when, in order to obtain from parliament money which would have been denied if he had admitted that he was married to a Catholic, he authorized Fox to deny his marriage in the House of Commons. How his porcine obstinacy was compelled to yield to the claims of a tardily recognized political expediency, but without a thought of the dictates of justice, will soon be manifested.

In July, 1821, the people of Ireland learned that for the first time since they had been subjected to the English crown, a reigning English monarch was about to set foot in their island without hostile weapons in his hands. The motive which impelled George IV. to this condescension must be ever a matter of conjecture. English statesmen then declared that he was actuated by a pure love of the sister-isle. *Credat Judæus Apella!* Very many, even among his flatterers, insisted that his unpopularity in England, produced by his outrageous persecution of the German princess whom he had located as Queen Caroline in the

(1) *Life of Lord Eldon*, v. 276.

place of his wife, led him to seek for a counter demonstration on the other side of the Channel. O'Connell declared: "He came to Ireland to humbug the Catholics, who, he thought, would take sweet words instead of useful deeds. We were not to be humbugged" (1). The royal visit lasted from Aug. 12 to Sept. 3; and during the three weeks of feasting, His Majesty made so many promises in favor of his Catholic subjects, that hope began to dawn in the breasts of many who had been the most distrustful of Protestant sincerity in regard to Papists. We read in the *Life of Lord Eldon* that the king "half believed himself that he was sincere," and that Eldon became so frightened, that he straightway engineered the royal departure. O'Connell was severely censured for his extraordinary courtesy toward the king, and toward even the Orange-Tory party, during this visit; but probably Canon O'Rourke has reason on his side, when he asks us to bear in mind that the great Liberator "was always an enthusiastic advocate for union among Irishmen, and that he, moreover, believed that attempts to promote union were attended with benefit, and that even the semblance of union was useful. The king's visit offered a most happy opportunity for promoting this union, and he, by his conduct, placed himself on this firm logical ground—that if the attempt to effect a patriotic union among his countrymen failed, that failure could by no possibility be attributed to him" (2). Moreover it is certain that much of the blame visited on O'Connell because of his

(1) O'NEILL DAUNT: *Personal Recollections of O'Connell*, Vol. i., p. 131. After stating that O'Connell gave this opinion to him, Daunt narrates the following interesting anecdote: "I have had," said O'Connell, "the honor of sustaining some royal abuse. William IV. scolded me in a royal speech; but George IV. had previously bestowed a most royal malediction on me. I attended the first levée after the Emancipation bill passed; the wretched king was suffering from an utterly broken constitution, and the presence-chamber was kept as thin as it was possible, to preserve him from inconvenient crowding. When I got into the midst of it, approaching the throne, I saw the lips of His Majesty moving; and thinking it possible he might be speaking to me, I advanced, in order to make, if requisite, a suitable reply. He had ceased to speak—I kissed hands and passed on. In some days, I saw a mysterious paragraph in a Scotch newspaper, remarking on the strange mode in which an Irish subject had been received by his prince, who was stated to have vented a curse at him. I happened to meet the Duke of Norfolk, and asked him if he could explain the paragraph. 'Yes,' said he, 'you are the person alluded to. The day you were at the levée, His Majesty said, as you were approaching: 'There is O'Connell!—'G—d damn the scoundrel!'"

(2) *Centenary Life of O'Connell*, p. 119.

conduct on this occasion was unmerited, being based on reports which were absolutely mendacious, as he showed in his reply to the article entitled *O'Connell's Inconsistencies*, which had appeared in the *Dublin Courier* (1).

Out of deference to the judgment of Plunket, who then had charge of the Catholic interests in the House of Commons, the question of general Catholic Emancipation was not brought before Parliament in 1822; but Canning introduced a bill allowing Catholic peers to sit in the House of Lords. When the Commons had passed the bill by a majority of twelve, and the Lords had rejected it by a majority of forty-two, a meeting of the Catholic Committee was called, and O'Connell urged the members to use all their influence to induce the Irish priests to take an active part in the politics of their country—a course which they had hitherto scrupulously avoided: "Gentlemen, we have a power that has never yet been called into the field, one that must coerce them to do us justice, and that power is the

(1) Taking up each of these statements, O'Connell thus replied:—" *He procured a meeting to be held at the Exchange.*"—Quite untrue. The meeting was held at the nomination of the Lord Mayor. It was *procured* by a requisition, signed by nearly thirty noblemen and Protestant bishops. The Duke of Leinster, the Earl of Enniskillen, Lord Farnham, Dr. Trench, the Protestant Archbishop of Tuam, etc., were the leading requisitionists. My name was, as it ought to be, low, very low down in the requisition. It is, therefore, as much at variance with the truth as anything can be to say that I procured that meeting. *'He proposed a palace should be built for George IV.'*—Quite untrue. The proposal respecting the palace was moved by Lord Carbery, seconded by Colonel Cuffe. There were three plans for a national testimonial submitted to the meeting. The one was for a column, the second a palace, the third a bridge. I supported the second during the debate; but it is not true that the proposal was mine. It was, as I have said, proposed by Lord Carbery—with whom I am very slightly acquainted—seconded by Colonel Cuffe, a gentleman, I believe, I never saw before that day or since, and never spoke to in my life. See, then, how false it is to make me the *procurer* of the meeting, and the *proposer* of the palace. *'He promised that a million should be raised for this purpose.'*—Again, a pure invention. I never made any such promise. *'He pledged himself to give one thousand pounds a year, from his own income, for that purpose.'*—Totally untrue. I did, indeed, make a pledge to give an annual sum out of my income, but it was an annual sum of twenty guineas—£22 15s. of the then Irish currency—and no more! The vile accuser turns twenty guineas a year into only £1,000 a year!—that is all. *'He escorted His Majesty to Kingstown.'*—Quite untrue. I did not escort His Majesty at all that day. He was, in the morning, in the county Wicklow. I rode with some gentlemen to Kingstown, and there remained until the king's arrival. I did not see him at all until the arrival at Kingstown. *'He followed him (literally) into the sea, in order to present him with a laurel crown.'*—This is so circumstantially false, that it must be called, literally, a lie. I did not follow the king at all; nor did I go nearer the water, when presenting the laurel crown, than about twenty paces. *'He knelt in the water.'*—Totally untrue. I presented the crown to the king in a tent, the nearest part of which to the water was at least twenty paces from the water's edge. I presented it at the end of the tent farthest from the water, in as dry a place as ever king stood upon. I, of course, knelt on

priesthood of Ireland. In combining them with us, we bring to our aid learning, virtue, and influence, not belonging to any other class. Without them we cannot succeed. To succeed we MUST have them with us, and from this day forward." There was a majority against this proposal, and it was combatted with the most persevering opposition; but O'Connell was immovable, and at last succeeded. "The clergy," says Fagan, "were brought into the agitation, with what result it would be superfluous to say" (1). It was determined that Ireland should have a great "Catholic Association" which should include every Catholic in the land; and it was by means of this permanent and, despite the Convention Act, legal organization, that Emancipation was finally carried. Thomas Wyse, no enthusiastic admirer of O'Connell, thus speaks of the great tribune's fitness for the task of forming this Association: "To conceive such a plan, and still more to reduce it from theory into practice, required a mind of very peculiar temperament. It required the ardor of youth, and the sagacity of age; a nature which could delight in obstacle, which could draw strength from opposition, which could triumph over time, and defy delay. It required a man who, feared if not respected by the aristocracy, applauded by the citizens, should be idolized by the

one knee in presenting the crown; but so far is it from being true, that I was guilty of any unbecoming servility, that I did not even kiss the hand which the king held out to me for that purpose. *'He forgot his promises.'*—Quite untrue. I made no promises, save that of paying twenty guineas a year as my mite towards building a palace; and so far was I from forgetting that promise, that I was one of the *very, very few* who attended the committee, after the king's departure. There were plenty to attend while he was here; but the moment he was gone, there was no getting the subscribers to meet—there was no getting those who put down their names to pay their subscriptions. Nay, I persevered until after all hope was extinct; nor did I abandon the plan of a palace until we found it impossible to procure from one of the then judges the sum of thirty guineas which he had affixed to his name while the king was here. I then, and not till then, gave up the palace in despair, and left the bridge-builders to complete their plan; having first paid in my own subscription. The bridge has since been built. There is, therefore, nothing more untrue than the assertion that I forgot any promise of mine, or declined to fulfil it. *'He, not long after the r. 23<sup>d</sup> departure, inveighed against His Majesty, in language which we cannot venture to subscribe.'* This indeed would establish me guilty of an inconsistency; but it does no such thing. Why? Because it is totally false. On the contrary, the fact is that I was reproached for years and years after the king's departure from Ireland, with being in the habit of speaking too favorably of the king. I was taunted with my complacency, not only in prose, but even in 'immortal verse.' But the fact is, before Emancipation, abuse of George IV. would have been such bad policy, that the enemies of religious liberty would gladly avail themselves of any such abuse, to render the king more desperate in his opposition."

(1) *Life and Times of Daniel O'Connell*, Vol. i., p. 26.

people ; a man who could touch with the spell most congenial to each, all those adverse and oftentimes conflicting natures. It required the audacious disdain of secondary considerations, the adventurous spirit of a fanatic, the intrepidity of a successful commander, the deep insight into his materials and resources, of an experienced general. It required a man who could view Irish interests through Ireland ; who, essentially Irish himself, knew where the national heart really lay, and could bend or drive it to every purpose ; a man, the reflection of the men on whom he had to act : the representative of their feelings, the organ of their desires, the speaker of their passions, and the reckless flatterer, at times, of their prejudices ; with an eloquence not of the schools only, but of the fields, not for one class, but for all,—a man doing what he recommended, and completing in the tedious details of the committee, what he had impetuously and often imperiously carried in the debate. Such a man, happily for the freedom and safety of the country, existed ; he had the fortune to conceive, and the resolution to execute :—The Catholic Association rose before him ” (1). Mr. John O’Connell, a son of the Liberator, thus describes the beginning of the organization. “ It has been stated that the first idea of a Catholic Association arose in a conversation between O’Connell and Sheil, in the house of a mutual friend in the County Wicklow, in the spring of 1823. The idea, however, had originated long before the rencontre in question, and it originated in Mr. O’Connell’s mind. He had been for some time revolving it, and maturing it in his thoughts, ere that event ; and the story had its rise from the simple circumstance of his having first mentioned his plan of a popular association, at a dinner party at Glencullen, the seat of C. Fitzsimon, Esq., the then residence of the late well known and respected T. O’Mara, Esq., where Mr. Sheil was also present. Mr. O’Connell then stated that his plan contemplated two classes of members, the one paying a pound, the other one shilling, a year—the working committee of the body to be chosen from the former class. . . . Mr. Sheil expressed doubts ;

(1) *Historical Sketch of the Catholic Association*, Vol. I., p. 197.

he feared the plan would not work, and that the time was not very suitable for such an effort as the getting up a new association. Mr. O'Connell said he considered the time come, and that the plan would work—that, in fact, he would *make it work*" (1). The new Association progressed rapidly, and principally because O'Connell was its heart and soul. Although primarily warring on the enemies of the Catholics, the great agitator did not spare the feelings of his co-religionists when they deserved rebuke. In one of the first meetings, he particularly impressed upon the Catholics of Dublin that their supineness was inexcusable, in neglecting to preserve the rights to which the laws entitled them. By a culpable passiveness, he said, they sacrificed their own and their brethren's privileges to the freedom of the city of Dublin, to which they were eligible for the last thirty years. "Some few years since," continued Mr. O'Connell, "I undertook, at my own expense, to obtain for a man named Cole, the civic rights to which he was entitled, as having served his time to a *freeman*; but when he had gone through all the forms, and completely succeeded, the poor man died; and the *Hibernian Journal* announced the event by stating, that *God had miraculously saved the Corporation from the contamination of a Papist!*"

In 1824 O'Connell established the great engine which came to be known as the "Catholic Rent," designed to furnish the sinews of war by means of a monthly contribution of one penny from every Catholic in Ireland. By some, even patriotic men, the Rent was ridiculed, and styled the "beggar's tax," but it performed its work. But it soon began to frighten the Protestants; and Canon O'Rourke says that he knew a Protestant lady, who sent a pound as Catholic Rent to the Association, expressing in her letter a hope, that the Rent was not intended "*for powder and ball.*" This letter gave O'Connell the opportunity of repeating, in the most decided terms, his doctrine of peaceful and constitutional agitation. During the speech which O'Connell made on the 4th of February, 1824, in proposing the establishment of the Catholic Rent, he assumed that the Irish Catholics numbered seven

(1) *Memoirs and Speeches of Daniel O'Connell, Esq., M. P., By his Son.* Vol. II., p. 408

millions ; he did not, therefore, hesitate to say that it would “with very little exertion produce *one hundred and twenty-two thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven pounds ten shillings*. “He liked,” he said, “to give them down to the very *shillings of it*, and had there been pence, he would give them the pence too” (a laugh, and cheers). “Suppose, however,” he continued, “that the product was less than one-half that sum. Say it would be *fifty thousand* pounds, although one penny per month from each Catholic in Ireland ought surely to yield a sum considerably above that amount.” For practical purposes he assumed the Catholic Rent would bring in fifty thousand pounds annually, which he proposed should be employed in the following manner :—For parliamentary expenses, £5,000 ; for the services of the press, £15,000 ; for law proceedings, in preserving the legal privileges of the Catholics and prosecuting Orange aggressors, £15,000 ; for the purpose of education for the Catholic poor, £5,000 ; *for educating Catholic priests for the service of America*, £5,000 ; which items amount to £45,000. The remaining £5,000 a year was to accumulate in order to repair and build Catholic chapels and schools. However, calculations of income based on population, as O’Rourke remarks, are often deceptive, even when the government tax-man has the law at his back ; of course they are not reliable at all in the case of voluntary offerings. “To this the Catholic Rent was no exception. For the whole five years during which it was collected, it produced very little over £50,000, which sum was O’Connell’s *reduced* estimate of income from it for *one* year.”

The month of December, 1824, witnessed the first prosecution of the Liberator by the government. At a meeting of the Association held on the 17th, O’Connell, probably incited by the presence of General O’Farrell Ambrose, an Irish Catholic who had been thirty-nine years in the Austrian service, and had seen thirty-four campaigns, declared that the *Dublin Courier* “had attacked the Catholics, and boasted that the Wellingtons, the Packs—in short that all the generals of the British army were Protestants. Why,” said O’Connell, “that is the *grievance*, not the *fault* of the Catholics. Was the *Courier* ignorant,” he continued, “that there was not a

foreign service, of which the Catholics were not at the head? Was the *Courier* aware that, when Maria Teresa instituted the order of the Cross of Military merit in Austria, of the first fifty individuals who were promoted to that honor, FORTY-TWO were Irish Catholics (hear, hear, and cheers). It was an extraordinary fact, but he (Mr. O'Connell) would pledge himself to procure the names of those distinguished individuals." Having reminded the British government that there was in Ireland such a thing as physical force which might one day be invoked by her sons, although he himself preferred constitutional agitation, the orator alluded to Bolivar, who had just triumphed in South America, and to the Greeks who were at that moment in revolt against the Turks. As reported in *Saunders's News Letter*, O'Connell said: "The Greeks were engaged in warfare for the recovery of their rights; they (the Catholics) trusted that their ends would be procured through more peaceable means. Nations had been driven mad by oppression. He hoped that Ireland would never be driven to the system pursued by the Greeks. He trusted in God they would be never so driven. He hoped Ireland would be restored to her rights; *but if that day should arrive, if she were driven mad by persecution, he wished that a new Bolivar might arise—that the spirit of the Greeks and of the South Americans might animate the people of Ireland!*" Three days afterward the orator was arrested on a charge of inciting to sedition; but the grand jury threw out the bills by a vote of fifteen to eight, and the majority of the English newspapers ridiculed the prosecution as a blunder. Nevertheless, the English government resolved to suppress the Catholic Association. When the parliament met on Feb. 3, 1825, the royal speech called on "the wisdom of parliament to consider without delay the means of applying a remedy to this evil." When it became evident that the Association was in danger of suppression, the largest meeting it had yet held convened on Feb. 9th. Resolutions were adopted, in which the proceedings of the Association were defended. One declared that the Association, in all its proceedings, had been most particular to act legally and constitutionally, and was guided not only by the letter, but by the spirit of the

*existing laws*—nay, more, that it manifested an unfeigned respect for the spirit of the Constitution ; that its proceedings were attended with the happiest effects, having quieted the fears of all the peaceable and loyal inhabitants of the country. On the same day, a petition to Parliament was adopted, praying that the Association might be heard by counsel at the bar of the House, to show cause why it ought not to be suppressed. But when the motion to hear the Association by counsel was put in parliament, it was rejected by a vote of 222 against 89 ; and then the bill for the suppression was passed by a majority of 146. However, despite this evident check to the aspirations of the Catholics, a report was credited, at that very time, that Emancipation would be effected in the parliamentary session then progressing. Plunket, the parliamentary manager for O'Connell, told him that all was settled, and that he should draw up the Emancipation Bill at once. On March 7th, O'Connell wrote to the Association announcing two clauses which he would embody in the measure—clauses which quite properly brought upon him showers of indignant protests. Treating of paragraph vii., he wrote : “ A provision is to be made for the Catholic clergy, which will enable them to give charity, instead of being almost the recipients of it.” And in paragraph viii., he announces that the elective franchise in *counties*, but not in cities, should be raised from 40s. to £5 or £10 (the sum does not seem to have been finally fixed). “ This alteration,” he says, “ was suggested by many members of parliament connected with government.” He approves of this, and says that the influence the forties gave the landlords was “ quite frightful ” ; and that, in his opinion, “ the raising of the qualification to five or even ten pounds would add to Catholic influence in Ireland.” But the Irish people did not fancy the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders ; and as for the pensioning of their clergy, in any form whatsoever, they would almost as readily have welcomed the *Veto*, against which their champion had fought so bravely. There was no need, however, for any intestine broil on this matter. Emancipation was still refused, even when coupled with the conditions which O'Connell had accepted. Fagan thinks that O'Connell was

treated with great perfidy in London on this occasion. He was led to believe that Emancipation was certain, once that it was accompanied by the "wings," as the obnoxious conditions were called. "Every one at the time in London, who was mixed up in the matter, believed it. Mr. Blake, the Chief Remembrancer, who was then in London, who was examined before the Committee on the state of Ireland, and who was also on terms of familiar intercourse with the leading political men of the day—he has often since stated his conviction, that the matter was settled. Lord Plunket was, as we have said, himself deceived, and was thus the means of deceiving O'Connell and the rest of the deputation. The system of deceit was carried so far as to induce O'Connell to attend the Duke of York's levee at the Horse Guards." It is not improbable that the government, fearful of the influence of O'Connell, hoped by means of his admission of the "wings" to embroil him with the Irish people. That the king had no intention of assenting to the bill, is shown by the fact that while O'Connell was framing the document, the Duke of York made his famous "So help me God" speech. The Dean and Chapter of Windsor had presented a petition "against any further concessions to the Catholics"; and His Royal Highness replied: "It is now twenty-five years since this measure was first brought into discussion. I cannot forget with what events that discussion was, at the time, connected—it was connected with the most serious illness of one now no more." He spoke of the impropriety of having Catholics legislating for the Protestant Church; but said there was a still more delicate question about the Coronation Oath; and he asked their lordships to consider the situation in which they placed the sovereign if they passed the bill. Finally, he said: "He had been for twenty-five years, ever since the question had been agitated, advocating the cause of Protestant ascendancy. I have been brought up from my earliest years in these principles, and from the time when I began to reason for myself, I have entertained them from conviction; and in every situation I may be placed in, during my future life, I WILL MAINTAIN THEM, SO HELP ME GOD!" (1).

(1) By this asseveration the duke meant that if he survived his brother, the king, and

O'Connell had frequently declared that he could "drive a coach and six through any parliamentary law"; and men were not surprised when it became known that he had devised a means whereby the suppression of the Catholic Association would be rendered practically nugatory. At a meeting held on June 8th, only four months after the parliamentary enterprise, O'Connell manifested his design in these words: "Let us rally and unite round the standard of liberty. I have promised in England that there shall be a new Catholic Association. I have promised that there shall be a new collection of the Rent. The people shall be enumerated—the census from the parishes is already coming in. I have this day got a census from the parish of Ardcaith, in the diocese of Meath. The return of the Catholic population is as follows:—males, 682; females, 561. And then as to the Protestants—there is but one Protestant inhabitant in the parish—and yet, what do you think the poor people pay for church-rate? No less than four pence an acre, although there is no Protestant church. But there is a salary of £20 a year for a parish clerk, who has nothing to do, and £10 for one who is too old to do anything. Lord Liverpool has determined to put down the Catholic question. The Catholics have been cruelly, and I will say, treacherously defeated, in their struggle for their rights, in one of the Houses of Parliament, after their claims had been, not only recognized, but triumphantly established in the other branch of the legislature; and under these circumstances it becomes our duty to consider, what means are best calculated to ensure the ultimate attainment, for ourselves and our children, of those rights which have been so long withheld. 'Tis true, we have been defeated, but we are not dismayed; we have been betrayed, but are unconquered still." A Committee was then appointed for the purpose of circumventing the "Algerine Act," as the Catholics styled the Act which suppressed their Association, and which had prohibited any association or meeting for a redress of grievances, for fur-

therefore mounted the throne, owing to the fact that George IV. had no legitimate children, he would continue the anti-emanipation policy. He died, however, in 1837, and was succeeded as heir-apparent by the Duke of Clarence, the third son of George III., who afterward reigned as William IV.

thering a petition on political subjects, for the prosecution or defence of even civil causes, or for any change in the established order of matters ecclesiastical or civil. Certainly it seemed that this drastic measure had cut the ground completely from under the feet of the consummate agitator; but at the next meeting, held on July 13, he declared that while the Committee had resolved "to obey a statute which they could not respect," they had determined to form a new Association which would continue to consolidate the constitutional resources of the Catholics. The new Association would not assume the power of acting for the purpose of procuring the redress of grievances in Church or State, or the alteration of any matters by law established, or for the purpose of carrying on the prosecution or defence of causes civil and criminal, and in order to guard still more against governmental interference, it had been determined that the new Catholic Association would not be composed of different divisions or parts, acting in any manner separate from each other, and there would be no distinct secretary or delegate, or other officer appointed by, or authorized to act for, any particular part; neither would the new Catholic Association communicate with any other society, or body of persons; neither would it, in any respect, act in any manner inconsistently with the said statute of *6 Geo. IV., cap. 4.* The new Catholic Association would be formed merely for the purposes of public or private charity, and such other purposes as are not prohibited by the statute of *6 Geo. IV., cap. 4.* The objects of the Association were declared to be: The promotion of public peace and concord; the encouragement of an enlightened and religious system of education, founded on the basis of Christian Charity and perfect fair dealing; the distinctive enumeration of the people according to their various creeds, and the number of children of each belief receiving education; the rendering of aid in the erection of places of Catholic worship, and interment of the dead; the promotion of improvements in native agriculture and manufactures; and, finally, the diffusion of information calculated to advance the cause of religious toleration, and the support of a liberal press. For

the future, petitions to Parliament were to be adopted at separate local meetings, instead of emanating, as heretofore, from a central body (1).

Immediately after the revival of the Catholic Association which the British Government fondly supposed to be buried, O'Connell established his "New Catholic Rent," a fund for the protection of persecuted tenants who had voted for religious and civil liberty at the last general election. The old Catholic Rent continued to be collected and handed in as usual, with the saving clause, "for all purposes not prohibited by law." He also instituted *The Order of Liberators*, from which his title of Liberator is derived. It was modelled on existing Orders of Knighthood, having Liberators, Knights Grand Cross, and Knights Companions. The title on which a person would be admitted to any of those grades, was the doing of some real service to his country. In originating the new Catholic Rent, O'Connell, in the letter he addressed to the people, signed himself, "DANIEL O'CONNELL, of the Order of Liberators." Meanwhile the new Association was growing in strength; and at a meeting held in Dublin in February, 1828, it was resolved: "That we will consider any Irish member (of Parliament) an enemy to the peace of Ireland, who shall not declare his determination not to support any administration which shall not make Catholic Emancipation a Cabinet measure." Soon after the passage of this resolution, the Duke of Wellington coolly told the Catholics that cessation of agitation would alone alleviate their lot. He received his answer when O'Connell triumphed in the Clare election. Several years previous to this famous event, John Keogh had conceived the idea of returning a Catholic to Parliament, in spite of the penal law which rendered a "Papist" ineligible. Keogh had contended that when the elected Catholic was rejected at the bar of the House, because he refused to take an oath, which it was absurd to expect him to take, the "fair-minded" people of England would feel how unjust a thing it was to disfranchise a constituency, because the man of their choice would not swear that *his*

(1) O'ROURKE; *Loc. cit.*—MCCULLAGH; *Memoirs of Richard L. Sheil*, Vol. 1., p. 251, et seq.—HUIS; *Memoirs of O'Connell*, p. 382.

*own religion was DAMNABLE AND IDOLATROUS!* O'Rourke surmises that perhaps O'Connell had never heard of this theory of Keogh; but it is certain that when the idea was communicated to P. V. Fitzpatrick by Sir David Roose, and then by Fitzpatrick to the Liberator, the latter accepted it enthusiastically, and offered himself for Clare. We quote the following passages from his address to his proposed constituents: "It is true that as a Catholic, I cannot, and of course never will take the oaths at present prescribed to members of Parliament; but the authority which created these oaths can abrogate them; and I entertain a confident hope that if you elect me, the most bigoted of our enemies will see the necessity of removing from the chosen representative of the people an obstacle which would prevent him from doing his duty to his king and to his country. The oath at present required by law is, '*that the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the invocation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and other Saints, as now practised in the Church of Rome, are impious and idolatrous.*' Of course I will never stain my soul with such an oath. I leave that to my honorable opponent, Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald. He has often taken that horrible oath. He is ready to take it again, and asks your votes to enable him so to swear. I would rather be torn limb from limb than take it. Electors of the County of Clare! choose between me, who abominate that oath, and Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, who has sworn it full twenty times! Return me to Parliament, and it is probable that such a blasphemous oath will be abolished forever. As your representative, I will try the question with the friends in Parliament of Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald. They may send me to prison. I am ready to go there, to promote the cause of the Catholics, and of universal liberty. The discussion which the attempt to exclude your representative from the House of Commons must excite, will create a sensation all over Europe, and produce such a burst of contemptuous indignation against British bigotry, in every enlightened country of the world, that the voice of all the great and good in England, Scotland and Ireland, being joined to the universal shout of the nations of the earth, will overpower every opposition, and render it impossible for Peel and Wellin-

ton any longer to close the doors of the constitution against the Catholics of Ireland. . . . If you return me to Parliament, I pledge myself to vote for every measure favorable to radical reform in the representative system, so that the House of Commons may truly, as our Catholic ancestors intended it should do, represent all the people; to vote for the repeal of the Vestry Bill, the Subletting Act, and the Grand Jury Laws; to vote for the diminution and more equal distribution of the overgrown wealth of the Established Church in Ireland, so that the surplus may be restored to the sustentation of the poor, the aged, and the infirm; to vote for every measure of retrenchment and reduction of the national expenditure, so as to relieve the people from the burdens of taxation, and to bring the question of the Repeal of The Union, at the earliest possible period, before the consideration of the Legislature. Electors of the County of Clare! choose between me and Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald; choose between him who so long cultivated his own interest, and one who seeks only to advance yours; choose between the sworn libeller of the Catholic faith, and one who has devoted his early life to your cause, who has consumed his manhood in a struggle for your liberties, and who has ever lived, and is ready to die, for the integrity, the honor, the purity of the Catholic faith, and the promotion of Irish freedom and happiness." When Wellington and Peel learned that more than two thirds of the voters of Clare had declared for O'Connell; that more than sixty thousand able-bodied men had taken part in the "chaining" of the champion through Ennis; that forty thousand others, fifteen thousand of whom were mounted, had escorted him into Limerick; they realized that Emancipation was won. On Dec. 11, Wellington, writing to Archbishop Curtis, the primate of Ireland, did indeed say that "he saw no prospect of a settlement"; but in the same letter he admitted: "If we could bury it in oblivion for a short time, and employ that time diligently in the consideration of its difficulties on all sides (for they are great), I should not despair of seeing a satisfactory remedy." And Lord Eldon, alluding to the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in favor of the Protestant Dissenters, a measure just

passed at the instance of Lord John Russell, said : " Soon-  
ner or later, perhaps in this very year, almost certainly in  
the next, the concessions to the Dissenters must be followed  
by the like concessions to the Roman Catholics. That  
seems unavoidable, though at present the policy is to conceal  
this additional purpose " (1).

Keen indeed must have been the anguish of George IV.,  
when Wellington and Peel demonstrated to him the neces-  
sity of granting Catholic Emancipation, and what was more  
poignant, of recommending that measure to Parliament.  
He yielded ; but his speech from the throne was read by  
commission. On Feb. 5, 1829, His Majesty's loyal peers  
and commoners were informed that : " The state of Ireland  
has been the object of His Majesty's continued solicitude.  
His Majesty laments that in that part of the United King-  
dom, an Association should still exist, dangerous to the  
public peace, and inconsistent with the spirit of the consti-  
tution : which keeps alive discord and ill-will amongst His  
Majesty's subjects, and which might, if permitted to continue,  
effectually obstruct every effort permanently to improve the  
condition of Ireland." He then expresses a hope that Par-  
liament will commit to him such powers as may enable him  
to maintain his just authority. In the next place he recom-  
mends to their deliberate consideration, " the whole condi-  
tion of Ireland ; and that they should review the laws which  
impose civil disabilities on His Majesty's Roman Catholic  
subjects ; finally, they are to consider, if the removal of  
these disabilities can be effected consistently with the full  
and permanent security of our establishments in church and  
state ; with the maintenance of the reformed religion estab-  
lished by law ; and of the rights and privileges of the bishops  
and clergy of this realm, and of the church committed to  
their charge." We are not informed by such records of the  
time as we have consulted whether the noble lords and the  
honorable commoners wept or smiled, when the reading of  
the royal recommendations was terminated. But during the  
next few days, their attention was given to an enormous  
quantity of petitions which poured upon them, some anathe-

(1) GRIZOT ; *Memoirs of Sir Robert Peel.*

matizing them if they heeded the clamors of the Papists, and others conjuring them to obey the dictates of justice and of common sense. When March the 5th arrived, Peel introduced into the House of Commons a "Catholic Relief Bill," which he supported in these words: "I rise as a minister of the king, and sustained by the just authority which belongs to that character, to vindicate the advice given to His Majesty by a united Cabinet—to insert in his *gracious* speech the command which has been read, respecting the propriety of taking into consideration the condition of Ireland, and the removal of the civil disabilities affecting our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects." Then the minister proceeded to demonstrate that his present attitude toward the Catholics was induced by considerations of *mere expediency*, not by any idea of the rights of man. "I have for years attempted to maintain the exclusion of the Roman Catholics from Parliament and the high offices of the State. I do not think it was an unnatural or unreasonable struggle. I resign it in consequence of the conviction that it can be no longer advantageously maintained; from believing that *there are not adequate materials or sufficient instruments for its effectual and permanent continuance. I yield, therefore, to a moral necessity which I cannot control, unwilling to push resistance to a point which might endanger the Establishment which I wish to defend. . . .* I move, Sir, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House, to consider the laws imposing civil disabilities on His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects." On the third reading of the bill, the division stood: For, 320; Against, 142. Majority for Catholic Emancipation in the House of Commons, 178. In the House of Lords, the bill was read for the first time on March 21st, and a very sharp debate ensued. When it had been read for the second time on April 2d, Wellington avowed that the extensive organization of the Irish people foreboded mischief; and he said that when he was asked why he did not carry the law into execution, he had to reply that *there was no resistance to the law*—a splendid testimony to the efficacy of O'Connell's policy of agitation. To the insistence that "if the law will not do, let us proceed to blows," the

duke replied: "What, I suppose, is meant by proceeding to blows is coming to civil war. I am one of those who have, probably, passed a longer period of my life engaged in war than most men, and principally, I may say, in civil war; and I must say this—that if I could avoid, by any sacrifice whatever, even one month of civil war, in the country to which I am attached, I would sacrifice my life in order to do it. I say, there is nothing which destroys property and demoralizes character to the degree which civil war does. By it the hand of man is raised against his neighbor, against his brother, and against his father; the servant betrays the master, and the whole becomes a scene of confusion and devastation." The division in the Lords on the third reading of the bill, gave a majority of one hundred and four.

"The year 1829 will undoubtedly remain for ever a great epoch in our history. The admission of Catholics into the Legislature was the first great blow which Protestant ascendancy received. England has indeed been since called an essentially Protestant country, and no doubt there are many who would still so call it. But when Catholics were admitted to an equality in the making of laws, the principle of a purely Protestant State was surrendered. In theory the majority of law-makers may be Catholics, and this is not consistent with a purely Protestant State. There is nothing in the English law to prevent the majority of the Cabinet ministers from being Catholics. Without breaking any Act of Parliament, and without violating their consciences, the fifteen judges and the vice-chancellors might all be Catholics. The making of laws and the administration of laws might be entirely in the hands of Catholics. This could not be in a State essentially Protestant. The sovereign, it is true, must be a Protestant; but Belgium was not the less a Catholic State when it had a Protestant king; nor is Saxony the less a Protestant State because it has a Catholic king. If the chancellor (the keeper of the Queen's conscience) cannot be a Catholic, the reason is not that a Catholic could not administer equity or preside over the House of Lords, but that he could not administer the ecclesiastical patronage in the hands of the Crown. The Act which enabled Lord O'Hagan

to be Chancellor of Ireland is a proof of this. The general commanding-in-chief may be a Catholic. The disestablishment of the Church of Ireland was logically grounded upon this principle—that the State in the British Isles is not essentially Protestant. The disestablishment of the Church in England will, at perhaps no very distant day, be merely a corollary to the Act of 1829. . . . Since the Act of Emancipation, we are entitled to retort upon the words of a great minister (1), that at no time, nor under any possible situation of affairs, can we ever go back to the old principle that Catholics are not in every respect equal before the law to their Protestant fellow-subjects. It is the more necessary to insist upon this, as some of the older ones amongst us, who can remember the passing of the Emancipation Act, may still retain some slight remnant of the old idea that we Catholics are a proscribed race. It is true the notion has been fast fading away; but no tinge should now remain. And it is especially important that our youth should be completely free from all suspicion that they are not on an exact equality before the law with their Protestant fellow-countrymen. For it was this sense of inequality which weakened the energy, overbore the strength, and destroyed the ambition of so many who might have used their talents to rise to the level of any others in the land. And even down to our own day, it may be the retiring shadow of the oppressor who has gone, which has kept many a young man of promise from feeling that sense of freedom which is necessary for action. For it cannot be doubted that there has been, and still is, amongst the Catholics of England, a fearful waste of talent and of strength, which might be of essential service both to the Church and to the State” (2).

There is no need, even though our limits permitted, for dilating upon the glory which has accrued to the name of Daniel O’Connell because of his preponderating share in the struggle for English and Irish Catholic Emancipation. The student knows how the praises of the Liberator have been

(1) Mr. Pitt, saying that he could not allow “under any circumstances, or under any possible situation of affairs, it (the relief demanded) ought to be discussed or entertained as a claim or question of right.”

(2) AMHERST: *Ubi supra*, in Introduction.

sounded by the most eloquent and most judicious publicists in every nation of Christendom. We may well hesitate ere we compare O'Connell with a Donoso Cortes or a Montalembert; but although the Irish champion attained his object by no great subtleties of reasoning, he was, among all the children of the Church in the nineteenth century, pre-eminently a "Catholic of action." He understood his mission; and as his most recent panegyrist has remarked, "he reduced that mission to action, and succeeded in effecting, by himself alone, and with the aid of his individual strength alone, what appeared impossible to an entire phalanx of men who were powerful because of their personal courage, and because of their social influence" (1). When O'Connell died in Genoa, on May 15, 1847, while on his way to the Eternal City, to which he had bequeathed his noble heart, the London *Standard* thought to stigmatize him as the "Thomas More of the nineteenth century, a thorough Popish fanatic"; and all the English and German Protestant journals of the day declared that the key of his whole career is furnished to those who realize that his life was devoted to "a tightening of the Pope's hold on Ireland." Reflecting on this universal Protestant opinion of the day, one is amused when he reads in the pages of that revered Masonic authority, Findel, that in 1799, when the future Liberator was twenty-four years old, he took the oaths of fidelity to the Dark Lantern in the Grand Lodge of Dublin; and that as a "devout" adept of Square and Triangle he filled the office of "Venerable" until the year 1838. When the Brethren of the Three Points claimed, in after years, Pope Pius IX. as one of their own—a matter which we shall touch in due time—the "profane" world thought that the impudence of the sectaries had culminated; but the innocent "profane" forgot that the apex of sublime audacity had been reached when Findel asserted that eternal hatred to Rome and her priesthood had been sworn by the great tribune who spent his entire life in destroying the work which the Lodges fabricated—by that same tribune who continually urged his auditors to abhor

(1) GAETANO ZOCCHI, S. J.: *Daniel O'Connell and the Revindication of Christian Right*, in the *Roman Civiltà Cattolica*, Aug. 7, 1897.

all secret societies, those fearful and yet despicable associations which were, as he proclaimed, "detested by all honest men." Findel forgot that there still lived in England and Ireland men who had been witnesses of O'Connell's simple and heroic Catholic life; men who had often heard him declaring: "I am ready for anything—anything but an abandonment of my religion, the religion of my ancestors." A phenomenal adept of Freemasonry indeed would have been made out of that O'Connell who never took an important step without the approbation of the Irish episcopate. The pious, although (in one sense) "liberal," Father Ventura discerned no Masonic traits in the hero whom he lauded as "one of the greatest glories of Catholicism; the grandest, the most extraordinary, the most stupendous personage, of modern times" (1). Lacordaire did not see in O'Connell a fit companion of Cagliostro, Weisshaupt, and Mazzini, when he compared the grand patriot to Moses, Judas Maccabeus, Constantine, Charlemagne, and Gregory VII., all of whom, however, "labored with the aid of a regular sovereignty, while O'Connell had only the strength of a citizen, and the sovereignty of genius" (2). Louis Veuillot did not exaggerate when he said that Rome was the sole place worthy of guarding the heart of O'Connell, "since Rome was his true country, he having, by his immense labor, by the splendor of his faith, by the glory of his courage, and by the fruitfulness of his genius, attained to a grandeur which made him a citizen not only of Ireland, but of that world of which Pius IX. was the great king" (3). The faculty of historical perception must be wanting in the person who does not agree with the prince of modern historians, the incomparably judicious Cantù, when he says, that "He who seeks for a personage who may be compared with this great agitator, must recur to the times of robust beings, to the days when a Peter the Hermit, a St. Bernard, a St. Anthony, drew to their standards hundreds of thousands of men" (4).

(1) *Funeral Oration for Daniel O'Connell, June 28 and 30.* Edit. Cairo. Rome, 1847.

(2) *Funeral Oration for Daniel O'Connell*, in Vol. vii. of Lacordaire's Works. Edit. Paris, 1862.

(3) *Mélanges*, Vol. iii., p. 551. Paris, 1857.

(4) *History of a Hundred Years*, Vol. iii., p. 178. Florence, 1851.

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY XVI.

Bartholomew Albert Cappellari was born in Belluno, in Lombardy, in 1765. At the age of eighteen he entered the monastic branch of the Camaldolese Benedictines (1), and with the habit of that Order he assumed the name of Mauro. The fame of Dom Mauro Cappellari as a theologian and a canonist caused Leo XII. to enroll him in the Sacred College in 1825. When the cardinals entered into Conclave to choose a successor to Pius VIII., who had died on Dec. 1, 1830, it appeared at first that the tiara would be placed on the head of the saintly Cardinal Giustiniani. But when twenty-one of the necessary twenty-nine votes were seen to be certainly his, the right of exclusion by the Spanish crown was exercised against him by Cardinal Marco, the agent of His Catholic Majesty. Probably the reason for this exclusion was the part taken by Giustiniani in the recent nominations to the long vacant sees in South America—nominations which the Spanish government had insisted on reserving to itself, although it had already practically admitted the independence of its revolted colonies (2). The manner of

(1) The Camaldolese are not, as many suppose, all hermits. Besides their hermitages, they have many magnificent monasteries, among which the principal one is that of St. Gregory on the Cælian Hill in Rome. It was from this monastery, then belonging to the parent Benedictine Order, that St. Augustine and his fellow-monks went forth, at the command of Pope St. Gregory I., to evangelize the Anglo-Saxons.

(2) "South America had thrown off the Spanish rule, and enjoyed an independence of some years' duration. On May 21, 1827, the Pope (Leo XII.) addressed the Cardinals in Consistory assembled, on the ecclesiastical position of that continent. Spain had refused to recognize the independence of its many states, although it had ceased effectually even to disturb them. It claimed still all its old rights over them, and among them that of episcopal presentation. The exercise of such a power, if it existed, would have been contradictory to its object, and therefore self-defeating. Bishops are intended to feed a flock; and of what use would bishops have been, who would never have been allowed even to look upon their sees, or to be heard by their people? For it would have been quite unreasonable to expect that the free republics would acknowledge the jurisdiction of the country which declared itself at war with them. On the other hand, there had been no formal ecclesiastical treaty or Concordat between these commonwealths and the Holy See, by which previous claims had been abrogated, and new rights invested in their present rulers. It was just a case for the exercise of the highest prerogative which both parties acknowledged to be inherent in the supremacy, however galling its application might be to one of them. In the allocution alluded to, the Pope announced that, not feeling justified in longer per-

Giustiniani's reception of this exclusion merits remembrance. When the cardinal-dean had read the notice which deprived him of any hopes of the tiara, if indeed he had ever hoped for it, Giustiniani arose and calmly said: "If I did not know courts by experience, I should certainly have cause to be surprised at the 'exclusion' published by the most eminent dean; since, far from being able to reproach myself with having given cause of complaint against me to His Catholic Majesty, during my nunciature, I dare congratulate myself with having rendered His Majesty signal service in the difficult circumstances wherein he was placed." He then referred to the fact that the Spanish government itself had often lauded his conduct, and continued: "I shall always cherish the memory of these kindnesses shown me by His Catholic Majesty, and shall entertain toward him the most profound respect, and in addition a most lively interest for all that can regard his welfare and that of his august family. I must add that of all the benefits conferred on me by His Majesty, I consider the greatest and most acceptable to me (at least in its effects) to be his having this day closed for me the access to the most sublime dignity of the Pontificate. Knowing, as I do, my great weakness, I could not bring myself to foresee that I should ever be asked to assume so heavy a burden; and when I saw, during these last days, that you thought of asking me, my heart was filled with the bitterest sorrow. To-day I find myself free from my anxiety; I am restored to tranquillity, and I retain only the gratification of knowing that some of my most worthy col-

lating those sees to remain vacant, and those immense populations to wander like sheep without a shepherd, he had provided them with worthy pastors, without the intervention of either side, but in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority. The Court of Madrid was angry, and refused to admit the Papal Nuncio, Tiberi; and a little episode in the life of the present Pontiff (Pius IX.) arose from this passing coolness. Pius VIII., at the request of Cienfuegos, envoy from Chili, sent as envoy to that republic Mgr. Muzi, and as his assistant the Ab. Mastai, now Pius IX. The Pope dying before the expedition had sailed from Genoa, it was confirmed by Leo XII., who, in his brief, declared that the Count Mastai had been originally appointed by his desire, describing him as "*Nobis apprime charus.*" The commissioners sailed Oct. 11th, 1823, but were driven by stress of weather into Palma, the capital of Majorca. Upon ascertaining from their papers who were the ecclesiastics on board, and what their mission, the governor had them arrested, kept them four days in a common prison, subjected them to an ignominious examination in the court, and was on the point of sending them to banishment in an African *presidio*, when common sense prevailed, and they were restored to liberty. See a full account in the *Dublin Review*, Vol. xxxiv., p. 469." WISEMAN; *Last Four Popes*, pt. ii., ch. 8.

leagues have deigned to cast a look on me, and have honored me with their votes, for which I beg to offer them my eternal and sincerest gratitude" (1). The Spanish government had certainly accentuated its displeasure toward all who had contributed to its defeat in the matter of the South American bishoprics; but it was doomed to behold the election of one who had been far more prominent than Giustiniani in thwarting its desires—the Camaldolese, Cappellari. As we have frequently had occasion to remark, the privilege of "exclusion" could be used but once in the same Conclave by its possessor; therefore, when their Eminences turned their attention to Cappellari, the objections of Spain were as though non-existent. The humble Camaldolese was raised to the Chair of Peter on Feb. 12, 1831; and he assumed the name of Gregory XVI., because of his devotion to St. Gregory the Great, the first Pope furnished by the Benedictine Order, and in honor of Pope Gregory XV., the founder of the Congregation of the Propaganda, of which he had been the Prefect. Shortly after the coronation of the new Pope-King, the editor-in-chief of *L'Avenir*, Lamennais, then already regarded as having succeeded to Bossuet's title, "The Last of the Fathers," thus expressed the sentiments which were then evoked in the minds of such Christians as were both discerning and well-minded: "Piety, Science, and Wisdom have again been placed on the immortal Throne of St. Peter. An excellent apprenticeship for the Popedom was that which Cardinal Cappellari underwent as Prefect of the Propaganda; he became accustomed to regard the world in its entirety." We shall see, in another dissertation, how Lamennais came to represent His Holiness as the incarnation of ignorance, both as to the world and as to the means for taming it. As yet, however, the heart of the Catholic publicist bade him proclaim that the blessing given by Gregory XVI., for the first time in his pontificate, *Urbi et Orbi*, "would remind the extremities of the earth of that benevolence which the very deserts have recognized."

Had Pope Gregory XVI. possessed all the qualities which

(1) MORONI: *Dictionary*, Vol. xxxi., p. 221.

Cardinal Mai, in his exhortation to the Eminent Fathers who were about to enter into the Conclave of 1830, urged those electors to discern in their choice for a successor to Pius VIII., he would not have been superabundantly equipped for his task. "Give us," cried Mai, "a Pontiff who in faith will be a Peter, who in constancy will equal Cornelius, who will be as felicitous as Sylvester, and who in eloquence will vie with Damasus. May he have the exquisite clearness of Leo the Great, the learning of Gelasius, the piety of the great Gregory, the fortitude of Symmachus, and may he be loved by princes as Adrian was loved. May he be a Eugenius in preserving harmony among the churches, a Nicholas in his patronage of the learned, a Julius in grandeur of thought, a Leo X. in liberality, a Pius V. in sanctity, and a Sixtus V. in strength of mind. And not to recur to olden times alone, give us a Pontiff in whom there will not be wanting the erudition of Benedict XIV., or the munificence of Pius VI., or the force and benignity of Pius VII., or the vigilance of Leo XII., or the rectitude of Pius VIII." This aspiration for an ideal Pontiff, a picture which the learned decipherer of palimpsests could scarcely have hoped to see realized, was not to be satisfied in Gregory XVI.; nevertheless, few Popes have been more fervent in their religious zeal, and he was a firm and prudent administrator of his temporal dominion.

It was the misfortune of Gregory XVI. to have assumed the duties of a Pope-King at a time when very many of the Italian clergy were not equal to the sublimity of their mission. The impartial, intensely patriotic, and uncompromisingly Catholic Cantù draws this picture of these unworthy sons of the sanctuary: "Having left the seminaries, into which a real vocation had not always led them; dreading impopularity and derision, they seemed desirous of obtaining forgiveness for their ecclesiastical position and dress by an adoption, as far as possible, of worldly manners. They frequented the cafes and other rendezvous, and were seen on the promenades, and even in the theatres. They formed their minds by reading the newspapers, so as to be able to chat on politics in the liberal jargon. They were no

strangers to the secret societies, nor did they keep aloof from conspiracies. With the romances of Berchet, the drolleries of Giusti, and the declamations of Gioberti, they inebriated themselves with the idea of Italy soon recovering her legitimate primacy. They tortured the Bible in order to discover encouragement and justification for their demolitions. They were the first in ridiculing the study of theology, the ecclesiastical virtues—charity, no less than devotion, and all priests who manifested uncommon learning or disinterested zeal; while they regarded as progress every slight on the faith of their ancestors, every condemnation of those ‘abuses’ in which they themselves participated, every secularization of ecclesiastical institutions, every abolition of a religious community. And they grieved because they were obliged to hide their own great talents and activity under the soutane. Such priests were caressed by the secret societies; and were allured by the prospect of a civil and social revolution which would, however, lay no hands on Catholicism, that is, on the benefices which they enjoyed, and on the dignities to which they aspired. Therefore many of them good-naturedly believed, or at least proclaimed, that Catholicism, about to lead the procession of modern ideas, would soon conquer the entire world” (1). The reader will note that in the mind of the great Italian historian there is no question of the morality or of the absolute faith of these “political priests” of Italy; when the number of ecclesiastics in Italy is considered, statistics would probably show that while the world of our day has resounded with the names of such wretches as Bassi, Gavazzi, Achille, etc., the clergy of no other country have furnished fewer scandals. Cantù wished to illustrate the baneful effects of the Giobertian fever—effects which still endure. Cardinal Bernetti, secretary of state to Gregory XVI., and the most calumniated statesman of his day, because he was really intelligent, and knew how to cope with men whose “diplomacy” was mere chicanery, spoke of the Italian clergy of that time in terms very similar to those used by Cantù. In a letter dated Aug. 4, 1845, written to a

(1) *Heretics of Italy*, Vol. iii., p. 531. Turin, 1866.

friend, probably Cantù himself, the cardinal said: "The clergy are imbued with ideas which are liberal, in the worst sense of the term. Profound studies are abandoned, despite the encouragement given to the students, despite the rewards given to professors, despite the favors which the Holy Father is ever ready to dispense. Young men prepare indeed for their future duties, but not with joy and ambition, as was the case in the halcyon days of Rome; few care to become learned theologians, profound casuists, able canonists; they become priests, but they aim at being men; and when they use this word 'men,' they give to it a buffoonesque emphasis, so absurd is their mixture of Catholic faith with Italian phantasmagorias. . . . The day will come when these mines, charged with the powder of Constitutionalism and Progress, will explode; and God grant that I, who have witnessed so many revolutions and disasters, may not behold new woes for the Church!" (1).

Gregory XVI. had scarcely entered his apartments, after having imparted his inaugural blessing "to the city and the world" from the *loggia* of St. Peter's, when he was informed of the revolt in the Romagna. The signal which had been given at the barricades of Paris during the "Three Days" of July of the previous year, when the elder branch of the House of Bourbon was dethroned to make way for the younger in the person of Louis Philippe d'Orleans, had been heeded. Temporary paralysis had been entailed by the general restorations of 1815 on the secret societies with which Europe was honeycombed; but those baneful organizations were now in the enjoyment of their pristine activity, and they had ordered another campaign against the temporal crown of the Roman Pontiff. This revolutionary movement was soon crushed, thanks to the interested intervention of Austria, who not only hoped to acquire for herself the so long coveted Legations, but was forced by self-interest to protect the Hapsburg dukes of Tuscany and Modena, as well as Mary Louisa, the so-called widow of Napoleon, to whom the Congress of Vienna had assigned the duchy of Parma as compensation for honors to which she could advance no

(1) Cited by Cantù, *loc. cit.*, p. 560.

legitimate claim. In their task of subverting again the dominion of the Pope-King, the Masonic Lodges had relied on the aid of the monarch whom they had just placed on the throne of his cousin; but Louis Philippe, through Casimir Périer, whom he had raised to the ministry, refused to do more than protest against the intervention of Austria. We must note here that a leading part in this insurrection was taken by the two sons of Louis Bonaparte and Hortense de Beauharnais, the young princes Charles Napoleon and Louis Napoleon (afterward emperor as Napoleon III.), who thus repaid the cordial and munificent hospitality which the Roman Pontiff had accorded, and was then according, to the Bonaparte family (1). When Bologna had been taken by the Austrians, and Rimini and Ancona had surrendered; when brute force had failed to destroy once more the civil royalty of the tiara, diplomatic chicanery undertook to emasculate that royalty. Louis Philippe knew full well that the late revolution in the Papal States was unjustifiable; but he owed some satisfaction to the Carbonari, who were affiliated to those who had made him King of the French. Therefore he pretended to regard the complaints of the rebels of the Romagna as worthy of consideration. In concert with Lord Palmerston, or rather in obedience to that English minister, who was then, and during many

(1) Justice to the memory of Napoleon III. demands that we record a circumstance which, in some sort palliates his guilt on this occasion. Prince Louis Napoleon, the vicissitudes of whose early life had given to him a character which was a result of mingling German pseudo-philosophy, Italian duplicity, English aristocratic tendencies, and Swiss quasi-democracy, was in his twenty-second year when he accompanied his elder brother, Charles, into the ranks of the armed Carbonari. Having entered an inn at Forlì, the landlord brought his register in order to receive the descriptions of the personality of his guests. A comrade of the princes wrote on the open page: "Accursi, conspirator, on the road to Rome to upset the Pope." Charles Bonaparte took the pen, and repeated the rhodomontade of Accursi. Then Louis Napoleon wrote on the register: "My duties and my sentiments of gratitude forbid, on my part, any *direct* attack on the Pope. My family has found, in all Europe, refuge and assistance only at the feet of the Holy Father; and I fear that I may find on the grand stairs of the Vatican my grandmother and the rest of my relatives. I accompany you (Accursi and Charles Bonaparte), in order to subvert the clerical power in the provinces; but do not ask me to march on Rome." On the following morning, Charles Bonaparte died in the arms of his brother, having received a ball in the breast, according to one story, or having been stabbed, as the servants of the inn narrated. The future emperor now escaped to Ancona, and thence into France, where Louis Philippe would have allowed him to remain, had not Casimir Périer induced the monarch to send him out of the kingdom. It was while Louis Napoleon was engaged in this insurrection of 1831, that the mother of his great uncle wrote to him: "You know, my son, that we owe to His Holiness the roof that covers us, and the bread that we eat."

subsequent years, the practical head of European Masonry, he induced the Masonic cabinets of Russia and Prussia, and the partly Masonic cabinet of Austria, to appoint delegates to a conference which should meet in Rome, the Pope's capital, to consider the ways and means for a prevention of future trouble in the Papal States. The impudence of these cabinets in undertaking such business in the Eternal City was truly sublime and phenomenal; therefore it was no matter of surprise to the Catholics of Europe, when they learned that a seat at this conference had been assigned to Sir Hamilton Seymour, a representative of England, a power which, unless its monarch and ministers braved the terrible penalties of *premunire*, could hold no diplomatic relations with the Holy See. When this body of bespangled and otherwise bedizzened sectaries had convened, they assigned to the Prussian delegate, the Chevalier Bunsen, the task of framing a *Memorandum* which should indicate to the Pontiff the conditions, an acceptance of which might secure to the Popedom, on the part of Masonry and its friends, a continuance of the recognition of the temporal power. The Pontiff was asked to grant, as though it was to be a new thing in his dominions, the admission of laymen to positions in the administration; and this demand was made in face of the fact, as admitted by Rayneval, the French ambassador in Rome, that the ecclesiastical employees of the pontifical government were in proportion to the laymen in office as is one to sixty (1). Municipal liberties were demanded for a country which had preserved the communal system with a tenacity which the vicissitudes of time never overcame—for a country to which other lands had turned for lessons when they essayed communal government (2). Reforms in the judiciary were demanded for a country which already enjoyed, and for centuries had enjoyed, as Rayneval observed, "a regular legislation, resting on foundations established by equity, and which past ages have respected; a legislation which is modified every

(1) SAUZET; *Rome Before Europe*, p. 125. Paris, 1870.

(2) For an excellent description of the development of municipal government in the Papal States, and of the local liberties enjoyed by the communes, see the *History of Pope Urban V.* by the Canon Magnan. Paris, 1860.

day, as need occurs, with a regularity which is unknown in any other land." There could have been but one object in urging on the Pontiff the adoption of institutions which were already in full vigor in his dominions; the Masonic conspirators wished to weaken, in the eyes of the peoples of Europe, and especially of the Italian populations, the majestic authority of the Pope-Kings. And it was, forsooth, "in the general interest of Europe," according to the *Memorandum*, that the conspiring powers insisted that the pontifical government should be secured on "the solid foundation of ameliorations, and of an internal guarantee, which would render it superior to *those fluctuations which must be inherent in the nature of every elective government.*" The rank and file of the Carbonari, whose aim was a so-called republic, could scarcely have welcomed this reflection which the "conservative" Masons of the European cabinets could not refrain from emitting; but they were willing to ignore it, providing that their immediate end were attained—the imposition of a Constitution on the papal government. The Carbonari, more honest and more logical, although apparently more openly diabolic than those other Masons whose aristocratic surroundings or proclivities rendered them "conservative" in everything that was not Catholic, were not blind to the fact that the paper Constitutions, devised by European Masonry during the previous fifty years, had been patched and tinkered, modified and metamorphosed, so persistently and necessarily, and amid the noise of tumbling thrones, that no sane mind could regard them as "internal guarantees" of a government's durability. The last demand of the Masonico-Franco-Anglo-Prusso-Russian conferees was for the establishment of a Supreme Court of Finance in Rome, and also for "an administrative Council which would be composed of persons elected by the local councils." The government of Louis Philippe, which filled Europe with incendiaries in order to preserve itself from the fire which its own hands had kindled, and which could have no justifiable confidence in its own durability, had the presumption to guarantee the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See, if Gregory XVI. would accept the conditions of the *Memoran-*

*dum* To this insidious offer Cardinal Bernetti replied that "although the guarantee of the French government was to be appreciated by the Holy See, nevertheless His Holiness found it impossible to purchase such security with a veritable abdication of his pontifical independence." However, the allied "conservative" Masonic powers persisted in their attack. Palmerston, through his representative, Seymour, chanted a eulogy of all past and future rebels to the papal authority; and assured Cardinal Bernetti that England would protect all future insurgents, unless the Pontiff introduced into his dominions "complete representative institutions, full liberty of the press, and a National Guard." In the name of the Pope, the cardinal-secretary replied that an illimited liberty of the press was less a danger to the Church than it was an impossibility for any serious government. "As for the National Guard," said Bernetti, "the Pontiff is not quite certain whether its advantages are greater than its inconveniences. But if the English government were itself to try in London, and for fifteen or twenty years, an experiment as to the value of that institution which it so cheerfully recommends to other governments, perhaps His Holiness might be induced to adopt it." The cut was neatly delivered; no English minister of that day would have dared to adopt the French invention of a National Guard in his own land. The sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia seemed to have experienced, shortly after this rejoinder of Bernetti, an attack of either shame for their impudence, or fear for their own crowns in the storm that they were invoking; whatever was their motive, Russia ordered her commissioner to repudiate everything that was imperious in the *Memorandum*, Prussia disavowed the conduct of her representative, and Austria quietly dropped the matter. The "king of the *bourgeoisie*" was incapable of shame; and as for England, she was the England whose post-Reformation foreign policy generally disgusts the unprejudiced observer. Palmerston ordered Sir Hamilton Seymour to return to Florence, to which capital he was accredited; and after the agent had departed, it was found that he had left for the papal secretary of state a letter of farewell which

was an implicit programme of the future Masonic campaign in Italy—a programme which, directed by Palmerston, was executed shortly afterward in Rome by Lord Minto (1).

We find it easy to understand why the cabinets of England, Russia, and Prussia, should have brought this pressure to bear upon Pope Gregory XVI. ; but why did France and Austria join in so unfilial and otherwise ungracious a task? Of course, Louis Philippe, as true a son of the Revolution as ever the veriest Jacobin of the Mountain had been, was a creature of the secret societies which had placed him on the throne of Henry V. ; but he was not entirely destitute of Catholic sentiments, and he knew that the immense majority of his countrymen were as sympathetic with the anxieties of the Roman Pontiff as the subjects of St. Louis could have been. Austria was Catholic and legitimist, even though the cabinet of Metternich did contain avowed Masons of high degree ; and although she was constantly on the watch for some opportunity for stealing the Legations from the Pope-King, her emperor did not cultivate the traditions of his German predecessors of the Holy Roman Empire to such an extent as to wish to despoil the Pontiff of all of the Pat-

(1) This piece of epistolary ambassadorial effrontery merits remembrance. "The undersigned has the honor of informing Your Excellency (*sic*) that he has received orders from his court to leave Rome, and to return to his post in Florence. The undersigned is also ordered to explain briefly to Your Excellency the reasons for which the English government sent him to Rome, and why it now withdraws him. The English government has no *direct* interest in the affairs of the Roman States, and has never dreamt of interfering in them. It was invited by the cabinets of France and Austria to take part in the negotiations at Rome, and it yielded to this invitation in the hope that its good offices, joined to those of the other cabinets, would help to procure an amicable settlement of the dissensions between the Pope and his subjects. The papal government not having done anything that it should have done to calm the discontent, the trouble has increased, especially because of the disappointment caused by the failure of the late negotiations in Rome. Failure has attended on the efforts made by the five powers, during the last year and more, to establish tranquillity in the Roman States ; the hope of seeing the populations voluntarily submissive to the power of the sovereign is no nearer realization than it was at the beginning of the negotiations. In these circumstances the undersigned has been ordered to declare that the English government has no more hope of success, and that there being no longer any reason for the presence of the undersigned in Rome, he has been ordered to return to his post in Florence. The undersigned has been told to express the regret that fills his heart because he has seen nothing done, during the past year and a half, for the re-establishment of tranquillity in Italy. The English government *foresees* that if the present course is pursued, new and more serious troubles will occur in the Roman States, and their consequences will be multiplied, and will become dangerous to the peace of Europe. If unfortunately this anticipation is verified, England at least will be free from all responsibility for the evils which will have been entailed because of the Pope's rejection of the wise and persistent advice of the English cabinet."

rimony of Peter. The fact is that the French and Austrian cabinets of that period vied with each other in an endeavor to secure the permanent support of the Masonic Lodges. Mazzini had been trying to obtain a *point d'appui* in these same Lodges for his society of "Young Italy," and its kindred associations of "Young Germany" and "Young Switzerland." If the cabinets of France and Austria could exclude the terrible Italian from the benefits of the more "conservative" Masonic Lodges, they would probably ward off from themselves the effects of the blow which "Young Italy" was about to deal against the Pope-King. Masonry was necessarily to be satisfied; therefore the French and Austrian cabinets proposed their species of capitulation to Gregory XVI. We abstain from dilating here on the matter of Mazzini and his "Young Italy," as plentiful occasion will be furnished when we treat of the reign of Pius IX.; we simply note that Mazzini, by his foundation of the journal entitled *Young Italy*, and by his simultaneous inauguration of the society bearing the same name, had separated from the Constitutional Carbonarism of the Restoration, and had inexorably cut his political and social ship adrift from everything papal, royal, or aristocratic; having resolved to establish a unitarian republic in Italy as the sole reliable means, according to his fancy, of procuring liberty for the "sons of the ancient Romans." His success as a political propagandist was phenomenal; and ere Gregory XVI. had reached his third year of reign, Italy appeared to be writhing fitfully over a volcano.

The generality of historians inform us that the Caliph Omar-ben-Akhattib wantonly burned the great Library of Alexandria; and while they seem to be ignorant of the many good reasons for a belief that at the time of Omar there was no library in Alexandria of any great value (1), they all grow eloquent in a denunciation of a vandalism which they declare this glorious nineteenth century to be incapable of perpetrating. Gregory XVI. was in the throes of his anxieties which had been entailed by the revolt in the Romagna, when there came to him from refined and cultivated Paris

(1) For proofs, see our apposite articles in the *Ave Maria*, Vols. xl. and xli.

information of an act of vandalism more condemnable than any ever excogitated by either Arab or Hun, or even by a follower of Genseric. For our account of this achievement of the allied forces of Masonry and mobocracy, we shall not rely on any legitimist or "clerical" evidence; the pages of Louis Blanc, one of the most energetic of the defenders of the principles of 1789, are before us. "It was by order of the magistrates of the city that the cross on the church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois was hurled from its pinnacle. The soldiers of the regular army were apparently hiding themselves; and the National Guards, so ardent in protecting the shops, left a clear path to the mob who had started to pillage the churches. It was the work of a moment to level an altar, to smash a pulpit, to pull the statues of the saints from their pedestals, to reduce the holy pictures to shreds. . . . The sacristy was ransacked, and vaudal buffoons donned the sacerdotal vestments." When the royal usurper was informed that the next enterprize of the liberals was to be an attack on the archiepiscopal residence, he commanded M. Baude, the prefect of police, to restrict his energies to the protection of the royal palace. As the revolutionary historian admits: "No measure for the protection of the archbishop was taken; but mysterious agents mingled with the mob, and, turning its fury away from the royal abode, allowed that fury to vent itself against the archiepiscopal palace." When a detachment of the 12th legion of the National Guard, commanded by Francis Arago, arrived on the spot, the demolition of the building was being finished, and the valuable Library was being annihilated. "It is impossible to estimate how much science and art lost by this wholesale destruction of rare books and precious manuscripts. M. Arago, a witness of the lugubrious scene, stormed with rage because he was unable to prevent this vandalism. However, he was about to command his battalion to advance, when he was informed that authoritative personages had induced the soldiers to allow matters to take their course. Particular mention was made of Thiers, then sub-secretary of state in the Ministry of Finance; and, in fact, M. Arago perceived that gentleman promenading amid the ruins, smil-

ing with satisfaction." Quite naturally, Louis Blanc, a thorough radical in his most moderate moments, says as little as the ascendancy of truth will allow him to say concerning this systematic devastation of one of the chief historical and literary glories of France. Another eye-witness, however, the famous *littérateur*, Paul Lacroix, gives many details of the vandalism (1). "The destruction of the Archbishop's Library of Paris must be recorded as one of the exploits of the National Guard." The uniformed and un-uniformed devastators formed a line reaching from the Library to the river; and the doomed volumes were passed from hand to hand, lacerated on the way, and then flung into the water. "More than 30,000 volumes of the most valuable books in the world were thus treated, while the mob vented its joy in insensate shouts. The 12th legion of the National Guard was the *plus peuple* of all the legions of that body; and it heartily sympathized with the vengeance which was openly proclaimed as against the priesthood, *contre la calotte*. . . . When I entered the immense hall where the great Library had reposed, it was empty; but, looking out of a window, I saw in the garden a heap of books which was more than twenty feet high, a remnant of the collection which had not yet been cast into the river. The guards were marching majestically on the top of this mass of literature, ever and anon bayoneting and otherwise lacerating the precious pages. . . . In a few moments not a volume of the grand collection remained" (2). The few Catholics who admire Thiers may not place much faith in the picture of their hero here drawn by Louis Blanc; but they must know that in 1849 Michel de Bourges, speaking in the National Assembly, reminded the chameleon-like statesman that when they were both students in law, they swore, at the same time, hatred to monarchy in very piquant (*sic*) circumstances: "M. Adolph Thiers held the crucifix while I took the oath, and I held the same crucifix while he swore to the same effect" (3).

(1) See the *Intermédiaire des Chercheurs et Curieux* for January 15, 1864; also the *Études Religieuses* for some extracts from the narrative of M. Lacroix.

(2) *History of Ten Years* (1830-1840), Vol. ii., p. 284.

(3) On Dec. 1, 1872, when Thiers was president of the Third French Republic, the *Provence*, a journal of Aix, recalled this and similar facts in the career of the great little man,

The truth is that in his Orleanist monarchical days, Thiers also merited the rebuke which the republican, Trélat, administered to his prosecutors during the famous trials of April, 1839: "There is here a judge who consecrated ten years of his life to develop republican sentiments in the minds of young men. I myself have seen him brandishing a dagger while he delivered a eulogy on Brutus. Does not that man feel that much of the responsibility for our acts rests with him? Without his republican eloquence, would we be here? I see before me many of my old comrades of the Carbonari; and I hold in my hands the oath which one of them took. And they want to condemn me for my fidelity to my oath" (1).

Proceeding now to the questions of a religious nature which were agitated during the pontificate of Gregory XVI. we must say a few words about Hermesianism, which then caused much trouble, although now its very name is almost unknown, even to many lovers of the recondite. Its author, George Hermes, was born in 1775, in the principality of Munster, in Germany. We learn from his writings that toward the end of his scholastic career, he conceived certain doubts concerning God, revelation, and immortality. He professed great admiration for Kant, who had proved, according to him, that "the olden metaphysics had no solid foundation"; but, nevertheless, he cared little for the Kantian system, feeling that Fichte had demonstrated that "the philosophy of Kant could not be defended." Raised to the priesthood in 1799, Hermes taught successively in the Universities of Munster and Bonn until his death in 1831. His system was vaunted by himself and his disciples as a reconciliation of the Catholic Faith with what he qualified as "the interests of human thought"; he fancied that he had created a rigorously philosophical demonstration of the truth of all Catholic doctrine. In his problematically laudable *entèrprise*, Hermes had thrown aside, as it were, and for the nonce, all that he really believed, and all that he knew, in matter of religion;

and no one of his numerous ex-monarchical friends attempted to refute the charges. The *Provence* quoted from the *Presse*, the *Credit*, and the *Opinion Publique* to show that in 1849 the oath of Thiers against monarchy was public property.

(1) The *National*, June 5, 1839.

he granted, for the moment, the truth of the supposition that in the universe there is nothing certainly true—not only no certainly true Catholic Church, but no other evident truth, such as that of the existence of God, of the existence of this world, etc. From a base of operations, therefore, which was nothing more nor less than positive and universal doubt, Hermes entered on a campaign with no other weapons than those furnished by his human intelligence; but the reader must not confound this universal doubt of the German speculativist with the methodical doubt of the Father of Modern Philosophy, Descartes. The doubt exercised by the French philosopher turned on metaphysical, not on moral certitude; he admitted, because of the moral evidence in their favor, things which an absence of metaphysical proof would have led him to reject; he excluded from his doubt, and most formally, not only those first principles which are universally admitted, and which he regarded as innate in the intellect of man, but also all the truths of divine faith and of the supernatural order; in fine, the methodical doubt of Descartes had nothing in common with the scepticism toward which the less logical mind, and especially the less precise habit of formulating his mental conceptions, led the German dreamer. The infelicitous inability of Hermes to express himself with lucidity, even in contingencies when his personal orthodoxy was involved, led Gregory XVI. to remark, in a letter to Elvenich, a most enthusiastic Hermesian: “I have read, examined, and weighed—*legi, examinavi, perpensi*—his doctrine. Hermes was undoubtedly a man of pure morality, and there can be no doubt as to his personal orthodoxy; but it may be that he was unable to explain his thoughts always in that precise manner which is indispensable in theology.” Hermes flattered himself, and his disciples applauded him, for having made a wonderful discovery; namely, a hitherto hidden or ignored principle by means of which man could attain, by successive steps of rigorous demonstration, to all truth—simple, religious, Catholic—a principle which would compel every investigator to admit that either there exists no truth whatever, or that truth is Catholicism. After a patient examination of this specious but evidently dangerous as-

sumption, Pope Gregory XVI. condemned it in a Brief issued on Sept. 26, 1835, from which we make the following synopsis : " Among the teachers of error may be numbered George Hermes, who, departing most rashly from the path which universal tradition and the Fathers have traced for the explanation and defense of the truths of faith ; who, even despising and haughtily condemning that path ; has opened a road of darkness which leads to many different errors by establishing positive doubt as the basis of all theological investigation, and by declaring as a principle that reason is the sole means by which man can attain to the knowledge of supernatural truth. . . . This author wanders in his notions. He advances ideas which are absurd and utterly at variance with the doctrines of the Catholic Church, especially when he treats of the nature and the rule of faith ; when he speaks of the Holy Scriptures, tradition, revelation, and the primacy in the Church ; when he assigns the motives of credibility ; when he describes the ordinary arguments for the demonstration of the existence of God ; when he speculates on the essence of God, on His holiness, justice, and liberty ; when he talks of the end which God proposes to Himself in those works which theologians designate as *ad extra* ; when he touches the necessity and distribution of grace, and the matter of rewards and punishments ; and when he descants on our first parents, on original sin, and on the capabilities of fallen man. These works (1) must be condemned, as containing doctrines and propositions which are respectively false, rash, captious, leading to scepticism and indifferentism, erroneous, scandalous, destructive to divine faith, redolent of heresy, and already condemned by the Church." During two years, little or no attention was paid in Germany to this Brief. In the Universities of Munster, Bonn, and Breslau, the professors were nearly all Hermesians ; nearly all the clergy were infected with the poison ; and in Prussia, then at variance with the Holy See because of the question of mixed marriages, the power of the government was used to further the progress of anything that Rome condemned. But in 1837, Mgr. Droste-

(1) The principal works of Hermes are *The Internal Truth of Christianity*, Munster, 1805 ; an *Introduction to Philosophy*, 1825 ; a *Positive Introduction*, 1829 ; and his *Dogma*, 1834.

Wischering, an intrepid prelate, having been appointed to the see of Cologne, issued a pastoral prescribing obedience to the pontifical decision, and ordering that eighteen accompanying anti-Hermesian propositions should be signed by all the professors and students in his jurisdiction, as well as by all those having care of souls. Many of the recalcitrants appealed to the king; and on Nov. 20, the archbishop was thrust into a mail-coach, and conducted by a troop of dragoons to the fortress of Minden. Then the government convoked the Chapter for the election of an administrator of the diocese of Cologne; and the canons servilely chose the royal candidate, thus securing the restoration of all the Hermesians to the places from which Droste-Wischering had expelled them. Elvenich, Braun, and many other Hermesians, continued for years to plead their cause at Rome; always insisting that the condemnation of their opinions was a defence of the doctrine of Lamennais. But Cardinal Lambruschini, the Jesuits, Perrone and Roothan, and all other Roman theologians who took part in the correspondence, needed to merely paraphrase the reply which Gregory XVI. emitted: "Both parties are in error; they who attribute everything to faith and leave nothing to reason, and they who claim everything for reason and grant nothing to faith." Thirty-five years after Gregory thus expressed himself, the Nineteenth General Council in its Constitution *Dei Filius* (Chap. IV.), circumscribed the respective missions of faith and reason when it said that reason demonstrates the foundations of faith; and, enlightened by faith, it develops a knowledge of divine things—*Ratio fidei fundamenta demonstrat, ejusque lumine illustrata, rerum divinarum scientiam excolat.*" But until the Council of the Vatican had put an end to all discussions on this matter among men of good faith, there were many who took advantage of the condemnations which they liked, in order to advance theories which were equally amenable to censure; for instance, Bautain and Bonnetty in France, and certain less celebrated writers in Germany (1).

(1) The article on *Hermesianism*, written by Mattès for the *Church Lexicon* of Wetzer and Welte, is especially notable for this propensity. See the article on the same subject in Le Noir's *Adaptation of the Dictionary of Bergier to the Intellectual Movement of the First Half of the Nineteenth Century*. Paris, 1880.

While the Hermesians of Germany were displaying a Protestant-like obstinacy in regard to the Gregorian Brief which had condemned the vagaries of their master, an equally enthusiastic school in France was furnishing to them an example of becoming docility to the decisions of the Roman Pontiff. Louis Bautain, born in Paris in 1796, entered the Superior Normal College in 1814, and had for his teachers such men as Cousin and Royer-Collard. In 1817 he obtained the chair of philosophy in the Royal College of Strasbourg, and his lectures soon procured for him a wide reputation for eloquence and solidity of thought. An avowed deist, a severe sickness taught him the value of religion, and he became an ardent Catholic, devoting his talent and energies to the production of works, of which his *Morality of the Gospel Compared with the Morality of the Philosophers* (1827) may be regarded as a sample. The conversion of Bautain was followed by that of many of his admirers, among whom we may mention three Israelites, Ratisbonne, (1) Goschler, and Lewal. These disciples, together with a young man who was destined to celebrity as Father Gratry of the Oratory, and another who in time became Cardinal de Bonnechose, followed their master into the priesthood; and Mgr. Legappe de Trévern, bishop of Strasbourg, confided his preparatory seminary to their care. But very soon it was rumored that an unsound philosophy was being taught by the new professors; and having investigated, the bishop requested the Abbé Bautain to subscribe the following six propositions. I. Reason can demonstrate with certainty the existence of God. Faith, a gift of heaven, is posterior to revelation; therefore it cannot properly be adduced to an atheist as a proof of the existence of God. II. The Mosaic Revelation is proved with certainty by the oral and written tradition of the Synagogue and of Christianity. III. The argument of Christian Revelation, based on the miracles of Jesus Christ, so convincing to the eye-witness (of those miracles) has lost none of its force

(1) This Ratisbonne, the elder, took the name of Marie-Theodore at his baptism, which occurred in 1826. He founded the Society of Our Lady of Sion, destined to the conversion of Jews, in 1842. His younger brother, who took as a Christian the name of Alphonse-Marie, was not converted until 1842; and he ascribed his change to a miraculous apparition of Our Lady to him in the church of San Andrea delle Fratte in Rome. See *The Three Romes*, by Mgr. Gaume, Vol. II., p. 173. Paris, 1847.

for subsequent generations. We find this proof in the oral and written tradition of all Christians. IV. We have no right to expect an incredulist to admit the resurrection of our Divine Saviour before we have given to him certain proofs of it; and these proofs are derived by reasonings from tradition. V. The use of reason precedes faith, and through revelation and grace reason leads men to faith. VI. Reason can prove with certainty the Revelation given by Moses to the Jews, and by Jesus Christ to the Christians. From these propositions, intended to contradict the peculiar theories of Bautain, the reader will perceive that the fundamental principle of the well-meaning professor was that without faith, we can be sure of nothing, not even of the existence of God. Although similar to the error of Lamennais on the same subject, this theory should not be confounded with that of the great unfortunate. Both Lamennais and Bautain wished to humiliate individual reason, and indeed they had both annihilated it; but while the former admitted the testimony of men as a criterion of truth, and claimed that the *sensus communis* is the same as that of the Church, the latter discerned no certainty without the aid of divine faith. Bautain contended that the Holy Scriptures "contain everything that is true, and everything that is good"; that is, he would have told men to regard the Bible as the sole criterion of truth, even though he frequently lauded the worth of tradition. The reply of Bautain to the demand of his bishop was unsatisfactory; and after many efforts to bring the professor into more orthodox ways, the prelate referred the affair to the Holy See. Gregory XVI. gave his decision in a Brief dated Dec. 20, 1834, confirming the judgment of the bishop. Immediately after he was informed that "Rome had spoken," Bautain signed the six propositions; and accompanied by the Abbé Bonnechose, he went to Rome, there to confirm his act of submission. When he returned to Strasbourg, he declared: "We departed from Rome with hearts full and light, as happens to all who have done their duty" (1).

During nearly the whole of his pontificate, the paternal heart of Gregory XVI. was afflicted by the persecution vis-

(1) *L'Ami de la Religion*, Vol. lxxxi., p. 305, 387, 418, 448.

ited by the government of Prussia on its Catholic subjects, because of their desire to obey the laws of the Church in the matter of mixed marriages. The dangers which are nearly always attendant on these unions had been immensely aggravated in 1803, when it was ordered by His Prussian Majesty that thereafter the Catholic party should not exact from the Protestant one a solemn promise that all children of the union should be raised as Catholics. This iniquitous law, which deprived the Prussian Catholics of that free exercise of their religion which had been assured to them by many treaties, was renewed in 1815; and after many years of suffering, the bishops of Prussia besought the Holy See to devise, if possible, some means of satisfying their tyrannical government without prejudice to Catholic duty. This appeal was made in the beginning of 1830, and on March 25, Pope Pius VIII. replied as follows: "You know full well the horror which the Church entertains for mixed marriages, unions which entail so many spiritual deformities and dangers. Precisely because of this horror, the Church has always insisted on obedience to those canons which prohibit those alliances. It is true that sometimes the Roman Pontiffs have derogated from this prohibition; but they so acted because of very grave reasons, and with the utmost reluctance. Again, they never failed to insert in the dispensations explicit conditions that there should be no danger of perversion for the Catholic party, and that all the progeny of both sexes should be trained in the Catholic religion. Therefore we would become guilty of a heinous crime before God and His Church, if we were to authorize you or the pastors in your dioceses to act in any way which might justify the conclusion that if the Church does not formally approve mixed marriages, she at least approves them indirectly and in reality. Each time, therefore, that a Catholic, especially a woman, wishes to espouse a non-Catholic, the pastor or bishop must instruct him or her in the canonical regulations concerning marriages; and they must warn him or her of the guilt which is incurred by a Catholic who dares to violate these canonical regulations by entering into a union, the consequence of which will be that the education of the

resulting children will depend entirely on the will of the non-Catholic parent. This salutary warning must be repeated, according as prudence may dictate, as the marriage-day approaches. Then, if the paternal counsels of the pastor have not been heeded, that pastor will indeed abstain from any censure of persons by name, simply in order to preserve religion from greater evils; but, on the other hand, the pastor must not honor the marriage with any religious ceremony; he must abstain from any act which might seem to imply that he has given his consent to the union. In fine, all that can be tolerated in these cases is that the pastors, for the sake of avoiding greater evils, may suffer the unions to be contracted in their presence; that they may certify in the Registry of Marriages, that the union has been validly accomplished; but that they shall beware of approving these illicit unions by any act of their own, above all by the use of any prayer or rite of the Church." All of the bishops of Prussia were not faithful to their duty in enforcing this Brief, which, as Gregory XVI. wrote, when commenting on it in 1837, "pushed its indulgence so far, that one might truly say that it reached the boundary line which could not be passed without violations of duty." But while the bishops of Treves, Munster, Breslau, and Paderborn compromised with the government, Mgr. Droste-Wischering, as we have seen, and the Polish prelate, Mgr. Dunin of Giesen and Posen, suffered imprisonment for their fidelity to conscience. When, despite the chicaneries and even perfidies of the Prussian cabinet, and of its ambassador in Rome, Bunsen, the true state of affairs was made known to Gregory XVI., he stigmatized the injustice of the tyrant in Berlin in language so energetic, that even the delinquent prelates were brought to a sense of their episcopal obligations. On his death-bed in Nov., 1836, the bishop of Treves had already announced that he rejected the agreement with the government into which he and his three companions in weakness had entered; and now the bishops of Munster and Paderborn followed his example. The bishop of Breslau heeded the exhortation of the Pontiff, and resigned his diocese. A general reaction occurred among the pastors who had been timid in the face of

civil power; and in 1838 the king, Frederick William III., deemed it the part of prudence to issue a decree whereby he admitted that it pertained to the bishop alone to judge as to what marriages in his diocese could receive the priestly benediction. Gregory XVI., wishing to give an object-lesson in this important matter to the Catholic world, caused an official account of the whole affair, together with all the documents which it had originated, to be published in Rome. When Frederick William IV. mounted the Prussian throne (1840), our Pontiff had the satisfaction of learning that the new monarch condescended to allow the bishops in his dominions to hold direct relations with the Father of Christendom; thereafter, decreed the king, the prelates should not be obliged to submit every iota of their correspondence with Rome to the good Protestant judgment of the royal prime minister (1).

The religious condition of Spain afflicted the heart of Gregory XVI. during his entire pontificate. Under the Napoleonic domination, two-thirds of the religious establishments in that pre-eminently Catholic land had been confiscated; some of the Religious Orders had been entirely suppressed; many of the bishops and their Chapters had been led either by fear or by bribery to receive the Articles of 1682. When Ferdinand VII. was restored to his throne, he re-established religious affairs in their olden condition; but in 1821 the false "liberalism" of the time imposed on him a revolutionary Constitution which led men to fear that the days of Aranda had returned (2). Immediately after the birth of the Princess Isabella in 1830, the influence of her mother, Maria Christina of Naples, induced Ferdinand VII. to abolish the Salic Law, to the prejudice of the legitimate heir to the crown, his brother, Don Carlos. Ferdinand died in 1833, and the three-year-old Isabella was proclaimed queen, under the regency of her mother. Then "liberalism" and all its attendant miseries became the order of the day in Spain; translations of every pre-eminently anti-Catholic or atheistic work were diffused throughout the land, and every other means for the demoralization

(1) *L'Ami de la Religion*, Vol. lxxxiv. and ci.—ALZOG; Vol. iii., p. 529, 539.

(2) See our Vol. iv., p. 468.

of the Spanish people was adopted. This revocation of that clause of the Salic Law, whereby a female was debarred from the Spanish throne, and which had been brought to the peninsula by its first Bourbon king, the grandson of Louis XIV., is so intimately connected with all the ecclesiastical as well as the political vicissitudes of the Land of the Cid during the last seventy years, that a brief narration of the means by which the abolition was effected will not be foreign to the purposes of our work. During the usurpation of the Spanish throne by Joseph Bonaparte, his French officers were indefatigable in their endeavors to propagate the ethics of Freemasonry, and thus to un-Hispanize a people who could not otherwise be conquered. A certain amount of success was attained, for men of the stamp of Llorente, the Josephist writer on the Spanish Inquisition, are always to be found in every land; but to the immense mass of the Spanish people a Freemason remained synonymous with a Frenchified Iberian, one who was practically a traitor to his country, an *Afrancesado* who was stench to the nostrils of a Spanish patriot. When the curtain fell on the Napoleonic drama, the weak hold of Freemasonry on Spain became still more feeble; and the "liberalization" of the Spanish throne became a matter of life or death for the Lodges. Other than a Masonic brain might have excogitated the plot which was now conceived; but none other than Masonic engineering could have executed it. During the year 1824 there was circulated among the Lodges an instruction from the Grand Orient, in which the following passage occurred: "In the present emergency, we should put forth greater efforts than ever to produce discord in the families of the despots. Throughout the entire extent of the Peninsula the Lodges must spread the report that malcontent royalists have conspired to dethrone Ferdinand VII. and to proclaim Don Carlos as king; that the other brothers of the king are accomplices in this design; and that the frequent visits of numerous royalists to the residences of the Infantes have no other object" (1). The diabolic order was obeyed. In 1826,

(1) The entire text of this instruction is given in the *History of Secret Societies in Spain*, by V. de La Fuente, Vol. iii., p. 662, et seqq. Madrid, 1850.

Spain was deluged with what purported to be copies of *pronunciamientos* emanating from royalist societies, and insisting on the substitution of Don Carlos for his brother on the throne of Spain. All of these incendiary documents were composed and printed in London, to which city the leaders of the Spanish adepts of Square and Triangle had fled (1). King Ferdinand began to mistrust his brother; the masses of the people knew not what to expect or what to fear. Don Carlos himself, a man of elevated character, sincerely religious, and of unimpeachable morality, was respected even by the Freemasons, and was loved by all of orthodox Spain; he was the presumptive heir to the crown, since the three successive marriages of the king had furnished no prince-royal. Naturally the king was jealous of this brother who was so greatly loved, and who seemed destined to succeed him; but when the Masonic trap was sprung, Ferdinand quickly recalled to mind the many instances of independence of judgment which Don Carlos had displayed, and the allegations of the sectarians were credited. However, the calumniated prince demanded an investigation; more than a thousand persons were interrogated, and the accused emerged triumphant from the ordeal. But the Lodges were not dismayed. On May 18, 1829, death claimed Queen Amelia, the pious third wife of Ferdinand VII.; and on June 19, the monarch, conquered by the arguments of his sister-in-law, Carlotta, daughter of King Francis I., of the Two Sicilies, made a demand on that sovereign for the hand of Carlotta's sister, Maria Christina. The marriage was celebrated on Dec. 15 of the same year; and great was the rejoicing in the Lodges, for several of the Neapolitan Bourbons had been enticed into the Masonic meshes, and it was well known that Maria Christina was not free from the contagion, although she had not given herself, like Carlotta, in bondage to the Brethren of the Three Points (2). In last analysis, all the miseries of Spain during the last seven decades may

(1) See *The Revolutions of Spain from 1808 to the End of 1836, With Biographical Sketches of the Most Distinguished Personages, and a Narrative of the War in the Peninsula, Down to the Present Time, from the Most Authentic Sources*, by W. Walton; Vol. I., p. 363. London, 1837.

(2) LA FUENTE; *Loc. cit.*, Vol. I., p. 510-599.

be charged to the Princess Carlotta, the willing instrument of the Lodges. Soon after the birth of the Infanta Isabella, the king was besieged by the two sisters with entreaties for an abolition of the Salic Law, so that in the event of no male issue being born to His Majesty by Christina, the royal diadem might devolve, not on Don Carlos, but on his niece. The decree was issued; but remorse soon seized on Ferdinand, and profiting by the absence of Carlotta, who was then in Andalusia, he signed a codicil to his will, revoking the unjust abolition. The execution of this codicil was to have remained a secret between His Majesty and the Minister, Calomarde; but there were too many adepts of the Square and Triangle in the palace. Carlotta was informed of the danger threatening the Masonic scheme; she hastened her return to La Granja; and aided by Christina, she so worried the vacillating monarch, then stretched on his bed of death, that the codicil was cancelled, and Don Carlos was summoned to acknowledge the baby Isabella as his future sovereign. The prince protested that he would defend with the armed hand his own rights and the true interests of the Spanish people; from that moment the Carlist flag was unfurled. While the king was dying, but apparently able to give sane directions, every member of the Ministry was dismissed, and his place was filled by some pet of the Lodges; and a decree of amnesty, recalling to Spain all the exiled sectarians, was promulgated. King Ferdinand VII. died in 1833, and with the regency of Queen Christina, under the ægis of Freemasonry, there began for Spain the most unhappy period of her history, a period of civil war and chronic revolution, and one the end of which no man can now foresee (1).

(1) If we rely on the knowledge possessed by the Masonic Grand Orient of Spain, there were no traces of Masonry in the Peninsula before 1728. In June and September, 1875, that esteemed Masonic authority, the *Monde Maçonnique*, published a long communication from the Spanish Grand Orient, in which we read: "The first traces of Masonry in Spain are those of a propaganda by that Masonry which was reformed in England in 1717, receiving the name of philosophical (See our Vol. iv., p. 411). . . . In a quarterly meeting of these English brethren, held on Wednesday, April 17, 1728, in the Crown Tavern near the London Stock Exchange, the delegate of the Grand Orient communicated a letter from some Masons of Madrid and other places in Spain, in which it was told how advantage had been taken of the presence of the Duke of Wharton (*sic*), in order to found a Lodge named *Matritense* in the street *Ancha de San Bernardo*. This Lodge met on the first Sunday of every month. The letter is dated Jan. 15, 1728; and it was signed by Philip, Duke of Wharton (*sic*), delegate of the Grand-Master; by Charles de Labelye, Venerable

Pope Gregory XVI. recognized the new government of Spain, just as he had recognized those of the recently revolted Spanish-American colonies ; that is, as a government *de facto*, pre-scinding entirely from the question of abstract rights. He had proclaimed the necessity of this procedure in reference to the Mexicans and South Americans in his Bull *Sollicitudo Ecclesiarum*, dated Aug. 31, 1831 ; and precisely because, as Wiseman remarked : " At the moment when changes were rapidly made in governments and dynasties, and when sceptres passed from hand to hand with the rapidity of magical or illusory exhibitions, it was at once bold and prudent to lay down simple principles by which the judgment of the Holy See might be easily anticipated ; at the same time that it kept itself clear of all internal disputes and embarrassing appeals during actual contests." However, the prudent policy of the Pope did not conciliate those whom the votaries of the Dark Lantern had blinded. In 1834 the cholera appeared in Madrid ; and simultaneously the " Liberals " spread the report that the priests, and of course the Jesuits especially, had poisoned the water-sources. On July 17 a furious mob attacked the Jesuit College, and massacred several of the fathers, using in some cases refinements of tortures which would have done credit to the minions of the English Elizabeth and Cromwell. Similar scenes were also enacted at the establishments of the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Fathers of Mersey. In 1835 the same panorama of " liberalism " was exhibited in Saragossa, Barcelona, Cordova, and many minor cities. In 1836, under the cloak of the authority of the six-year-old Isabella, the Masonic Ministry confiscated all the property of the Religious Orders ; and then came the turn of the secular clergy. Hundreds of the priests and many of the bishops were banished ; churches, asylums, and hospitals were pillaged. On Feb. 1, 1836, and on several oc-

by Richard I, First Vigilant ; etc., etc. Therefore, the first authentic trace of Spanish Masonry, attested by documents still existing in Madrid and in London, shows that the institution began here, just as in France, through a delegation from the English Grand-Master ; and that a Frenchman was the first Venerable." The reader must not forget that it was not until ten years after this birth of Spanish Masonry, that the Order was condemned by the Church. This fact will account readily for what would otherwise be inexplicable—that Masonry should have been able to establish itself, though never so slightly, on Spanish soil.

casions during the following five years, the Pope begged for the prayers of Christendom in behalf of the afflicted Church of Spain. To the first Allocution of the Pontiff, the Masonic tool and champion, Espartero, replied with a manifesto which characterized the papal complaint as "offensive to Spanish honor, and a declaration of war." All relations with the Holy See were suspended; and the vacant sees were filled by persons named by the government, and installed by force. But the "Duke of Victory" was banished from Spain; and when, in 1844, the majority of Isabella II. placed, to some extent, the reins of power in her own hands, comparative peace was restored to the Spanish Church. We must note, however, that no restoration of the stolen ecclesiastical property was made; post-Reformation history shows that just as in England, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, so in Catholic countries which have periodically succumbed to Masonic rule, the grip of the state on Church property is never loosened, once that it has been effected (1).

Portugal also was the occasion of much sorrow and anxiety to Gregory XVI. Just as in the case of Spain, the Napoleonic fever and its accompanying Masonic eruptions had left the patient on the verge of both political and spiritual death. The reader will remember that when the armies of Napoleon invaded Portugal in 1807, the regent, afterward King John VI., fled to the most promising of the Portuguese colonies, Brazil, leaving to England the task of defending his native land. The fall of Napoleon having restored to him his European crown, Dom Juan preferred to remain in Rio Janeiro, styling himself "King of Portugal, Brazil, and the Algarves"; thus reducing, as it were, his European dominions to the condition of a quasi-dependency on an American state. The Portuguese bore the absence of the royal court with bad grace; the agents of the Dark Lantern found their task easy when they incited the mob to a revolution; nor did the promulgation of a new Constitution, that panacea of the "liberals" for all political evils, and for the introduction of which John VI. made the long

(1) For interesting details concerning the vicissitudes of the Church of Spain during the pontificate of Gregory XVI., see *L'Ami de la Religion*, Vol. xxiii., p. 82-93; HENBION: *History*, Vol. xiii., p. 253, et seqq.

voyage from his loved Brazil, please the majority of the nation. When John VI. died in 1826, his eldest son and heir, Dom Pedro, avowing that, like his father, he preferred Brazil as a home and as a kingdom, resigned the crown of Portugal to his daughter, Doña Maria da Gloria; and with the resignation he presented to his Portuguese subjects, by way of parting gift, a presumably glorious second Constitution which he had imitated from the French *Charte* which was then not very much loved or respected by the subjects of Charles X. When passing the crown of Portugal to his daughter, Dom Pedro had chosen to ignore a fundamental law of the kingdom, which, voted by the Cortes in 1641, and confirmed by letters-patent of King John IV. on Sept. 12, 1642, decreed that if the Portuguese monarch should ever don a second crown, that of Portugal should pass to his nearest male kinsman. This kinsman, in the present case, was Dom Miguel, a brother of Dom Pedro, whom that monarch had constituted regent during the minority of Doña Maria da Gloria. The national sentiment called on Dom Miguel to assert his right; and as soon as the British forces had departed, that prince convoked the Cortes. Dom Pedro was pronounced a foreigner, because of his now separate kingdom of Brazil; therefore he could not pass the crown of Portugal to his daughter; therefore, but also because of the fundamental law of 1642, Dom Miguel was proclaimed king of Portugal in July, 1828. The Lodges put forth all their strength to prevent the triumph of "absolutism" in the person of Dom Miguel; but in the civil war which ensued, although the power and money of England aided the "liberals," the legitimate monarch everywhere triumphed, and had not the French Revolution of 1830 occurred, his reign would have been consolidated. Louis Philippe, influenced by his natural fear of legitimacy, and by England, whose commercial clutch on Portugal was threatened by Dom Miguel, declared for Doña Maria; and after a gallant struggle against England, the dominating powers in France, and the Brethren of the Three Points, legitimacy in Portugal succumbed. The triumph of the Lodges was signalized immediately by an onslaught on the Church. On Sept. 30,

1833, Pope Gregory XVI. protested, in an Allocution to the Sacred College, against the banishment of entire religious communities from Portugal, and against a decree whereby the government of Lisbon had forbidden all religious orders in its jurisdiction to receive any more novices. On Aug. 17, 1834, the Pontiff complained, in another Allocution, of a law by which all convents, colleges, hospitals, and asylums, owned by religious communities, were suppressed, all their property being confiscated to the state. The preamble to this law, said Gregory, contained a quantity of calumnies, than which "the most virulent enemy of religion and of the holy institutes could not invent anything more outrageous, more false and more opposed by incontestable monuments of ecclesiastical history." Truly, the adepts of Square and Triangle had waxed strong in Catholic Portugal, since the first introduction of their baneful society into that land in the first years of the nineteenth century (1), or perhaps during the ministry of the infamous Pombal (2). Probably much of the success of Masonry in Portugal is due to the fact that in the time of Pombal very many of the educated and aristocratic class were infected with Jansenism; it is certain that the famous Jansenist journal, the *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques* which we have already introduced to the reader (3), was widely circulated in Lisbon. Again, an ultracismontanism such as no Gallican ever accepted had been rife in Portugal during many years; as a "liberal" writer of our day avows, this spirit had paralyzed religious zeal in its possessors (4). Moving in an atmosphere of Jansenism and Gallicanism, the votaries of Masonry could well be confident that the religious face which they presented would

(1) According to the *Chaine d'Union*, a Masonic organ much esteemed by European adepts, the first Lodges in Portugal were founded by English and French brethren during the Napoleonic era. See this journal for 1872-73, p. 581-584.

(2) Joseph Delvaux, an ecclesiastic of some distinction, who sojourned in Portugal during the critical period from 1829 to 1834, and whose *Unedited Letters on the Restoration of the Jesuits in Portugal* were published in Paris in 1866, says: "No one doubts that the rebels have issued from the Masonic Lodges. A constant tradition attributes to Pombal the establishment of the first regular lodge in Lisbon. It was modelled on those of England, which he had known while he was ambassador in that country... Whether he himself was a Mason, cannot be verified; but it is indubitable that he and the sect which he transplanted to Portugal prepared the events, the consequences of which we now behold."

(3) See our Vol. iv., p. 587, in Note.

(4) DE LAVELEYE, *Letters from Italy*. Paris, 1880.

not be detested as a mask. It was in the name of religion that the Constitutionals, directed by the Lodges, banished the religious orders almost as soon as Dom Miguel was defeated; just as in 1862 they expelled the Sisters of Charity in the same name. Finally, we must remember that like the olden Gnostics and Manicheans, and like the more modern Albigenses and Templars, the adepts of Square and Triangle had been aided by the connivance of a no small portion of the secular clergy. After the Papacy, the chief object of the hostility of Masonry has ever been the Religious Orders; and in Portugal especially care was taken to separate, ostensibly, the cause of these Orders from that of the secular clergy. Ecclesiastical property, when not owned by regular communities, was generally safe in the days of which we now write; the privileges of the secular clergy, the external respect ostentatiously accorded to bishops, suffered no diminution; no attempt to detract from the adventitious grandeurs of divine worship was as yet even excogitated. These tactics blinded the masses of the Portuguese people, while they acted as mental and spiritual soporifics to such of the secular clergy as were either supinely ignorant or profoundly worldly. It was not necessary for Masonry to penetrate into the seminaries, or into the ranks of the ordained clergy; although, indeed, as in the case of the German Illuminati (1), very many ecclesiastics, some even of the higher order, suffered themselves to be drawn into the Lodges. The object of the conspirators was gained when the greater part of the Portuguese secular clergy, bishops as well as priests, had been implicitly separated from the centre of Christian unity; when, although not self-proclaimed schismatics, those deluded or perhaps conscious advocates of Gallicanism and of German Febronianism had become champions of all that the Brethren of the Three Points wished, at that moment, to actuate. We shall return to this point when, in our dissertation on Freemasonry in Latin America, we shall have occasion to descant on the melancholy state of religious matters in Brazil during the reign of Pius IX. One of the lamentable consequences of the malevolent attitude of the

(1) See our Vol. iv. p. 427.

Portuguese government of this period toward the Holy See was the schism of Goa, which, to the great detriment of the missionary cause in Hindostan, was not terminated until our day. The right of patronage which the Portuguese cabinet, with no view to the spiritual welfare of the peoples of India, insisted on exercising even in regions where it no longer enjoyed any jurisdiction, had produced many evils. Many of the bishops were destitute of any qualifications for the episcopate, and many insisted on residing in the more comfortable mother-country. Pope Gregory XVI. resolved to strike at the root of the evil. In 1838 he promulgated the Bull *Multa Proclare*, abolishing all the Portuguese bishoprics in India, and instituting in their place a number of Apostolic Vicariates in immediate dependence from the Holy See. The episcopal creatures of His Most Faithful Majesty's sectarian cabinet refused to obey the pontifical decree; the majority of the Portuguese clergy in India were equally contumacious; and many of the people, innocent and dumbfounded, found themselves drawn into the vortex of schism.

At the time when Gregory XVI. occupied the pontifical throne, the slave-trade, which in the olden time had been conducted by Spaniards, Frenchmen, and Portuguese, to almost the same extent as by Englishmen and Hollanders, was nearly exclusively in the hands of adventurers, who were either British subjects or citizens of the then orthodox Puritan regions around Cape Cod. When the Pontiff issued, on Dec. 3, 1839, his Bull *In Supremo Apostolatus Fastigio* against the nefarious traffic in human beings, he knew that his words would be heeded by only a small portion of the comparatively small contingent of Catholic traders in human liberty; but he performed his duty in words even more energetic than those which, in 1888, the now reigning Leo XIII. used in a similar contingency. The Pontiff showed how his predecessors had always condemned human slavery, whether that of the negro race in which nearly all Europe and America had been engaged for centuries; or that of the South American and Mexican aborigines, the guilt of which, during the sixteenth century, was shared equally by Spaniards and Portuguese; or, Gregory might have added, that of the white race,

initiated by the "pious" Cromwell, and continued by his equally pious successors in the government of Protestant England. Pope Pius II., on Oct. 7, 1462, had excommunicated the Portuguese who captured slaves in Guinea. Paul III., who had already declared that any attempted justification of Indian slavery was "an invention of the demon," had written, on May 29, 1537, to the archbishop of Toledo a letter which, as no occasion for its presentation occurred when we were treating of the sixteenth century, we here transcribe: "The Incarnate Wisdom, which can neither deceive nor be deceived, ordered its apostles to preach the Gospel and to instruct every people without distinction in its light, because all are capable of receiving that light. But the inveterate adversary of the human race, always hostile to good works and to whatever leads men to salvation, wished to prevent the preaching of the Gospel to all, and therefore he invented a means unknown before our days. Men filled with cupidity, and constantly intent on satisfying it, have served as instruments for the malice of Satan which would prevent, if possible, the Church from receiving into her bosom all the peoples of the West and the East who have been only recently made known to her. According to these masters of lies, the Indians should be regarded and treated as beasts, and reduced to slavery, because they do not possess the faith, or because they are incapable of receiving it. Under this pretext, which experience has proved to be an insensate calumny, the poor Indians are treated more harshly than beasts of burden. . . . Not being able to forget that we are the Vicar of Jesus Christ, representing Him on earth in the office confided to us through no merit of our own, we shall never neglect anything which may bring all the sheep into the fold of the Good Shepherd. Nor are the Indians less worthy of our attention, being men like ourselves; for we know not only that they are capable, after instruction, of receiving the gift of faith, but that they use praiseworthy endeavors to advance in Christian piety. Therefore, in order to render to them the justice that is due to them, and in order to remove what would be an obstacle to their conversion, we declare that the Indians, like all other races of men, even

though they are not baptized, should enjoy their natural liberty, together with the ownership of their properties; that no man has a right to disturb them in the possession of what they have received from the beneficent hand of God; and that everything done to the contrary is condemned by both the divine and the natural law" (1). Following in the steps of Pius II., Paul III., Urban VIII. (April 22, 1639), and Benedict XIV. (Dec. 20, 1741), Gregory XVI. insisted on that fact which the Protestant Macaulay was fain to admit, that the Catholic Church had always endeavored to abolish the institution of slavery. "This solicitude of our predecessors," continued Gregory, "contributed not a little to protect the Indians from the cruelty of their conquerors and from the cupidity of Christian merchants. Nevertheless, much is yet to be done before the efforts of the Holy See will be crowned with entire success; for the traffic in negroes, though partially prohibited, is still conducted by very many Christians. Wishing, therefore, to banish this ignominy from every Christian country, and following in the footsteps

(1) Robertson, in his *History of America*, bk. viii., says that in spite of this Bull of Paul III., the Council of Lima of 1567 ordered that, because of their incapacity, the Eucharist should not be administered to the Indian converts; and he adds that in his time, although two centuries have passed since the Indians of Latin America became Catholics, scarcely one can be found with intelligence sufficient to warrant the priests in admitting him to Communion. He admits that some few of the Indians acquire an academic education, but he says that they are esteemed by the Catholic clergy as of no account, and are never admitted to Holy Orders. That Robertson, in this matter as in very many others, erred egregiously, if not also wilfully, is evident to him who reads the decree of the council which was held in Lima in 1567, ordering that whenever the Indians showed that they understood the meaning of Holy Communion, and were otherwise fit, they should be admitted to the altar like other Christians. We give the words of the decree. "*Hujus provincie antisidites cum animadvertent gentem hanc Indorum et recentem esse et infantilem in fide, atque id illorum saluti expedire judicarent, statuerunt ut usque dum fidem perfecte tenerent, hoc Divino Sacramento, quod est perfectiorum cibum, non communicarentur. recepto si quis ei percipiendi satis idoneus videretur. . . . Placuit huic sancte synodo monere, prout serio monet, omnes Indorum parochos, ut quos, audita jam confessione, perspexerint hunc caelestem cibum a reliquo corporali discernere, atque eundem devotè cupere et poscere, quoniam sine causa neminem divino alimento privare possumus, quo tempore ceteris Christianis solent, Indis omnibus administrarent.*" A decree of the second Council of Lima, held in 1583, shows that it was the fault of many of the priests that many of the Indians did not approach the altar; that these priests were negligent, not that the Church despised the Indians, or that the Indians were too ignorant; or, as Robertson is careful to tell his ignorant readers in England, that the faith of the Indians was unsubstantial and vacillating. This second Council of Lima had for its president St. Toribio Mogrobelo, and his participation was a sufficient guarantee of the prudence and accuracy of the proceedings. The synodals said: "*Cæleste Viaticum, quod nulli ex hæc vita migranti negat mater Ecclesia, multis ab hinc annis Indis atque Ætiopibus cæterisque miserabilibus præberi debere, Concilium Limense constituit. Sed tamen, sacerdotum plurimum vel negligentia vel zelo quodam præpostero atque intempestivo,*

of our predecessors, we warn all Christians, let them be of any condition whatsoever, that they are commanded by us to no longer molest Indians, negroes, or any other race of men, by despoiling them of their goods, or by reducing them to slavery; or by aiding or encouraging those who conduct that inhuman traffic which proceeds on the principle that the blacks are not men, but rather animals created for servitude, and which, therefore, contrary to the dictates of justice and humanity, buys and sells those unfortunates, and condemns them to tasks which are often insupportable. By virtue of our Apostolic authority, we order that no ecclesiastic or layman presume to defend the traffic in negroes as licit under any pretext whatsoever; and that no ecclesiastic pre-

*illis nihilo majis hodie prebetur. Quo fit ut imbecilles animæ tanto bono, tamque necessario, priventur. Volens igitur Sancta Synodus ad executionem perducere que, Christo duce, ad salutem Indorum ordinata sunt, severe præcipit omnibus parochis, ut extreme laborantibus Indis atque Æthiopibus Viaticum administrare non prætermittant, dummodo in eis debitam dispositionem agnoscant, nempe, fidem in Christum et penitentiam in Deum. . . . Porro parochos, qui a prima hujus decreti promulgatione negligentes fuerint, noverint se, præter divinæ ultionis judicium, etiam penas arbitrio ordinariorum daturus.*" As for Robertson's assertions concerning an irremediable deficiency of intellect on the part of the Mexican and South American Indians, and the weakness of their faith, we may cite to the contrary a letter which Garces, the third bishop of Tlascala in Mexico, wrote to Pope Paul III. in 1536, in which the prelate placed his Indian diocesan on a higher spiritual and intellectual plane than that occupied by very many of the whites of his flock. The letter is given in full by Cantù, bk. xiv., ch. 6. At the time that Garces wrote, nearly a century before the Pilgrim Fathers landed in America, there were more than a million Christian Indians in Mexico alone, and in the Seminary of the Holy Cross hundreds of them were studying Latin, rhetoric, philosophy, and medicine. As for the assertion that the Indians were not admitted to the priesthood, had Robertson known anything about the policy of the Catholic Church toward newly-converted peoples, and had he been disposed to tell the truth on matters affecting that Church, he would have abstained from this calumny. It is true that the First Provincial Council of Mexico, held in 1555, prohibited the ordination of Indians; but it expressly stated that the reason for its action was the too inferior social condition of the neophytes, an inferiority which would possibly discredit the ecclesiastical state. And this prohibition was enforced for only thirty years. In the Third Provincial Council of Mexico, held in 1585, it was decreed that an aborigine should be on a perfect equality with the whites in all matters of the sanctuary. Of course, Robertson, holding a brief for the Anglo-Saxon, and perhaps also for the "Scotch-Irish" race (he was a Scotchman), and being unable to deny that those sons of the Establishment and of the Covenant were sweeping the Indian peoples from every territory into which they carried the English flag, could not abide the picture presented by Latin America. He saw contented populations, at least the equals of his countrymen in refinement, and indefinitely superior in morality. The Spaniards and Portuguese had not exterminated their Indian subjects, but had converted them, civilized them, and intermarried with them; and seven-eighths of the inhabitants of Latin America were then, as now, of either pure or mixed Indian blood. Hence the desire of the Presbyterian minister and royal historiographer to represent the missionary work of the Catholic Church in America as a failure; and to effect that object he endeavored to prove by the admissions of Catholic prelates that the Christianity of the great bulk of the Mexican and South American population was a mere veneering.

sume to teach, in public or in private, anything which may contradict the teaching of this, our Apostolic Letter."

We shall find occasion for comment on other features of the pontificate of Gregory XVI., in several of the following dissertations. The cited work of Cardinal Wiseman will furnish the reader with much interesting information regarding the rule of this Pontiff as a temporal sovereign, and with many illustrations of his sanctity as a man. We would merely remark that Gregory XVI. never forgot that he had been, and, in more senses than one, was still a monk. Amid the splendors of the pontifical throne he preserved for himself the simplicity and austerity of the cloister. Just as in the monasteries of his youth and matured manhood, his bed was a harsh mattress of straw; and his private table emitted no groans under the monastic fare which more than satisfied him. He was kind to his relations, and to every one of his household; but he never allowed natural affection to entice him beyond the bounds of strict justice. He was very shrewd, Christianly simple though he was, to the innermost depths of his soul. Thus, although he could half-forgivingly, half-criticizingly remark concerning Bishop Mastai-Ferretti of Imola, the future Pope Pius IX., that "in the Mastai house even the cat is a liberal," he heartily agreed with his friend, Father Ventura, as to the necessity of an anti-Austrian policy—a policy which Pius IX. was to actuate. Gregory XVI. went to his reward on June 1, 1846, in the eighty-second year of his age, and the sixteenth of his reign.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### LACORDAIRE AND LAMENNAIS.\*

One of the most peculiar and most attractive personages whom history can discover; an impassioned friend of the nineteenth century, "in the very depths of whose bowels he was born" (1); and, nevertheless, a submissive conquest of the

\* This Chapter appeared as an article in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. xxii.

(1) Montalembert on Lacordaire.

faith to which he afterward subjugated so many happy souls ; Lacordaire was, of all the public men of our day, the most striking instance of what Catholicism can do for the natural man. Passionately devoted to liberty in a society which was too apt to confound that sacred gift with unbridled license, Lacordaire was saved by his Catholicism from a plunge into the gulf of anarchy. Endowed with a subtlety of imagination which is rarely given to man, he would have conceived arguments for any and every attractive theory, and would have wandered into the paths of intellectual and spiritual darkness, had he not been guided by the Star of Bethlehem. But because he was Catholic to the core, the quondam disciple of the mutilated Titan, Lamennais, bowed before the decision of the Chair of Peter ; the editor of *L'Avenir* transferred his logic and his eloquence to the pulpit of Notre Dame ; the Christian liberal of 1848 preserved his honor and his true liberty by abandoning the Constituent Assembly of the Second Republic ; and finally, just as in 1832 he had said that " he departed from Rome free and victorious," so at the end of his career he was able to proclaim that " the Catholic Church is the liberatrix of the human mind." Catholic in every pulsation of his heart, in every conception of his mind, he could love men without loving the world ; human respect, that most powerful obstacle to the propagation of every kind of truth, was conquered by him on the day when he bent to the yoke of Christ ; and therefore no man, better than Lacordaire, could effect that work for which he was pre-eminently distinguished—the infusion of shame for their cowardice into the hearts of those children of the Revolution who dreaded to be seen entering into a church. " Lacordaire caused these disciples of Voltaire to make the sign of the cross like Marceau, and to communicate with Paqueron and Ozanam " (1). He knew how to reach the hearts, to illumine the intellects of the devotees of that false liberalism which Montalembert has so thoroughly revealed to us. And yet this orator and polemic, who reminds us of Bossuet ; this tribune and political leader, who seemed to be another O'Connell ; this priest and ascetic, who stands forth

(1) PELLISSIER : *The Glories of Christian France*, p. 239. Paris, 1890.

among the living and dead of the nineteenth century as the most perfect embodiment of the spirit of St. Dominic, had himself drunk deeply of the poisoned waters of that bastard liberalism. His widowed mother, a strong and courageous Christian, had transmitted and developed her own characteristics in her four sons; and while he was still a child, the favorite recreation of little Henri was to preach some juvenile attempts at sermons to a congregation composed of his nurse and playmates. But when, after a sojourn of seven years at the State Lycée of Dijon, her boys returned to her maternal embraces, Mme. Lacordaire found that not one of them could join in her prayers. The future *conferencier* of Notre Dame says in his *Memoirs*: "When seventeen years old, I left college with my religion destroyed . . . holding before my eyes, as the luminary of my life, the human ideal of glory. And this result is easily explained. We had lived continually, during the course of our education, surrounded by the examples of ancient heroism and by the masterpieces of antiquity; and nothing had supported our faith while following a system in which the divine word gave forth only an indistinct sound, without eloquence and without consequences." In fine, the yoke of the University of that day was on the young Lacordaire; like all his professors, he cherished the vague reveries of Deism, and breathed the miasma of Voltairian scepticism.

Shortly after his admittance to the bar, Lacordaire, then only twenty-two years of age, attained to such distinction that the great Berryer predicted to him: "It is in your power to reach the highest rank in our profession." And the president, Séguier, remarked, after listening to one of his pleadings: "Gentlemen, it is not Patru that we have heard, but Bossuet." But at this very time, amid the whisperings of ambition, and in spite of the sentimental Deism of Rousseau, which he had brought from the University, Lacordaire had begun to apprehend that truth which illumined the old age of Chateaubriand: "The Christian idea is the future of the world. Far from having arrived at its end, the religion of the Saviour has scarcely entered on its third period—the political one. Although immovable in its dogmas, Christ-

ianity is mobile in the light that it sheds ; its transformation involves a general transformation" (1). In 1824 he was able to write to a friend : " It is strange, indeed, how my views have changed. Never was I more of a philosopher than I am at present ; but I believe more and more. . . . We can reach Christianity by all sorts of roads ; for it is the centre of all truths." Great was the surprise of M. Guillemin, the advocate to whom Lacordaire had brought letters of introduction when he arrived in Paris, when he heard that the priesthood was the great hope of the young man who but a year before had scorned the idea of going to confession. Mgr. de Quélen, the archbishop of Paris, was also surprised when the brilliant young lawyer requested him to procure his admission into the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice. " Gladly," replied the prelate ; " you have defended perishable interests at the bar ; now you shall defend those which are eternal."

From the moment of his entrance into the seminary, Lacordaire kept ever present before his mind, as he himself tells us, the great object of his life, and the great obstacle which he would probably encounter : " My object is to make Jesus Christ known to those who now know Him not ; the obstacle will be a desire to have men talk about me." The directors of Saint-Sulpice tested the vocation of their brilliant candidate to the utmost, and deferred his ordination long beyond the customary term ; but his humility stood the proof, and shortly after his ascent to the altar he gave a good indication of the spirit which animated him. One of his superiors, the Abbé Boyer, persuaded that he would effect more good in a position where his legal abilities and his knowledge of the world would be called into play, thus playfully addressed him : " Sit down ; I am about to make a cardinal of you." Then the Abbé told his late disciple that he had besought the royal Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs (Mgr. de Frayssinous), who had the right of appointment, to confer upon the young priest an auditorship of the Roman *Ruota*, which was then vacant. Such a position is generally a stepping-stone to the cardinalate ; but Lacor-

(1) *Memoirs from Beyond the Tomb*, vol. II.

daire, far from manifesting any gratitude for M. Boyer's consideration, hastened to interject: "Had I coveted honors, I would have remained in the world; therefore, think no more of this project. I shall remain a simple priest, and probably I shall yet become a religious." It is evident that Lacordaire felt, with Pascal, that "the mania for being somebody destroys the best minds of our day. Glory is the best thing here below; and that very fact shows how little the things of earth really are."

Lacordaire began his priestly life at Paris just as he finished it at Sorèze; teaching the young, whose sympathies he knew so well how to captivate, at first as almoner in the College of Henry IV., and then in the same capacity with the Sisters of the Visitation. He devoted his spare time to the study of Christian apologetics, and to the gathering of those materials from the Bible, patrology, history, and philosophy, which afterward he used so advantageously in the pulpit. But he seems to have yearned for a more active life. We read that he often asked himself: "What am I doing? I dream, I read, I pray to the good God, I laugh two or three times a week, and I weep once or twice. Sometimes I rage against the University, that most unendurable child of kings that I know." He thought of becoming a missionary in the United States; and, having received permission from Mgr. de Quélen, he accepted the vicar-generalship of New York from Mgr. Dubois, who was then in Paris. However, it had been decreed by Providence that he should remain in his beloved France. He had already begun to bid farewell to his friends when he received from Abbé Gerbet a letter tendering him an associate editorship on the *Avenir*, then just founded by Lamennais. The motto of this new journal, "God and Liberty," banished from his mind every yearning for a foreign mission. Lamennais, Gerbet, and Montalembert had taken seriously the cry of "Liberty," with which the usurping "king of the *bourgeoisie*," Louis-Philippe, had saluted the forced flight of the lawful heir of St. Louis. They thought that they saw some hope in that insult to the fallen monarch, "At last the Constitution will be a reality." They fancied that the "Days

of July" indicated a possibility of a successful assault on the thralldom of the University; in fine, they believed that freedom of education, for which the Catholics of France had prayed so long, was now attainable. One of the most judicious publicists of this century, the erudite Benedictine, Dom Piolin, thus speaks of the French University of our day, which was fondly supposed to have taken the place of the grand University of Paris. "Certainly the French University is an evil; it is founded on a principle which is false and contrary to Christianity. It is also the most active instrument of tyranny. The decree of March 17, 1808, by which Napoleon I. instituted it, was one of the greatest crimes of the despot—one of those by which he most efficaciously dishonored our unfortunate country. . . . Talleyrand, another evil genius of France, had divined that a body constituted outside the Church, giving instruction to the youth of an entire nation, would produce a race similar, if not inferior, to the ancient pagans. The views of these two men have been realized; at the present hour they are being realized more and more; wait a little, and you will see their bitter fruits. If the Christian spirit, which is still strongly implanted in the hearts of the majority of the French people, did not succeed in rejecting the virus insinuated into the young children of both sexes, we should have to despair of the country; to expect, every ten or twelve years, the orgies of the Commune; and to behold the worst savagery, the normal condition of a nation without God, without worship, and without morality. How comes it, then, that many eminent men, many honorable characters, even many truly pious and learned priests, join a corporation whose consequences are so dangerous? To this question there are many answers. . . . In the new University many of the old teaching corporations had some of their members; and these maintained an excellent spirit, impelling many to regard the institution as a continuation, or even a renovation, of the venerable University of Paris, with which it had nothing in common."

From this time, during several years the life of Lacordaire was intertwined with that of Lamennais. Before we sketch the career of this extraordinary man—a career which was so

agitated, sombre, and well-nigh tragic—a few words should be said concerning the sources which are available to one who wishes to form an approximately accurate conception of him. Of course, a good idea of the man may be attained by the excellent biographical studies which we possess in regard to those grand characters with whose careers that of Lamennais was connected during its most notable phases—the “Lives” of Lacordaire (1), Montalembert (2), Gerbet (3), and Maurice de Guerin (4). But although forty-three years have passed since the *corbillard des pauvres* conveyed the mortal frame of Lamennais to Père-la-Chaise, the illustrious unfortunate has not been the subject of a really satisfactory biographer; of one, that is, who has been able to discover and unite the details of his striking career. Ange Blaize, one of his nephews, published in 1858 a “Biographical Essay,” which gave many precious documents, but which was merely a sketch of his uncle’s life. In 1859 M. Forgues, to whom Lamennais had bequeathed his papers, published two volumes of interesting correspondence, but they cover only the years 1818–1840, as the relatives of Lamennais secured a decree from the Court of Appeals, in Paris, prohibiting Forgues from issuing any more of the letters (5). In 1866 Ange Blaize produced two volumes of unedited works, which embraced only those of the author’s early life (6). In the same year Eugene de la Gournerie, of all men one of the best versed in the religious matters of our century, edited the letters which the two Lamennais brothers had written to Gabriel Bruté, at first professor in the seminary of Rennes, then a priest on the American mission, and finally bishop of Vincennes, in Indiana (7). On the death of Mgr. Bruté, in 1839, these letters had passed into the hands of Bishop Dubois, of New York, and in time Archbishop Hughes gave them to

(1) *The Reverend Father H. D. Lacordaire*, by Chocarne.—*Father Lacordaire*, by Montalembert.—*Father Lacordaire*, by Guillermin.

(2) FOURNIER; *Charles de Montalembert*.

(3) LADOUÉ; *Mgr. Gerbet, His Life, His Works, and the Lamennaisian School*.

(4) D'ARVOR; *Eugenie and Maurice de Guerin*, in the *Illustrations du XIX<sup>e</sup> Siècle*.

(5) *Posthumous Works of Lamennais, Published According to the Wish of the Author*.

(6) *Unedited Works of F. de Lamennais, Published by A. Blaize*.

(7) *Unedited Letters of J. M. and F. de Lamennais Addressed to Mgr. Bruté, with an Introduction by Eugenie de la Gournerie*.

Henri de Courey, an American correspondent of the *Paris Univers*. The packet bore the following endorsement by Bruté, which must interest American readers: "Seventy letters from the two brothers, Jean and Féli de Lamennais. Exceedingly interesting, as treating of the ecclesiastical, literary, and political affairs of that time. I must preserve this treasure, even after it has ceased to be one of friendship. Oh, my God! Accept this separation! How I feel it, even now that twelve years have passed!" In these letters of Féli, says La Gournerie, we hear "the ardent voice of Tertullian, and the sweeter accents of St. Francis de Sales."

Another excellent source of knowledge in regard to Lamennais is the already cited work on Gerbet by the Abbé de Ladoue (1872). "The life of Gerbet," says Sainte-Beuve, "is very simple, having but one episode—his relationship with Lamennais, to whom he gave himself, for many years, with an unlimited devotion, and which terminated only when the grand, immoderate spirit rebelled. Gerbet, after having fulfilled the duties of a religious friendship, after waiting and hoping, retired in silence. For a long time he had been to Lamennais what Nicole was to Arnauld—a moderator. He had softened his friend's asperities as much as possible, and had saved him from many collisions. Only when there remained no possibility of continuing the task did he grow weary" (1).

Another precious source of information is one by Arthur du Bois de la Villerabel (2), embracing one hundred and fifty-two letters, addressed to Louis Marion, one of the friends of Lamennais from his boyhood; and in this correspondence the writer probably reveals his soul as in none of his other letters.

Probably the most valuable source of information is that published in 1893 by the Oratorian, Alfred Roussel (3), a collection of letters written by the two Lamennais and by the principal frequenters of La Chênaie, which were furnished to Roussel by another Oratorian, Mathurin Houet,

(1) *Causeries du Lundi*, Vol. vi., p. 314.

(2) *Confidences of Lamennais*, 1896.

(3) *Lamennais, According to Unedited Documents*, by Alfred Roussel of the Oratory of Rennes.

whose life had been for many years bound up with that of the great writer, and who never despaired of the wanderer's ultimate conversion, as we shall see. The volume issued in 1895 by Eugene Spuller, a politician of some note in the councils of the present Third Republic, affects the profundity of a philosophical essay, but it furnishes nothing new concerning its subject.

In 1896 there appeared a work in English (1) which might have benefited those who cannot recur to the admirable writings of Roussel and Ricard, had the author confined himself to the cold facts which those judicious publicists had marked out for him, and had he not essayed reflections on philosophical and theological matters which at least verge on heterodoxy. The title of this book is misleading. None of the enthusiasts of La Chênaie would have associated their names with that malodorous and nondescript thing which has been styled "Liberal Catholicism." Perhaps the term "Catholic Liberals" may be properly applied to Lacordaire, Montalembert, Gerbet, Guerin, and a few others of that interesting company, inasmuch as they aimed at a Catholicizing of the modicum of good which was discernible in the political liberalism which was the will-o'-the-wisp of their day. But "Liberal Catholics" they were not; and Lamennais himself, even when involved in rebellion to the Chair of Peter, would have spurned the name. And even though "the master" would have accepted the designation, even though his revolt may be regarded as the end toward which the "Liberal Catholic" must tend, one man does not constitute a "movement." Mr. Gibson gives us to understand on two or three occasions, that he is a Catholic; but he has produced a book which will lead the unwary to think that the catastrophe of the life of Lamennais was the result of the influence of a besottedly obstinate royalist cabal upon papal pig-headedness.

Born at Saint-Malo in 1781, Felicité-Robert de Lamennais prosecuted his early studies amid the storms of the great revolution. Such surroundings quite naturally caused the

(1) *The Abbé de Lamennais and the Liberal Catholic Movement in France*, by the Hon. W. Gibson. London, 1896.

teachings of Rousseau to be more attractive to his juvenile mind than those of Christ. But in his twenty-second year he abandoned the paths of incredulism, made his first Communion, and received the ecclesiastical tonsure. Not until he had attained his thirty-seventh year, and therefore the maturity of his powers, did he receive the priesthood. Several years before he stood at the altar, he had announced his change of front by the publication of a translation of the *Spiritual Guide* of Louis of Blois; but attention to him as a serious thinker had not been accorded until 1808, when he issued his *Reflections on the Condition of the Church During the Eighteenth Century and on the Present Situation*, attacking the "Organic Articles" which Napoleon had audaciously added to the already signed Concordat of 1801. Of course these reflections were interdicted by Fouché, the imperial Minister of Police. In 1814 Lamennais published a treatise on *The Tradition of the Church Concerning the Institution of Bishops*, a work which procured for him much contradiction on the part of dying Gallicanism. In 1818 appeared the first volume of his *Essay on Indifference in Religious Matters*, the key-note of which was struck by the ardent Breton at its very commencement: "Ah! who will breathe on these dry bones, and give life to them? Good and evil; the tree which gives life, and that which entails death, both nourished by one and the same soil; grow among peoples who, scarcely raising their heads, pass beneath, stretch upward their hands, and pluck the fruit by chance." The somewhat bilious and ironic style of the book aided the incontestable arguments which it presented; a happy reaction was soon evident in a society which had been permeated by the poison of Voltairianism and of the Revolution. The author was regarded by many as another Father of the Church. As Lacordaire said: "A hundred and fourteen years had passed over the tomb of Bossuet, a hundred and three over that of Fénelon, seventy-six over that of Massillon . . . when M. de Lamennais appeared. . . In one day he found himself invested with the power of Bossuet." Jean-Marie, the holy brother of the brilliant publicist, who had toiled patiently to develop in him both intellectuality and piety,

felt that his labor was now bearing promise of ultimate reward, and in his exultation he cried: "God has made him a soldier." Even he who had hitherto ranked, in the estimation of the French clergy, as the first of their champions of that day—even Frayssinous declared: "That man has an eloquence which would raise the dead." Joseph Le Maistre pronounced the effect of the essay to be nothing less than "an earthquake under a leaden sky"; and Montalembert saw in its author "the most celebrated and the most venerated of the French priests." Naturally there were some ultra-conservatives who murmured their displeasure because of some very daring flights of the new apologist, but the majority agreed with De Bonald when he told Lamennais: "Let the frogs croak!" It is interesting to note the impression produced by these early writings of Lamennais on the mind of Cantù: "Lamennais defended the papal authority with democratic ardor, recalling all the arguments which were ever adduced against certainty, and concluding that, in the order of principles, certitude is impossible, if there does not exist any infallible authority; and concluding also that, in the order of facts, such an authority always existed. That authority is the Catholic Church, in the triple manifestation of the divine word in patriarchal tradition, Moses, and Christ. In the *Essay on Indifference*, wonderful for its close reasoning and its robust eloquence, Lamennais concedes to philosophers that the adhesion of the intellect is distinctive of truth, but only when that adhesion is characterized by universality and perpetuity—qualities which are found only in the Catholic Church, and which are in her because she is the traditional echo of the divine word in every place and time. Descending to applications (in his *Religion Considered in its Relation to the Political and Civil Orders*, Paris, 1825), he combats the irreligious tendencies of politics. In the Middle Age the Catholic Church imposed belief and duties, and out of a dismembered society she formed one which was divine and indestructible, tending to reduce all to unity, and to co-ordinate the nations as members of one sole family. When the belief of the Middle Age had been shaken, 'political science became one of force di-

rected by interest; between the peoples there was no right but that of blind and brutal strength; between power and its subjects, the same blind and brutal strength.' Three systems dominate in Europe (continues Lamennais): the Catholic, which places the spiritual power of the Church between the sovereign and the subject; the Gallican, which makes kings irremovable, frees them from every really obligatory law, and leaves tyranny as the sole remedy against tyranny; and finally, the philosophical system, which constitutes the people the judge in every question of sovereignty. Therefore, Lamennais called for freedom of the press, of association, of teaching; and he placed the sovereignty in the people, declaring the king liable to deposition if he violated the law. The purblind liberals could not understand these theories, and they hooted at this priest who would have pushed the world back to the feet of Gregory VII.; but the king understood it, and its defender was called before the correctional tribunals. Many of the bishops, frightened at the resoluteness of Lamennais, emitted, in Paris, an exposition of their sentiments in regard to the independence of kings in the temporal order, as upheld by the Declaration of 1682. Lamennais, in a mordant reply, ridiculed both liberals and Gallicans, who, by their withdrawal of the civil power from all religious dependence, rendered it capable of degenerating into tyranny; he pitied the clergy who were courtiers of a government which protected them merely that it might have their support; and he insisted that from those brutal governments which robbed the prelates of their purple and jewels, those prelates derived that real glory of martyrdom which sanctifies the earth" (1).

The first volume of the *Essay on Indifference* had shown the importance and necessity of faith; but there remained many questions for solution. What is the true faith? How can we discover it? What authority should dominate and regulate human reason? Great was the impatience with which men awaited the second volume, in which they were confident that if Lamennais did not succeed in advancing

(1) *Universal History*, Bk. xviii., ch. 18. Ninth Ital. Edit., Turin, 1862.

any *nova*, he would at least present matters *nove*. "After two years of expectation," writes Lacordaire, "the second volume appeared. From the heights of the olden defence of the faith, from the bosom of the eloquence which he had sent in waves against the enemies of truth, M. de Lamennais had descended into the arid discussions of philosophy—to the question of certitude, at once the clearest and the most obscure approached by the human mind." In fact, the essay had undertaken to prove that "man, taken individually, can know nothing with certainty; but taken collectively, he can acquire certainty as to some things." In other words, one man may err; but when all agree, truth is found. Lacordaire ingenuously tells us: "I have often asked myself how a system, the faultiness of which I now perceive so clearly, could have held my reason in suspense for so long a time; and I have come to the conclusion that since I struggled against an intelligence stronger than my own, and struggled alone against it, it was impossible for me not to be conquered." If a mind like that of Lacordaire succumbed to the influence of Lamennais, it is not surprising that the brilliant apologist became the idol of nearly all the younger clergy of France, and that from every portion of Europe the dangerous incense of extravagant praise was wafted toward him. No wonder that he became "that grand immoderate spirit" which Sainte-Beuve described; and that to those who suspected his philosophy, especially to the bishops of France, he retorted either that they were all Gallicans, or that they understood nothing about the matter in question. No physical advantages on his part contributed to the ascendancy which this wonderful genius exercised over so many persons of more than ordinarily judicial perspicacity. Maurice de Guérin, shortly after his enrollment among the solitaries of La Chênaie, thus wrote to his sister Eugénie: "You see a Druid resuscitated in Brittany, chanting of liberty with a rather savage voice. . . . The great man is short, slim, pallid, gray-eyed, with an oblong head, the nose long and thick, and his forehead is furrowed deeply by wrinkles which stretch between the brows down to the root of the nose. From head to foot he is clothed in coarse gray

cloth, and he wears a straw hat which is very dilapidated." And Wiseman says of him : " How he did so mightily prevail on others it is hard to say. He was truly in look and presence almost contemptible ; small, weakly, without pride of countenance or mastery of eye, without any external grace ; his tongue seemed to be the organ by which, unaided, he gave marvellous utterance to thoughts clear, deep, and strong. Several times have I held long conversations with him at various intervals, and he was always the same. With his head hung down, his hands clasped before him, or gently moving in one another, in answer to a question he poured out a stream of thought, flowing spontaneously and unrippled as a stream through a summer meadow. He at once seized the whole subject, divided it into heads as symmetrically as Fléchier or Massillon ; then took them one by one, enucleated each, and drew his conclusions. All this went on in a monotonous but soft tone, and so unbroken, so unhesitating, and yet so polished and elegant, that, if you had closed your eyes, you might have easily fancied that you were listening to the reading of a finished and elaborately corrected volume."

The *Avenir* appeared for the first time on October 15, 1830 ; and the government of July was soon made to understand that no ordinary men were insisting that the State should respect " those who bore the grand name of Catholics." Prosecution followed after prosecution ; and when on one of these occasions the daring editors were charged with being the " organs of a foreign power," Lacordaire replied that their Master, God, is nowhere a foreigner. The *Avenir* announced that on May 9, 1831, its editors would open a free school in a house hired by Lacordaire ; and accordingly three teachers who had not been authorized by the State, namely, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and De Coux, began their labors with twenty scholars. On the second day a commissary of police ordered the pupils, in the name of the law, to depart. " In the name of your parents," cried Lacordaire, " I command you to remain " ; and the children obeyed him. Then the police ejected both pupils and master, although the latter was in his own house. As one of

the teachers, Montalembert, was a peer of France, the trial of the awful criminals was conducted by the Court of Peers. The brilliant defence by Lacordaire, and the equally impressive one by young Montalembert, are matters of history; a minimum of punishment, a fine of a hundred francs, was inflicted. A more threatening storm, however, was soon encountered by the daring journal. Shortly after the appearance of the first number of the *Avenir*, its editors had formed an association entitled a "General Agency for the Defence of Religious Liberty," which was destined to propagate the doctrines which the journal would advance. These doctrines were all in advocacy of a total separation of Church and State; of a suppression of the indemnities which the French government had agreed to give the Church, in partial recompense (about a quarter of 1 per cent.) for the ecclesiastical property stolen from her in the days of Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality; of entire freedom of worship for all respectable sects; of freedom of instruction; and of absolute liberty of the press. To this mixture of good and evil the *Avenir* often added pretensions of a much more audacious and radical nature. Thus, in the issue of February 2, 1831, we read: "During the last fifteen years M. de Lamennais has labored for the regeneration of Catholicism; to restore to it, under a new form and by the aid of recent progress, the force and the life which have abandoned it." In many of the dioceses of France the ordinaries prohibited the adventurous periodical; and many, notably Mgr. d'Astros, archbishop of Toulouse, condemned fifty-six propositions of the Lamennaisian system. The first twenty of these propositions were taken from the *Essay on Indifference* (Vols. 3 and 4); eleven were drawn from the *Philosophical Doctrines on Certitude*, by the Abbé Olympe-Philippe Gerbet, afterward Bishop of Perpignan; eight from the *Catechism of the Sensus Communis*, by Rohrbacher; and seventeen from the *Avenir* itself. In 1834 thirteen bishops formally censured these propositions; and shortly afterward thirty-seven other prelates sent in their adhesion to the condemnation, while fourteen, though not adhering, manifested their disapproval of Lamennaisism. Ten bishops preferred to refer the mat-

ter at once to the Holy See (1). This condemnation was forwarded to Rome in 1832; but already Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert, the three principal editors, had decided to suspend the publication of the *Avenir* temporarily, and to proceed to the Eternal City as "pilgrims of God and liberty," with the intention of submitting their doctrines to the judgment of the Vicar of Christ.

It is amusing to note that Mr. Gibson, who thinks that the episcopal condemnation of the *Avenir* may have been shortsighted, is careful to inform us that, "*amongst Catholics the condemnation was re-echoed by the worldly-wise, the interested, and the timidly-devout—all those, that is to say, the slothful serenity of whose devotional or social atmosphere had been disturbed by the somewhat acrid terms of the uncompromising journal, and who seized the opportunity which now offered itself, of turning over and composing themselves to sleep through the great drama of human society, the action of which was beginning too vividly to impress them.*" In the minds of such Catholics as these, religion, according to Mr. Gibson, "had been identified with the divine right of kings"; and we are frequently asked by this author to sympathize with Lamennais as he suffers from "their cowardly and underhand operations." The unfortunate writes to a friend at this time that these "interdicts, intrigues, underhand dealings—a frightful system of organized calumny—have been supported by Rome. Without explaining herself, . . . without wishing to pronounce a judgment we asked for humbly six months ago, she encourages and even urges on her enemies and ours. The position is untenable; we are going to abandon the *Avenir*, which was working splendidly. The only barrier which stood between the Church and material force is about to fail; . . . my soul is torn with grief. They repel, they trample on those who ask only one thing, that they should be allowed to sacrifice themselves, and the triumph of the Church would have been certain had they only wished it. . . . But no; her rulers have said it, it is necessary that she should die, it is necessary. . . ." It was with

(1) *Defense of Social Order Against Modern Carbonarism, With a Judgment on M. de Lamennais; by M. Boyer, Director in the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice. Paris, 1835.*

these sentiments rankling in his heart that Lamennais set out for Rome. We would prefer to remain under the guidance of Choearne or of Ricard; but the persistent efforts of Mr. Gibson to palliate the guilt of his idol, demand that we at least show how he prepares one for the action of Gregory XVI., "the monk inexperienced in the things of this world." He informs us that after Napoleon's "war of liberation" during that period, which "demonstrated the utility of an organization like that of the Carbonari," it is "abundantly evident, from contemporary literature, that the Popes might at this time have succeeded in winning for themselves a great position, as the representatives of a great idea; but, unfortunately, no one capable of realizing this was elected to the See of Peter. . . . Leo XII. was mediæval in his sympathies. By nature he was by no means despotic; but his reign became the occasion of a fatal reaction, sometimes marked with frightful atrocities. . . . Thus it happened that the name of one of the best intentioned of Popes came to be identified in the eyes of the Italians with the revival of inquisitorial methods, the encouragement of informers, secret trials before interested tribunals, and all the abominations of which men had fondly imagined that they had finally disappeared." Since such is Mr. Gibson's reading of history, we may suppose that he sympathizes with Lamennais (and not once in his book does he give us any reason to suppose the contrary) when the jaundiced visitor writes to Gerbet while he is waiting for an audience with Gregory XVI.: "Imagine to yourself an old man surrounded by men, many of them tonsured, who manage his affairs—men to whom religion is as indifferent as it is to all the cabinets of Europe—ambitious, covetous, avaricious . . . blind and infatuated as the eunuchs of the Lower Empire. Such is the government of this country, such are the men who have everything in their hands, and who daily sacrifice the Church to the vilest interests and the most vainly conceived of their temporal affairs. They count the peoples for nothing, and see in the world only ten or a dozen men who have become, because they are powerful, or seem so, their true divinities. And in spite of this, everything is sinking or

passing away, everything is dying. There are a few virtuous people who see this and who groan at it; but the remedy—where is it? I cannot see it.”

A memorial, drawn up by Lacordaire, was presented to Gregory XVI. Unable to approve the tendencies of the incriminated journal, the Pontiff willingly recognized the zeal and talent of its editors; therefore, he ordered information to be given to them of an early examination of their doctrines, and he added that since this examination might necessitate a tedious investigation, a return to France would probably be pleasing to them. But the impetuous Lamennais besieged the doors of Cardinal Pacca, and finally a pontifical audience was granted on condition that there should be no allusion to the *Avenir*. “Hoping against hope,” says Gibson, that the audience “might result in winning for the Church a place in that future which seemed to him inevitable” (truly the Church should be grateful for his consideration), Lamennais proceeded to the Vatican. Ricard tells us that when Lamennais prostrated himself before the Pontiff, His Holiness gently raised him, and opening his own snuff-box, asked him whether he ever used the stimulant. Politeness led the Abbé to taken a pinch, and the Pope, having also taken one, and having scrupulously flickered off some fallen grains from his soutane, asked his visitor whether he was fond of art. “Sometimes, Holy Father,” replied the impatient man. “That is not enough,” returned the Pontiff. Then with something very like impertinence Lamennais explained: “I love art in its proper place, Your Holiness, but at present . . .” Whereupon Gregory hastened to remark: “Nevertheless, in Rome art is a very important matter.” Persisting in his endeavor to introduce the affair of the *Avenir*, the Abbé observed: “Undoubtedly, Holy Father; but if Your Holiness will permit me. . . .” Again the Pontiff warded off the inconvenient subject by asking: “Monsieur l’Abbé, have you visited the church of St. Peter in Chains?” The question seemed to furnish a fine opportunity, and Lamennais replied: “I have visited it, Holy Father; and would to God no other church in Christendom were ‘in chains!’” The Pope ignored the allusion, and pursued his train of

thought: "Did you admire the 'Moses' of Michelangelo?" And Gregory went to a bureau, and producing a silver statuette, he asked: "Do you recognize the lion's paw?" Lamennais looked at the precious object, but with an air of distraction. The Pope insisted: "Look at it well!" The poor man obeyed, and the Pontiff said: "I would like to give it to you; but nothing here belongs to me, since I must transmit, in my turn, all I have received to my successor." Then Gregory tenderly placed his hand on the head of his disappointed visitor, and having blessed him, said: "Farewell, Monsieur l'Ablé." The self-love of Lamennais was deeply wounded by this interview. He failed, and all of his apologists have failed, to perceive the delicacy of the Pontiff's hesitation to enter on a subject, the consideration of which might have entailed the condemnation of one whom Pope Leo XII. had so greatly admired, that he kept his portrait in his study, and bequeathed it in a special manner to his successor (1).

"The master," as Lamennais was styled by his admirers, wished to remain in Rome and provoke a decision, but Lacordaire had appreciated the meaning of the late audience, and he returned to France. Six months afterward, Lamennais lost his patience, and announced his intention to return also, and for the purpose of resuming the publication of the *Avenir*. The sojourn in the capital of Christendom had evoked very dissimilar sentiments in the hearts of these two great men. The mind of Lamennais was of far superior calibre to that of Luther, and he possessed an artistic taste, of which the German heresiarch had no conception. But the pride of Lamennais was as excessive as the vanity of the ex-Augustinian; and having entered Rome while dominated by that passion, he, like Luther during his visit, could discern nothing but ambition, subterfuge, and luxury. On the contrary, Lacordaire, like his other companion, Montalembert, though burning with perhaps even a more intense love of liberty than that which tortured Lamennais, returned from Rome strengthened in his faith that she was the depository of divine revelation. "The world seeks peace and

(1) Many have thought that Leo XII. intended, at one time, to enroll Lamennais in the Sacred College. See Wiseman's *Last Four Popes*, pt. ii., ch 6.

freedom, but in the paths of turbulence and servitude. The Church alone has ever been a source of these blessings for the human race. When the nations shall have tired of being parricides, they will find in her the good which they no longer possess. . . . Rome! Serene amid the tempests of Europe, thou hast not doubted of thyself, thou hast felt no fatigue. Thy glance, turned to the four quarters of the world, followed with sublime penetration the development of human affairs in their relation to the divine; while the storms left thee calm, because thou wast animated by the breath of God. . . . Rome! God knows that I did not fail to recognize thee, when I saw no kings prostrate at thy gates. I kissed thy dust with unspeakable joy and respect. Thou didst appear to me as what thou truly art—the benefactress of the human family in the past, the hope of its future, the sole grandeur now existing in Europe, the captive of a universal jealousy, the queen of the world.”

In August, 1832, Lacordaire visited Munich, and he had scarcely entered his hotel when he was met by Lamennais and Montalembert, who, on their way to France, had seen a notice of their friend's intention. Lacordaire at once entered on the subject of the resumption of the *Avenir*, and he succeeded in convincing “the master” of its inadvisability. Then the three friends attended a banquet tendered to them by the scholars and artists of the most literary and artistic city in Germany. Toward the end of the feast, Lamennais was called from the hall to receive from a messenger of the papal nuncio a copy of the Encyclical of Gregory XVI., in which the *Avenir* was condemned. Lamennais dissimulated his rage, and he even yielded to Lacordaire's suggestion that the three ex-editors should immediately sign an act of submission to the Papal decision. Accompanying the copy of the Encyclical received by Lamennais was a letter from Cardinal Pacca, which had been written by that prelate by the express order of Pope Gregory XVI. We subjoin a few passages of this interesting document: “Since you love truth, and desire to know it in order that you may welcome it, I shall frankly and briefly mention the chief features which have specially displeased His Holiness, after his ex-

amination of the *Avenir*. Firstly, he regretted that the editors have assumed to discuss before the public, and then even to decide, most delicate questions which should be decided by the government of the Church and by her supreme head. From this procedure there necessarily results a perturbation of minds, and even a division among the clergy, which scandalize the faithful. Secondly, the Holy Father disapproves and even reprobates those doctrines on civil and political liberty which, undoubtedly against your wishes, tend by their very nature to incite and propagate everywhere among subjects a spirit of rebellion against their sovereigns. That spirit is openly opposed to the precepts of the Gospel and of our holy Church—obedience on the part of the peoples, and justice on the part of rulers. Thirdly, the doctrines of the *Avenir* on freedom of worship and on the liberty of the press—doctrines which have been advanced by the editors with so much exaggeration—are reprehensible, being contrary to the maxims and precepts of the Church. They have surprised and afflicted His Holiness; because if, in certain circumstances, prudence commends a toleration of them as a lesser evil, they can never be defended by a Catholic as good and desirable things. This, M. l'Abbé, is the communication His Holiness has wished me to convey to you in confidential form. The Holy Father remembers with keen satisfaction the beautiful and solemn promise which you, at the head of your associate editors, once published, to the effect that you would imitate, according to the injunctions of our Saviour, the docility of little children, by an entire submission to the Vicar of Jesus Christ."

La Chênaie was a venerable country house in Brittany, about six miles from Dinan, whither M. Féli, as his friends fondly termed Lamennais, was wont to assemble his disciples during the last years of the Restoration and during the first years of the king of the *bourgeoisie*. The Lamennaisians playfully styled the humble habitation a *chateau*, but Féli describes it as a little hermitage. Between the years 1825 and 1833 many of the friends of "the master" resided altogether at La Chênaie, enjoying the tender hospitality of

him whom they regarded as one chosen by God to form their minds for the defence of religion—the sole object of their lives. Among those who nearly habitually resided at La Chênaie was Gerbet; and among those who passed much of their time there we may mention, besides Lacordaire, Edmond de Corzalès, Leon and Eugene Boré, M. de Coux, the Abbé Rohrbacher, the Abbé Blanc, the Abbé Bornet, M. de Hercé, Montalembert, the Abbé de Salinis, the Abbé de Scorbiac, Eloi Jourdain (Charles Sainte-Foy), Cyprien Robert, La Provotaye, Daniel du Breil de Marzan, Hippolyte de la Morvonnais, and Maurice de Guérin. The last named tells us, in his *Relics*: “Unless one experienced it, the charm of these conversations could not be described. There philosophy, politics, travels, anecdotes, tales, pleasantries, all dropped from the lips of the master in forms the most original, the most vivid, the most incisive.” Every morning Féli assembled his friends in the chapel, which, in 1810, his holy brother and he had built at the extremity of the terrace, and there he celebrated Mass, and frequently fortified them with the Bread of Life. Many times during the day the company visited their Sacramental Lord, and on all the greater feasts they received the Benediction. Many years after he had quitted La Chênaie, and the most melancholy of dissensions had separated him from his olden friends, Lamennais wrote to M. Marion, who had advised the sale of some of the timber: “Although, apparently I shall never again see La Chênaie, all my souvenirs reside there, and I cannot think, without pain, of that beautiful spot, so cared for by me, as shorn of any of its charms. In comparison with those charms, what is a little money? Even now I walk in imagination under those trees in whose sap my olden life ran. It seems to me that if they were gone, I would be alone in the world. I know well that others will cut them down some day, but then I shall be no longer alive. Therefore, I ask a respite for those poor trees; their age is too much like my own, and I cannot see death approaching those who looked on my birth” (1). On September 4, 1832, Lacordaire wrote to “the master” that his rela-

(1) Letter to Marion, Dec. 31, 1844, in the *Confidences of Lamennais*.

tions with La Chênaie must necessarily terminate; he had realized that a gulf now separated him from his former guide. "To-night I leave La Chênaie, and from a motive of honor, being convinced that at length my life is useless to you, because of the difference of our ideas on the Church and society, a difference which increases every day, in spite of my sincere efforts to agree with you." And he afterward said: "I abandoned M. de Lamennais because I believed that the Church was more likely to be right than he was; because she has more claim to the submission of my intellect than he has. I have not instituted a school in place of his, but I have entered into the universal school." His reasons for separating from his old-time friend are indicated by Lacordaire in a letter to Montalembert: "The Church does not say to you, 'See!' for she has not that power; but she does say to you, 'Believe!' She says to you, now that you are twenty-three years old, and addicted to a certain line of thought, just what she said to you on the day of your First Communion: 'Receive the hidden and incomprehensible God; humble your reason before that of God and His Church, His organ.' Why, indeed, was the Church given to us, unless to lead us back to truth when we have been beguiled by error?"

In January, 1835, Lacordaire was appointed to deliver the Lenten Conferences at Notre Dame; and then Paris beheld what was to her a strange scene—the great basilica invaded at an early hour by more than six thousand men of every age, religion, and political school, all waiting to be refreshed by the all-powerful words of him of whom Montalembert wrote: "Who will render for us his surprises, his risky strokes, his familiarities—those adventurous assaults of a genius as audacious as sure of itself, skirting the precipice without ever falling over, and then mounting to the highest heavens as Bossuet alone has ever done; an effort which literally overwhelmed his auditors, leaving them a prey to an emotion which only one word can express, that word *ravissement*, which has been so commonly abused, but which recalls to the Christian mind the vision of St. Paul—*quoniam raptus in paradisum.*" The grand Conferences of

Lacordaire are probably familiar to the reader; if they are not, let him know that all the great orator's teachings, inasmuch as they affected the hitherto unbelieving portion of his hearers, may be summarized in his words: "The olden society perished, because God had been expelled from it; the new suffers, because God has not been invited into it." The limits of this dissertation preclude any reference to his career as a Dominican friar, or to his momentous reception into the French Academy, which he entered, as he expressed the idea, as "a symbol of liberty, strengthened by religion" (1). He adorned the Academy only for a moment. When he returned to his dear College of Sorèze, he greeted his brethren and pupils with these prophetic words: "I come to you like *Œdipus*, with a fragile laurel in one hand, and a bit of cypress in the other." He resumed his work, but his God had called him to his reward. During his last illness he composed the canticle on St. Mary Magdalen, which many regard as his masterpiece. On September 27, 1861, he resigned his office as provincial of the French Dominicans, and the last words of his eloquent tongue were uttered on November 20th, as he extended his arms toward heaven: "*Mon Dieu! Ouvrez-moi!*" He died on the following day, the Feast of the Presentation. If the reader is curious regarding the personal appearance of Lacordaire, he may learn from Montalembert what the great orator was when he had just enlisted under the banner of Lamennais: "He was twenty-eight years of age. His slender frame, his delicate and regular features, his sculptural brow, the royal carriage of his head, his black and flashing eye, and I know not what union of elegance and modesty in his entire person—all this was but the envelope of a soul which ever seemed to be on the point of flying away to heaven. His flaming glances emitted treasures both of indignation and of tenderness. His voice, already so nervous and vibrating, often assumed an accent of infinite sweetness. Born for combat and for love, he already bore the seal of the double royalty of soul and of

(1) In regard to the sad want of taste and the apparent but probably feigned ignorance of history displayed by Guizot in his discourse of reception on this occasion, see our Vol. II., p. 355.

talent. He appeared to me charming at once and terrible; the very type of enthusiasm for good, and of virtue armed in the cause of truth. I saw in him one predestined to all that youth adores and desires the most—to genius and glory.”

Sadly different from the death of Lacordaire was that of him whom God seemed, at one time, to have given to His Church as the Bossuet of the nineteenth century. When the future ornament of the Dominican Order and his friend returned to La Chênaie, after their futile visit to the Eternal City, the former soon perceived that there was to be no revival of the serene delights which had made the “little hermitage” so dear to each of them. “The woods,” writes Lacordaire, “had their olden silences and their olden storms; the sky of Brittany was the same, but the heart of the master was changed. The wound was still fresh, and each day the knife was turned in it by the very hand which should have withdrawn it and poured into its place the balm of God. Profound gloom had settled on that brow from which peace had been banished. Broken and menacing sentences dropped from those lips which had ever expressed the unction of the Gospel. Sometimes I thought that in him I beheld Saul; but none of us had the harp of David with which to calm those sudden irruptions of the evil one, and most fearful anticipations constantly overwhelmed my crushed spirit.” The crisis could not be long delayed. In 1834 appeared the *Words of a Believer*, a work which Lamennais himself pronounced a revenge for all the “disappointments of his life.” Once that he had resolved on the publication of this book, which Gregory XVI. was to term “small in size, but immense in perversity,” he yearned to see it in circulation. He entrusted the task of putting the manuscript through the press to Sainte-Beuve, writing to him: “I send you herewith a little manuscript which I would wish you to have issued as quickly as possible. I depart in two days. Arrange with a publisher quickly, very quickly, I pray you.” It has been well said that the contents of this work can be summarized in two propositions: all kings are monsters, and priests are the *seides* of kings. And over this blatant demagogy the author affected to make the sign of the cross,

beginning it with the invocation: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Royer-Collard fancies that he sees in the book the spirit of 1793 making its Easter duty. De Nettement calls it a would-be Apocalypse, interspersed with many blasphemies. Vitrolles termed it the red cap of the *sans-culottes* surmounting the Cross. These qualifications do not exaggerate; for the calmly judicial Encyclical of June 25, 1834, manifests the horror of the Supreme Pontiff for a volume which, as we have observed, he stigmatizes as *mole quidem exiguum, pravitate tamen ingentem*, and he declares that it presents propositions which are respectively "false, calumnious, rash, productive of anarchy, contrary to the word of God, impious, scandalous, erroneous, already condemned by the Holy Church when anathematizing the Waldenses, Wyckliffites, Hussites and other heretics of that stamp." We may observe that this Encyclical also condemns a system of philosophy which is evidently that of Lamennais. "You must perceive, Venerable Brothers, that here we also speak of that fallacious system of philosophy, recently invented, which we must reprobate entirely—a system in which an uncurbed yearning for novelties seeks no longer for truth where she really is to be found, but rather, casting aside holy and apostolic tradition, introduces doctrines which are futile, uncertain, and not at all approved by the Church." Lamennais celebrated the Holy Sacrifice for the last time on April 7th, the Easter Sunday of 1833. "Who would have said on that day," asks Sainte-Beuve, "who would have said to those who were grouped around the master, that he who had just given to them the Holy Communion would never again give it to another; that he would ever afterward refuse it for himself; and that too truly his device was to be 'an oak beaten down by the storm,' with the haughty motto, 'I break, but I do not bend?'" (1). Mgr. Antoine Ricard graphically describes the twenty-one years of bitter existence which followed the rupture of Lamennais with the Church which he had probably

(1) Ricard narrates that Lamennais once said to his nephew that if he were asked to select an emblem indicative of his career, he would choose the unbending, though possibly breaking oak.

once loved, and certainly had once served and honored so well. We wish not to dilate on sorrows such as these; the reader will find them depicted in the pages of Ricard, and he will receive new light upon them from the *confidences* of the unfortunate to a friend, revealed in 1886 by Arthur du Bois de Villerabel. Some years after the catastrophe, the fallen champion wrote to a friend in Saint-Malo: "I am alone. I perceive time receding, just as a traveller, seated on a naked rock at the edge of a torrent, waits for the stream to become fordable, that he may push on to his night's rest." The end of his life's journey did not come until the winter of 1854, when he was seventy-three years of age. When it became evident, on February 27th, that the hand of death was beckoning to him, his loving niece threw herself on her knees at his bedside and whispered: "Féli, you wish for a priest, do you not?" The obstinate man replied: "No!" In vain the weeping woman besought him to have care of his soul; he continually cried: "Leave me in peace!" Friends removed the niece to the next room as she exclaimed: "It is terrible to me to see my uncle die in this way, for it was he who made me a Christian." Soon afterward the sufferer said: "I wish to be interred among the poor, and like one of them. Put no mark over my grave—not even a simple stone." They told him that the archbishop of Paris wished to see him. He tried to speak, but seeing that he could not be understood, he made a gesture which might have indicated either impatience or discouragement, and turned his face to the wall. What passed between God and his soul at that moment we shall know on the day of final judgment. His last act of intelligence was an anxious look around the room, and then, as though he had not seen what he had sought, he began to weep. Three days afterward seven or eight persons followed a hearse—one of the kind furnished to the very poor—to the cemetery of Père-la-Chaise. When the grave had been filled, the digger asked: "Do you want a cross?" One of the friends of the deceased, M. Barbet, replied: "No!" Not another word was spoken at the ceremony.

Among the olden disciples who, while reprobating the

apostasy of Lamennais, remained personally attached to him until the very end, one of the most worthy and notable was Mathurin Houet, superior of the Oratory at Rennes, who died in 1890. Until the death of "M. Féli," Houet continued to hope and pray for his conversion, and when the master had gone to his dread account, the still loving friend tried to convince himself that the long extinguished luminary of the Church had finally been revived by "that penetrating and inexorable light which appears in our last moments as the dawn of eternity" (1). Enlightened far beyond the danger of superstition, the pious Oratorian nevertheless sought for justification of his confidence in that border-land which is occupied by certain children of divine predilection. "Indeed, we may hope," said he one day to M. Roussel; "it has been revealed to a holy religious that M. de Lamennais is saved" (2). Strange as it may appear, Houet was convinced of the good faith of Lamennais. Roussel is of the same opinion. Edmond Biré thinks that such must be the conclusion of all who read the work of Roussel. "It appears to me that the author of the *Words of a Believer* was not influenced, at the time of his rupture with the Church, by any interested motive. Far from having anything to gain by this rupture, it entailed upon him the loss of comfortable surroundings, of an immense popularity, and of a veritable intellectual royalty. It condemned him to isolation and to powerlessness. It deprived him of numerous devoted and enthusiastic friends, and threw him into a little group of sectarians who were foes of every ideal and of every grandeur. He was one of the grandest geniuses of his day, and perhaps he was its greatest writer. Nothing would have been easier than for him to have satisfied his ambition, if he had any, by a change of opinions. He derived from his persistency no other profit than greater poverty and a long imprisonment (3). Therefore his life testifies to his sincerity. If it were necessary, other witnesses would testify to it. I

(1) Letter of Lamennais to the Marquis de Coriolis, July 7, 1830, in the *Correspondence*, edited by Forgues, Vol. ii., p. 147.

(2) ROUSSEL; *ibi supra*, Vol. i., p. 6.

(3) On December 26, 1840, Lamennais was condemned to a year's imprisonment and a fine of 2,000 francs, because of his pamphlet, *The Country and the Government*.

allude to all those friends of his early life, who, though profoundly grieved by his apostasy, remained attached to him" (1). Biré errs when he contends that Lamennais was influenced by no interested motive when he refused submission to the teaching authority of the Church. He was influenced by pride, than which no wealth or its attendant luxury and sensuality can dominate more the intellectual man who has once preferred its allurements to the empire of truth. And the pride of Lamennais was not that inflating sentiment which actuates the ordinary man. It was not that comparatively harmless bubble which should rather be termed vanity. The pride of Lamennais was, in the words of Gregory XVI., *Superbia Satánica*. At times it frightened himself. He tells us how, when only eight years of age, his nurse was leading him along the ramparts of Saint-Malo, while the sea was being agitated by a violent tempest, and how the sight so affected him that "he thought that he discerned the Infinite and saw God." Then, astonished at what was passing in his soul, he said of the heedless crowd around him: "They behold what I behold, but they do not see what I see." Often when narrating this episode of his childhood, the mature Lamennais would say: "Whenever I think of that distant time, I tremble at the recollection of that haughty sentiment in a boy of eight years" (2). In 1809, when he was twenty-seven years of age, he wrote to Bruté: "You are right; one page, one line, one word of St. Francis de Sales or of the *Imitation* is far superior to all these miserably contentious pamphlets which only dry up the soul—mine especially, already so arid. My God! what has plunged me into this unhappy state? Pride! Yes, pride; every day I perceive that truth" (3). After the publication of the first volume of his *Essay on Indifference*, he thus expressed his opinion of the projected second volume: "The second will be much more valuable. I shall develop a new system of defence of Christianity against incredulists and heretics, which will be extremely simple, but which will be so rigorously demonstrative that, unless one is prepared to deny his

(1) BIRÉ; *History and Literature*, p. 305. Lyons, 1895.

(2) BLAIZE; *loc. cit.*, Vol. 1., p. 8.

(3) ROUSSEL; *loc. cit.*, Vol. 1., p. 22.

own existence, he will perforce repeat the Creed to the very end" (1). No one ever dared to contradict Lamennais. When he was not sure of the assent of his company, he either showed his irritation, or wrapped himself in silence. Sometimes, however, a more than ordinarily candid admirer would venture to warn him of the risks he was running. Thus, in the summer of 1825, the chief luminary of the French bar, Berryer, having listened at La Chênaie to a most eloquent exposition of some of those audacious theories which the master afterward developed in his *Outlines of a Philosophy*, felt that he was captivated; but he cried: "My friend, you frighten me. You will become a sectarian; and I foresee that you will lose the empire which you now exercise over me." Lamennais replied: "Sooner than do that, would that I could return to the womb of my mother" (2).

The works which Lamennais produced during the years of his separation from the Church were worthy of the author of the *Words of a Believer*. In 1835 appeared a collection of extracts from those articles in the *Avenir* and the *Mémorial Catholique*, which had entailed his condemnation; and in his preface he excuses his changes of opinion, both religious and political, by a law of progress in the human mind, the effects of which he has experienced. For the reader must know that during the early years of the Restoration our publicist had been more royalist than the king. When he became proprietor and editor of the *Conservateur* and of the *Drapeau Blanc*, he seemed to have but one idea, namely, that there was safety for France and for the king in absolute monarchy alone. In the orthodox portion of his career he gloried in being a prophet raised by God to purge the French Church of Gallicanism. But even before he published the *Words of a Believer*, he had deserted the ranks of the ultramontane theologians, and had enrolled himself among such of the Gallican juriconsults as were really hostile to the independence of the Church, and who were condemned by the saner portion of the Gallican publicists. As

(1) LA GOURNERIE; *loc. cit.*, letter of February 22, 1818.

(2) After his return to Paris, Berryer narrated this episode to Laurentie. See the articles on *The Abbé de Lamennais*, by Laurentie, in the *Paris Union* for March, 1854. Also the *Mélanges*, by Laurentie, Vol. II., p. 714.

an excuse for this change of attitude, Lamennais pleaded : " In the war which I once waged against you I was too much of the soldier ; I perceived only one side of the question. Your parliaments have been reproached for their many great resistances against ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but they have rendered great services to society, and without their barrier against Roman usurpations, Rome would have seized on everything, and the priest would have been a king." Well did Boyer say that Lamennais, during his later career, condemned as nonsense every truth which he had once affirmed to be an axiom and a principle. In 1836 the *Affairs of Rome* appeared ; in 1838 the *Book of the People* ; in 1840 an *Outline of a Philosophy* ; in 1846 a *Translation of the Gospels*, with democratic and irreligious commentaries. In the *Outline*, Lamennais tried to reconcile Christianity and Pantheism. Like all Pantheists, he rejected the Christian idea of creation ; but he contended that God indeed created, though out of His own substance. According to this aberration, the divine intelligence at first conceived all the types of creation ; and then, when God wished to actuate these types as created forces, He placed a limit to His infinite power, and the created forces came into being. Created spirits were actuated by God's placing a limit to His infinite intelligence. In fine, God placed a limit to His own infinite life, and thus completed what we see as life ; He did this by attraction in the physical, and by love in the superior order. Every force in the universe, therefore, is the divine force and power—God the Father, with limitation. Every intelligence is the divine—the Son, with limitation. All life, all love, is the very life of God, with limitation. The force which is in us is really and substantially the force of God ; our intelligence, which tries to find truth, is substantially God's own ; our will, weak and vacillating as it is, is substantially God's will. Of course, Lamennais affected to modify what was an absolute deification of the universe. Although maintaining the idea of unity of substance, he held that the infinite substance, precisely because of the limitation which it receives on becoming finite, is essentially different from what it was in its infinite state. Thus he affected to preserve an essential difference

between God and creatures. The entire theory of the *Outline* rests on this distinction of a difference between God and the universe, which is not substantial but essential. Substantially, they are identical; essentially, they are different; although substantially identical with the infinite, the finite is nevertheless essentially distinct from the infinite. And when Lamennais is asked for a reason for this distinction between a substantial and an essential difference, he replies that it is a mystery. "It is the mystery of creation; and it would be absurd to try to penetrate it, since we know that substance is radically incomprehensible to finite beings." The reader shall judge whether the subtleties of Lamennais save him from Pantheism.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

OZANAM.

"Christianity and erudition; profound science and simple faith; all the subtleties of criticism, and all the wealth of an imagination placed at the service of Christian truth; an activity which carried him continually from the Library of the Institute to the garrets of the poor; a gift of eloquence which dominated a raging audience of young Voltairians by sheer persuasion, and which also calmed the sufferings of the sick and the outbreaks of the indigent; such is the spectacle offered to our admiration by the life of a man of genius and of heart whom we may regard as both the rival of Faurel and of Villemain, and the emulator of St. Vincent de Paul" (1). Brave words truly, when penned in eulogy of a professor of the revolutionary Sorbonne of the nineteenth century; but they express no more than the severe truth concerning the life of Frederick Ozanam, which was one continual apostolate of a priest exercised by a layman. Probably no layman of this century, Montalembert excepted, has stamped upon his time so legible a mark of his Catholicity as that impressed by Ozanam. The aim of his life was to glorify Catholicism by means of his works; in fine, his

(1) PELLISSIER; *The Glories of Christian France*, p. 180. Paris, 1890.

career formed a picture of what a Catholic layman should be in our day, especially in our country, where Catholic organizations are in their infancy, when, indeed, they are not still unborn. He realized that God demands the co-operation of the laity with the zeal of His priests for the prosecution of the work for which He came upon earth. Frederick Ozanam was born at Milan in 1813, of French parents whom the horrors of the French Revolution had driven from their country. On the fall of Napoleon, the family returned to Lyons, the native city of its heads; and the young Frederick made his first studies under his elder brother, who had embraced the ecclesiastical career. At the age of ten he entered the Royal College of Lyons; and, to use the words of one of his professors, he "proved himself one of those students whom a prudent master restrains rather than spurs." To those who are familiar with the circumstances of the time, it will not appear strange that the precocious lad should have had his peace of mind troubled, even at an early age, by doubts concerning the fundamental truths of Christianity. But he came out of this trial with an increase of faith and of zeal. In later years Ozanam thus wrote to two friends concerning this ordeal: "Attacked for a time by scepticism, I realized the utter necessity of clinging, with all my strength, to the column of the Temple, even though it were to crush me when it fell; and behold, to-day I still cling to that column which I find illuminated by the rays of wisdom, of glory, and of beauty; I embrace it with enthusiasm and with love; I shall remain at its foot, and thence I shall extend my arms in invitation to the wanderers on the sea of life to regard it as their beacon of deliverance." And as though he had already conceived the idea of his Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, he cried: "Happy will I be, if a few friends will gather around me so that we may join our efforts, create some good work, and having attracted others to our circle, lead all society to assemble under that protecting shadow! Then Catholicism, full of youth and strength, will arise before the world, and place itself at the head of this budding century, in order to lead it unto civilization and happiness. When speaking to you thus, my

friends, I am frightened by the fulness of the intellectual pleasure that I experience; the work is magnificent, and I am young and full of hope." The first result of his confirmed conviction was a project to compose a work which should bear the title, *The Christian Religion Demonstrated by the Antiquity of Historical, Religious, and Moral Beliefs*; and this design, although not executed by the youth of fifteen, nor afterward, nevertheless can be discerned as the generative and dominating thought in all his writings. Another effect of his early struggle against religious doubt is delicately described by his friend, Lacordaire: "In the pages which he had left, in his actions and discourses, you never find that anger which seeks revenge, nor that bitterness which grows as it is expressed, nor that contempt which defies, nor that irony which mocks, under the pretext of instructing or of correcting. While never lowering the Church in the eyes of the world, he ever extends a generous hand; because he is guided by that all-powerful sceptre, charity. He laments more than he accuses, he pardons more than he condemns."

Ozanam was only sixteen years of age when he received his Baccalaureate in letters; and then, merely to please his parents, he proceeded to Paris for the study of law. He relieved his mind, however, by publishing some poetry and many articles, all being permeated by the one idea—an apology of Christianity, and a research into philosophical truth. It is interesting to note his disappreciation of Paris, as at this period he compared it with Lyons, of which he always spoke as of his native city. "Paris displeases me; it is a moral desert. . . . For me, this city without limits, in which I am lost, is a Babylon, a place of exile; and Lyons, which holds those whom I have left behind, which has so much good-fellowship, the people of which are so charitable, and where the altars and faith are so respected, is my native city." He looks on the "Pantheon" from his window, and he writes: "This pagan temple in the heart of a Christian city, with its magnificent cupola, widowed of that cross which once crowned it so appropriately, is a singular monument. What is the meaning of a tomb without the cross, without any religious thought presiding over it? If death is merely

a material phenomenon which leaves behind it no hope, what signify these honors rendered to dry bones and rotting flesh? Truly the cult in the Pantheon is a comedy like that of Reason and Liberty." With such sentiments predominating in his soul, it was not strange that when he was still in his eighteenth year he should have begun to wield the pen in opposition to the sham philosophies of his day. Fifteen years had passed since Count Claude de Saint-Simon had formulated his doctrines; and they were now fairly well known by the general public of all civilized countries. In 1830 Ozanam attacked these theories in two articles which proved so logical that the doctrinarians were unable to reply. Even *Le Globe*, to which Augustin Thierry, Auguste Comte, Carnot, and Chevalier were contributors, preserved the same prudent silence. In 1831 the young polemic again entered the lists against this false and proofless system, in his *Reflections on the Doctrine of Saint-Simon*; and he proved that while his adversaries held Christianity to be a gross fetichism, our religion is, on the contrary, an outcome of that original religion of humanity, which the Jewish people alone preserved in its primitive orthodoxy, because they alone guarded the traditions of the human race. J. J. Ampère thus speaks of this work from a literary and philosophical point of view: "When scarcely eighteen years of age, he composed a pamphlet against Saint-Simonism, in which the youth of the author is manifest, but which merits being cited because of a sincerity and courage which impelled an unknown lad to combat a sect boasting men of talent, whose preaching had obtained a sort of success. This effort is also remarkable because it displays most of the qualities that afterward developed in Ozanam—namely, a vivid taste, though that of a novice, for erudition of the most varied kind; also warmth, impetuosity, and, united with an engaging conviction as to things, a great moderation toward persons. I like to indicate a liberality of views which led him to recognize sympathy even outside the ranks in which he fought; and to honor generously, for instance, in this book, the struggles of spiritualistic philosophy against materialism." Saint-Simonism vaunted itself as the direct heir of

Christianity, which it declared to be already relegated to the morgue of dead religious systems; it predicted for itself a future of indefinite progress, and it was destined to precede its founders to the tomb. Meanwhile it promised men that it would establish, by means of science and a new discipline, an indefinite reign of happiness, during which the rights of pleasure would be rehabilitated, and all the passions of man would undergo a "pacific reorganization." There was to be no more evil in the world—a very convenient consummation for the Saint-Simonians, who had shown their powerlessness in the matter of combating the ever present monster. Ozanam, on the contrary, recognized evil as an eloquent and stubborn fact; and he proposed to combat it with the arms of Christian charity.

At this period occurred an incident which will interest the reader. Ozanam had often expressed a desire to meet Chateaubriand, and finally he obtained an introduction. Chateaubriand had just returned from Mass, and he received the lad with great kindness. After some conversation he asked if Ozanam intended to go to the theatre that evening. Lacordaire tells us that the boy at first hesitated to avow that his mother had advised him never to enter a theatre; but finally he uttered the words. Chateaubriand embraced him, saying, "I conjure you to follow your mother's counsels. You would gain nothing at the theatre, and perhaps you would lose much." In fine, Ozanam never put foot into a theatre until he was twenty-seven years old, and then to see *Polyeucte*. Then he thought, says Lacordaire, that nothing can equal the representation furnished by the spirit to itself in a silent and a solitary reading of the great masters. Another effect of Ozanam's visit to Chateaubriand is noted by the great Dominican. "The charm it had left in his memory revealed to him the importance of the reception accorded by great men to those whom they have filled with admiration; and when he found himself honored and in request, he often thought of his obscure days, and freely opened his doors to the young men who were recommended to him from all sides, or who themselves sought him. Five times a week—that is, every day when he had not to appear in public—he re-

ceived them from eight to ten in the morning. And he received them graciously, conversing with them at length; and, although often devoured by the desire for the work they had interrupted, he would show no impatience. He felt himself a priest for those souls, and, like St. Paul, accountable for them all."

But let us hasten to the great event of Ozanam's life, and the one for which his memory is chiefly revered in this country. Many of his young friends had joined him in requesting the Abbé Gerbet, afterward bishop of Perpignan, to give them a series of Conferences on the philosophy of history. These reunions soon gave the idea of the celebrated Conferences of Notre Dame, first ordered by Mgr. de Quélen; but their chief effect was the institution of one of the most providential organizations of our day. Once, in the middle of an animated debate on the vitality of Catholicism, a young orator objected that the old faith was now dying. "If your faith is sincere," he cried, "it should show itself in works! Where are they? Let us see them!" The answer came very quickly. Some one exclaimed: "Let us establish a Conference of Charity!" No sooner said than done. The first reunions were held in the respective rooms of the young men; and, to use the words of the great Dom Guéranger, who was present at the first formal assemblage of the new Society, Ozanam was the *coryphée* of this crack corps of the French youth. M. Bailly, the editor of the *Tribune Catholique*, whose age and experience in good works seemed to designate him for the position, was elected president, and St. Vincent de Paul was chosen for patron. Of course, time has necessitated some new regulations, but the fundamental rules of the Society remain as they then were. Its object is always the same—to relieve the poor in their temporal necessities; to promote their moral improvement by visits to their homes; to render more easy their way to heaven. From their very beginning these Conferences were charged with being political machines. Under the government of Napoleon III., the Minister Persigny, applauded by the Freemasons and the French press—then, as now, almost entirely under Jewish control,—pre-

pared the way for the persecutions with which the Third Republic visited the Society. But all this only proves the great good done by it ; the enemies of the Church ever assail her most important points. And in France, especially, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul is never backward in any truly Catholic work. For Ozanam, the success of the new Society was the constant preoccupation of his mind ; his correspondence and discourses show what a preponderating part he had in it. A few months before he was called to his reward, when his strength was far from equal to his will, he journeyed to Florence to sustain the Italian Conferences, then persecuted by the civil power.

One of the most eminent bishops of that time, Mgr. Paris of Langres, characterized the great work of Ozanam in these terms : "I believe that the Catholic laymen of today have a particular and providential mission. Everywhere the world is secularizing itself. Everywhere the powers of the time repeat that the State is laic. Well, God has replied to the declaration : "I shall establish among you a lay priesthood—one destitute of that sacramental character which you blaspheme, one not clothed in that costume which you contemn, one which does not follow that segregated manner of life which you criticise ; but one which will manifest the intelligence and zeal of the veritable priesthood, not indeed performing those sacred functions which must ever remain within the limits of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, but performing social functions. Behold the action of Divine Providence in our days—the work of St. Vincent de Paul, of St. Francis Regis, of St. Joseph, of Ozanam."

In June, 1833, Ozanam and two friends, as representatives of a large section of the Parisian youth, called on Mgr. de Quélen, the archbishop, to request the establishment at Notre Dame of a series of Conferences such as they had enjoyed from the eloquence of the Abbé Gerbet. The prelate blessed them, and, embracing them, said : "In your persons I embrace all the Catholic youth " ; but he hesitated to accord the favor. There was no difficulty as to the Conferences themselves ; but as to the preacher, whom the students had already chosen—namely, the Abbé Lacordaire,

there was much hesitation. Concerning this fact, Dom Piolin, one of the biographers of Ozanam, and a man thoroughly acquainted with the inside history of the struggles of his day, says: "This may appear inexplicable to one who did not live at that time. The students not only requested the establishment of the Conferences, but they designated the preacher who was to give them. This man was certainly designed for the chair by his talent and by success already obtained. He was the Abbé Lacordaire, whom the students knew, above all, for his journal *L'Avenir*, and because of his trial in the matter of the free schools. But it must not be forgotten that three of the five prosecutions against *L'Avenir*, during its short existence, were caused by articles from the pen of Lacordaire. Nor must it be forgotten that the brilliant orator was one of three pilgrims, according to their expression, who went to Rome in November, 1831, to defend doctrines which were afterward condemned by the Encyclical '*Mirari vos*' (1832). Certainly Lacordaire signalized himself by his thorough submission to the decree of the Holy See, and there is no doubt that the avowal was as sincere as it was public; but, nevertheless, there were many recriminations against certain persons who were regarded as having worked for that condemnation. We would rather not recall here certain conversations in the drawing-room of Mme. de Swetchine—and these conversations had their echo,—but we will say that the published correspondence gives incontestable proof of the rankling then at the bottom of many hearts." Finally, in 1835, the archbishop himself offered the chair to the young and brilliant orator. The fame of these Conferences is world-wide; and since the days of their preacher, Ravignon, Félix, Matignon, and Monsabré have continued them with almost equal success.

By this time the literary reputation of Ozanam, although he was still a young man, was very great. The younger Dumas has somewhere said that nowadays "young men make their *début* in literature with old ideas in their heads; it requires much experience to conceive young ideas." But in Ozanam profound reflection had taken the place of experience, and competent judges expected to see him at the apex

of literary fame, long before he would have attained his prime. However, neither ambition nor his own tastes tempted him to deviate from the path his father had wished him to follow. He passed his examination for the Doctorate in Law in 1836; and when, in 1839, a chair of Commercial Law was established in the College of Lyons, the consent of Cousin, then Minister of Public Instruction, was obtained for Ozanam's promotion to it. Cousin was by no means what is now called a clerical; but when he sent the appointment to the new professor, and regretted that "his own regiment" could not claim such a recruit, he closed a flattering letter by saying, "I am sure, at any rate, that you will always serve the cause of true philosophy." Just a year before this appointment, when Ozanam, surrounded by circumstances of unusual pomp, had passed his examination for the Doctorate in Letters, Cousin, who had been one of the board, cried out to him: "Monsieur Ozanam, greater eloquence than yours is impossible!" Commenting on this compliment, Leon Gautier says: "These words will cause more than one erudite of the *petite école*, and to tell the truth, more than one pedant to smile. These rhetoricians of science would cheerfully write on the doors of our schools, 'Here all eloquence is prohibited.' They forbid us to be warm or even animated. 'Impassibility in pedagogy' is the dream of these shallow minds; and they fancy that with it we can master twenty-year-old intelligences. In Germany, perhaps; in France, never. In this matter, Ozanam is a model which we must copy persistently. He studied profoundly the matter of his lectures; he prepared them with the aid of the best scientific data; then he gave full play to his imagination, and feared not if he soared into eloquence during his delivery. . . . Ozanam gained quickly the affections of an essentially mobile public, one which was then more passionate than ever. At that period the term 'clerical' had not yet been invented; but the hatred of 1840 was no less ferocious. Nevertheless this professor who was only twenty-eight years old was received most favorably. Was his success due to his learning or to his eloquence? I think not; and I express my entire thought when I say that Oza-

nam was generous, and that his generosity was the best explanation of a triumph which was almost unexpected, although merited. Every noble cause attracted Ozanam. Were he living now, perhaps he would not speak of liberty as he spoke at that time; but it is enough to say that no one ever questioned his charming sincerity. He had a heart of crystal, in which everyone could read; and he possessed the gift of a spontaneous and unaffected enthusiasm. This it was that captivated the young; this made him popular as a professor; and from this point of view, no professor of his day was so popular as Ozanam" (1).

But if Cousin would have attached Ozanam to the University, others were endeavoring to direct his talents in other directions. Lacordaire entered the Order of Preachers in 1840, and would have liked to draw Ozanam after himself. Montalembert wished him to become co-editor of a periodical he had just founded. And the great preacher, the Abbé Combalot, said to the young lawyer's elder brother: "I would rather see Ozanam in the chair of truth than in that of the University." To the University Ozanam did go, and as an apostle. The chair of Foreign Literature being vacant in the College of Lyons, he applied to M. Cousin; but as that Minister was about to proclaim a competition for an adjunct professorship of that branch in the Sorbonne, he advised Ozanam to enter the concursus. The other candidates had been preparing for over a year, and there now remained only five months before the trial. Nevertheless, when the day arrived, Ozanam obtained the chair amid the applause even of his rivals. When the concursus was over, Fourier, the professor of Foreign Literature, then sixty-eight years old, successfully demanded that the young adjunct should be allowed to take his place whenever he might deem fitting. Ozanam always contended that God had especially aided him in this triumph. Speaking of Ozanam in the chair, the younger Ampère said: "Those who have not heard him do not know his talent. Laborious preparation, obstinate researches of texts, knowledge accumulated by great efforts, and then a brilliant improvisa-

(1) *Portraits of the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. ii., p. 134. Paris, 1895.

tion in entrancing language,—such is the teaching of Ozanam. Very seldom are so united the two great merits of a professor—depth and form, science and eloquence. He prepared his lectures like a Benedictine, and he delivered them like an orator; a double labor, which undermined an ardent constitution, and finally killed him.” As to his relations with the students, M. Caro, that Academician whose master intellect was part of so sympathetic a nature, that he was called the *philosophe des dames*, spoke as follows: “Ingenious and good, we need not be surprised that he was popular among the young men around him; I never loved any master as I did him. Inevitable sympathy drew a youth to him, and this sympathy was faithful on both sides. In the course of years, nearly all his old disciples became his friends. No one could give him up who had once known him.” During his entire career as professor in the University, which, like all similar “unsectarian” establishments of our day, almost constantly furnished instances of would-be teachers handling subjects the first principles of which they ignore, Ozanam was ever on guard lest he might fall into the slightest inexactness of expression in regard to Christian dogma. When about to treat of, or to touch upon, any such matter of more than ordinary delicacy, he would consult some one of his ecclesiastical intimates—for instance, Dom Guéranger. Concerning this trait of Ozanam, Dom Piolin says: “We can bear witness to the scrupulousness with which he endeavored to avoid the slightest inexactness of expression whenever he touched on the dogmas and truths of Christianity. In June, 1843, I was working with Dom Guéranger. One day Ozanam entered the room, and told the abbot that being obliged, in his next lecture, to treat of certain points of the mystic life and of monastic discipline, he had called on his friend to be made sure that he was about to express himself correctly. He had brought his notes; and for about an hour, he announced his own views, and received the explanations of Dom Guéranger, engraving, as it were, each word in his memory, so visibly intense was the attention which was depicted on his features. It pleases me to be able to mention this incident in the life of

so well-informed a man. The fact ought to be a lesson to the multitude of writers who presume to treat of the most delicate questions of the mystic life, although they have not made the slightest study of its principles. The same remark may be made in regard to many lucubrations on monastic discipline; very seldom is exactness of expression observed."

M. Fourier died in 1843; and after some difficulty on the part of Villemain, then Minister of Public Instruction, Ozanam became titular professor in the chair which he had adorned so well. So young a titular had never been installed in the University. His lectures required much preparatory labor; but he continually found time for a further exercise of his educational apostolate in the best journals and periodicals of France. In 1843, while he was delivering his account of the literary history of Italy from the dawn of Christianity to the advent of Charlemagne, he published some of his most remarkable writings in the *Correspondant*, and in the *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*. These articles were greatly admired, even by the "liberals" of the time; but they did not produce that furious excitement in the hostile camp which was caused at the same time by a discourse on the literary obligations of Catholics, which, at the request of Archbishop Affre, the professor pronounced before the "Catholic Circle." Michelet and Quinet, then teaching in the Collège de France, raised the insensate cry of "Jesuitism"—a word which had not yet given place to the equally ridiculous one of "clericalism"; and every means was adopted to excite the studious youth of the University against the uncompromisingly Catholic professor. In reality, the whole question between Michelet and Quinet, on the one side, and Ozanam, Lenormant, and Cœur, on the other, was the great one of freedom of education—a right which the Masonic powers in office refused to Catholics. But Ozanam persisted in his course; and as Lacordaire remarked, "he retained the affection of the Catholics, the esteem of the Faculty of which he was a member, and outside of those camps, the sympathy of that fickle crowd which is termed the public, and which sooner or later decides everything."

In 1844 the death of M. Bailly caused the unanimous election of Ozanam to the presidency of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, but his humility and numerous occupations would not allow him to accept the position; he entered, however, upon the duties of vice-president, and until his death was ever active in promoting the work of the organization. In 1846 he was named Chevalier of the Legion of Honor, and shortly afterward made a trip into Italy. He was affectionately received by Pope Pius IX., then surrounded by the honors of apotheosis on the part of the liberal party. Ozanam believed in the sincerity of these demonstrations, and with him, in this case, the wish was father of the thought. He was a pronounced democrat, but in a Christian sense. He firmly believed in the possibility, nay, the necessity, of a Christian democracy in the circumstances of to-day. In his mind democracy was now the natural goal of political progress, and he was persuaded that God was now leading the world toward it. "Gentlemen," he observed on one occasion, "when the barbarians overran Roman civilization, the Church pursued them, saying, 'I pass to the barbarians'; and with those barbarians she constituted modern civilization. To-day it is not barbarism, but democracy which invades the world. Let us pass over to the democracy, and with it let us form the civilization of the future." These ideas and hopes were shared by Lacordaire and by the Abbé Maret, then professor at the Sorbonne, and afterward titular bishop of Sura. They founded a journal, *L'Ère Nouvelle*, to propagate their views; but it lasted only a year (1848-49). Several very rash opinions were hazarded in this paper; so very rash that all the pressure of the French Government could not induce the Holy See to confirm the nomination of Maret, in 1860, to the diocese of Vanues. As to Lacordaire, he was called to Rome, and made to subscribe to propositions contrary to many advanced in *L'Ère Nouvelle*. Ozanam, however, steered aloof of these shoals; and during his connection with the journal, he combated those monstrosities which seem to be necessary accompaniments of European democracy.

The revolution of 1848, as at first actuated in France, was not displeasing to Ozanam. The republic which it pro-

claimed was certainly more legitimate than the bastard monarchy of Louis Philippe which it had subverted; in the beginning, at least, it seemed to recognize the rights of the Church as they had not been recognized, in France, for many years; and it was with sincere pleasure that many of the *curés* blessed the "liberty poles" of the day, and intoned the *Domine, salvam fac Rempublicam* in their churches. Amid all these opinions, illusions, hopes, and utopias appeared the white robe of Lacordaire, who was giving, in all tranquillity, his Conferences at Notre Dame. Ozanam allowed no excitement of the world to interfere with his enjoyment of these spiritual and literary feasts; but Leon Gautier narrates one episode which showed that the professor's democratic fever accompanied him to the cathedral. He had conceived the idea that so eminently "popular" a preacher as Lacordaire should not tolerate so "aristocratic" an institution as payment for sittings in a reserved portion of the nave. Therefore, one day the auditors of the great Dominican were treated to a rather distracting exhibition. Ozanam, who was dressed in the full uniform of the National Guard, suddenly left his seat, and tore away the barrier which separated the free from the reserved places. "This fact," says Gautier, "was frequently narrated to me by Dr. Faivre, the late Dean of the Faculty of Science in Lyons, who aided Ozanam in the rather revolutionary demonstration. In justice, however, I must add that they had obtained the consent of Lacordaire, and that from the height of his pulpit the great orator smiled upon them" (1). Ozanam had accepted the Republic of 1848 frankly and hopefully; and it was in order to demonstrate how the spirit of Christianity develops the glory and prosperity of true republics, that he immediately began his course of lectures on *The History of the Italian Republics of the Middle Age*. His illusion was of short duration; an experience of a few weeks showed that the work of the Masonic Lodges and that of mediæval Catholicism were not to be mentioned in the same breath. Impelled only by the obligations and hopes of Christian charity, it was he who, on June 25, 1848, together with Bailly and Cornudet, accompanied Archbishop

(1) *Loc cit.*, p. 138.

Affre through the insurgent ranks on his way to the quarters of General Cavaignac, head of the executive power of the Republic, where the prelate was to beg for the pardon of the rebels who would lay down their arms; and he also was one of the few who followed the saintly shepherd to his martyrdom at the barricade of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine (1).

In 1849 the constitution of Ozanam, never robust, began to show signs of decay. An attack of pleurisy in 1851 forced him to interrupt his lectures, and go to the Eaux-Bonnes, where he founded a Conference of St. Vincent de Paul. After a voyage in Spain, he proceeded to Tuscany, where the dowager grand-duchess had shown herself hostile to the Society so dear to his heart. His zeal in its favor was rewarded by permission to establish Conferences throughout the grand-duchy. At Pisa he grew weaker, but he devoted his time to annotations of the Bible; and in after years his friends gathered the sheets and published the contents, with the title *Book of the Sick*. On his journey toward France,

(1) The socialistic and other "exalted" leaders of the populace, not contented with a republic in which order, moderation, and justice were observed, had drawn the workmen of the capital into open insurrection against the authority of the National Assembly; and on June 24 that representative body had invested General Cavaignac, already head of the executive, with dictatorial powers. Senard, the president of the Assembly, announcing this proceeding to the National Guard, said: "Among the insurgents there are many who are mere victims of deception; and now the crime of those who have beguiled the unfortunates is patent. They do not demand a republic; that is already proclaimed. They do not ask for universal suffrage; that is already in force. What then do they desire? We know very well. They wish for anarchy, incendiarism, pillage. National Guards, let us unite for the defense of our beautiful capital!" Martial law was proclaimed, and the struggle assumed frightful proportions. During the night of the 24th, the troops carried the Faubourg Poissinière, thanks to the arrival of the National Guards of Rouen, which placed the insurgents between two fires. The Pantheon (the desecrated church of St. Geneviève) had been battered with cannon, and retaken, but with the loss of General Damesme, who was replaced by General Brea. After a night of fitful repose, the combat recommenced with the dawn. Brea carried the Faubourg Saint-Marcel, and was about to charge on some formidable barricades at the Barrière Fontainebleau, when he conceived the idea of parleying with the enemy. Having raised the white flag, he was asked to pass the barricades, in order to confer with the rebel leaders. Full of a legitimate confidence, and accompanied only by an aide, he crossed the barrier; and was dragged into a neighboring house and massacred, together with his companion. One may imagine the savage aspect which the combat thenceforth presented. The carnage was at its height, when Archbishop Affre waited on Cavaignac, and asked for permission to make his way through the attacking troops to the front of the battle, there to endeavor to bring his wayward children to reason. In vain Cavaignac mentioned the fate of General Brea; the prelate calmly replied: "A good pastor gives his life for his sheep." On his way to the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, where sixty-five successive barricades were confronting the governmental forces, he paused ever and anon to exercise the ministry of his office, as wounded and dying men were being carried from the field. Arrived before the first barricade, he showed the order of Cavaignac to the commanding officer, and demanded a cessation of the firing. The bugles gave the signal

in which land of his predilection he wished to die, he found awaiting him at Leghorn a member's diploma of the Italian Academy *della Crusca*: and also, what was inexpressibly dear to him, letters of affiliation to the Franciscan Order, sent to him by the General through the intervention of Cardinal Mai. Before embarking he received the Last Sacraments, and on his arrival at Marseilles, they were again administered. He was received by his beloved Society, and on the Feast of the Nativity of Our Lady (1853), surrounded by his wife and family, he peacefully expired. Pope Pius IX. sent a letter of consolation to Mme. Ozanam; Lacordaire, the younger Ampère, Caro, Perreyve, Laprade, and other eminent men, pronounced eulogies on him. Guizot terminated his panegyric in these words: "This model of a Christian man of letters, worthy and humble, an ardent friend of science and a firm champion of the faith, tenderly enjoying the pure pleasures of life, was taken away from the holiest

to the troops; a similar one caused a suspension of the insurgent fire; and the archbishop advanced, bareheaded, directly to the barricade. Many of the rebels jumped down to meet him; some greeted him with curses, while others knelt and kissed his hands and soutane. Calmly and distinctly he began to plead: "My friends"; and suddenly a musket was discharged. Then came from the Insurgents the cry: "We are betrayed! To arms!" Those who had come forth to meet the archbishop quickly regained their posts, for the firing had been resumed; but as they looked toward the prelate they saw him fall. He had received a bullet in the groin. Again many of the insurgents sprang over the barricade, and lifting their wounded pastor, they swore that it was no gun of the people, but one belonging to the *bourgeoisie* that had laid him low. A litter was extemporized, and by direction of the *curé* de Saint-Antoine the victim of his pastoral charity was borne to the parochial residence. As the bearers proceeded, their murmurs of vengeance because of his misfortune reached the ears of the sufferer; and he cried: "No revenge, my friends! Let my blood be the last shed in this dissension!" Shortly after his arrival at the presbytery, the physicians informed him that his wound was certainly mortal. Raising his eyes toward heaven, he said in an undisturbed voice, "My God, I offer Thee my life; accept it in expiation of my sins, and as an oblation for the prevention of further effusion of blood! My life, oh God! is a little thing; but take it! I die content, if my sacrifice terminates this horrible civil war." After a few moments of meditation, he said: "Tell the insurgents that I conjure them to depose their arms. The government will not treat them badly." When he was told that the fight had ceased, as soon as it became generally known that he was wounded, he rejoiced; but his humility led him to say: "I suppose that when I am dead, they will pronounce on me eulogies that I do not at all merit." After he had received the Last Sacraments, he asked to be removed to his own residence. All Paris seemed to lute the streets through which the *cortège* passed; and the face of the dying man was the most serene in the multitude. His sacrifice was accomplished on the following day, and simultaneously the last traces of the insurrection disappeared. During the eight days that the body of Archbishop Affre was exposed in state, as we learn from the secular journals of the time, more than forty thousand swords were drawn from their scabbards, and laid upon the hands which seemed, even in death, to bless France.—CHANTEREL; *Universal History*. Vol. vi., p. 501, 20th edit., Paris, 1891.—GULLERMIN; *Denis Augustus Affre, in the Illustrious Men of the Nineteenth Century*. Paris, 1885.

affections and the noblest labors too soon, according to the world, but when he was mature for heaven and for glory."

To M. Guizot the world is supremely indebted for a *History of Civilization*, but this *doctinaire* too persistently misinterpreted or ignored the influence of the Church. Ozanam filled his lagunes. To give an adequate idea of the writings of this young champion of the Church and of humanity is not our intention, but a brief analysis may prove acceptable. The works of Ozanam fill eight octavo volumes. The first and second give us, in the work entitled *The Civilization of the Fifth Century*, the customs of that period, the paganism, law, literature, theology, and philosophy; the Papacy and monasticism; the condition of women; the Latin language become a Christian tongue; the material civilization of the Roman Empire; the origin of the new Latin nations. By some strange oversight, this edition does not reproduce the *Documents Illustrating the Literary History of Italy from the Eighth to the Thirteenth Century*, published in 1850, as the result of a mission entrusted to Ozanam in 1846 by M. de Salvandy, then Minister of Public Instruction. The third and fourth volumes give the work entitled *The Germans before Christianity*, of which the first part describes what is now called Germany as it was before the coming of the Romans, its religion, language, and laws; the second part, treating of the same barbaric regions in face of Roman civilization, then as they were when made partly Christian under the Romans, and finally we have an account of the preaching of Irish and English monks, the Church, state, and schools. The fifth volume comprises the charming study entitled *The Franciscan Poets of Italy in the Thirteenth Century*, which treats of the services rendered by the Franciscans to Italian literature, and of the sources of Dante's *Divina Commedia*. The sixth volume presents the work on *Dante and the Philosophy of the Thirteenth Century*, an exposition of the *Commedia* from a thirteenth-century philosophical point of view. The seventh and eighth volumes give a collection of *Mélanges*—a series of articles on questions of religion, philosophy, jurisprudence, politics, and a number of biographies, descriptions of travels, etc.

## CHAPTER IX.

MONTALEMBERT AND THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM OF  
EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

Among the many noble families whose heroic devotion to France has been a hereditary characteristic for centuries, that of the Montalemberts has ever been conspicuous. They have ever justified the proud saying of the chivalrous Francis I.: "We are four gentlemen of Guienne who await in the lists any and all enemies of France; I, Sansac, Montalembert, and La Chastaigneraye"; but they were never known as mere hangers-on of the royal court, being, on the contrary, as the comrade of King Francis said, "better adapted for dealing blows to the foe, than for handing a shirt to the king." From this stock came that Charles René de Montalembert who was destined to show that neither nobility of lineage nor filial submission to the laws of the Church are obstacles to the moral, literary, oratorical, and political development of a Frenchman of the nineteenth century; that, in fine, "it is possible for one to have mind and heart attentive to all the interests of the present, to bring to the conduct of public affairs and to a study of the questions of the day the qualities of lucidity and practical common sense, without any abandonment of the traditions of an illustrious race, and without any neglect of the duties and belief of a fervent Catholic" (1). Count René de Montalembert had been driven from France by the Revolution, and had married in London the only daughter of James Forbes, a scion of the noble house of Granard. It was in the English capital that the future Catholic champion was born in 1810; and when the Restoration permitted Count René to return to France, he left the boy in the care of his dotting grandfather. Forbes was a man of remarkable attainments, and a member of the Royal Society; and he regarded the education of his charge as the chief pleasure of his declining years. From the time when he was able to walk until his tenth year, Charles may

(1) PELLISSIER; *The Glories of Christian France*, p. 144. Paris, 1860.

be said to have lived with his grandfather in the library of the latter ; and he not only acquired the rudiments of Latin and Greek, as well as an excellent knowledge of his two mother-tongues, but what was of more importance, he imbibed a taste for really serious study, together with an aptitude for profound observation, and for minute research into the reasons of things. In 1819 the death of his grandfather caused the removal of the boy to his father's house in Paris ; and here his studies were continued for seven years under the guidance of private tutors. In 1826 he entered the College of Sainte-Barbe, now known as the Collège Rollin. As "liberal" himself as any one of his new companions, all of whom were already indoctrinated with the theories of Foy, Lafayette, and other agitators of the period, Montalembert rendered himself popular by his translations of the great English parliamentarians, Fox, Pitt, and Grattan ; but he found himself almost alone in the matter of religious belief, there being but one or two fellows who did not vaunt himself a disciple of Voltaire. The *rara avis* was Léon Cornudet ; and as he was in the class of philosophy, while Montalembert was in that of rhetoric, the quickly made friends supplemented their unfrequent interviews by an epistolary correspondence which afterward saw the light for the edification of many under the title of *Letters to a College Friend*. The reader of these letters learns that in his eighteenth year Montalembert professed the same opinions which he propagated in his mature manhood. Son of a peer of France, and already determined on an entrance into political life, this young French student had taken for his models in statecraft those English parliamentarians whose career and discourses had captivated his imagination. "We will show the world," writes the young rhetorician, "that men can be Christians without being retrogrades, and that we can serve God with the noble humility of free men." In his exaltation the lad sent to his friend a sort of profession of political and religious faith which he had signed with his blood. Calmly and after due thought, however, the two enthusiasts, after having received Holy Communion together, solemnly swore to devote their friendship to the cause of "God and Liberty."

Thus the young Montalembert adopted the watchword which was to be proclaimed by Lamennais and Lacordaire ; and he framed it several years before those publicists used it, and when he did not know them.

In 1829 Montalembert visited Ireland, and called on O'Connell, who was then triumphing in a rôle such as the French youth had imagined for himself—that of a leader in a contest for full religious liberty. He was in London when the Three Days of July, 1830, expelled the elder branch of the Bourbons from France ; and he hurried to Paris in order to watch the progress of a revolution which did not entirely displease him. He found that Lamennais had just undertaken the editorship of a politico-religious journal in order to combat the theories of those Catholics, both clerical and lay, who seemed to fancy that the fall of the throne of the legitimate “son of St. Louis” necessarily involved the destruction of the altar. Montalembert would not have been true to the traditions of his class, had he not cherished the idea of a *réel* “alliance between the altar and the throne” ; but the history of the past two centuries had shown that in France that alliance had been made a gilded slavery for the Church, and the history of the past thirty years had demonstrated that such slavery was no longer tolerable. He immediately offered his services to *L'Avenir*, and they were graciously accepted. In the rooms of Lamennais he met Lacordaire for the first time ; and at once they loved each other “with that love,” he afterward wrote, “which is experienced by the young, pure, and generous, when they are together under the fire of the enemy.” When Montalembert joined the editorial staff of the journal bearing the motto, “God and Liberty,” he devoted himself entirely to that cause ; indeed, half measures and compromises were so foreign to his nature, that he could have appropriated to himself the remark which his father had made when he reproved the ministers of Louis XVIII. for not sending enough of troops into Spain : “When France draws her sword, she draws it entirely.” When treating of Lacordaire and Lamennais, we spoke sufficiently concerning the history of *L'Avenir*, and concerning the prosecution of Montalembert,

Lacordaire, and M. de Coux, for having dared to teach some children without permission from the government. We heard our young publicist describing himself, when replying to the initial questions of the court, as "Count Charles de Montalembert, twenty one-years old, *Schoolmaster, and Peer of France.*" We now add only a couple of passages from his grand speech of defense: "The task of our lawyers is finished; ours begins. They have recited for you the strict language of right and of the law. It is for us, the accused, while explaining the motives of our conduct, to speak another language—that of our beliefs and of our affections, that of our hearts and of our faith—the Catholic language." It is very improbable that the court, composed chiefly of venerable peers who had grown old in the services of various governments, which were all equally indifferent to both religion and liberty, had ever before heard this "Catholic language" resounding through its forensic precincts. They had heard the eloquence of men like De Bonald and Chateaubriand, of Catholic royalists, or perhaps, rather, of royalist Catholics; but an eloquence which was purely and simply Catholic must have been indeed new to them. "We are resigned," continued the pedagogue-peer, "to everything but servitude. It is well for the government to understand this fact, and to think of it frequently." In his vindication of a Catholic parent's right to refuse to consign his children to the atheistic teaching and to the immoral discipline of the University, Montalembert recalled his own experiences in Sainte-Barbe, one of the colleges affiliated and subject to that governmental establishment. He inveighed against the contagious scepticism, the cold and calculated impiety, and the flagrant monstrosities of immorality, which remained ever afterward "among the souvenirs of every boy who spent even one week in such an institution." And he protested against a system which subjected an innocent child to the horrible risk which he himself had undergone, "the risk of purchasing a little science at the cost of the faith of his fathers, at the cost of all that was pure and fresh in his soul, at the cost of honor and of every virtue." The House of Peers refused to be influenced by these accents of truth; the

cause of liberty, of morality, and of the future of France, yielded to the threat of a loss of their hereditary privileges which hung over their heads. The punishment inflicted was certainly nominal ; but the Universitarian monopoly was re-consecrated, receiving a new lease of life, which was to endure for more than twenty years. And these "liberals" of 1830, who so deliberately condemned Catholic children to religious indifference, were the men who continually decried as a revolting abuse of power the conduct of Louis XIV., in ordering the children of Calvinists to be raised in the Catholic faith.

Twenty-two years of the life of Montalembert were devoted to the conquest of freedom of education ; and since an accurate idea of the importance of his work depends on a knowledge of the true significance of the pedagogic pretensions of the government of Louis Philippe, we subjoin a brief sketch of the origin and privileges of the "University of France." The reader must know that the ancient University of Paris had no authority and exercised no direct influence over the other Universities of the kingdom ; the other institutions, just like the many schools of the cloister, had their own special methods. Centuries of experience had demonstrated the utility of this independence, when Napoleon, whose continual aim was to centralize every power and influence in his own hands, conceived the idea of a new teaching body, comparable indeed, in some respects, with the venerable University of Paris, but to be founded on a much vaster plan. The entire system of instruction in France was to be guided by one and the same administration. By an imperial decree of March 17, 1808, it was ordered that all teaching in the empire should be the exclusive prerogative of the new "University of France" ; that no educational establishment could be continued or founded without the sanction of the grand-master of the said University ; and that no person, not a member of the same, could open a school, or teach science, letters, or art. Apparently an exception was made in favor of ecclesiastical seminaries ; but that exception was practically nullified by the order that the bishops, to whom the direction of their

respective seminaries was ostensibly conceded, should respect the ordinances of the head of the state in all educational matters. The exception was nullified also by the provision determining the number of Faculties of Theology in France—one for each ecclesiastical province; and by the fact that the professors in the seminaries were to be appointed by the grand-master of the University in the first instance, the chairs to be obtained thereafter by concursus. It was also ordered that all teaching in the seminaries should be in accordance with the Four Articles of 1682; that, in fine, as Napoleon expressed the idea, all ecclesiastical education should be based primarily on the precepts of the Church, but it should also be grounded in the idea of “fidelity to the emperor; to the imperial monarchy, the depository of the happiness of the people; and to the Napoleonic dynasty, the preserver of the unity of France, and of all the liberal principles which are proclaimed in the constitution.” When Napoleon first undertook to undo the fell work of the Revolution in matters ecclesiastical, his grand governmental instincts told him that the clergy ought, after the mothers of France, to be the first educators of French youth. “Napoleon never hesitated,” says De Pradt, “in the matter of the necessity of confiding public instruction to the clergy. I do not know whether that system is a good one or not; but I do know that it was his—‘That is their business,’ said he” (1). But the time arrived when, as the son of the Revolution himself said, “having slept in the bed of royalty, he was infected with the madness of kings” (2), and since the first symptom of that madness is generally a desire to wield crozier as well as sceptre, he found himself at war with the Roman Pontiff. Then came the creation of a body of laymen dependent entirely on the state, controlling public instruction in all its ramifications, despite the indubitable fact that the interests of souls—a matter pertaining to the province of the clergy—are necessarily involved in that instruction. It must not be forgotten,

(1) DE PRADT; *The Four Concordats*. Paris, 1830.—POUJOLAT; *Life of Ravignan*. Paris, 1875.

(2) See the *Memoirs for the History of France under Napoleon, Written at St. Helena under His Dictation by the Count de Montholon*. Paris, 1835.

however, that Napoleon still realized that ordinary laymen could scarcely fulfil in a creditable manner that mission which may well be termed a second priesthood. He knew that the state could not expect to find in its hirelings that spirit of devotedness to the educational apostolate which is of the very essence of the priestly and the religious life; but fancying that some semblance of that spirit might be evoked by merely barren imitation of impressive externals, he laid upon most of his Universitarian employees the obligation of leading a community life, and one of celibacy. In Article CI. of his decree of 1808, he ordered: "The provosts and censors of the *lycées*, the principals and regents of the colleges, as well as the prefects of studies in these colleges, will be constrained to celibacy and to the life in community." Did Napoleon forget that while a governmental decree may institute a parody of sacerdotal or monastic celibacy, something more than the pen of a secretary of state is requisite to enable the children of men to resist carnal temptation? Ought not his sublime intelligence, his own experience, have taught him that by this decree he placed a premium on the immorality of his governmental pedagogues? Of course this hypocritical mask was removed by the Restoration; and many other obnoxious features of the new University were also remedied. By a decree of Feb. 17, 1815, Louis XVIII. reduced the number of Academies, and gave to them the name of Universities; the *Lycées* were thereafter to be styled Royal Colleges. Each University was to be composed of a Council, of which the diocesan bishop was to be a member; and of Faculties, and of Royal and Communal Colleges. Each College, with the exception of the one in the principal city of the University circumscription, was to be governed by a bureau of administration, of which the bishop was to be a member. Instead of the Napoleonic grand-master of the "University of France," there was to be a Royal Council of Public Instruction, composed of a president and eleven councillors, two of the latter to be chosen from among the clergy. The president was to conduct all correspondence, to present all business to the council, to sign all decisions and to see that they were respected, and

to have a casting vote when a tie resulted. On Feb. 27, 1821, a royal ordinance empowered the bishops to superintend all religious instruction in the colleges; and in the following year the celebrated Frayssinous, who had recently been made titular bishop of Hermopolis, was created head of the University. Certainly the revolutionary University had been deprived of some of its poison; but in 1828, the Martignac-Portalis ministry gave a severe blow to the cause of free education, when it so far yielded to the clamors of the "liberal" opposition as to decree that the eight colleges of the Jesuits should be incorporated with the University, and that thereafter no one could teach in France, unless he or she declared in writing that he or she did not belong to any order or society which was not *legally* established in the kingdom. Shortly after the publication of this decree, another was issued, declaring that thereafter the number of ecclesiastical students should never exceed twenty thousand; and that no externs should be allowed to receive instruction in the seminaries. With the revolution of 1830 came the restoration of its Napoleonic prerogatives to the University. Then the chairs of public instruction throughout the kingdom were filled by men who were formed according to the image of the state as it was then constituted—Positivists at best, but generally rank Pantheists and sordid Materialists.

When Charles de Montalembert undertook to procure freedom of education in France, he entered into his paternal inheritance; for the last words of Count René in the House of Peers had been: "As Frenchmen and as Catholics we ask for, indeed, we demand, freedom of education. That freedom is indispensable for the happiness of our families, for the maintenance of paternal authority; and for my part, I shall not cease to demand it, so long as I have a seat in this assembly." The time seemed to be opportune for success against the Universitarian monopoly, when the liberal agitation penetrated all minds in 1830, and when the superior talents of Lamennais and his disciples gave strength to the cause. But the sanguine Christian liberals were doomed to learn that one of the saddest consequences of the Revolution

of 1789, a continual Hosanna to liberty without the possession of the thing itself, was destined to satisfy their countrymen for many years. Ever since the subversion of the throne of St. Louis, neither reason nor experience has been able to convince Frenchmen that the interference of the State in every possible concern of the citizen is not a consummation devoutly to be desired; even in our day, after so long a trial, the average French republican, unless he is a positive anarchist, finds Statolatry a very comfortable doctrine. But in spite of this slavish tendency of the victims of the principles of 1789, Montalembert continued to hope that his Catholic compatriots would soon realize that religion ought to penetrate and inspire all education; that religion "ought to exercise over education that absolute domination, without which no education can be truly good." Like Mme. de Staël, who was very far from being a "clerical," Montalembert believed that "religion is nothing unless it is all"; and that this truth is realized by the Masonic liberalasters of our time, is shown by the zeal with which they effect the banishment of religion from the halls of education in every land where they attain predominance. As a first step in the career which he had marked out for himself, as a first blow in "that determined and holy combat of conscience, truth, and right, against the then triumphant forces of mendacity," Montalembert laid the foundations of a "Catholic Party" in 1836, shortly after his marriage with Mlle. de Mérode, a daughter of that Belgian patriot and statesman who had recently contributed so powerfully to the independence of his country (1). In a letter to Rio, the famous art critic who so enthusiastically shared in the literary and philosophical movement started by Lamennais, but who remained uncompromisingly orthodox, the champion said: "There must be in France a party which will be simply Catholic, liberal without being democratic, conservative though not absolutist. This is evident to both you and me; but it is no less certain that such a party can be formed only

(1) It was only after his union with Mlle. de Mérode that Montalembert discovered that his beloved companion was a lineal descendant of the "dear St. Elizabeth of Hungary" whose life he had so charmingly delineated. He always ascribed his domestic happiness to the protection of his "sweet saint."

amid a thousand disappointments and a thousand heart-burnings. And, indeed, if it were formed otherwise, it would be a mere bonfire, a thing of no durability and of no use." Evidently the Catholic champion had taken to heart the lesson of Calvary, the all-powerful nature and the all but absolute necessity of sacrifice as a factor in any truly humanitarian movement. The first difficulty encountered was the indifference of very many of the French Catholics. The majority of these held themselves aloof from political life, waiting for the coronation of their idolized "child of the miracle" (1), the noble Comte de Chambord, whom they so zealously proclaimed as Henry V., King of France and of Navarre. Others compromised with the Orleans usurper, in order to secure their properties, and for the sake of office. And very many refused co-operation in any policy of aggression, on the ground that resignation was the first of Christian virtues. There was no exaggeration in the words with which Montalembert described these victims of a policy of *laissez faire*: "The French Catholics of our time have a predominant inclination for one thing that is peculiar to them—sleep. To sleep profoundly, to sleep comfortably, to sleep for a long time; and when they awake, to go to sleep again as quickly as possible; such, down to the present day, has been their politics, their philosophy, and according to some, their ability." Montalembert tried to rouse them; and alleging the example of the Catholics of Ireland and of Belgium, he urged them to talk, to petition, and to vote. His success was but small; and probably the chief reason was the distrust of public discussion which was entertained by most of the French bishops. One prelate would murmur: "Noise does no good, and what is good makes no noise"; and he would illustrate his fancied truism by indicating the recent exaggerations of *L'Avenir*. Another would express horror

(1) The Brethren of the Three Points had hoped to exterminate the elder line of the Bourbons by the murder of the Duc de Berry, son and heir of Charles X., on Feb. 13, 1820; but seven months after the catastrophe the Duchesse de Berry (Mary Caroline of Naples) gave birth to a son. The rage of the sectaries and the joy of the legitimists because of this birth caused the young prince to be acclaimed as "the child of the miracle"; and the admirers of Victor Hugo will please note that their idol was at the head of the poets of the day who congratulated France on the promised perpetuation of the elder branch of the Bourbons.

of lay "interference" in ecclesiastical affairs, apparently ignoring that what was urged was some lay energy to destroy the most monumental and most outrageous of lay interferences with what belonged to the sanctuary. Archbishop Affre of Paris and several other prelates opposed most vigorously the formation of a Committee of Direction for the Catholic Party; but fortunately Mgr. Parisis of Langres, who held that "the laity had not only a right, but a sacred duty to speak and act" in the premises, appealed to Mgr. Fornari, the papal nuncio. The representative of Gregory XVI. declared: "In the present circumstances it belongs to the laity to save the Church of France." This approbation infused new energy into Montalembert; and the government of Louis Philippe found that ten years after the apparent burial of the educational question in the grave of *L'Avenir*, the same question was being agitated in the House of Peers.

In 1842 Montalembert published his pamphlet on *The Duties of Catholics in the Matter of Freedom of Education*, giving both the signal and the programme for the campaign. Not since the days of the League, three centuries previously, had the Catholics of France rallied together in utter independence of political or dynastic interests, intent only on the defence of their rights as children of the Church of Christ. Their cause was championed by a noble band. Before the peers perorated Montalembert. In the pulpit of Notre Dame argued and appealed Lacordaire and Ravignan. In the Chamber of Deputies were heard the eloquent accents of Berryer and Carné. In the columns of *L'Univers* cowardice and supineness were made to blush by the invectives of Louis Veuillot, the most brilliant journalist who has wielded pen since journalism became a profession. In the University itself, the philippics of Ozanam and Lenormant demonstrated that while all despots in Christian times have, like Napoleon, found fault with the Church because she "leaves to monarchs only the bodies of their subjects," reason replies that the Church demands merely a distinction between the spiritual and the temporal. In fine, all these earnest sons of Catholicism, supported, in their respective circles, by the Abbé Combalot and by the (then) Abbés De-

paulou and Gerbet, showed to all who were not wilfully blind, that in their day also was verified the description of the effects of State education which the very un-clerical Portalis gave in 1802—a description which we, who have studied the course pursued by the Third French so-called Republic, find also verified under the rule of that conglomeration of inanities and insanities. “It is time for theory to be silent in the presence of facts,” said Portalis; “there should be no instruction without education; and there can be no education without morality and religion. Our instructors have taught in the desert; for it has been imprudently decreed that religion must not be mentioned in the schools. Instruction has been null for the last ten years. Our children have been given over to a most dangerous idleness, and to a most alarming vagabondage. They have no idea of a Deity, and no notion of the just and the unjust; hence their ferocious and barbarous manners, and hence a ferocious people. If we compare the present condition of public instruction with what it ought to be, we must tremble for future generations. All France calls on religion to come to the aid of morality and society” (1).

The bravery of Montalembert was naturally very distasteful to Louis Philippe; and when the champion appeared at court, after a brief visit to Madeira, made because of the ill health of his wife, the monarch very significantly asked: “M. de Montalembert, when do you return to Madeira?” But intimidation was wasted on Montalembert; and on April 16, 1844, he called on the royal cabinet to render an account of its religious policy. Then from among the motley crowd of Orleanists, radicals, time-serving Catholics, and Masonic adepts, was heard the cry that the Catholics were rebels to the civil authority; and in the Chamber of Deputies the elder Dupin urged the government to act with unsparing vigor—“*Soyez implacable!*” he cried. Montalembert replied: “When we were silent under oppression, it was asserted that we were conspiring in darkness; that we were engaged in subterranean in-

(1) *Explanation of the Reasons for the Concordat, Given to the Corps Legislatif by Baron Portalis, Minister of Worship.* Paris, 1804.

trigues. In the days of the Restoration, you cried: 'Ye Blacks, come out from under the earth!' When we presented ourselves, and announced what we are and what we want, you exclaimed: 'What audacity! What insolence!' . . . Well, be 'implacable,' if you so wish. Do all that you desire and are able to do! The Church replies to you through the mouth of Tertullian: 'You have no need to fear us, and we do not fear you.' As for myself, I proclaim, in the name of the French Catholic laymen of the nineteenth century, that amid a free people we are unwilling to be Helots. We are the successors of the martyrs, and we shall never tremble before the successors of Julian the Apostate. *We are sons of the Crusaders*; and we shall never quail before the sons of Voltaire." This qualification of the Catholic party as being composed of "sons of the Crusaders" was a happy thought, and for years it was a kind of war-cry for the friends of educational freedom. When it was heard by the nominal Catholics who supported the irreligious policy of the Government of July, their patriotism must have rebuked them; for the sons of the Crusaders are the true servants and soldiers of France, and have for their model that St. Louis who was respected by all his enemies, whereas Voltaire was the complacent valet of the Prussian Frederick II. Ten days after this first attack on the enemy's positions, Montalembert repeated his onslaught on the occasion of the presentation of a bill on secondary education by Villemain and Cousin, both of whom were professors in the Sorbonne, and had alternated as grand-masters of the University. Villemain expressed his disgust with the opposition of "that young man" who pretended to question the value of state-dispensed education; and the young man ridiculed the pretended fears of his adversaries: "You fill every place—Chambers, academies, tribunals. In the Sorbonne just as in the Palais de Justice, in the College of France just as in the Court of Cassation, you alone speak, and you speak continually. You alone are masters, and you are masters everywhere. You are everything, we are nothing; and nevertheless you tremble. And before whom? Before us poor ultramontane fanatics, before the sacristy, as you term us."

And then he ridiculed the University as being like a body of Chinese mandarins. Cousin also was prodded by Montalembert. The father of eclecticism had not disdained to attack the Jesuits from the tribune, adopting as weapons a number of those falsified passages from the works of certain authors of the Society which had formed an arsenal for the parliamentary jurists in the campaign which preceded the suppression of the sons of Loyola (1). Montalembert had an easy task in his restoration of the mutilated and interpolated texts of the Jesuit writers; and, he observed: "Since we have been brought to the subject of Escobar, it will be admitted that at least in this instance, *Escobarterie* is not peculiar to the Jesuits." The debate of that day resulted in a victory for the Orleanist principles, for Masonry, and for irreligion in general, by a majority of only eighteen. Meanwhile the misdeeds of the Jesuits were being depicted by Michelet and Quinet in the College of France; in the columns of the *Débats* the crimes of *Rodin* and other mythical Jesuits were being evolved by Eugene Sue as incidents in the path of his *Wandering Jew*; and in the Chamber of Deputies, the elder Dupin and Thiers were urging the application of existing laws to the detriment of the hated Society. Montalembert ridiculed these efforts of the anti-Catholic party; and reminding his fellow-peers of the vitality of the Society of Jesus, he said: "You must realize that in last analysis, the sacrifice of the just is of profit only to justice. Such has been the case ever since the time of Pontius Pilate; and I would recommend a consideration of this fact to those successors of that famous statesman who are now among us."

After the revolution of 1848, when Ozanam, Lacordaire, and Maret founded the *Ere Nouvelle* in the interest of democratic ideas, Montalembert accepted indeed the situation created by the events of Feb. 24; but fearing the advent of a *sans-culotte* administration, he entered the ranks of the conservatives. The Catholic Electoral Committee having begun its campaign for a selection of candidates for the Constituent Assembly, he published this declaration: "I have cher-

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 461.

ished a sincere and disinterested faith in constitutional monarchy; I still believe that representative government has given to our country thirty-four years of peace, order, prosperity, and liberty—not complete, indeed, but incomparably better than any in our previous history. But if the Republic, while bettering the condition of the workingman, will guarantee, as does the Republic of the United States, the supreme benefit of liberty to religion, to the family, and to property, then it will have no more sincere and more devoted defender than myself.” Elected in the Department of Doubs, he immediately assumed the defence of his favorite thesis, predicting that education by the State would make no more republicans than it had made monarchists since the date of its introduction. Almost the sole effect of his discourse was a denunciation of himself, on the part of certain electors of Cherbourg, as an orator sold to the enemies of France. The Assembly paid no attention to this and similar attacks. We have seen how Montalembert had taken in 1831 the motto “God and Liberty” for his own. Now he substituted. “God and Society”; being unable to countenance that remedy for the evils around him which consisted, as he said, “in chopping society into bits, and stewing them in the caldron of Socialism.” He urged the Assembly to wage serious war against Socialism; and when one of its organs declared that the Catholic party had “vowed itself to the infernal gods of the Revolution,” he replied: “We know what that means. It is a choice between the scaffold of the Terror and the poniard which felled Rossi. Behold the infernal gods of the Revolution!” It was on the occasion of this discourse, on Oct. 19, 1849, that Victor Hugo inaugurated his puerile and cowardly custom of leaving the Assembly, immediately after one of his illogical frothings, so that he might not hear its refutation. Louis Napoleon, then prince-president, had sent to Pope Pius IX., then at Gaeta, a letter which appeared to dictate conditions for his restoration to his capital. In the debate which followed, Hugo attacked the papal government in virulent fashion; and as he descended from the tribune, he noticed Montalembert preparing to mount it, and then he marched directly to the door. One

passage of the discourse which Montalembert then delivered merits remembrance: "We may deny the strength of the Holy See; but we cannot deny its weakness. And you must remember that in this very weakness lies the secret of its invincible strength in resisting your attacks. Permit me to make a homely comparison. When a man is forced to fight with a woman, she can brave him with impunity, unless indeed she is the most debased of creatures. She can say to him: 'Strike me, if you will; but you will disgrace yourself, and you will not conquer me!' Well, the Church is a woman, and she is more than a woman; she is a mother (A whirlwind of applause here greeted the orator). She is a mother, the mother of Europe, the mother of modern society. One may be an unnatural son, an ungrateful son, a rebellious son, but one is always a son; and there comes a moment when this matricidal contest becomes insupportable to the human race, and when he who has engaged in it falls, crushed, annihilated, either by defeat or by the unanimous reprobation of humanity." Thiers was enchanted with this discourse. "Montalembert," said he, "is the most eloquent of men, and this oration was the most beautiful that I have ever heard. It causes me to envy him; but I hope that this envy is not a sin, for I love the beautiful, and I love Montalembert." At this period Thiers had come to agree with his olden adversary on another important point, the one which was ever foremost in that adversary's mind, the educational question. Thiers had hitherto proclaimed the Universitarian monopoly the brightest gem in the crown of Napoleon; now, he agreed with Montalembert in the opinion that the same monopoly was responsible for the progress of the revolutionary fever. The ex-Orleanist minister was one of the loudest in applauding the following illustration: "Probably you have translated Livy as I have, and probably you have forgotten him as I have; but you may remember the siege of Falerii by the Romans under Camillus. During the siege, the schoolmaster, to whose care had been entrusted the *élite* of the Faliscan youth, led the children to the camp of the enemy, and there delivered them. I hesitate not in declaring that the same thing is

done here in France by the monopoly of public instruction."

The courage and persistence of Montalembert and the Catholic party were rewarded to some extent in 1850; no intelligent observer of the politics of the day would have imagined that anything more satisfactory than a compromise on the great issue would be effected. M. de Falloux, Minister of Public Instruction, appointed a commission to agree upon a new educational law which would be considered by the government. The principal members of this commission were Montalembert, the Abbé Dupanloup, Cousin, and Thiers; and the result of the deliberations was the law which Lacordaire termed "the Edict of Nantes of the nineteenth century." By this measure it was enacted that the University should remain a public institution, supported and directed by the State, but enjoying no longer the monopoly of education. The Church was allowed to have and to direct her own educational establishments; and then throughout England, Germany, and the United States the sage journalists of Protestantism declared that by this concession the French government had signified its willingness that the Inquisition should be re-established in France. On the other hand, many wise and zealous Catholics blamed Montalembert and Dupanloup for having consented to State pedagogy in any form; the fiery Louis Veuillot filled columns of *L'Univers* with verbal pyrotechnics which depicted Montalembert in what was almost the guise of a traitor. Montalembert replied from the tribune to this indictment in these words: "We have been charged with having substituted an alliance for our fight. Gentlemen, I have been in the combat, and I enjoyed it; I fought longer, and perhaps better, than many of those who now blame me for having stopped fighting. But I have never believed that war is the prime need of our country." This defence was sufficient; but the champion erred, when, knowing as he did that Freemasonry and its kindred powers of darkness had been and still were in control of the French government, he conceded that "the State may have a right to *offer* a national system of education." Whatever he might have been obliged to

tolerate, he should not have conceded that the government of his day might have a *right to offer* an educational system, even to that part of the nation which was composed of its deluded partisans; for such a concession was the declaration as a principle that legalized disorder and rampant atheism have a right to assume the office of cultivators of intellects and directors of consciences. We do not recognize the right of opium eaters and morphine fiends to *offer* their poisons even to their own children. However, Montalembert had fought the good fight; and had he survived to witness the abominations of the Third Republic, he would have realized the necessity of restricting the action of the State to matters of the purely secular administration. He would have taught that the government ought not to be what Pellissier terms an anonymous association for the development of the rich lodes of a mine, forcing them to produce, for its own profit, the greatest possible quantity of electoral and taxable material.

The scope of our work precludes any detailed notice of the purely political features of the career of Montalembert; but we may devote a few words to an explanation of his attitude toward Louis Napoleon at the time when that prince was planning the restoration of the empire. Of all the members of the Assembly, the Catholic champion was the most fearful of any success on the part of the Socialist propaganda; and in order to check that movement, he was forced to choose between the majority of the Assembly and the prince-president. A man of very ordinary power of discernment must have perceived that the Constitution of '48 foreshadowed a conflict between the executive and the legislative powers; and it was morally certain that France, accustomed to so many centuries of monarchy, would decide in favor of the executive. Again, the anti-Socialist deputies formed, as Montalembert said, a veritable "Tower of Babel"; when there was a question of the safety of society, the legitimist tongue acclaimed Henry V., the Orleanist tongue prated on the Count of Paris, and the Bonapartist tongue lauded the firm hand of the Empire. Montalembert allowed his sympathies to influence him when he witnessed the insults which

the Mountain heaped on the head of Louis Napoleon; and when the election for the presidency was held, he deprived General Cavaignac of nearly all the Catholic votes. During several interviews between Montalembert and Louis Napoleon, the prince had indicated that he detested centralization; and his silence as to education caused Montalembert to hope for the best. M. de Falloux was wont to say: "During my life, I have known two great silences; the silence of Lacordaire, and that of Louis Bonaparte; the silence of a monk, and that of a conspirator." The consummate loyalty of Montalembert was duped by the man who appeared to be so gentle, serious, and modest; who knew how to listen better than any prince of his day; and who seemed to yearn for good advice. Even the apparent lack of brilliancy of the future emperor seemed to promise security; so mute and so apparently indecisive a personage was scarcely to be feared. Montalembert justified his conduct fully in his discourse of Feb. 10, 1851: "I have undertaken to defend the government without any enthusiasm, without unlimited confidence in any person whomsoever. I do not speak of the past; I do not answer for the future. I am not the president's voucher, nor am I either his friend, his counsellor, or his advocate. I am simply his witness; and before the country I bear witness that he has in no way injured that grand cause of order which we all wish to serve. It may be that some day he will cause me to regret that I ever had faith in him; but now, since I owe him nothing and ask him for nothing, he can do nothing for me." His course embroiled him with Thiers and Molé, and with all the leaders of the majority; while his language did not please Louis Napoleon. He was soon forced to cry: "They tell me that I shall be alone; but I hope better for my country. However, I have been alone for a long time, under other governments; and I shall resign myself to perpetual solitude, sooner than become a silent accomplice in the furling of my standard." When the prince-president, on Dec. 2, 1851, dissolved the Assembly by force of arms, Montalembert wrote to Lacordaire: "I did not counsel or approve this deed; I knew nothing about it." In regard to the course

to be pursued by Montalembert in the matter of the plebiscite which Louis Napoleon had ordered, the friends of the champion did not agree. Dupanloup, Lacordaire, Ravignan, Villemain, and Foisset, were most eloquent in their entreaties that he should take no part whatever in the election. Bishops Parisis and Gousset, the Chancellor Pasquier, Donoso Cortes, Mme. Swetchine, and many others, thought that he might recognize an "accomplished fact." On Dec. 12, he published a letter in which he said to the Catholics of France that in regard to the proposed condonation of the extra-legal conduct of the president, "to vote against it would be to vote for Socialism; to abstain from voting would be an abdication of your rights. Therefore, vote 'Yes.'" He was soon undeceived. He found that the consultative Chamber was consulted in nothing. When he called at the Elysée, the prince hearkened to his arguments concerning the liberty of the Church with an air of distraction. In vain did Fould and Persigny urge him to accept a senatorship; he was determined in his resolve to preserve his independence at any cost. When men asked why he would not be a senator, when he was perfectly willing to sit in the legislative body, he replied: "Perhaps it is true that the members of the Corps Législatif are mere *supes* (*comparses*); but the senators are confederates (*compères*) in the trickery."

No public man realized better than Montalembert the capricious despotism of public opinion; he had ever preserved in his memory the words of his father: "Human passions demand from us, above all else, that we sacrifice our independence completely; that we submit blindly to the ideas which are dominant at the moment, even though those ideas were to precipitate us into the abyss." He was not surprised, therefore; but he would have been more than human, if he had not been saddened; when, in 1857, after twenty-two years of brilliant and loyal service in the cause of political and religious liberty in the legislative assemblies of France, he saw the governmental candidate preferred to himself by the majority of the Catholic voters. It had been the general opinion that the government would not oppose the election of Montalembert; but the holders of this opin-

ion must have given to Louis Napoleon credit for a sublimely forgiving disposition. In the previous summer, during a tour which was at once political and archæological, Montalembert had attended a banquet at Alaise (Doubs), the town which disputes with Alise-Sainte-Reine (Côte-d'Or) the honor of having been the Alesia of Cæsar's Gallic War. Perhaps imprudently, Montalembert on this occasion sacrificed his archæological opinions (for he did not credit the claims of Alaise) to his political interests; and in response to a toast to that town, he said: "Well, since it was here that Vercingetorix made his last struggle for Gallic independence, let us drink to the memory of Vercingetorix—the enemy of Cæsar!" A governmental candidate contested the next election in the Department of Doubs, and Montalembert was defeated. He never pretended to conceal his chagrin at this treatment by the electors of Doubs, those Franche-Comtois whom he had served so faithfully; comparing himself to the Lacedæmonian boy who did not cry out while his entrails were being devoured, he said: "The fox is there, and for a long time."

When the French troops crossed the Alps in 1859, in order to "make Italy," one of the first to protest against the religious consequences of this intervention was Montalembert. He took a prominent part in the war of polemics which was waged in the following year, and his pamphlet entitled *Pius IX. in 1849 and in 1859*, was worthy of his reputation. He showed how the imperial policy of 1859 had destroyed the work effected by the French Republic of 1849, and alluding to the emperor's sympathies with the unitarian revolution in Italy, he said: "Thousands of voices in the Church repeat the *Non licet* of the Gospel. . . . That did not prevent Herod from working his own will; but after all, who would like to have been Herod? That did not prevent Pilate from allowing the passions of a blind and wicked people to triumph, so long as he could wash his hands of that triumph; but who would like to be the Pilate of the Papacy?" Of course the pamphlet was seized, but its author was not prosecuted. In the Piedmontese parliament Cavour undertook to reply to Montalembert, and reminding

the deputies of an earlier work by the champion, he said: "In this work which caused a great sensation, we noticed how the illustrious writer, *in a lucid moment*, demonstrated to Europe that liberty had been very useful in elevating the religious spirit." Montalembert replied: "I must protest, Monsieur le Comte, that I agree with you on no point. . . . I want an alliance of religion and liberty; but liberty pleases the Church, only when she herself enjoys liberty. Here I am speaking in my own name, without mission, without authority, and relying only on an experience which is already long, and which has been singularly instructive during the last ten years; but I do say without hesitation that my ideal is that of a Free Church in the bosom of a Free State." Cavour retorted: "That is also our ideal; and if we wish to go to Rome, it is precisely in order to proclaim the principle of A Free Church in a Free State." To this hypocrisy Montalembert replied by pointing to a picture which was spread at that very time before the eyes of all humanity: "You speak to me of a Free Church in a Free State; but I see only a Threatened Church in a Hostile State, a Despoiled Church in a Thieving State." When we come to treat of the pontificate of Pius IX., we shall have occasion to speak at some length on this specious formula so persistently and so impudently flaunted by the school of Cavour; and we shall see the effects which were produced when the audacious statesman's interpretation of an excellent formula was reduced to practice.

Happily for Montalembert, death called him to the reward of his labors for the Church of Christ before his beloved France experienced her signal punishment at the hands of an angry God—the shame, unique in her history, of the German war, followed by the horrors of the Commune. He had already declared that the devious policy of Napoleon III., the suppression of all political vitality, the encouragement of a bestial pursuit of pleasure, the incitement to a practical adoration of Mammon, were "paving the way for a revolution, in comparison with which the crises of 1830 and 1848 would appear to have been child's play." One of his latest utterances was indicative of his unquestioning docility to the teach-

ings of the Church. A few days before his death, which occurred on March 13, 1870, several months before the promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility, to which promulgation he was opposed as a matter of present expediency, some friends asked him what he would do, if the dogma were proclaimed. "My course would be very simple," he replied; "I would submit." Already, in 1864, when Pope Pius IX. was about to issue his Encyclical, *Quanta Cura*, followed by the since much discussed *Syllabus*, and when Montalembert was told by certain adversaries that those documents would contain a condemnation of some of his teachings, he had given similar testimony to his never-failing Catholic obedience: "We shall know the nature of this Encyclical when it appears. I shall yield to it every respect, just as I yielded to the Encyclical, *Mirari vos*, thirty-two years ago." No other course could have been followed by him whose whole life had been a combat for the cause of God and Liberty represented by the Church. In the eyes of Montalembert, the entire world was dominated and transfigured by God and Religion; and therefore it was that he, the self-dedicated Catholic champion, engaged in a struggle of superhuman dignity, was a man of pre-eminent personal humility. Throughout his entire career, those who knew him well saw that he was never any more arrogant than he had been when, a youth of twenty-one, he said to his judges, the Peers of France: "Oppressed by the weight of the responsibility which I have assumed, I feel that by myself I am only a boy, a mere nothing; that I am so inexperienced and obscure, that nothing can encourage me, save the thought of the grand cause, of which I am a humble defender. . . . I know too well that at my age one has neither antecedents nor authority; but at my age, just as at any other, one has duties and beliefs." But the humility of Montalembert never interfered with his courage: "I am convinced that the greatest of evils in political society is fear. In that infamous and bloody epoch which some persistently try to rehabilitate, do you know what was the cause of all our catastrophes? It was fear. Yes; the fear which honest men feel for villains, the fear which little villains feel for great ones. Do not fear, gentlemen; do not allow the

unprincipled to monopolize all energy, all audacity. Let good men have the energy of good; let good citizens show, when it is necessary, their own audacity. Montalembert never allowed his ardor to impel him into theatrical transports; his zeal never turned his gestures into the exaggerations of pantomime; although, as Pellissier observes, "the agitation inseparable from public discussion, the enthusiasm of his friends, and the ability of his adversaries, tended to push him into these excesses." Perhaps he owed his constant empire over himself, in no small degree, to the counsels which his friend, Joseph Theophile Foisset, gave to him at the outset of his parliamentary career. Among other warnings, Foisset gave the following: "Never waste yourself; never enter the tribune unless you have a serious duty to perform. Remain modest; never allow the dignity of your life to be compromised by any acceptance of the advances that will be made to you, although you should not repel such advances with ostentation. Follow the path of an independent conservative; it is a good path in itself, and it will cause men to listen to you" (1). Down to the very end of his life, Montalembert preserved the youthfulness of his heart. One must sympathize with the tears of a father, as he reads these words, wrung from a heart which was, nevertheless, entirely reconciled to the will of God. Speaking of his sufferings because of separation from one of his daughters who had recently taken the veil, he said: "I am caught in my own net. No one can understand my grief; no one, not even you, will pity me. My tears will not cease to flow—those tears which do not touch or interest any one else, although they are much more poignant and legitimate than those which are excited by the sorrows of youth." During this trial, he compared himself to a warrior who is "proud of his victory, but wounded, and with blood still flowing from his wounds"; but, as in every other trial of his life, he remembered the motto which his father, during his exile, had written beneath the cross which ornamented the escutcheon of his family, *Cecidi, Sed Surgam*.

When Guizot reproached Montalembert with being exclusively devoted to the cause of religious liberty, he received the

(1) FOISSET; *Montalembert*. Paris, 1887.

reply: "The liberty to which I am devoted is liberty in its entirety, the liberty of all in everything." But unlike most of the liberals of his generation and country, Montalembert, not having made a *tabula rasa* of all French history which antedated 1789, did not derive his liberalism from that epoch. He cherished no sympathy for the Constituent Assembly, which he preferred to designate as a *Deconstituante*, since it demolished more than it constructed; "it had a mania for that uniformity which is a parody of unity, and which Montesquieu termed the passion of second-rate men. It preferred to declare that during twelve centuries the French people had been merely a collection of slaves, so that it might create a new people, a people which had just been manufactured like a machine on which it might experiment with the theories and abstractions with which it had become enamored." Such remarks would not have been made by a Mirabeau or by a Lafayette. Montalembert was an aristocrat in the best sense of the term; and although an aristocratic liberal, he disliked democracy, which was the constant hobby of his friend, Lacordaire, who devoted many an hour to the attempt to demolish what he styled Montalembert's class prejudices. The ideal government for Montalembert was that of parliamentary monarchy, and principally because he thought that it alone could save France from a so-called equality which he regarded as a general debasement. He was fond of saying that the despotism of the Revolution, and he might have added, of every Statolatry, regards liberty as a concession of the state—an implication that servitude is the natural condition of the individual man. "I contend," said he, "that in a free country the contrary principle must be admitted. Liberty is according to the natural law. The restriction of liberty, the intervention of the public authority, can be justified only when it is necessary."

From the day when the electors of Doubs relegated him to private life, Montalembert devoted himself untiringly to historical and other literary work. In his early days he had been a fervid romanticist, dividing his admiration among Lamartine, Hugo, and Sainte-Beuve. Like Lamén-

nais and Lacordaire, he belonged, as a writer, to the school of that prince of the romanticists, Chateaubriand. In his later years he imitated Sainte-Beuve, who had thrown off the enchantment of the romanticists, and had returned to the rule of the classics of French literature. Among foreign writers, the preferences of Montalembert were firstly, for Dante, and then for Shakspeare, Burke (whom he termed the "grandest of moderns"), and Joseph de Maistre. Among ancient writers, he preferred Tacitus, but probably because of that author's hostility to the Cæsars. Most of his writings appeared in the *Correspondant*, the editorship of which he had assumed in order to make it a Catholic *Revue des Deux Mondes*. The last years of his life were devoted to the production of his *Monks of the West*. He himself tells us how he came to give us this grand work. When he had finished his charming *Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary*, he resolved to write a *Life of St. Bernard*. This saint was a monk; and in his studies of the Middle Age, absolutely necessary for a proper treatment of his subject, Montalembert found that at that period nearly all the Popes, bishops, and saints, the bulwarks of the Christian society of the time, had also belonged to the cloister. Therefore he prepared an elaborate *Introduction* for his work, setting forth the commencements and the development of monastic institutions. This *Introduction*, finished in 1842, was a full volume in itself; and it had nearly all been printed, when he bethought himself of submitting the proofs to the Abbé Dupanloup and to M. Foisset. The prescient abbé advised his friend to enlarge his plan, so that it might include a complete history of the monastic glories of the West. The humble publicist deferred to the judgment of one whom he regarded as his intellectual superior; he suppressed his book; and began to revise and develop it. His political engagements prevented the appearance of the first two volumes of *The Monks of the West* until twenty years had elapsed since he had begun to study the career of St. Bernard; two other volumes followed just before his death; and the remaining two were published by his executors. Beginning with the accession of Constantine, and ending his

researches with the twelfth century; treating firstly of St. Anthony and the anchorites of the desert, and discoursing afterward on all the great luminaries of monasticism, down to St. Bernard; he proved the truth of the assertion which he had so often pronounced in the tribune—that the Church was the mother of Europe, and that she was such through her monks, the apostles and civilizers of the Teutonic and Slavic barbarians. Montalembert had no toleration for that sickly sentimentality, so well exemplified in the *Genius of Christianity* by Chateaubriand, which asks the men of the nineteenth century to admire the monasteries of the olden time because they were refuges for sick and despairing souls. He protested against the idea that the monasteries were *Lect Invalides* of the world. “The monasteries were not peopled by sickly souls, but by the most healthy and most vigorous souls that the world has ever produced. Far from being a refuge for the weak, the religious life was the arena of the strong.”

Montalembert was of too pure and ardent a nature, not to have had many loving and beloved friends; but he loved none as he loved Lacordaire. From their first meeting in the rooms of Lamennais, their mutual affection was never for a moment lessened by their numerous and frequent differences concerning even important matters. When Lacordaire died, Montalembert thought for a while that Father Hyacinth had succeeded to the place which the great Dominican had occupied in his heart; it was to the eloquent Carmelite, as to the heir of some of Lacordaire's talent, that he gave the rosary which had been the latter's solace for many years. When, in Sept., 1869, Father Hyacinth discarded his monastic tunic, Montalembert endeavored to restore him to the path of duty, and therefore of necessary sacrifice. If his words seem to indicate a needlessly harsh estimate of certain good Catholics whose opinions on debatable subjects differed from his own, Montalembert was justified, absolutely speaking, when he said to the unfrocked son of Mt. Carmel: “During the last fifteen years I have heard the name of Lamennais used as a bugbear by every narrow, suspicious, servile, and jealous mind; and if I have the mis-

fortune of living fifteen years longer, I shall hear your name pronounced, every day, as a warning to every priest, to every Christian, who manifests any spark of intelligence or generosity." Montalembert was not to know, in this world, that the ex-Carmelite had taken unto himself a "wife"; but as though he had foreseen the degradation of his whilom friend, he added: "If, unhappily, you heed the invitations of free-thinkers, if you become an orator at profane and vulgar meetings, you will fall far lower than Lamennais himself; you will become the plaything of a publicity which is without mercy and without restraint; you will be the *ludibrium vulgi*, like those captive gladiators who were dishonored, in spite of their natural nobility, by the caprices of an obscene pagan mob."

As a parliamentary orator, Montalembert was generally calm and even phlegmatic; but he was also graceful and even elegant in his delivery. His manners were always those of the *vieille noblesse*; he was always at his ease, and he was polite even in his sarcasms. Not so profound a jurist as Berryer, not so fine a debater as Thiers, nor so precise a logician as Guizot, he nevertheless moved his auditors as these parliamentarians never moved them. After 1840, it was said that "his explanations of parental rights; of the weakness of the Holy See which constitutes its principal strength; of religion, the family, and property; and of very many other subjects; became the daily bread of Catholic polemics" (1). And it is certain that no equally nourishing daily bread has as yet been tendered by any other publicist in any land, for the use of those whom duty to God and country incites to periodical combat against Statolatrous usurpation of individual, and especially of parental rights in the matter of education. One of the last letters written by the Catholic champion was addressed to the students of Switzerland, the sorrowing children of the remorselessly crushed Sonderbund: "Courage and confidence! Work energetically for the good cause, for the truth and for justice, and be assured that you will never regret your labor." Three months afterward, on

(1) FOURIER; *Montalembert, in the Illustrrious Men of the Nineteenth Century*. Paris, 1882.

March 13, 1870, Catholic France mourned for one of the noblest of her many sons who have placed their love of liberty, of literature, and of art, at the service of their faith. The whole life of Montalembert was a refutation of the impudent assertion, so brazenly declaimed by sectaries of every species, that the Church is hostile to liberty. His entire career showed that the Church and the religion which she teaches are neither monarchical nor republican; that all that they seek is the reign of God on earth; that, therefore, they are the only real bulwarks of order and of justice. And until the last moment of his life, Montalembert never despaired of convincing his countrymen of this truth; he had no patience with those "Catholics of resignation" who, admitting that the world was decadent, asked to be allowed to die in peace. Like Pascal, addressing his "enemies triumphant in evil," but with much more reason for confidence than that which animated the deluded coryphæe of Jansenism, until his last breath Montalembert cried: "I am one against thirty thousand; but I am in the right, and we shall see who will conquer." In fact, Montalembert believed most firmly that a state which affects to banish God from its counsels is doomed to misery; and with M. de Bonald he proclaimed: "The Revolution began with the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and it will finish only with a Declaration of the Rights of God." Above all else, Montalembert was a Catholic, "*Catholique avant tout*"; and although the liberalasters of his day affected to discern a lack of patriotism in that avowal, one more worthy of the name of "liberal," Gladstone, at the very moment when, in one of his Vatican pamphlets, he was decrying Montalembert's profession of faith, was constrained to admit that the formula "properly conveys no more than a truism; for every Christian must seek to place his religion even before his country in his inner heart" (1).

(1) \* Montalembert was the spokesman of Catholics in a Catholic country. But France had in his time, and has now, many wayward children. The infidel principles which burst forth at the commencement of the great Revolution have, in greater or less degree, dominated in the government of the country down to our own time. In spite of so much that is greatest and best in France, she was gradually becoming an un-Christian country. In this state of things, the Christian champion rushed to the front, and loudly proclaimed, 'Remember, we are Catholic before everything.' What did he mean? He meant that

## CHAPTER. X.

DUPANLOUP.

The career of Mgr. Felix Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans, is one of those meteor-like lives which so illumine everything in their courses, that one cannot trace their paths without forming, at the same time, an extensive acquaintance with contemporaneous history. During his life, his actions and sentiments were much discussed; and, like all who play a prominent part in the political and religious struggles of their day, he made many enemies. Now the smoke of the battles he fought, and in some cases provoked, has been dissipated; and we may therefore form an equitable judgment on both him and his adversaries. Journalists were wont to style him "the fiery bishop," and he called himself an "old soldier." Probably he was the only bishop of the nineteenth century, if not of all time, who obtained from three successive Popes as many as forty-six Briefs, commendatory of his labors for the triumph of religion, and in defense of the maligned and persecuted Papacy. Felix-Antoine-Philibert Dupanloup was a Savoyard by birth, and therefore a natural subject of the king of Sardinia, but he

nothing that was un-Christian could be for the good of France. He meant that un-Christian principles disgraced his country, and that Christian principles honored her; and it was necessary in France then, and over the whole of Europe it is now necessary, to raise the cry of 'Catholic before everything,' if they who wish to give to God what belongs to God are to be rallied to stand the shock of the enemy, who would give everything to Cæsar. We might, indeed, express the meaning of Montalembert, in the words used by Mr. Gladstone. When speaking of the words, 'A Catholic first, an Englishman afterwards,' he says, they 'properly convey no more than a truism; for every Christian must seek to place his religion even before his country in his inner heart.' Yes, the thought of Montalembert's inner heart was that, being a Christian, he must seek to place his religion even before his country. But he was not the man to be content to preserve Christian thoughts in his inner heart, and by word and by deed to flatter and help on the un-Christian principles of those around him. He was no gigantic hypocrite, pandering to tastes which in his heart he detested; he was no coward, 'letting *I dare not* wait upon *I would*.' He was a man whose mouth spoke out of the abundance of his inner heart. He was a man who could and did raise his voice when necessary, to proclaim what his heart believed. And herein was his great offence, in the opinion of such men as Mr. Gladstone. Let a Catholic keep his Christian principles in his inner heart, while with voice or with pen he denies them, and he is well pleasing in the eyes of the Liberal party. But let a Catholic give utterance to his principles; let him, as becomes a man, act upon them, and the chief men of the Liberal party will denounce him as incapable of being loyal, and of discharg-

became a naturalized Frenchman in 1818. He was born in 1802, in a little village near Aix-les-Bains, of a poor family. His father having abandoned his wife, the courageous woman made her way to Paris, as a place where she could more easily earn a living. She was able to send the little Felix to school, he manifesting some desire to become a lawyer, and he learned his Catechism at Saint-Sulpice. In time he developed a vocation to the altar, was received among the "*petits clercs*" of the great seminary, and at seventeen had finished his Humanities. Being obliged to live in domestic service, his mother could not give a home to her son during his vacations; but the lad was introduced by his professors to several noble and generous families, who welcomed him to their chateaux. Prominent among these friends was the Abbé-Duc de Rohan, at whose chateau of La Roche-Guyon the student formed a friendship with young Montalembert, who was already giving indications of his illustrious manhood. At Saint-Sulpice he was a fellow-student with Lacordaire and Ravignan; and some of the most remarkable personages of the French clergy, such as Frayssenous and De Quelen, manifested a keen interest in his career. Even before he was ordained, his evident predilection for the teaching of children had obtained for him the position of head-catechist at the Madeleine; and his first occupation as a priest was the development of these

ing his civil duty. It is no sin in England to be a Christian; but to act, under all circumstances, as a Christian should act, is treason. . . . A grand motto of which any Christian might be proud has been put by our enemies into a special form, for the express purpose of suggesting what is false; and then we are told that it is we who have led our countrymen to construe the motto in the evil sense which by that special form is conveyed. Mr. Gladstone, continuing his comments on the free translation of Montalembert's motto, observes: 'We take them to mean that the convert intends, in case of any conflict between the Queen and Pope, to follow the Pope, and let the Queen shift for herself; which, happily, she can well do.' What right has Mr. Gladstone to take the words to mean anything but what a Catholic would mean by them? If he will put words into our mouths, at least he should give us the privilege of interpreting them. But he will not allow us even this. He interprets them himself, charges us with the interpretation, and finds on the interpretation a charge of intending to follow the Pope rather than the Queen in purely civil matters. If such conduct were pursued toward any other class of Englishmen than Catholics, what would not be said of it? How true are the words which the author of 'Norton Broadland' puts into the mouth of Lord Hillsworth!—'I must confess I am astonished at the way in which even people who know how to behave in every other relation of life, seem to forget that they are ladies and gentlemen the moment that they come in contact with Catholicity.'—AMHERST; *The History of Catholic Emancipation, From 1771 to 1820*, in Introduction. London, 1886.

classes. Eight years of catechetical instruction served to illustrate more and more the pre-eminent qualifications of Dupanloup for the training of youth, and he was appointed superior of the *petit-seminaire* of Saint-Nicolas, the noblest families of the realm confiding their children to his care. He guided his charges by means of their consciences, their sense of honor and of loyalty; but he had no pity for meanness or for a lie. One day a high-born pupil received permission to attend at the marriage of his sister, provided he would return in time for a certain class. He did not show himself until eight in the evening, whereupon the superior promptly expelled him. "Had he been the son of a peasant," he remarked, "I might have done differently; but he was the son of a gentleman." It was while he was at Saint-Nicolas that he had the inexpressible joy of preparing the eminent diplomat and notorious apostate, Talleyrand, for death. The archbishop of Paris, Mgr. de Quelen, had constantly prayed for this conversion, and had often said, "I would give my life for it." And he vowed a statue to Our Lady "*de la Delivrante*" in Normandy, if his prayer were heard. When Talleyrand fell ill in May, 1838, the prelate sent the Abbé Dupanloup to him, with a retractation of his oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, made in 1790, which he would have to sign, before he could be reconciled with the Church. The abbé told him that the archbishop had offered his own life for his conversion, and the old diplomat said: "He might make a better use of it." But faithful, at the last, to the motto of his grand old family, "No King but God," the one-time bishop of Autun signed: "Charles Maurice, Prince de Talleyrand," in the presence of Dupanloup, and of MM. de Barante, Molé, Royer-Collard, and Saint-Aulaire. The prelate fulfilled his vow, and died on Dec. 31, 1839.

The successor of Mgr. de Quelen in the See of Paris was Mgr. Affre, and one of his first appointments was that of Dupanloup to a chair in the Sorbonne. The great reputation of Dupanloup had prompted the faculty of the Sorbonne to confer the laureate, on this occasion, "by acclamation"; but he wished otherwise, and he chose for his thesis, rather

strangely, in view of his later course, a defense of the infallibility of the Pope. But his lectures were soon interrupted by the weakness of the Minister, Villemain, who was too subservient to the Voltairians of the day. Thereupon Mgr. Affre made the professor his vicar-general, and very soon the new dignitary found himself in the heat of the struggle for freedom of education. Although the Constitution of 1830 had formally pronounced that teaching was free, in practice there was no freedom. The complaints which Lamennais had made, in 1823, against the University and its teachings, were of as much force as ever; and in September, 1842, a republican and free-thinking journal, *Le National*, was constrained to admit: "The education given by the University is impious, immoral, and incoherent." Every family which wished its sons to receive a Christian education, sent them to the colleges of Belgium or Switzerland. Nothing could be expected from a regime in the hands of olden Universitarians like Guizot, Thiers, and Villemain. Dupanloup's *Two Letters to the Duke de Broglie*, and his book on *Religious Pacification* showed the world that a new champion had arisen for the Church, and procured for him the felicitations of the Roman Pontiff. The contest lasted long years, and Dupanloup displeased a great many; his archbishop deemed him rather *ultra* and rash, while others charged him with compromising with the enemy. His title of vicar-general hampered him, and he resigned it that he might be more free to labor in the great cause. About this time he had an opportunity of responding practically to an assertion of Thiers, that an ecclesiastical education enervates the spirit of patriotism. The king of Sardinia had always hoped to attract the Savoyard-born back to his native allegiance, and had already, in 1842, tendered him the bishopric of Annecy. Now that he saw his favorite free from his vicar-generalship, he again offered him a bishopric, and the portfolio of Minister of Public Instruction in his ministerial cabinet. Had the Abbé Dupanloup accepted the offer of Charles-Albert, would he have joined the line of the Sugers, the Ximenes, the Wolseys, the Alborno, the Consalvis? We doubt it; but, at any rate, he had an opportunity to

prove that if he was ambitious, it was not in a political line. He replied to the Marquis Brignole, the Sardinian ambassador, who made him the offer, that he felt a repugnance for the mitre, and that Providence having attached him to France, there he would remain.

The fall of Louis Philippe, Feb. 24, 1848, bringing with it an unbridled liberty of the press (when the government was not criticised), and therefore a horde of journalistic insects more or less venomous, the intervention of Christian journalism became a necessity. Dupanloup bought the *Ami de la Religion*, a paper of some age, and his vigorous pen at once rejuvenated it. He also made every effort to bring together men whose combined action would further the cause of truth; he made friends of Montalembert and Falloux, of Thiers and Cousin, and therefore the long-debated question of educational liberty was soon on the way to solution. When Louis Napoleon became President, he was obliged to meditate on such unions as these; therefore France restored the Pope to his throne, and freedom of teaching became, for a time, an established fact. Dupanloup became a member of an extra-parliamentary commission, of which Thiers was president, and in which the abbé was opposed by Cousin; he convinced them so well, that Thiers wrote to him, when their labors were terminated: "Without your aid I would have lost patience, so little of your profound intelligence did I find among your friends, so little of your impartiality and conciliatory spirit. I would have liked to satisfy you in everything, but that was impossible."

Several attempts had been made to induce the Abbé Dupanloup, who had been a titular canon of Notre Dame since his resignation of the vicar-generalship, to accept a mitre; but while, as a soldier of God, he was ever anxious to combat in the van, he wished to remain the simple priest, a journalist, orator, and polemic. It was chiefly owing to the arguments of Cardinal Giraud, archbishop of Cambrai, that he yielded. "Is it now," asked His Eminence, "when the fight is so terrible, that, under the pretext of tranquillity, you refuse a command when it is tendered to you?" Consecrated at Paris on Dec. 9, 1849, he took possession of the

See of Orleans two days afterward. He immediately began a visitation of his diocese. One of his first acts was the institution of an additional preparatory seminary, in which he raised the studies to such a level that the students soon represented the tragedies of Sophocles, Æschylus, and Euripides, in the original text, to the astonishment of Villemain and other Universitarians. About this time he entered into the celebrated controversy of the classics, excited by the learned Abbé Gaume, who, believing that he had found "a devouring worm" in the too pagan education of the Colleges, desired to banish from every curriculum followed by youth, the pages of Horace, Virgil, Ovid, Sallust, Cicero, and Tacitus, substituting in their stead the Christian classics. The prelate demonstrated that the thesis of Gaume was too absolute, that the reading of the pagan classics had not perverted St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Thomas of Aquin, and so many of the saints who have arisen since the Renaissance. Victory attended his efforts, but he entertained no rancor against his adversary, as he evinced by his visit to Gaume in 1852. The campaign of Mgr. Dupanloup in favor of the classics was the cause of his election to a seat in the Academy; and on his reception, Nov. 9, 1854, the subject of his discourse was "The Alliance between Religion and Letters." When Littré, then the high-priest of modern Positivism, was elected to a seat beside him, Mgr. Dupanloup resigned his own. The Abbé Le Noir says of this resignation: "We admire the serious implacability of his manifestation of his Theism in face of an indifferent Academy, leaving his fauteuil empty at the side of that of an atheist, whose candidature he had opposed. After having taken the stand that he took, he had the courage to do what he ought to do, a courage nowadays almost universally wanting; and the manner in which nearly the entire press commented on this act of energy, is only one of many indications of the moral debasement into which we have fallen." (1) In spite of his protest, the Academy retained

(1) When Littré was in his seventy-sixth year, he became a Freemason; and after his death, his olden brethren of the sect declared that he ordered that his funeral should be consistent with his life, that is, that no religious ceremonies should accompany it. This precaution was unnecessary, for the Church would not have intervened at the burial of a

the name of the illustrious prelate on its list. Salvandy, in his reply to Mgr. Dupanloup's discourse on the day of his reception among the Forty, had said: "Childhood was the first love of your life, and it will be the last." This was true, and, therefore, as Salvandy also remarked, Dupanloup "was a whole corps of instructors in himself." Scarcely was he settled in his diocese, than he resumed the composition of treatises on his favorite subject. His first volume *On Education* had appeared in 1850; the two following were issued in 1857; and three others, devoted to the *Higher Education*, were published in his latter years. The *Letters on the Education of Young Girls* saw the light only after his death; on the very day of his demise, he corrected its last proofs.

After the war of Italian independence of 1859, olden treaties of peace became waste-paper, and in face of outrages on the Roman Pontiff, on all right and justice, the government of Napoleon III. prohibited all discussion of them; a suspi-

man who had never received baptism, and who had ever proclaimed his anti-Christian sentiments. But the mercy of God had decreed that the great Littré, the proud genius who had been venerated by the foremost scientists of his day, should not die and be buried as though he were a dog. There were many acts in the life of Littré, which, to our poor human intelligence, would seem to furnish the reason for the grace vouchsafed to him in his last moments. He had rebuked the arrogance of the Jacobins with his cry: "Beware! In France universal suffrage is Catholicism." He had rendered justice to the Ages of Faith. He had been ever generous and tolerant. He had been accustomed to consult the *curé* of his parish, that he might know what poor persons had most need of his help. He had refused to vote for that infamous creation of Ferry, *Article VII.*; and his writings against the anti-religious decrees of the Third Republic had been vigorous and unintermittent. Finally, during the last years of his life, he had become intimate with the Abbé Huvelin, vicar of Saint-Augustin, who visited him several times a week, and who, when he became dangerously ill, visited him every day. When the Abbé entered the room of his friend on June 1, 1881, he found the sick man speechless, but perfectly conscious, holding the hand of his weeping wife, and gazing with unutterable love on the kneeling daughter whom, with an inconsistency which is often seen in French atheists, he had carefully avoided to poison with his own infidelity. Littré smiled a welcome to the priest, and the two were left alone in the room. We may safely suppose that the minister of God knew his duty; and that if, during those moments when he and the dying man were at the very feet of the Saviour who was soon to be the Judge of one of them, he had not found the proper dispositions in the heart of his friend, he would not have summoned the wife and daughter, and in their presence baptized, communicated, and anointed the venerable scientist. During the Mass of Requiem which was celebrated for Littré on June 4, in the church of Notre-Dame-des-Champs, groups of Freemasons, gathered outside the sacred edifice, disturbed the mourners with their noisy protests against the religious funeral. After the recitation of the last prayers in the cemetery of Montparnasse, although the widow and daughter protested against the sacrilege, Wiroubouff, the editor of the *Revue Positiviste*, pronounced a Masonic eulogy of the deceased, concluding with impotent denunciations of the religious funeral just performed.

cious police spied on the clergy, muzzled the Christian press, and molested Catholics in many ways. One vigorous protest sounded through France, and was re-echoed throughout the world. It was the voice of the bishop of Orleans, saying: "I can no longer confine to my own soul the emotions which this spectacle excites, and which, I am sure, are shared by every Catholic. What kind of hearts would be ours, if they did not suffer now, or rather if we suffered such indignities in silence? . . . A devoted son of the Holy Roman Church, mother and mistress of all the others, I protest against the revolutionary impiety which ignores the rights of the Pontiff, and wishes to rob him of his patrimony. As a Catholic bishop, I protest against the humiliation and the debasement menacing the first bishop of the world, him who represents the episcopate in its plenitude. I protest in the name of Catholicism, the splendor, dignity, and independence of which are diminished by this attack on the universal pastor, the Vicar of Jesus Christ. I protest as a Frenchman; for what Frenchman is not humiliated on witnessing, in spite of the contrary counsels and the protests of the emperor, this miserable consequence of our victories, and of the effusion of our soldier's blood? I protest in the name of gratitude, for history shows me the Sovereign Pontiffs as the luminous symbols of European civilization, as the benefactors of Italy, and as the saviours of liberty, in the days of its greatest peril. I protest in the name of good sense and of honor, which are violated by the complicity of an Italian government with conspirators and rebels, and by the onslaught of base and unintelligent passions against principles proclaimed by every true statesman in the Christian world. I protest in the name of shame and of European law, against this violation of Majesty. . . . I protest in the name of justice, against spoliation by the strong hand; in the name of truth, against lies; in the name of order, against anarchy; in the name of reverence, against the contempt of every right. I protest in my conscience and before God, in the face of my country, in the face of the world, and before the Church. Whether or not my protest finds an echo, I have fulfilled a duty." On Christmas-eve there arrived at Orleans a copy of the brochure in

which Napoleon III. pretended to dictate to the Pope and to a European Congress the course to be followed; only the Vatican and its gardens were to be left to the successor of St. Peter. On the 26th a crushing answer to this pamphlet appeared in all the great journals of Paris. It was from the pen of Mgr. Dupanloup. The initiative of the bishop of Orleans was followed by Montalembert, Falloux, Villemain, Cousin, Thiers, Lacordaire, and even Guizot. In a few months our prelate published his first eloquent book on *The Papal Sovereignty*, and when the battle of Castelfidardo had convinced all Catholics of the treachery of the Imperial government, he was the first to celebrate a solemn Requiem for those who had accompanied the heroic Pimodan to a glorious death. The temporal power was certainly dying; we forget how many times it has died. Pius IX. now affirmed his spiritual power by the issue of his celebrated *Syllabus*, a condemnation of the most important errors of modern philosophers and other publicists. On January 9, 1865, the cardinal-archbishop of Besançon and the bishop of Moulins were prosecuted for having read the *Syllabus* from their pulpits the day before; and on the 26th appeared our prelate's work on *The Convention of September 15, and the Encyclical of December 8*. The writer showed that Napoleon was either a dupe or an accomplice of the Piedmontese government, and he cast such a light upon the Pontifical document, that his adversaries declared his interpretation a disfigurement and a travesty. But scores of bishops, from every part of the world, showed that they thought differently, by their congratulatory letters; and very soon he received a Papal Brief of approbation. Night and day two presses were kept reproducing this luminous work, and in a few weeks, thirty-four French editions and three different Italian translations were exhausted.

When, in 1867, Mgr. Dupanloup was consulted by Pope Pius IX. upon the feasibility and need of a General Council, he, like all those approached in this regard, readily admitted the advantages which the Church would derive from such an assembly. When the Council met, he showed himself to be less well-inspired than he had been in emergencies

of less importance. It is but justice, however, to Mgr. Dupanloup, to say that he did not begin the controversy upon the propriety of making the doctrine of Papal Infallibility a matter of faith. This dispute had been in full blast throughout France, six months before he published his *Observations*. Was it opportune to rank this debated doctrine, generally though it was held, among the revealed truths of dogma? Dupanloup thought that he knew well the state of men's minds; he feared the ill-will of the European cabinets; and he feared even a rebellion of certain rather dubious Catholics. His very relations with certain influential statesmen led him to exaggerate the dangers which, they insisted, would result from the definition. No one questioned his right to sustain his opinion in the Council; but unfortunately, he carried into the debates an ardor which many misunderstood, but which was only natural to him, whenever he deemed himself in the right. He was even accused of trying to form a coalition against the will of the Church, as manifested by the immense majority of the bishops; some few even whispered that he had sold himself to the civil power (1). Had he been desirous of popularity as a means of advancement, what more easy than to have joined the majority? But no; he made many sacrifices, for he was sincere. Again, obstinacy is a characteristic of the heretically disposed. When Mgr. Dupanloup found that his views were repelled by the Council, the question having been decided by a vote of 533 to 2, there was no hesitation. He promulgated the decree in his diocese, and forwarded his submission directly to the Pontiff. The decision promulgated in the session of the Vatican Council, held on July 19, 1870, produced in France none of the effects which Dupanloup's fears had anticipated. The Napoleonic cabinet had indeed announced itself ready to take such measures as would prevent the doctrine of Papal Infallibility from becoming "an incentive to violations of public law, and a cause of social trouble"; but it now had other than theological difficulties to confront. On July 19, war commenced between France

(1) Mgr. de Segur, in his otherwise excellent work on Papal Infallibility (Paris, 1871), is particularly severe on Mgr. Dupanloup.

and Germany; the victims of Castelfidardo were about to be avenged.

“Do not expect a bishop to admire war,” wrote Dupanloup; “but I pray most ardently for the triumph of justice, and for the glorious army which combats and suffers to obtain it for us.” He immediately organized the services of charity in aid of the victims of war, prescribed a monthly collection in each parish, and at once put down his own name for 3,000 francs. The disasters which fell upon France from Aug. 4 to Sept. 4, pierced his heart; and in a letter to his clergy, he said: “A month ago, I cursed war; to-day, when it puts so many frightful spectacles before my eyes, I curse it a thousand times more. I curse it in the name of outraged heaven, in the name of an ensanguined earth, and in the name of a stricken humanity. But do not think that my misplaced confidence, and the horrors I experience, will plunge me into a cowardly discouragement. . . . I believe in God; I do not believe in force.” In a short time the Bavarians under Gen. Von der Tann, after three days of combat, entered Orleans, and demanded from the city a million of francs as a war contribution, and 80,000 francs a day in provisions. Such an indemnity was exorbitant, and the municipal council besought the bishop to intercede with the enemy. After labor, and only when he had convinced the Prussian king in person that Orleans was in danger of famine, he obtained the remission of the provision tax. Many occasions for his intercession now offered themselves. Thus, some German soldiers having been fired upon in the darkness by unknown parties in the communes of Saint-Sigismond and Les Aydes, fifty residents of the first place, and eleven of the second, were told off on Oct. 12, to be shot the next morning. The prelate wrote at once such a touching letter to Von der Tann, that the general went at once to the barracks, had the dismayed prisoners led out, and addressed them: “You deserve death, but I pardon you. Remember, however, that you owe your lives to your bishop.” Many wounded Frenchmen having come to a stage of convalescence, the German general was about to send them off to Germany as pris-

oners of war, when our prelate drew his attention to the terms of the Convention of Geneva, whereby these wounded should be sent to their homes, there to remain during the war. "Monseigneur," replied the officer, "my orders are to cause you no anxiety"; and the wounded were soon homeward bound. One ray of hope came to Orleans. The French victory of Coulmiers (Nov. 9.) entailed the evacuation of Orleans, and Mgr. Dupanloup chanted a public *Te Deum* in the cathedral. This was the only *Te Deum* chanted by the French during the war. During the three weeks when Orleans was free from the enemy, the bishop sought everywhere for aid for his people. Among other offerings that came to him was one of 200,000 francs from Ireland, in return for 30,000 that he had once sent from the church of Saint-Roch in Paris. Another offering came to him in a very pleasant manner. The giver was an English-appearing man, and he asked the prelate: "Monseigneur, do you not remember me? You gave me my first Communion." It was the Prince de Joinville, a son of Louis Philippe, to whom Dupanloup, in his early days, while he was almoner to the Duchess d'Angouleme, had been catechist (1). They had not met for forty years, and now the scion of fallen royalty had come to give his services, once so valued by France, to his distressed country. The Republican government, however, feared to accept them, and after having fired a few cannon-shots in defense of the newly-attacked Orleans, Joinville departed. Meanwhile, the Germans had triumphed at Metz, and after the unfortunate efforts at Beaune-la-Rolande, Patay, and Loigny, the French army fell back on Orleans, passed the Loire, and consequently Orleans was again open to the enemy. The former occupation, having been effected by Bavarians, had been comparatively tolerable; but a different sort of men now entered it, and Dupanloup was destined to much suffering. His residence was invaded, and his private chamber was always guarded by two sentinels. Von der Tann remarked to him: "Monseigneur, you will now learn what real Prussians are; these men are Brandeburgers." One morning a rough captain rushed into his

(1) At this time (1829), he was also catechist to the Count de Chambord.

room, and blurted: "Here, you've kept me waiting five minutes. You've got to give up all your bedrooms to the general commanding the 3d corps."—"But, at least," returned Monseigneur, "you will allow my vicars-general to retain theirs?" The boor grasped his sword-hilt, and seemed about to draw upon the prelate. "What, sir?" said the bishop; "do you think to frighten the bishop of Orleans?" The abashed man retired, grumbling, "We are not Huns; we are civilized people" (1). After three days of bacchanalia in his mansion, the Prussian leaders took their departure, and were replaced by surgeons, who installed 250 wounded Germans in the episcopal apartments. It was only Christian charity to acquiesce in this, but then the Prussian doctors proposed to expel 50 wounded Frenchmen whom Mgr. Dupanloup had received. He protested so energetically, that he gained his point; the Frenchmen remained.

On the termination of the war, the grateful Orleanais elected their bishop to the National Assembly, then meeting at Bordeaux. Mgr. Dupanloup would have declined the representation: "I am sixty-nine years old, and I wish not to be separated from you." But he was forced to content his people, and he was the only bishop in the Assembly. His attitude as a legislator was reserved and worthy of an ecclesiastic. Leaving aside those personal ambitions and questions of party which are the bane of parliamentary government, he came to the front only when matters of religious and social interest were presented. His two first discourses were in favor of the Pope-King, and they drew re-assuring declarations from Thiers; his next four speeches were the main cause of the retention of military chaplains in the army. The Papacy, so maltreated by the Empire, had very little reason for blaming the Third Republic, during the first years of its existence; indeed, in 1874, this was

(1) While the above-mentioned officer was assigning the different rooms of the mansion to his comrades, a superior officer waited on Monseigneur, and ordered a banquet for sixty to be made ready at once. "And see that there is champagne!" "I have none," replied the prelate; "it has never entered my cellar." The astonished Prussians visited the cellar, and could not believe their eyes. "To think," they grumbled, "that a man so celebrated in Germany should have no champagne!"

probably the only government on the Continent which did not decree some measure hostile to the Church. At this time, M. de Corcelles, representative of France at the Vatican, begged Mgr. Dupanloup to pay another visit to Pius IX. He was received with the utmost affection; there was no allusion to past differences. The Pontiff wished our prelate to trace a tableau of the spoliations of the Church, effected by the Italian government; the consequence of the desire was the famous letter to Minghetti, Minister of Finance in the Italian cabinet, in which the writer showed, beyond all possibility of cavil, that the Roman question was not yet solved, and that, sooner or later, the temporal sovereignty of the Pope would have to be restored, in order to insure his liberty.

It is a curious fact that the political life of Dupanloup began at the Sorbonne, with a dispute concerning Voltaire, and ended at the Luxembourg with a debate on the same subject. He was a member of the Senate when the Municipal Council of Paris resolved to give to the centenary of the Sage of Ferney an official and national sanction. At once the bishop of Orleans published ten letters addressed to the Council, affixing ineffaceable stigmas upon the impious cynic, who, for that matter, ought to be regarded as *demodé et dépassé* in our day. The manifestation remained the work of a mere party, and the government disavowed it. One good effect accrued from these manifestations in favor of probably the most unpatriotic "great man" that France ever produced; and that was the presentation, in fuller relief, of the sweet and glorious Maid of Orleans whom the despicable cynic had so foully reviled. The memory of Joan of Arc was a passion with Mgr. Dupanloup; he had revived, as far as modern notions would allow, the olden *fêtes* in her honor; he had often preached her panegyric; and had made three journeys to Rome expressly to further the cause of her canonization. He deemed the moment when all good Christians were seized with a renewed disgust for her wretched reviler, an appropriate one for an appeal in honor of the Maid; he proposed to ornament the cathedral of Orleans with a series of magnificent pictures in stained glass, furnishing a

complete representation of her wonderful career. All France responded with a more than sufficient subscription, and thus Voltaire added another jewel to the crown of her whom he had tried to debase.

When Mgr. Dupanloup died (Oct. 11, 1878), in his seventy-seventh year, his funeral showed the estimation in which he was held by the best of his contemporaries. The Church was represented by twenty-four bishops; while the Academy and the Senate, the arts, sciences, and literature, were also in mournful attendance. There was no panegyric; he had prohibited it. The bishop who would never own a carriage, whose distinguishing mark in the street was an old cotton umbrella, and who was never so happy as when chatting with some little *gamin* who reminded him of his native Savoy, had desired to be attended by simplicity to the very grave. In the midst of so many and various duties, he had always reserved for pious exercises four hours a day, two in the morning and two at night; and when he drew his last breath, his Rosary was in his hand.

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### RATIONALISM AND ITS CONSEQUENT ABERRATIONS OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

Whether or not the Jewish Pantheist, Spinoza (1632-1677), should be considered the first founder of that Rationalistic school which is merely a logical consequence of the essential principle of Protestantism—the denial of all authority in matters of faith (1), it is certain that a free path was opened for the pest by the vagaries of certain German Protestant theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, who professed a sublime toleration for all contradictory dogmas, and demanded only the practice of virtue. This school of “Pietists,” as they were termed, was founded by Philip Spener (1635-1705), an Alsatian who officiated as a Lutheran pastor in different parts of Germany. Disgusted

(1) In Spinoza's *Letters to Oldenburg* are found the germs of all the Rationalistic doctrines.

with the dissensions between the "orthodox" Lutherans and the "reformed," those who refused to heed the official "Symbolic" formulas of doctrine, Spener boldly declared that the principles of the glorious Reformation prohibited any condemnation of the doctrines of those who refused to subject their intelligences to the official teaching. To this spirit of independence Spener joined a love of mysticism, insisting that no one should dare treat of theological matters, unless he was thoroughly illumined by the light of the Holy Ghost; and in order to produce the proper school of theologians, he established a number of *Collegia Pietatis*, thus originating the name by which his disciples were thenceforward known. The University of Halle, recently founded by the Elector of Brandenburg (soon to be king of Prussia as Frederick I.), was entirely Pietistic before the end of the seventeenth century; but the Universities of Wittenberg and Leipsic denounced as heretical 264 of the Spenerian theses. It is amusing to hear Meyer, a Protestant theologian of Hamburg, replying to the question, "Who are the Pietists?" in this fashion: "They are fanatics who, under an appearance of piety, persecute the pure and true Lutheran religion; who destroy its very foundations (the Confession of Augsburg), and the doctrines thence resulting; who open the gates of the Church to all heretics, defending and receiving them, allowing each one to believe as he pleases; who delude innocent souls with their hypocrisy" (1). Spener, however, in a work which Leibnitz deemed triumphant, easily demonstrated that his principles were reconcilable with those which had actuated the framers of the Confession of Augsburg; that is, he showed the absurdity of which the Lutherans were guilty, when they commanded respect for this or that "Symbolic" ordinance which had been promulgated here or there by persons without authority, and which differed from other "Symbolic" books which the rulers of other territories had issued. Shortly after the death of Spener in 1705, there was effected a kind of reconciliation between the "orthodox" Lutherans and the Pietists. Both parties realized the need of union, if they were

(1) ARMAND SAINTES; *History of Rationalism*, p. 77. Paris, 1850.

to hope to combat successfully the philosophic speculations of Wolf, which were attacking the foundations of revealed religion. But the cause of revealed religion, so far as that cause was still upheld by the Protestant world, had received a severe blow; the way for Rationalism had been opened. Having noted the chief reason which justifies the ecclesiastical historian in assigning a place in his records to a mention of the German Pietists, we may remark, before we take leave of those inconsistent imitators of asceticism, that their affectation of mysticism contributed greatly to the propagation of the Illuminism of Weisshaupt (1). The Prussian friend and disciple of Voltaire, the mis-styled "great" Frederick II., regarded the Pietists as "the Jansenists of Protestantism"; and he used to say that if they had a Cemetery of Saint-Médard, they would excel the convulsionaries of that Jansenistic shrine (2). And Mosheim, apparently forgetting that his words would apply much more naturally to Luther, says of Dippel, one of the leaders of Pietism: "If posterity ever reads the fantastical writings of this fanatical reformer, it will wonder that our ancestors were sufficiently blind to regard as an apostle a man who audaciously violated the most essential principles of religion and of common sense" (3).

"It was through the breach opened by Pietism," observes the Protestant, Armand Saintes, "that a number of Rationalists entered, and enabled others to occupy the entire edifice" (4); and the same author remarks that the so-called Wolfian philosophy, which was adopted to check the progress of Pietism, contributed to the triumph of the Rationalistic cause, since its arid and pedantic theorems were based on reason alone. When the school of Wolf had embraced nearly the entire teaching body of German Protestantism, the Sacred Scriptures, hitherto the substance of all Protestant sermons, came to be regarded as mere supplementary matter; and the people were treated to purely human reasons for the belief that they were asked to cherish. Then

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 427.

(2) See the article *Spencer* in Michaud's *Universal Biography*.

(3) *Ecclesiastical History*, cent. xvii., sect. 2, pt. 2, ch. 1.

(4) *Loc cit.*, Vol. 1., p. 7.

came the example of the crowned Voltairian of Prussia to aid in the propagation of Rationalism. Some of the German rationalistic coryphees imitated the phlegmatic deists of England, making a grand parade of historical and philosophical erudition. Thus the poet, Lessing, spread his poison by means of his *Fragments of an Unknown* (1); and the publisher, Nicolai of Berlin, became, through his *Universal German Library*, nearly as much of a dictator of opinion in Germany, as the Encyclopedists had become in France. Another class of German writers imitated the French, rather than the English incredulists. Chief among these were Edelmann, a Saxon, author of *Moses Unmasked* (1740), of *Christ and Belial* (1742), and of *The Divinity of Reason* (1752); and Basedow, a professor in Hamburg, author of *Considerations on the Limits of Revelation* (1764). The gross Naturalism of these speculativists was not accepted by all of the German ministerial Rationalists; many preferred a system which would not reject supernaturalism entirely, but would merely insist on receiving as true only such things as are comprehended by reason. Hence arose the "New Exegesis," which may be said to have been founded by Ernesti, a professor of theology in Leipsic. Ernesti would have us examine the Scriptures in precisely the same manner that we use when examining any other work; in order to explain the Biblical teachings, we should consider the profane history of the time in question, the bearings of philology on the passage, the sentiments of the day when the passage was written, etc. Semler, a professor in the University of Halle, greatly developed the "New Exegesis," establishing certain rules of criticism which justified him in rejecting portions of the Scriptures which had been always accepted as authentic by all Christians, and in supposing that the Apostles, and Our Lord Himself, "accommodated" themselves to the ideas of the Jews of their day. In accordance with this theory of "accommodation," all the miracles of Christ were explained by Semler in a natural sense; and he held that whenever the Saviour spoke of such subjects as angels, demons, the resur-

(1) This "Unknown," whose ideas Lessing borrowed, was Reimar, a professor of philosophy in Hamburg, who died in 1748.

rection of the dead, etc., He did not impute the reality of such subjects. Michaëlis, a worthy co-laborer with Semler, prostituted his philological science to a search after new senses, in which, as he claimed, many passages of Scripture ought to be understood; and many of his disciples, while appearing to respect the text, interpreted it in a fashion which bade fair to reduce the Gospel narrative to the level of a mythological tale. Such was the labyrinth in which the spiritual progeny of Luther found itself when the speculations of Kant rendered its deliverance a matter of still greater difficulty.

In 1788, two years after he had succeeded his uncle, the pupil of Voltaire, on the Prussian throne, Frederick William II. issued an edict on religious matters which is an eloquent testimony to the ravages which Rationalism had already made in the ranks of the German Protestant clergy. Having confirmed the right of Catholics to the public exercise of their religion; and having declared that he would *tolerate* the Jews, Mennonites, and Bohemian Brethren, the monarch prohibited absolutely the toleration of any other religionists, and ordered that no member of the "privileged" denominations should dare to attempt to make any converts. Commenting on this latter prohibition, the king commands that special watch be kept on the Catholic priests, since they are "indefatigable proselytizers"; but instead of finding anything to blame in the zeal of his ministers, he reproves them for their utter indifference in regard to the doctrines of their own communion, for their readiness to deny the fundamental teachings of Christianity, and for their attacks on the authority of the Bible (1). The same edict suppressed the *Universal German Library* which had been founded by Nicolai; and until the death of Frederick Wil-

(1) This edict terminated with some very wise advice to the Prussians in regard to their morals; but the monarch's own example helped to nullify his counsels. Not only did he waste his revenues on a number of charlatans and visionaries, but he was openly unfaithful to his marriage vows. He had three wives living at one time, having received permission from the Lutheran clergy to repudiate his legitimate sponse, Elizabeth of Brunswick, and her successor, a princess of Hesse. Imitating the condescension of Luther, Melancthon, etc., in the matter of the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse (see our Vol. III., p. 320), the ministers told their sovereign that "it was better for him to contract an illegal marriage, than to fall unceasingly into sin after sin." SEGUR; *Historical and Political Tableau of Europe from 1788 to 1796*, Vol. I., p. 71.

liam II., that diabolic publication continued to be issued in Holstein. Meanwhile, in Prussia just as in other countries of Protestant Germany, the ministers and professors persisted in the propagation of their "Neologism" or "New Exegesis"; emitting new systems of Biblical interpretation, all of which more or less attacked the divine authority of the books which their lay disciples worshipped as a fetich. Thus Eberhard, who had published in 1772 an *Apology of Socrates* (1), in which he attacked the Christian doctrines on the fall of man, now began to teach that Christianity was the effect of a kind of fusion of the intellectual culture of the Greeks with the moral culture of the Jews and other Asiatic peoples (2). To add to the confusion, the pernicious philosophy of Kant began to dominate Protestant German intelligence.

KANT. This speculativist was of Scotch descent, but born in Königsberg, in 1724. With the intention of combatting both the notions of the Materialists and those of the Spiritualistic dogmatists of the Wolfian school, he produced a *Criticism of Pure Reason*, contending that the intelligence of man, forced to regard things merely according to laws and forms which are of its own capacity, can never grasp their reality, and therefore appreciates only their *subjective*, not their *objective* value; that our intelligence is capable of perceiving *phenomena*, indeed, but not of perceiving *noumena*, things as they are in themselves. This idea once fixed in his mind, the speculativist of Königsberg applied it to the most fundamental truths; denying the value of the arguments which had hitherto been advanced in proof of the existence of God—arguments, for instance, drawn from the need of a First Cause, from the order which is visible in the universe, etc. However, in another work, the *Criticism of Practical Reason*, Kant admitted a moral law, written in the heart of man, and the existence of *absolute* duty, to which all particular interests are to be sacrificed; and from this principle or *categorical imperative*, as he termed it, he pro-

(1) Written on the occasion of the condemnation of Marmontel's *Belisarius* by the Paris Sorbonne.

(2) Eberhard afterward developed this theory in his *Spirit of Primitive Christianity*. Berlin, 1807.

ceeded to the idea of a Supreme Legislator who is the Judge of all our actions. Such was Kant's method of demonstrating the existence of God; he deduced all his ideas of religion from the *practical* element, and entered on the questions of *Theodicea*, only when he had established his principles of morality. His notion of religion was that of a system which incites in the mind a *moral ideal*: and he regarded all mysteries as so many moral allegories. Thus, in the work entitled *Religion Within the Limits of Reason*, he presents the Trinity as God regarded as the Moral Legislator, as the Administrator of the Moral Law, and the incorruptible Judge. He discerns in "The Word Made Flesh" an objective realization of the *moral ideal*, and a type of the perfection toward which man should aspire. The personality of Christ, according to Kant, is a mystery; His active life and His ascension into heaven were miracles; but nevertheless, contended the speculativist, a belief in the existence of the miraculous is no part of religion. As for the Church, she is to be respected, declared Kant, as a *moral* society; an association of men in harmony with the ideal of holiness; but the pretension that in prayer or in the recourse to Sacraments there is to be found a means of grace, is a superstition and a *species of idolatry*. The lucubration of Kant on *Religion Within the Limits of Reason* appeared with the sanction of the Theological Faculty of Königsberg; and after a few years Heine was able to congratulate the Germans on their consequent emancipation from the fetters of antiquated theology: "In the world of thought we have had revolutions, just as the French have had their own in the material world, and we were encouraged by the demolition of the olden dogmatism, as much as by the destruction of the Bastille" (1). Frederick William II. deemed it not inconsistent with his own trigamous existence to write to Kant, his "very worthy, very learned, friend and professor," reproving him for abusing the rights of philosophy in order to destroy the foundations of Christianity, and threatening him with a loss of the royal favor, if he persisted in

(1) *Essays on the History of Modern Literature in Germany*, p. 172. Hamburg. 1833.

his course. Then Kant promised that so long as Frederick William II. lived, he would abstain from religious discussions (1). Kant frequently avowed that he had no precise notion concerning a future life; and shortly before his death (1804), when his intimate friend, Hesse, asked him for his definite opinion on that subject, he replied that he had formed "none whatever."

FICHTE. Kant had always made a distinction between *object* and *subject*, although the former was, in his mind, very subordinate to the latter. Theophilus Fichte (1762–1814), a disciple of Kant, was not satisfied with the secondary and unknown state to which his master had consigned everything *objective*—in fine, the universe; he abolished the *objective* entirely. He would scarcely talk of *subject* and *object*; in his "philosophical" language, those terms were replaced by the *Ego* and *Non-Ego*. The *Ego* represented each person's feelings, intelligence, all his activity—that is, himself; the *Non-Ego* included all outside humanity, the rest of the universe. The principle of all philosophy, according to this dreamer, should be in the sphere of the *subject*—that is, in one's self; we know nothing concerning what is outside ourselves; we have no right to speak of anything but ourselves. We should close the door of the soul to every impression from without; we should concentrate our entire attention on ourselves, on our *Ego*; and only then we will become truly enlightened. The *Ego* in us shows itself to itself; that internal activity, of which each one of us is conscious, reflects on itself, and reveals its true origin to us. Fichte presents this mass of nebosity as an immediate and self-evident truth, one which needs no demonstration; and then from his *Ego*, his consciousness, which has created itself by means of its own activity and capabilities of reflection, he proceeds to draw a realization that there is something outside his *Ego*. "My activity," he sagely pronounces, "my *Ego*, experiences a shock which hurls it back on itself; my power has encountered an object which resists it, which poses as a denial of my activity. Therefore there is born in me a feeling that there is an existence distinct from my own—a

(1) SAINTES; *History of the Life of Kant*, p. 96. Paris, 1850.

*Non-Ego*, a universe, an objectivity, which limits me." A moment of lucidity seems to have been vouchsafed to the would-be metaphysician; for he now pays some little attention to the insistence of common sense, which proclaims that he can no longer say that the *object* is nothing, since, if the *Ego* finds itself limited by the *Non-Ego*, the *Ego* is not absolute and all-powerful. But the poor man fancies that he can recover his position; he claims that it is his own *Ego* that limits him: "What is it that thinks of the *Non-Ego*? The *Ego*. What thinks of the things that are outside of myself? I myself. By thinking of these things, I give existence to them. The picture of things arises from the depths of my *Ego*; I conceive them as existent; I give reality to them; I *objectivate* them; I furnish an external world. Therefore all these representations are born in my free and intelligent activity. It is true that the *Ego*, distinguishing itself from these pictures, encounters limitations; but since these representations—this *Non-Ego*—are produced by the *Ego* itself, it follows that it is the *Ego* that limits itself, and that, although opposed by the *Non-Ego*, it ceases not to be absolute, infinite, and sovereignly free." Well indeed it was to term such ravings a "*Transcendental Idealism*"; for they summoned a man to the most senseless of idolatries—that of himself, as though he were the source of his own life.

SCHELLING. One son of the Reformation had subordinated *objective* existence to that of the *subject*; another had banished all *objectivity*, everything outside himself, in favor of his own *Ego*; and now for a crowning glory of travestied Human Reason, it remained that some more enterprising foe of Popery should relegate *subjectivity* itself to the realm of nothingness. This task was undertaken by Frederick William Schelling (1775–1854), a Wurtembergian, and also a disciple of Kant. According to this sophist, it was no longer necessary to examine into the reality of any existence outside of ourselves; but we ought to discover whether we ourselves are real objects, in the "transcendental" sense of the term. *Object* and *subject* are correlative; therefore, argued Schelling, if we remove one, the other vanishes. Truth can be found, he concluded, only in an existence

which is absolute; and in reality there is only one existence, and that is one, eternal, and immutable. True philosophy is attained, according to Schelling, by a destruction of both the idea of *subject* and that of *object*; that destruction consummated, "intellectual intuition" enables the philosopher to grasp the truth of that absolute existence which is God, the principle of unity and of happiness.

HEGEL. Between the system of Schelling and that of his disciple, Hegel (1770–1851), rector of the University of Berlin, there is a difference of method alone. Unity is the continual preoccupation of the mind of Hegel; and he discerns unity in an identity of existence and thought, and in an identity of the substance that exists and the substance that thinks. He styled his system "the system of identity"; and it consists, says Gratry, in upholding an identity of all things in the real order, and an identity even of contraries and contradictories in the logical order (1). Commenting on the Hegelianists of our day, the learned and liberal Oratorian well says that they cannot distinguish the absurd from the evident; that they have abandoned all intellectual consistency, all restraints of logic, and all settled forms of reasoning; that they prate on all conceivable subjects, without knowing anything about them. The distinctive formulas of Hegelianism, the axioms held by every member of the "monstrous sect of sophists and atheists," as Gratry terms them, are these: There is no such thing as contradiction—There is no difference between affirmation and negation—No assertion is less true than its contrary—Existence and nothing are the same thing. Among the chief efforts of Hegelianism to subvert every principle of philosophy, morality, and religion, we may cite *Hegel and Hegelianism*, by Edmund Scherer; the *Critical History of the School of Alexandria*, by Vacherot; and the *Life of Jesus*, by Renan.

STRAUSS. Of all the ramifications of German Rationalism, the most dangerous, because the least nebulous where all is nebulous, is the Theory of Myths, which was reduced to the appearance of a system by David Strauss (1808–1874), a

(1) *The Sophists and Criticism*. Paris, 1854.

Lutheran minister of Wurtemberg, and a tutor in the "Evangelical" seminary of Tubingen. As detailed in the *Life of Jesus*, which Strauss published in 1835, this theory holds that Jesus Christ is merely a myth. The ostensibly Christian minister contends that in regard to the real life of Jesus of Nazareth, all that we know is, that having been baptized by John, the son of Zachary, He attracted to Himself a number of disciples, and finally succumbed to the hatred of the Pharisees; as for the wonders narrated in the Gospels, they are simply a product of superexalted imagination. These Gospels, according to the calculations of the most exact criticism, were not published during the time of the generation that had known Jesus; indeed, the New Testament was not completed until more than half a century had elapsed since the Christian priests began their career of proselytizing. In this space of time, triumphantly exclaims Strauss, how natural, how easy it was for the imagination of the admirers of Jesus to completely metamorphose His teachings, His character, and His very nature! From the Biblical narratives of the births of Abraham and Moses the early Christians derived their idea of the birth of their Messiah; from the stories concerning Nemrod and Pharaoh, they fabricated the tale of the Massacre of the Innocents; they located the manger in Bethlehem, merely because of a certain prophetic verse; the Star of Bethlehem was merely a souvenir of the Star of Jacob, mentioned by the prophet Balaam; the Presentation in the Temple was a pretty story, devised in order to make Jesus interesting; Jesus in the Temple, explaining Holy Writ when he was twelve years of age, was an imitation from the stories of Moses, Samuel, and Solomon. Strauss discovers that "the narrow mind of the Baptist, his illiberal tendencies, would not have allowed him to comprehend, still less to predict, the coming of the Messiah." As for the denial, on the part of Jesus, that His kingdom was of this world, Strauss refuses to heed it; for he finds that Jesus really hoped to obtain the sceptre of David. In the estimation of Strauss, the discourses of Jesus, as recorded by Sts. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, are incoherent fragments; while those given by St. John are

reminiscences of the School of Alexandria. The miracles of Jesus, according to Strauss, were originally narrated as parables; and in time they were credited as realities. In the Passion of Jesus, as narrated by the Evangelists, Strauss finds nothing pertaining to history, excepting the cross. He says that the agony in the garden, the bloody sweat, and the chalice presented by an angel, are all borrowed from the Lamentations of Jeremiah. Similarly, he derives from the twenty-second and the sixty-ninth Psalms the mention of the divided tunic, of the nailing to the cross, of the devouring thirst of the dying Jesus, of His last words, etc. The German sceptic in ministerial guise dares to say that the touching description of the Passion, given by St. John, "does honor to the ingenuity and animated style of the narrator." Having noted this phlegmatic exhibition of the Lutheran minister's Paganism, the reader will not be surprised when he learns that the trainer of the Protestant students in Tübingen denied the reality of the Crucifixion of Christ. As for the Resurrection, that crowning miracle was, in the mind of this luminary of Rationalistic Protestantism, an hallucination of the disciples of Our Lord, something like that of St. Paul, when he was travelling toward Damascus. The Ascension reminded the philosophaster of the apotheosis of Romulus, or of the fiery horses conveying Elias to heaven; but when using the latter comparison, Strauss flippantly remarks that "in order to conform to the sweeter disposition of Jesus, the fiery horses were changed into clouds." Such, in brief, is the substance of the tissue of repeated "perhaps" and "probably" with which, through fifteen hundred pages of what Rationalists term argumentation, Strauss attempted to sap the foundations of Christian faith. It were an insult to the intelligence of the reader to enter on a serious refutation of a mere mass of gratuitous suppositions and absurd allegations. Strauss resumed his entire "argumentation," when he said that the Gospel is a tissue of miracles; that miracles are impossible; and that, therefore, the Gospel narrative is not history, but a myth. Rousseau had already replied to the rationalistic assumption concerning the impossibility of miracles, when he wrote:

“Can God work miracles?—that is, can God derogate from the laws which He has established? This question, if seriously put, would be impious, if it were not absurd. The man who answers it negatively would be honored too much by punishment; he should merely be isolated.” Probably the most appropriate method of “refuting” the Straussian system was that adopted by a magistrate of Bordeaux, who had meditated on the words of the Holy Ghost: “Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he imagine himself to be wise” (*Prov.*, xxvi., 5). This author applied the rules of the Straussian mythism to the commonly received history of Napoleon, showing how all the attributes of that grand personage had been borrowed from the Sun, and how, therefore, he also is a myth.

FRENCH RATIONALISM. The French rationalists are less obscure and more logical than those of Germany, and therefore they are more baneful. The gross Materialism of La Mettrie was adopted by Cabanis, Broussais, Destutt de Tracy, and many others. Cabanis (1757-1808), the celebrated physician who furnished Condorcet with the poison which enabled him to escape from the guillotine (1794), began his speculations with the idea that all our ideas come from our senses; and he tried to explain this phenomenon by following, as it were, the paths pursued by our sensations, starting from the extremities of the nerves, which receive the first impressions from external objects, and ending his journey at the brain, in which these impressions are definitively fixed (1). When the sensations have arrived in the brain, said Cabanis, they are transformed into ideas. He described thought as “a secretion of the brain.” Broussais (1772-1838), who, in a discourse pronounced at the grave of Gall, the phrenologist, congratulated that materialist on “having fought, during his entire life, against the foes of enlightenment and of philosophy,” merited well of medical science; but his materialism is revolting. In his numerous writings, and in his public lectures at Val-de-Grace, he taught that there is no spiritual substance in man; that there is no such thing as soul; that perception, judgment,

(1) *Relations Between Physique and Morality.* Paris, 1802.

will, memory, moral affections, are all immediate results of cerebral action, or rather, different modes of an excitation of the nervous system; that our appetites, desires, and passions, are modifications of the viscera, perceived by the brain; that the virtues and vices of man are merely consequences of the struggle ever subsisting between the encephalon and the chief viscera. Count Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836) also contended that our faculty of thinking is a phenomenon proceeding from our physical organizations. According to this member of the French Academy, man is simply a compost of movements and sensations which are subject to necessity; and to the objection that his doctrine differentiated man very little from the brute, he complacently replied: "Man's sole superiority over the brute consists in his having an organization which is more favorable to a *perfection* of speech." The morality inculcated by M. de Tracy was consistent with his principle: "Every living being has an essential right to satisfy his desire, and his sole duty is to do all that he can in order to attain this object; because, being endowed with passions, he can be destined only to the least possible amount of suffering" (1).

Cousin. During the course of a few years, no school of French Rationalism was so much in vogue among the less gross of the philosophists, as that which was styled the Eclectic. As its name indicates, it started with the idea that as there must be some truth in every error, the entire edifice of truth might be constructed with materials taken from every error that could be found. The mission of the Eclectics, according to their chief master, Victor Cousin, was "to separate the errors which are mixed with that portion of truth which is the life of each system"; but Cousin forgot that this task presupposes a knowledge of what is and is not truth, and that, in the words of Jouffroy, "to undertake the task of inspection and selection, without a previous acquaintance with the truth, is to expect to attain an end before possessing the means." The eight hundred students who were subjected to the quasi-hypnotism of the Talma of the Faculty of Letters, as Cousin was termed, proclaimed

(1) *Elements of Ideology*. Paris, 1820.

his system a miracle of originality; but we find it in the Probabilism of Cicero, in the Conceptualism of Abélard, and in the Optimism of Leibnitz. And its natural consequence, Syncretism, or the mixture and confusion of all doctrines, into which the Eclectics soon fell, was a revival of that Neo-Platonic school which was founded, in the third century, by Ammonius Saccas, Plotinus, Jamblicus, Porphyrius, etc.—that school which endeavored to check the conquering progress of Christianity, and to shut off the light of the Christian School of Alexandria, by a union of all the discordant intellectual forces of dying Paganism. The modern Eclectics were necessarily very tolerant of all systems, the Catholic alone excepted; they welcomed with equal cordiality the sensualism of Condillac, the scepticism of the school of Voltaire, and despite their own anti-Christian prejudices, all the vagaries of every one of the Protestant sects. And why should they have hesitated? “There are no false systems,” said Cousin, “although there are many incomplete ones, which are true in themselves, but defective inasmuch as each one pretends to possess that absolute truth which is to be found only in all. Everything taught is true in itself; but it becomes false, when it is accepted, to the exclusion of all else. Error is merely incomplete truth; no other kind of error is possible” (1). While the *beaux esprits* of Eclecticism were fatiguing themselves in an endeavor to discover and to inculcate absurdities, Jouffroy, in one of those lucid moments which frequently seemed to be harbingers of the advent of that faith in which this most brilliant of the Eclectics was to die (2), thus spoke of the Catechism, that little book which is the *vade mecum* of every Catholic seeker for truth: “Here you will find the solution of all the questions, of all without exception, which I have proposed. Ask a Christian whence comes the human race; he knows the answer. Ask him whither he is going; he

(1) COUSIN; *Philosophical Fragments*, In Preface. Third Edit., Paris, 1838. For a refutation of the paradox, according to which truth can result from an amalgamation of many contradictory systems, see RAIMBOURG; *Rationalism and Tradition*. Paris, 1832.

(2) The Abbé de Noirlieu, *curé* of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas, who attended Jouffroy in his last sickness (1842), wrote to the archbishop of Paris that his penitent said: “Ah! *M. le curé*, these systems are worth nothing. A good Act of Christian faith is worth thousands of thousands of them.” BACNARD; *Doubt and Its Victims*. Paris, 1883.

knows the answer. Ask him how he is going thither; he knows the answer. Ask that little child, who has never thought at all about his life, why he is here below, and what will become of him after his death; and he will give you a sublime reply. Ask him how the world came into existence; why God placed animals, plants, etc., upon the earth; how the world came to be peopled, whether by one at a time, or by many families; why men speak in different languages, why they suffer, why they fight each other; how all this is going to an end. He knows it all; the origin of the world, the origin of species, the diversity of races, the destiny of man here and hereafter, the relations of man with God and with his fellows, the rights of man over creation. And when he grows up, he will have no doubts concerning the natural law, or political law, or the law of nations; for all these will appear clear to him, as explained by Christianity. Behold what I term a grand religion! I recognize it by this sign. It leaves unanswered not one of the questions which interest humanity" (1). This admission, drawn by the ascendancy of truth from Jouffroy, reminds us of the reply which Diderot gave to one of his comrades in impiety who had detected him teaching the Catechism to his little daughter: "Where will you find anything better?"

**SAINTE-SIMON.** The idea of an indefinite progress of the human race toward perfection in this world, and even of its attainment of that end, was broached by some philosophists in the first years of the eighteenth century; but it was reserved to Count Claude de Saint-Simon (1760-1825) to attempt a practical hastening of the journey. While a boy of eighteen, serving on the staff of Lafayette in the War of the American Revolution, he fancied that the events around him indicated that an era of universal liberty and of consequent happiness was then dawning upon the world. When the French Revolution occurred, he fancied that it was an effect of the decadence of Catholicism, and that a new doctrine was necessary to prevent the dissolution of society. It was, therefore, "upon the ruins of the Catholic Church" that

(1) JOUFFROY: *The Problem of Human Destiny*, in the *Philosophical Miscellanies*. Paris, 1833.

Saint-Simon thought he would erect a mansion of bliss. After many travels and much study, he began, in 1810, to publish his theories, all of which were presented in such fashion as to show that he regarded his dream as a kind of religion, rather than as a philosophical doctrine. He contended that humanity, obeying a fatal and necessary law, had always advanced in the path of perfectibility; and that then a new era of indescribable beatitude was approaching. However, he was pained on observing that many interests conspired to retard this glorious consummation; that the retrogrades desired to push civilization backward, instead of forward. Because of this wicked propensity, France and indeed all Europe had suffered the fearful miseries of the previous fifty years. The storms of the Revolution had wrecked the fortune of Saint-Simon; the remnant, only 144,000 francs, was engulfed in the publication of works which produced no revenue for their author; and his mature age found him without protectors, with few disciples, and in real poverty. He attempted suicide; but he lingered for several months, and died as he had lived, a foe to the "old," and a self-styled herald of a "new Christianity." In his last book, which bore this title, and appeared just before his death, Saint-Simon said: "Moses promised universal brotherhood to men; Jesus prepared it; Saint-Simon has realized it. . . . Industry and science are holy, since they serve to ameliorate the condition of the poor, and to bring them nearer to God. Hereafter society will consist only of priests (ordained *à la* Saint-Simon), scientists, and workingmen. The leaders of these three classes will form the government; all property will belong to the (Saint-Simonian) Church; all occupations will be religious functions; every condition of life will be a grade in the social hierarchy. The kingdom of God arrives; all the prophesies are fulfilled." The dying sectary said to the few disciples who had remained to him: "The fruit is ripe; you will gather it." But even these few disciples did not agree. Some wished to reform the world by means of the physical sciences, which they termed *positive ideas*; they contended that religious ideas, very appropriate in the olden time, would be

too retrogressive for men whose reason had become developed. Others held that religious ideas were as necessary as ever, although they might be modified to suit present conditions and the expected future progress. The principal partisans of the latter opinion were Bazard, Enfantin, and Lherminier; and they very sagely appealed to the feelings of the female Saint-Simonians for an endorsement of their views. Their appeal was successful, and since the necessity of a new religion was thus made evident, they immediately instituted a hierarchy of "fathers" and "children" for the "Saint-Simonian Church," of which Bazard and Enfantin were declared to be the "supreme fathers." The fundamental doctrines of the new "Church" were as follows: I. Christianity, good in itself, well proportioned to the needs of the olden time, had been an admirable institution, and the philosophers of the eighteenth century had shown their ignorance when they denied it; but, nevertheless, Christianity had outlived its time, and was now powerless and quite dead. II. Saint-Simonism succeeded Christianity, just as that religion had succeeded Mosaicism. III. Christianity had thought only of the souls of men, and had treated the flesh harshly; but Saint-Simonism was to rehabilitate the flesh, and was to proclaim, as the end of man, the greatest amount of pleasure in this life. IV. Woman had been regarded as a slave by the Mosaic religion; Christianity had merely protected her; but Saint-Simonism would emancipate her, and make her the equal of man. V. Since the flesh cannot be rehabilitated, so long as men believe in the doctrine of Original Sin, that teaching is rejected; the nature of man was never vitiated, and there is no punishment for sin after death. VI. God has not the attributes which Christianity discerns in Him; Saint-Simonism proclaims that "God is all that is"; that is, Saint-Simonism is unadulterated Pantheism. VII. Therefore, there can be no question of creation; nature always existed. Man originally had neither speech nor thought; he has trained himself, and has progressed to his present condition; he will continue to advance toward perfection, and will finally be quasi-deified, and will desire nothing more. VIII. In order that this grand consummation

may be attained, it is necessary that all distinctions of birth or wealth disappear; all the members of the Saint-Simonian "family," perfectly equal in the matter of birth, are to be classified, and to be treated in accordance with their respective capabilities; and it is the privilege and duty of the "priests" or "fathers" to effect this classification. Many young men, and a few women who were not quite so young, were persuaded to enter the new organization; but a schism soon occurred, because of the divergent views of the "supreme fathers" on the subject of the fair sex. Bazard was willing to allow divorce to his adepts; but that concession to passion did not satisfy Enfantin, who insisted on that promiscuity of intercourse which came to be dignified by the name of "free love." Enfantin declared that he was waiting for a special companion, who was to be the "Woman-Messiah"; his disciples searched for her throughout France, especially among the women of the street, and when it was asserted that she was to come from the Orient, they sent agents to search in Constantinople. The imprisonment of "Father" Enfantin, convicted of offences against public morals in 1832, ruined Saint-Simonism as a "religion"; but individuals continued to advocate many of its theories. It cannot be denied that among the Saint-Simonians there were, especially while the founder of the system lived, very many men of talent with generous souls, who had been seduced by the dream of perfectibility, and by the hope of unadulterated felicity on earth.

LEROUX. One of the most prominent of the Saint-Simonians, Peter Leroux (1798-1871), manager of *Le Globe*, the official organ of the sect, followed Bazard when that "supreme father" separated from Enfantin (1). Very soon, however, he founded an independent school, the tenets of which, divested of their blasphemous illustrations, may be reduced to these points: I. Man is neither a soul, nor an animal; he is "an animal transformed by reason, and united to Humanity." II. His destiny is to be in communication with his fellows,

(1) After editing the *Revue Encyclopédique* for some time, Leroux founded the *Encyclopédie Nouvelle* in 1838, but want of funds forced its suspension. He then joined Mad. Sand and Vlardot in founding the *Revue Indépendante*, and in 1846 he started the *Revue Sociale*. Among his numerous adversaries, none was so bitter as Proudhon.

and with the universe; the means for this communication are the family, one's country, and property. III. The true original sin is the despotism existing in the family, in one's country, and in property. IV. The remedy for this evil is charity; that is, a more extensive communication of men with their fellows. V. Christianity was once the grandest of religions; but there is something grander than Christianity, namely, Humanity. VI. Beyond this life, there are no such things as heaven, purgatory, or hell; to admit the dualism of a heaven and an earth, as though there were two worlds, has ever been an unfortunate error. VII. That which is, but is not seen, is heaven; that which is, and is seen, is earth; understood in this manner, heaven is God, and the earth and its contents are creatures. VIII. Every man is identified with Humanity; he does not exist by himself, but by the Humanity which is in him. Humanity does not die, but undergoes modifications in individuals; the individuals continue to live in Humanity, and grow with Humanity toward perfection. IX. Adam was a myth. There was no beginning for man; Humanity, considered in its essence, always was, and always will be.

FOURIER. As a panacea for all the evils which afflict society, Charles Fourier (1768-1837) wished to abolish its division into families. He would have formed among men certain social aggregations which he styled "groups, series, and phalanxes." A "group" was to consist of seven or nine individuals, and it would be "the first cell of the social hive, the nucleus of the association." From twenty-four to thirty-two "groups" were to form a "series"; and the different "series" were to constitute "phalanxes," each of which would number eighteen hundred persons. The habitation of a "phalanx" was to be termed a *phalanstère*; and it was to be provided with every possible means of pleasure. Persons of both sexes and of every age could enter into the new Eden, and they would be classified according to their tastes and capabilities. Communism was to be absolute, in everything affecting the individual; but the "phalanxes," etc., might have their own respective interests. The "phalanxes" were to unite in forming cities, provinces, and kingdoms, according as their interests might dictate; but they were to

all unite in a grand aggregation which would fill the habitable earth, and have its centre on the Bosphorus. The "philosophical" doctrines of Fourier may be summarized as follows: I. God, man, and the universe, are one; they absorb each other, or are fused together; as Saint-Simon said, God is all that is. II. The will of God is manifested by a universal attraction, from which is born a universal analogy; every human passion has its *analogue* in nature or in God. III. The world will last until it will have completed its eighty-thousandth year. It is now about seven thousand years old, and therefore in its infancy. It will soon enter upon its youth, and after a continual advance in the way of progress, it will attain a maturity which will endure for eight thousand years. Then its decadence will begin, and with its final decrepitude will come its dissolution. IV. God produced sixteen species of men; nine in the Old World, and seven in America. All these species are subject to the Universal Law of Analogy. V. When this world shall have disappeared, there will appear in succession eighteen others, each being produced by a union of the Austral and Boreal fluids. VI. The souls of men do not die with their bodies; but they pass into other human bodies which will live on this earth or somewhere else. The reason of this journey is found in the fact that the human body cannot be deprived of its right to physical pleasure. VII. The Law of Universal Analogy is illustrated in man by means of his passions, which come from God, as is evident from the fact that every human being is actuated, more or less, by their impulses. Whenever a human being encounters an obstacle to the gratification of passion, that obstacle comes from himself or herself, and the energies of the sufferer should be directed to a removal of the obstacle, not to a subjugation of the passion. In fine, there will never be harmony in this world, until a free rein is accorded to every individual passion. VIII. In each human being there are twelve radical passions, seven of which reside in the soul, and five in the flesh. It is from the free play of these passions that the *religious* sentiment originates; that sentiment is simply a result of a combination of all the passions, just as white is produced by

a union of all the colors of the prism. IX. The first duty of a human being is to follow the impulse of passion. X. The ordinary idea of vice and of virtue is essentially false. XI. The end of man is to cultivate the earth; his destiny is happiness; the means at his command are found in the Fourierite association, the destined producer of universal concord. XII. True happiness consists in having very many passions, and abundant means for their gratification. Fourier dared to represent his doctrines as those taught by Jesus of Nazareth; and he insisted that he and his disciples were destined to restore to their pristine purity the teachings which the New Testament had obscured, and which Catholicism had completely transformed.

COMTE AND THE POSITIVISTS. Auguste Comte (1798-1857), a native of Montpellier in France, graduated at the *Polytechnique* of Paris, and was a tutor in that establishment during the greater part of his life. He began to advance his positivistic theories as early as 1820 in the *Organisateur* of Paris; but their full development was attained in the *Course of Positive Philosophy*, which he delivered during the period between 1830 and 1842. Afterward he published several books in defense of his notions (1), as well as a number of *Considerations on Sciences and Scientists, and on the Spiritual Power*, which appeared in the *Producteur* of Paris, and led Benjamin Constant to denounce him as a defender of "Theocratism" and of "Industrial Popery." Comte would have reduced all philosophy to the "pure sciences," which he divided into six categories: mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, and social science. Besides these sciences there is nothing, thought Comte, which can claim the attention of man. Comte was an enthusiastic perfectibilist. In the progress of the human race he discerned three phases; that of a conquering military activity, that of a defensive military activity, and that of a pacific activity; and all of these, according to his dream, are subordinate to a scientific and philosophical progression which is constant and continuous. The Positivistic doctrine, with which the

(1) *Discourse on the Positive Spirit*, 1844.—*System of Positive Politics; or, A Treatise on Sociology*, 1851.—*A Positivist Calendar*, 1852.

name of Comte is now identified, was not excogitated by him; it has been the basis of Materialism in every age. We find it in the Scepticism of Enesidemus and of Sextus the Empiric; and moderns have only re-discovered it in the Empiricism of Hume which denied every idea of substance, cause, and finality. Comte merely pushed to its last and logical consequences the doctrine of scientific Materialism; he occupied himself, in the matter of human knowledge, only with facts and their relations; and he discerned the end and object of all scientific indagations in sociology. With Comte, psychology was an impossibility; all his researches were within the limits of physiology and biology. Positivism suppressed the idea of the absolute; just as Spinoza found his absolute in fatality, as Fichte found his in his *Ego*, and Schelling his in identity, so the Positivists found their absolutes in a "positivity" which they regarded as science, and in a "Humanity" which is revealed by science. In the morality of Positivism there is no idea of absolute duty or right; its morality is founded only on the inclination one person experiences in regard to another, *vers autrui*—an idea which caused its moral doctrine to be styled "Altruism," a thing which has nothing in common with Christian Charity. Comte believed in no Rights of Man as belonging to man as such; he admitted in man merely those privileges which society confers upon its members. None of the so-called systems of modern philosophy has effected more than Positivism toward the destruction of every grandeur of humanity. Besides the mathematical Positivism of Comte in philosophy, there are Positivisms of art, literature, music, and even of religion. There is the Positivism of the honest and good Littré (1), which dresses it-

(1) While this grand philologist was composing his monumental *Dictionary*, he founded the *Revue Positive* (1857), and by his numerous articles in support of the Comtian theories, wherein he applied those doctrines to the political, economic, and social ideas of the day, he came to be regarded as the new head of the Positivist school. In the Preface which Littré wrote for the *Materialism and Spiritualism* of Leblais, he held that thought is to the nervous substance that which weight is to matter; that is, that thought is an "irreducible phenomenon" which, in the present state of our knowledge, is its own explanation. "Just as the physicist perceives that matter has weight, so the physiologist sees that the nervous substance thinks; and neither the physicist nor the physiologist pretends to explain what he sees." And, nevertheless, like all Positivists, Littré contended that he was "no more a Materialist than he was a Spiritualist," even when he held that free will is "an

self in the fashion. "There is the Positivism of Proudhon which, with its panoply of war, is the most aggressive of all. There is the Positivism of the naked law, which guards the gate of the soul against the attacks of science and of reason. There is the Positivism of the multitude, which ends in Utilitarianism. There is the Positivism of artists who wish to be 'Realists.' There is the Positivism of scientists who will be guided by observation alone. There is the Positivism of literary men who, like the artists, wish to hear no more talk about that ideal which even Kant recognized as the 'great categorical imperative' in art, logic, and morality—the rule for our judgments and our acts. There is the Positivism of churchmen, which would reduce religion to 'pure practice.' In a word, there is Positivism everywhere around us; we see only the diabolic forms, either displayed or disguised, of this monster. What need have we, asks the new philosopher, of that hypothetical ideal which once we sought in the heavens? Let us return to earth; let us be practical. By one stroke of the pen metaphysics are laid aside; the thinker can now build without a foundation; philosophy is neutralized; human laziness wants nothing better; let us eat and drink—behold our philosophy! What need have we, asks the new writer, to seek for that beautiful which was the dream of our fathers? What need have we of that beauty of language for which our

illusion of internal optics"; that the brain transforms impressions into sensations and volitions, just as the liver changes food into bile; that morality, like beauty, is "a mere gift of nature." The heterodoxy of Littré was due to the circumstances of his parentage and early education. As a man, he seems to have lived in thorough accordance with the dictates of the natural law; and therefore he finally merited the grace of divine faith. Both of his parents were ardent and consistent, although not cruel, Jacobins; his infantine ears heard naught but praises of the men and things of the Revolution; his education was the pestiferous breath of the University. But he remained an honest man, and therefore he was ever tolerant of religious belief in others. In his later years he could write: "I have seen too much of the sufferings and difficulties of human life, to wish to deprive any person of those convictions which sustain him in his days of trial." Much of the goodness of Littré must be ascribed to his fidelity, in practical life, to the dictates of sound reason; but that same fidelity owed its existence to the example and encouragement of his Catholic wife and daughter. His mother, Jacobin though she was, was a woman of common sense; and when her son, in his thirty-fifth year, left to her the task of finding for him a suitable wife, she chose a thoroughly pious woman. Sainte-Beuve, the great critic who never believed and never hoped, said, when speaking of this marriage: "The daughter who was born to Littré, the girl who became so worthy of her father, an intelligent help in his labors, was raised in the faith of her mother. Thus it was that this philosopher, a man whose heart was as tender as his mind was elevated, understood toleration and practiced it. He himself educated his daughter, and just as he had ever re-

...fathers strove unceasingly, and which they never found sufficiently perfect for their taste? Let us make no useless efforts; let us speak the language of the people; let us strive for wealth; let us eat and drink—behold our literature! What need have we, asks the new artist, to yearn for perfection of color, of design, of model, of melody, of harmony, of rhythm, etc.? What we want is the useful—behold our art! What need have we, asks the new scientist, to dream of hypotheses in order to explain things? Let us take things as they appear to our senses; let us confine our researches to realities. Theory, if it is well founded, will be attained by experience—behold our science! What need have we, asks the new pastor of souls, to form demonstrations based on that reason which is ever in opposition to itself? Let us believe and practice as did our fathers; let us eat and drink, and God will do the rest—behold our religion! Now, what is all this? It is Positivism. Reason is debased; religion is materialized; science is weakened; style becomes vulgar; voice disappears in measure; music is mathematicized (and despising melody, it becomes mere noise); painting is atrophied; art is extinct; man is inert; soul sleeps; nations decay; all things are dying" (1).

spected the plety of his wife, he respected that of his child with a delicacy which was perfect." Speaking of the study of Littré in his country-house at Mesnil, that great Catholic scientist, Pasteur, said: "There is the little table at which, near his own desk, his wife and daughter always worked by his side; and above that table—visible witness of Littré's tolerant spirit—was the image of Christ." When the great scholar retired to Mesnil, he always asked the parish-priest for the names of the poor who needed help, or whose maladies he might alleviate by a free exercise of the medical knowledge which he had acquired in his youth. Another indication of the good faith of Littré is the justice which he always rendered to the Church of the Middle Age. And let it be ever remembered that he refused to vote for the infamous anti-clerical laws of Jules Ferry, and that his pen did good service in defence of clerical liberty. On June 1, 1881, Littré, then on his bed of death, was baptized by the Abbé Huvellin, vicar of the parish of Saint-Augustin, a priest with whom he had long been intimate, and who had visited him several times in every week of his last years. Shortly after his reception of the Last Sacraments, he made a happy death. During the Mass of Requiem at Notre-Dame-des-Champs, the Freemasons were gathered in large numbers outside the sacred edifice; and they loudly protested against the "mummery" that was being performed over the remains of one who had belonged to the Dark Lantern. When the body had been deposited in its grave in the Cemetery of Montparnasse, Wiroubouff, the manager of the *Revue Positiviste*, scorning the entreaties of the widow and daughter, addressed the spectators in the name of the Masonic Order, ridiculing the ceremony which had just taken place.

(1) LE NOIR: *The Dictionary of Bergier Adapted to the Intellectual Movement of the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. x., p. 482. Paris, 1876.

GIÖBERTI. Far more dangerous than the Rationalism of Germany, because it was lucid and logical; also more to be feared than any of the philosophistic systems of France, because it was specious and practical; was the Semi-Rationalism which Giöberti excogitated for the "regeneration" of Italy. The first works of this philosopher, polemic, and statesman, were redolent of learning, art, faith, and charity; so great became his influence over not only the younger portion of the Italian clergy, but also over the more worthy and enlightened among the political leaders who were dreaming of a renovated Italy, that it was said that at that time all the foremost statesmen of the peninsula were like so many seminarians, whose walks were superintended by a theologian. At that time Giöberti regarded Rationalism as the prime cause of the evils of modern society; and he contended that only a sincere return to Catholic ideas would restore modern philosophy (1). Cantù, who had been, with Giöberti, one of the original Neo-Guelphs, thus speaks of the lamentable change which came over his friend: "Already accustomed to yield to circumstances, he lost the light of that truth which had been his passion, when once he became drunk with the wine of disobedience; he debased himself by tempestuous discussions and violent writings in which he satisfied his personal rancors, at the same time that he drew weapons for use against the Church from his theological arsenal. The worst happened when an admiring rather than a prudent friendship published certain of his posthumous works which he had either merely outlined, or had written under the impulse of the moment when he was suffering from the bitter disappointments which often waited on his excessive pride—writings which probably he would have either destroyed or corrected, when calm reflection would have supervened; writings, also, in which he did indeed proffer rationalistic objections, which now appear to have been approved by him, although he may have intended to refute them. Reprobation is due, therefore, to some of the works which bear his name, rather than to Giöberti. Especially in the *Philosophy of Revelation*, how can

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 442.

we believe that while advancing so many resplendent truths, and after an admirable defence of the supernatural and the miraculous, Gioberti would abandon Catholic unity by a declaration that many evangelical precepts were adapted only to their time; that the dogmas of predestination, of the small number of the elect, of eternal punishment, of an expiation in a future life, are absurdities; that the modern propaganda should be chiefly laic; that our epoch is one of an entire secularization of the Gospel?... Only he who has never written can fail to understand that symmetry and consistency are obtained only when a final polishing has been given to a work. We regard these salient contradictions of Gioberti as proofs that his posthumous works are simply so much material which he had prepared for future construction" (1). We may well hope that the great historian's judgment was correct; but it is certain that the mitigated Rationalism styled Giobertianism has been, during the past fifty years, a veritable plague in Italy (2). The partisans of this system had a lucidity of intellect which prevented their agreeing with German Transcendentalism in a divinization of human reason; but, nevertheless, while protesting their wish to reconcile reason with faith, they accorded to the former a supremacy over the latter. They described eloquently the distinction between the supernatural and the natural, even while they confounded them. They did not deny the dogma of original sin; but they ignored the effects of that calamity, since they reprobated mortification of the flesh and all asceticism. They proclaimed their belief in a state of future beatitude; but their chief efforts were directed toward a happiness on earth. They did not profess a belief in the perfectibility of the human race; but by their agitations they led the populations of Italy to yearn after an indefinite progress toward an unknown end. Their words indicated a filial devotion to the Church; but they wished to "modernize" a Catholicism which they declared to be "exaggerated, old-fashioned, ultra-mystical, and anti-social."

(1) CANTÙ; *Heretics of Italy*, Discourse lvi. Turin, 1866.

(2) For a complete refutation of these theories, see the *Civiltà Cattolica*, Series II., Vol. IV., no. 86.

They talked much about Christ, the Redeemer ; but they prated persistently about the human and civil effects of the Redemption, as though the Saviour had suffered and died principally for the political freedom of men, and for the improvement of their material conditions.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE REVIVAL OF CHRISTIANITY IN JAPAN.

The existence of Japan was first revealed to Europe by the narrative of Marco Polo in 1298. During his residence at the court of the Tartar emperor, Kublai-Khan, the daring and indefatigable explorer had learned much concerning *Cipangu*, as the Tartars termed the distant insular empire ; but when he repeated the information to his compatriots, few credited his tales. Not until 1542, the year in which St. Francis Xavier landed in India, did a European tread the soil of Japan, and thus demonstrate that when speaking of the existence of *Cipangu*, the great Venetian traveller had been neither a romancer nor a dreamer. Then it was that the Portuguese, Mendez Pinto, together with two companions, was driven by contrary winds to the coast of Tanegashima, whence he sailed to Kyu-Shu, one of the four largest islands of the finally discovered Japan ; and at the same time, three other Portuguese, who had been sailing toward China, were also cast on the shore of Kyu-Shu. The natives were greatly interested by the few Western products which Pinto and his companions were able to show them ; commercial relations were soon opened ; and from that day the Portuguese began to trade with the Land of the Rising Sun. The Europeans found two religions in Japan, Shintoism and Buddhism. The former, the "Way of the Gods," was the original religion of the land, its beginnings being confounded with those of the nation ; the latter had arrived in the sixth century of our era, having come from India, by way of China and Corea. The emperors had, in some sort, officially united these two systems ; and in very many places, the same temple was served by a Buddhist *bozu* (bonze) and

a Shinto *kamushi*—an arrangement which soon led the people to believe that the *Hotoke*, or gods of India, were identical with their own gods, the *Kami*, and which caused many of the early missionaries to represent Japan as having but one religion (1). During many centuries before the arrival of the Portuguese, the sovereigns of Japan, succumbing to the somniferous influence of Buddhism, had held themselves aloof from terrestrial affairs, yielding to the charms of a sacred quietude amid the mysteries of their capital, Myako (2), a city of palaces and temples; and they were ever venerated by the people as direct descendants of the national gods, and were regarded as the real heads of the state, although the reins of government were in other hands. The effective power had been disputed during several centuries by various powerful families, when, in 1190, it was concentrated in the person of a kind of lieutenant-general, who was styled the *Shogun*, and was not only regarded as the first among the great feudal lords, but as their head, was officially invested with the imperial authority (3). The feudal lords or *Daimios* (4) were, nevertheless, independent in their respective territories, issuing decrees, administering justice, levying taxes, raising armies, etc. In fact, the *Daimios* were petty kings; and hence it is that the *Relations* of the early missionaries speak of these princes as of so many real sovereigns. Under the rule of the *Dairi* (5), the *Shogun*, and the *Daimios*, the people were divided into four classes or *Shimin* (6), namely, the warriors, called *Samurai* or *Shizoku*; the agriculturists or *Hyakusho*; the artisans or *Shokumin*; and the traders or *Shonin* (7). The

(1) When the imperial power was restored in 1868, the two religions were again separated; and then the power of Buddhism began to decline.

(2) This word, composed of *Mya* and *Ko*, signifies the place where the emperor resided. Myako, also called Koto, became the capital in A. D. 794.

(3) The term *Shogun* is nearly equivalent to our word "generalissimo." At first it was applied to the generals who were sent to subdue the Ainos, an aboriginal race in the northern portion of the empire; but in 1190 Yoritomo gave to the Shogunate a greater significance.

(4) The literal meaning of *Daimio* is "a great name."

(5) This term was originally used to indicate the portion of the imperial palace which was reserved for the personal use of the sovereign; and in time it came to indicate the emperor himself.

(6) The word *Shimin* signifies "the four peoples."

(7) The Japanese sign for *Samurai* is the one used by the Chinese to indicate a lettered

*Samurai* were the armed retainers of the *Daimios*, supported by their lords even in time of peace, and owing to them fidelity, even unto death.

St. Francis Xavier and five companions (1) debarked from a Chinese junk at the port of Kagoshima on the Feast of the Assumption of our Lady, 1549; and when, after a sojourn of twenty-seven months, Xavier departed in obedience to an order of St. Ignatius which imposed upon him the superiority of the recently created Province of India, he had baptized many thousands of the Japanese, and had gained the good will of several of the *Daimios*. The work thus begun was continued by other Jesuits brought to Japan in the Portuguese ships; and in 1582, at the death of Nobunaga, who had made himself the veritable sovereign of Japan, and was very partial to the Christian missionaries, there were in the empire 250 churches, attended by 200,000 of the faithful, among whom were the *Daimios* of Bungo, Arima, and Omura. Certainly it was a consoling and beautiful picture which was unfolded before the eyes of Pope Gregory XIII. by the embassy, composed of three Japanese princes, which His Holiness received in the Vatican on March 23, 1585; and when, that Pontiff having died eighteen days afterward, the new Pope (Sixtus V.) created the noble orientals Knights of the Golden Spur and Roman Patricians, men regarded the scene as a harbinger of a compensation which the Church was about to receive, in return for the losses which she had recently experienced in Germany and England. But these sanguine prophets forgot that with the exception of the Irish and the Anglo-Saxons, no nation has

man or mandarin. The word *Hyakusho* signifies "the hundred families," that is, the generality of the people. *Shokunin* means "men who work at a trade." *Shonin* is equivalent to our word "merchants."

(1) These companions were Father Como de Torrez and a lay brother, Juan Fernandez, both Jesuits; and three Japanese neophytes whom the saint had met at Malacca. One of these Japanese, a *Samurai* named Anjiro, torn with remorse because of a wicked life, had sought for encouragement among the bonzes, and had been on the point of despairing, when he remembered that the Portuguese in Kagoshima were ever talking about the wonderful sanctity and miraculous powers of a Christian priest who was then laboring in India. Having sought in many places for the holy missionary, he finally found him in Malacca, and received baptism, with the name of Paul de Santa Fe. The other Japanese were servants of this *Samurai*, and they also embraced Christianity. It was this Paul who introduced St. Francis to his lord, the prince of Satsuma; and it was in his house that the saint studied the Japanese language.

ever been converted from Paganism to Christianity without a profuse shedding of blood on the part of the apostles of the faith. When the Japanese ambassadors returned to their insular empire, they found that Hideyoshi, who had succeeded Nobunaga in his usurpation of the powers of the Shogunate, had yielded to the instigations of the bonzes, and had ordered the destruction of all the Christian churches, and the immediate expulsion of all the Christian priests from Japan. The Christian princes, however, had obtained a delay of six months in the execution of this decree, and permission for the missionaries to reside thereafter in Nagasaki for the benefit of the Portuguese residents; and under cover of this concession, the Jesuits had continued to propagate the faith. The return of the ambassadors in 1590, three years after the publication of the persecuting decree, effected a change in the mind of Hideyoshi. The envoys were accompanied by the Jesuit, Valegnani, as ambassador of the king of Spain; and when he had learned that the conduct of Hideyoshi was due to the suspicion that the missionaries were plotting against the independence of Japan, he offered to place ten of his fellow-religious in the hands of the prince, as hostages for the loyalty of their companions. The offer was accepted, and the Japanese Christians breathed more freely. The distrust of Hideyoshi was also considerably diminished by news that Konishi Yukinaga, a Christian, one of his commanding generals in the expedition recently undertaken against Corea, had covered himself with glory; and that four of his subordinate generals, the Christian *Daimios* of Tsushima, Arima, Omura, and Amikusa, had greatly contributed to the glory of Japan. The usurper even closed his eyes when four Spanish Franciscans, recently arrived from the Philippines, erected churches in Nagasaki and Osaka, and even in the capital; and when, in 1596, the Jesuit, Peter Martinez, having been consecrated to the episcopate, came for the purpose of exercising his office over all the Christians in Japan, he received full permission from Hideyoshi in an audience which was accorded to him. But in July, 1596, when the Christians in Japan numbered 300,000 under the care of 134 re-

ligious, there happened an event which revived the absurd suspicions of Hideyoshi, and entailed its first general persecution on the Japanese Church. A Spanish ship, the "San Felipe," while voyaging from Manila to New Spain, was wrecked on the coast of the province of Tosa; and according to the Japanese law, its cargo was declared the property of the *Dairi*. The Spanish captain tried intimidation as a means for saving the property. He showed to the Japanese officials a map of the world, and pointed to the immense possessions of Spain in both hemispheres, an empire on which the sun never declined. When the astonished Japanese asked how such a great empire could have been formed, the mariner replied: "By means of religion and the sword. Our priests prepare the way of conquest by converting nations to Christianity; then the work of subjugating the converts is mere child's play for us." When this remark was reported to Hideyoshi, he swore that "the Christians should learn that they could not play with him"; and on Dec. 9, nine religious were arrested at Myako and Osaka, and the governors of those cities were ordered to furnish lists of all who held any relations with those missionaries. Then were repeated the scenes which were common among the early Christians, on the eve of a general persecution. All prepared for the coming trial; old and young, rich and poor, strengthened themselves by prayer and fasting; all brought forth their choicest garments, "so that their triumph might be celebrated with befitting pomp, and in order that they might be clothed as splendidly as possible when fastened to the cross" (1). Many great lords hastened to the prisons where the priests were confined, demanding to be allowed to share their lot. Among these was Prince Justo, a relative of Hideyoshi, who had recently been placed over three provinces. However, when the martyrs were led forth for their passion, they were found to be only twenty-four in number: six Spanish Franciscans (2); three Japanese Jes-

(1) CHARLEVOIX; *History and General Description of Japan*, bk. x., ch. 8. Rouen, 1715.

(2) Fr. Peter Baptist, native of Castel San Stephano, in the diocese of Avila, a priest, fifty years old. Fr. Martin of the Ascension, priest, native of Vergara, province of Guipuscoa, thirty years old. Fr. Francis Blanco, priest, native of Monterey in Galicia, thirty years old.

nit clerics (1); and fifteen Japanese laics, members of the Third Order of St. Francis (2). Three of these laics, whose ages ranged from eleven to fourteen years, were "altar boys" who had refused to be separated from the fathers whom they loved so well. On Jan. 3, all of these confessors of the faith were led to a square in Myako where, according to the order of the government, their noses and ears were to be amputated; but the manager of the exhibition seems to have been somewhat affected by pity, for he contented himself with cutting off the lobes of their left ears. Then the victims were promenaded through the streets of the capital; after which "disgrace" they were subjected to the same treatment in Osaka, Sakai, Nagoya, and many other cities. Nagasaki had been designated as the place for the consummation of the martyrdom; and during the whole of the journey, they were accompanied by many Christians who proclaimed loudly their envy of the lot which had befallen the fortunate followers of Jesus. Two of these sympathizers obtained the wish of their hearts, and were joined to the exulting band, thus increasing the number to twenty-six. The last stage of the journey but one, from Sonogi to Tokitsu, was made by water; and the martyrs passed the night of Feb. 4 in the open air on the boat; but the glacial cold did not interfere with their canticles of joy. On the road to Nagasaki, the procession paused at Urakami; and here all the victims made their sacramental confessions. Finally, the little hill of Tateyama, near Nagasaki, which all Japanese Christians have ever since styled the Holy Mountain, was reached. Here twenty-six crosses had been prepared; each sufferer was at once laid on his instrument of torture,

Bro. Philip of Jesus, a cleric, native of Mexico, twenty-three years old. Bro. Francis of St. Michael, lay brother, native of Padilha in Castille. Bro. Gonzalez Garcia, lay brother, native of Bazain in India, of Portuguese parents.

(1) Paul Miki, Japanese, son of a lord in the court of Nobunaga, and a cleric in the Society of Jesus, thirty-three years old. John Suwano, or Goto, Japanese, cleric of the Society of Jesus, nineteen years old. James Kisaemon, Japanese, catechist in the Society of Jesus, sixty-four years old.

(2) Cosmo Takeya, Michael Kozaki, Paul Ibaraku, Leo Karasumaru, Louis Ibaraki, eleven years old; Anthony, thirteen years old; Thomas Kozaki, son of Michael, fourteen years old; Mathias, Bonaventure, Joachim Sakakibara, Francis of Meaco, Thomas Date, John Kisaemon, Gabriel, Paul Suzuk, Francis, Peter Kozaki Sukejiro, all Japanese. We have added the names of two Japanese who afterward joined this band.

bound to it by ropes, and by an iron collar which encircled his neck ; and then all the crosses, arranged in a single line, were lifted and dropped into their sockets. Then arose from one of the crosses, the one occupied by Father Peter Baptist, the strains of the *Canticle of Zachary* ; and the alternate verses were chanted by his companions. Then the noble cleric, Miki, prayed aloud for the conversion of his countrymen ; and at length, just as the executioners advanced to give the fatal lance-thrust from groin to shoulder, the pure voice of Anthony, the thirteen-year-old acolyte, ascended toward heaven with the first words of the *Laudate, pueri* ; but the happy child terminated his song with the angels in paradise. "Jesus! Mary!" cried each champion of the Catholic faith as he received the delivering thrust ; and thus was consummated the first in the long series of hecatombs, by means of which God designed to establish His Church in Japan (1).

Hideyoshi died in 1598, after having ordered the Japanese to adore him as a new *Hachiman*, or god of war, in a temple which he had constructed for his godship in Myako. His heir, a boy of six years, was placed under the tutelage of Yeyasu Tokugawa, an able man who soon began to ignore the rights of his ward, and ultimately obtained from the *Dairi* the title of *Shogun* (1604), which had not been borne since its suppression by Nobunaga, forty years previously, and which remained in his family until the imperial restoration of 1868. The first fifteen years of the new domination were devoted by Yeyasu to a consolidation of his power ; and therefore he had no time for a persecution of the "Perverse Religion of Jesus" (2). There were indeed several bloody persecutions, but these were purely local. The effects of the sacrifice on the Holy Mountain were quickly manifested ; in 1605 the Japanese Christians numbered 1,800,000. The Jesuits and Franciscans had been reinforced by the Domin-

(1) These twenty-six martyrs were beatified by Urban VIII. in 1627, and were canonized by Pius IX. on June 8, 1862.

(2) Such was the title by which, ever since the first persecutions, the pagan Japanese indicated the Catholic Faith. *Iaso Kyo* means the Religion of Jesus ; but they contemptuously termed it *Iaso Ja-Kyo*, the Perverse Religion of Jesus ; or, briefly, *Ja-Kyo*, the Perverse Religion.

ican and Augustinian Orders; not only churches, but hospitals and orphanages were found in nearly every province; divine worship was public, and was conducted with considerable solemnity. In 1607, when Louis Cerquiera, bishop of Japan, was received in audience by Yeyasu, he experienced much kindness. In 1611 the missionaries erected an astronomical observatory at Osaka; and in Myako Father Spinola established an academy, which was frequented by many courtiers of the *Dairi*, who were desirous of proficiency in mathematics. In 1613 the *Daimio* of Sendai, Date Masamune, sent one of his vassals, Hasekura Rokuyemon, as ambassador to Pope Paul V. and to Spain. Rokuyemon was baptized in Madrid on Feb. 16, 1615, in presence of King Philip III. and of Anne of Austria, then betrothed to Louis XIII. of France. At Rome he was made a citizen and a Roman senator (1). These facts show that the prospects of the

(1) In 1876 the Abbé Langlais, a missionary of the Society of Foreign Missions in Paris, discovered in Sendai the letters-patent by which Rokuyemon was made a Roman citizen and senator; and they are now preserved in the museum of Tokio. We give the text of this document: "*Quod Euloricus Reulius Vincenius Mutus de Papazurris, Jacobus Vellius, alimv urbis conservatores de illustro et excellmo Philippo Francisco Farecura Rocuyemon Romana civitate donando ad senatum retulere S. P. Q. R. de ea re ita fieri censuit.*

"*Quod in Urbe Romana antiquissimis etiam illis regum temporibus usitatum est, sequentibus deinde annis, Respublica consuevit ne nostra quidem cetas omisit, hesteros nempe viros, virtute seu nobilitate insignes, ad hanc almam Urbem ex orbe universo confluentes, S. P. Q. R. non solum benigniter, verum etiam munificenter amplexus, illos magnitudine Romani nominis desuper noticiam propriamque nobilitatem cohonestando Civitate Romana donavit, ut viri virtute nobilitateque prestantes, inter Romanos cives adsciti, magno Reipublice nostrae usui atque ornameto fuissent vel esse aliquando possent.*

"*Nos igitur antiquissimi moris nostraeque majorum exempli autoritate permoti non omittendum putavimus inter cives patritiosque Romanos adscire Illustrissimum et Excellentissimum Philippum Franciscum Farecura Rocuyemon ex civitate serventi. in Sendai regni Vozu in Japonico ortum. Cum ipse ex tam leuquinis et remolissimis regionibus ad hanc almam Urbem venerit orator ad Sanctissimum Dominum nostrum Paulum Quintum Burghesium Romanum Pontificem Marimum, pro Serenissimis, Idate Masamune, regis Vozu in imperio Japonico, et Romanum Pontificem Catholice et Universalis Ecclesiae pastorem, totius orbis parentem et Jesu Christi Filii Dei Omnipotentis Vicarium, ea qua decet reverentia venerando, ad accipiendam dicti regis ac regni tutelam paternamque curam hortaretur.*

"*Eapropter, S. P. Q. R. ut cum ipso strictissimo amoris nexu colligeretur, praefatum Illustrissimum et Excellentissimum Philippum Franciscum Farecura Rocuyemon amplissimo munere Romanae Civitatis decorandum et in Senatorum ordinem merita cooptandum censuit. Illius voluntatem ac sententiam singulari omnium consensu ac laetitia comprobata per scribas ejusdem sacri senatus in publicis litteris ad aeternam memoriam referri eidem S. P. Q. R. ita placuit, ut beneficium horumque non magis dare quam accipere videntur. Anno ab Urbe Condita MCCCCLXVI., et ab Orbe Redempto MDCXV., XII. Kal. Decembris."*

Japanese Church were indeed brilliant when it was overwhelmed by the storm which all but annihilated it. The primary cause of this persecution was the virulent hatred of Catholicism which was a part of the very life of the Hollanders and Englishmen who had just arrived in Japan, and who had been dismayed by the success which was attending the missionary enterprise of the "Scarlet Whore of Babylon." Add to this truly diabolic envy the commercial greed of the Dutch and English, which prompted them to adopt any means which would enable them to supplant the Spanish and Portuguese in Japanese trade; and you have the secret of the all but complete disappearance of Christianity from Japan in the early part of the seventeenth century.

The Dutch trod the soil of Japan for the first time in 1609, and the English followed in 1611. The Hollanders were allowed to establish a trading agency, or "factory," on the island of Hirado, but in 1640 the twelve or thirteen resident merchants were transferred to Deshima. From the day of their arrival the Dutch endeavored to envenom the mind of Yeyasu with tales of Catholic conspiracies against the integrity of Japan; according to the Protestant traders, every Catholic priest in the empire was a sworn agent of the Spanish sovereign, and every Japanese Christian had been infected with a spirit of disloyalty to his government. Whether or not Yeyasu really believed that he was in danger from a Spanish and Portuguese invasion (1), he at least perceived that by a persecution of the Christians he could rid himself of many Christian *Daimios* who were partisans of the son of Hideyoshi, a prince who had now attained his majority. Accordingly, in 1613 he summoned fourteen lords of his court, and ordered them to renounce their religion under pain of being reduced to absolute beggary. All preferred penury to apostasy. The shedding of Christian blood began in the province of Arima. On Jan. 28, two brothers, Thomas and Mathias, their mother and their children, were decapitated at the same time. On April 27, the *Daimio* caused his two young Christian brothers to be slaughtered during their sleep; and on Oct. 5, the same prince

(1) At this period both Spain and Portugal were ruled by the same sovereign.

sent to the stake eight persons, three of whom, Adrian Takahashi Moto, Leo Hayashida Sukeyemon, and Leo Take-tomi, were lords of his court. When the Christians of the neighborhood learned that this hecatomb was about to be offered, over 20,000 appeared at the gate of the prison, and accompanied the martyrs to the place of execution, reciting with them the prayers of the Rosary of Our Lady. When the flames had begun their work, James Hayashida, a child of twelve years, whose fastenings had given way, but who was already a mass of fire, jumped to the ground; but he had no thought of escape. He had left his stake in order to throw himself, crying 'Jesus, Mary,' into the embrace of his burning mother. And at the same instant, his sister, Magdalen, who had consecrated her virginity to God, picked up some of the burning faggots from her pyre, and arranged them on her head in the form of a crown, as though she wished to be decorated in a befitting manner, when she would stand before her Spouse. During the ensuing two years, all the missionaries, excepting a few who succeeded in secreting themselves, were transported to the Philippines; but this deprivation of encouragement and consolation did not further the cause of apostasy among the faithful. Yeyasu died in 1615, and was succeeded by his third son, Hidetada. This prince renewed the persecuting edict of his father; for he had learned that several of the missionaries had eluded the search for their persons, and that many others, undeterred by fear of death, had recently landed in Japan. On May 22, 1617, John Baptist de Maciado de Tevora, a Portuguese Jesuit, and Peter of the Ascension, a Spanish Franciscan, were beheaded at Omura. On June 1, Alfonso Narvarrete, the provincial vicar of the Dominicans, and Ferdinand of St. Joseph, an Augustinian, suffered the same fate in the island of Tuka-shima. When Hidetada entered Myako in 1619, he burned fifty Christians, men, women, and children, at the same time. In 1621, a Dutch and an English ship captured a small Spanish vessel as it neared the Japanese coasts, and delivered the captain, two passengers, and the crew of thirteen, to the Daimio of *Hirado*. After an imprisonment of a year, the captain and the two

passengers, a Spanish Augustinian named Peter de Zugnica, and a Flemish Dominican named Louis Florez, were burned at Nagasaki; and the thirteen sailors, having refused liberty at the expense of apostasy, were decapitated. On Sept. 2, 1622, there occurred at Nagasaki the event which is noted as the Grand Martyrdom in Japanese ecclesiastical history. The hecatomb consisted of ten Jesuits, six Dominicans, four Franciscans, and thirty-two of the *élite* of Japanese society. The priests and five of the laics were fastened to crosses; the remaining twenty-seven victims were then decapitated; a bleeding head was then placed on a pole, and planted in front of each cross; and finally the crucified were burnt. Scenes like this were common during the remainder of the year, at Nagasaki, Omura, Hirado, and Shimabara. In 1623, Hidetada was succeeded by Yemitsu, a still more determined persecutor. In the provinces nearest to Yedo he instituted a most exact search for votaries of the "perverse religion"; and on Dec. 4, 29, and 31, ninety-one were given to the flames. In 1624, the persecution became general throughout the empire; the provinces which had contained the majority of the Christians, such as Hirado, Hizen, Bungo, Higo, Aki, and Iyo, were nearly depopulated, either by the slaughter or by the flight of so many of their inhabitants. But although every city of the empire had been made a shambles for humanity, the Christians remained indomitable; and therefore the Pagans resolved to use more terrible means than fire and sword to effect their end. Dutch Protestants are constrained to corroborate the narratives of the Catholic writers who describe the horrors which characterized the domination of Yemitsu from 1633 to 1637. Reyer Gitsbertz, as quoted by Charlevoix (1), tells how the finger-nails were torn from the hands of many of the martyrs; how, day after day, awls were thrust under the finger-nails of others; how some were flung into ditches which had been filled with vipers; how sulphurous smoke was conveyed by funnels to the nostrils of others; how many were lacerated by thorns, drawn slowly over every part of their bodies; how some were scourged until the souls departed from the nearly

(1) *Loc. cit.*, bk. xvii., ch. 2.

fleshless frames ; how infants were used as clubs with which to beat out the lives of their mothers ; how nerves and sinews were slowly laid bare, and then drawn out of the quivering limbs ; how many were tortured by a gradual roasting of their flesh by means of torches which crept slowly along their bodies until death relieved them ; how others were sawed into pieces, care being taken to pour restorative cordials down their throats from time to time, lest they might die too quickly. It is difficult to form a judgment on the number of Christians who were martyred during these early Japanese persecutions. It is certain that more than two hundred missionaries died for the faith ; and the most authoritative writers assign two millions as the number of the secular champions (1). It would have been strange, indeed, if no thought of fighting for their religious liberty had ever been entertained by the Japanese Christians ; but so long as their priests were with them, this natural impulse was repressed in favor of resignation. However, in 1637, the province of Arima, from which either martyrdom or deportation had banished its spiritual guides, became the scene of a desperate insurrection. The surviving male adult Christians of that province, to the number of 37,000, with a prince of the ancient ruling family at their head, assailed and captured the stronghold of Shimabara. Immediately besieged by the *Shogun* with 80,000 disciplined soldiers, they resisted successfully until the Dutch Protestants furnished a park of artillery to the Pagans ; then they made a sortie, and all, to a man, perished on the field of battle. The final act of this drama of persecution which signalized the rule of Yemitsu, but by no means the last bloody sacrifice which Japanese

(1) For this and other matters connected with the history of Christianity in Japan, the best works for consultation are : ALEXANDER OF RHODES ; *History of the Life and Glorious Death of Five Fathers of the Society of Jesus, who Suffered in Japan with Three Seculars in 1643.* Paris, 1654. CHARLEVOIX ; *ubi supra.* BOUX ; *History of Twenty-six Martyrs in Japan.* Paris, 1860. FORCADE ; *The First Missionary in Japan in the Nineteenth Century.* Paris, 1876. MARBOT ; *Life of Mgr. Forcade.* Paris, 1887. LAUNAY ; *General History of the Society for Foreign Missions.* Paris, 1860. KOEMPFER ; *Natural, Civil, and Ecclesiastical History of the Empire of Japan.* Cologne, 1727. LEON PAGES, *History of the Christian Religion in Japan, from 1598 to 1655.* Paris, 1880. *The Persecution of Christians in Japan and the Japanese Embassy in Europe ; A Memorial Addressed to the French Constituent Assembly.* Paris, 1872. LAYBLE ; *The Imperial Restoration in Japan.* Paris, 1880. MARNAS ; *The Religion of Jesus Resuscitated in Japan in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century.* Lyons, 1896.

Paganism demanded from the "Perverse Religion," was presented in 1640. Four Portuguese ambassadors, with a suite of seventy-four persons, arrived at Nagasaki. In spite of their ambassadorial character, all were thrown into prison, and informed that a renunciation of the Catholic faith would alone save them from death. Decapitation was the fate of all, excepting the sailors of the vessels which had brought them, thirteen in number, who were spared in order that they might return to Macao with this warning to Catholic Christendom: "So long as the sun warms the earth, let no Christian dare to enter Japan! Whoever disregards this prohibition, even though he be the king of Spain, or the God of the Christians, or even the great Sakya-Muni himself (1), will lose his head!"

More than two centuries were to elapse, ere a Christian could enter Japan without the sacrifice of his life. No exception to this rule was made when the Dutch were allowed to retain their establishment in Deshima; for each one of these Protestants denied his faith in Our Redeemer by the first step he took on Japanese soil. In the eyes of the Japanese, veneration for the cross, as the instrument of the Passion of Jesus, was a prime characteristic of all Christians; and whenever the Japanese succeeded in making an apostate, they forced him to consummate his crime, and, as it were, to testify to his sincerity, by trampling on that same cross. No Dutchman could land in Japan without performing the *Je Fumi*, as this act of apostasy was termed; for on every wharf or other landing-place a cross was either painted or engraved, ever awaiting the sacrilegious foot of the renegade. Of course these Calvinists of Holland, who, like all other Protestants, affected horror because of the alleged Catholic doctrine of the permissibility of equivocation, defended their abominable concession to Mammon by the assertion that they did not *really* intend to deny Christ when they desecrated His cross. These defenders of a new casuistry knew that the Japanese Pagans, whether they themselves had conceived the idea, or had rather derived it from the Protestants, as the missionaries contended, regarded the *Je Fumi* as the

(1) Siddhartha, the great "Buddha."

seal of apostasy from Christianity. These pretended imitators of the primitive Christians knew that those confessors of the faith suffered death, rather than swear by the deity of Caesar—an oath which the Romans regarded as a profession of Paganism. These self-fancied experts in the Old Testament must have known that Eleazar preferred martyrdom to a life preserved by an act which, harmless in itself, would have been regarded by the Pagans as a denial of his God. And finally, if, unlike most Protestants, these Dutch Calvinists were well acquainted with the New Testament, with the sayings of Him whom they professed to regard as the Eternal Word, they must have known that He reprobated not only all who would deny Him formally, but also all who would be ashamed of Him (1). But the fact is that the Dutch Protestant traders in Japan did, for more than two centuries, deny Christ *most formally*, since they trampled on His image in order to convince the Japanese Pagans that they were not Christians, and that therefore they were worthy of domicilization in Japan. This fact is stubborn, and “will not down”; and hence it is that Kœmpfer (2), Haren (3), and other Dutch apologists of their renegade compatriots, gloss over the subject of the *Je Fumi*, when indeed they venture to mention it, and prefer to descant upon such matters as the dissensions between the various Religions Orders, to which misfortunes they sagely attribute the sufferings of the early Japanese Church. Kœmpfer, however, was constrained to avow that the Hollanders, in order to retain the commercial privileges which their treachery and profanity had stolen from the Spaniards and Portuguese, underwent the most abominable physical and spiritual debasements. Describing scenes which he himself witnessed, Kœmpfer says that the Hollanders, shut up in Deshima, and continually watched “as though they were the worst criminals in the world, are obliged to forego every kind of divine service on Sundays and solemn feast-days; to abstain from all psalm-singing and public prayer; to avoid all mention of the name of Christ in the presence of the natives; to eschew

(1) *Luke*, ix., 26.(2) *Ubi supra*, bk. iv., ch. 6.(3) *Historical Researches on the Condition of the Christian Religion in Japan*. Amsterdam, 1778.

every external mark of Christianity ; and, finally, to endure patiently and abjectly injuries which revolt persons who possess any refinement " (1).

During the two centuries when Japan was inexorably prohibited to the Catholic apostolate, many heroic souls succeeded in their endeavors to elude the vigilance of the Pagan authorities, at least so far as to enter the islands, and there lay down their lives as guarantees of an ultimate conquest by that Church, the blood of whose martyrs has ever been her most fruitful seed. Thus, in 1642, five Jesuits availed themselves of a vessel which the governor of the Philippines sent with reinforcements for the Spanish citadel in Formosa, which was then besieged by the Dutch. When the ship neared the Japanese coasts, the apostles induced the captain to land them on a small island in the Strait of Satsuma. The sufferings of these heroes, Fathers Rubino and Capecci, Italians ; Miciszki, a Pole ; Morales, a Spaniard ; and Marquez, a Portuguese ; together with those of three young laymen, two Portuguese and a Corean, who had joined them at Manila ; are described by Alexander of Rhodes, in accordance with the narratives detailed to him by Hollanders and Japanese eye-witnesses of the events. Not until they had endured seven months of horrible torture, agonies which remind us only of those which the Huguenots of the previous century had been wont to inflict on their Catholic victims (2), were they hung by their feet over a ditch filled with indescribable filth, and there, after from three to seven days of torments, allowed to breathe forth their souls to God (3). Shortly after these Christian champions had gone to their reward, five Jesuits landed in the Riu Kiu islands, then dependent on the principality of Satsuma. Four were priests ;

(1) *Loc. cit.*

(2) See our Vol. iii., p. 389.

(3) One of the torments merits particular mention. The victim was bound to a plank by ropes passing over every part of his body, excepting his left arm. This member was left free, so that if he concluded to apostatize, rather than suffer any more, he might signal his intention by laying his hand on his breast. Then the plank and its burden were laid on the ground. A funnel was forced down the throat of the martyr, and water was poured into him until his stomach would hold no more. Then another plank was laid over the upper part of the sufferer, and two men jumped upon it, thus forcing the water from every outlet of the quivering frame. This torture, which frequently resulted in immediate death, was inflicted on Rubino and his companions 105 times in the seven months of their martyrdom.

namely, two Spaniards called Maquez and Arojo, and two Italians named Chiara and Cassola. One, a Japanese called Andrew, was a lay brother. By order of the *Shogun*, the martyrdom of this band took place at Yedo; and it was effected by a slow sawing of the bodies into fragments, a Japanese physician being in attendance for the purpose of administering strengthening cordials, binding arteries, etc., so that death might not relieve the victims too readily. One episode of this martyrdom is interesting, as showing the estimation in which the Christianity of Protestants was held by the Japanese of that day. While the Jesuits were being conducted to Yedo, they were joined by ten Dutch mariners, who, having ventured to cast anchor at a port other than their privileged Deshima, were being also led to answer before the *Shogun*. The Dutch captain, Henry Cornelius Schaep, assisted at the examination and tortures of the Catholic martyrs; and it was from his narrative that Charlevoix (1) derived information of the facts which we now adduce. Schaep and his sailors were restored to liberty, and simply because they had convinced the Japanese that they were not Christians. During the entire journey to Yedo, said the captain, the foreigners were continually approached by natives who were curious to learn the nature of their religion. In order to discover this important fact, the questioners always placed their forefingers together in the form of a cross, and then kissing them, they asked the strangers to do likewise. When the Dutchmen refused, the natives cried: "Ah! Holland!" and departed satisfied. When the Hollanders were led into the presence of the *Daimio* of Hitachi, that prince also asked them whether they were Christians, telling them to kiss their crossed forefingers, if the answer was affirmative; and when they made signs indicative of horror for such an act, each of them received two cups of wine. Then the prince showed them a picture of the Madonna and Child; and when he saw that they manifested no signs of respect, "he laughed," said the captain, "and from that time the Dutchmen were treated most cordially, and received splendid presents."

(1) *Ubi supra*, bk. xix.

One of the most noteworthy of the missionary attempts to resume the task of Christianizing Japan, and especially interesting because of the light which a narrative of it sheds on the attitude of the Dutchmen of Deshima in face of Catholicism, is recorded in practically similar terms by Spanish (1), Dutch (2), and Japanese (3) authorities. The Japanese work, which we shall quote as it is cited by Marnas (4), is a circumstantial record of the interviews which the author, Arai Hakuseki, had with the martyr in the capacity of governmental examiner and interpreter. John Baptist Sidotti, a native of Palermo, and a secular priest, passed four years in the Philippines before he could procure the means of journeying to Japan, and to almost certain martyrdom. At length his apostolic zeal communicated itself to the soul of the governor of the Philippines, Don Domingos Zalbalburn Recheverri; and thorough son of Castilian Catholicism as he was, that officer equipped a ship at his own expense, and entrusted to Don Miguel de Eloriaga, the commander of the Spanish galleys in the Pacific, the duty of conveying Sidotti to the post which Heaven seemed to have decreed that he should occupy. On Oct. 12, 1708, Eloriaga placed the apostle on the island of Tanega-Shima. Almost immediately arrested, Sidotti was taken to Nagasaki; and the two governors, the princes of Arima and of Higo, summoned from the Dutch establishment in Deshima the superintendent, Gasper Van Mansdale, and several other Hollanders, that they might act as interpreters at the trial of the audacious Christian. From the details of this first trial of Sidotti we select one incident as peculiarly interesting. One of the Dutchmen, Douw by name, knew a little Latin; and as Sidotti's knowledge of Japanese was very limited, this Douw was told to put certain questions to him. A mat was placed by the side of the prisoner, and one of the governors signed to Douw to oc-

(1) *A Brief Narrative of the Arrival of Don J. B. Sidotti in the City of Manila*. Rome, 1718.

(2) VALENTYN; *A Short Account of What Passed in the Palaces of the Governors of Nagasaki, Arima, and Higo No Kami, Relative to a Roman Priest, J. B. Sidotti, Who Landed in Japan in the Year 1708*. Cited by Marnas.

(3) *Sei Yo Kebun (European History)*. Published in 1890 by an association of Japanese literary men.

(4) *Ubi supra*, Vol. i., p. 60, et seqq.

copy it; whereupon the Dutch Resident protested that it was an insult to all Hollanders, for whom Japan professed friendship, to put one of their number on an apparent equality with "a Papist." The governors assured the agent that no indignity was offered to the Dutch; that the present question was one concerning a service which they owed to the great sovereign of Japan. And the governors added that were Douw to sit in a more honorable position than that occupied by the Christian, the latter might refuse to answer the questions which they intended to put. After much debate, the mat of Douw was raised a couple of inches higher than that of the "Papist." Then followed the examination, and it was found that Sidotti was an Auditor of the Roman *Ruota*, forty years of age; that he had studied Japanese with the firm intention of endeavoring to convert the islanders to Christianity; that he still cherished that intention, and that with the help of God's grace he would persevere in it, even unto the last instant of his mortal life. He was then returned to his prison, and a report of the proceedings was sent to Yedo. Not until Oct. 28, 1709, did orders arrive for his conveyance to the court of the *Shogun*; and he made this journey of four hundred leagues, continually confined for five weeks in a *norimono* (1), suffering so fearfully from the cramped position, and from the consequent non-circulation of the blood, that during the remaining six years of his life he was unable to walk. When he had been placed on the floor before the commissioners of the *Shogun*, he could be retained in a sitting posture only by the aid of two soldiers. Three examinations were held during the month of December; and Hakuseki, the official interpreter, and the author of the *Sei Yo Kibun*, speaking of the impressions produced in his own mind by the attitude and replies of Sidotti, says: "From this examination I concluded that he was a superior man, one whose mind was endowed with a considerable amount of knowledge. His character was certainly that of a sincere, serious, calm, and self-denying man. There was in him one characteristic which greatly charmed me; he thanked me immediately for the most

(1) This is a kind of sedan-chair, so narrow and low-roofed that the passenger must perforce sit with his legs folded under his trunk.

trivial attention; his gentleness was that of a sage." In fact, Hakuseki conceived a sincere affection for the Christian priest; and whereas the Protestant Dutchmen had contributed their utmost to send him to the most horrible of tortures and of deaths, the Pagan official endeavored to save him from all punishment. Hakuseki tells us that he addressed to the *Shogun* a memorial which terminated with these words: "I would advise that this Christian be instructed concerning the severity of the laws of our country; and that after he shall have been warned as to the fate which must overtake the foreigner who lands on our shores, he be allowed to return to Luçon by the first ship which arrives at Nagasaki from Canton." Probably it was this memorial which caused the *Shogun* to decree that Sidotti should be merely imprisoned for life. Five years were now passed by the martyr in what was, if we reflect on Japanese ideas of consideration for prisoners, comparative comfort; but in 1714, two of his jailers, a man and a woman, whom he had converted and baptized, were seized by a desire for martyrdom, and proclaimed their Christianity to the authorities. Then, as the Dutch author already cited testifies, the Christian champion was thrust into a hole in the ground, four or five feet in depth; over this species of cell was placed a cover, an aperture in which allowed the passage of sufficient air to prevent immediate suffocation, and through which a modicum of abominable food was passed at rare intervals. Not until Dec. 15, 1715, did Sidotti obtain his martyr's crown.

For more than two centuries after the too successful persecution by Yemitsu, material for sad but hopeful speculation was furnished by the question, so often propounded to each other by the Catholic missionaries in China and India, as to whether there were still any Christians in Japan. Of course it was impossible that the fulness of the faith should have been preserved by a people who were deprived of the priesthood. There had been very few native priests in Japan; and when the last of these died, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass became a matter of tradition. But it was not impossible that out of the two millions of Catholics whom Yeyasu began to exterminate, there should have survived

many who would have continued to practice in secret all the Christian offices which laymen could practice without the intervention of the priesthood; and certainly these Christians would have baptized their offspring, and would have transmitted a more or less accurate knowledge of Christian doctrine to a remote posterity. The opinion of very many missionaries was expressed by Mgr. Imbert, vicar-apostolic of Corea, when he wrote in 1838: "If Corea is the object of my chief care, it does not absorb all my thoughts. I often turn my desires and hopes to the shores of Japan. I often picture to myself some scattered surviving remnants of the olden Japanese Church, living in the forests or on the mountains whither their ancestors fled; invoking in the silence and obscurity of their retreat the God whom they cannot adore publicly; and yearning for the happy time when the blood of their martyred forefathers will have become the seed of new Christians, for the day when some ministers of peace will bring again to their land the tidings of great joy" (1). Mgr. Imbert, together with the Abbés Maubant and Chastan (2), was martyred in Seoul on Sept. 21, 1839; but had he lived a few years longer, he would have found that his conjectures were well founded. On March 17, 1865, the Abbé Petitjean, one of the two priests who then officiated in the recently constructed church of The Twenty-Six Martyrs in Nagasaki, noticed a group of twelve or fifteen Japanese of both sexes, strangers to him, standing before the closed door of the sacred edifice, and manifesting far more respect than curiosity. Opening the door, the Abbé walked up the aisle of the church, followed by the strange natives; and when, having arrived at the rail of the sanctuary, he genuflected before the Blessed Sacrament, he was astonished when three of the women, about fifty years of age, knelt by his side. Praying to Our Lord to inspire him with words which would touch efficaciously these apparently willing hearts, the missionary arose. Suddenly one of the women, her hand over her heart, came close to him, and with a look around the church as though she feared that the walls would

(1) Letter to the *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, Vol. xiii., p. 165.

(2) All three were subjects of the Seminary for Foreign Missions in Paris.

hear her, whispered: "All of these persons have hearts just like your own"—a Japanese method of expressing that their faith was the same as that of the priest. "Where do you come from?" asked Petitjean. "From Urakami," was the reply; "in Urakami nearly all have the same hearts that we have." Then the woman asked: "*Sancta Maria no gozowa doko*—Where is the image of Holy Mary?" Whatever doubts the abbé may have entertained concerning the identity of his visitors, they were dissipated by this mention of the holy name of the Mother of God. He signed to those whom he now recognized as descendants of the primitive Japanese Christians, indicating that they should follow him. Together, shepherd and the remains of a flock which had been dispersed two centuries ago, they all knelt before the altar dedicated to the honor of Mary; and we may imagine the joy of Petitjean, when he heard the exclamations: "Yes, yes! This is indeed the Holy Mary! See! She holds in her arms *On ko Jesus Sama*—her august Son, Jesus!" Then there were many interchanges of ideas between the priest and the strangers concerning the *Deus Sama*, the *Jesus Sama*, and the *Sancta Maria Sama* (1). The image of the Infant Jesus reminded the simple souls of the Feast of the Nativity, which they celebrated in the eleventh month. One of them remarked to the abbé: "We keep the feast of *On Aruji* (2), *Jesus Sama*, on the twenty-fifth day of the *Shimo Tsuki* (3). It has been handed down to us that at midnight on that day Jesus was born in a stable; that afterward He grew up in poverty and suffering; and that when He was thirty-three years old, He died on a cross for our salvation. Just now we are in the time of sorrow—*kanashimi no setsu*: do you observe that solemnity?" Petitjean understood that his questioner meant the season of Lent; and he replied that then the Christian world was at the seventeenth day of *kanashimi no setsu*. Soon the visitors began to talk of St. Joseph, whom they termed *O Jesus Sama no yo-fu*—"the putative father of Jesus." While this

(1) In Japanese, the word *Sama* is an honorific term, equivalent to Sir, My Lord, Monsieur, or Madame.

(2) The Master, The Lord.

(3) The Month of the Hoar Frosts.

conversation was being held, some other Japanese entered the church ; and the first callers, having observed them, tried to hide themselves. But almost immediately they returned to the priest, saying that there was no need of fear ; that they had recognized the newcomers as men from their own town, and that all had hearts like their own. However, they said they ought to depart, since at any moment governmental officers or other Pagans might enter the church. The reader must know that although several ports of Japan had been opened to foreign commerce by the treaties of 1858, and although Christian churches had been tolerated soon afterward in those ports for the accommodation of foreigners, many years were to elapse, ere a Japanese would be free to profess the "perverse religion" (1). Therefore the abbé bade an affectionate farewell to his guests, after having obtained from them a promise that they would visit him as soon as possible. But on the following day, and on many successive days, other bands of "old Christians" prostrated themselves at the altar of *Jesus Sama*; the news of their interview with the Christian priest had been spread throughout the valley of Urakami by the first callers. From letters which, in the form of a diary, the Abbé Petitjean wrote at this period to his superiors of the Seminary for Foreign Missions, and which are cited by Marnas, we gather some interesting particulars concerning the intercourse between these zealous souls and their newly-found pastors. On March 18, the abbé writes: "From ten in the morning until night these bands succeed each other. The Japanese officers, alarmed by this extraordinary attendance, send one of their number into the church every quarter of an hour." On March 19, he says: "Same concourse as yesterday. Many Japanese remain in the church, even at Mass, and among them I can recognize our Christians. By fours or fives, as they come to venerate the crucifix, I teach them how to make the Sign of the Cross, for they have been accustomed to make it by marking a cross

(1) Even as late as 1858, as Petitjean learned in 1866, these same "old Christians" of Urakami had been visited by dire persecution. Eighty had been arrested because of their Christian practices, and of these, thirty were thrust into prison. During the next two years the mangled bodies of ten of them were cast into the pit reserved for dead criminals; but were secretly removed by the relatives, and respectfully interred. The twenty others were finally discharged; and their condition corroborated their story of their treatment.

with the right thumb on the forehead and the breast (1). They always ask our names, telling us that their names are Petoro (from *Pedro*), Paolo, Jiwano (from *Juan*), Domingo, etc." On March 20, he writes: "The number of visitors increases; the whole quarter is thunderstruck; the officers have mounted guard around the church. As yesterday, so to-day, we refrain from showing ourselves in the church, since the least imprudence would compromise these poor creatures. When perchance we can send them a word, we tell them to return to-morrow, that the officers are watching them. One mother of a family replied: 'We shall come to-morrow—I, my husband, and my children. Meanwhile, pray for us. If you please, remember our names; my husband is called Paolo, my son here is Petoro, and I am named Marina.'" On March 21: "The officers are still on the watch. Christians and Pagans are mixed together in crowds. We recognize the former by their laying their right hands on their breasts, whenever they catch our eyes. We tell them to come only once in a fortnight, so that they may not expose themselves to the vengeance of the government. They understand that their lives are at stake, but their zeal in seeking us is invincible." On March 22: "Our Christians have undoubtedly heeded our recommendations, for they now come in smaller numbers; and hence the officers either stay away, or come without their swords. We have been able to talk with a few of our friends, and have appointed to meet them to-morrow on a mountain near the city. We hope to satisfy ourselves then on certain points; for instance, as to whether these 'old Christians' have preserved the integrity of the form of Baptism. And have they preserved a knowledge of the essential mysteries of Christian faith? Do they say their prayers regularly? Of course we shall be unable to effect all that we wish to-morrow; but unless a sabre-stroke overtakes us, the neighboring mountains and forests will enable us hereafter to continue the work." On March 23: "We have returned from

Besides repeated floggings and continual semi-starvation, they had endured such torments as skinning of the hands, removal of the finger-nails, and crushing with rocks.

(1) Such is and was the Spanish and Portuguese fashion: therefore their tradition was at least two centuries old.

our rendezvous. Only one of our friends was there, but he gave us very important information. In spite of persecution, Urakami has never ceased to contain many Christians; Holy Baptism has been regularly administered; Sundays and feast-days have been observed. They pray to God; and they invoke the Blessed Virgin, their guardian-angels, and their patron-saints. Paolo, my informant, has promised to introduce me, next Thursday, to the 'baptizer' (1) of Urakami in a house which is visited freely by Europeans, and the master of which is a Christian. Last year we were there with the Abbé Girard and Furet; but we little knew that the family was Christian. When I mentioned this fact to Paolo, he replied: 'We saw you often in our village and in the city; but we did not know that you were priests, until you had built your church.' When we returned from this meeting with Paolo, we found a large crowd of Christians waiting to enter the church, for we had closed the doors when we departed. There were also on hand many officers, but they had no swords. The cunning fellows would like to repeat the game of Yokohama (2); but they will be shrewd, indeed, if they detect us in public preaching. Of course the governor is very much pleased with me, because of the lessons in French which I give in his college during two hours of every day; but I believe that were I to preach to the people, he would sacrifice me to his inveterate hatred of Christianity. Why should I take the risk, when there are many of the faithful, to whom I can minister secretly?

(1) In every community of these "old Christians," one or more persons of more than ordinary intelligence and integrity were entrusted with the duty of baptizing the newly born.

(2) In 1861, the Abbé Girard of the Seminary for Foreign Missions, who had been recognized by the Japanese government as a Catholic priest and as the official interpreter of the French consul-general, was informed that in many parts of the empire there were groups of families who were descendants of certain apostate Christians of the olden time. These families had retained a certain knowledge of the Christian faith, and the real Christians supposed them to be "of the same heart as themselves," while in reality they were employed by the government as decoys to entrap the votaries of the "perverse religion." Marnas says that this report was never confirmed; but whether it was true or not, Girard, as Superior of the Japanese Mission, determined to endeavor to communicate with some of these descendants of apostates, hoping that he might find one or more repentant souls among them. There was little reason for this hope; for enmity is a powerful foe to religious sentiment, and in every city and village of the empire the public placards still announced a reward of 300 taels to every denouncer of a Japanese Christian. Girard thought that his end would be best served by the erection of churches, wherever permission could

Twelve leagues from Nagasaki there is another village of Christians, although less populous than Urakami; and perhaps we may discover many others, when we penetrate further into the country." During the following month of May, the two priests in Nagasaki discovered several communities of "old Christians." A young man named Gaspard Yosaku, newly arrived from the Goto islands, attracted by the crowd which was entering the church, satisfied his curiosity by making one of the number; and when he saw the cross, and the statue of Mary, he knew that he was in a church of the *Kirishitan*, and hastened to pay his respects to the priests. He told them that his family was originally from Nagasaki, and had fled from persecution, two centuries previously; that they had preserved the faith inviolably, and that there were a thousand Christians on the island where he dwelt. A few days after this discovery, while Petitjean was praying before the altar of Mary, two fathers of families approached him with the usual declaration that their hearts were like his own, and said: "We come from a village which is ten leagues from Nagasaki, and we have made a long detour, in order to outwit the police. In our mountains there are fifteen hundred Christians; but we have no images or other religious objects, the government having destroyed them all. So please give us some, that we may be helped to pray." On May 15, at break of day, there arrived a deputation from the

be obtained, for the use of the resident Catholic foreigners. Through the influence of the French consul-general, he erected a neat little church in Yokohama, and it was dedicated on Jan. 12, 1862. Writing to the directors of the Seminary for Foreign Missions on Feb. 25, Girard said: "During the past month nearly a thousand Japanese have visited our chapel every day. Suddenly our joy was turned into consternation. While leaving our precincts, thirty-three of our hearers were seized, bound, and imprisoned. Nevertheless, on the following day there was a great number of Japanese in the church. Twenty-two of these were also arrested; and then there was a general panic. We had recourse to M. de Bellecourt (the French Minister); and His Excellency held a long conference with the Japanese authorities. These gentlemen denied nothing, excused nothing; they plainly declared that the Japanese in question had violated a fundamental law of their country, and that they would experience its utmost severity. After much disputation, the governor said that some compromise might be effected, if I would promise never to preach again in Japanese. M. de Bellecourt knew perfectly well that he could not make such a promise in my name; but he visited me personally, and asked me whether I could not make some concessions, in order to save the lives of the prisoners. I replied that we would accord everything excepting an abdication of our divine right to preach the Gospel. . . . On March 1, M. de Bellecourt informed me that he had obtained the freedom of our prisoners; and that in order to show some conciliatory disposition to the Japanese government, he had agreed to request me to abstain from preaching in the language of the country."

Christians of the island of Kaminoshima, headed by their "baptizer." This man pronounced distinctly the words which he used when administering the Sacrament of Regeneration, and the form was found to be valid. He said that his co-religionists frequently recited the Rosary; and that the Act of Contrition was familiar to them, being invariably pronounced at the hour of death. He was curious to know the name of the "Great Priest" who was then the "Grand Head of the Kingdom of Rome." When about to depart, the "baptizer" asked, with an air of timidity: "Have you any children?" Petitjean answered: "The good God has given to us all your countrymen as our children. Other children we cannot have; for just like the first priests who came to Japan, we are bound to celibacy." Then the entire company fell on their knees, and having touched the ground with their foreheads, they exclaimed: "*Virgen degosaru! O arigato! O arigato!*"—They are virgins! Thanks! Thanks!" The simple souls had heard that a few weeks previously, some of the Christians of Urakami, visiting Nagasaki, had noticed a cross on top of the recently-built Protestant temple, and imagining that the building was their long-desired place of worship, had entered, but only to be quickly undeceived. The preacher received them enthusiastically, and urged them to bring their wives for instruction in the religion of Christ; but unfortunately the poor man added that his wife would be very glad to meet the Japanese ladies. The remark showed that the dominie was of religious stock very different from that of St. Francis Xavier and his successors; and the men of Urakami bade him farewell. Petitjean learned afterward that the "old Christians" had another infallible method of discovering whether they should pronounce an ostensibly Christian system a sham or the Church of Christ. They would ask every missionary whom they met for the first time: "Have the Great Kingdom of Rome and your kingdom the same heart? Have you been sent by the Great Head of the Kingdom of Rome?" On May 17, another Christian village, situated in the mountains near Nagasaki, sent a deputation, begging for a visit from the priests. On June 8 Petitjean wrote to Girard that he knew of twenty

Christian communities, and that he had communicated with seven "baptizers." He wished Girard, as his superior, to determine as to the advisability of attempting some kind of organization in these scattered flocks; but he was advised to be content, for the present, with such secret meetings as could be held. We have remarked that Petitjean had observed that the proper form of Baptism had been perpetuated among such of the "old Christians" as he had met. But in the latter part of 1865, he found that in the island of Kuroshima the form was at least defective, and that in the Goto archipelago it was very often absolutely invalid. The "baptizers" were carefully instructed as to their duties, and conditional baptism was given in every case where there was the least probability of its necessity. The question of marriage among the "old Christians" caused much anxiety and trouble to the missionaries. Many of the "old Christians," following the example of their Pagan compatriots, who regarded marriage as neither a civil nor a religious act, had discarded their legitimate wives, and entered into other unions. "It was reserved to us," wrote M. Petitjean, "to teach them that marriage is a Sacrament. According to the custom of Japan, marriage is dissoluble, at the will of the parties; and our (old) Christians, whose lives are often impregnated with Paganism, conform too frequently to such usages. Already two men have come to us, and having explained their situation, have asked what they should do, in order to save their souls. One of them will separate from his illegitimate spouse; but the other will not be obliged to make such a sacrifice, since his first companion and he were debarred from marriage by the prohibitive degrees of consanguinity. We fear that other cases, not so easy of solution, are before us." It was soon made evident that one fourth of the marriages among the "old Christians" were invalid, either because of previous unions, or because of disregard of the impediments of consanguinity or affinity.

On August 9, 1866, the Abbé Casenave, procurator of the Society for the Foreign Missions at Shanghai, arrived at Nagasaki, bearing to the Abbé Petitjean the pontifical Bull for his promotion to the episcopate, and his appointment as

Vicar-Apostolic of Japan. The new prelate was consecrated on Oct. 21 at Hong Kong by Mgr. Guillemin, Vicar-Apostolic of Canton, and he returned immediately to Japan. Debarking at Yokohama, in order that he might consult with M. Roches, the French Minister, who had captivated the esteem of the *Shogun*, Mgr. Petitjean was encouraged by the assurance that "if the Christians of Japan were disturbed, they might rely on the protection of the Minister of France." And M. Roches added that he had good reason for belief that complete religious toleration would soon reign in the entire empire. Nine months had elapsed since this remark of the Minister, when the newly resuscitated Church was visited by an open persecution which, although not so murderously violent as those of the seventeenth century, would certainly have annihilated it, had it been a human institution. During the night of July 14, 1867, the chapels of Urakami were pillaged and destroyed by emissaries of the government, and sixty-four of the principal Christians were thrust into prison; the authorities alleging as an excuse for this violence the refusal of the Christians to allow bonzes to conduct Christian funerals with Pagan rites. A few days afterward, 110 Christians of the province of Oruma were also arrested. In the beginning of October, the representative of the *Shogun* at Nagasaki announced to M. Léques, the Consul of France, that because of the intercession of the French Minister, the Christian prisoners were to be released (1). But before the mandate was obeyed, a supreme effort was put forth for the purpose of procuring the apostasy of all the unfortunates. Thirty had already signified their readiness to do anything for the sake of release from their abode of torture; and chicanery was adopted as a means for the conquest of the others. On Oct. 5, the prisoners were led into the presence of the governor, and they were told that they would be freed, if they signed this avowal: "This is a public admission that we recognize the prohibition, by public authority, of the foreign religion which we have followed" (2). The Abbé

(1) The promise had been given when M. Roches first protested; that is, immediately after the arrest.

(2) "O Kamino koshowa itsu shinkowo mojosuru tokorewo konotabi O Kamiyori meshisayeno kiwo o soreiru tono kohode gosarimasen."

Cousin, writing to the Seminary for Foreign Missions on Oct. 12, tells us how this equivocal formula was received. It was signed by the thirty who had already practically apostatized; the others remained firm until they were subjected to torture. One alone, Domingo Zen-yemon, the "baptizer" of Urakami, was indomitable. But immediately after their liberation, thirty-eight of these weak creatures proceeded to the house of the governor, and protesting that they had "apostatized only with their tongues," insisted that they were ready to die for their faith. A few days afterward, ten others wished to follow their example, but they were not allowed to see the governor. Nearly all the apostates soon begged to be reconciled with the Church; but as guards were placed before each of their houses, they were unable to meet the priests. Writing to the directors of the Seminary for Foreign Missions, the Abbé Laucaigne said: "I cannot understand how such souls could have apostatized; they must have been mad for a moment, for now they seem to be strong indeed. By the advice of Zen-yemon, they fast every Friday." In a few weeks the unfortunates were relieved from surveillance, and were at once received again into the Church. When the Shogunate had been abolished (Jan., 1868), many Christians opined that the imperial restoration would be signalized by at least a negative amelioration of their lot; that the government of the Mikado would close its eyes to the progress which the Church was making among the natives. But in April the foreign Ministers, then resident in Yokohama, read the following edict, which had been affixed to the gates of the city, and which, according to a notification by the Supreme Council, was to be made known "in even the most insignificant villages of the empire": "Since the abominable religion of the Christians is severely prohibited, every person is obliged to denounce all suspected individuals to the competent authorities. A reward will be given for every denunciation" (1). The following circular,

(1) The scale of rewards for informers had been fixed by an edict issued in the First Year of Shotoku, Fifth Month (June, 1711), and now preserved in the Museum of Tokio. For the denunciation of a *Pater* (word derived from *Pater*, the title of a priest) was given 500 pieces of silver. For the denunciation of an *Irman* (word derived from the Spanish *Hermano*, a "Brother"), 300 pieces. For the denunciation of a "Relapsed," that is, of

published on June 7, by the Supreme Council in reference to the Christians of Urakami, will serve as a specimen of the orders which were given in regard to all the Christian communities: "In spite of the many severe prohibitory edicts issued during the course of centuries by the Shogunal government, Christianity has not yet been extirpated. It has been learned that among the inhabitants of Urakami, a town near Nagasaki, the number of the secret professors of this religion is increasing every day. In this emergency, His Majesty, moved by sentiments of benevolence and humanity, has ordered as follows: Since this religion has been long prohibited in the empire, the *Daimios*, into whose jurisdiction these individuals will be deported, must endeavor, when they have said persons in their hands, to bring them to a sense of their duty as subjects by instruction and paternal exhortation; but all the rigors of the law must be visited on those who do not submit. A list of the most obstinate must be sent to the Supreme Council. None of the deported, unless they show signs of repentance, shall have any communication with the regular inhabitants. The local authorities will employ the deported in agriculture, or at the oil wells, or in the mines, or in any other manual labor, as may appear most profitable. The deported must reside in villages on the mountains. They will be sent in lots from Nagasaki, and the *Daimios* will have commissioners at the points of disembarkation to receive their respective quotas." The accompanying lists of the names of places whither the deported were to be conveyed show that the designated unfortunates numbered 4,010, but in reality the victims were 3,404. Some of these were taken to their destinations immediately, but most of them were not deported until 1870. All, excepting the few who apostatized, endured the painful exile and still greater horrors until 1873 (1). When the survivors were allowed to return to

an apostate who had afterward repented, and had been reconciled with the Church, 300 pieces. For the denunciation of a simple Christian, 100 pieces. If the denouncer, however, was himself a Christian, he received 500 pieces.

(1) Marnas devotes a chapter to the tortures suffered by these Christians of Urakami. The favorite method of furthering apostasy was to keep the victim for one or two hours in a pool of ice-cold water. When he was pulled out, his comrades were charitably allowed to huddle around him, and to try to restore his vitality by pressing him to their own comparatively warm bodies.

their desolated Urakami, a census made by their pastor, the Abbé Lemaréchal, showed that one fourth of the original number had died, victims of torture, or of starvation, or of brutal taskmasters, or of all combined.

Four days before the departure of the famous Japanese embassy which was sent on Dec. 22, 1871, to the United States and Europe in order to procure a revision of the treaties which were then expiring, sixty more Christians were deported from Nagasaki. Nevertheless, one of the consequences of this embassy was a resolution, on the part of the government of the Mikado, to take, as it afterward expressed the idea, "one step on the road toward religious toleration." Since the beginning of the modern persecution, there had been no time when the misnamed Christian Powers of the West could not have brought it to an end. The indifference of these ostensibly Christian governments is generally ascribed to the fact that they took interest in Japan only so far as their commercial relations were concerned; but probably the real reason for their inaction is to be found in the fact that a persecution of Catholics did not excite those heretical or Masonic sympathies which respond so readily when Oriental heretics bring infinitely less trouble on themselves. The only powers which were able to exercise any influence over Japan were France, England, the United States, and Russia. The inveterate hatred of "Orthodox" Russia for the Holy See caused her to at least smile at any sign of apparent failure on the part of the great converter of the heathen. The foreign policies of England and the United States are directed by men whose energies, when occasion is born, are invariably exercised in favor of any cause which promises to injure the Church. As for France, the land of St. Louis and of the Maid, since 1830 each one of her governments has been a Masonic creation. However, we do not assert that the representatives of the Western Powers in Japan were always frankly indifferent to the sufferings of the Japanese Christians; we know that on several occasions they tenderly reminded the imperial authorities that religious intolerance was not in accordance with that Western civilization which the Japanese were try-

ing to assimilate. But they never presented a determined front in the face of the chicanery and the frequently absolute mendacity of the Japanese government; and every interposition on their part was as much of a comedy as was that conference which was held on Feb. 9, 1870, between the representatives of France, England, the United States, and Holland, and the imperial Ministers, Sawa and Terashima. When this conference dissolved, Sir Harry Parkes on the part of England, Max. Outrey on the part of France, C. E. De Long on the part of the United States, and M. Von Brandt on the part of Holland, signed the following document: "The Japanese government having declared that serious troubles have been caused because certain missionaries have preached outside the limits of the reservation, and said government having declared that this proceeding furnished one of the reasons because of which it deemed the deportation of the native Christians in the neighborhood of Nagasaki a political necessity; therefore the representatives of the foreign powers do not hesitate to announce that they themselves, in their own name, will use every possible means to prevent the foreign missionaries from repeating their action, and that the representatives of the powers will punish the said missionaries if they persist—(*qu'ils les puniront, s'ils y persistent*)". Such pusillanimity was not shared, however, by the peoples of Europe. When the Japanese ambassadors had finished their consultations with the Cabinet of Washington concerning a future treaty of commerce, they departed for England on Oct. 31, 1872. On their arrival, they found that the public mind was debating whether the British government ought not to profit by the occasion to insist upon a cessation of religious persecution in Japan, even though the victims were Catholics. Lord Ebury, president of the Council of the Evangelical Alliance, presented a memorial, answering this question in the affirmative, to Lord Granville, the Minister for Foreign Affairs (1). It was in France, however, that the ambassadors were first made

(1) Granville charged Sir Harry Parkes, because of his long experience in Japan, with the duty of framing a report on the condition of the native Christians. The report was an attempt to extenuate the guilt of the Japanese government, simply because the persecution was "a legacy from past ages."—*China Telegraph*, Feb. 9, 1872.

to realize that the honors heaped upon them only accentuated the deep humiliation felt by the Catholics of Europe because of the supineness of their governments in face of the sufferings of their co-religionists. Léon Pagès had just published his eloquent and masterly memorial entitled *The Persecution of the Christians in Japan, and the Japanese Embassy in Europe*; and the great heart of Catholic France, just then encouraged by the temporary reaction against the maxims of the Commune, was asking itself whether France had indeed abandoned her traditional position as protectress of the foreign missions. The sentiments of the immense majority of Frenchmen were voiced in the National Assembly when, in the session of Dec. 7, 1872, Count Desbassayns de Richemont directed the attention of the deputies to the lamentable condition of the Japanese Catholics (1), and elicited from Count Charles de Remusat, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the assurance that the French government would use all its influence to procure religious toleration in the island empire. The promise was fulfilled; and to add to the impression produced on the mind of the ambassadors, when they arrived in the capital of Catholic Belgium, their carriages were continually followed by multitudes of the

(1) The speech of M. de Richemont merits remembrance. "Gentlemen, one of our honorable colleagues drew our attention yesterday to certain lamentable occurrences on the eastern coast of Africa; and he called on the Minister of Marine to instruct the French officers commanding in those waters to come to an understanding with the English cruisers, in order to put an end to a crime against humanity. I allude to the slave-trade. Now I would ask permission to address an analogous question to the Minister for Foreign Affairs; I would speak of facts which are not less lamentable than the slave-trade. Facts which, I am sure, will excite the attention of this entire assembly to a humanitarian question of the first importance. You know, gentlemen, that one of the most immovable empires of the Far East, the empire of Japan, has recently presented an extraordinary spectacle, throwing off suddenly and at once its lethargy of centuries, abandoning the absolute exclusiveness which has been the special characteristic of its policy, and manifesting a taste—we may call it a passion—for the civilization of the West. And not only has Japan sought to adopt our arts and inventions; she has asked the most prominent of the civilized nations in both hemispheres—France, England, and the United States—to send to her their scientists, jurists, professors, etc., and those nations have responded to the request. In every part of Japan, schools have been opened, old laws have been modified, chairs of public law have been founded; and even our fashions in dress have been introduced. We could only applaud this transformation, gentlemen, if that same empire did not, at the same time, exhibit to us a most unexpected contrast, a painfully scandalous scene. Until to-day we were accustomed to think that persecutions of Christians occurred only in the olden time, or among barbarians. Who would have thought that we were to behold the practice of persecution associated with the practices of modern progress? Who would have imagined that the same dispatch would inform us of the opening of a railroad, and

faithful who demanded justice for their brethren in the Land of the Rising Sun. The ambassadors were men of consummate ability and of great experience; and two of them, Iwakura Tomomi and Okubo Toshimichi, courageously abandoned their prejudices which had been consecrated by many centuries of possession, and advised the government of the Mikado to liberate all the Christian confessors. The news of this change of sentiment on the part of such influential statesmen caused joyful anticipations to be entertained by the clergy in Japan. At Yokohama, each morning after his Mass the Abbé Pettier would walk out in order to see whether the placards against "the perverse religion" were still in position; and finally, on March 31, 1873, Mgr. Petitjean was able to write to the Abbé Osouf, procurator for the Society of the Foreign Missions at Hong Kong, that the denunciations had disappeared. The Christians who were still in prison or in exile were allowed to return to their homes. However, it soon transpired that the Japanese government did not regard its present leniency as other than "a step toward toleration." Such were its words to the French representative; and in its notice to the prefects to remove the obnoxious placards, it stated that "those denunciations were no

of a persevering torment of men whose sole crime was their adoration of Jesus Christ? . . . These facts are so eloquent, gentlemen, that they need no comment. I merely remind the Assembly that Japan, properly desirous of obtaining a place among civilized nations, is just now sending a formal embassy to various European powers. I have deemed the present an opportune occasion for a request to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, as to whether he can furnish any light on the facts which I have had the honor of laying before the Assembly; as to whether any diplomatic proceedings in regard to them have been held; and finally, as to whether the Minister does not perceive that the advent of the Japanese embassy furnishes an excellent opportunity for the voice of France to be heard in regard to a most painful state of affairs. Gentlemen, you will not contradict me, when I say that France has ever been, and is still, despite her recent misfortune, the first among Christian nations. . . . The French tribune has always defended the persecuted; and I believe that I simply express the thought of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, when I proclaim that in every crisis and under any form of government whatever, France will never resign to another that protection which probably forms the most honorable page in her history." This discourse was greeted, according to the *Journal Officiel*, by hearty plaudits from all the members excepting those of the radical Extreme Left; and the reply of Count de Remusat, on the part of the government, recognized the truth of all that M. de Richemont had advanced. In conclusion, the Minister said: "Nothing indicates that this embassy has any other object than a study of our arts, railroads, telegraphs, and other inventions of this century. But besides teaching these valuable things to the Japanese, besides initiating them into all the benefits of modern civilization, we shall neglect no occasion of causing the return of the ambassadors to be signalized by the acquisition, on the part of the Japanese populations, of that which is much more precious—an appreciation of humanity and toleration."

longer necessary, since their tenor was sufficiently known to the people."

By a decree of May 22, 1876, the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda divided Japan into two vicariates-apostolic. The northern vicariate, comprising Yeso and the adjacent islands, and the northern part of Nippon, including the provinces of Echizen, Mino, and Owari, was assigned to Mgr. Osouf, a native of Coutances in France, and director of the Seminary for Foreign Missions in Paris (1). The second vicariate, including the rest of the empire, was entrusted to Mgr. Petitjean, who had been sole vicar since 1866. One of the first consequences of the comparative, although precarious, freedom now enjoyed by the missionaries, and certainly the most momentous and most consoling of all, was the need of more apostles of the faith throughout the empire. Fortunately there were many zealous souls ready to respond to the call emitted by Mgrs. Osouf and Petitjean. God had designed that the resuscitation of that faith which had been planted in Japan by the sons of Sts. Ignatius, Dominic, and Francis, should be effected by secular priests, and by priests who were Frenchmen (2). We have seen how the French Society for Foreign Missions entered Japan through the breach which had been opened by St. Francis Xavier; and to-day that Society continues to respect its traditions. Thanks to the missionary spirit which ever has been a pre-eminent characteristic of the French clergy and the French Catholicity, the Society for Foreign Missions could rest assured that Japan would never cry in vain for priests, so long as France remained France; but history, as well as *a priori* reasoning, shows that a native clergy is necessary for the perpetuation of a work which foreign priests have initiated. Immediately after the discovery of the remnants of the olden

(1) From 1850 to 1875 he had been procurator of the Society at Singapore and at Hong Kong.

(2) In the early days of the resuscitation, the Christian religion was called by the Japanese Pagans "The Religion of the French." The Abbé Marin, director of the school established by the French Sisters of Saint-Maur at Tokio, narrates how a young Japanese officer whom he accompanied on a visit of inspection through Northern Japan, and whom he converted, was seized by a mortal sickness; and how, when he could no longer talk, he asked for writing materials with a gesture, and then, as a servant held his wrist, he traced the words: "God! France!" and expired.

Japanese Church, and when his relations with them were perforce secret and infrequent, Mgr. Petitjean had surrounded himself with a number of intelligent young Christians, who, while passing for his servants in the minds of the Pagans, were being educated by the Abbé Laucaigne. Soon afterward the Abbé Cousin formed a class of ten other lads, all of whom had signified a desire to become priests; and in 1868, when the storm of persecution began to rage, he succeeded in transferring them to the college established by his Society in Pinang, in China. In 1870 the Abbé Laucaigne conveyed his band of students, now thirteen in number, to the same institution; and he took with them a Japanese scholar of eminence who would impart to them a full knowledge of the literature of their country. Nor had the prescient missionary neglected to bring also five Japanese printers for the purpose of producing books treating of Christian doctrine and devotion in their own language. All of these students suffered much from sickness in China; four died, but the others returned as priests to Japan in due time. Meanwhile Mgr. Petitjean had opened a little seminary in Tokio; and in 1874 another was founded in Nagasaki. In 1882 the seminary in Tokio contained only twelve students, but that of Nagasaki counted seventy. Speaking of the sacerdotal spirit of the first Japanese priests, the Abbé Marnas reminds us that experience has demonstrated that it is very difficult to lead the sons of converted Pagans to the priesthood. "They have in their blood a something which must necessarily be eradicated; and it is an admitted fact that those of them who aspire to the altar should have come from at least two or three generations of Christian ancestors, if they are to be priests in the depths of their souls." But, adds the experienced missionary, "thanks to the faith of the primitive native confessors of Japan—a faith which was transmitted from father to son during more than two centuries—the formation of a native clergy was not a futile attempt" (1). Many of the seminarians had shared the imprisonment and other sufferings of their parents for the faith; and they were not only pious,

(1) *Ubi supra*, Vol. II., p. 479.

but fond of study. They were not allowed to neglect the study of their own classics ; and it was only when they had learned to speak Latin with facility, that they were introduced to the study of philosophy, theology, and history. It was at the midnight Mass of the Christmas of 1881 in the Church at Nagasaki that, for the first time in two hundred years, a Japanese deacon preached a sermon to his compatriots ; and in the following year this deacon and two others were raised to the priesthood, thus inaugurating the body of zealous native ecclesiastics who will soon furnish the future bishops of the resuscitated Japanese Church.

The cessation of all active persecution of the Christians had worked no change in the position of Buddhism and Shintoism in Japan. These two religions were still recognized as institutions of the state, were supported by the public purse, and in return, were supervised, both as to doctrine and as to discipline, by the civil authority. This official recognition enabled the Buddhist bonzes and the Shintoist *kannushi* to molest the Christians, especially in the matter of funerals ; and in 1884 the government of the Mikado resolved to break all official connection with the two Pagan systems. The decree was promulgated on Aug. 11, and the reader will appreciate its importance, if he reflects on the observations which, on that occasion, the Abbè Midon addressed to the directors of the Seminary for Foreign Missions : “ Buddhism, undoubtedly the most diffused system in Japan, dates from the sixth century, having been imported from Corea, as a present to the emperor from the sovereign of that country. Thanks to the imperial favor, in fifty years it acquired very many temples and monasteries ; several emperors even abdicated, in order to become monks. By the side of Buddhism flourished Shintoism, the original religion of Japan, and a system which rendered worship to the ancestors of the Mikado, and to himself when he had died. But, whereas Buddhism possessed a body of doctrines, Shintoism was satisfied with certain external ceremonies. The bonzes, instead of clinging rigorously to the Buddhist doctrine, became lax, and in order to conciliate the Shintoists, placed their *kami*, or gods, by the side of the Buddhist divinities, and even intro-

duced the latter into the temples of Shinto. It was not a rare thing to behold a number of Buddhist chapels in a *mya* (Shintoist temple). In time Buddhism became so powerful, that the authority of the Mikado disappeared; and when, three centuries ago, the dynasty of the Tokugawa usurped the functions of the grand-licutenancy of the empire, and proposed to annihilate Christianity, it showered favors on the bonzes, and invested them with the powers of officers of state. They were obliged to prepare an annual census, and to assure themselves whether any Christians were to be found. It was their prerogative to preside at all funerals; and any refusal to accept their ministrations was regarded as an avowal of Christianity, and was punished accordingly. While the Shogunate lasted, Shintoism preserved some semblance of existence only within the precincts of the imperial palace; but the restoration of 1868 effected a change. Then Buddhism was ordered to render its dues to Shintoism; the deities of Shintoism could no longer be found in the Buddhist temples; and the Buddhist divinities disappeared from the *kami*. . . . The public newspapers have narrated how the bonzes recently attacked the Christian oratories in Kyoto, Mino, Gei-Shu, Kishu, and other places, showering stones on the worshippers, and wounding many. The government was regarded as responsible for these excesses; but in the face of Europe it could not admit its complicity. Therefore it has just issued a decree, the entire purport of which we do not know, but in which it disclaims any connection with the outrages perpetrated by the ministers of the national religion. It has given autonomy to each of the sects, thirty-seven in number, each being allowed to govern itself by means of a kind of patriarch who is to be subject to the Minister of the Interior. According to the letter of the law, there is to be hereafter no state-religion; but, nevertheless, Shintoism remains the religion of the sovereign, and its ceremonies are still obligatory for very many of the governmental officers. One would suppose, considering the decree in itself, that it would gratify the bonzes, since it restores to them that liberty of action which they enjoyed before the restoration. But all the sects are enraged by the decree; and this fact indicates that they

regard it as the first of a series which will finally culminate in a law granting entire religious liberty. Everywhere we hear the cry that Buddhism has weakened."

By a Brief dated March 20, 1888, Pope Leo XIII. detached from the southern vicariate-apostolic all that portion of Nippon which is at the west of Lake Biwa, as well as Shikoku and its dependent islands; and the resultant new vicariate was confided to the episcopal care of Mgr. Midon, a native of Nancy, who had been pro-vicar of the northern vicariate since 1876. A partition of the northern vicariate followed in 1891; the new jurisdiction, entitled the vicariate of Hakodate, embracing the island of Yeso and the northern provinces of Nippon, being entrusted to Mgr. Berlioz, who had been administrator of the district during the previous six years. These changes in the ecclesiastical organization of Japan were quickly followed by the most important change that could have been made—the institution of a regular hierarchy for the empire. In the new Constitution which was proclaimed by the Mikado on Feb 11, 1891, it was established in the twenty-eighth article that: "All Japanese subjects shall enjoy freedom of conscience in everything that is not prejudicial to peace and good order, or contrary to their duties as subjects." Regarding this disposition of the imperial government as a guarantee that the Church would thereafter be secure from persecution, and that no impediment to her regular development would be encouraged or tolerated, Pope Leo XIII issued, on June 15, 1891, an Apostolic Letter whereby he made Tokyo an archiepiscopal see, having for suffragan dioceses those of Nagasaki, Osaka, and Hakodate. Mgr. Osouf was named metropolitan; and the suffragan dioceses were assigned respectively to Bishops Cousin, Midon, and Berlioz. From the reports which the four prelates submitted to the Propaganda on Aug. 1, 1895, we learn that there were then in Japan 108 missionary priests, of whom 20 were Japanese. To assist these in their apostolic work there were 27 Marianists, devoted to the instruction of the male sex (1); and

(1) This society was founded in 1817 by William Joseph Chaminade, a canon of the cathedral of Bordeaux, and was approved by the Holy See in 1825. It is composed of both

also 136 female religious belonging to the Congregations of the Infant Jesus (Saint-Maur) and of Saint-Paul de Chartres, 51 of whom were Japanese, occupied in the education of girls. There were 304 catechists, of whom 154 were Japanese. The Japanese Catholic population then numbered 50,302; the number of foreign Catholics resident in the empire was not recorded. There were 71 churches or chapels; and 98 oratories had been improvised in private houses. The various seminaries had been consolidated into one in 1890, and had been established in Nagasaki, with 46 aspirants to the priesthood, all Japanese. There were two colleges, fully worthy of that designation, for the education of boys; and their Japanese students numbered 181. Higher education was given to Japanese females in three of the convents, and there were 171 resident pupils. The primary schools, 41 in number, were attended by 2,924 children. The catechists, whose importance cannot be overestimated by one who considers the circumstances, have a training-school in Nagasaki, where at present there are 12 subjects preparing for their arduous mission. The orphan asylums numbered 19 in 1895, but it was said that many new ones were being projected; these institutions then sheltered and educated 2,080 children. There were 26 industrial schools, attended by 764 pupils of both sexes. Four hospitals, one of which was exclusively for lepers, had full staffs of chaplains and physicians, and 45 trained nurses; and in addition to these essential concomitants of Catholic charity, there were 14 free dispensaries of medicine. Few readers of this exposition will not find their interest chiefly excited by the fact that one-fifth of the priests in Japan are natives. Of what mental and spiritual calibre are these native lights of the sanctuary who must be, humanly speaking, the principal hope of the Japanese Church? The question is answered by studying the natives who are in the seminary. The Abbé Marnas, who had observed these students for many years, says: "Their studies are

priests and laymen, and is devoted exclusively to the education of youth, its chief establishment being the Collège Stanislaus in Paris. Besides its houses in France, it has many in Spain, Belgium, Germany, and Africa.

serious, indeed, but they enjoy them ; they apply themselves to their tasks assiduously, and they succeed. In the lower classes they learn Latin, the Japanese language, and the Chinese signs. In the next classes they learn history, geography, the sciences, and philosophy. Then come dogmatic and moral theology, and the Sacred Scriptures. The entire course embraces a period of more than fifteen years ; and very rarely does an aspirant receive the priesthood until he is thirty years old. Before they receive the subdiaconate, they are subjected to a test. The rule requires that they leave the seminary for a year, spending that period as catechists, under the supervision of missionaries, in the interior of the country ; then, if they fear to bind themselves by the inviolable obligations which every priest must contract before he ascends to the altar, they need advance no further. Even those who still persist in their original design are then tested during another year in the seminary, before they are allowed to take the decisive step. The appearance of these young men pleases one ; they are simple, polite, full of good humor, and high spirited ; they are equally ardent in their play and in their studies. Their countenances are open and pure. In the sanctuary they are recollected and grave ; they perform the ceremonies perfectly, and they chant the liturgy well. Most of them are sons of confessors of the faith ; and some of them had the happiness of suffering for Jesus in their tender childhood, having shared the imprisonment of their parents during the last persecution. Those whose parents are converted Pagans are a minority ; they come from dioceses which are not so fortunate as to have had any ‘old Christians.’ Who can regard indifferently these young disciples of the Saviour, who are to have undoubtedly a fruitful career in a land which is so given to grand aspirations ?” (1).

What is to be the religious future of Japan ? Before the days of toleration, when to preach Christ was equivalent to the signing of one’s death-warrant, the task of the missionary was comparatively simple. His foe was undiluted Paganism, and its followers saw in his doctrine that of the

(1) *Ubi supra*, Vol. ii., p. 546.

Christ whom he announced. Complications now confront the Pagan who is curious to learn something concerning the Jesus whom he hears proclaimed as the Saviour of Men. With the days of security there came to Japan a horde of heretical preachers who could not agree among themselves as to the constituents of Christian doctrine; but who unanimously denounced as indeed "the perverse religion" the sole Christianity which had ever been taught in Japan—the religion of St. Francis Xavier, of the Twenty-Six Martyrs, and of their thousands of imitators. Amid the din of discordant vociferations, the poor Pagan is tempted to turn his back on all his religious adversaries; or at most to accept some one of the invitations merely as a means of acquiring a Western education. It is an undeniable fact that the Japanese are much more willing to accept a knowledge of Western science, than they are to adopt Western ideas of religion. Hence it is that when a Japanese has lost his faith in Buddhism or Shintoism, he may be tempted to be satisfied with that system which makes the fewest demands for obedience; which presents no definite body of doctrine to which he must subscribe, under pain of being "as the heathen and the publican"; which consecrates his right of private judgment, as essentially the prerogative of every Christian, in all religious matters; which hampers him the least when there is a question of gratifying his baser passions; which is, in fine, because of its practical deification of human reason, no more of a revealed religion than the Paganism which he has abandoned. Such are the apparent advantages presented to the Pagan by any one of the Protestant sects which have recently invaded Japan; and since many of their so-called missionaries are also teachers, with immense salaries, in the public schools of the state, it is a matter of wonder that their "converts" are not more numerous (1). Another source of triumph for heresy in Japan is the fact that when Japanese of wealth go to Europe or to America for purposes of study, they are generally attracted by the glamor surrounding those institutions which are the most inimical to Catholicism—institutions in

(1) According to Marnas, there were 33,110 Protestants in Japan in 1895.

which the study of history is really that vast conspiracy against truth which Joseph de Maistre so eloquently stigmatized. Very many of these Japanese seekers of truth return home with an increase of hatred for Christianity, as the consequence of having followed the curriculum of an ostensibly Christian University. In 1893, one of these civilized Japanese Pagans, Inouye Tetsujiro, who had received the doctorate in philosophy from the University of Berlin, and was then a professor in the University of Tokio, published a work in which he endeavored to invest Buddhistic Pantheism with all the forms of German Rationalism. In writing this book, Tetsujiro was actuated, surmises the Abbé Ligneuil (1), not only by a devotion to the party of Old Japan, but by a deference to Masonic influences. "He copies too exactly the charges of the Masons against the Church, and he uses their phraseology too constantly, not to have had more than a passing acquaintance with the sect. His great reputation for science, and eminent position, gave much authority to his words; and therefore he was well fitted for a new enterprise against Christianity." He endeavored to show that Christianity is detrimental to Japan; and principally because it proposes a new God for the adoration of a people who have hitherto worshipped the gods who founded their nation. For the Japanese, declares Tetsujiro, the true religion is patriotism; the morality of a Japanese should consist entirely in fidelity to the Mikado, and in respect to his parents; both his religion and his morality should have no other object than the dignity of the nation and the happiness of his family. Since Christianity proposes to man an end other than national glory and family prosperity, it follows, concludes the Germanized professor, that no Japanese of common sense can be a Christian, and, least of all, a Catholic. The Japanese are told that in the West the Catholic Church is decadent; that it is despised by the upper classes and by all the highly educated, who have long ago discovered that its doctrines are incompatible with the teachings of experimental science. Great stress is laid on the alleged inferiority of the Catholic

(1) In the report of the work in 1893, sent to the Seminary for Foreign Missions.

clergy in all matters of intellect, as well as on the corruption so prevalent in Europe, and which the Church has been unable to prevent. The author draws freely from the stock in trade of the Protestant preachers; and therefore he regales his readers with sage reflections on the pig-headed obstinacy of Catholicism as it ever opposes the civilization of the human race. Of course he emits the customary lamentations of Protestants because of the horrors of the Inquisition, and concerning the torture of Galileo, etc.; and of similar ebullitions there are over two hundred, not one of which is supported by proof, but which is invariably accompanied by the refrain: "Therefore, Christianity is the enemy of Japan." In view of the vogue attained by this and similar works which have attained an immense circulation among the Pagans of the Mikado's empire, the missionaries are now straining every nerve in the difficult task of developing the powers of the Catholic press; as yet there is but one Catholic periodical published in Japanese, and there is only one Catholic newspaper. In this matter of using the press as a means of religious propaganda among the Japanese, the Protestants, and even the few emissaries of the "Orthodox" Russian Church, are far more active than the Catholics; probably for the reason that the time of the Catholic missionary is entirely devoted to the essential duties of his ministry. But in spite of all the bibles, tracts, and newspapers, with which the Protestants deluge the land, such influence as they have acquired is that of a social force, rather than that of a religion, properly so called; for a chaos of incoherent opinions ever vacillating and never authoritative, cannot satisfy the reflective mind of a Japanese—and nearly all Japanese minds are reflective—who yearns sincerely for religious truth. As for the efforts of Russian "Orthodoxy" to gain a foothold in Japan, every subject of the Mikado knows that the Muscovite Establishment is a purely National Church—a system inseparable from the secular policy of the czarate, and the autocrat's most effective agent of police; therefore the ardent patriotism of the nation, joined to the fear inspired by the proximity of "Holy Russia," will never encourage a colonel of hussars to feign

an ecclesiastical jurisdiction of any great extent in the Land of the Rising Sun. The sentiments of an intelligent and sincere Japanese toward the Catholic Church must necessarily be of a nature diametrically opposite to those which he entertains toward any one of the innumerable Protestant sects, or toward the agents of the Holy Synod of St. Petersburg. He realizes that the progress of Catholicism in his beloved country is not the march of a conqueror toward temporal domination; and he realizes also that while the insubordinate spirit of Protestantism propagates ideas of false independence in a land where a religious respect for authority has ever been a salient characteristic, the spirit of Catholicism is not a social danger. Considerations such as these lead the Catholic observer to predict the near triumph of the Church of Christ in Japan. Certainly there is one great obstacle in the austerity of the doctrine which must be accepted, ere a Japanese can claim spiritual kinship with the Christian martyrs of his race. The definite faith of the Catholic Church, admitting of no elasticity for the purpose of accommodation to the peculiar temperament or idiosyncrasy of the individual, is repugnant to the haughty spirit of the natural Japanese; her inflexible laws of morality, dominating the very thoughts of a Catholic, as well as his actions, excite a revolt on the part of the grosser passions. But this obstacle is conquered by the grace of God; and the works performed by the Church, works which are peculiarly her own,—the works of her sublime charity, which would be impossibilities without the aid of divine grace,—are continually leading sincere souls to the foot of that altar and of that tribunal where the plenitude of that grace is distributed.

---

### CHAPTER XIII.

#### THE "OXFORD MOVEMENT."

One of the consequences of the French Revolution of 1830 was a great development of Radicalism in England; as the younger Mill tells us, that event "aroused his utmost en-

thusiasm, and gave him, as it were, a new existence" (1). In 1832 the famous Reform Bill was passed; and then, in the minds of the more conservative, every English institution was shaken to its foundations. "Every party, every interest, political or religious," writes Thomas Mozley, "was pushing its claims to universal acceptance, with the single exception of the Church of England, which was folding its robes to die with what dignity it could. . . . At such a time, when a thousand projectors were screaming from a thousand platforms, when all England was dinned with philanthropy and revolution, spirituality and reform; when the scissors and pastepot were everywhere at work on the Prayer-Book; when Whately was preparing to walk quietly over ten churches in Ireland; and Arnold was confidently hoping to surpass Bunsen's scheme of universal comprehension in England; Newman was laboriously working his way into the hitherto unvisited region of Patristic Theology" (2). Certainly those Protestants who regarded themselves as churchmen had reason to fear for the existence of the royal Establishment; for the Radicals talked of appointing parliamentary committees for a revision of the Prayer-Book and of the Creeds—a measure which was certainly within the parliamentary province, as much as had been the original sanction of that Prayer-Book and of those Creeds. It certainly appeared that the Radicals had designs on the very existence of the Anglican Church; for a measure was in progress for a parliamentary suppression of ten of the Anglican sees in Ireland. According to his son, John Stuart Mill detested, "next to an aristocracy, an Established Church or corporation of priests, as being by position the great depravers of religion, and interested in opposing the progress of the human mind." Alarmed at the prospect of Disestablishment, Dr. Arnold, the famous master of Rugby School, published in 1832 a pamphlet on Church Reform, proposing that the discordant members of the State Church should sink all dogmatic differences, and that the Dissenters should be recognized as good Anglicans; stipulating, however, that

(1) See Mill's *Autobiography*, p. 172.

(2) *Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement*.

the enlarged Establishment should be closed to all Unitarians, although, as was well remarked, his own theory of Scripture interpretation scarcely accorded with a belief in the divinity of Our Lord (1). It is evident that the school represented by Arnold—the Oriel school, or Noetics, as they were called—was influenced by the incendiary principles advanced by Stuart Mill; as Mark Pattison said: “This knot of Oriel men was distinctly the product of the French Revolution. They called everything in question; they appealed to first principles, and disallowed authority as a judge in intellectual matters” (2); and their teachings were the logical source of the views afterward advocated by Dean Stanley, Professor Jowett, and Matthew Arnold. Simultaneously with the Arnoldian theory, another and very different movement was being undertaken at Oxford with the same object of protecting the Establishment from threatened dissolution. “The true and primary author of it,” declared Newman in later years, “as is usual with great motive powers, was out of sight. . . . Need I say that I am speaking of John Keble?” (3). In the words of Church, “Keble gave the inspiration, Froude (Richard Hurrell) the impulse; then Newman took up the work, and

(1) “Arnold divided the world into Christians and non-Christians: Christians were all who professed to believe in Christ as a Divine Person and to worship Him; and the brotherhood, the ‘Societas’ of Christians, was all that was meant by ‘the Church’ in the New Testament. It mattered, of course, to the conscience of each Christian what he had made up his mind to believe, but to no one else. Church organization was, according to circumstances, partly inevitable or expedient, partly mischievous, but in no case of divine authority. Teaching, ministering the word, was a thing of divine appointment, but not so the mode of exercising it, either as to persons, forms, or methods. Sacraments there were, signs and pledges of divine love and help, in every action of life, in every sight of nature, and eminently two most touching ones, recommended to Christians by the Redeemer Himself; but except as a matter of mere order, one man might deal with these as lawfully as another. Church history there was, fruitful in interest, instruction, and warning; for it was the record of the long struggle of the true idea of the Church against the false, and of the fatal disappearance of the true before the forces of blindness and wickedness. Dr. Arnold’s was a passionate attempt to place the true idea in the light. Of the difficulties of his theory he made light account. There was the vivid central truth which glowed through his soul and quickened all his thoughts. He became its champion and militant apostle. These doctrines, combined with his strong political liberalism, made the Midlands hot for Dr. Arnold. But he liked the fighting, as he thought, against the narrow and frightened orthodoxy around him. And he was in the thick of this fighting when another set of ideas about the Church—the ideas on which alone it seemed to a number of earnest and anxious minds that the cause of the Church could be maintained—the ideas which were the beginning of the Oxford movement, crossed his path.”—*The Oxford Movement; Twelve Years, 1833-1845*. By R. W. Church, *Sometime Dean of St. Paul’s*. London, 1891.

(2) *Memoirs*, p. 79.

(3) *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, pt. iv.

the impulse henceforward, and the direction, were his" (1). This movement differed more from the Latitudinarianism of the Arnoldians than it did from the Radicalism which had evoked it; for while Arnold held the historical truth that the union of the Establishment with the State is of its very essence, the party of the Movement would have deluded itself, in all sincerity, with the fond notion that the essence of the Establishment is independent of the will of the crown. Again, the men of the Movement considered Dogma as essential to religion; whereas Arnold prided himself on being an advocate of the "anti-dogmatic principle," and was ready to concede any and all demands in the matter of doctrine, provided that the number of professing Anglicans could be increased. Finally, the Anglo-Radicals held that the idea of a priesthood is contrary to the proper conception of Christian equality, and that the sacramental theory is a superstition; some of these gentry, like Hampden, declared that the doctrine of the Incarnation is a mere theological opinion, not at all essential to the "simple religion of Christ" (2); and others, like Arnold, contended that the

(1) "Froude never would have been the man he was but for his daily and hourly intercourse with Keble; and Froude brought to bear upon Newman's mind, at a critical period of its development, Keble's ideas and feelings about religion and the Church, Keble's reality of thought and purpose, Keble's transparent and saintly simplicity. Froude brought Keble and Newman to understand one another, when the elder man was shy and suspicious of the younger, and the younger, though full of veneration for the elder, was hardly yet in full sympathy with what was most characteristic and most cherished in the elder's religious convictions. Keble attracted and moulded Froude; he impressed Froude with his strong churehmanship, his severity and reality of life, his poetry and high standard of scholarly excellence. Froude learned from him to be anti-Erastian, anti-Methodistical, anti-sentimental, and as strong in his hatred of the world, as contemptuous of popular approval, as any Methodist. Yet all this might merely have made a strong impression, or formed one more marked school of doctrine, without the fierce energy which received it and which it inspired. But Froude, in accepting Keble's ideas, resolved to make them active, public, aggressive; and he found in Newman a colleague whose bold originality responded to his own. Together they worked as tutors; together they worked when their tutorships came to an end; together they worked when thrown into companionship in their Mediterranean voyage in the Winter of 1832 and the Spring of 1833. They came back, full of aspirations and anxieties which spurred them on. . . . Others besides Keble and Froude and Newman were seriously considering what could best be done to arrest the current which was running strong against the Church, and discussing schemes of resistance and defence. Others were stirring up themselves and their brethren to meet the new emergencies, to respond to the new call. Some of these were in communication with the Oriel men, and ultimately took part with them in organizing vigorous measures. But it was not till Mr. Newman made up his mind to force on the public mind, in a way which could not be evaded, the great article of the Creed—"I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church"—that the movement began. CHURCH; *loc. cit.*, ch. 3.

(2) Cited by Newman, *Apologia*, p. 49.—In his *Observations on Religious Dissent*,

doctrine of a visible Church cannot consistently be held by an English churchman. The difference between the position occupied by the Arnoldians and that defended by Keble, Hurrell Froude, Newman, and their friends, was well accentuated when Newman, commenting on the pamphlet on *Religious Dissent* which Hampden had sent to him, replied: "I dare not trust myself to put on paper my feelings about the principles contained in it, tending as they do, in my opinion, altogether to make shipwreck of Christian faith"; and when Arnold affected to despise the Movement as "a dress, a ritual, a name, a ceremony, a technical phraseology—the superstition of a priesthood without its power, the form of episcopal government without its substance, a system imperfect and paralyzed, not independent, not sovereign, afraid to cast off the subjection against which it is perpetually murmuring—objects so pitiful, that if gained ever so completely, they would make no man the wiser, or the better; they would lead to no good, intellectual, moral, or spiritual." However, widely as the two schools differed, each predicted with admirable accuracy the fate of the other. The Anglico-Radicals, with Arnold as their spokesman, prophesied in 1836 that the Movement would end in Popery; and the school of Keble and Newman declared that the Liberals would finally become free-thinkers. The conversions of 1845 evinced the admirable foresight of Arnold; and to-day his name is associated, well remarks Wilfrid Ward, with a belief concerning the Supreme Being which differs little from the Agnosticism of Herbert Spencer. And, nevertheless, neither of the parties even dreamed of its probable destiny; had that destiny been apprehended, such was the temper of the minds of all, that they would have put an immediate end to their respective enterprises. For the leaders of both phalanxes were then devotedly attached to the English Establishment, and they were equally ambitious of serving its best interests; they

(p. 20), Hampden asks a Unitarian "whether it is not *theological dogmatism*, and not *religious belief*, properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent; and he says that he cannot deny to Unitarians the name of Christians. He also asserts that "theological opinion, as necessarily mixed up with speculative knowledge, ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian society, or a mark of discrimination between Christian and Christian."

differed merely as to the means—"the Newmanites proposed to inoculate the Church with a little Popery, and the Arnoldites to inoculate it with a little Liberalism, as the best safeguard against these diseases in their malignant form" (1).

In Cardinal Newman's *Apologia* we read: "On January 14, 1833, Mr. Keble preached the assize sermon in the University Pulpit. It was published under the title of *National Apostasy*. I have ever considered and kept the day as the start of the religious movement of 1833." In this memorable sermon Keble assumed that the administration of the day, flushed with triumph because of the passage of the Reform Bill, was about to invade the rights, and to alter the constitution, of the Church of England. He said that churchmen had hitherto taken for granted that England was "a nation which had for centuries acknowledged, as an essential part of its theory of government, that, *as a Christian nation, she is also a part of Christ's Church, and bound, in all her legislation and policy, by the fundamental laws of that Church.*" When "a Government and people, so constituted, threw off the restraint which in many respects such a principle would impose upon them, nay, disavowed the principle itself," they were guilty of a "direct disavowal of the sovereignty of God. If it be true anywhere that such enactments are forced on the legislature by public opinion, is *Apostasy* too hard a word to describe the temper of such a nation?" The sermon was a call to face an immediate and pressing danger; to consider how it was to be met by churchmen; and the effect was described as like that of a thunderbolt upon men sunk in lethargy. But the first step taken for the purpose of rendering the Movement a living force was put forth on July 25, when there met in the parsonage of Hugh James Rose at Hadleigh, in Suffolk, a few of those spirits concerning whom Thomas Mozley wrote: "There had never been seen at Oxford, indeed seldom anywhere, so large and noble a sacrifice of the most precious gifts and powers to a sacred cause." In later days, when the resultant controversies had embittered the minds of the

(1) *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement, by Wilfrid Ward.* London, 1889.

more ultra of the English Protestants, it became the fashion to term this meeting at Hadleigh a "conspiracy"; even Hurrell Froude so designated it, and Percival wrote a narrative of it, in order to show that it was no more of a conspiracy than would be any meeting having for an object something not approved by outsiders. Froude was the sole representative of the Oriel men at Hadleigh. Both Keble and Newman were absent; but during the four days that the sessions lasted, they kept up a close correspondence with the debaters. All of the participants afterward recorded the state of mind under which they labored. William Palmer (1) says: "We felt ourselves assailed by enemies from without and foes within. Our prelates were threatened and insulted by Ministers of State. In Ireland ten bishoprics were suppressed. We were advised to feel thankful that a more sweeping measure had not been adopted. What was to come next? . . . Was the same principle of concession to popular clamor to be exemplified in the dismemberment of the English Church? . . . We were overwhelmed with pamphlets on Church Reform. Lord Henley, brother-in-law

(1) William Palmer is best known to the average reader by the endeavors which he made, during his Protestant days, to effect a union between the Anglican and the Russian "Orthodox" Churches—an attempt which resulted only in his being told by the Greco-Slavonic heretics that he should be reconciled with his own patriarch, the Pope of Rome, ere he extended the olive-branch to the separatist patriarchates of the Orient. Dean Church makes these comments on the calibre of Palmer: "Another coadjutor, whose part at the time also seemed rather that of a chief, was Mr. William Palmer, of Worcester College. He had been educated at Trinity College, Dublin, but he had transferred his home to Oxford, both in the University and the city. He was a man of exact and scholastic mind, well equipped at all points in controversial theology, strong in clear theories and precise definitions, familiar with objections current in the schools and with the answers to them, and well versed in all the questions, arguments, and authorities belonging to the great debate with Rome. He had definite and well-arranged ideas about the nature and office of the Church; and, from his study of the Roman controversy, he had at command the distinctions necessary to discriminate between things which popular views confused, and to protect the doctrines characteristic of the Church from being identified with Romanism. Especially he had given great attention to the public devotional language and forms of the Church, and had produced by far the best book in the English language on the history and significance of the offices of the English Church—the *Origines Liturgicae*, published at the University Press in 1832. It was a book to give a man authority with divines and scholars; and among those with whom at this time he acted, no one had so compact and defensible a theory, even if it was somewhat rigid and technical, of the peculiar constitution of the English Church as Mr. Palmer. With the deepest belief in this theory, he saw great dangers threatening, partly from general ignorance and looseness of thought, partly from antagonistic ideas and principles only too distinct and too popular; and he threw all his learning and zeal on the side of those who, like himself, were alive to those dangers, and were prepared for a great effort to counteract them." Palmer became a Catholic in 1856.

of Sir Robert Peel; Dr. Burton, and others of name and influence, led the way. Dr. Arnold of Rugby ventured to propose *that all sects should be united by Act of Parliament with the Church of England*. Reports, apparently well founded, were prevalent that some of the prelates were favorable to alterations in the Liturgy. Pamphlets were in wide circulation recommending the abolition of the Creeds (at least in public worship), especially urging the expulsion of the Athanasian Creed; the removal of all mention of the Blessed Trinity; of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; of the practice of absolution. We knew not to what quarter to look for support. A prelacy threatened and apparently intimidated; a government making its power subservient to agitators who avowedly sought the destruction of the Church. . . . And, worst of all, *no principle in the public mind to which we could appeal*: an utter ignorance of all rational grounds of attachment to the Church; an oblivion of its spiritual character as an institution not of man but of God; the grossest Erastianism most widely prevalent, especially amongst all classes of politicians. There was in all this enough to appal the stoutest heart; and those who can recall the feeling of those days will at once remember the deep depression into which the Church had fallen, and the gloomy forebodings universally prevalent." But hearken to Newman as he, while penning his *Apologia*, recalls his reflections of those days: "The Whigs had come into power; Lord Grey had told the bishops to 'set their houses in order,' and some of the prelates had been insulted and threatened in the streets of London. The vital question was: How were we to keep the Church from being Liberalized? There was so much apathy on the subject in some quarters, such imbecile alarm in others; the true principles of churchmanship seemed so radically decayed, and there was such distraction in the councils of the clergy. The bishop of London of the day, an active and open-hearted man, had been for years engaged in diluting the high orthodoxy of the Church by the introduction of the Evangelical body into places of influence and trust. He had deeply offended men who agreed with myself by an off-hand saying (as it was reported) to

the effect that belief in the Apostolical Succession had gone out with the Non-jurors. . . . I felt affection for my own Church, but not tenderness; I felt dismay at her prospects, anger and scorn at her do-nothing perplexity. I thought that if Liberalism once got a footing within her, it was sure of victory in the event. I saw that Reformation principles were powerless to rescue her. As to leaving her, the thought never crossed my imagination: still I ever kept before me that there was something greater than the Established Church, and that that was the Church Catholic and Apostolic, set up from the beginning, of which she was but the local presence and organ. She was nothing, unless she was this. She must be dealt with strongly, or she would be lost. There was need of a second Reformation." After much discussion, the conferees at Hadleigh adopted a "formulary" which began by saying: "Events have occurred within the last few years calculated to inspire the true members and friends of the Church with the deepest uneasiness." The danger manacing the Church of England did not threaten it merely as an Establishment; "every one who has become acquainted with the literature of the day, must have observed the sedulous attempts made in various quarters to reconcile members of the Church to alterations in its doctrines and discipline. Projects of change, which include the annihilation of our Creeds and the removal of doctrinal statements incidentally contained in our worship, have been boldly and assiduously put forth. Our services have been subjected to licentious criticism, with the view of superseding some of them and of entirely remodelling others. The very elementary principles of our ritual and discipline have been rudely questioned; our apostolical polity has been ridiculed and denied." In the autumn of 1833 strenuous efforts were made for the formation of one general or several particular Associations which would try to obviate the dangers signalled at Hadleigh; but since "jealousy was entertained of it in high quarters," while Froude objected to any association less wide than the Church itself, and Newman detested the idea of committees and meetings in London, the plan proved abortive. Instead of an Association, an

"Address to His Grace of Canterbury" was proposed; such a document was prepared by Palmer, and through his exertions the signatures of nearly 7,000 ministers were obtained. From the presentation of this Address, which, in spite of all its antecedent acclamations, contained only some vague expressions about the "consecration of the State," and some praises of the practical benefits of the Establishment, Percival, writing in 1842, dated "the commencement of the turn of the tide which had threatened to overwhelm our Church and our religion" (1). The Address certainly gave much courage to the more conservative clergy of the Establishment; for, observes Church, it showed that "they were stronger and more resolute than their enemies thought." But Newman was not satisfied with either Addresses or Associations; he wanted "plain speaking," a thing which was not to be found in any joint productions which were revised or sanctioned by "judicious" or "safe" advisers. Newman felt that each man in the movement should use the pen, and that, although working with the others for one supreme end, each man should write and speak for himself. It was because of this suggestion of Newman that there then eventuated what Thomas Mozley termed "that portentous birth of time, the *Tracts for the Times*."

When these *Tracts* began to appear in quick succession during the autumn of 1833, men soon realized that the contents were of sterner stuff than those of the insipid leaflets with which the word "tract" had hitherto been associated; as Church remarks, "the pertinacity of good ladies who pressed (the ordinary tracts) on strangers, and who extolled their efficacy as if it was that of a quack medicine, had lowered the general respect for them." Newman had "out of his own head begun the *Tracts*"; no wonder, then, that men recognized them as clear and stirring appeals to reason, as not at all verbose, and as utterly void of any futile attempts at rhetoric. Newman himself describes the mood in which he penned the initial *Tract*. He says that he was in the "exultation of health restored and home regained"; he felt, he says, an "exuberant and joyous energy which he

(1) Collection of Papers, p. 32.

never had before or since"; his health and strength "had come back to him with such a rebound" that some of his friends did not know him. "I had the consciousness that I was employed in that work which I had been dreaming about, and which I felt to be so momentous and inspiring. I had a supreme confidence in our cause; we were upholding that primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church, and which was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies and by the Anglican divines. That ancient religion had well-nigh faded out of the land through the political changes of the last one hundred and fifty years, and it must be restored. It would be, in fact, a second Reformation—a better Reformation, for it would return, not to the sixteenth century, but to the seventeenth. No time was to be lost, for the Whigs had come to do their worst, and the rescue might come too late. Bishoprics were already in course of suppression; Church property was in course of confiscation; sees would be soon receiving unsuitable occupants. We knew enough to begin preaching, and there was no one else to preach" (1). Newman addressed the first *Tract* to "his fellow laborers in the ministry"; and it was an earnest exhortation to his Anglican brethren to be equal to the responsibilities of that priesthood which, as yet, he believed them to possess (2). When the first forty-six

(1) *Remains of Hurrell Froude*; Vol. i., p. 265.

(2) We subjoin some passages of this interesting document: "Christ has not left His Church without claim of its own upon the attention of men. Surely not. Hard Master He cannot be, to bid us oppose the world, yet give us no credentials for so doing. There are some who rest their divine mission on their own unsupported assertion; others, who rest it upon their popularity; others, on their success; and others, who rest it upon their temporal distinctions. This last case has, perhaps, been too much our own; I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built—OUR APOSTOLICAL DESCENT. We have been born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present bishops, who have appointed us as their assistants, and in some sense representatives. . . . And if we trace back the power of ordination from hand to hand, of course we shall come to the Apostles at last. We know we do, as a plain historical fact; and therefore all we, who have been ordained clergy, in the very form of our ordination acknowledged the doctrine of the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. And for the same reason, we must necessarily consider none to be *really* ordained who have not *thus* been ordained. For if ordination is a divine ordinance, it must be necessary; and if it is not a divine ordinance, how dare we use it? Therefore, all who use it, all of us, must consider it necessary. As well might we pretend the Sacraments are not necessary to salvation, while we make use of the offices in the Liturgy; for when God appoints means of grace, they are *the* means. I do not see how any one can escape from this plain view of

*Tracts* were collected in a volume toward the end of 1834, a preface explained their object. "The following *Tracts* were published," it said, "with the object of contributing something toward the practical revival of doctrines which, although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members, and are withdrawn from public view even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them. The Apostolic Succession, the Holy Catholic Church, were principles of action in the minds of our predecessors of the seventeenth century; but, in proportion as the maintenance of the Church has been secured by law, her ministers have been under the temptation of leaning on an arm of flesh instead of her own divinely-provided discipline, a temptation increased by political events and arrangements which need not here be more than alluded to. A lamentable increase of sectarianism has followed; being occasioned (in addition to other more obvious causes), first, by the cold aspect which the new Church

the subject, except (as I have already hinted) by declaring that the words do not mean all that they say. But only reflect what a most unseemly time for random words is that in which ministers are set apart for their office. Do we not adopt a Liturgy *in order to* hinder inconsiderate idle language, and shall we, in the most sacred of all services, write down, subscribe, and use again and again, forms of speech which have not been weighed, and cannot be taken strictly? Therefore, my dear brethren, act up to your professions. Let it not be said that you have neglected a gift; for if you have the Spirit of the Apostles on you, surely this *is* a great gift. 'Stir up the gift of God which is in you.' Make much of it. Show your value of it. Keep it before your minds as an honorable badge, far higher than that secular respectability, or cultivation, or polish, or learning, or rank, which gives you a hearing with the many. Tell *them* of your gift. The times will soon drive you to do this, if you mean to be still anything. But wait not for the times. Do not be compelled, by the world's forsaking you, to recur as if unwillingly to the high source of your authority. Speak out now, before you are forced, both as glorying in your privilege and to insure your rightful honor from your people. A notion has gone abroad that they can take away your power. They think they have given and can take it away. They think it lies in the Church property, and they know that they have politically the power to confiscate that property. They have been deluded into a notion that present palpable usefulness, producible results, acceptableness to your flocks—that these and such like are the tests of your divine commission. Enlighten them in this matter. Exalt our holy fathers the bishops, as the representatives of the Apostles, and the Angels of the Churches; and magnify your office, as being ordained by them to take part in their ministry. But, if you will not adopt my view of the subject, which I offer to you, not doubtingly, yet (I hope) respectfully, at all events, CHOOSE YOUR SIDE. To remain neuter much longer will be itself to take a part. *Choose* your side; since side you shortly must, with one or other party, even though you do nothing. Fear to be of those whose line is decided for them by chance circumstances, and who may perchance find themselves with the enemies of Christ, while they think but to remove themselves from worldly politics. Such abstinence is impossible in troublous times. 'He that is not with Me is against Me; and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth abroad.'"

doctrines have presented to the religious sensibilities of the mind, next to their meagreness in suggesting motives to restrain it from seeking out a more influential discipline. Doubtless obedience to the law of the land, and the careful maintenance of 'decency and order' (the topics in usage among us), are plain duties of the Gospel, and a reasonable ground for keeping in communion with the Established Church; yet, if Providence has graciously provided for our weakness more interesting and constraining motives, it is a sin thanklessly to neglect them; just as it would be a mistake to rest the duties of temperance or justice on the mere law of natural religion, when they are mercifully sanctioned in the Gospel by the more winning authority of our Saviour, Christ. Experience has shown the inefficacy of the mere injunctions of Church order, however scripturally enforced, in restraining from schism the awakened and anxious sinner; who goes to a dissenting preacher 'because' (as he expresses it) 'he gets good from him'; and though he does not stand excused in God's sight for yielding to the temptation, surely the ministers of the Church are not blameless if, by keeping back the more gracious and consoling truths provided for the little ones of Christ, they indirectly lead them into it. Had he been taught as a child, that the Sacraments, not preaching, are the sources of Divine Grace; that the Apostolical ministry had a virtue in it which went out over the whole Church, when sought by the prayer of faith; that fellowship with it was a gift and privilege as well as a duty, we could not have had so many wanderers from our fold, nor so many cold hearts within it. This instance may suggest many others of the superior *influence* of an apostolical over a mere secular method of teaching. The awakened mind knows its wants, but cannot provide for them; and in its hunger will feed upon ashes, if it cannot obtain the pure milk of the word. Methodism and Popery are, in different ways, the refuge of those whom the Church stints of the gifts of grace; they are the foster-mothers of abandoned children. . . . The multitude of men cannot teach or guide themselves; and an injunction given to them to depend on their private judgment, cruel in itself, is doubly

hurtful, as throwing them on such teachers as speak daringly and promise largely, and not only aid but supersede individual exertion. These remarks may serve as a clue, for those who care to pursue it, to the views which have led to the publication of the following *Tracts*. . . There are zealous sons and servants of the English branch (of the Church of Christ) who see with sorrow that she is defrauded of her full usefulness by particular theories and principles of the present age, which interfere with the execution of one portion of her commission ; and while they consider that the revival of this portion of truth is especially adapted to break up existing parties in the Church, and to form instead a bond of union among all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, they believe that nothing but these neglected doctrines, faithfully preached, will repress that extension of Popery, for which the ever-multiplying divisions of the religious world are too clearly preparing the way."

Newman admits, in his *Apologia*, that the Tractarian enterprise had not afforded him ultimate rest when, in 1836, he delivered his celebrated series of sermons in St. Mary's, the University church ; therefore it was natural that those discourses should have been more or less tentative in character. Descanting to his Protestant auditors on *The Prophetic Office of the Church, Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, he urged Anglicanism to doff its Protestant characteristics, and to enter on a "middle path—*via media*" between Protestantism and Popery ; but he avowed that "it still remained to be tried whether the *via media* was capable of being professed, acted on, and maintained on a large sphere of action, or whether it was a mere modification or transition stage of either Romanism or popular Protestantism." Men like Dean Church, who had studied the Movement in all its phases and in all its participating personages, declared that these sermons alone gave to it an extension of life, and that without them it would never have acquired the influence which it soon exercised. "Even people who heard them continually," says the dean, "and who felt them to be different from any other sermons, hardly estimated their real power, or knew at the time the influence

which the sermons were having upon them. Plain, direct, unornamented, clothed in English that was only pure and lucid, free from any faults of taste, strong in their flexibility and perfect command both of language and thought, they were the expression of a piercing and large insight into character and conscience and motives, of a sympathy at once most tender and most stern with the tempted and the wavering, of an absolute and burning faith in God and His counsels, in His love, in His judgments, in the awful glory of His generosity and His magnificence. They made men think of the things which the preacher spoke of, and not of the sermon or the preacher. While men were reading and talking about the *Tracts*, they were hearing the sermons; and in the sermons they heard the living meaning, and reason, and bearing of the *Tracts*, their ethical affinities, their moral standard. The sermons created a moral atmosphere, in which men judged the questions in debate. It was no dry theological correctness and completeness which were sought for. No love of privilege, no formal hierarchical claims, urged on the writers. What they thought in danger, what they aspired to revive and save, was the very life of religion, the truth and substance of all that makes it the hope of human society." None of the adventitious arts of the orator aided Newman. Justin McCarthy says: "In all the arts that make a great preacher or orator, Cardinal Newman was deficient. His manner was constrained and ungraceful, and even awkward; his voice was thin and weak, his bearing was not at first impressive in any way—a gaunt, emaciated figure, a sharp eagle face, and a cold meditative eye, rather repelled than attracted those who saw him for the first time" (1). And, nevertheless, the late Pro-

(1) Sir F. Doyle, in his *Reminiscences*, differs from Justin McCarthy in his estimate of Newman's manner and appearance: "When I knew him at Oxford, these somewhat disparaging remarks would not have been applicable. His manner, it is true, may have been self-repressed, constrained it was not. His bearing was neither awkward nor ungraceful; it was simply quiet and calm, because under strict control; but beneath that calmness, intense feeling, I think, was obvious to those who had any instinct of sympathy with him. But if Mr. McCarthy's acquaintance with him only began when he took office in an Irish Catholic University, I can quite understand that (flexibility not being one of his special gifts) he may have failed now and again to bring himself into perfect harmony with an Irish audience. He was probably too much of a typical Englishman for his place; nevertheless, Mr. McCarthy, though he does not seem to have admired him in the pulpit, is fully sensible of his intellectual powers and general eminence. Dr. Pusey, who used every now and then

fessor Shairpe of St. Andrews, who believed that "if Newman had preached one of his St. Mary's sermons before a Scotch town congregation, they would have thought the preacher a 'silly body,' " thus described the impression produced on himself by those discourses: "As he spoke, how the old truth became new; how it came home with a meaning never felt before! He laid his finger how gently, yet how powerfully, on some inner place in the hearer's heart, and told him things about himself he had never known till then. Subtlest truths, which it would have taken philosophers pages of circumlocution and big words to state, were dropped out by the way in a sentence or two of the most transparent Saxon. What delicacy of style, yet what strength! how simple, yet how suggestive! how homely, yet how refined! how penetrating, yet how tender-hearted! If now and then there was a forlorn undertone which at the time seemed inexplicable, you might be perplexed at the drift of what he said, but you felt all the more drawn to the speaker. . . . After hearing these sermons you might come away, still not believing the tenets peculiar to the High Church system; but you would be harder than most men, if you did not feel more than ever ashamed of coarseness, selfishness, worldliness,—if you did not feel the things of faith brought closer to the soul" (1).

It is needless to state that the Newmanites, or Tractarians, as they came to be styled (2), made many very virulent enemies; even persons of presumed refinement frequently refused to them the ordinary courtesies of society. Their supposed Romanism angered the Evangelicals; their asceticism tortured the smug parsons of the Establishment; their constant representation of "mere dogma" irritated the Liberals.

to take Newman's duties at St. Mary's, was to me a much less interesting person. [A learned man, no doubt, but dull and tedious as a preacher.] Certainly, in spite of the name *Puesytem* having been given to the Oxford attempt at a new Catholic departure, he was not the Columbus of that voyage of discovery undertaken to find a safer haven for the Church of England. I may, however, be more or less unjust to him, as I owe him a sort of grudge. His discourses were not only less attractive than those of Dr. Newman, but always much longer, and the result of this was that the learned Canon of Christ Church generally made me late for dinner at my College, a calamity never inflicted on his All Souls' hearers by the terser and swifter fellow of Oriel whom he was replacing."

(1) *John Keble*; by J. C. Shairpe, Professor of Humanity, St. Andrews; p. 12—17 London, 1866.

(2) Wholly thought to improve the nickname into "Tractites."

Dr. Arnold termed them "Oxford malignants"; and Whately, the Protestant incumbent of Dublin, styled them "secret infidels," comparing them to the "Children of the Mist," to the "Veiled Prophets," and even to the Indian Thugs (1). This antagonism on the part of the immense majority of the English Protestants was accentuated in 1838, when the Movement received an accession of many able men who cherished decidedly Roman proclivities. As Newman afterward wrote (2), "a new school of thought was rising, as is usual in doctrinal inquiries, and was sweeping the original party of the Movement aside." The most noteworthy of the new Tractarians were Oakley, Faber, Dalgairns, John Brande Morris, and Seager. Newman says that Oakley was the possessor "of elegant genius, of classical mind, and of rare talent in literary composition"; and his standing at Oxford was deservedly high. Church says that Seager and Morris were "men of wide and abstruse learning, quaint and eccentric scholars in habit and look, students of the ancient type, who even fifty years ago seemed out of date in their generation." The dean knew Faber to be "a man with a high gift of imagination, remarkable powers of assimilating knowledge, and a great richness and novelty and elegance of thought, which, with much melody of voice, made him ultimately a very attractive preacher." Speaking of Dalgairns, the same authority quotes the remark made by "a competent judge" concerning a paper by the young student which had been submitted to him: "That man has an eye for theology." In his Oxford days, says Church, "there was in Dalgairns a bright and frank briskness, a mixture of modesty and arch daring, which gave him an almost boyish appearance; but beneath this boyish appearance there was a subtle

(1) 'Dr. Wilson was mightily pleased with my calling the traditionals the 'Children of the Mist.' The title of 'Veiled Prophets' he thought too severe" (1838, *Life*, ed. 1875, p. 167. "As for the suspicion of secret infidelity, I have said no more than I sincerely feel," *ib.* p. 181. "It would be a curious thing if you (the Provost of Oriel) were to bring into your Bampton Lectures a mention of the Thugs. . . . Observe their submissive piety, their faith in long-preserved *tradition*, their regular succession of ordinations to their offices, their *faith* in the sacramental virtue of the consecrated governor; in short, compare our religion with the *Thuggce*, putting out of account all those considerations which the traditionists deprecate the discussion of, and where is the difference?" (1840) *ib.* p. 194.

(2) *Apologia*, p. 163.

and powerful intellect, alive to the problems of religious philosophy, and impatient of any but the most thorough solutions of them; while, on the other hand, the religious affections were part of his nature, and mind and will and heart yielded an unreserved and absolute obedience to the leading and guidance of faith. In his later days, with his mind at ease, Father Dalgairns threw himself into the great battle with unbelief; and few men have commanded more the respect of opponents not much given to think well of the arguments for religion, by the freshness and the solidity of his reasoning. At this time, enthusiastic in temper, and acute and exacting as a thinker, he found the Church Movement just, as it were, on the turn of the wave. He was attracted to it at first by its reaction against what was unreal and shallow, by its affinities with what was deep in idea and earnest in life; then, and finally, he was repelled from it, by its want of completeness, by its English acquiescence in compromise, by its hesitations and clinging to insular associations and sympathies, which had little interest for him." Another person, who was at this time even more prominent in the advanced portion of the Movement party, was W. G. Ward, Fellow of Balliol. Mr. Ward, continues the dean of St. Paul's, had distinguished himself greatly at the Oxford Union as a vigorous speaker, at first on the Tory side; "he came afterward under the influence of Arthur Stanley, then fresh from Rugby, and naturally learned to admire Dr. Arnold; but Dr. Arnold's religious vagaries did not satisfy him; the Movement, with its boldness and originality of idea and ethical character, had laid strong hold on him, and he passed into one of the most thorough-going adherents of Mr. Newman. There was something to smile at in his person, and in some of his ways—his unbusiness-like habits, his joyousness of manner, his racy stories; but few more powerful intellects passed through Oxford in his time, and he has justified his University reputation by his distinction since, both as a Roman Catholic theologian and professor, and as a profound metaphysical thinker, the antagonist on their own ground of J. Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer." The new recruits of Tractarianism were far more un-Anglican

than were the original leaders of the Movement: Newman, Pusey, and Keble, who had persuaded themselves that the Establishment was the lineal descendant of the ancient British Church. Certainly, the study of the Fathers and of the early English saints, prosecuted especially by Pusey, had induced in the minds of the would-be Catholicizers of Anglicanism many suspiciously Roman opinions. But, as Newman afterward wrote: "Judge of their dismay, when, according to the Arabian tale, on their striking their anchors into the supposed soil, lighting their fires on it, and fixing in it the poles of their tents, suddenly their island began to move, to heave, to splash, to frisk to and fro, to dive, and at last to swim away, spouting out inhospitable jets of water upon the credulous mariners who had made it their home. . . . They saw distinctly, in the reasonings of the Fathers, the justification of what they had been accustomed to consider the corruption of Rome. . . . Time went on; and there was no mistaking or denying the misfortune which was impending over them. They had reared a goodly house, but their foundations were falling in. The soil and the masonry were both bad. The Fathers *would* protect Romanists. The Anglican divines *would* misquote the Fathers, and shrink from the very doctors to whom they appealed. The bishops of the seventeenth century were shy of the bishops of the fourth" (1). Nevertheless, the logical consequences of this discovery were long resisted by the still persisting Protestant prejudices of the original Tractarians; Pusey and Keble resisted until they doffed their mortality. In 1839, when the second part of Hurrell Froude's *Remains* was published, it became evident that Romanizing tendencies were indeed swaying the Movement. In the *Preface* of that interesting work, it was stated that the editors, by publishing the sentiments of Hurrell Froude so unreservedly, "indicated their own general acquiescence in the opinion that the persons chiefly instrumental in the Reformation were not as a party to be trusted on ecclesiastical questions, nor yet to be imitated in the practical handling of the unspeakably awful matters with which they were concerned." And concerning

(1) *Anglican Difficulties*, p. 121.

the differences between the English Reformers and the Fathers of the Church, the reader was told: "You must choose between the two lines; they are not only diverging, but contrary." Men were asked to note the difference between the practical Christian ideal of the Fathers and that presented by the Calvinist-Zwinglian school of Cranmer, etc. "Compare the sayings and manner of the two schools on the subjects of fasting, celibacy, religious vows, voluntary retirement and contemplation, the memory of the saints, rites and ceremonies, recommended by antiquity." It is not strange, therefore, that there soon loomed up before Newman "a vista, the end of which he could not see"; that for a moment he even entertained the thought that "the Church of Rome will be found right, after all." In the summer of 1839 he studied the subject of the Monophysite heretics; and having realized that the Monophysites had been in a position similar to that of the Anglicans of his day, and that the Church had stamped them as heretics, he felt that his fundamental idea of the *via media*, the defence of his companions and himself against the charge of schism by an appeal to antiquity, was perhaps untenable. He mentioned his perturbation to Henry Wilberforce, speaking also of the possibility of his joining the Roman Church; whereupon Wilberforce, "upon whom such a fear came like a thunder-stroke, expressed his hope that Mr. Newman might die, rather than take such a step" (1). St. Augustine's words with reference to the Donatists, "*securus judicat orbis terrarum*," had shown to Newman that in the first centuries of Christianity "they decided ecclesiastical questions by a simpler rule than that of antiquity; nay, St. Augustine was one of the prime oracles of antiquity; here, then, was antiquity deciding against itself." Wilberforce says that Newman never again "settled down exactly into his old position; before August, 1839, he had always both spoken and written of the Roman Church in the strong language of condemnation which he had learned from the great Anglican writers, of whom it must be said that however Catholic on any other subject, the very mention of the Pope acted as a

(1) Thus Wilberforce in the *Dublin Review*, April, 1869, p. 327.

chemical test to precipitate in a moment their latent Protestantism. He no longer maintained the *via media*, or attacked Rome as schismatical. His new position was that 'Rome is the Church, and we are the Church'; and 'there is no need to inquire which of the two has deflected most from the Apostolic standard.' This is the view he puts forward in the article on *The Catholicity of the English Church*, which appeared in Jan., 1840, and was the first result of his restored tranquillity of mind."

While the Anglican impassiveness of the University of Oxford was being stirred into sensibility by so many of the most gifted of her sons, and while the very foundations of the Establishment were being undermined by engineers who as yet wore its uniform, what was the attitude of the University authorities, and of the Anglican wearers of mitres? All that the dean of St. Paul's advances by way of explanation of the course adopted, in this emergency, by the Heads of Houses in Oxford, may be summarized in one of his sentences: "There was always a stick ready to beat the offenders; everything could be called Popish; but for the most part they looked on with smiles, with jokes, sometimes with *scolding*." Caring more for their *otium cum dignitate* than for discussions which might generate strife, the Heads of Houses were satisfied with discountenancing the thing which they heard mentioned as Tractarianism, or as Newmanism, or as Puseyism. And at length, says Church, "they found themselves going along with the outside current of uninstructed and ignoble prejudice, in a settled and pronounced dislike, which took for granted that all was wrong in the Movement, which admitted any ill-natured surmise and foolish misrepresentation, and really allowed itself to acquiesce in the belief that men so well known in Oxford, once so admired and honored, had sunk down to deliberate corrupters of the truth, and palterers with their own intellects and consciences. It came in a few years to be understood on both sides, that the authorities were in direct antagonism to the Movement; and though their efforts in opposition to it were feeble and petty, it went on under the dead weight of official University disapproval. It would have been a great thing

for the English Church—though it is hard to see how, things being as they were, it would have come about—if the Movement had gone on, at least with the friendly interest, if not with the support, of the University rulers. Instead of that, after the first two or three years there was one long and bitter fight in Oxford, with the anger on one side created by the belief of vague but growing dangers, and a sense of incapacity in resisting them, and with deep resentment at injustice and stupidity on the other." As for the bishops of the Establishment, nearly all of whom had been appointed by the crown for political or social reasons, Archbishop Howley, Phillpotts of Exeter, Kaye of Lincoln, and Marsh of Peterborough, alone could be termed theologians. Ryder of Lichfield, and the two Sumners of Winchester and Chester, were Evangelicals. Blomfield of London was the most appreciative of the dangers which menaced Anglicanism; but he was never sure of his mind, and he realized that if the question of Tractarianism ever came before him, his theological abilities would be found unable to solve it. The position of these men, whom the Newmanites still regarded as shepherds of Israel, was delicate indeed; the Tractarians exalted their office as no conservative Anglican ever ventured to exalt it, while any favor shown to those magnifiers of the episcopate would be resented by the then powerful Evangelical party. It seemed, therefore, to the bishops, just as to the authorities of Oxford, that a policy of *laissez aller* was the prudent one. But in the spring of 1841, the appearance of the memorable *Tract No. 90* aroused the Heads of Houses in Oxford from their lethargy, and convinced the prelates that temporization would no longer suffice.

Newman's principal motive in writing *Tract No. 90* is given in the following passage of a letter which he sent to Dr. Jelf, then canon of Christ Church, on March 16, 1841: "There is at this moment a great progress of the religious mind of our Church to something deeper and truer than satisfied the last century. I have always contended, and will contend, that it is not satisfactorily accounted for by any particular movements of individuals on a particular spot. The poets and philosophers of the age have borne witness to it

many years. Those great names in our literature, Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Wordsworth, Mr. Coleridge, though in different ways and with essential differences one from another, and perhaps from any Church system, bear witness to it. The system of Mr. Irving is another witness to it. The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been practically in possession of that something is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic. The question, then, is whether we shall give them up to the Roman Church or claim them for ourselves, as we well may, by reverting to that older system which has of late years indeed been superseded, but which has been and is quite congenial (to say the least), I should rather say proper and natural, or even necessary, to our Church. But if we do give them up, then we must give up the men who cherish them; we must consent either to give up the men or to admit their principles. . . . The Tract is grounded on the belief that the *Articles* need not be so closed as the received method of teaching closes them, and ought not to be for the sake of many persons. If we will close them, we run the risk of subjecting persons whom we should least like to lose to the temptation of joining the Church of Rome." Some of the more advanced Tractarians had agreed with their opponents that the *Thirty-nine Articles* opposed absolutely the doctrines which Newman defended on the authority of certain Anglican theologians, but which were, according to both parties, distinctively Roman; and Newman had undertaken to demonstrate, by a rigorous examination of the language of the *Articles*, that the famous exposition of English Protestantism was reconcilable with the Catholic tenets. "It is often urged," declares No. 90, "and sometimes felt and granted, that there are in the *Articles* propositions or terms inconsistent with the Catholic faith; or, at least, if persons do not go so far as to feel the objection as of force, they are perplexed how best to answer it, or how most simply to explain the passages on

which it is made to rest. The following *Tract* is drawn up with the view of showing how groundless the objection is, and further, of approximating toward the argumentative answer to it, of which most men have an implicit apprehension, though they may have nothing more. That there are real difficulties to a Catholic Christian in the ecclesiastical position of our Church at this day, no one can deny; but the statements of the *Articles* are not in the number, and it may be right at the present moment to insist upon this." The enterprise which Newman had undertaken, an endeavor to show that the *Thirty-nine Articles* might be interpreted in a Catholic sense, was worthy of his powerful intellect, if its magnitude alone was considered; but the arguments adduced by him merely demonstrated that he still clung desperately to his hope—it must have ceased long ago to be a conviction—that the English Establishment was a "branch" of the Universal Church. An almost general panic resulted in Oxford when the contents of No. 90 had been digested; loud and perhaps sincere denunciations of the author's orthodoxy, of his false reasonings, and of his moral principles, resounded through the ancient halls. The *Tract* had been published on 27th February. On the 8th of March four senior tutors, one of whom was Mr. H. B. Wilson, of St. John's, and another Mr. Tait, of Balliol, addressed the editor of the *Tract*, charging No. 90 with suggesting and opening a way, by which men might, at least in the case of Roman views, violate their solemn engagements to their University. On the 15th of March, the Board of Heads of Houses, refusing to wait for Mr. Newman's defense, which was known to be coming, and which bears date 13th March, published their judgment. They declared that in No. 90 "modes of interpretation were suggested, and have since been advocated in other publications purporting to be written by members of the University, by which subscription to the *Articles* might be reconciled with the adoption of Roman Catholic error." And they announced their resolution, "That modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said *Tract*, evading rather than explaining the sense of the *Thirty-nine Articles*, and reconciling subscription to them with the adoption of er-

rors which they are designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned statutes" (1).

The fall of 1841 witnessed one of the facts which helped to destroy Newman's belief in the Catholicity of the Establishment; "it was," he afterward said, "one of the blows which broke me" (2). The Prussian sovereign had conceived the idea of an inter-communion between his newly-manufactured State Church and the Church of England. As a first step toward a closer alliance between the two bodies, it was proposed to institute a Protestant bishopric at Jerusalem, the prelate to be nominated alternately by England and Prussia, to be consecrated by English bishops, and to exercise jurisdiction over the English and German Protestants in Palestine. When the project was submitted to Archbishop Howley of Canterbury and Bishop Blomfield of London, they immediately approved it, to the dismay of those who asserted the Apostolicity and Catholicity of the Establishment (3). Newman saw in this proposed close communion with Lutherans and Calvinists a patent contradiction of all the arguments which he had so laboriously framed for proof of the historical and constitutional Catholicity of his beloved Church. He sent a vehement protest to the archbishop. For three or four more years Newman continued to recognize the claims of the Establishment, imperfect and faulty though he felt it to be; he still deemed it possible to restore to it the vitality which he fancied that it had once possessed. But in January, 1843, he published a retraction of the severe language which he had hitherto used in regard to the Papacy; and in the following September, he tendered his resignation of St. Mary's, and announced that he would soon resign his fellowship. He had finally realized that he could no longer hold any office in the Church of England, or again be her champion; now there remained for him, he considered, only the duty of dis-

(1) That is, the statutes of the University, cited in the preamble to the resolution.

(2) *Apologia*, pp. 243, 253.

(3) Cardinal Wiseman, writing to Phillipps on Dec. 8, 1842, says that the Austrian Minister to England told him that the design was "concocted by correspondence directly between the king of Prussia and Dr. Howley."

covering whether it was or not a delusion which was urging him to enter into the Roman communion. That this consummation was by no means improbable, he informed his sisters and his more intimate friends. The cruel struggle between Newman's dearest affections and his growing convictions, says Church, had begun, and it long continued, with the belief that though England was wrong, Rome was not right. He thought, continues the dean, "that though the Roman argument seemed more and more unanswerable, there were insuperable difficulties of certain fact which made the Roman conclusion incredible; that there was so much good and truth in England, with all its defects and faults, which was unaccountable and unintelligible on the Roman hypothesis; that the real upshot was that the whole state of things in Christendom was abnormal; that to English churchmen the English Church had immediate and direct claims which nothing but the most irresistible counter-claims could overcome or neutralize—the claims of a shipwrecked body cut off from country and home, yet as a shipwrecked body still organized, and with much saved from the wreck, and not to be deserted, as long as it held together, in an uncertain attempt to rejoin its lost unity. Resignation, retirement, silence, lay communion, the hope of ultimate, though perhaps long deferred reunion—these were his first thoughts. Misgivings could not be helped, would not be denied, but need not be paraded, were to be kept at arm's length as long as possible. This is the picture presented in the autobiography of these painful and dreary years; and there is every evidence that it is a faithful one."

Some months before Newman resigned from St. Mary's, and retired permanently to Littlemore, there had occurred a definite separation of the more moderate Tractarians, represented by Dr. Pusey, and the more advanced ones, such as Ward and Oakley, who used the columns of the *British Critic* for an advocacy of principles which the Establishment, with all of its phenomenal elasticity, could not be expected to tolerate. Ward and Oakley openly denied that the Church of England possessed any of the "notes" of a Church; with every successive article in the *Critic* they ac-

cepted more of Roman doctrine; and they did not hesitate to say that the Roman Pontiff is the divinely-appointed Primate of Christendom. When it was urged that with such opinions they could not be justified in remaining Anglicans, they replied that Providence had placed them in the Establishment; that the admirable elasticity of Anglicanism allowed its professors to hold any Roman doctrine; and that it was better to not make an open profession of Catholicism, until a large number of Anglicans would have been convinced of their duty to accompany them (1). Newman seems to have smiled on this comfortable theory when it was first broached; for in a letter to Hope Scott, Sept., 1843, he speaks of "those who feel they can with a safe conscience remain with us while they are allowed to testify in behalf of Catholicism, and to promote its interests; *i. e.*, as if by such acts they were putting our Church, or at least a portion of it in which they are included, in the position of catechumens. They think they may stay while they are moving themselves and others, nay, say the whole Church, toward Rome. . . . Is this not an intelligible ground? I should like your opinion of it." It must be noted, however, that when Ward carried his theory to its logical development, holding that "the whole cycle of Roman doctrine, confirmed by the Pope," might be consistent with membership in the Establishment, Newman wrote to Hope Scott: "You are quite right in saying that I do not take Ward and Oakley's grounds that all Roman doctrine may be held in our Church, and that as Roman, I have always and everywhere resisted it." At this period Ward had become the *enfant terrible* of the Tractarian party. Unlike all the Pusyites, who were staunch worshippers of the dissimulating weakling whom they designated as "the martyr-king," he stoutly contended that the execution of Charles I. was the only defensible course in the circumstances. At this closing period of the Movement, he proclaimed as hair-splitting and unreal the theory that the Establishment was a part of the Catholic Church. He would not recognize in himself or in his ministerial brethren any sacerdotal character or

(1) WILFRID WARD: *loc. cit.*, p. 213.

power. When some Puseyite innocent, in order to play in the emasculated travesty which his party dignified with the name of Auricular Confession, would ask Ward to act as "ghostly father," he was indeed not repelled, but when he had finished his communication, he received no "absolution"; the sturdily honest Ward would then simply kneel by his side, and beg God to forgive both of them. One day Macmullen, one of the Tractarians who afterward did receive the priesthood, told Ward to bear in mind that, according to the principles of the Movement, he was really a priest of God; whereupon he replied: "If that is the case, the whole thing is infernal humbug." In 1843, realizing the need of reconciling his frequent admiring references to Rome with the objects of the Movement, Ward wrote in the *British Critic*: "It may be worth while to remind our readers that we are defending a class of doctrines which on the whole have the distinct sanction, both of our Church's formularies and of our 'standard divines,' and yet are wholly alien to the very fundamental principles of our present practical system. The very word '*sacerdos*,' which Mr. Bernard and Archbishop Whately, whom he quotes, regard as the symbol and spring of a Christian corruption, is sanctioned in the Latin version of our *Articles*, which all the world knows to be of equal authority with the English. . . . The *Athanasian Creed* speaks of something, which it calls 'the Catholic faith,' as so authoritative, that its denial incurs an anathema; a sanction with which our Church has not invested the very fundamental basis of a 'scriptural religion,' not even such doctrines as the canonicity and inspiration of Scripture itself, essential and Catholic though these doctrines be. And in their general view of the Church's office our 'great divines,' it is well known, have displayed the same spirit. As to ceremonial religion, in particular, who can possibly go beyond Archbishop Laud in his attachment to it? And as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, let any one impartially peruse No. 81 of the *Tracts for the Times*. On the other hand, in our existing practice (though it is hardly worth while to set about illustrating what is so very plain) unlimited private judgment on the text of Scripture is openly claimed, and

without rebuke, by our people. Again, we have in Ireland, *e. g.*, abandoned the very word 'priest' to the Roman Catholics; an ordinary layman would be hardly more astonished at being told that his clergyman was in communion with the Pope, than that in the Eucharist the said clergyman offered a 'sacrifice' (*Tract* 81, p. 256), 'a propitiatory oblation' (JOHNSON, p. 314), 'a complete sacrifice' (BRETT, p. 395) for the people; and certainly anything more utterly irreconcilable with the whole idea of the relative sacredness of holy things and places, or of a symbolized and sacramental religion, than the popular mode of behaving in churches, or the ordinary form of Sunday service, it is difficult for the most active imagination to conceive. Now, this whole view, thus distinctly recognized by our Church in theory, thus wholly abandoned in practice, has been preserved abroad in practice as well as in theory. We are absolutely driven, then, were we ever so averse, to consider Rome in its degree our model; for we are met *in limine* by objections derived from the witnessed effect of these doctrines in Roman Catholic countries. The English theoretical system agrees with Rome in these matters; the English practical system differs from her; in entering a protest, then, against our practical system in defence of our theoretical, we have necessarily the appearance of appealing to Rome against England. . . . The truth is, that we have been so long accustomed to a vague, shadowy, indefinite creed—to a creed which we dare not contemplate steadily lest it fade from our sight in the contemplation—which we dare not approach closely lest it melt away, as it were, from our very breath—that we cannot be brought into the presence of a real orthodox Catholic, 'knowing what he believes' and saying it, without feeling ourselves in a strangely uncomfortable position: we have been so long accustomed to theological gloom and twilight, that the first intrusion of the light of day pains and distresses us. The pain and distress, then, must with such persons come first; but the sun brings with it real light and warmth notwithstanding; and they, too, will in time learn and appropriate their share in its happy influences; they, too, will in time exult that after the long night the day has

begun to dawn on them ; that they have been rescued from the oppressive, arrogant, and insulting dominion of Protestant superstition, and brought safely into the fulness and freshness of Gospel truth." It is no wonder that the consequence of these and similar articles in the *British Critic* was the discontinuance of that Review, in deference to the anti-Roman sentiments of men like Pusey, and like the William Palmer of that day. Palmer now wrote a pamphlet giving "a narrative of the events connected with the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*, with reflections on existing tendencies to Romanism," and complaining of the excesses of Ward, Oakley, and others of the "extreme party." This narrative was the cause of Ward's book on *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered in Comparison with Existing Practices*, a work which, in the words of Dean Stanley, gave the signal for the "closing scene of the conflict of the first Oxford Movement" (1).

While Ward was writing the *Ideal*, Newman had said to Dalgairns : "The great thing we have to look for now is Ward's *magnum opus* "; therefore when the book appeared, Dalgairns hastened to Littlemore, and asked for the great leader's opinion on it. Newman was reading it at the moment, and he replied : "It won't do "; and he especially indicated his rejection of Ward's belief that Anglicans were free to regard the Church of Rome as their authorized teach-

(1) Its dedication was as follows : "To all members of the English Church who have her welfare deeply at heart, these pages, which have been prompted by an earnest desire to bear part, if it might be allowed, in the great work of restoring unity of doctrine and action within her pale, are respectfully and affectionately inscribed." In the Preface, the author writes : "The one object which has been nearest my heart throughout has been the attempting to lay down a sufficient basis on which all who profess what are called 'High Church' sentiments might be able to co-operate without compromise on any side." This basis is the principle—which he maintains that Catholic asceticism has ever presupposed—"that careful and individual moral discipline is the only possible basis on which Christian Faith and Practice can be reared." If it be allowed that the existing English Church entirely neglects, as Mr. Ward maintains, the duty of such moral discipline, then he concludes "that to remedy these defects is an object of so much magnitude as to offer the fullest scope for all our energies;—that to act heartily and unsuspectingly on our points of agreement is the sure way of arriving at agreement on matters which are now points of difference." At the same time he adds, "I have felt it a positive duty in no way to conceal my own deeply and deliberately entertained opinions on the ultimate result which would ensue from all wisely directed endeavors to reform and purify our Church," that result being a nearer and nearer approximation to the principles and doctrines current in the Church of Rome, and finally to repentance for the schism of the sixteenth century, and the wish to acknowledge once more the primacy of the See of Peter, and its divine commission as guardian of Catholic truth.

er. The feeling of the Puseyite Tractarians, and of nearly all the High Church Anglicans, in regard to the *Ideal*, was expressed by Gresley, prebendary of Lichfield, when he wrote : " Most heartily do I wish that Mr. Ward was anywhere else, rather than at the University of Oxford at the present time, or that he had never been so ill-advised as to publish his unhappy book, or indeed anything else. With good and upright intentions, Mr. Ward's writings have been singularly infelicitous. The Church was going on very well when Mr. Ward unhappily became connected with the *British Critic* ; since which time all has gone wrong. The peculiar mischief in Mr. Ward's writings is that he puts forth the most important and valuable truths which, if discreetly stated, might be of the greatest value to the Church ; but coupling them with such extravagant statements, such apparent arrogance and scorn of those who differ from him, such misstatements of other persons' views, and such an obvious leaning, or rather identification of himself with the Church of Rome, that an insuperable prejudice is raised against the very improvements he advocates. Never was there such a mixture of opposites. It may be questioned whether Mr. Ward's Romanizing tendencies might not have been passed over unheeded, but for the vehement manner in which he denounces the unholiness, and imbecility, and latitudinarianism, and various evil attributes, which, whether rightly or not, he thinks he perceives in the present system of our Church. It is on account of this, that the anger of many persons is concentrated upon him. He has himself contrived the conductor which is to bring all the electric fluid on his own head." It soon transpired that the Oxford authorities had determined to make an example of Ward. Six passages from the *Ideal* were said to be inconsistent with the *Thirty-nine Articles*, and therefore with the good faith of Ward, who had subscribed them ; and the Heads of Houses had decided that in a Convocation to be held on Feb. 13, 1845, a resolution to that effect should be passed, and that a second resolution should deprive the culprit of his degrees, while a third should declare that in future " the *Articles* must be accepted, not according to the subtle explanations of the nineteenth century,

but according to the rigid definitions of the sixteenth. It laid down that whenever subscribed at the University of Oxford, they must be accepted in that sense in which they had been originally uttered, and in which the University imposed them" (1). This determination of the dons caused great excitement in all circles of thought; for although few, even among the advanced Tractarians, accepted all of Ward's conclusions, it was seen that the proposed course was equivalent, on the part of the University, to an ostracization of fully one-half of its most promising sons. The sense of the University of that moment was "Low Church"; but, asks Wilfrid Ward, was this sense identical with that of the framers of the *Articles*, as it professed to be? Keble wrote against a condemnation of Ward, although he did not approve the *Ideal*. Pusey preserved absolute silence. Tait, afterward incumbent of Canterbury, approved the personal condemnation of the criminated passages of the *Ideal*; but he wrote to the vice-chancellor that the proposed test established a principle which would bear hard not only on Ward and the Newmanites, but also on many whose place in the Establishment was regarded as secure—a position in which Ward had already intrenched himself, when he said: "My subscription is as honest as that of others." Newman took no part in the struggle. Archdeacon Wilberforce wrote against Ward, and for the test. Gladstone, although he wrote strongly in an attempted refutation of the *Ideal*, refused to countenance the test. Writing to Wilberforce on Dec. 29, 1844, he said: "With respect to the new test I have not heard the argument for it, and have some difficulty in conceiving what it can be. In the first place, I apprehend much is to be said on the naked question of legality; but that I pass by. On general grounds I see very many objections. Firstly, the recurrence to the sense of first promulgation is no guarantee against Wardism, because it is part of Ward's theory that he is acting wholly within the theory of the promulgators. Secondly, the sense of first promulgation is a matter only to be known by much historical study; and so far as I can get at it, I am disposed to believe it was a sense

(1) Dean Stanley, in the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1881, p. 320.

very liberal towards the Church of Rome. This appears to me to stand on the face of the *Articles* much more than any other sense. But whether that be so or not, I do not think you should call on men to affirm virtually propositions of history, unless they are known either by study or notoriety. And in this case few could have adequately studied, and I am not aware that any sense (*quoad* these points) is notorious. Thirdly, I find, however, much greater difficulty still in conjecturing what is meant by the present sense of the University. I think there is no University sense sufficiently definite to be made the subject of a test. But even if this position be waived, where is this definite sense to be found? And is it fixed, or does it vary from year to year?" The result of this agitation was the abandonment of the test; but when the Oxford Convocation met on Feb. 13, the passages from the *Ideal* were condemned by a vote of 777 to 391; and Ward was deprived of his degrees by a vote of 569 to 511. Among the voices which voted *non placet*, that of Mr. Gladstone was very vehement; indeed, the great commoner voted in favor of Ward on both propositions. At the close of the proceedings Ward called on Pusey, and in a jocose manner he commented on the anomalous position which he now perforce occupied in the University; he was a Fellow of Balliol, but since his degree had been cancelled, he was practically an undergraduate. "They can't expect me to wear an undergraduate's cap and gown," he remarked; "I suppose I must wear my beaver." Then a grave voice from the end of the room reached his ear: "The situation seems to me, Mr. Ward, to be one of the utmost gravity. It is indeed a serious crisis. Let us not at such a time give way to a spirit of levity or hilarity." The speaker was Archdeacon Manning, who had voted for Ward, and who now met him for the first time. The conversation that ensued would indicate that Manning at least did not then regard the *Ideal* as too Catholic in tone; for when Ward repeated his opinion, expressed in his work, that the doctrines of Luther were worse than atheism, the archdeacon replied: "The most Lutheran book I have ever read was called *The Ideal of a Christian Church*" (1).

(1) There was much in the Oxford proceedings against Ward that was calculated to

A strong effort to procure the condemnation of *Traet No. 90* in this Convocation had been made by the foes of Newman; a requisition to the Board, issued in the names of Dr. Fausset and Dr. Ellerton, received nearly 500 signatures. But many leading minds, Gladstone among them, convinced the proctors that they ought to exercise their right of Veto on the project; and when, after the degradation of Ward, the vice-chancellor put the question, the proctors stopped the proceedings (1).

The Movement was now on the verge of collapse. Dean Stanley was wont to ascribe that consummation to the scandal which, according to him, had been operated among the

amuse. Shortly after the appearance of the *Ideal*, he was deprived of his tutorship of mathematics in Balliol, and just before the Feast of Sts. Simon and Jude he was forbidden to act any longer as deputy-chaplain for Oakley. His son tells us that when that day arrived, in the ordinary course of things, he was to read the Epistle at the Communion service on one side of the Communion table, while Dr. Jenkyns, as senior ecclesiastic, read the Gospel at the other side. Mr. Ward himself expected some sort of protest from the Master, and he was not disappointed. A scene long remembered by the undergraduates who were present followed. Directly the Master saw Mr. Ward advancing to the Epistle side of the table, he shot forth from his place and rushed to the Gospel side, and just as Mr. Ward was beginning, commenced in his loudest tones: — "The Epistle is taken from the first chapter of St. Jude." Mr. Ward made no further attempt to continue, and the Master, now thoroughly aroused, read *at him* across the Communion table. The words of the Epistle were singularly appropriate to the situation, and the Master, with ominous pauses and looks at the irreverent Puseyite, who had sown sedition in the Church and blasphemed the Heads of Houses, read as follows slowly and emphatically: "For there are certain men erept in unawares" (pause, and look at Mr. Ward) "who were before of old ordained unto this condemnation" (pause, and look), "ungodly men" (pause, and look);—and a little later, still more slowly and bitterly he read, "they speak evil of dignities!"

(1) "On this part of the question, those who have ever been honored by Mr. Newman's friendship must feel it dangerous to allow themselves thus to speak. And yet they must speak; for no one else can appreciate it as truly as they do. When they see the person whom they had been accustomed to revere as few men are revered, whose labors, whose greatness, whose tenderness, whose singleness and holiness of purpose, they have been permitted to know intimately—not allowed even the poor privilege of satisfying, by silence and retirement—by the relinquishment of preferment, position, and influence—the persevering hostility of persons whom they cannot help comparing with him—not permitted even to submit in peace to those irregular censures, to which he seems to have been even morbidly alive, but dragged forth to suffer an oblique and tardy condemnation; called again to account for matters now long ago accounted for; on which a judgment has been pronounced, which, whatever others may think of it, he at least has accepted as conclusive—when they contrast his merits, his submission, his treatment, which they see and know, with the merits, the bearing, the fortunes of those who are doggedly pursuing him, it does become very difficult to speak without sullyng what it is a kind of pleasure to feel is *his* cause by using hard words, or betraying it by not using them. It is too difficult to speak, as ought to be spoken, of this ungenerous and gratuitous afterthought—too difficult to keep clear of what, at least, will be *thought* exaggeration; too difficult to do justice to what they feel to be undoubtedly true; and I will not attempt to say more than enough to mark an opinion which ought to be plainly avowed, as to the nature of this procedure."—*Short Appeal to Members of Convocation on the Proposed Censure of No. 90*. By Frederic Rogers, Fellow of Oriel (Dated Feb. 8, 1845).

more devout of the Tractarians by the marriage of Ward (1). No such absurd reason could have caused dejection in the minds of the men who had rallied around the standard of John Henry Newman. There were several events which may have hastened the demise of Tractarianism; for instance, the decision of the Ecclesiastical Courts in regard to the Stone Altar case, the Margaret Street proceedings, etc. (2). But the prime cause was undoubtedly the declared intention of Newman, the very soul of the Movement, to become a Catholic. After the degradation of Ward, says the dean of St. Paul's, "there was a widespread feeling of insecurity. Friends did not know of friends, how their minds were working, how they might go. Anxious letters passed, the writers not daring to say too much, or reveal too much alarm. And yet there was still some hope that at least with the great leader matters were not desperate. To his own

(1) "Ward had first taken deacon's orders with no belief in their sacramental character. But even after his final ordination as a Newmanite, the anomalous state of the English Church seemed to him to throw such doubt on the Episcopal Succession, that he had never believed in the validity of his own orders. His views on clerical celibacy were therefore no bar to his marriage. Still, when it came to the alternative of breaking off a friendship which had been so much to him, and taking a step which must necessarily, in the excited state of feeling on every point in Catholic doctrine, be a shock to his supporters, he hesitated; and it was only the decided counsel of the men to whom he ever looked for advice in matters of duty, which determined him to act as he acted. Newman held that it was his vocation, as he felt it to be for his happiness, that the friendship should be allowed to become what it had fast been becoming. Miss Frances Mary Wingfield was the youngest daughter of the Rev. John Wingfield, D. D., one of the pluralists of bygone days, who held, among other preferments, a canonry of York, a probendal stall at Worcester, and another living at Bromsgrove. She had long been a zealous Puseyite, and had followed Mr. Ward's career with all the sympathy which was natural in a disciple of Oakley. They were engaged to be married in the winter of 1844, on the eve of the events described in the last chapter. It was thought advisable, considering the exasperated state of public feeling, that the engagement should not be publicly known until after the proceedings of 13th February. It was not a time at which the public mind would be disposed to take a fair view of the subject; and the broad fact that the English clergyman who advocated clerical celibacy was himself about to marry, would be a more effective weapon in the hands of his opponents than the more complicated and personal considerations by which individual duty is decided, could be for his friends. In calmer times the case might have been otherwise. John Wesley advocated clerical celibacy, and yet thought that his own circumstances and character warranted him in marrying. And though he had not even the plea which Mr. Ward had, that he did not regard his orders as assured, or his vocation to be that of a priest, we do not hear of his marriage being criticised. But December, 1844, was a moment of intense excitement and consequent unfairness on all sides in the English Church. The party could not risk the possible consequences of disclosure, and the engagement was not divulged until the great day of Mr. Ward's trial before the University was past. It was a nine days' wonder, and a year or two later, when Mr. Ward had become a Catholic layman, probably very few disapproved of it."—WILFRID WARD; *ubi supra*, ch. 14.

(2) Wilfrid Ward describes both matters.

friends he gave warning ; he had already done so in a way to leave little to expect but at last to lose him ; he spoke of resigning his fellowship in October, though he wished to defer this till the following June ; but nothing final had been said publicly. Even at the last it was only anticipated by some that he would retire into lay communion. But that silence was awful and ominous. . . . The defeated party, though defeated signally and conspicuously in the sight of the Church and the country, had in it too large a proportion of the serious and able men of the University, with too clear and high a purpose, and too distinct a sense of the strength and reality of their ground, to be in as disadvantageous a condition as from a distance might be imagined. A closer view would have discovered how much sympathy there was for their objects and for their main principles in many who greatly disapproved of much in the recent course and tendency of the Movement. It might have been seen how the unwise measures of the Heads had awakened convictions among many who were not naturally on their side, that it was necessary both on the ground of justice and policy to arrest all extreme measures, and to give a breathing time to the minority. Confidence in their prospects as a party might have been impaired in the Tractarians ; but confidence in their principles, confidence that they had rightly interpreted the spirit, the claims, and the duties of the English Church, confidence that devotion to its cause was the call of God, whatever might happen to their own fortunes, this confidence was unshaken by the catastrophe of February." But in September, 1845, Ward and his wife were received into the Catholic Church by the Jesuit, Father Brownbill ; and on Oct. 8, Newman made his abjuration of Protestantism in the hands of the Passionist, Father Dominic. Immediately after his reception of conditional baptism, Newman went to his desk, on which rested the manuscript of his not yet completed *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, and wrote by way of an Appendix to the work the words which Hutton well describes as destined to be remembered as long as the English language endures : "Such were the thoughts concerning the 'blessed vision of peace,' of one whose long

continued petition had been that the Most Merciful would not despise the work of his own hands nor leave him to himself, while yet his eyes were dim and his breast laden, and he could but employ Reason in the Things of Faith. And now, dear reader, time is short and eternity long. Put not from you what you have here found; reject it not as mere matter of present controversy. Set not out to reject it, and looking about for the best way of doing so; seduce not yourself with the imagination that it comes of disgust, or disappointment, or restlessness, or wounded feeling, or undue sensibility, or other weakness. Wrap not yourself round in the associations of years past, nor determine that to be the truth which you wish to be so, nor make an idol of cherished anticipations. Time is short, eternity is long. ‘*Nunc dimittis servum Tuum, Domine, secundum verbum Tuum in pace. Quia viderunt oculi mei salutare Tuum*’” (1). Numerous in-

(1) “It has been said that at that time the adequate and complete formula of the faith of many men, eminent in judgment and will, was these words—*Credo in Newmanum*. A word from him, even less than that, a passing shade of expression, a gesture, a silent pause, were obeyed or listened to, as the commands of a king or the decrees of an infallible Pontiff. Rarely has a man in this or any other age enjoyed more fully the intoxicating joys of an intellectual and moral dictatorship. What is pathetic in his case is, that during almost all this time the object of this adoration, the idol of this worship, was a prey to the poignant anguish of doubt. He saw an abyss open beside him, and, more unfortunate than Pascal, it was he who brought to it all those who confided in him. . . . Very soon he felt that he had not the right to limit his affirmations to what was useful to his cause. It would have been very convenient, but not sufficiently honest, to cut off from his theories all that went beyond the current conception of Anglicanism, to prune away all that threatened the claims or showed the contradictions of the Church of England. Accepting, invoking a part of the formula of Vincent de Lerins, he could not conscientiously reject and condemn the remainder. Did not his doctrine of the rule of Christian antiquity, of conformity to the primitive Church, logically imply Catholicism? How could he assert with the same breath that the Church was by divine right the depository and interpreter of revealed truth, and that she was the mistress of errors and sponsor of popular superstitions? With what right could he proclaim the infallible authority of the Church of the first three centuries, of the great Œcumenical Councils, only to recognize the great defection of the Church in the Middle Ages, the straying from the right path of the Council of Trent? The terror with which Newman saw the uprising of these questions was sincere. If his mind began to throw off the yoke of his Protestant prejudices, his heart and imagination were still enslaved by them. . . . It seemed to Newman that he was doomed to strike a deadly blow at his mother, the Church (of England), whether he forsook her to kneel before her proud enemy, or whether he tore away from her with his own hands the crown that he had just placed upon her head. This inner strife was already far advanced when, as a climax, there came a whole series of external facts, of undeniable, practical realities, which showed him the flitious and imaginary elements of his fundamental affirmations. It was no longer a question of knowing theoretically whether a Church possessing, or claiming a part of the supernatural attributes of the ideal Church, has the logical right to repudiate the others. . . . Newman had to own that Anglicanism did not possess the distinctive signs of the Church of God. How could such fictions as the following be maintained, when

deed were the conversions which were encouraged by the example of Newman; and the disappointed Pusey could find consolation only by flattering himself with the fancy that their change of faith had worked harm in the characters of his olden friends: "All who have left us have deteriorated so much—all, that is, with two exceptions. One exception is Newman, whose nature is so beautiful, so perfect, that nothing, not even going over to Rome, could change him. The other exception is Ward. Ward had got so bad already, that with him further deterioration was impossible."

In 1850 there originated in England another Romeward movement, one which owed its existence to an official act of the crown, in its capacity of Supreme Head of the Church of England. This governmental action consecrated, with the highest sanction known to Anglicanism, the Erastianism or State supremacy in religious matters which Dr. Arnold upheld, and which the Newmanites had tried to overthrow. Dr. Philpotts, the Anglican incumbent of Exeter, was asked to confer canonical institution to the vicarage of Brampford Speke on a minister named G. C. Gorham, a man who had publicly rejected the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. The prelate refused to grant the institution, and his view was upheld by the Court of Arches, the ecclesiastical court

every fact gave the lie to them?—fictions, such as an inspired witness to revelation, an inviolable depository of dogma, a faithful administrator of the Sacraments, an episcopate in direct line of Apostolic Succession—how could they be maintained when the Church of England suffered and accepted the appointment of a heretic, Hampden, as Regius Professor of Theology; when she bestirred herself only to condemn Baptismal Regeneration, too strictly taught by Pusey, or the too Catholic system of interpretation of Tract 90, or the impetuous Word and his *Ideal Church*; when the Episcopacy gave over to the civil power the keys of the citadel, flinging energy only to fire upon its own troops, and to show severity against the too zealous faithful? From that time, Newman himself tells us he was on his death-bed. For five years longer the death struggle went on. . . . In order to justify in his own eyes this obstinate resistance, he took refuge in the most desperate resolutions, the subtlest and even the most sophistical expedients. At one time he found some relief in the mystical theory of the Babylonian Captivity. In his eyes the Establishment was sick, a slave to civil power, a prey to error; it was her children's duty all the same to live and die in her bosom, that is to say, deprived of the graces granted to more favored communions, but with the bitter satisfaction of being obedient to the end, faithful in spite of all. This ingenious expedient ceased to satisfy him the day when he perceived that by this subterfuge he merely came back to Protestant Individualism and to the suppression of the Church as a means of grace. In the main, his decision was taken when he clearly saw that he was held back, less by the scruples of his conscience, the doubts of his reason, or the affections of his heart, than by the apprehension of a party leader, the annoyances of the humiliated teacher, the point of honor of the general obliged to go over to the enemy."—PRESENSE: Manning—1. *His Protestant Years*; II. *His Catholic Years*. In the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 1 and 15, 1896.

of the archbishop of Canterbury. Then Mr. Gorham quite naturally appealed to Her Majesty. The cause was tried by Her Gracious Majesty's Privy Council; and to the decision of this secular tribunal the ecclesiastical dignitaries of the Establishment, like good and submissive subjects in all matters religious and political, reverently bowed. The Royal Privy Council declared, on March 8, that Gorham's opinion in the matter of Baptism could be legitimately held by a minister of the Anglican Church. This direct domination of the State in matters of faith, this imposition of a State Creed in defiance of the declarations of the representative churchmen of the Establishment, showed all but the innocently ignorant or the wilfully blind that the depositary of Anglican doctrine, so far as the Church of England could be said to have any definite body of doctrine, was a lay tribunal which might be composed of Christians, Jews, and Agnostics, in any or no proportion. The decision should have surprised no person who was at all conversant with the history of England; for it was merely consonant with the attitude of the English sovereigns ever since Queen Bess thrust her Act of Uniformity into the faces of her prelates in the Convocation of 1559. Nevertheless, the surviving Tractarians, styled Puseyites since the conversion of Newman, were startled; probably because they had fancied that the functions of their lay Pope had fallen into desuetude. On March 12 fourteen of the more prominent ones met at the residence of Mr. Hope (afterward Hope Scott of Abbotsford) to discuss the feasibility of some action in the emergency. The meeting resulted merely in the passage of a series of resolutions condemning the enterprise of the Privy Council. On March 17, Wiseman, then still vicar-apostolic of the London District, referred to the Gorham case in a sermon which he delivered in St. George's cathedral. He showed how the archbishops of Canterbury, in Catholic times, had "suffered exile, and even death when necessary, rather than submit to the usurpation and claims of the State in regard to the Church." What remedy was there, he asked, when the secular power was even *requested* to determine matters of faith? "Is there, then, no appeal?"

Has there never been any appeal beyond this [appeal to Ecclesiastical Courts and the Privy Council]? I have shown you, my brethren, that there were, in ancient times, appeals to another power, to a spiritual and superior power, acknowledged by the whole Church. To that they [the Anglicans] cannot appeal; and there has been the great error, that they have cut themselves so completely off from that authority, and that tribunal, to which alone an appeal in matters of faith would lie, that it is necessary for them to treat this appeal as final, because it leaves them no other direction in which to escape. Yes, my brethren, in former times, if a matter like this had risen in one Church, it would not have been left to her, with her own limited resources, to fight the battle. . . . But how is it that England, or rather, we will say, that which calls itself her Church, should be now so cut off from the sympathies of the rest of the world? Will she dare to appeal to the Universal Church in which, so many of her writers declare, lies the ultimate appeal in matters of faith? Yes, I admit their words. It is to the Universal Church that the only final appeal can come; whether that Universal Church be represented by her head, or whether she be represented by a General Council, or whether she be represented by all the Churches of the Catholic unity, separated, indeed, in place, but yet speaking with one assent. To that authority, however represented, I own that the appeal must lie. Then, let this Church, let this powerful Church, as no doubt in many ways she is, raise her voice and call upon the Catholic Church throughout the world, to come and bear part with her, and sustain her, in this her intended struggle. Or let her ask all others to join their suffrages to the truth of the doctrine which it is said has been now, for the first time, impugned. Why does she not do so? Or if she does, will they respond? Is there, then, no longer any internal union, any bond of love and of charity, that binds her to the rest of the Christian world, so that, upon her cry of distress, it will rise to succor her, and, if it may not help, at least to console her and encourage her? Will Gaul send a Saint Germanus or a Saint Lupus once more, as she did when the Pelagian heresy was threatening

the faith of this island, to come and instruct men in the truth, and to confute the propagators of that heresy?" Reflections such as these were probably dominant in the mind of Gladstone, when he rose from a sick bed to tell Manning: "The English Church is lost, if she does not save herself by an act of courage." Certainly the Anglo-Catholic reaction, as the men of the Movement complacently styled their idea, could no longer continue to tacitly ignore the royal ecclesiastical supremacy; to prate about a rule of faith as determined by the voice of the Universal Church or by the decrees of ancient Œcumenical Councils. In the name of the queen, the Supreme Head of the Church of England, a lay tribunal appointed by her had decided that it was allowable for a "priest" of the Establishment to deny a Sacrament; and as though the subserviency of the State "bishops" needed to be emphasized, three of those gentlemen had exercised a purely *consultative* vote when the decision was being debated. The "act of courage" suggested by Gladstone was attempted when Manning, Robert Wilberforce, Pusey, Mill (professor of Hebrew at Cambridge), Henry Wilberforce, Keble, and Hope, protested against the royal definition of doctrine; but when the moment of subscription arrived, the future "Grand Old Man" declared that he could not sign, because of his oath as a Privy Councillor (1). On March 19 Manning presided over a meeting of the clergy of his archdeaconry, and drew up a declaration against the royal supremacy, which was afterward signed by about 1,800 ministers, although very few afterward showed that they had the courage of their convictions. Then, feeling that Anglicanism was "a mere ruin," Manning remained in retirement until December, waking, each morning, as he wrote to his fellow-sufferer, Robert Wilberforce, with "his heart almost broke"; he was as though "torn to pieces between truth and affection." Frequently he said: "If I remain an Anglican, I shall end by being a mere mystic. Nothing, in any case, will make

(1) Philpotts of Exeter had said: "We have three men on whom we can rely—Gladstone in the State; Hope (Sir Walter Scott's grandson by marriage) at the bar; and Manning in the Church." He judged rightly, only in regard to Gladstone.

me return to English Protestantism, or to any other." If he still entertained any hope that the chief pastors of the Establishment would yet act in some manner which would show that their organization was really a Church, he was disillusionized when those "bishops," four alone excepted, imitated Sumner, the incumbent of Canterbury, in a refusal to countenance a project to transfer ecclesiastical jurisdiction from the Privy Council to the episcopal body; and when the Anglican primate announced that he would never question the sentence of "a regular tribunal," and that furthermore he saw no illegality in the canonical institution of a minister who did not believe in Baptismal Regeneration. On Nov. 17, Manning exercised his archidiaconal functions for the last time; he presided at a meeting of the ministers of Chichester which had been convoked in order to protest against the action of Pope Pius IX. in the restoration of the English hierarchy which had been suppressed by Elizabeth. He announced to his brethren that he had resolved to enter the Catholic Church; and on April 6, 1851, he and Mr. Hope abjured, confessed, made their Profession of Faith, and received conditional baptism and absolution at the hands of Father Brown-Hill. Then Manning could write: "I feel that I have no other desire than to persevere in what God has given me for the sake of His Son. What a blessed ending! As the soul says to Dante—*E de martirio veni a questa pace!*" (1).

Nearly all Anglican polemics have endeavored to minimize the importance of the Oxford Movement. The members of the so-called High Church party see in it a rebuke to their own want of logic; and the Liberals seem to ignore its very essence. We have heard Dr. Arnold describing it as "a dress, a ritual, a name, a ceremony, objects so pitiful that if gained ever so completely, they would make no man the wiser or the better"; and in later days Dean Stanley affect-

(1) A few months afterward, the London *Times* exultantly announced that Manning had discovered the folly of his hallucinations, and had returned to the forgiving bosom of his true mother, abandoning the deceits of "the Italian mission." The enterprising editor received the following assurance: "I have found in the Catholic Church all that I sought; more even than I should have been capable of imagining, so long as I remained outside of her."

ed to be surprised when he "looked back upon the trivial elements which produced so much excitement. . . . The Apostolical Succession, the revival of obsolete rubrics, together with one or two Patristic tendencies, such as the doctrine of reserve and of mysticism, were the staple of their teaching" (1). The Protestant progeny of the Movement, those self-styled "Anglo-Catholics" who claim to be one with the Church of Sts. Gregory and Augustine, who insist upon a Real Presence in what they style a Mass in their temples, should feel uncomfortable when a dignitary of the Establishment is allowed to hold that the Apostolic Succession is a mere triviality, and that their presumed Sacrifice of the Altar is simply a revival of an obsolete rubric; but had the dean of Westminster held other views, he would have been a Newmanite in his younger days, and being a good logician, he would probably never have attained his deanery. Mark Pattison is so anxious to escape that necessity of communicating with Rome which Newman's logic found to be of the very essence of Catholicity, that he falls back on the ultra-Protestant theory of an invisible Church. After feigning to have discovered that Newman's great gifts were expended on what was a very "narrow basis of philosophical culture," and after declaring that "all the grand development of human reason was a sealed book to him," Pattison extols that "unity of all thought, which far transcends the *mere mechanical association* of unthinking members of the Catholic Church; a great spiritual unity by the side of which *all sects and denominations shrink into vanity*" (2). Professor Jowett, at present Master of Balliol, says that "the leaders of the Movement, though not deficient in the wisdom of the serpent, had no true knowledge of the world; they had never

(1) Thus in the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1881.

(2) Pattison's *Memoirs*, p. 210. Pattison died rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. The Protestant Pressensé speaks of him as "an embittered or rather a withered soul, less so through the disappointments and delays of his University ambitions, than by his great spiritual mishap. His life's chance lost by missing the coach when he was going to abjure Protestantism with his master, he fell into systematic doubt, into the mischievous erudition of a Bayle, the haughty and superfine criticism of a Renan. As a result, the chief work of that long life of studious leisure was the volume of *Memoirs* where he has drawn the darkest, the most melancholy, the most painful picture of a wasted intellect, of a barren heart voluntarily shrivelled and yet forever inconsolable for an ideal, half-seen, half-possessed, and then forever lost." *Loc. cit.*, pt. 1.

applied the lessons of ecclesiastical history to their own times. They did not consider that the string, if overstrained, would break, or that their own type of character was suited to a very few; it never occurred to them that the Movement which they had created would inevitably be followed by a reaction. Good and simple-minded and accomplished men as they were, and quite free from any taint of personal ambition, they do not seem to have understood that *the power of the priest and of the confessional would no longer be endured in England; that we had put away casuistry, and were determined to place religion on a moral and historical basis*" (1). Dean Church is personally favorable toward the Tractarians who "went over to Rome"; but the tone of his entire work is evinced when he implies that the Movement was superfluous and not worth the troubles which it generated: "The English Church was after all as well worth living in and fighting for as any other; it was not only in England that light and dark, in teaching and in life, were largely intermingled, and the mixture had to be largely allowed for. We had our Sparta, a noble, if a rough and an incomplete one; patiently to do our best, for it was better than leaving it to its fate, in obedience to signs and reasonings which the heat of strife might well make delusive" (2). An excellent soporific indeed for an Anglican who desires merely to sleep comfortably, and when awakened, to turn over, and sleep again. A younger brother of Hurrell Froude, that James Anthony Froude who in certain circles is regarded as a historian, blames the Movement for the shipwreck of faith in Christianity which he and a few others afterward suffered; he would have us believe that "but for the Oxford Movement scepticism might have continued a harmless speculation of a few philosophers." And, nevertheless, this same James Anthony Froude justifies, in his *Nemesis of Faith* which was written after his break with Newman, the anti-Erastian action of the Tractarians, when he thus describes the Establishment:

(1) *Recollections of W. G. Ward* furnished by Prof. Jowett to Wilfrid Ward for the latter's work on his father. See *Appendix D* of Wilfrid Ward's book.

(2) *Loc. cit.*, p. 401.

“A foolish Church, chattering, parrot-like, old notes, of which it had forgot the meaning; a clergy who not only thought not at all, but whose heavy ignorance, from long unreality, clung about them like a garment, and who mistook their fool’s cap and bells for a crown of wisdom, and the music of the spheres; selfishness alike recognized practically as the rule of conduct, and faith in God, in man, in virtue, exchanged for faith in the belly, in fortunes, carriages, lazy sofas, and cushioned pews; Bentham politics, and Paley religion; all the thought deserving to be called thought, the flowing tide of Germany, and the philosophy of Hume and Gibbon; all the spiritual feeling, the light froth of the Wesleyans and Evangelicals; and the only real stern life to be found anywhere, in a strong resolved and haughty democratic independence, heaving and rolling underneath the chaff-spread surface. How was it like to fare with the clergy gentlemen, and the Church turned respectable in the struggle, with enemies like these? Erastianism, pluralities, prebendal stalls, and pony-gigging parsons,—what work were they like to make against the proud, rugged, intellectual republicanism, with a fire sword between its lips, bidding cant and lies be still, and philosophy, with Niebuhr criticism for a reaping sickle, mowing down their darling story-books? High time it was to move indeed. High time for the Church warriors to look about them, to burnish up their armor, to seize what ground was yet remaining, what time to train for the battle. . . . The question with the *Tract* writers was, whether with the help of the old framework they could un-Protestantize its working character, and reinspire it with so much of the old life as should enable it to do the same work in England which the Roman Church produced abroad. . . . To wean the Church from its Erastianism into militancy, where it might at least command respect for its sincerity. . . . Slowly then to draw the people out of the whirl of business to thought upon themselves—from self-assertion, from the clamoring for their rights and the craving for independence, to alms-giving, to endurance of wrong, to the confessional—from doing to praying—from early hours in the office or in the field, to Matins and daily service; this was

the purpose of the Tract Movement. God knows, if Christianity be true, a purpose needful enough to get fulfilled" (1).

Finally, there are many Anglicans who contend that Newman and his followers needed not to abandon their mother, the Established Church of England, in order to find that Catholicity which they sought. Had they possessed a little patience, they would have heard a grand acclamation of Catholic doctrine from Anglican pulpits; they would have seen "Mass" celebrated in many Anglican temples; they would have heard all the distinctively Catholic doctrines proclaimed in many Anglican pulpits. This insistence is perhaps plausible; but it would not have affected the resolution of any one of the converts of 1845, or of those of later date. The Newmanites had aimed at a Catholicization of the Church of England as a Church; they had not aimed at an acceptance of Catholic doctrine and practices by certain individual Anglicans, here and there, as the result of the mere private judgment of those individuals. It is true that in our day we have heard the doctrines of the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist admitted by many Anglicans; and it is true that what they term a "Mass" is publicly performed by the spiritual progeny of those who, in attestation of their "Evangelical" Protestantism, abolished the Altars of Sacrifice, placing the consecrated slabs in the pavement of the desecrated churches, so that the English people, like the Dutch Protestant performers of the *Ye Fumi* in Japan, might furnish the world with an object-lesson of their hatred of all the "idoltrous abominations" of Catholicism. But if Newman and his companions could have foreseen such and similar changes, they would have recognized them not as a

(1) Pressensé speaks of James Anthony Froude as of one of "those who suffered shipwreck through Anglo-Catholicism; unfortunate men who fell under the influence of Newman just enough to repudiate the comfortable compromises, the easy terms of the official and established religion, and not enough to throw themselves and take a firm position upon the rock of dogmatism, the faith of authority. They caught the mystic fever only to awake shivering and depressed after the fits, and this passing attack of Catholicism allowed them to fall back into disheartened scepticism or militant Agnosticism. . . . James Anthony Froude had grown up at the feet of Newman, and was for long the most fervent and docile of disciples; but the Nemesis of Faith carried him far from that sheltered port into a stormy sea. Finally, a contrary current swept him into the arms of Carlyle, the apostle of Agnostic Stoicism. Healed, but feeling ever after the traces of his old wounds, he made his life-work, his *History of England in the Sixteenth Century*, a gigantic diatribe against Catholicism."

Catholicization of the Establishment, but as the results of mere individual fancy ; for in the parish-church next to the one in which the "Mass" was celebrated, and Confession was advised, the Mass, Confession, etc., were to be denounced as idolatrous deceits of the Scarlet Woman. Not until the Newmanites were convinced that the spasmodic and, comparatively speaking, seldom heard profession of Catholic doctrine was the official teaching of the Church of England, would they have hesitated perchance as to their duty to prostrate themselves before the Chair of Peter ; and such hesitation would have ceased, when they reflected that no mere declaration of a belief in the Real Presence will suffice to produce that Real Presence, and that Absolution from sin can be granted only by a validly-ordained and jurisdiction-possessing priest of the Catholic Church.

---

#### CHAPTER XIV.

##### THE CARBONARI. MAZZINI AND "YOUNG ITALY."

One of the necessary consequences of the triumph of the French Revolution in Italy was the development of Freemasonry in regions which hitherto had known the pest almost only by name ; and when Napoleon had arrived at the height of his power, the Italian Lodges became his principal support in the peninsula. The very names of the Lodges indicated the subserviency of the Italian portion of the sect to the rule of the foreigner ; thus in Milan, in 1805, the five Lodges were styled : "The Royal Napoleon," "The Royal Joseph," "The Eugene (Beauharnais)," "The Concord," and "The Happy Union." In the narrative of *The First Labors of the Grand Orient in Italy*, published at that time, we read of the exuberant joy which animated the brethren when Napoleon gave to them a grand-master in the person of his stepson, and when he raised his most devoted Italian friends to the most influential positions in the sect. In the *Catechism of the Three Degrees*, issued in 1808, and in the *General Constitution of the Grand Orient*, which appeared in

1809, the flatteries showered on the demi-god are couched in absurd Gallicisms which indicate that the Italian sectaries were willing to abandon even their language, had such been the will of their protector—and manipulator. Every session of a Lodge was opened and closed with cries of “Vive l’Empereur!” In 1812, the Grand Orient of Paris had jurisdiction over 1,089 dependent Lodges in Italy; and it received from them annually two millions of francs for the French grand-master, Joseph Bonaparte, and a hundred thousand for Joseph’s vicar, Cambacérès. With this powerful weapon in his hands, it is not wonderful that Napoleon experienced no revolt on the part of his Italian provinces, even when he left the bones of thousands of Italy’s sons on the steppes of Russia. The time came, however, when the sectaries were forced to retire from the public gaze; with the fall of Napoleon came the restoration of the olden dynasties of Italy; and thereafter the work of the Lodges was necessarily conducted in pristine secrecy, chiefly by means of Carbonarism, into which Italian Masonry was, for the greater part, speedily transformed. The origin of the *Carboneria* is very obscure. Some investigators have fancied that they can trace it, at least as a secret society of some sort, back to the times of the Guelphs and Ghibellines; but it was only about the year 1815 that it came out of the darkness of tradition, and appeared as a concrete fact—an embodiment of the spirit of hatred toward Christianity, with an organization as a society, possessing statutes, and avowing a definite object. The original members of this redoubtable organization were said to have held their nocturnal meetings in the silence of the woods, in the huts of charcoal-burners, *carbonari*: hence their name, and hence much of their symbolic terminology. Thus, their Lodge was termed a *Vendita* (among the French, a *Vente*) as though it was a “market” for the sale of charcoal. The place of meeting was styled a *Baracca* (in France, a *Hutte*); the country around the adepts was a “forest”; the delivery of the land from “tyranny” or from “superstition” was designated as “driving the wolves from the forest”; the rallying-cry was: “Vengeance for the sheep devoured by

the wolf!" There were four kinds of *Vendite*: particular, central, high (the *Alta Vendita*), and above all, the Supreme *Vendita*. Each particular *Vendita* was composed of twenty "Good Cousins"; and the different *Vendite* were unknown to each other, all communications being conducted by delegates from the *Alta Vendita*. No communications were ever written; they were delivered *viva voce*, by means of certain conventional phrases which were frequently changed. As a sign for recognition, there was always presented one-half of a card which had been cut in a peculiar fashion, the other half having been left with the *Vendita* receiving the communication. Since the principal field for the operations of Carbonarism was to be Italy, the founders of modern Carbonarism readily appreciated the necessity of surrounding the first steps of their neophytes with an apparently Catholic paraphernalia, ere they could hope to drag the deluded souls into the depths of Masonic Pantheism and moral Anarchy. Imitating the French Jacobins, who had styled Jesus Christ "the first of the *sans-culottes*," the Carbonari termed Our Lord "the first of the Good Cousins," and they vouchsafed to acclaim Him as "The Grand Architect of the Universe." The aspirants to the degrees of Apprentice and Master must have been pleased with the frequent mention of the names of the Holy Trinity, of the Blessed Virgin, of St. Joseph, and of the Apostles; and they did not feel like strangers in a new world when they heard much talk about Baptism, Original Sin, and the Capital Sins. They could not realize that they were bidding farewell to Christian hope, when they were continually reminded of the Cross of Christ, of the Crown of Thorns, and of the Scourging at the Pillar; when they heard the watchwords of the *Rose-Cross*—Faith, Hope, and Charity; when they were told to recite the *Pater Noster* and the *Ave Maria*; when they were asked to join in toasts to Christ, "the envoy of the Creator," and to St. Theobald (1). But when the new Carbonaro came to study

(1) If the aspirant was at all versed in hagiology, which is not probable, he must have wondered as to the identity of this St. Theobald. The Knights Templars "would have told him that Theobald was of their own canonization; that he was the restorer of the grand order which had been destroyed by Clement V.; that he was the first grand-master after Molay." So says Clavel, one of the officers of the Grand Orient of France, in his *Pictorial History of Freemasonry*, p. 215.

the "Catechism of the Master," he saw matters in a different light: "Question: Who were the first Good Cousins? Answer: The Twelve Apostles, who, when about to separate, arranged certain signs by which the faithful might recognize one another. Q.: What is the meaning of the first sign, called the Sign of the Ladder? A.: The Stole. (Here the candidate learned that every Good Cousin is a priest, a successor of the Apostles.) Q.: What is the meaning of the Stole? A.: The faith of our holy religion (Carbonarism), and the sign adopted by the Apostles for mutual recognition. Q.: What is the meaning of the second sign, that which is called the Sign of the Cincture? A.: It means that we must curb our passions, and submit our wills (to the grand-master, the *grand' eletto*). Q.: What is the meaning of the Maniple, the third sign? A.: Martyrdom; that is, that we must have our hands cut off, sooner than violate our oaths. Q.: What do the Sun, Moon, and Stars mean? A.: The first father, the Holy Virgin, and the sons of light, that is, the Good Cousins" (1). In the ceremony for the reception of the mastership, everything corresponds to the Masonic *Rose-Cross*. The recipient in each case figures as the suffering Christ; with Christ he replies that he is the Son of God; and after having carried his cross to a miniature Calvary, he is not crucified, but is admitted to the degree of Master. The ceremonies and language used at the collation of the third and last degree in the hierarchy of the Carbonari, that of *grand' eletto*, *grand' élu*, would seem to have been copied from the ritual devised by Weisshaupt for his Illuminati (2). This degree, says Saint-Edme, is never conferred without the greatest precautions, and most secretly; the recipient must be known for wisdom, an indomitable zeal, well tried courage, and an unlimited devotion to the success of the order. "And, above all," adds the expert, "the candidate must be known as a true friend of liberty, and as ready to war against the tyrannical governments which are the abhorred

(1) SAINT-EDME; *Constitutions and Organization of the Carbonari; or, Exact Documents Concerning the Existence, Origin, and Object of that Secret Society*. Paris, 1821. In his Introduction, Saint-Edme says: "Mason and Carbonaro, I have been able to study the relations which subsist between these two societies; and I have found the same statutes, the same usages, above all, in the last degree of the Carbonari."

(2) See our Vol. iv., p. 427.

masters of ancient and beautiful Ausonia (especially the Pope)." The following dialogue between the Venerable Grand-Master Grand-Elect and his two "Illuminators" needs no comment. *Ven. G. M.* : "Good Cousin, first Illuminator, what is the hour?" *1st Ill.* : "Respectable Grand-Elect, the tocsin sounds on all sides, and it is heard even in the depths of our grotto ; I think that it is the signal for all free men to awake, and that it is midnight." *V. G. M.* : "Good Cousin, second Illuminator, at what hour ought our secret labors begin?" *2d Ill.* : "At midnight, Respectable Grand-Elect, when the popular masses, directed by our faithful ones, the Good Cousins-Directors, are assembled, organized, and marching against tyranny, ready to strike grand blows." *V. G. M.* : "Good Cousins, Flame-Bearers, and guardians of the security of our refuge, are you certain that no profane person has crept in among us, and that all the Carbonari here present in this *Vendita* are really Grand-Masters Grand-Elect?" *A Fl. B.* : "Yes, Venerable Grand-Elect ; the guards have performed their duty ; and there is here neither any profane one, nor any subaltern Carbonaro." *V. G. M.* : "Since everything is well arranged, my Good Cousins, I invite you to assist me in beginning our nocturnal labors, by joining in the toasts which I now propose. 1st. To the Creator of the Universe ! 2d. To Christ, His envoy on earth for the propagation of philosophy, liberty, and equality ! 3d. To His Apostles and preachers ! 4th. To St. Theobald, the founder of the Carbonari ! 5th. To the eternal destruction of all tyrannies ! 6th. To the foundation of a wise and endless liberty on the eternal ruins of the enemies of the peoples ! And now, Good Cousin, our orator, Star of our nocturnal assemblies, you may speak." *Star* : "In the beginning, at that time which is termed the Golden Age, our meetings were useless, my Good Cousins. Then, all men, obeying the simple laws of nature, were virtuous and energetic, their virtues having no other object than beneficence. Then the earth had no special masters ; and it furnished in abundance all that was necessary for its cultivators. . . . At first, men covered themselves with leaves ; but when they became corrupted, they began to clothe themselves

with the skins of animals, having made war on those innocent creatures, arrogating to themselves a right of life and death over them. This first forgetfulness of the rights of *Humanity* soon destroyed the primitive peace and the universal fraternity. . . . The most able among men seized power; and it was recognized by the unenlightened mediocrities, who hoped to be properly ruled. . . . Soon these rulers gave out the idea that their authority came from Heaven, and that it was hereditary and omnipotent. . . . When the peoples assembled and tried to destroy tyranny, a handful of audacious bandits, styling themselves sacred, impeccable, and inviolable, treated as rebels the veritable sovereigns of the State, the totality of the individuals who composed the nation. . . . Such, my Good Cousins, is the frightful fate of our beautiful Ausonia, the mother of the fine arts, the country of the most illustrious heroes, and once the mistress of three-fourths of the earth. . . . It was in order to free Italy, that our predecessors, the first Good Cousins, formed this respectable *Carbonara*. . . . We have all taken, on the Sign of the Redemption by the Saviour of the world, a sacred oath to restore his Holy Philosophy. The time has arrived, my Good Cousins; the tocsin for the general insurrection has sounded; the armed peoples are on the march; at the rising of the sun, the tyrants will have lived, and liberty will triumph" (1). John de Witt, one of the best authorities of our day in the matter of secret societies, tells us that the real object of the order is revealed to very few of the adepts; that such is the case in all Masonic organizations, we have shown in our general dissertation on Freemasonry (2). But the testimony of one who had been a most advanced Carbonaro is of value. "How mistaken is he," exclaims De Witt, "who thinks that in the first three degrees he will learn the veritable spirit and the tendencies of the Carbonari! In the first three degrees there is still a question of Christianity, and of the Church. . . . The initiated imagine, because of this formula, that in the object of the association there is something noble; that the members are seeking a purer morality, a stronger piety, and the independence and

(1) SAINT-EDME; *Ubi supra*, p. 94-103.

(2) Vol. IV., p. 431.

unity of their country. . . . But everything changes with the reception of the other degrees. Already in the fourth, that of the "Apostles," the adept has promised to subvert all monarchies, especially the thrones occupied by the Bourbon family ("*Lilia pedibus destrue!*"). But in the seventh degree, which very few attain, the revelation is extended; and finally the veil is withdrawn entirely when one becomes a Supreme Patriarch. Then it is perceived that the great end of the Carbonari is the same as that pursued by the Illuminati. This seventh degree, P. ∴ S. ∴ P, *Princeps Summus Patriarcha*, makes a man prince and bishop at once; thus coinciding with the *Homo-Rex*, "Man-King," of the Illuminati. The initiated swears to effect the ruin of every religion, and of every positive government, whether that government be despotic or democratic. . . . For the execution of their designs, every means is permissible—poison, perjury, everything is at their service. . . . The Supreme Patriarch laughs at the zeal of the masses of the Carbonari who sacrifice themselves for the liberty and independence of Italy. Neither one nor the other is his object; they are only means" (1).

John De Witt, the Swedish author of this appreciation of the definitive object of the Carbonari, had been a Supreme Patriarch in the order, and had been also a Master-Mason in nearly every one of the rites. According to his researches, the modern organization of the Carbonari, whether or not the order had existed during many centuries in Italy, was derived from France. And Cantù, who belonged "to the generation which either took part in Carbonarism, or was a martyr to it," says that the sect, instead of being of Italian origin, "was rather transplanted from foreign lands into the forests of Calabria, in order to check the boundless ambition of the *Napoleonidi*; and that Murat, urged by his Minister, Maghella, made use of it for the furtherance of his desire to become an independent king of all Italy" (2). After stating that "the Carbonari draw their veritable origin from Free-

(1) *Fragments Drawn from the History of My Life and of My Epoch*, p. 21. Leipsic, 1831.

(2) *Heretics of Italy*, Discourse lvi. Turin, 1866.

masonry," De Witt says: "When Napoleon mounted the throne, he ruined Masonry by favoring it, it being an association very dangerous for him. It thus lost its independence, and became a mere tool of the police, serving only as a means to penetrate into the sentiments of the adepts. Then a new affiliation, in the very bosom of Masonry, was formed by such of the brethren as still yearned for the defunct Republic. Besançon was the headquarters of these *Maçons Charbonniers*, or Good Cousins, and *Maçons Philadelphes*. Colonel Oudet was their chief, and most of them were military men. They propagated the order in Piedmont, and the other Northern countries of Italy; not until several years afterward did they extend it to the southern part of the peninsula, where, favored by the ex-government (Murat's), it spread with rapidity. In 1809 the first *Vendita* was established at Capua. . . . After the occupation of Naples by the Austrians, the *Alta Vendita* dissolved, not because it feared discovery, for there was no danger, but because of a wish to put limits to the influence of the subordinate *Vendite*. In the summer of 1821, the eleven chiefs met in Capua; and they resolved to send two brothers to the *Grand Firmament* (Grand Orient of France), to confer as to the advisability of transferring the seat of the directory of the Carbonari. They inclined to the belief that the seat should be in Paris, since that capital, of all others, has the most frequent communications with the rest of Europe, is inhabited by the most influential members of society, and is the richest in financial resources. . . . The *Grand Firmament* decreed that the association of the *Adelphes* and *Philadelphes* (1) is incorporated with the order; and that each *Adelphé* or *Philadelphé* should receive, at his admission, the three symbolic degrees, if he were not already a Mason. . . . Everything was prepared for the fusion of the *Alta Vendita* with the *Grand Firmament*. The two deputies entrusted with this duty were the Sicilian, the Duca di Garatula, and the Neapolitan, Carlo Chiricone Klerckon, son of the Duca Framarino, prefect of the king's palace. The latter was accredited also to

(1) So the first Good Cousins had been termed before they went from Franche-Comté to Italy.

Germany and Switzerland. When he arrived at Geneva, whither I had come from France, he handed me letters from one of my intimate friends who had been agent in Naples for the malcontents of Poland. . . . Klerekon informed me of the object of his mission ; and he urged me strongly to accept the office of inspector-general of the Carbonari in Switzerland and in Germany, handing to me the appointment which he had brought from Naples" (1). Even if other proofs were wanting, this narrative of De Witt would silence those aristocratic and self-fanciedly "conservative" Masons who affect to believe that the Carbonari, more logical (and perhaps more sincere) than themselves, have no connection with Masonry. Achille de Vaulabelle, a Masonic historian much quoted by his own, gives some interesting details of the development of Carbonarism in France. Just as in Italy, it had a *Haute-Vente* and subordinate associations ; and in order to prevent a governmental interference with one *Vente* from affecting another, the punishment of death was decreed for any *Charbonnier* who would try to penetrate into any *Vente* other than his own. The French *Charbonnerie* was well organized in the army ; but there it consisted of legions, cohorts, centuries, and *manipules*. The order had also a parliamentary Committee, to which Lafayette, also a member of the *Haute-Vente*, belonged. "The progress of the *Charbonnerie* in France," says Vaulabelle, "was irresistible ; in the latter days of 1821, everything was ready for an insurrection at Rochelle, Poitiers, Niort, Colmar, Neuf-Brisach,

(1) The *Memoirs* of De Witt shed much light on the corruption with which the pest of Masonry had infected the highest governmental regions in the early part of this century. Having been arrested by the Austrian police in Milan, he found that his prison was made a veritable *salon* by the Field-Marshal Bubna, the Austrian commander-in-chief in Upper Italy. When transferred to Bayreuth, he was treated like a prince by Walden, the president of the Regency. He experienced the same courtesies from Schuckmann, the Minister of Police in Berlin, when he was imprisoned in that city. He tells how he, the known inspector-general of the German and Swiss Carbonari, was intimate with Decazes, the Paris chief of police ; with the famous Major Favier, the aide-de-camp of Marshal Marmont ; with the apostate Gregoire, whose house was the rendezvous for the German Carbonari. At page 24 of his *Memoirs*, he says : "The Freemasons cast their gentle influence through the walls of my prisons ; and often when I expected to meet an accusing judge, I discovered a protecting friend." Whenever he was about to be tried, some Masonic officer of the tribunals would tell him beforehand what evidence the government possessed. At Berlin, he writes, "by an express order of M. Schneckmann I was allowed to copy a report which the French police had sent to Prince Metternich, and which he, because of its importance, had sent to the different governments."

Nantes, Belfort, Bordeaux, and Toulouse. *Ventes* had been founded in very many regiments; and every change of garrison had been means for a propaganda of Carbonarism" (1). In the *Popular Conferences* which Eugene Spuller, afterward Minister of Public Instruction, published in 1873, he says: "The Carbonari found it necessary to admit many men of reputation who could exercise an efficacious influence on public opinion, and who would be named on occasion, so as to cover the acts of the association with their authority. The organizers remained in the shade, so as to be able to handle more freely the elements at their disposal. . . . It had been said that each member of the association was to have a musket and twenty-five cartridges. When the Ordonnances of July appeared in the *Moniteur*, Paris was ready, and France was behind Paris; the royalty was lost." The progress of Carbonarism in Spain is sufficiently indicated by a communication from the Spanish Grand Orient which was published in the *Monde Maçonnique* for Aug., 1875: "After 1817, and for six years (and ever since, we may add), the history of Spain is a history of Masonry. Riego, leader of the insurrection of 1820, was made grand-master in 1821. Then came, after 1823, our *persecutions*, during which the *sacred fire* was preserved, thanks to the Duke de San Lorenzo, to many of the higher nobility, and even to the Infant, Don Francis, in 1828." The advance made by Carbonarism in the Two Sicilies is indicated by the Neapolitan historian, Coletta, when he says that the affiliated in 1820 numbered 642,000; and a document now preserved in the Aulic Chancellery of Vienna (2), makes the number still larger: "In the kingdom of the Two Sicilies there are more than 800,000 Carbonari; it would be folly to ask for their destruction."

When we reflect on the main intention of the Carbonari, we are scarcely prepared to learn that several of the ostensibly Catholic monarchs, and very many of their immediate relatives, were enrolled in the *Vendite*. It seems to be merely natural that nearly all the Protestant sovereigns of the nineteenth century should have been adepts of Free-

(1) *History of the Two Restorations*, Vol. v., p. 148.

(2) Cited by La Farina, in his *History of Italy*.

masonry ; and that Alexander I., the Head of the " Orthodox " Russian Church, should have followed the Will o' the Wisp, revealed by the rays of the Dark Lantern, until the approach of death warned him to rely on the light furnished by the Catholic Church (1). But that Catholic princes should have joined an organization which openly avowed an undying hatred for both Altar and Throne, can be explained by the supposition that they hoped to use that organization for their own ambitious purposes—in other words, that they hoped to be able to serve God and Satan at the same time. And indeed, when Christina of Spain, the sister of the thoroughly Catholic Ferdinand II. of the Two Sicilies, threw herself into the arms of the Carbonari, it was in order to deprive Don Carlos, the legitimate king of Spain, of his throne, in favor of her daughter, who thereby became Queen Isabella II. (2). When the Portuguese and Brazilian Don Pedro I. performed the same political and religious somersault, it was in order to give to his daughter, Dona Maria, the crown which belonged to his brother, Don Miguel (3). When the Count of Aquila, brother of Ferdinand II., betrayed his nephew and king, Francis II. of the Two Sicilies, it was with the hope that the revolutionary turmoil might eventuate in his own coronation. To the same facility in religious legerdemain must be ascribed the Carbonarism of Charles Albert, king of Sardinia (4), during his early years, and his more or less open relations with the sect during his entire reign. In the autumn of 1845, Massimo d'Azeglio travelled through the peninsula, endeavoring to effect an alliance between the Mazzinian republicans and the monarchist partisans of Charles Albert, in the interest of Italian

(1) For the reasons for our belief that Alexander I. died with the wish to enter the communion of the Catholic Church, if time were granted to him, see this Volume, p. 93, in Note.

(2) See this Volume, p. 259.

(3) *Ibi*, p. 264.

(4) In 1872 there appeared in Florence a curious book entitled *Count Cibrario and His Times*, in which, among many interesting revelations, there was one to the effect that Charles Albert never formally became a Carbonaro, but merely made the sect an ally to effect the military revolution of 1821. But it is certain that the entire reign of Charles Albert was Carbonaristic. It matters little whether or not he ever took the oaths of the sect, if his every royal act was in accordance with its dictates. We note that his abettors in 1821 were all members of the *Alta Vendita*; namely, the Duc d'Alberg, the French ambassador and a nephew of Talleyrand; Count Bardaxi, the Spanish ambassador; and Count Sciala Sdory, the envoy from Bavaria.

unity. In the *Recollections* of his life which were published in 1867, D'Azeglio tells us that in order to induce the Carbonari to place confidence in Charles Albert, he was wont to use this argument: "Let us treat this matter calmly. Probably you will tell me that if we were to ask Charles Albert to do something which would be contrary to his interests, you would not be able to rely on the traitor who abandoned the Carbonari in 1821. Well, now we desire to obtain from him something that is profitable to him, although indeed it is more profitable to us. We ask him to allow us to make him greater and more powerful. You cannot rely on the word of a robber, even though he were to promise ten times to become an honest man; but certainly it would be unreasonable to believe that he would not keep his promise, if you were to ask him to commit a robbery." In the *Memoirs* of her husband, Mme. Rattazzi says that the *missi dominici* of the Piedmontese propaganda at this period were "all aristocratic and gold-laced conspirators, but conspirators according to the Italian heart. . . . The constitutional monarchy of Charles Albert was being grafted on the stunted republic of Mazzini." In the *Memoirs* of Cretineau-Joly, published by Maynard in 1875, we are treated to a description of an interview which the historian of the Society of Jesus and of the Vendée had in 1846 with Charles Albert; and the writer shows satisfactorily that the unfortunate monarch had been a Carbonaro, and that he had the grace to be ashamed of the fact (1). When Cretin-

(1) "The king was very pallid. His countenance, on which penances and mystic enthusiasm had impressed deep and premature wrinkles, affected a calm which was belied by a nervous trembling at every movement. One could perceive that with all his remorse, he was decisive neither for good nor for evil; and that in time of danger, he would never have those sudden inspirations of which Tacitus speaks—inspirations which produce crimes in some, but which excite saving expedients in others. He received me with cool and deliberate sadness. After some preliminary congratulations on my preceding works, felicitations which he had more than once given me by letter, he addressed me with visible effort: 'Monsieur Cretineau-Joly, I understand that now you are engaged on a work just as important, but much more difficult. You will have to judge of men and things very little understood. Some of those men did evil for the pleasure they derived from it; others did it, because they were drawn into it either by (diabolical) obsession or by a vague yearning for innovation. The latter were more mistaken than sinful; and you may be assured of that fact by me, for I had the misfortune of yielding to seduction in my youth.' I bowed, without uttering a word; and the king, understanding my silence and interpreting it according to his desires, asked: 'Do I utter your own thoughts, Monsieur?' I would have liked to reply in the affirmative, but I knew well that dupes among the Carbonari are the exception. . . . Then the king remarked: 'I have heard of certain documents which a certain archduke showed to you. It is whispered that the arrogant Felix de Schwartz-

eau-Joly visited Naples in 1846 by recommendation of Pius IX., in order to procure additional material for his projected work on the secret societies, and in order to verify many of the materials which he possessed already, he found the court of the young king, Ferdinand II. (the "Bomba" of Palmerston, Gladstone, and others of that ilk), a hotbed of dormant Carbonarism. Ferdinand's predecessor, Francis I., himself impregnated with the poison of the sect, had bequeathed this legacy to his noble son; and a less resolute and principled monarch would have been ruined by the incubus. The Marquis Pietra-Castella, President of the Royal Council; and the Marquis del Carretto, the Minister of Police; even these had been Carbonari, and men whispered that the durability of their conversion depended on the permanence of the king's Christianity. Even the all-powerful Mgr. Coclé, a Redemptorist, and titular archbishop of Patras, and confessor to His Majesty, was then fresh from the councils of the *Alta Vendita*; and General Saluzzo, first aide-de-camp of the king, told Cretineau-Joly that probably the prelate was still a Carbonaro, for "anything that concerned the secret societies touched him closely" (1).

berg, whose insolence during his ambassadorship at Turin caused me so much suffering, has had frequent relations with you at Naples and elsewhere. They have written to me from Vienna that he has given you certain information which, in the present circumstances, it would be more than an indiscretion for you to publish. Have you really any such documents concerning me? Like a jurymen who pronounces a verdict of guilt, I replied hesitatingly that perhaps I had such papers. My words affected the king like a condemnation; he had perceived that I was not at all intimidated, but that I was not disposed to gloat over my discoveries. . . . Finally, the king said, brusquely, and as though interrupting a painful monologue: 'After all, Monsieur, it is a direct outrage that you are meditating against me, and an outrage that is undeserved, since it is based on fraud.' I had observed each gesture of the unhappy prince; and in his haggard eyes, his brow corrugated more by remorse than by repentance, I had studied the anguish of his soul. I was giving way to a pity which might have led me to grant some concessions, when his last words restored my equilibrium. At once I cried: 'Sire, I am not in the habit of relying on fraud. My work will have but one fault; the unique fault of being true. Perhaps it will contain a judgment on your Majesty which will be counterbalanced by the honor of no victory, or by the pity for no defeat.'

(1) Cretineau-Joly was unable to see Ferdinand II.; Mgr. Coclé so engineered, that an audience was not granted. When the historian returned to Rome, Dec. 21, 1847, he was informed by Pius IX. that fatherly charity and princely duty urged the Pontiff to prevent the publication of the revelations then in the possession of the Frenchman. In fact, Charles Albert had written to the Pontiff, begging him to use his influence in checking the "indiscreet" enterprise of the historian. But in 1849, while Pius IX. was at Gaeta, Cardinal Fornari, the nuncio in Paris, asked Cretineau-Joly to complete and publish the much-debated book; and Cardinal Antonelli wrote in the same sense from Gaeta. Again the Pope interfered; for His Holiness wished not to expose to the world the history of

We have noticed how the Carbonari, realizing that their principal work was to be effected among a people whose traditions, aspirations, and manners of thought, had hitherto been Catholic to a greater extent than were the dominant sentiments of any other people on earth, surrounded the sessions of their *Vendite* with the atmosphere of a bastard Christianity, in order to render less perceptible the transition of their adepts to practical Paganism. Similar cunning actuated the Roman *Alta Vendita* in 1819, when it issued an *Instruction*, the diabolic calculations of which have probably never been excelled in all the annals of human perversity. The idea of transforming Catholicism, by means of a corruption of its very heart, has never seemed extravagant to men like Frederick II. of Prussia, the two Napoleons, Louis Philippe, "Father" Infantin, Cavour, and Bismarck; such men could close their eyes to the directing presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, and therefore they could hope to "transform" an institution which is sustained by an immaterial force which is impregnable to human audacity. Forty years before the aristocrats of the *Alta Vendita* urged their scheme on their followers, Weisshaupt, the German founder of Illuminism, had traced a plan for the same conspiracy; but it lacked the diabolic intelligence, the audacious defiance of an invincible logic, which characterized the Italian conception: "Among the anxieties now agitating the most vigorous intellects of Italy, there is one which, above all, must not be forgotten. At all times the Papacy has exercised a decisive influence on the affairs of Italy. Through the voices, pens, hearts, and arms of its innumerable bishops, priests, friars, monks, nuns, and of a laity of every degree in society, the Papacy has always had at its disposal many per-

many men of high position, whom he believed to be converted from their Iniquities. Finally, the *History of the Sonderbund* and the *Roman Church in the Face of the Revolution* appeared, containing most of the documents which had excited so much dread; but respect for very many noble and some royal families led to the suppression of several names which had figured in the *Alta Vendita*. "Now, at length," says the Abbé Maynard, "we know all—even those who were hidden under the revolutionary pseudonyms of 'Nubins,' 'Picolo-Tigre,' etc., whose identity could not have been manifested in charity at that time." See *Cretincau-Joly: His Political, Religious, and Literary Life*, by the Abbé Maynard, p. 336-371. Paris, 1875.—DESCHAMPS; *The Secret Societies and Society; or, A Philosophy of Contemporary History*, bk. III., ch. 7, § 4. Sixth Edition. Paris, 1883.

sons who were prepared for martyrdom ; wherever the Papacy casts a glance, it sees friends who impoverish themselves, and who die for its sake. Some Popes have appreciated this immense power ; but they profited by it only in a measure. We are concerned to-day, not with any restoration of that power which is now shorn of its prestige ; *our final aim is that of Voltaire, and that of the French Revolution—the annihilation of Catholicism, and that of the Christian idea, which, if allowed to survive amid the ruins of Rome, would perpetuate Catholicism.* In order to attain this happy end, without such disasters as have postponed success during the past centuries, we must pay no attention to the nebulous Germans, the vain Frenchmen, and the phlegmatic Englishmen, who fancy that they can kill Catholicism either with an obscene song, or with an illogical conclusion, or with an uncouth sarcasm. Catholicism has a tenacity of life which resists all such attacks ; it has encountered enemies much more terrible and much more implacable, and it has enjoyed the pleasure of sprinkling holy water on their graves. Let us therefore leave to our brethren on the other side of the Alps the sterile extravagancies of their anti-Catholic zeal ; let us permit them to ridicule our Madonnas, and our external devotions, which will be, after all, our passports while we are perfecting our conspiracy. . . . Italy cannot breathe without permission from the supreme shepherd. With him she has the hundred arms of Briareus ; without him, she is reduced to deplorable impotency, and is a victim of intestine divisions and hostilities, from the Alps to the furthest Apennines. . . . The Pope will never come to the secret societies ; let the societies take the first step toward the Church. This cannot be effected in one day, nor in one year ; perhaps many years will be requisite, perhaps a century ; but in our ranks a soldier dies, and the battle goes on. . . . What we must have is a Pope according to our desires. . . . When we obtain such a one, we shall assail the Church more successfully than we could assail her with all the pamphlets written by our brethren in France and England. We shall attain this end ; but how and when ? We know not ; but since nothing should prevent our keeping in the right path, we now give to you

certain counsels which must be communicated to the brethren, but without it appearing that they are orders of the *Vendita*. We can do nothing with the elder cardinals, or with the prelates of the school of Consalvi, who are men of strong character; but we draw from our manufactories of popularity and impopularity, weapons which will render useless or ridiculous the power which is in their hands. With one word cunningly concocted, then uttered in some appropriate circle whence it will travel into the taverns and the streets, we can annihilate a man. If a prelate is sent from Rome into the provinces as an official, discover immediately his character, his antecedents, his qualities, and his defects. Is he one of our avowed enemies, an Albani, a Pallotta, a Bernetti, a Della Genga, a Rivarola? Then entangle him in your nets; create for him a frightful reputation for cruelty and bloodthirstiness. . . . Crush the enemy, whoever he may be; crush him with calumnies! Crush him, above all, in the egg; seduce the young, and draw them into the secret societies! In order to proceed with measured but sure steps, two things are of supreme necessity. Appear to be doves, while you are cunning as serpents; and never communicate the secret to your parents, to your children, to your wives, and least of all, to your confessors. *Whoever violates the secret, signs his death-warrant.* . . . Never use impious or impure language to the young; in order to insinuate yourselves into domestic circles, you must seem to be grave and moral. Having gained reputation in the Colleges and Universities, make the young men desirous of your conversation. Talk to them about the olden splendors of Papal Rome. Then, since every Italian heart cherishes a remembrance of the Roman Republic, confuse together these two recollections; warm the hearts of your hearers, now swelled with patriotic enthusiasm; lend them poems which are redolent of nationality. Thus you will bring them, little by little, to the necessary pitch. . . . The revolution now being projected by certain madmen will fail; men and things are not ripe for it, and they will not be ripe for some time. But we can draw from the confusion a cord which can be made to vibrate in the hearts of the younger clergy; namely, a hatred for the foreigner. Render

the German hateful and ridiculous. Talk much about Papal supremacy, and excite remembrances of the wars between the Church and the Empire; remind men of the Guelphs and Ghibellines; and thus you will acquire a reputation as fervent Catholics, and you will become intimate with the younger clergy, and you may penetrate into the monasteries. These young priests will one day be men of position; they will govern, administrate, judge, and even elect a Pontiff. This Pontiff, like his fellows, will be penetrated by Italian and humanitarian ideas. If you wish to revolutionize Italy, seek for such a Pope. *If you wish to found the Kingdom of the Elect on the throne of the Whore of Babylon, cause the clergy to march under your banner, while they fancy that they are marching under that of the Holy Keys.* If you wish to destroy the last vestiges of tyranny, throw out your nets, like Simon Bar Jona, but not like him, into the sea. Throw them into the depths of the sacristies, the seminaries, and the convents; and if you are not too precipitate, your haul of fish will be more miraculous than that of Peter. With the tiara and the cope you will fish up a revolution which will suffice to set fire to the four corners of the earth" (1). Perhaps this circular will explain, in accordance with the proverb that a wish is often father to the thought, the frenzied joy of the sectaries on the accession of Pius IX.; the dictators of the *Alta Vendita* may have thought that the true liberalism which had ever inspired the mind and heart of Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti was the counterfeit which they dangled before their yearning dupes. These gentry had no reason to believe that Cardinal Mastai-Ferretti had imbibed the poison of the *Vendite*; but intelligent though they undoubtedly were, beyond the ordinary capacity of men, they tried to deceive themselves into a belief that at length a Roman Pontiff had shown himself willing, not to be merely personally immoral (such a thing would be no absolute historical absurdity), but to make, in his pontifical capacity, shipwreck of the first principles of morality and justice. The very

(1) This Instruction was found among the papers of the *Alta Vendita* which fell into the hands of the government of Gregory XVI. in 1846, and of which we have already spoken. It may be found in full in Cretineau-Joly's *Roman Church in Face of the Revolution*, Vol. ii., p. 85.

fact that the leaders of the Carbonari and other Masonic sects held such views, should have shown their true character to the multitude who believed that some of them, at least, were the good Catholics that they brazenly affected to be. The plan for a corruption of Catholicism by the election of a Carbonaro to the Chair of Peter, a plan devised by the Roman *Alla Vendita*, an inner circle which enjoyed an uncontested supremacy over not only all the Carbonari, but also over all the Masonic Lodges of France and of Germany, would have had, from a human point of view, every prospect of success, had not one very human fact ruined the enterprise. Freemasonry, despite the assertion of some authoritative Masons that the order is governed by one chief termed "the Patriarch," was not then, and never has been, thoroughly united. In this disunion we may discern the hand of God thwarting the schemes of the most diabolic of all the sects which have ever striven to banish the very name of Christ from the earth; for if Masonry ever does attain to perfect unity, the Christians of that day may cease to speculate as to when Antichrist is to manifest himself among men. The real "abomination of desolation" will then be at hand. And now a word concerning this unity.

With regard to a unity of direction over all the notable secret societies, Masonry included, in the civilized and semi-civilized world, there is a diversity of opinion among Masons, just as among the profane. Certainly the national Grand Orients call themselves independent of each other, and often "excommunicate" each other. But on the other hand, in the sixteenth century, there was certainly one Patriarch for all the Masonic sects, although his existence was known to very few of the adepts; this is shown by the famous Charter of Cologne (1535) now preserved in the archives of the mother-lodge at Amsterdam. In the eighteenth century, the Order of the Temple, so called, was an inner order which directed the workings of all Masons, without any suspicion of its influence on the part of the great majority of the adepts. It was by means of this inner order that Illuminism came to dominate all the Lodges of all the Rites of Masonry at the close of the eighteenth century.

At this time the High Scotch Grades were sanctuaries for this inner order, and hence they have ever since been recognized by the Masonic Powers, in spite of the protests of many Masons of the symbolic degrees, and in spite of temporary schisms. But these High Degrees, says Jannet, have lost their significance in our days ; and it is not in their Chapters that we can find the supreme direction of Universal Masonry. That this direction continued in the early nineteenth century, is evident from the sudden abandonment of Napoleon by Masoury in 1808. Amant Neuf, in his fine work on *Freemasonry*, cites a discourse of one of the so-called Templars, M. d'Asveld, who claimed in 1832 that at the time of the Restoration his order was the directing force in Masonry and its affiliations. But the correspondence of the Roman *Alta Vendita* which we have already adduced, shows that at that time the redoubtable aristocratic renegades were dominant over at least French and German Masonry, as well as that of Italy. The *Alta Vendita* succeeded in dominating even Mazzini, until the time when that energetic individual ridded himself of its members by those summary methods which were habitual to him. A discourse by Malapert before the Lodge *Alsace-Lorraine*, and published in the Masonic *Chaîne d'Union* for 1874 (p. 88), shows that about 1840 the Lodges of the world began to receive their signals from St. Petersburg and Berlin ; "then they were plunged into the currents of Pan-Germanism and Pan-Slavism." Eckert, a Saxon lawyer who devoted his life to an unmasking of the secret societies, and whose work is a veritable mine of precious documents concerning them, came to the conclusion that the "inner order" has always existed as the directive force of "external Masonry." The work of Eckert was published at Leipsic in 1857 ; and his French translator, Gyr, thus summarizes his investigations : "Masonry, being a universal association, is governed by one head, who is called a patriarch. The title of grand-master of the order is not the exclusive privilege of one family or one nation. Scotland, England, France, and Germany, have all given supreme heads to the order. It would seem that to-day Lord Palmerston is the patriarch.

By the side of the patriarch are two committees, one legislative, the other executive ; and these committees, composed of delegates from the Grand Orient, alone know the patriarch, and have dealings with him. All modern revolutions prove that the order has two distinct divisions ; one pacific, the other warlike. The former uses only intellectual means ; that is, speech and writing. It leads to suicide or mutual destruction the authorities or other persons whom it has destined to ruin. It obtains for the good of the order all the influential positions in the State, in the Protestant churches, and in the Universities. It seduces the masses, and rules public opinion, by means of the press and through associations. . . . Its directory is called a Grand Orient ; and its Lodges are closed, when the combatting division pushes into the streets the masses whom it has brought into the order. When the pacific division has done its work, so that a violent attack has a chance of success ; when passions are sufficiently inflamed, when a government is sufficiently weakened, and when the great offices are filled by traitors ; then the belligerent division receives orders to exercise its activity. The directory of the combatting division is called the *Firmament* ; and from the moment that the reins have been placed in its hands, the pacific division no longer holds any Lodges. These tactics are in keeping with the cunning of the order ; by closing the Lodges, the order is saved from any accusation of being concerned in the revolt." Henry Misley, the friend of Espartero, Kosuth, Cavour, Victor Emmanuel, and above all, of Palmerston, wrote to Deschamps in 1855 : "I know the world a little ; and I know that as regards the great future that is preparing, only four or five hold the cards. Many more think that they hold them ; but they are deceived" (1). The authority of Misley, admitting the existence of a directive centre as successor to the olden supreme patriarch of Masonry, is certainly great ; but we have seen in our day, that despite the ties which bound them together, Mazzini and the *Alta Vendita* could not agree ; nor could Louis

(1) For knowledge of the part played by Misley among the Carbonari, see Louis Blanc's *History of Ten Years*, and Frost's *Secret Societies*, (London, 1876).

Napoleon and Mazzini, Bismarck and Carl Marx. These are but instances of the antagonism of different factions of the sect among themselves; and they seem to indicate that there is no one directing power over all the ramifications of Masonry.

The members of the *Alta Vendita*, all of them "conservative" Masons, would have been well content to confine their efforts to a destruction of Catholicism; aristocrats as they nearly all were, they had no sympathy with the republican tendencies of the "mere people"; capitalists as they were, they were well satisfied with social conditions which did not interfere with the "sacred rights of property." But among the rank and file of the Carbonari were thousands who yearned for more than a destruction of the Church; who expected that the social, political, and financial equality of men would be made realities by the organization which had seduced them from the Church. This equality was to be attained, they fancied, by the Universal Republic; therefore it was evident, to any observant person, that the power of the *Alta Vendita* would be grievously shaken, when the banner of a "Young Europe" would be raised by a man who would know how to attract the restless elements of the *Carboneria*. That man appeared after the repression of the revolt of the Romagna in 1831. Giuseppe Mazzini, born in Genoa in 1808, was a conspirator by nature, and a man of extraordinary ability; else at the age of twenty-three he could not have formed an organization which robbed the *Alta Vendita* of its primacy in iniquity. Mazzini wanted none but young men in the society which he appropriately styled "Young Italy"; and he possessed many qualities which attracted the young to him, and made of them his devoted slaves. They were fascinated by his cosmopolitan ideas, and by his language, which was like that of one of the prophets of Israel. Elder men, the men of the people, adored him because of his evident disinterestedness, a quality which was painfully absent among all the professional patriots of the day. He welcomed sectaries of every stamp, men who had been accustomed to execrate each other; all that was necessary was that they should sink their dif-

ferences as members of his grand "educational association." He wanted no invisible directors for either Young Italy, or Young Germany, or Young France; he discarded all the Masonic paraphernalia of symbols and of masculine millinery, as degrading to a cause which demanded virility in its defenders. He even dared to assert that instead of so much talk about the "rights" of man, something should be said about his "duties." Progress was the aim of Mazzini; and he proposed to attain his great end simply for the people, and by means of the people, in spite of the aristocrats of the *Alta Vendita*, and of the other Masonic centres. It was whispered that he had been disappointed, because the *Alta Vendita* had refused to admit him within its charmed circle; but his entire career shows that when he sought to enter among the wire-pullers of Masonry, it was not for personal aggrandizement, but for the purpose of directing the forces of the tremendous engine in what he deemed the way of perfection for Humanity. However, the programme of Mazzini showed that his soul was still saturated with the poison in which Masonry had steeped it during his early years. He proclaimed that "The Italian people are called to destroy Catholicism in the name of the Continuous Revelation" (1). "God is God, and Humanity is His prophet. God is incarnated successively in Humanity. Humanity is religion. We believe in Humanity, the sole interpreter of the Law of God on the earth" (2). "Christ was holy, and His voice was acclaimed as divine" (3). "Catholicism is dead; although it has been preserved for some time for the admiration of antiquarians" (4). Mazzini was no Rationalist, for frequently he admitted the supernatural; neither had he any sympathy for Protestantism, for he declared that while Catholicism eventuates in despotism, Protestantism ultimately induces anarchy (5). Of course, he favored the projects of Protestant "missionaries" in Italy; and during his short tenure of power in Rome in 1849, he held frequent

(1) Thus in his *Revolutionary Initiative of the Peoples*.

(2) *Proclamation to the Italians in 1853*.

(3) *Political Prose Writings*, p. 221. Florence, 1880.

(4) *Preface to a Work by Didier*.

(5) *Political Prose Writings*, p. 39.

conferences with such gentry. But they were merely so many torches with which he proposed to fire the edifice of Catholicism, so that there would be room for "not a Church, but a people of believers, an assemblage of virtuous men, the Universal Religion of Humanity" (1). Two years had not elapsed since Mazzini had begun the publication of his Journal, *Young Italy*, when it became evident that Italy was reposing on a volcano. The base of operations for Mazzini was furnished, of course, by the Masonic Lodges; but his association was scarcely a secret society. The decisions of its leader were formed and delivered amid the mystery which is inseparable from all things Masonic; but the objects of "Young Italy," and the means proposed for their attainment, were audaciously published throughout Christendom. From the articles for the organization of "Young Italy," we select the following as indicating its essence: I. "This Society is instituted for the indispensable destruction of all the governments of the peninsula, and in order to form one republican State in their place." II. "Having experienced the horrible evils of absolute power, and the still greater evils of constitutional monarchies, we must labor to found a One and Indivisible Republic." XXX. "They who do not obey the orders of the society, or who reveal its secrets, will be inexorably poniarded. Traitors will receive the same punishment." XXXI. "The secret tribunal will pronounce the sentence, and it will designate one or two of the affiliated to execute the same." XXXII. "Whoever refuses to execute a sentence of the tribunal, will be regarded as a traitor, and will be killed on the spot." XXXIII. "If the guilty party should escape, he will be pursued inexorably, and will be struck by an invisible hand, even though he were on the bosom of his mother, or in the tabernacle of Christ." XXXIV. "Each secret tribunal will be competent, not only to judge inculpatated adepts, but also to sentence to death every person stricken by its anathema." Innumerable were the political assassinations which followed the organization of "Young Italy," and of its sister societies, "Young Germany," and

(1) *Manifesto of the National Committee.* London, 1851.

“Young Switzerland,” of which Mazzini was also the leading spirit. Among the most noteworthy of these murders were those of the director of police in Modena; of the prefect of police in Naples; of the papal legate in Ravenna; of the student, Lessing, in Zurich, for having penetrated into certain of Mazzini’s secrets; of the generals, Latour, Auerswald, Lemberg, and Lignowski; of Count Rossi, of whose sacrifice we shall treat in the following dissertation; and of the Swiss patriot, Joseph Len. To this list we might add, without much exaggeration, the names of all the victims of Swiss Protestant fanaticism who fell in the war of the *Sunderbund*; since it was the spirit of Mazzini that dictated that war, and since the radical army of General Dufour was composed largely of adepts of the “Young Europe.” Mazzini was the head of this “Young Europe,” says Eckert, “and of the fighting forces of Masonry; and we read in the *Latomia* that the Minister, Nothomb, who had left the Masons, declared then to Verhægen, in the National Palace itself, that Masonry had then become in Belgium a powerful and dangerous weapon in the hands of certain men; that the Swiss insurrection had a base of operations in the machinations of the Belgian Lodges; and that Defacqz, the grand-master of those Lodges, had made his journey into Switzerland in 1844, only for the purpose of preparing the troubles (of the *Sunderbund*)” (1).

During many years, in spite of the fears and jealousy felt in his regard by the great Masonic powers, namely, Palmerston, Cavour, and Napoleon III., the creator of “Young Italy” was nearly predominant in European politics. Notwithstanding all the resources of all the Cabinet Ministers in Europe, he was better informed concerning the desires and capabilities of the various governments than any diplomat in the service. Every page in his correspondence shows a marvellous knowledge, which can be explained only by the supposition that at least one of his agents was always present at every important governmental council in Europe. Even in 1867, when the power of Mazzini was diminishing, it was to him that Bismarck was obliged to have recourse,

(1) *Freemasonry*, Vol. ii., p. 218.

in order to obtain written proof of the existence of a secret treaty between Napoleon III. and Victor Emmanuel (1). But the day came when the prince of sectaries perforce complained that while 150,000 francs would enable him to revolutionize Italy, he could not obtain the petty sum (2). Palmerston, Victor Emmanuel, and Napoleon III., although dissentient frequently among themselves, were ever ready to counteract the plans of one who menaced all alike. Again, the most active members of the "Young Europe," men like Rattazzi (men who then became Mazzini's pet hatred), La Farina, Klapka, Turr, Kossuth, had tired of his intellectual and moral supremacy, and had thrown off his yoke; while the majority of the Italian Masonic Lodges had rallied around Cavour, as soon as he had originated the "Italian Question" at the Congress of Paris, and had thus prepared the way for the events of 1859-'60 (3). In this emergency, especially since he found it almost impossible to organize in Italy a branch of that "Universal Republican Alliance" which he had founded in the United States in 1865, Mazzini resolved to turn to the Masonic Lodges which, perhaps, he had too much despised. He induced his most trusted agents, Moriundo, Villa, and Diamilla-Muller, to return to the Masonic fold, with the ultimate object of procuring the subjugation of all the Italian Lodges to the Grand Orient of Palermo, in which the Mazzinian influence was unshaken. Whether his plot would have succeeded, is problematical. In 1870, Victor Emmanuel deprived Mazzini of a powerful weapon, when he made Rome the capital of Italy; and "the old conspirator" died at Pisa on March 11, 1872.

(1) DESCHAMPS; *Ubi supra*, bk. iii., ch. 7, § 12.

(2) Letter of April 1, 1867, among the many curious documents published by Mazzini's intimate, Diamilla-Muller, in his *Secret Italian Politics*. Turin, 1880.

(3) The *Memoirs of Rattazzi*, written by his widow (*née* Wyse-Bonaparte), are filled with indications of the antagonism which had subsisted between Cavour, as the representative of the olden policy of the Carbonari, and the author of "Young Italy."

## CHAPTER XV.

## THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS IX.

Giovanni Maria Mastai-Ferretti, the second son of Count Girolamo Mastai-Ferretti by his wife, Caterina Sollazzi, was born in Sinigaglia, in the States of the Church, on May 13, 1792. During his infant years, the horrors of the first French Revolution, a large portion of which Italy had been made to share, tinged all the information concerning the outer world which penetrated into the pious retirement of his family; and in his seventh year, the future Vicar of Christ on earth learned that his sovereign, the more than octogenarian Pius VI., had been imprisoned by the acclaimers of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. When he began to communicate with the outer world, he was frequently told that the last Pope-King had reigned in Rome; aye, that never again would emancipated humanity be influenced by the ravings of an Old Man of the Vatican. He soon witnessed a demonstration of the short-sightedness of the foes of the Papacy; Pius VI. indeed died in his prison, but for a moment Providence interfered with the triumphs of the revolutionary forces, and during the lull a new Pontiff ascended to the Chair of Peter. Under the influences of these lessons, the young Mastai began his classical studies when he was twelve years of age, under the guidance of the Fathers of the Pious Schools in their College of Volterra, in Tuscany. Again a few years, and he heard that once more the temporal sovereignty of the Pope had vanished forever and ever, and that also the spiritual dominion of the Holy See was certainly a thing of the past; Pius. VII. was a prisoner of the all-powerful and glorious Napoleon, and the pastors of the Catholic Church could hold no communication with their Supreme Pontiff. But a few more years passed, and the venerable Pope-King returned to his capital and to his liberty. When this happy event occurred, Giovanni Maria Mastai had completed the course of the College of Volterra; and as the restored Pontiff passed through Sinigaglia on his way

to the Eternal City, he gave his special blessing to the youth whose experience in the Popedom was to be so like his own. Certain writers have recorded that at this time the future Pius IX. had adopted the military profession; but their assertion is refuted by their hopeless disagreement as to the service into which he is supposed to have entered. Some say that in his nineteenth year Mastai was enrolled in the *garde d'honneur* of Napoleon; but that idea can scarcely be credited by one who remembers that Giovanni dearly loved his two uncles who had suffered from Napoleon, because of their fidelity to Pius VII. Andrew Mastai, bishop of Pesaro, had been dragged from his palace at night, and had been immured for years in the citadel of Mantua; and another uncle, a canon of St. Peter's in Rome, had escaped the same fate by taking the road to exile. Other writers, forgetting that his sympathies were always anti-Austrian, say that Giovanni entered the Austrian army; while others contend that he became one of the Noble Guards of Pius VII. The last assertion may be specious; but it is contradicted by a fact which militates also against the others. The young Mastai was notoriously an epileptic; and such persons are never admitted into the military profession. Mastai had conceived the desire, however, of serving under the banner of the Church; but at her altars, not in the ranks of the armed defenders of the Pontiff. The best physicians had pronounced his case a hopeless one, and they anticipated for him an early death; but he was confident of a cure as a consequence of his devotion of his life to the glory of God, and accordingly he proceeded to Rome, and began his ecclesiastical studies. The year 1819 found the levite prepared for the sanctuary in all that pertains to qualifications of piety and of science; but his malady still afflicted him, and he was admitted to the priesthood only on condition that he should be assisted by another priest, whenever he celebrated Mass. Shortly after his ordination, he threw himself at the feet of Pius VII., beseeching His Holiness to relieve him from the rather inconvenient obligation. The saintly Pontiff, who had often admired the dispositions of the young man, and who was perhaps enlightened from on high as to the

destiny of the suppliant, raised him, and taking him by the hands, said: "We grant you this favor, and principally because we are confident that your cruel malady will never afflict you again." The prediction was realized.

The first four years of the priesthood of the Abbate Mastai were spent in the chaplaincy of the asylum of *Tata Giovanni*, one of the many noble works of charity with which Rome, when it was papal, used to abound. The scion of a refined aristocracy lived entirely among these children who had been gathered from the streets or from the haunts of vice; he trained them to be honest workmen and edifying Christians; all of his private revenue was given to the establishment; and to the last day of his life he always took a special interest in all the workmen who had graduated from the scene of his first priestly labors. But the time came soon when the zeal of this young priest was to be known no longer to God alone. In 1823, the Holy See appointed Mgr. Muzi nuncio to Chili, for the purpose of arranging many ecclesiastical troubles which had been occasioned by the revolutions of the day; and the chaplain of *Tata Giovanni* was ordered to accompany the prelate as auditor. The Countess Mastai readily appreciated the honor which had been conferred on her son; but she remembered his former ill health, and dreaded to part with him for so long a time. She besought the secretary of state to appoint another auditor; but His Eminence was obliged to inform her that when he had laid the matter before the Pope, the reply had been: "Tell the countess that her son is about to cross the ocean in the service of the Church, and that he will return safe and sound." During the two years of his stay in America, the auditor visited nearly all the missions in Chili, Peru, and Columbia, undergoing all the hardships which were the concomitants of travel in those regions in that day (1).

(1) On his way to Chili, Mastai learned something of what it is to be a prisoner. On the sad Sept. 20, 1870, when the diplomatic body were assembled around him in anticipation of further outrages on the part of the Sardinian troops who had just forced the Porta Pia, Pius IX. remarked: "I remember that when I went to Chili, France and Spain were at war in the matter of the restoration of Ferdinand VII. My ship paused at Palma, in the Balearic Islands; and the Spanish authorities detained her on the pretext that no one could go to Chili, without the permission of the Cortes. As for myself, I was simply thrust into prison; and then I understood the necessity of the independence of the Pope.

Returning to Rome in 1825, he was made a canon of the church of Santa Maria in Via Lata, was elevated to the prelature, and received the presidency of the great Ospizio di San Michele, that grand school of trades and of art which, when the Pope ruled in Rome, was unique in Christendom as a blessing to the poor. Mastai showed in this new charge so much administrative ability, that the new Pontiff, Leo XII., appointed him archbishop of Spoleto in 1827. It was during his occupancy of the see of Spoleto that the future Pontiff came into personal contact with the revolutionists who were to be the bane of his pontificate. The insurrection of 1832 had been nearly suppressed by the Austro-Pontifical troops, when four thousand of the insurgents, pursued by an Austrian division, appeared before Spoleto, which was without means of defense. The archbishop went forth to meet the excited and half-starved fugitives, and by a judicious mixture of charity and firmness he prevailed on them to lay their arms at his feet. In order to relieve their immediate necessities, he tendered several thousand scudi to their leader, one Sercognani; but the prudent rebels declared that they preferred that the prelate himself should distribute the money. Meanwhile, the Austrians were approaching, and the archbishop hastened to save his proteges from capture by insisting to the victorious general that he had given his episcopal word that they should all be allowed to return to their homes. In the latter part of 1832, Mgr. Mastai was transferred to the diocese of Imola, which, although not an archbishopric, was a much more important see than Spoleto, and had nearly always been assigned to a cardinal. The biographers of Pius IX. find in his episcopate of Imola abundant material wherewith to illustrate the apostolic charity of his heart; they tell us that the annals of Imola record his embellishment of the churches, his care that want of patrimony should not prevent a worthy aspirant from entrance into the diocesan seminary, his fatherly protection

The folks on the ship were allowed to send me every day a ration of food; but I could receive no letters, no journals, etc. On that occasion I learned some prison tricks. We used to hide notes in the bread; and thus I heard about the victory of the Duc d'Angouleme at the Trocadero. After that affair, the Spanish insurgents had other things to think about, and they allowed us to depart."

of the sick or superannuated clergy, his zeal for the primary education of the poor, his endowment of hospitals, and his shelter of the unfortunates who desired to imitate the repentance of Mary Magdalen. With the remnant of his patrimony which had not been exhausted in aiding the Roman hospitals of *Tata Giovanni* and San Michele, he endowed a house for the Sisters of the Good Shepherd whom he brought from Angers in France to care for "his poor lost lambs who were trying to find the fold"; and when the nuns arrived, and it was found that the establishment was not yet ready, he received them in his palace, and waited on them at table. Traits such as these caused Pope Gregory XVI. to ignore his own lament that "in the Mastai household even the cat was a Liberal"; and on Dec. 14, 1840, the archbishop-bishop of Imola was enrolled in the Sacred College.

On June 14, 1846, fifty-four cardinals entered into Conclave in order to elect a successor to Gregory XVI.; and after forty-eight hours of consideration, Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti donned the tiara as Pope Pius IX., entering on one of the most eventful of pontificates, one which was also unique in its duration, since his thirty-two years in the Chair of Peter exceeded by seven those passed by the Prince of the Apostles in the bishopric of Rome, and since no other Pope had "seen the years of Peter." No Pope of modern times has evoked such sentiments, when first bending under the weight of the triple crown, as the accession of Pius IX. evoked, not only in Italy, but throughout Europe; and no ruler, ecclesiastical or secular, in any age or in any land, has ever realized more acutely the utter contemptibility of such manifestations. To say that Pius IX. was a popular idol throughout Italy during the first few months of his reign, and that the enthusiasm of his subjects was a frenzy, would be a phlegmatic indication of the state of men's minds when they proclaimed him "the expected of the nations," "the liberator of the peoples," and when they applauded as divinely oracular the most trivial word that dropped perchance from his lips. The manifestations of joy which in those days continually reached the ears of the Pontiff in his palace, and which even interfered with his progress when he appeared in the city, were certainly to-

kens of a national and Catholic appreciation ; but they were also the work of the secret societies, which had determined to soporize the Pope, if possible, with the incense of flattery in order to obtain concessions which would be afterward used against his throne. Such had been the Masonic procedure in the case of Louis XVI., and it had succeeded ; such had been the Masonic design in regard to the king of Naples, Ferdinand II., and although in this case it had failed as yet, there were still hopes of its ultimate triumph. A month after his election, Pius IX. accorded an amnesty to all political offenders, excepting only priests, and men who had been military or civil officers of the government ; and it was well understood that even these would be pardoned, if they applied for the grace. In the following month, the Pontiff instituted a Council of State (*Consulta di Stato*), the members of which were to be elected by the communes, and were to consider the needs of the country, but were to have no initiative in the making of laws. Day after day great crowds assembled on Monte Cavallo, shouting their thanks to the Pope for what promised to be a forerunner of that written constitution which the Liberals declared to be the source of every political good. Very soon, however, it became evident that the sentiments of devotion to the Pope-King were weakening ; and that the great majority of the shouters were obedient to leaders whose identity was unknown by the government. In fact, these assemblages had been organized in accordance with the orders of Mazzini, to make the mob cognizant of its power (1) ; and already Lord Minto, the "official" agent of Lord Palmerston, of that English statesman who was in many respects the practical head of the Masonic propaganda throughout Europe, was preparing that mob to work the will of the sect in the Eternal City. This Minto, so dear to

(1) In his latest manifesto to the "Friends of Italy," dated Nov., 1846, Mazzini had thus prescribed : "Avail yourselves of the least concession, in order to assemble the masses, even though it be only to acknowledge it. Festivals, songs, meetings, various relations among men of all kinds of opinion, all suffice to excite thought, to make the people realize their strength, and to make them ask for more. The difficulty is not in convincing people ; that can be done with a few big words, such as 'liberty, rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity, despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery,' etc. The thing is to gather the people together. The day when this occurs will be the dawn of a new era." LUBIENSKI ; *Wars and Revolutions of Italy*. Paris, 1852.

the votaries of the Dark Lantern in those days, had been received with undisguised enthusiasm by the Masous of that Rome with which, according to a fundamental law of Protestant England, he could have no "official" relations. He had been acclaimed by all of those "clubs" which were really so many *Vendite* of the Carbonari, and which embraced many corrupted members of the Roman aristocracy, as well as many from the inferior strata of society, who all—nobles and plebeians—proclaimed their modern "liberalism" by crimes and sacrileges which attested their Satanic origin. This Minto, presumed an English "gentleman," hobnobbed with the scum of the Roman slums, receiving with *bonhomie* the most prominent leaders of the curbstone democracy, and composing verses in their honor; and instead of expelling him from Rome, Pius IX. merely smiled when "the people" forgot the road to the Quirinal, and passed the evenings serenading the envoy of the "Grand Orient of the Orient" (1). But the Pontiff continued in the path of what he deemed to be rational reform. Was he encouraged when Thiers, from the height of the French tribune, cried out to him: "*Courage, Saint-Père!*"? Probably no more than when, a few days before that hypocritical demonstration, Cicervacchio, the tavern-keeper and demagogue, had jumped on his carriage wheel, and thrusting his impu-

(1) Lest the reader may think that we ascribe to "Old Pam" too preponderating a role in the revolutionary movements of his day, we adduce the testimony of Mme. Rattazzi (*née* Princess Wyse-Bonaparte), who, in her *Memoirs* of her too celebrated second husband, makes of the English statesman a prime initiator of the Italian and other Masonic revolutions of the Continent; although, indeed, because of certain family pique against Louis Napoleon, she rather minimizes the intervention of her imperial cousin in order to magnify that of Palmerston. The testimony of this experienced woman is the more valuable, inasmuch as it is really that of Rattazzi himself. We hear Palmerston *execrating* the Pontiff and all the princes of the House of Bourbon (p. 99, 200). His correspondence continually mentions the oaths of a *Knight Kadosch*, and he is fond of quoting the Masonic war-cry of that day, *Lilia pedibus destrue* (See our Vol. iv., p. 425). In 1852, Cavour, just become prime-minister of Piedmont, "was assured of the loyal assistance of Palmerston" in preventing Austria from repressing Mazzinian demonstrations in her dominions (p. 311). In 1856, toward the end of the Congress of Paris, at which Cavour had so impudently attacked the Papal government and that of Ferdinand II., Napoleon III. advised the Piedmontese to consult Palmerston as the sovereign arbiter in such matters (p. 326). In 1858 when the Neapolitan government had captured the *Capigliari*, an English ship which had brought the piratical expedition of Pisacane to its shores, the impudent protests of Cavour "were supported by Lord Palmerston" (p. 335). In 1860, the so-called "heroic" landing of Garibaldi's Thousand at Marsala, of which we shall soon speak, was protected by a British fleet, and by Palmerston's orders (p. 457).

dent face through the window, had shouted : “ *Coraggio, Santo Padre!* ” The reforms which he successively promulgated, the formation of a National Guard and a limited liberty of the press, were granted because he believed them reasonable and just ; if he hesitated to grant a Constitution, it was both because he distrusted the parliamentary system as a producer of national happiness, and because he could not perceive its compatibility with the pontifical independence. But on Jan. 29, 1848, a Constitution was promulgated at Naples ; on Feb. 4, at Turin ; and on Feb. 17, at Florence. Then Pius IX. resolved to humor his people with the fancied panacea, and he signed the document on March 14. There were to be two legislative bodies : the *Alto Consiglio*, or Upper House, composed of members named for life by the Pope ; and a Chamber of deputies, the members of which were to be elected by such of the people as paid taxes to the amount of 64 *lire*, or who were communal employees, or who had taken some University degree. Political censorship of the press was abolished ; but the ecclesiastical censorship, in the interests of morality, was retained. But the Masonic powers had never intended to be satisfied with any Constitution which recognized the Roman Pontiff as a temporal sovereign. In the Consistory of April 29, 1848, Pius IX. was forced to protest against the endeavors of the sectaries to compel him to acts which his pontifical conscience could not sanction : “ Now that many demand that we join the other princes and the peoples of Italy in a war against Austria, we have deemed it our duty to protest formally and loudly in this solemn assembly against a design which is so foreign to our thoughts, seeing that we, although unworthy, hold on earth the place of Him who is the Author of peace, the Friend of charity ; and considering that, faithful to the divine obligations of our supreme apostolate, we embrace all countries and all nations in the same sentiments of paternal love. . . . And here we cannot avoid repelling, before all the nations of the earth, the perfidious suggestion that the Roman Pontiff should preside over the formation of a new republic, to be constituted out of all the states of Italy.” This Allocution appeared to the Masonic conspirators to furnish

an excellent pretext for a sedition. Cicervacchio brought forth his dregs of the populace, and the Civic Guard closed the gates of the city. The "clubs," or *Vendite*, as we have termed them, resounded with the eloquence of Count Terenzio Mamiani, Florentino, Galetti, Sterbini, and of the apostate monk, Gavazzi, all insisting that the Pope should be forced to retract his Allocution, and to enter on a war, in which not one of the orators intended to participate. Pius IX. endeavored to avert the storm by asking Mamiani to form and head a new ministry. There was a vein of true nobility in Mamiani; for of all the Roman opponents of the Papal government, he alone had refused, at the time of the amnesty, to give his word of honor that he would conspire no more. Perhaps it was this trait that led Pius IX. to trust him to some extent. At the opening of the new parliament, for members of which, strange to say, few besides Carbonari had voted, Mamiani pronounced a discourse in which he said that "the Pope would thereafter pray, bless, and pardon; that the most important affairs of state would be left to the discretion of the Chambers." But in his reply to the address of the Houses, the Pontiff energetically declared that he would not confine himself to blessing and forgiving; that he would exercise his "full liberty of action." A few days afterward, the Chambers declared themselves in permanent session, and sent two deputies to the Pope, with a demand for an immediate declaration of war against Austria. The Pontiff again refused to commit what he regarded as an unjustifiable act; but it was well known that could he have thrown the Germans out of Italy by the adoption of any means not incompatible with his pontifical duty, he would have repeated the cry of Julius II., "*fuori i barbari!*" with his whole soul. On May 3, the very day when Mamiani had composed his ministry, Pius IX. had given to the world a testimony to his desire that Italy should be freed from the incubus of foreign rule. He wrote to the Austrian emperor as follows: "Whenever war ensanguines Christian soil, the Holy See is heard entreating for peace; and in our Allocution of April 29 of last year, when we said that our paternal heart abhorred a declaration of war, we expressed our ardent desire of being

able to contribute to peace. Therefore, let Your Majesty not be displeased, if we address ourselves to your piety, exhorting you, with an affection really paternal, to withdraw from a war which will only entail a series of calamities, without reconquering for the empire the hearts of the Lombards and Venetians. Let the generous German (*sic*) people not be displeased if we ask them to crush sentiments of hatred, and to welcome relations of friendly neighborhood instead of a domination without grandeur, one which can have no happy consequences, since it relies on force alone. *We trust that your nation, so properly proud of its own independence, will not deem it honorable to make bloody attacks on Italian nationality.* Let both nationalities be recognized nobly as sisters; for they are two daughters equally dear to our heart, and we would rejoice if we could see them contented with their respective natural frontiers, living in peace, and meriting the divine blessing by acts worthy of themselves. We pray the Author of all intelligence and of all good to enlighten Your Majesty with His holy counsels." The revolutionists chose to ignore this proof that Pius IX. had not forgotten that he was an Italian; that he favored heartily all legitimate Italian aspirations. When it was made known that he had again refused to join his army to that of the Sardinian monarch, then suffering from its first defeats by Radetzky, the windows of many cardinals were broken, and the streets resounded with cries of: "Death to the priests! Down with the Pope!"—an excellent demonstration, of course, of the advantages of "A Free Church in A Free State." Being now a "Constitutional monarch," Pius IX. could only prorogue the Chambers, and look around for a new premier. He fixed his choice on Count Pellegrino Rossi, a statesman of ability who had been a Carbonaro, and had been proscribed as such. Rossi was a native of Carrara; and in 1815 he had attached himself to the fortunes of Murat, when that Napoleonic monarch had invaded the Roman States. In 1830 he had been naturalized a Frenchman; he became an intimate of Guizot, and Louis Philippe made him a peer of France, and his ambassador to the Holy See. Although now disgusted with Carbonarism, Rossi was still an enthusiastic

advocate of Italian national independence, and one of his sons was then fighting the Austrians in Lombardy. He doubted his own fitness for the emergency ; but, persuaded by the arguments of the Duc d' Harcourt, who soon became the ambassador of France in Rome, and especially by the encouragement given by the French Franciscan, Vaures, he said to the latter: "*In verbo tuo larabo rete*—At thy word I will let down the net."

During the two ensuing months, Rossi displayed superhuman activity in the noble cause to which, as he avowed, he had dedicated his life. His chief aim was to actuate the fundamental idea of Cantù and the other Neo-Guelphs which had been rejected by Gregory XVI., but was not repugnant to Pius IX.—a confederation of all the Italian states, which would have had all the advantages of a unitarian arrangement, and would have engendered none of the terrible evils of centralization. Negotiations were begun at Naples, Turin, and Florence ; but the ambition of Piedmont had already excoGITATED the idea of a Piedmontese Italy, and not daring to reject the Neo-Guelphic plan in principle, the cabinet of Charles Albert tried to destroy it by insisting that the Neapolitan kingdom, the most powerful of the Italian states, should be excluded from the Confederation. However, in spite of the machinations of the Piedmontese statesmen, the best minds in Italy were confident that the diplomatic ability of Rossi, and the force of his arguments, would yet triumph. Such success was not desirable by the Brethren of the Three Points ; but their dissatisfaction with Rossi became rage when they saw that under his administration the lovers of order in the Papal States were breathing freely, and when they heard him proclaim that "the Papacy is the sole grandeur remaining in Italy," and that "in order to repress the factious, he would himself take up arms, and the Pope would not be reached, unless by passing over the body of Rossi." Then began a series of virulent articles by Sterbini in his *Contemporaneo*, all tending to show that the good of Italy demanded the "removal" of the traitor to Carbonarism ; and Mazzini, the veritable Old Man of the Mountain of his time, declared in a public letter that "said death was nec-

essary." While the Masonic press was preparing the minds of men to acclaim with joy the determined catastrophe, the ultimate plan was being laid in one of those *Scientific Congresses* so abundant in the Italy of the nineteenth century, and which were generally devoted to political conspiracy, rather than to intellectual matters (1). The Scientific Congress of 1848 met in Turin; and among its Roman delegates were Mamiani, Sterbini, and Charles Lucien Bonaparte—a very different man from his father, that Lucien whom Pius VII. made Prince of Canino, and who braved his imperial brother's anger, rather than fail in his Christian duty. After the close of this Congress, says Labiinski, certain of its members met in a house in Florence or in Leghorn, and there, in accordance with the jurisprudence of the Carbonari, sentenced Rossi to death. The executioner was chosen by lot from among twelve or fifteen members of Mazzini's "Young Italy," who met in the Teatro Capranica. On the eve of the appointed day, these wretches obtained from the hospital of San Giacomo the corpse of a man whose height

(1) In appearance, nothing could have been more innocent than these reunions. Their sessions always opened with a solemn Mass. In the ninth Congress, held at Venice, in 1847, Prince Charles Lucien Bonaparte, alluding to Italian politics, said: "Now we have finished our Novena; next year we will celebrate the Feast." After the unification of Italy, the promoters of these Congresses openly boasted of the part which the associations had taken in the revolutions of the century. At the Congress held in Rome in 1873, the mayor, Luigi Panciani, grand-master of the Grand Orient of Italy, and an ex-Garibaldian, said in his opening discourse: "The resurrection of Italy is in great part due to you. Our movement began with the Scientific Congress which was held at Pisa in 1839. The days of Milan in 1848 corresponded to the Congress of Venice in 1847; as did also that heroic movement of 1848-'49, which may be termed the aurora of the Italian resurrection. . . . The Italian government congratulates itself because of your work, and hopes to have your aid in governing the country." Count Solaro della Margherita, the sole Christian prime-minister of Piedmont in our day, and the redoubtable adversary of the policy of Cavour, in his memorandum of 1852 (cited by Menecacci, in his *Memoirs for the History of the Italian Revolution*, Rome, 1879) says: "The first Congress of Italian Scientists met at Pisa in 1839; and there it was that the web was woven, the threads of which had been prepared long before. Charles Lucien Bonaparte was the chief workman, working with an object of his own, and not perceiving that he was a mere instrument of the sectaries. . . . They spoke of science and art in public; but the coryphees of the various liberal factions of the peninsula had their private reunions, in which they talked of very different things. . . . *O cæci reges qui rem non cernitis istam*, could have been pronounced after one read the pamphlet which was published at Lugano, revealing the entire tendency of these Congresses. . . . When the Congress was about to assemble at Turin, I could not avoid telling the king what was no longer a mystery. They told him just as they told King Ferdinand of Naples and the grand-duke of Tuscany, that he was to be the champion of Italy. The king smiled at my communication, and *tolerated* it. I think that his conscience was somewhat troubled under my look, but he did not draw back. He might have deprived me of my portfolio, but he did not; as for changing my views, he did not try to do so."—See also the already cited work of Mme. Rattazzi, Vol. i., pp. 191, 225.

had about equalled that of the doomed statesman ; and having conveyed it to the theatre, they there subjected the chosen one to a trial of his skill. The corpse was propped against the wall, and the blow was given so scientifically, that there was a general exclamation : “ Bravo ! The rehearsal was fine ; the piece must succeed.” In the early morning of Nov. 15, 1848, Rossi received many warnings, notably one from the Duchess di Rignano ; but he calmly replied that the cause of the Pope was that of God. Then he proceeded to the Palazzo della Cancelleria, for the opening of the Chambers. Just as he began to ascend the grand staircase, his neck was pierced by a poniard which cut the carotid artery. The murderer cried : “ *È fatto*—it is done ” ; and the crowd of Masonic adepts, who had purposely occupied the locality in anticipation of the glorious enterprise, shouted : “ *Bravo ! Well struck !* ” The attendant ranks opened, and the assassin, Sante-Costantini, disappeared. The news was quickly conveyed to the Chambers ; and Sturbinetti, the president of the Deputies, calmly ejaculated : “ The House will proceed to the order of the day.” Then the Duc d’Harcourt, the French ambassador, turning to the other members of the diplomatic body, cried : “ What infamy ! Gentlemen, let us leave this hall ! We must not, by our presence, appear to be accomplices in this proceeding ! ” It is needless to say that the diplomatic tribune was vacated immediately. Meanwhile the votaries of the Dark Lantern were promenading through the streets from which cowardly terror had banished all honest men ; the ribald tongues of the “ Friends of Liberty ” loudly proclaimed the apotheosis of their modern Brutus ; and in default of the body of the victim, which they had intended to parade in triumph through the city, but which had been hidden in the vault of a church by Father Vaures, they carried the bloody dagger, ornamented with flowers, and fastened to the Italian Tricolor. Then the instrument of Masonic vengeance was ceremoniously deposited in a place of honor in the Cafè of the Fine Arts, in order that all “ true Italians ” might venerate it, to the accompaniment of the refrain which was said to have been composed by Sterbini, “ *Benedetta la mano che Rossi pugnalò*—Blessed

be the hand that stabbed Rossi!" And when night had fallen, the diabolic horde proceeded in procession to the house of mourning, and raised the weapon before a window of the room where the widow and her children were weeping (1).

It was already evident that the Head of the Church was no longer a free agent in his capital; but this fact was accentuated during the next few days, when the Pontiff was besieged in the Quirinal, forced to replace his faithful Swiss Guard with a detachment of that Civic Guard which was a mere creature of the Lodges, and compelled to accept a ministry which did not even disguise its hostility to the Papacy. During this crisis, the representatives of foreign states, with two exceptions, were in almost constant attendance on the sorely-beset Pontiff, in order to afford him at least the moral support of their governments. The exceptions were the ambassador of His Sardinian Majesty, and Lord Minto, pretendedly the "officious" agent of England, but really the servant of Palmerston, in his capacity of Orient of the Orient; and their time was spent in the various revolutionary clubs, arranging for the final consummation so ardently desired by Masonry. When Pius IX. had accepted the ministry composed of Sterbini, Galetti, Lunati, and others of whom he had never heard, he said to the diplomatic body: "Gentleman, I am a prisoner. You may inform Europe that henceforth I shall take no part in the government of the Roman States. I cannot allow a misuse to be made of my name, and I have given orders that in all administrative measures the ordinary forms of language are not to be observed." But the Masonic ministers refused to omit the name of Pius IX. from their administrative decrees; and it continually appeared that the Pope was sanctioning the most infamous measures. This fact, joined to the evident danger menacing the Holy Father and his entire court at the hands of the assassins of Rossi, compelled the papal counsellors to advise an abandonment of

(1) LUBIENSKI; *Ubi supra*, ch. 12 and 13.—DESCHAMPS; *Secret Societies and Society*; or, *the Philosophy of Contemporary History*, bk. ii., ch. 9. Paris, 1882.—D'ARLINCOURT; *Red Italy*. Paris, 1855.—BALEYDIER; *History of the Revolution in Rome*. Paris, 1850.

Rome. The Pontiff hesitated to take so momentous a step ; but during the evening of November 22, he received what seemed to be an indication of the will of Heaven that he should seek a temporary refuge in a foreign land. Mgr. Chartrousse, bishop of Valence in France, had sent to him a small package, accompanied by the following letter : " Most Holy Father, the great Pontiff, Pius VI., during his exile in France, and especially while at Valence where he died, and where his heart and bowels are now preserved, always either carried the Holy Eucharist on his bosom, or had it carried on the breast of one of the domestic prelates who were in his company. In the Most August Sacrament he found a guide for his actions, strength to bear his sufferings, a consolation in his griefs, until the time should arrive when it would be his Viaticum for eternity. I am the undoubted possessor of the little pyx which served the holy Pontiff in this religious and touching manner ; and I now present it to Your Holiness. Heir of the throne, the name, the virtues, the courage, and almost the tribulations of the grand Pius VI., you will probably appreciate this interesting relic, which, I dare to hope, will now have a different destiny. But who knows the designs of Providence in regard to Your Holiness? . . . I leave the pyx in the same little silken bag which contained it when in the possession of Pius VI. ; it is absolutely as it was when hanging from the neck of that immortal Pontiff. Prostrate at the feet of Your Holiness, I ask for your Apostolic benediction." Pius IX. kissed the precious memorial of the "*Peregrinus Apostolicus*," as the sixth Pius is styled in the prophecy attributed to St. Malachy ; he placed in it the Sacred Host, and hung it around his neck ; and was ready for the exile on which he had finally determined (1). But how was he to

(1) In his Allocution of Dec. 25, 1874, Pius IX. thus explained this resolution : " At its commencement, the revolution was apparently timid, obsequious, and flattering. It was even hypocritical, and deceived many men of good faith : it mingled with them even at the foot of the altar, where some nourished themselves with the Bread of Life, and others ate and drank for their own condemnation. The revolutionists demanded and obtained all that it was permissible to accord them. After each concession, they applauded loudly ; then they raised new pretensions, even demanding an aggressive and battle-fighting Pontiff. But the Pope, who wished not to be, and could not become a fighter, was obliged to leave Rome ; the resolution was forced on him by horrible threats, the execution of which was being prepared."

evade the vigilance of his guards? Thanks to the skill and prudence of the French ambassador, and to the devotedness of a French lady (*née* Giraud), the wife of the Bavarian ambassador, he escaped from the Quirinal during the night of the 24th, gained the Neapolitan frontier, and was received most filially by Ferdinand II. (1). During the eighteen months of the Pontiff's residence in his dominions, King Ferdinand showed himself to be as considerate and magnificent a host as so resolutely Christian a monarch would naturally be; in fact, he showed that he merited the hatred with which Masonry pursued him during his entire reign, and which it afterward visited successfully on his less resolute son (2).

On April 18, 1849, Cardinal Antonelli, in the name of Pius IX., called on the Catholic powers to restore him to his dominions; and in response to this appeal, plenipotentiaries of France, Spain, Portugal, Naples, Austria, and Bavaria met at Gaeta for a furtherance of the necessary concert. Austria, probably with an eye on the ever-coveted Legations, would gladly have worked alone for the desired end, and there were not wanting among the papal counsellors men who advised an entire ignoring of the French Second Republic. But the Pontiff's thoroughly Italian aversion for Austria, and his predilection for France as the Eldest Daughter of the Church, led him to decide that the more responsible and more honorable task of subduing his capital should be

(1) SAINT-ALBIN; *History of Pius IX. and His Pontificate*. Paris, 1870.—VILLEFRANCHE; *Pius IX., His Life and His Century*. Paris, 1878.

(2) Two days after his arrival in Gaeta, our Pontiff, surrounded by all the royal family and all the foreign ambassadors, proceeded to the Chapel of the Trinity, and there, before the Blessed Sacrament, he prayed aloud: "Omnipotent God, my August Father and Master! behold at Thy feet Thy unworthy Vicar, who beseeches Thee to bless him, and to direct his steps. O my God! sanctify his intentions, rectify his actions, and govern him so that on these shores or on any others where he may be forced to seek a refuge, he may always be an instrument of Thy glory, and of the glory of Thy persecuted Church! If, in order to appease Thy too just anger, his life would be to Thee an agreeable holocaust, take it; he offers it to Thee. Take it; it was given to him by Thee. But, O my God! let Thy glory triumph! Let Thy Church triumph! Confirm the good, support the weak, arouse from their terrible slumber those who sleep in sin! Bless, O Lord, the sovereign who is here prostrate before Thee! Bless his companion, bless his family! Bless all his subjects, and bless his faithful army! Bless all the cardinals, bishops, and clergy of this kingdom, that they may accomplish, by the sweet ways of Thy holy law, the sanctification of this people! With this hope, we trust not only to escape here below the snares of the impious, but also to place our feet, one day, on the shores of eternal security: *Ut hic in æternum, Te auxiliante, salvi et liberi esse mereamur.*"

assigned to the government of the latter country, while Ferdinand of Naples should enter the Papal States from the southern side, and Austria should attend to the Romagna. Meanwhile, the promoters of the presumed Italian Millennium were holding their Satanic revels in the capital of Christendom under the guidance of a Triumvirate composed of Mazzini, Carlo Armellini, and a lawyer named Saffi. Of course, the indefatigable Mazzini was the soul of this executive, and to him must be ascribed the guilt of all the sacrileges and other horrors which signalized the regime of the short-lived Roman Republic of '48. It is true that the churches were not pillaged, the confessionals burnt in the Piazza del Popolo, the houses of the cardinals and the best citizens sacked, eighteen priests massacred by Zambianchi, until the Nicene adventurer, Garibaldi, on March 27, brought into Rome his horde of Piedmontese and Lombards, Frenchmen, Germans, Hungarians, and renegade Poles, heroes of all the revolutions which had been the curse of Europe during the previous year; but at any moment Mazzini could have silenced the blasphemous tongue of Garibaldi, and could have paralyzed his murderous arm. The Saturnalia of hell terminated only on July 3, when the French troops under General Oudinot carried Rome by assault, and at the same time Mazzini fled from the responsibility which he had incurred, while Garibaldi led his surviving cut-throats, ostensibly to the succor of the heroically struggling Venetians, but in reality to an opportunity for disbandment. A few words concerning the origin of this French intervention in favor of the dispossessed Pontiff, and concerning the part played in it by Louis Napoleon, will interest the reader. In spite of the Masonic elements which were then in possession of the reins of her government, the heart of France had been moved by the insults offered to the Pontiff in his own capital by the sectaries; and immediately there was instituted that grand work of the "Peter's Pence," which afterward spread throughout Christendom. Very soon it became evident that all remembrance of the *Gesta Dei per Francos* was not dead in the land of St. Louis; and the two candidates for the presidency, Cavaignac and Louis Napoleon, vied with each other

in an endeavor to secure the Catholic vote, even to the point of an apparent rupture with the Masonic powers. General Cavaignac, then head of the executive power, sent to Rome; not a Masonic adept, but a practical Catholic, M. de Corcelles, charged with the duty of informing His Holiness that a French brigade was at his disposal, "to restore to him his personal liberty, if that had been taken from him." Bastide, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, endeavored to save the Masonic position by an assurance that French interference would go no further than to guarantee the "personal safety of the Pope"; but the immense majority of the French applauded the noble Montalembert when he declared in the Assembly, three days after the departure of Corcelles, that is, on Nov. 30, 1848, that "the person of the Pope is infinitely dear and infinitely sacred to Frenchmen, but his authority is much dearer and much more sacred." Then Cavaignac sent to the Pope, who had arrived in Gaeta ten days previously, the following letter: "Most Holy Father, the French nation, profoundly grieved by the afflictions of Your Holiness during the last few days, has been also deeply touched by the paternal confidence with which Your Holiness has asked of it a hospitality which it will be glad to accord, and which will be worthy of Your Holiness and of itself. I write, therefore, in order that no fear may interfere with the resolution taken by Your Holiness. Our Republic, the existence of which is consecrated by the reflecting and sovereign will of the French nation, will behold with pride Your Holiness giving to it by your presence a religious consecration; and it will receive you with the respect which befits so grand and generous a nation." In order to neutralize the effect of this letter among the Catholics, Louis Napoleon sent, on Dec. 9, the eve of the presidential election, a letter to the papal nuncio in Paris, outbidding Cavaignac for the Catholic vote: "Monseigneur, I cannot allow you to credit the reports now current, which represent me as an accomplice of the Prince of Canino in his present conduct at Rome. For a long time I have held no relations whatever with the eldest son of Lucien Bonaparte; and with all my soul I deplore the fact that he does not realize that the maintenance

of the temporal sovereignty of the venerable Head of the Church is intimately connected with the welfare of Catholicism, just as it is with the liberty and independence of Italy." This letter effected more for the election of Louis Napoleon than all the rhapsodies of Victor Hugo, the songs of Beranger, the descriptions of Tliiers, or even the Napoleonic legend, still so vivid. But when the prince-president attained to the first object of his ambition, it was found that only one of the new ministers, M. de Falloux, really desired the restoration of the Pope to his temporal throne; and the most powerful of the democratic orators, Victor Hugo, Ledru-Rollin, and Jules Favre, were virulently hostile to such a measure. But M. de Falloux was energetic; and he was aided in the Chambers by the eloquence of Montalembert, and throughout France by a unity in the Catholic party—a unity which France was too soon to lose. The Roman expedition was undertaken, but that no credit for it was due to Louis Napoleon is certain.

The first measure taken by the victorious Oudinot was the very proper one of sending the keys of the Eternal City to the Pope-King. His messenger was Colonel Niel (afterward Marshal), then chief-of-staff to General Vaillant. The words of acknowledgment pronounced by Pius IX. on this occasion show the absurdity of the complaint soon afterward made by the prince-president in his famous letter to Edgard Ney (1), to the effect that no praise of the French

(1) This letter to Colonel Edgard Ney, one of his officers of ordonnance, was asserted by Louis Napoleon to have been private; but its immediate insertion in the *Moniteur*, and the immediate mission of the recipient to Rome, showed that it was intended to be a political manifesto. The document reads as follows: "My dear Ney, the French Republic did not send an army to Rome in order to strangle Italian liberty, but in order to regulate it by preserving it from its own excesses, and in order to give it a solid foundation by restoring to his throne the Pontiff who was the first (Italian sovereign) to inaugurate useful reforms. I am pained on seeing that the benevolent intentions of His Holiness, and our own acts, are still sterile, because of passion and hostile influences; they are proposing tyranny and proscription as conditions of the Pope's return to Rome. Tell General Rostolan (the French commander in Rome) for me that he must not allow an act to be committed under the shadow of the Tricolor which might give a false complexion to our intervention. I thus summarize the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope: General amnesty, secularization of the administration, the Code Napoleon, and a liberal government. I was wounded personally, when I read the proclamation issued by the three cardinals, and saw that no mention was made of France, or of the sufferings of our brave soldiers. Every insult given to our flag or to our uniform goes straight to my heart, and I ask you to make it known that if France does not sell her services, she at least demands

soldiers had been uttered by the three cardinals whom the Pope had sent to Rome as his representatives. "Colonel," exclaimed His Holiness, "on other occasions I have declared that I could always rely on France. She had promised me nothing; but I felt that at the proper time she would give to the Church her treasures, her blood, and what is perhaps more difficult for her valorous sons, that restrained ardor, the persevering patience, to which I owe that Rome, the well-beloved and well-tried city of the world toward which I ever turned my thoughts during my exile, has been preserved intact. Tell the commanding general and all the generals under his orders; tell all their officers and all their soldiers; that my gratitude to them is unlimited. My prayers for the prosperity of your country will now be more fervent than they ever were. As to my love for the French, I cannot promise that it will be increased; that is an impossibility." For a time Louis Napoleon insisted on certain conditions being fulfilled, ere he would allow the Pontiff to return to Rome; a general amnesty was to be proclaimed, the administration was to be "secularized," the Code Napoleon was to be introduced, and the government was to be "liberalized." Pius IX. replied that he would retire to Austria, or even to America, "the way to which country he knew well," ere he would return to his States, hampered by conditions imposed by a third party; but of his own accord he did what he had intended always to do—he issued an amnesty, and by a *Motu proprio* of Sept. 14, 1849, he announced to his subjects that it was his intention to grant to the provinces and communes liberties which, as the event proved, were greater than those enjoyed in republican France. As for the proposed "liberalization" of his government, Pius IX. knew

that her sacrifices be recognized. When our armies made the tour of Europe, they left everywhere, as a trace of their passage, the germs of liberty and the destruction of feudal abuses; so let it not be said that in 1848 a French army has produced other results. Tell the general to thank the army in my name for its noble conduct. I have learned with grief that the army has not been treated, even physically, as it ought to have been treated; nothing leading to the comfort of our troops must be neglected." The most eloquent proof of the wanton absurdity of this sop to the Carbonari, this encouragement to defeated but still presumptuous Piedmont, was the refusal of General Rostolan to publish it in the Roman journals. The general even requested Ney to leave Rome immediately; and when Louis Napoleon himself formally "invited" him to publish the mendacious document, Rostolan replied with his resignation.

full well that such a process would infallibly lead to chronic revolution. As to the introduction of the Code Napoleon, was it reasonable to ask the Father of Christendom to accept in principle the destruction of a legislation over which the ideas of God and of religion presided? And as to the "secularization" of the government, the Pope could reply by adducing the figures presented by M. de Corelles, showing that while there were 6,836 lay functionaries in the civil administration of the papal dominions, there were only 289 ecclesiastics, of whom 179 were chaplains of prisons and similar institutions, and ten were attached to the offices of the cardinal-vicar of Rome. However, toward the end of March, 1850, the prince-president informed His Holiness that there were no obstacles to his return to his capital; and no conditions were mentioned. Louis Napoleon contented himself with prohibiting the soldiers of the expeditionary army from wearing the commemorative medals which the Pontiff had given to them. On April 12, Rome welcomed the Pope-King with every appearance of sincere gratification.

Continuing our succinct, although, as far as essentials are concerned, complete narrative of the political events of the pontificate of Pius IX., we come to a consideration of the causes which led to another destruction of the temporal dominion of the Holy See—a destruction which some persons regard as definitive. When the Congress of Paris, convened in 1856 to arrange terms of peace after the conclusion of the Crimean War, had determined the labors for which alone it had ostensibly met, Count Benso di Cavour brought on the table a subject, the introduction of which evinced the reason for which alone the little Sub-Alpine kingdom had been allowed to join the Anglo-French alliance in the war just concluded. Cavour, the most unprincipled as he was the ablest statesman of modern Europe, had furnished to the allies a *corps d'armée* which was not at all needed, and which contributed nothing or very little to the result of a war in which Piedmont had no interest; but he had gained his object—a voice in the determining councils of Europe, which he was to use for the advancement of a cause which Piedmont had made her own, and to which he had dedicated his life.

Sure of the support of Lord Clarendon, the English plenipotentiary, and nearly sure of that of Walewski, the French representative, he asked the members of the Congress to consider the condition of affairs in the States of the Church; and then the schemer perorated in this fashion: "The States of the Church have never known any prosperity, unless when they formed a part of the French Empire or of the Kingdom of Italy. . . . In our day, the emperor, Napoleon III., with that steady and accurate power of vision which characterizes him, understood and indicated the solution of the problem in his letter to Colonel Ney: secularization, and the Code Napoleon; but it is evident that the court of Rome will resist that combination until the last moment, and with every possible means. Of course, Rome may apparently yield so far as to adopt certain civil and political reforms, intending to render them illusory in practice; but she knows very well that secularization and the Code Napoleon, once introduced into the edifice of the temporal power, would undermine its foundations, and cause it to tumble, since they would deprive it of its principal supports, clerical privileges and the Canon Law. . . . The clerical organization opposes insurmountable obstacles to every kind of innovation." This tirade was greeted by Walewski and by Clarendon with terms which manifested no hesitation, on the part of their governments, to further the thinly-veiled designs of Piedmont. Among the members of the Congress was one from Prussia, although that enterprising country had taken no part either in the Crimean War or in the intervention which had terminated it. Probably the permission accorded to Prussia was due to "that steady and accurate power of vision which characterized Napoleon III.;" but, of course, Prussia could not have foreseen the profit which would accrue to her from the alliance of Napoleon III. and the Italian Revolution, else her representative, Otho von Manteuffel, would not have remarked that Cavour's incriminations appeared very like an endorsement of European revolution. The France of the *sans culottes*, and all materialistic France, encouraged the emperor to "make Italy"; but, as Villefranche says: "Catholic France asked whether the ruler whom it had accepted,

and who had hitherto appeared to serve it well, was about to betray it in favor of a return to the conspiratory habits of his youth." However, these fears were allayed in some measure by a report of the French ambassador at Rome to the Minister of Foreign Affairs—a document which clearly refuted the calumnies of Cavour against the papal administration. This diplomat, Alphonse Gerard de Rayneval, knew Rome intimately; he had been secretary of the embassy under Louis Philippe, and had been ambassador also under the Second Republic. But his report did not accord with the designs of the conspirators; hence the imperial government did not give to it the official publicity of an insertion in the *Moniteur*, nor did the Judæo-Masonic-Revolutionary press even mention its existence. Frenchmen learned its contents only from the columns of the London *Daily News*. The capital importance of this official report compels us to quote it at some length: "I do not deny that there is a certain uneasiness among the Roman populations; but this is not to be attributed to any fault in the pontifical government. The cause is much less simple, and it pertains to a very different order of ideas. It is found above all in the fact that the present role of Italy in the world does not correspond to the national souvenirs, or to the visions and aspirations of the Italians. . . . The Italians have penetration, intelligence, a vivid perception of everything; but these precious gifts are counterbalanced by a want of energy, of strength of soul, and of any true civic courage. Continually suspicious of one another, they live isolated; they have no commercial or manufacturing associations, no mutual political understanding; and solid national armies are impossible among them. On parade the ranks of an army are full; but when danger arrives, the leaders are accused of treason, and the soldiers distrust each other. This default of equilibrium between the intelligence and the character of the Italians furnishes the key of their entire history, and of all their political infirmities. . . . Pius IX. showed great ardor for reforms; and we know what catastrophe followed. . . . I have often asked bitter foes of the pontifical government how many priests they thought to be employed in the administration;

and they replied : 'Three thousand, or thereabout.' And they refused to believe me when, with documents in hand, I showed that these ecclesiastics did not number two hundred, and that the half of those were not in Holy Orders. . . . The Church understood that the sacred functions of a priest might often be incompatible with governmental administrative duties ; and therefore she opened the door to the lay element by instituting the *prelatura*. . . . All the Roman prelates are not obliged to enter into Holy Orders ; most of them do not. Thus Mgr. Matteucci, the Minister of Police ; Mgr. Mertel, Minister of the Interior ; Mgr. Berardi, Sub-Secretary of State ; and many others, who are free to marry to-morrow, if they so wish, constitute a religious caste, sacrificing their own interests to those of the State. . . . A curious fact presents itself for our consideration. From those provinces which are governed by laymen, there come many deputations, asking that they be governed by ecclesiastical delegates. . . . The people accuse the lay delegates of subordinating the public interests to those of their families . . . I have studied the Roman codes of procedure and of commerce ; they are beyond criticism ; the hypothecary code has been examined by French jurisconsults, and they have cited it as a model. The municipal organization is so broad, that to-day it seems necessary to enlarge, not the municipal power, but the governmental supervision. . . . We know what revolutions cost. The Roman Republic provided for its expenses by creating paper-money, which soon depreciated considerably. The pontifical government did not hesitate to recognize those notes, and to withdraw them from circulation by buying them. The sum was considerable, seven millions of scudi ; that is, more than the annual revenue of the State. . . . In spite of the debts bequeathed by the revolution ; in spite of the extraordinary expenses entailed by the reorganization of the army ; in spite of the large disbursements for public works ; the budget, which, at the restoration of Pius IX., showed a great deficit, has gradually approached the equilibrium. . . . The taxes are always less than the average taxes in other European countries. A Roman pays to the State 22 francs ; a Frenchman 45. . . . This continual talk about

abuses in the papal government is composed of phrases which are regarded as so much Gospel truth. But where are these abuses? Men complain because travellers are asked for *pourboires* at the custom-houses. Of course that is blamable; but would a secularization of the government cure the country of a vice which is deeply seated in the nature of the people? . . . At any rate, whenever a man becomes rich here, he is always a layman. . . . To conclude, we are forced to admit, after examination, that the pontifical government has not failed in its duty; that it has marched regularly in the way of reform, and that it has made great progress." When Catholics perused this report of a French ambassador, one who enjoyed the confidence of the emperor, and who was in a position to be able to speak *ab experto* concerning the truth of Cavour's allegations against the pontifical government, they felt that there was now no danger that France would be forced to play the game of the Carbonari; and certain procedures of the emperor at this period confirmed their feeling of security. Napoleon III. besought Pius IX. "to deign to hold at the baptismal font the heir just given to him by Providence"; and the Pontiff sent Cardinal Patrizzi as legate *a latere* to represent him in the ceremony. His Holiness sent, at the same time, the "Golden Rose" to the empress. Then followed the re-institution of the Chapter of Saint-Denis at the express request of the emperor. But the new-born security of the French Catholics was short-lived. On Jan. 14, 1858, Count Felice Orsini, emulating the act of Pianori in 1855, and that of other Italians in 1853, tried to assassinate Napoleon III.; but the emperor escaped, while eight others were killed, and one hundred and forty-eight were wounded. This Orsini was a son of one of Louis Napoleon's companions in the insurrection of the Romagna in 1831; he had been condemned for high treason by the government of Gregory XVI. in 1845, had been amnestied by Pius IX., and had been a member of the Roman Constituent Assembly of 1849. At the trial of Orsini and his associates, his lawyer, Jules Favre, read a "political testament" which the assassin had written in his prison—a document which had probably been inspired by the brilliant

Masonic jurisconsult himself, and in which it was calmly avowed that the attempt had been undertaken with the object of reminding the emperor of his olden agreement with the Carbonari to procure the independence of Italy; that, furthermore, he, Orsini, was only one of hundreds who had sworn to effect the deed which he had failed to accomplish. "Let Your Majesty remember," concluded the daring enthusiast, "that so long as Italy is not independent, the tranquillity of Europe and that of Your Majesty are chimeras" (1). Orsini was guillotined, shouting under the axe: "*Viva l'Italia!*" and from that moment the policy of Napoleon III. was avowedly Masonic.

On January 1, 1859, on the occasion of the usual reception of the ambassadors at the Tuileries, the emperor astonished the Austrian envoy with the significant words: "I regret that my relations with your government are not as cordial as they have been." A few months afterward the lightning-like

(1) On March 13, 1861, Emile Keller, member of the Corps Legislatif from the Haut-Rhin, openly stigmatized the War of '59 as a mere compliance with the last will of Orsini. The imperial government, of course, moved heaven and earth to prevent the re-election of Keller; but no sane and ordinarily impartial publicist of the day took him to task. The circumstances connected with the Napoleonic change of policy were too well known. For the benefit of the reader, however, we reproduce a resumé of those circumstances as given in 1874 by the *Giornale di Firenze*. "At the moment of the attempt on his life, the emperor showed a coolness which was truly admirable. Just as at the time of the attempts at the Hippodrome and at the Opera Comique in 1853, and of that of Pianori in 1855, he at first scorned the implacable persecution of the Italian sect, of which he was a member, but which he had deserted in order to devote himself to the prosperity of France, and to the consolidation of his dynasty. But after reflection, Napoleon III. was seized by that anxiety which often possesses souls which are the most thoroughly balanced. The prince-imperial was a babe. What would be the fate of the empire, and of that child, if the sect, which had decreed the death of Napoleon, succeeded in its design? Amid his terrible perplexities, the emperor bethought himself of the advice once given to him by his mother, Queen Hortense: 'If you ever find yourself in extreme peril, and need good council, betake yourself to the lawyer, X. . . He will surely save you.' This lawyer, whose name I do not wish to mention here, was a Roman exile whom Napoleon himself had known during the insurrection of the Romagna. He was then living near Paris in that mysterious condition which is neither wealth nor poverty, but which Masonry assures to its leaders. Napoleon ordered M. . . to bring X. . . to the Tuileries; and the meeting took place on the following morning. When X. . . entered the imperial cabinet, Napoleon arose, seized the visitor's hands, and exclaimed: 'They want to kill me; what have I done?' X. . . replied: 'You have forgotten that you are an Italian, and that you are bound by oath to assure the independence and the grandeur of our country.' Napoleon declared that his love for Italy was still vivid in his heart; but that as the Emperor of the French, he owed himself also and above all to the grandeur of France. The lawyer insisted that nothing prevented His Majesty from devoting himself to France; but that he might and should work for Italy. If he did not, the secret societies had resolved to suppress every obstacle which impeded the delivery of Italy from the yoke of Austria, and which stood in the way of Italian unity. 'What do they want me to do?' asked Napoleon. The lawyer promised to consult his

campaign of Magenta and Solferino gave Lombardy to France, with the understanding that the conquest should be handed over to Piedmont. Then came the revolt of the Romagna against the Pope-King, already prepared by Pepoli and other agents of Cavour. On May 3, 1859, before his departure for the Italian campaign, the French emperor had issued a proclamation in which he declared that he would "respect the territories and the rights of neutral powers"; and he had added: "We do not go into Italy in order to foment disorder, or to subvert the authority of the Holy Father whom we have restored to his throne. We go in order to relieve the Pope from that foreign oppression which weighs on the entire peninsula." In the preliminaries of peace signed at Villafranca on July 11, he had agreed with the Austrian sovereign to respect the integrity of the papal dominions, and to further the formation of an Italian Confederation, under the honorary presidency of the Pontiff. But in spite of these assurances, he made no sign of opposition when, under the pretext of obeying the will of the populations, Piedmont annexed not only Modena and Par-

friends, and to announce the decision in a few days. When the reply was given, the emperor found that three things were required: I. The pardon of Orsini. II. The proclamation of the independence of Italy. III. A declaration of war between France and Austria. A delay of fifteen months was accorded to Napoleon, that he might prepare events; and during that time he was to enjoy perfect security. Every one knows the documents which appeared from this time, showing the sudden change of imperial policy, and its conformity to that indicated in the letter to Edgard Ney. The emperor tried earnestly to comply with the first demand of the sect. He caused the empress to implore for the pardon of Orsini; he consulted his Ministers and the diplomatic body; and he found resistance in only one person—one whose profession would have inclined him to clemency, but who believed that the emperor had no right to impede the course of justice. This person was Cardinal Morlot, who said: 'Sire, your Majesty can do much in France, but you cannot do that. By a wonderful favor of Providence, your life has just been spared; but around you French blood was shed, and that crime must be expiated. If it is not expiated, every idea of justice will disappear; and *justitia regnorum fundamentum*.' Napoleon understood; he went to see Orsini. What was the nature of this interview between the two adepts of the Lodge of Cesena? Perhaps all will never be known; but we do know that at this meeting Napoleon renewed the obligations which he had assumed in his youth, and which he had confirmed in the hands of the lawyer, X. . . And in the arms of him whom he could not save, he swore to be the executor of the criminal's Last Will and Testament. The expression is correct; Napoleon was the testamentary executive of Orsini. It was agreed that Orsini should write a letter announcing the programme for Italian unity, and that Napoleon should give the document to the public. Then occurred one of the greatest scandals of our time; this testamentary letter was read before the judges of Orsini, and it was published in the *Moniteur*. Martyr for the Italian idea, Orsini perished, knowing for a certainty that Italy would be free, and that the Pope would be uncrowned."

ma, but also the Papal Legations. As we learn from a despatch of M. de Thouvenel, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs (dated Feb. 12, 1860), Napoleon even wrote to Pius IX., three days after the preliminaries of Villafranca, the following letter: "In this new condition of things, Your Holiness can exercise the greatest influence, and you can cause the cessation of every source of trouble for the future. Consent, therefore, or rather by your own *Motu proprio* grant to the Legations a separate administration under a lay government nominated by yourself, but surrounded by an elective council. Let this province pay a fixed revenue to the Holy See, and Your Holiness will assure the tranquillity of your States, and you will be able to dispense with the service of foreign troops. I beseech Your Holiness to listen to the voice of one who is a devoted son of the Church, but who understands the needs of our epoch." On Dec. 31, the emperor wrote to His Holiness another letter in which he presumed to say that the Holy See should consent to the loss of the Legations, "in order to preserve the rest of its temporal dominion." The Pontiff replied: "I do not ignore the difficulty of the position in which Your Majesty is involved; but you might escape from this position by some decisive measure. However, it is precisely because Your Majesty is in this position that I am counselled to cede the revolted provinces, with the hope of retaining the others. Such a project presents insurmountable difficulties. Consider my situation, my sacred character, and the rights of the Holy See—rights which are not those of a dynasty, but of all Catholics. . . . I cannot cede what is not mine; and again, if I were to cede the Legations, I would encourage the Revolution to play the same game in the provinces which remain to me. . . . You say that the Powers will guarantee to me the debris of the pontifical royalty. Perhaps they will; but in case of fresh revolts, which are very probable, since they are being continually excited by outside parties, do you believe that the Powers will then help me in an efficacious manner? . . . Your Majesty says that the repose of Europe depends on my ceding those Legations which have caused so much embarrassment to the pontifical

government during the last fifty years. Now, since I have already promised to talk candidly to Your Majesty, let me ask you to enumerate the revolutions which have occurred in France during the last seventy years. Then let me ask Your Majesty whether any parties will dare to inform the grand French nation that the quietude of Europe demands that its empire be curtailed. You perceive that your argument proves too much; therefore you will permit me to reject it. And allow me to remind Your Majesty that you know very well how the rebellion in Bologna, Ravenna, and other cities was effected; that you know whose money and other means did the work. Among these populations nearly every citizen was stupefied by a rebellion which he had not expected (1). . . . *Sire, I entreat you, in the name of the Church, and also in the name of your own interests, to act*

(1) The manner in which the duchies of Tuscany, Parma, and Modena, and the papal province of the Romagna, were annexed to Piedmont in accordance with the presumed "will of their peoples," is graphically described by Carletti, in his *Revelations of an Agent of the Count de Cavour*, published after Carletti's death by Stefano di San Pol, the editor of the *Contemporaneo* of Florence. Carletti had been one of Cavour's most trusted agents; and when San Pol presented the *Revelations* to the king in his *Forty Truths Told to the Court of Turin*, he said to His Majesty: "Sire, it is not I that speak here. Like an honest citizen I unveil for you what Carletti unveiled for Italy and Europe. The book has been printed abroad, and it has been reproduced in Naples, Rome, Bologna, and Florence; and it has never been contradicted." We pass over Carletti's interesting account of the proceedings in the duchies, and make some extracts from his narrative of the annexation of the Romagna: "When Farini (the representative of Victor Emmanuel in the ex-duchies) annexed the Romagna to his government, which then took the name of the Province of Emilia, Pepoli and Montanari ridded themselves of Cipriani, whom they themselves had called to the government. The father of this Cipriani had failed in business in Balegna (in Corsica), his brother had failed in Leghorn, and he himself had bankrupted in America; such was the man who had been called to rule the Romagna instead of the legate of the Pope. The object of these successive annexations of Parma and the Romagna to the government of Farini has never been clearly explained. The French government affected repugnance toward permitting the annexation of the Romagna to Piedmont, but it would not oppose the annexation of the Emilia—a question of words. And as to the annexation to Piedmont of all the Romagnese provinces under the name of the Emilia, all that I have said in regard to the elections to the local parliaments in the duchies can be applied exactly to this second appeal to Universal Suffrage. More than four-fifths of the tax-payers of the Emilia abstained from voting. This fact is so notorious throughout Central Italy, that I would not mention it, were it not for the sake of my readers beyond the Alps. All the manifestations of approval which preceded or accompanied the voting were organized by us. All those placards about which the Piedmontese journals made such noise, those placards bearing the inscriptions, 'Viva l'indipendenza d'Italia!' and 'We want Victor Emmanuel for our legitimate king,' were brought to us already printed from Turin, and we ourselves placed them in all the balconies and at all the windows; and in spite of the freedom of suffrage, no person would have dared to remove them. In order to effect the illuminations, we stimulated the zeal of the inhabitants as they did in Paris in 1848, but with this difference. In Paris the inciters were drawn from the native mob; but we employed Piedmontese and other foreigners who obeyed our

*in such a manner that my apprehensions in your regard may not be justified.* Certain *Memoirs*, which are termed secret, inform me that the emperor, Napoleon I., left to his family certain useful counsels which are worthy of a Christian philosopher who found consolation in adversity only in religion." The letter of Napoleon to the Pontiff drew from Cavour the following remarks in the Chamber of Deputies at Turin on May 26, 1860: "The letter of Napoleon III. to the Pope, proclaiming that the papal reign in the Romagna is ended, will be memorable in the history of Italy. I think that by this letter the emperor has acquired a title to our gratitude, not inferior to that which he merited when he defeated the Austrians on the heights of Solferino. Certainly by this letter Napoleon has put an end to priestly domination, a thing which has been more injurious to us, perhaps, than the rule of Austria. It has been said that I attach too much

countersigns. Woe to the windows of those who did not correspond quickly enough to our imperative cries of 'Lights, lights!'; the archbishop of Naples knows something about this. After the vote for annexation, I went to Turin with Farini, who received the Ministry of the Interior. On the day after our arrival, I was sent to Rome, with the mission to incite to action the Revolutionary Committee of that city; by my advice a demonstration was prepared for March 19, St. Joseph's Day. We knew well that we had no chance of success, even though the French were to look on with folded arms; but we hoped to intimidate the Pope by deceiving him as to our real strength, and thus to induce him to leave Rome. Had he done so, the French army would have departed, and our success would have been assured. But the court of Rome resisted, and we were made ridiculous. However, in spite of this set-back, my enterprise was not altogether a failure. I had brought from Turin two very adroit agents, Biambilla and Bondinelli, whom I succeeded in getting into the pontifical army; and by means of a cryptographic system they kept me well posted. Shortly afterward I got a number of Piedmontese *carabinieri* into the army which General La Moricière was then organizing; and they aided us greatly at Castelfidardo." The schemes of the conspirators in order to prepare "popular receptions" for Victor Emmanuel, when he visited his new provinces, make interesting reading; we cite only one: "At Bologna, the archbishop, Mgr. Viale-Prela, obstinately refused to chant the *Te Deum* which we demanded, and in order to prevent any of his moderate canons from obeying us, he adopted the energetic measure of suspending them all *a divinis*. Then we procured the services of three army chaplains, and of twelve students; and having taken the episcopal insignia from the sacristy of the cathedral, we placed them at the head of our procession, and went to receive the king." After the king's trip to Parma, where he was saluted with cries of 'Bread!' Carletti went to Ancona, in order to introduce more traitors into the papal garrison. "Our agents had been instructed on three principal points: They were to bribe soldiers to desert during time of peace, and for this purpose they had full access to the cash-boxes of the Piedmontese consulate. In case of battle, the bribed soldiers were to raise the cry '*sauve qui peut*,' or to kill their officers during the action. We know how well these instructions were carried out at Castelfidardo. . . . General de Pimodan was assassinated at the moment when he was about to throw himself, at the head of a few braves, against a Piedmontese column; that Biambilla, whom I had engaged in Rome, shot him in the back. Biambilla was made a sergeant as soon as he arrived in the Piedmontese camp, and now he is in garrison at Milan. He had merely obeyed orders."

importance to this letter ; but I reply that it is not a simple letter, but rather a proclamation of a grand principle, for in it a great sovereign of a grand Catholic nation declares that the temporal power of the Pope is not sacred, and such a fact is just as important for the Italian question as was the battle of Solferino. The question of the temporal power of the Pope is not only an Italian question, but a European question, a universal question, and *I do not know that, without this declaration by Napoleon, any one would have dared to assume the responsibility of annexing the Romagna.* Hence, no one can say that our cession of Savoy and Nice has been without compensation." On March 26, 1860, Pius IX. issued his Bull of Excommunication against all the participators in the robbery of which the Holy See had just been the victim : " We declare that all those who have taken part in the rebellion, usurpation, occupation, and criminal invasion of the aforesaid provinces of our States ; together with all their abettors, counsellors, and adherents ; have incurred the Greater Excommunication, and the other ecclesiastical censures inflicted by the holy Canons and by the Apostolic Constitutions, notably by the Council of Trent. And in so far as it may be necessary, we again excommunicate and anathematize them."

In May, 1860, the revolutionary press of Europe, and its servile copyists in the United States, announced to their credulous readers what they unblushingly termed the "reckless daring" of Garibaldi, the blasphemous pet of the Lodges, in his landing at defenceless Marsala. The miserable adventurer had been convoyed by a British fleet into the harbor ; Her Majesty's admiral had forbidden the Neapolitan men-of-war from interfering with the expedition ; in fact, as Garibaldi afterward admitted, in an address to the mayor of Southampton on April 4, 1864, and in his speech at the Crystal Palace on May 16, " Had it not been for the help of England, it would have been impossible for us, in 1860, to do what we did in the two Sicilies ; without the aid of Admiral Mondy, I could never have traversed the Straits of Messina ; and without the assistance of Lord Palmerston, Naples would still be subject to the Bourbons " (1). After

(1) See also Mme. Rattazzi's *Rattazzi and His Times*, p. 473. — Menacci's *Memoirs for*

this "daring" exploit of the now apotheosized filibuster, the "Liberal" world gloated over his march through Sicily with an army composed of liberated convicts and of every other scum, while nearly every Neapolitan general either treacherously turned aside, or openly joined the deluded and deluding rabble. Then occurred that massacre of the royalist prisoners at Milazzo, which was ordered "for the sake of example." Then came the proclamation of an Agrarian Law, and the division of communal lands among those who "were combatting against the olden tyranny." Then the prisons at Castellamare were opened, and 1,500 robbers and murderers were dismissed "on their word of honor." Then the Masonic world was edified by the decree which pronounced "sacred" the memory of the assassin, Agesilao Milano. Then we heard of the "generalship" of the red-shirted intellectual nullity, as he crossed to the mainland, and effected his march on Naples, the road having been cleared by the machinations of the champion-traitor of this century, Liborio Romano, whom Francis II. had foolishly entrusted with full powers, but whom the wise and energetic Ferdinand II. would have sent to the galleys. Then the admirers of opera-bouffe in real life smiled; but the serious-minded were sickened when Naples beheld the embrace of Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi—the recreant *Re Galantuomo* prostituting the hitherto unsullied Cross of Savoy to the caress of red-handed sacrilege. Then came the wholesale shooting of royalist prisoners and Bourbon "suspects" without trial, by General Cialdini—a proceeding which even the arch-revolutionist, Nicotera, pronounced in the Italian parliament to be "worthy of Tamerlane, Genghis-Khan, and Attila." Events like these prepared the mind of an observer ere he witnessed the Saturnalia of immorality which now spread through the Two Sicilies. One of the most hideous traits of this revolution, remarked Lord Malmesbury in the British House of Lords, was the public exhibition and sale of the most abominable books and pictures, expressly invented for the corruption of the youth of both sexes. The atheistic journals rivalled each

other in the publication of such sacrilegious novels as *The Carpenter of Nazareth*. Books of the most disgusting nature were openly hawked in the streets, and their subjects, said Lord Malmesbury, "were generally the Pope, the members of the House of Bourbon, and even the gentle Sisters of Charity. That such indecency was possible, I could not have believed, if I myself had not beheld it." The Socialist apostle, Proudhon, writing in the *Courier* of Lyons, on July 31, 1862, said: "During the last four years, the Italians have gathered nought but ruin from the unitarian policy preconised by Mazzini, and carried out by Cavour. In his entire life, Mazzini knew how to effect only two things; to draw money from the rich, and blood from the people. And he never restored either. Truly, the Italians are patient." While Naples was receiving its first share of the demoralization with which the Revolution had already endowed Northern Italy, her king, Francis II., the son of Ferdinand II. by Maria-Cristina of Savoy (1), was combatting for his crown and Neapolitan independence on his northern frontier.

(1) On January 16, 1836, the canon of Castel Sant' Elmo announced to the expectant Neapolitans that a prince-royal, heir to the throne of the Two Sicilies, had just taken his first glimpse of earth. Maria-Cristina of Savoy, one of the most lovable and admirable princesses of a royal house which, until our day, was ever pre-eminently distinguished for the virtue as well as for the valor of its scions, had realized the hopes of her venerating subjects; and her consort, King Ferdinand II., one of the worthiest and therefore one of the most calumniated of modern sovereigns, thanked God for the prospective continuance of the Neapolitan line of the House of Bourbon. Three years previously Maria-Cristina, daughter of King Victor Emmanuel I. of Sardinia, had come to Naples with the reputation of a saint; and from that day all her actions—political, social, and domestic—had made men declare that St. Elizabeth of Hungary had reappeared on earth. It was a day of rejoicing in Naples; but soon the kingdom was astounded and prostrated by a request of the monarch that public prayers should be offered for the preservation of the life of his young wife. As Maria-Cristina had predicted to her sisters several months before her confinement, and when she was in the best of health, God had called her to Himself. In all her sufferings she evinced a supernatural calm; and the king, although nearly crazed with grief, remarked to the assembled clergy and princes: "You perceive, gentlemen, that as one lives so one dies." Feeling the approach of death, Maria-Cristina turned to her relatives and servants, and said: "I beg the forgiveness of each of you for any fault I may have committed in your regard, and I entreat you all to pray for my soul." Then she asked for her babe, and the little prince was placed in her arms. For several minutes she embraced him in silence; then, blessing him, she removed from her neck a medal of Our Lady of Sorrows which she had worn since her infancy, and placing it on the heart of the child, she gave him to the king. While the Litany was being recited she made every response; and when it was finished she exclaimed, in distinct accents: "My God, I have believed in Thee, hoped in Thee, and loved Thee with all my heart!" With this final manifestation of faith, hope, and charity, the soul of Maria-Cristina appeared at the throne of her Creator. During her life Maria-Cristina had been regarded as a saint; and after her death the people declared that the general veneration for her memory was confirmed by many miracles and graces obtained

Endowed with the intelligence, if not with the energy of his father, Francis II. had much of the exquisite goodness of heart which had distinguished his mother. A few months previous to his demise, Ferdinand II. had witnessed the marriage of his heir with Maria-Sofia, a daughter of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria; and the warm welcome accorded by the Neapolitans to the radiantly beautiful girl of eighteen had led the sturdy monarch to hope that the storms of his own reign would not be repeated. But the medal of the Seven Dolours of Mary, placed on the breast of her child by the saintly Maria-Cristina, had been providentially significant. The position of the young monarch was a difficult one; and, unfortunately, he began his reign by an act of imprudence. His first royal act was the proclamation of a full amnesty for all political offences; and thus he filled his kingdom with conspirators whom a wiser policy would have kept where they could effect but little harm, for they were utterly incapable of gratitude. But this mistake could have been remedied, had not the young monarch confided the administration of his government to a "liberal" ministry. Shortly after Francis II. had retired to Gaeta, in accordance with the counsels of the infamous Liborio Romano, the regular army of Sardinia invaded the States of the Church. Besides the garrison of Gaeta, Francis could then dispose of a few thousands of the olden Neapolitan army, who had spurned the bribes of the Cabinet of Turin, and thrown themselves into Capua. He attacked and defeated the Garibaldians on the Volturno, and would have followed up his advantage, had not his generals advised a few days of recuperation in Capua. The king returned to Gaeta, and in the following week the Capuan army capitulated to His Majesty of Sardinia. Then began the siege of Gaeta, during which the young queen, Maria-Sofia, remained at her husband's side; for of her it was to be said, "She fought as long as there was one unbroke-

by those who invoked her intercession. The Holy See, ever slow in taking any positive steps in the matter of canonization, allowed twenty-three years to elapse before it officially noticed the popular clamor for ecclesiastical cognizance of the heroic virtues of the queen. Finally, on the 9th of July, 1859, Pope Pius IX. confirmed the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites which permitted the formal introduction of the cause of her beatification; and therefore Catholics are allowed to speak of her as Venerable, while they await the day when they may address her as Blessed.

en sword among her friends." On the 22d of January, 1861, Victor Emmanuel II. began the bombardment of the last stronghold of his royal cousin ; but the day of treason had passed, and around Francis II. there were now none but enthusiastic defenders of a legitimate monarchy. During the twenty-three days of murderous combat which now ensued, the young king and queen were almost constantly exposed to fire ; and when not on the bastions, blackened with powder and treading in blood, they were performing works of heavenly charity at the ambulances or in the hospitals. The horrors of the siege were augmented by an outbreak of typhus ; and all the wounded succumbed to the epidemic. It was while aiding the Sisters of Charity to alleviate suffering and to encourage the dying that Queen Maria-Sofia received the title of Angel of Gaeta, by which all true legitimists still designate her. On February 13, when the ramparts of Gaeta were in ruins, every one of its guns dismantled, and the ammunition and food exhausted, King Francis II. capitulated. On the 14th he departed for Rome, the ever-open refuge of misfortune. From the day of his entrance into the calm of Papal Rome, Francis gave himself to an imitation of the virtues of the holy mother who had probably foreseen that his crown was to be, in its own small and mundane fashion, one of thorns. The last years of the life of Francis II. were passed in France and in the Tyrol ; and it may be said that wherever they resided, the poor alone knew that the Hero and Angel of Gaeta still lived. Many a time both expressed resignation with their lot, because of the difficulty experienced by the Catholic sovereigns of our day in reigning according to the laws of God and of His Church. They fully realized that all earthly dynasties and all political schemes are perishable things. In a few years, at most, the edifice reared in Italy upon a foundation of fraud and sacrilege will be a ruin ; and ruins themselves perish in time. But even ruins, says some poet, leave souvenirs behind them—the remembrance of the shames of which they have been the theatre ; and historians will find in the records of the nineteenth century few events so shameful as that of the dethronement of Francis II.

The annexation of the Romagna to Piedmont was soon followed by another outrage on the papal dominion. Toward the end of 1859, M. de La Guéronnière, under the inspiration of Napoleon III., had written the pamphlet, entitled *The Pope and the Congress*, a work which all the semi-official journals of France proclaimed as representing the views of the emperor on the Roman question, although it repeated all the old calumnies against the papal government, and declared that Italy should be allowed to construct her national edifice, and that the Pontiff should retain no domain but that of the Vatican and its gardens. On Sept. 4 of the following year, the emperor proceeded to Chambery, in Savoy, in order to receive the felicitations of the new subjects whom Cavour had just given as a compensation for the letter of Napoleon III. in regard to the Pope, as we have heard the Minister declaring in the parliament at Turin. At Chambery he received Cialdini and Farini, who brought to him greetings from their sovereign. What happened during this momentous interview? All that we know is that immediately after his return to his army, Cialdini invaded the pontifical territory without any declaration of war; attacked the little papal army which La Moricière, the conqueror of Abd-el-Kader, had recently organized to defend the Roman States against the Garibaldians, then concentrated on the Neapolitan frontier; and after defeating La Moricière's force of 5,600 with one of more than 45,000, he took possession of the Marches and Umbria. M. de Becdelièvre, colonel of the pontifical Zouaves, narrates that during his residence in Recanati, after the capitulation of Loreto, he asked the Piedmontese general, Cugia, whether he did not think that France would put a stop to the enterprise of Victor Emmanuel; whether the general had not read the dispatch of the Duc de Grammont to the French consul in Ancona, stating that the emperor would oppose with force any Piedmontese invasion of Roman territory. Then, adds Becdelièvre, Cugia laughed, and replied: "Last Friday, our commander-in-chief, Cialdini, lunched at Chambery, and when he asked for instructions as to what he should do, he was told: 'Enter, and act quickly!'" As you see, we are acting

quickly." All the journals of that day published a letter from Quatrebarbes, the papal governor of Ancona, in which that gallant officer told how, on Sept. 11, M. de Courey, the French consul at that port, ran into his residence with a telegram signed by the Duc de Grammont, the French ambassador to the Holy See. This dispatch said: "The emperor will not tolerate the culpable invasion of the Papal States by the Piedmontese government. He has written from Marseilles to the king of Sardinia, declaring that he will resist such invasion. Orders have been given for the embarkment of fresh troops at Toulon, and they will arrive at Civita Vecchia without delay." And La Moricière, in his report concerning the operations of his troops, addressed to the papal Pro-Minister of War, says that this dispatch was transmitted directly to him from Rome, and that it ended with the injunction to the French consul: "You will regulate your conduct accordingly." We may imagine, therefore, the astonishment of La Moricière, when he was informed by the Piedmontese general, Fanti, that the troops of Victor Emmanuel would enter Umbria, if the pontifical forces opposed "the national movement" in any way. The papal commander replied: "There we have the old fable of the wolf and the lamb; it would have been more frank to declare war on us at once. But victory is not always on the side of the strongest battalions; we must rely on the assistance of God!" The Battle of Castelfidardo was fought on Sept. 18, 1860. Despite the immense numerical superiority of the Piedmontese forces, and despite the cowardly or perhaps treacherous flight of the Swiss regiments of the Line, the cause of the Pope-King was defended with calm and holy ardor by the majority of the little army of the Cross, especially by the heroic Franco-Belge Zouaves, and by about a hundred Irishmen. La Moricière succeeded in cutting his way to Ancona with about five hundred men. As he neared the Adriatic port, heavy cannonading told him that the siege had begun. Until Sept. 30, he resisted with patient heroism the attacks of Cialdini by land, and of Admiral Persano by sea; then finding that less than twelve hundred men remained for the defence, he raised the white flag. In the let-

ter which La Moricière received from Pius IX. shortly after the capitulation of Ancona, the Pontiff expressed this historical judgment: "The enemies of truth and of justice may distort narratives of events at their pleasure; but all honest men will laud as triumphant for the Church the spectacle witnessed recently in the Papal States—a little army organized in a few months by your zeal and intelligence, an army which was more than sufficient to suppress the Revolution, if that Revolution had not been protected by forces incomparably greater than our own, and had not been aided by all the means that can be suggested by fraud and mendacity." The crime of Castelfidardo, the prime cause of which was Napoleon III., and which eventuated in the annexation of the Marches and of Umbria by Piedmont, was thus stigmatized by Mgr. Pie (afterward Cardinal), bishop of Poitiers: "Pilate could have saved Christ; and without Pilate, Christ could not have been put to death. The signal could be given by him alone; *Nobis non licet interficere*, said the Jews. Wash your hands, O Pilate! Declare yourself innocent of the death of Christ! Then our sole reply will be in those words which we recite every day, and which our furthest posterity will also recite: 'I believe in Jesus Christ, the only Son of God the Father, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was born of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and suffered and died *under Pontius Pilate.*'"

On March 27, 1861, the Piedmontese parliament proclaimed Rome the capital of Italy, "one and indivisible"; and at the same time Victor Emmanuel began to style himself King of Italy. Of course, England and the United States recognized the new kingdom immediately; Russia and Prussia waited for a year; Spain and Bavaria delayed until 1865; Austria was not convinced of the sanctity of "accomplished facts," until after her disaster at Sadowa in 1866. To all those who urged Pius IX. "to be reconciled with Italy," the Pontiff replied in his Allocution of March 18: "The Holy See is always consistent with itself. It never ceases to be the promoter and the support of civilization; the monuments of history prove this. . . . But is that a true civilization which despoils and enchains the Church; which despises treaties,

and recognizes no right in weakness? . . . It is certain that the Popes will never come to an agreement with that species of civilization. What is there in common, asks the Apostle, between Christ and Belial? . . . Let no one hope that we shall ever extend our hand to the usurpers of our provinces, until they will have undone the usurpation. . . . To advance such a proposition is to suppose that this Holy See, which has ever been the rampart of justice and of truth, can sanction as a principle that a robber may possess in peace his stolen goods, and also that the successful issue of an injustice converts it into a just thing. . . . When we are asked to perform unjust things, *præstare non possumus*." Three months after the delivery of this Allocution, that is, on June 6, 1861, when he had all but attained the height of his ambition, the power of presiding over an Italian parliament in Italy's "natural capital," Cavour was stricken by death. He was only fifty years of age; but, as the infamous Saint-Simonian, *Enfantin*, said at the time, "The life of Cavour had been firmly incarnated in the world. It is quite evident that if that blade no longer survives in his usual apoplectical condition, he still lives in the political world, into which he poured, drop by drop, his entire personality" (1). Hence the death of the great architect did not interfere with the progress of the work which he had initiated. Certainly the demise of him who had been, in spite of Palmerston's Grand

(1) Cavour was no priest-eater, like Garibaldi and most of the followers of the Dark Lantern. He was at heart always a Catholic. He was a sectary; but he had become one, hoping to use the power of Masonry for his own ends. He was a Statolater; and therefore he was ever ready to sacrifice the Church when the ecclesiastical came into collision with the civil power. But he always intended to make his peace with Mother Church, when he would find it convenient to do so, or when death would seem to be at hand. It is certain that frequently Cavour relieved, out of his own pocket, the necessities of poor priests who were victims of his State policy; and on one of these occasions he said to one of his colleagues: "If those gentlemen of the Left but saw us engaged in such good work!" Seven years before his death, while Turin was being desolated by an epidemic, he took precautions lest he might die without the aid of a priest; making arrangements with Fra Giacomo, of the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli, who was the confidant of his charities. While he was engaged in this business with the priest, Rattazzi entered the room. Cavour accompanied Fra Giacomo politely to the door, and remarked to Rattazzi: "We have arranged matters, lest anything happen to me." The fatal illness of Cavour lasted for six days, and it is certain that he received the Last Sacraments from Fra Giacomo. There is no reason for a supposition that the friar did not know his duty, or, that knowing it, he sacrilegiously neglected to perform it; therefore, we may hope for the best, and suppose that his penitent complied with the conditions which were the *sine qua non* for absolution.

Orient of the Orient, the real, though secret director of all the Masonic organizations in Italy, produced for a time many rivalries in the general-staff of the order—rivalries which were well known to the “profane” world (1). But these competitions did not dampen the ardor of the rank and file of the Brethren of the Three Points in the supreme effort of their order to “crush the infamous one.” On Sept. 15, 1864, the Cabinets of the Tuileries and Turin agreed, firstly, that Victor Emmanuel should make no further attacks on the States of the Church, and that his government should assume the debts of the provinces which it had stolen from the Holy See; secondly, that Napoleon III. should withdraw the French army of occupation from Rome within two years; and thirdly, that Victor Emmanuel should make Florence his capital within six months. As was observed by Pepoli, one of the signers of this convention, “the treaty injured in no way the national programme of Italy; it simply broke the tie which united France to the ‘enemies’ of Italy.” After the Austro-Prussian War of 1866, the catastrophe of which may well be ascribed to the blindness of Napoleon III., and which entailed a United Germany as a menace to France similar to that already nearly constituted by United Italy, Venice was handed over to France; and

(1) Until 1859 the Italian Lodges had depended from one or another foreign Grand Orient. Thus, those of Genoa and Leghorn depended from the Mother-Lodge of the Supreme Council of Paris. But in 1859 an independent Lodge, the *Ausonia*, was founded at Turin; and soon this *Ausonia* became the Mother-Lodge of Italy. On the death of Cavour, the grand-mastership was tendered to Nigra, then the Piedmontese chargé d'affaires at Paris; but since all the Lodges had not voted, Nigra declined the position. A grand “Convent” of Italian Masonry was then held on Dec. 26; and in this assembly twenty-nine deputies representing the following Lodges: *Fabio Massimo* of Rome, *Iside* and *Pompeia* of Alexandria, in Egypt, *Argilano* of Ascoli, *Severa* of Bologna, *Vittoria* of Cagliari, *Eliopolis* of Cairo, *Concordia* of Florence, *Rigenerazione* of Genoa, Four Lodges of Leghorn, *Lume* and *Verità* of Messina, *Fraternità* of Mondovi, *Valle di Potenza* of Macerata, *Insubria* of Milan, *Azione e Fede* of Pisa, *Utica* of Tunis, and the Turinese Lodges of *Ausonia*, *Progresso*, and *Cavour*. This “convent” decreed that thereafter God should be styled the Great Architect of the Universe; that all religions should be free; that every Mason should be bound to absolute obedience; that every Mason should preserve silence, not only concerning all that was effected in a Lodge, but also concerning the names of its members or its frequenters; that whenever a Masonic funeral was celebrated in public, the eulogist should use no Masonic language; and that the Masonic insignia should not be worn at the funeral of a deceased brother. On the last day of the “convent,” Jan. 1, 1862, on the motion of the Lodge *Garibaldi* of Leghorn, the title of First Mason of Italy was conferred on Garibaldi; and it was decreed that a medal of gold, inscribed “The First Constituent Assembly of Italy” on one side, and with “To Joseph Garibaldi, the First Mason of Italy” on the other, should be given to the Masonic demi-god. Nigra was then

that power duly transferred the quondam Queen of the Adriatic to the House of Savoy. The time had now arrived for the fulfilment of the Napoleonic promise to remove the protection of the French flag from the pontifical capital. On Dec. 6, 1866, our Pontiff received the officers of the Army of Occupation in a farewell audience, pronouncing a touching discourse, from which we quote the following passages: "When your banner left France, eighteen years ago, in order to defend the rights of the Holy See, it was accompanied by the acclamations of all Christendom. To-day it returns to France. I hope that it will be received with the same acclamations, but I doubt it; for it is quite evident that my enemies will not cease to attack me, when that flag ceases to cover me. We must not deceive ourselves; the Revolution will come here; so it has proclaimed, and so it still proclaims. . . . Six years ago, when I was talking to a representative of France, he asked me whether I wished to send any message to the emperor. I replied: 'When St. Augustine, bishop of Hippo, a city now French, saw the barbarians at the gates of that city, he prayed to God that he might die before they entered, so terrified was he at the prospect of the miseries which their advent would entail. Tell this to the emperor; he will understand.' Then the ambassador said

again elected to the grand-mastership; and again he declined, whereupon Cordova was elected. But the Scotch Rite, which had its Grand Orient at Palermo, rebelled, nominating Garibaldi in a circular addressed to all the Lodges, saying: "Let it be known to all the Masons of all lands, to all who are engaged in the construction of the Temple of Humanity, that we have named as Grand-Commander, Grand-Master of the Masonic Order in Italy, General Joseph Garibaldi, the man whom the Great Architect of the Universe created for the deliverance of the oppressed peoples, and for the emancipation of all the now downtrodden nationalities." There was no difference between the claims of Cordova and those of Garibaldi to the honors of Masonry, unless the greater blatantry of the latter constituted such claims; hence in the following year Cordova was induced to resign, and the "convent" of Florence chose the loudest talker in Italy to be grand-master. At this time, Masonry in Italy, not counting the *Vendite* of the Carbonari, numbered sixty-seven Lodges. The Constitution of Italian Masonry was now solemnly sanctioned. Art. IV. declared that "Masonry finds its God in the Principle of the Natural and Moral Order, under the symbol of the Grand Architect of the Universe." Art. V. enningly announced: "Masonry inculcates no special profession of religious belief; and it excludes only those beliefs which interfere with the beliefs of others." Art. VIII., however, manifested the veritable quintessence of Masonic doctrine: "As the definitive object of its labors, Masonry proposes to unite all free men into one great family, which ought and will succeed all churches, things based on blind faith and theocratic authority, superstitions which are intolerant of each other; and thus *Masonry will establish the veritable and sole Church of Humanity.*" For more particulars concerning the "Convent" of Florence, see the *Unità Cattolica*, July 21 and 22, 1864, and the *Civiltà Cattolica*, Sept. 3, 1864.

to me: 'Holy Father, rest assured that the barbarians will not enter here.' That ambassador was not a prophet. But depart, my dear sons, with my blessing. If you see the emperor, tell him that I pray for him every day. They say that his health is poor; I pray for his health. They say that his soul is not tranquil; I pray for his soul. The French nation is Christian; its head should also be Christian. . . . Depart, my sons! I give you my blessing, hoping that it will accompany you during the entire voyage of your lives. Do not think that you leave me here alone! The good God remains to me; and in Him I have placed my confidence." To take the place of the official army of France, many of her bravest and noblest sons had already come to the capital of Christendom; most of them were relics of the glorious army of La Moricière. That Christian hero had died in 1865; but Charette remained, and the traditions of the French Zouaves survived. Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Spain, and Ireland also contributed their quotas; and a new force was soon ready for the defence of the Patrimony of St. Peter. In addition to these French and other braves whom history will ever describe as the Pontifical Zouaves, there came to the aid of the Pope-King a legion of Frenchmen, mostly volunteers from the French army, whom Napoleon III. had allowed to enlist under the banner of the Keys of Peter. This body of trained troops was called the Legion of Antibes, because it had been enrolled at that place. With these few but devoted soldiers of the Cross, the pontifical government was prepared to combat the hordes which Garibaldi, without any pretense of secrecy, recruited in 1867 for a final onslaught on the remnant of the Pope's temporal domain. But the open aid given to the filibuster by the Italian government, even to the extent of causing Cialdini to cross the papal frontier with a division of the regular army, so enraged the Catholics of France, that the emperor was forced to despatch a division of his troops to the scene of imminent conflict. The share which 2,000 of these troops took in deciding the battle of Mentana, in which 3,000 of the pontificals engaged 12,000 Garibaldians on Nov. 3, 1867, was never condoned to Napoleon III. by the Revolution.

“Assuredly,” wrote the Duc de Gramont to Banneville on July 31, 1870, “it is not for reasons of strategetic necessity that we evacuate the Roman States; but the political necessity is evident. We must conciliate the Italian Cabinet.” When Napoleon III., on July 26, 1870, sent the order for the departure of the single French brigade which then helped to garrison the remnant of the Patrimony of Peter, there was no thought in France of that small number of soldiers being needed in the German War, into which the emperor had so unpreparedly entered. A desire to conciliate the revolutionary tiger that ruled Italy far more than her king ruled her, was the sole object of the blinded emperor in leaving the Pope-King to his fate. Part of the French brigade embarked at Civita Vecchia on Aug. 4; and on that day the French met their first serious reverse in the war—10,000, surprised at Wissembourg, were crushed by 40,000 Germans, after a heroic struggle. The remainder of the brigade sailed on the 6th; and on that day, the unequal combat at Froschwiller resulted in another disaster for France. On Aug. 20, Prince Napoleon departed for Florence, bearing instructions, “authorizing Italy to go ahead” (1). Even now Victor Emmanuel hesitated to take the shameful step; but the Masonic Lodges frightened him with the threat that they would take the matter into their own hands. Mazzini, having been allowed to return to Italy from his long exile, even started a republican insurrection in Sicily (2). Then orders were given to General Cadorna to advance on the Eternal City. On Sept. 2, Napoleon III. capitulated at Sedan, and two days afterward he ceased to reign; ten years had elapsed, to a day, since he had told the Piedmontese to proceed with their work, “but quickly” (3).

(1) See the article by Prince Napoleon, published in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March, 1878. Also, the reply of the Duc de Gramont, in the *Revue de France*, April 15, 1878.

(2) FROST; *The Secret Societies of the European Revolution*, Vol. II., p. 170. London, 1876.

(3) “It has been well said that by making Italy, Napoleon III. unmade France; Sadowa and Sedan existed in germ in Solferino and Castellidardo. In fact, without Solferino, and especially without Castellidardo, Piedmont would not have been sufficiently strong to tender a useful alliance to Prussia against Austria; and in any case, France would have abstained from favoring that alliance, from rewarding it with the gift of Venice, from leaving her Rhenish frontier unguarded during the war, and from adhering to the Treaty of

On Sept. 8, Victor Emmanuel wrote to the Pontiff a letter in which he affected to believe that His Holiness would regard the approaching violence as proceeding from an ardent love for his sacred person; that the Pope would perceive that the bombardment of Rome and the consequent killings would be effected simply in order to prevent injury to property and a shedding of blood; that the revolutionary despoilers were actuated by mere zeal for justice; and, finally, that the Roman Pontiff was about to be imprisoned, in order that he might enjoy perfect freedom. This extraordinary document was conveyed to Rome by Ponzani di San Martino. When the envoy waited on Cardinal Antonelli, and requested an audience with His Holiness, the secretary received him with an habitual courtesy, but declined to touch on the object for which the audience was asked. "As to your purpose," said His Eminence, "you will permit me to be silent in regard to it. I know all that you would say;

Prague. It was Napoleon III., much more than Bismarck, who constructed, bit by bit, Prussian greatness and German unity, inasmuch as the prevention of them depended entirely on him, and inasmuch as he was an accomplice in producing both, when he obeyed the Italian revolutionists, and gratified the French liberals, their allies. On the other hand, the gift of Savoy and Nice from Cavour led him to anticipate an analogous generosity from Bismarck in the shape of the gift of the left bank of the Rhine. He announced this in his famous discourse at Auxerre. The Prussian Minister, whose far too much lauded ability was at least half composed of the inability of the Cabinet of the Tuileries, was impudent enough to publish a portion of the diplomatic correspondence on this subject; and the Italian Minister (La Marmora) added *A Little More Light*, much more than was desired by the men at Berlin." Here we note that in the parliamentary session of Jan. 16, 1874, Bismarck tried to destroy the effect produced by La Marmora's *Little More Light*; but he succeeded only in showing how completely subject to the will of Napoleon III. the Prussian annexations had been, when they were first initiated. "After the battle of Sadowa," said Bismarck, "Napoleon informed us, by a telegram, of the possibility of his interference, and of the appearance of France on the theatre of war. At that time he had few troops ready for mobilization; but the addition of a few French regiments would have been sufficient to give an excellent army to the Southern Germans, who had good material, but no organization. We would have been obliged to cover Berlin, and therefore to renounce all success against Austria." Villefranche, the author whose reflections we have just interrupted, continues: "Bismarck caused Napoleon III. to hope, at first for some indefinite territorial compensations, then for Mayence and Rhenish Bavaria, then for only Landau, a possession of Belgium, which was, he said, 'a nest of demagogues which ought to be destroyed.'... Thenceforth it was evident that Napoleon III. would be forced to turn his cannon against the edifice which his intrigues had helped to construct. But history does not explain, and it appears to be inexplicable by a human mind, how it was that from the day when the shock was seen to be inevitable, the French emperor was so careless in the way of preparation. He had three years during which to arrange his forces, to enlarge his army, to equip his fortresses, to make alliances; he could have had other advantages, had he wished, for it was he that declared the war. But when the war began, he had nothing ready, absolutely nothing. In this blindness of the emperor from the time of the Italian War down to that of the final catastrophe, there was something *pro* denial." VILLEFRANCHE; *Ubi supra*, ch. 19.

and you know all that I could reply. At present, brute force, not logic, is in power." When the Pontiff had read the royal missive, he quietly remarked: "They speak of guarantees. Who will guarantee these guarantees? Your king cannot guarantee them. Your king is no longer king; he is dependent on his parliament, and that parliament depends on the secret societies." Then the ambassador begged the Pope to judge of the king by his good intentions, and to remember, above all, that Victor Emmanuel was merely the executor of the will of twenty-four millions of Italians. "You lie, Signore," cried Pius IX.; "you calumniate Italy! Twenty-three millions of the Italians are devoted to me, and ask for only one thing—that the Revolution leave them and the Pope in quiet. There may be a million whom you have poisoned with false doctrine and with shameful greed; and those are the friends of your king, and the abettors of his ambition. Go, sir! You shall receive my reply to-morrow. Now my grief and indignation will not allow me to write." On Sept. 11, the envoy received the pontifical answer, which was couched in these terms: "Sire, I have received the letter which Your Majesty sent by the hand of Count Ponza di San Martino. That letter is unworthy of an affectionate son who glories in professing the Catholic faith, and who finds his honor in a royal loyalty. I enter into none of the details of the letter; since I wish not to renew the grief which its first perusal excited in my heart. I bless God, who has permitted Your Majesty to embitter the last years of my life. I cannot accede to the demands contained in your letter, nor can I conform to the principles advanced in it. I call on God, and I place in His hands my cause, which is His own. I pray that He may accord abundant grace to Your Majesty; that He may deliver you from every danger; and that He may extend to you the mercies which you need." The Piedmontese monarch did not wait for this answer; on Sept. 11, the day when it was handed to his envoy, 60,000 of his soldiers, under the command of Cadorna, crossed the papal frontier. On Sept. 20, a breach in the Porta Pia was effected; and then, by order of the Pope, who had made a show of resist-

ance, only in order to show that he succumbed to violence, the little papal army capitulated. On Oct. 2, a royal decree announced: "I. Rome and the Roman provinces form an integral part of the Kingdom of Italy. II. The supreme Pontiff retains the dignity, the inviolability, and all the prerogatives of a sovereign. III. A special law will determine the means most proper for securing, even by territorial franchises, the independence of the Supreme Pontiff, and the free exercise of the spiritual authority of the Holy See." The experience of the next few years was to show the insincerity of the second and third articles; and the first proof of their nugatoriness was given in the following November, when all the journals daring to publish a Pontifical *Encyclical* were seized. The text of this document had been sent to a printer in Geneva, in order to circumvent the Italian police; and the Catholic world was thus enabled to learn the sentiments of the Holy See with regard to its present situation and future prospects. In this *Encyclical*, dated Nov. 1, 1870, Pius IX. recapitulated the outrages visited by the Revolution and the secret societies on the Holy See during the previous eleven years, and it concluded with the following protestation: "We declare again with all possible solemnity that our intention and will is to retain in their integrity, intact and inviolable, all the domains and rights of the Holy See, and to transmit them to our successors. We declare that every usurpation of these rights, whether recent or old, is unjust, violent, and null; and that all the acts of the rebels or of the invaders, whether accomplished or to be accomplished in confirmation of the usurpation, are by us now condemned, annulled, quashed, and abrogated. We also declare, and we protest before God and the Catholic world, that we are now undergoing a captivity of such a nature that it is impossible for us to exercise our pastoral authority with security, facility, and liberty. . . . Since our warnings, demands, and protests have been fruitless, we now, by the authority of God Almighty, of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and by our own, declare to you, Venerable Brothers, and through you to the Universal Church, that the invaders of any one of our domains, be their dignity what it may, and

even though special mention ought to be made concerning them ; and also all their abettors, counsellors, helpers, and adherents, as well as all others who have committed these things themselves or have procured their actuation ; have all incurred, according to the form and tenor of our Apostolic Letters of March 26, 1860, the Greater Excommunication, and the other ecclesiastical censures inflicted by the Holy Canons, by the Apostolic Constitutions, and by the decrees of General Councils, notably by that of Trent." On March 13, 1871, the government of Victor Emmanuel promulgated the famous " Law of Guarantees," to which it directed the attention of the Catholic world as to a proof of its kind consideration for the security and comfort of the Roman Pontiff. This law recognized the person of the Pontiff as inviolable, and as enjoying the right of receiving all the honors of a sovereign ; it also assured to him an annual " dotation " of 3,225,000 *lire* (\$645,000), together with the use of the Vatican and Lateran palaces, and of the villa of Castel Gandolfo, near Albano. No sensible person failed to perceive that the " Law of Guarantees " was a one-sided contract ; that the Holy See took no part in its preparation or acceptance, and that therefore it was not binding on the Pontiff. We cannot suppose that the framers of this law imagined, for a moment, that Pius IX. or any one of his successors would accept its provisions ; the Italian intellect is too lucid to have fallen into so egregious an error. Certainly the Pontiff saw that in Article IX. he was " assured " of perfect liberty in all the functions of his *spiritual* ministry ; but who was to assign the limits of that *spiritual* ministry ? Very soon after the promulgation of this law, the German ally of the Italian government, arrogant almost unto madness because of his unique victory over France, imprisoned bishops as guilty of treason against the German state, because they had presumed to censure certain of their rebellious priests. Nothing could prevent the Piedmontese robbers from similar action, even in the case of the Bishop of Bishops. In Article XVIII., all ecclesiastical property was confiscated, under the pretense that it was to be re-organized, and *administered* by the State, the new step-mother of souls. This article alone

would have entailed the papal condemnation of the law. No wonder, therefore, that when the first installment of the hypocritically-assigned revenue was laid before Pius IX., he spurned it, saying: "Certainly I need money; and my children, throughout the world, are now bleeding themselves, so to speak, to supply the needs which you have created. But I cannot avoid the knowledge that it is a part of my stolen property that you now tender me as a present. I shall never accept such monies, unless they are handed to me in the form of restitution; I shall never sign my name to a receipt, when the signature would be an acquiescence in theft." And to this day the prisoner of the Vatican has been beholden for his support, and for the needs of his pontifical administration, solely to the "Peter's Pence," the charity of his faithful children.

During the pontificate of Pius IX. the zeal of polemics was continually occupied with several questions which our limits require that we barely indicate. There are some features of this reign, however, which demand from us more than a passing allusion. One of these points is the conduct of our Pontiff in resisting by force of arms the usurpation of his States by the Sub-Alpine kingdom; but elsewhere we have remarked that history tells us that the world, of whose spirit the carping critics of Pius IX. are redolent, has ever admired every temporal monarch who drew his sword in support of his crown. Why should we admit that, alone among all sovereigns, the Pope-King should answer the filibuster and the crowned usurper with a benediction? Referring the reader to what we have said already on this matter (1), we shall pay some attention to the clamors concerning the blessings of a Free Church in a Free State—clamors with which our ears have been dinned, during the last forty years, and which are still intermittently emitted by not only the open foes of the Papacy, but even by some who imagine that they are staunch defenders of Catholicism. This formula, A Free Church in A Free State, a texture of words so pre-eminently elastic that it lends itself readily to purposes of deception, is generally ascribed to Count Cavour;

(1) See our chapter on *The Battle of Civitella*, in Vol. ii., p. 139.

and it indicates the quintessence of the prescription devised by the school of Cavour, Palmerston, and Napoleon III., as a cure for the chief evils in modern Christendom. It is certain that the Sardinian statesman never claimed the now famous saying as a creation of his scheming brain; nay, he admitted in open parliament that, "in a lucid interval, an illustrious writer" had first used the phrase in convincing Europe how liberty had contributed much toward an awakening of the religious spirit (1). Let us pardon Cavour for the insinuation that the lucidity of Montalembert was only intermittently manifested. It is true that the great French publicist invented the formula; although the sentiment which it served to illustrate was not quite so radical as one would be led to suppose by the Cavourian dexterously twisted quotation of his words. In fact, Montalembert complained that "a highly-placed delinquent had stolen the phrase from his writings" (2). Very soon the Catholic polemic failed to recognize the verbal scintillation which he had emitted in thorough good faith, with no suspicion of its possible acceptance in a sense very different from that which he attached to it. The *Italianissimo* minister completely travestied the phrase; and its new significance did not appear remarkably clear to his own colleagues. A member of his cabinet declared: "I have heard this formula enunciated by many, and I have given not a little study to it; but as yet I have not been able to apprehend its meaning" (3). In the virginal sense of the words, the falsely-styled Cavourian formula is entirely Catholic in sentiment, and it is also thoroughly American. But if understood in accordance with the interpretation given to them by the Italian unitarians, these words present a significance very un-Catholic and un-American. The original sentiment is about as much like the travestied, as the average American republican is like the average Italian liberal. Indeed, were the formula really indicative of a state of affairs in which the Church is allowed to exercise her moral and social activity without any guardianship on the part of the State, the Catholics of Italy would willingly adopt it as their own motto.

(1) *Official Acts of 1860*, p. 594.(2) Thus in the *Correspondant* for August, 1863.(3) *Official Acts of 1862*, p. 4,678.

They, like all other Catholics, would gladly see the relations between Rome and their bishops unimpeded by any need of a royal *executur*, and unprotected by Concordats, which but too frequently require too many concessions on the part of the Holy See. However, it was not intended to bring about such a condition of things, when sky-reaching acclamations hailed the newly-born "freedom" of the Spouse of Christ in every State which was invaded by that revolution which entered on its fateful march after the War of 1859. One of the first measures enacted by the Piedmontese "liberators" was the abrogation of the Concordat which each invaded State had made with the Roman Pontiff; and this outrage was perpetrated in the face of the fact that the public law of the Sardinian kingdom avowed the sacred and binding force of such agreements (1). The property of the Church was immediately sequestrated, although the Piedmontese *Statuto* of Charles Albert proclaims the inviolability of all property, of whatever nature; and although the mania to appropriate ecclesiastical revenues was never actuated, in one solitary instance, in the case of Protestants or of Jews. In each of the usurped territories, a new and iniquitous oath was required of the bishops; and when it was indignantly rejected with an almost absolute unanimity, the prison cell or exile became the lot of the recusants. Thus the cardinal-archbishop of Naples was twice exiled; and the same fate befell the cardinal-archbishop of Pisa. Cardinal Baluffi, archbishop of Imola, was dragged before the tribunals. Cardinal de Angelis, archbishop of Fermo, was placed in the midst of a troop of carbineers, taken to Turin, and there incarcerated for six years. Proceedings were also instituted against the cardinal-archbishop of Benevento, the cardinal-bishop of Camerino, and other prelates. Nearly all the bishops of the usurped kingdom of the Two Sicilies were banished; and the few who remained were subjected to dangers and insults

(1) King Charles Emmanuel III., in a letter to Pope Clement XI., dated October 14, 1742, admits that Concordats "are sacred things, according to the law of nations, and that therefore they must not be violated." But even though these instruments were merely temporary conventions, and of only one-sided obligatory force, their title to respect by the Sardinian Government would be guaranteed by the Civil Code, paragraph 1,225 of which enacts that "agreements legally made have the force of law for those who make them, and they can be revoked only by mutual consent."

which might have been expected from the olden Huns, rather than from the sons of that Italy of which St. Ambrose once wrote that there were no unfaithful Christians within her limits. The bishop of Faenza was condemned to three years of imprisonment and a fine of 6,000 lire; the bishop of Spoleto was confined without a trial. The vicar-capitular of Bologna was jailed for three years, and fined 2,000 lire; and similar cases were innumerable in other parts of the olden States of the Church. Very many dioceses remained widowed of their pastors, because the elections were not recognized as legal by the advocates of a Free Church in a Free State. All episcopal pastoral letters were subjected to the "preventive censure" of these gentry. Every ecclesiastical seminary was placed under governmental surveillance; only a governmental programme of studies could be followed; and theology alone could be taught,—the royal inspectors being, of course, the judges of what constitutes theology. The civil authorities alone could decide as to the time, length, and components of a religious procession or of any other religious function; as to the proper method of ringing the bells of churches, or as to what images and pictures were to be exposed in the temples of God. Very frequently, under the pretext that there were too many sacred edifices, churches were turned into prisons, barracks, stables, theatres, and sometimes they were put to worse uses. The priest who refused Communion to any patriotic citizen of this pious State; who denied Christian burial to one who died blaspheming the Saviour; who would not allow a professed and braggart atheist to be a sponsor at a baptism; was prosecuted as "a disturber of consciences," in accordance with the circular of the Minister Gioja, dated May 13, 1851 (1). On January 16, 1863, all royal procurators-general were ordered to prosecute such bishops as had the audacity to refuse faculties to priests who had signed the Passaglia address (2). Bishops were compelled to illumina-

(1) On February 28, 1863, a similar ordinance decreed that no one should pay attention to the pontifical prescriptions for the ensuing Lent; but should judge, each for himself, as to what he would eat or drink. On March 24 appeared a regulation concerning the *Oremus* in the Mass.

(2) In 1861 there appeared a work entitled, *A Letter to Catholic Bishops on the Cause of*

ate their cathedrals and residences, as well as all edifices over which they exercised control, whenever the government deemed the occasion a fitting one; but they could never do the same thing of their own volition. When a deputation of insurgents from the Romagna waited upon Victor Emmanuel, then at Milan, on September 22, 1859, to ask him to annex their country to Piedmont, the Milanese governor, Vigliani, ordered the vicar-capitular to illuminate all the ecclesiastical edifices, reminding the vicar that the Government would not be responsible for the consequences of the fury of the mob, if the command were not obeyed. On another occasion the vicar-capitular of Bologna promulgated a decision of the Holy See concerning absolution from certain censures, and he was imprisoned for years. A priest of Gaeta suffered the same penalty, because his manner of blessing did not please the mayor. Most of these condemnations, however—and they are but a small proportion of the number on record,—had at least a shadow of excuse, inasmuch as a violation of what was styled a law had been committed; but there were many instances of persecution for purely imaginary violations of provisions which even the elastic code of the sectaries never contemplated. Thus on June 3, 1862, the Supreme Administrative Council of Naples condemned all the canons of the Cathedral Chapter, because of their “hostile attitude.” And when, in 1864, the zealous Catholics of Italy formed the “Association for the Defence of the Catholic Religion”—every member of which gave his name to the Government, and which was so thoroughly non-political that it kept aloof even from elections,—from one end of the kingdom to the other there arose an outcry

*Italy, by a Catholic Priest*, from the pen of Don Carlo Passaglia, an ex-Jesuit, and generally reputed a brilliant theologian. In this work Passaglia contended that every State, to merit the name and condition of such, should be able to subsist without recourse to foreign arms against its own citizens. And, applying this principle to the Roman States, the author held that their inhabitants had a perfect right to co-operate in the formation of an Italian kingdom. Let the Pope, therefore, he concluded, obviate imminent disaster to the Church by a voluntary renunciation of his earthly principality. In conformity with these ideas, a petition to the Pontiff was circulated among the clergy of Italy; and it was signed by hundreds of priests, many of whom were undoubtedly in good faith, and were only desirous of concord in their distracted land. It is remarkable, however, that not one bishop signed the petition. An experience of the real meaning of the *Italianissimo* theory of a Free Church in a Free State soon led the signers to a retraction.

against the "Austro-Bourbon Clerical Conspiracy," which was styled by the royal advocates of the day "a vast net of plotters against the governmental conduct of ecclesiastical affairs,—a conspiracy which aims at the disturbance of consciences, and which excites the fanaticism of the people, under the pretext of wakening them out of the lethargy of religious indifferentism." Then was passed the famous Crispi Law against suspects, on May 17, 1866; and no less than 6,825 members of the Association were summoned before the tribunals. Of these, 4,171 were thrust into the ordinary prisons, there to be kept, without trial, until the "liberal" fever had somewhat abated (1). These facts, and hundreds of similar ones which our limited space will not permit us to adduce, were the work of the most strenuous advocates of a Free Church in a Free State; therefore they sanction that interpretation of the deceitful formula which implies, aye, proclaims, that every shadow of liberty must be an unattainable good for the Church and for churchmen. An ostracization of an entire class of citizens, which must ever prove a prolific source of irritation, is one of the means whereby harmony is to be promoted in Italy; in plain language, the nation is to consist of conquerors and conquered. And, nevertheless, the Italian Church asks for very little. Her clergy put forth no exorbitant claims; they realize that the days of a dominant and privileged hierarchy have vanished, perhaps never to return,—whether for the good of

(1) In August, 1866, Cantù wrote: "This law of passion and of war against the Church has been enacted in spite of the lessons of the past, and of the interrogations of a future to which we are bequeathing so many disappointments, errors, and sorrows. . . . If the powers of Europe uphold the Pontiff, if he is a force with whom the other forces must account, it is because the people are very far from having abandoned him. In other cases, dynasties disappear before the plots of a minister or of a conspirator. Before the power of gold and the gleam of a Red Shirt" (the historian alludes to the dethronement of Francis II. of the Two Sicilies), "armies disband and employees perjure themselves. But it is not so here. However, if God wills that there shall no longer be a people to rule whom a priest without sword suffices,—a priest who proclaims peace and wants no war, a capital where every language has colleges, representatives, and tribunals; which is the common refuge of the persecuted, and the school of artists and of the erudite: where are kept the archives of that civilization which went out from it unto the entire modern world: where there is a quiet which is repugnant to, and a silence which mortifies the convulsive unrest of other peoples; if, in fine, we are to behold a verification of the prophecy that the demon will yet conquer the saints (*A poc.*, xli., 7); then there will certainly be danger for Catholics, but none for Catholicism; since the timid will hear the words: 'Ye of little faith, why do ye doubt?'" *Lectures of Italy*, Discourse iv. Turin, 1866.

the country, time will tell. All that they ask from the men now at the helm of State is equality with their lay-countrymen—the right to observe the canons of the Church. They insist that the Church be regarded as a distinct moral entity, with a right to make and to obey its own laws. Dante reprobated ancient Rome for confusing the two powers of Church and State—*i due reggimenti*. Papal Rome teaches that Church and State are distinct, though not separate. For her there are no National Churches, mere slaves to the policies of a day. She wants neither a Church in a State nor a State in a Church; and it must also be noted that she does not wish for a State without the Church. Her ideal—aye, more than an ideal, for she has actuated it in her day—is a State in harmony with the Church, each being free in the field of action which alone it should properly occupy. That is, the State should be the guardian of *civil* liberty—a thing which is subject to human devices and fluctuations; and the Church should guard *moral* liberty, which is subject only to the divine law. The conflict between Church and State is perennial. Nero and others of that ilk, Julian, many even of the Holy Roman Emperors, Voltaire and the Encyclopedists, the modern Terrorists,—all entered upon it heart and soul, and they failed. We may safely say, therefore, that a little bunch of verbal firecrackers will not end the long struggle.

Pius IX. has been styled the Pope of the Immaculate Conception. The general sentiment of Catholic theologians has always favored the doctrine that the Mother of God was preserved, at the first instant of her conception by St. Anne, from the stain of Original Sin; and this sentiment was based, firstly, upon the sayings of the principal Fathers of the Church; secondly, upon the precaution of the Tridentine synodals in declaring that they did not intend to include Mary in their assertions that original sin is the portion of the children of Adam; and thirdly, on the decrees of many Pontiffs, approving the Feast and Office of the Immaculate Conception, and forbidding the teaching of the contrary opinion. Until our own day, this truth was a matter of general Catholic *belief*, though not one of *faith*. Before Pius IX. fled to

Gaeta, he had appointed a commission of Consultors, to consider whether the pious belief in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin could be defined as a matter of faith. At Gaeta, under the date of Feb. 2, 1849, he addressed an Encyclical to the entire hierarchy, asking their opinion; and of the 750 recipients, more than 600 replied in the affirmative. If we consider that there must have been some cases of death or illness, or of lost letters, it is evident that these replies indicate the mind of the Universal Teaching Church on this matter (1). In 1852, our Pontiff named a special commission, consisting of Card. Fornari, Mgr. Caterini (afterward cardinal), the Canon Audisio; F. Spada, a Dominican; the Jesuits, Passaglia, Schrader, and Perrone; and F. Tonini, a Conventual Franciscan; to consider the question. The reply was that a Definition was both possible and opportune. Then two extraordinary commissions were appointed; one composed of nineteen cardinals, and the other of Mgrs. Barnabò and Capalti (afterward cardinals); the Oratorian Theiner; the Jesuits, Perrone and Passaglia; and the Dominicans, Spada and Ferrari. Of these commissioners, only one pronounced the Definition inopportune. On Nov. 20, 1854, a number of bishops who had arrived in Rome for the expected solemnity, met in the Ducal Hall of the Vatican, under the presidency of Cardinals Brunelli, Caterini, and Santucci; where they were informed by Brunelli that His Holiness desired to know their opinions concerning the draft of the Bull which he was about to issue. The Pontiff, said His Eminence, did not find said draft entirely conformable to his own ideas; but he had no intention to unite the bishops in Council, *nor did he propose to authorize any discussion, on their part, as to the propriety or the opportuneness of the imminent decree.* Accordingly, 120 bishops deliberated, during four days, as to the form of the Bull; and finally, the Pontiff announced to the Sacred College that the long-desired promulgation would be effected on Dec. 8.

(1) By order of the Pontiff, all these replies were published in ten quarto volumes, entitled *Opinions Concerning the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the B. V. Mary; Addressed to His Holiness, Pope Pius IX., in Reply to his Encyclical Dated at Gaeta on Feb. 2, 1849.* Rome, 1851-'54. A copy of this interesting collection was presented to each bishop who attended at the solemn definition of the dogma.

On the appointed day, Pius IX. pontificated in St. Peter's ; and after the Gospel, Cardinal Macchi besought His Holiness, in the name of the Universal Church, to issue his Dogmatic Decree. Then the immense congregation of more than 50,000 persons knelt as the Supreme Pontiff intoned the first words of the *Veni, Creator Spiritus* ; and all joined with him in the whole of the grand invocatory chant. Then Pius IX. arose, and standing before his pontifical throne with that majesty which seems to necessarily surround every Pope in the exercise of his functions as Vicar of Christ, but which was perfectly natural to Pio Nono, he pronounced in those clear, melodious, and sonorous tones which must ever ring in the ears of all who ever heard them, the long-expected and infallible declaration that it is a matter of Catholic faith that : " The Blessed Virgin Mary, from the first moment of her Conception, by a particular grace and privilege of Almighty God, and through the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the human race, was preserved and exempted from every stain of Original Sin." It had been reserved, in the inscrutable decrees of Divine Providence, to the most materialistic of centuries to hear a decision for which the Ages of Faith had yearned in vain (1). By this decree, issued sixteen years before the

(1) At the very head of the immense list of works which form the literature of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady, place should be assigned to the monumental collection in 320 volumes, due to the indefatigable and discriminating labors of the Abbé Sire of the diocese of Puy, in France. Here we find, in reference to the dogma, all the apposite *Acts* of the Holy See ; the chief episcopal lucubrations ; all the great theological treatises ; the reports of the papal commissions ; the principal works on the subject published, since the Definition, in Italy, France, Spain, the English-speaking lands, Belgium, Germany, and Sweden ; a great number of sermons in every cultured language, preached in the years 1854-'60 ; articles from Reviews and journals in every civilized country, '54-'60 ; the chief works written against the dogma ; narratives of the festivities in its honor from the rising to the setting of the sun ; dissertations, descriptions of columns, statues, medals, etc., perpetuating the remembrance of the Definition. Twenty of these volumes are devoted to translations of the entire Dogmatic Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* into 1. Castilian, Greek, Albanian, Roumanian, Italian, Portuguese, Maltese, Romance, French. II. Venetian, Tyrolese, Lombard, Piedmontese, Genoese, Sardinian, Romagnuola, Neapolitan, Calabrese, Sicilian. III. Basque, Hable, Gallego, Catalan, Valencian, Majorcan, Aljanida, Gitano. IV. Flemish, Alsatian, Breton, Limousin, Auvergnat, Languedoc, Provençal, Corsican, Nizzard, Navarrese. V. English, Irish, Picard, Norman, Champenois, Lorrainese, Burgundian, Franche-Comtoise, Morvane, Bourbonnaise, Lyonnaise, Dauphinoise, Savoyard, Poitevin, Agenoise, Gascon, Bearnaise. VI. Hindustanee, Mahratta, Congouny, Mallyatam, Bengalese, Toutongou, Burman, Siamese, Laosian, Cambogian, Carian, Malay, Baonnars. VII. Annamite, Thibetan, Tartar, Chinese, Japanese. VIII. Arabic, Coptic, Kabyle, Berber, Abyssinian, Gallas, and many languages of American Indians, of Oceanica, Africa,

Vatican Council proclaimed the dogma of Papal Infallibility, Pope Pius IX. practically declared that dogma. It is vain to assert that the Pontiff did not proclaim, *by himself*, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary; that he had obtained the judgment of the episcopate. Those episcopal judgments were like so many documents in a civil process; and assuredly such documents are not a judicial sentence—a decree pronounced by the judge alone. The attending bishops had been formally enjoined to attempt no judgment on the dogmatic question, which, said Card. Brunelli, was reserved to the Pontiff. A distinguished French prelate, Mgr. de Ségur, informs us that during an audience with Pius IX. a few days after the Definition, he spoke with His Holiness on the matter of Papal Infallibility, and that the Pontiff observed: "I think that I have already defined that truth equivalently by my decree of Dec. 8" (1).

One of the most important Acts of this pontificate was the issue of the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*, a document which was as much discussed and distorted, even by many who had never read it, as the later decree on Papal Infallibility. In this letter, dated Dec. 8, 1864, Pius IX. showed how his immediate predecessors, and he also, had condemned the many monstrous errors which produce such havoc in the Church and society of the nineteenth century; and then he asked the attention of the world to an accompanying *Syllabus* or collection of eighty errors which he had previously reprobated in various Encyclicals and Allocutions—errors which affect the Church and her rights; the State and the limits of its jurisdiction; the family; Faith and Reason; in fine, all that is nearest and dearest to humanity. The *Syllabus* was divided into ten chapters, of which each contained several propositions, with references to their previous condemnations. We shall furnish the reader with a synopsis of the different heads of reprobated doctrine. I. Pantheism, Naturalism, and Absolute Rationalism; *i. e.*, the denial

Polynesia, and Australasia. Truly does this admirable work realize Mary's own prophecy. "All generations shall call me Blessed."

(1) *The Dogma of Infallibility*, pt. 1, no. 12. Paris, 1881.

of the divine personality and providence, of revelation, and of miracles (1). II. Moderate Rationalism, which puts theology and philosophy on the same plane; and holds that reason can arrive, by its own strength, to a knowledge of all dogma, and that philosophy should submit to no authority (2). III. Indifferentism and Latitudinarianism, which hold that all religions alike conduce to salvation (3). IV. Socialism, Communism, and Secret Societies (4). V. The affirmation that the Church depends, in all things, from the civil power; that Popes and Councils have encroached on the rights of civil rulers, and that they have erred in faith and discipline. The assertion that the Church has no temporal authority, direct or indirect; that she has no right to any sort of immunities or to manage her own theological teachings. The assertion that the Supreme Pontificate can be transferred from the Roman to any other episcopal See; and that National Churches are to be instituted (5). VI. The interference of the State in sacred things; as in its abuse of the royal *Exequatur*, its annulment of Concordats, its seizure of Seminaries, its preventing bishops from communicating with the Apostolic See, its wish for an entire separation of Church and State (6). VII. The ethical error that morality is independent of religious sanction, and of all divine or ecclesiastical authority. The idea that force makes right; that "accomplished facts" constitute public law; that non-intervention is a sacred duty; that patriotism justifies every iniquity (7). VIII. Civil marriage, with the understanding that the religious ceremony is a mere accessory (8). IX. The errors concerning the temporal dominion of the Supreme Pontiff over the Roman States; and especial-

(1) Al. *Maxima quidem*, June 9, '62. Enc. *Qui pluribus*, Nov. 9, '46. Enc. *Singulari quidem*, Mch. 17, '56.

(2) Epist. *Gravissimas*, to the Abp. of Freisingen, Dec. 11, '62. Epist. *Tuas libenter*, to same, Dec. 21, '63. To this system pertains, in great part, that of Gunther, condemned in letter to the Abp. of Cologne in '47.

(3) Lett. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, June 10, '51. Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, June 9, '62. Alloc. *Ubi primum*, Dec. 17, '47. Enc. *Quanto conficiamur*, Aug. 17, '63.

(4) Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, Apr. 20, '49. Enc. *Noscitis*, Dec. 8, '49.

(5) Alloc. *Mullis gravibusque*, Dec. 17, '60.

(6) Lett. Ap. *Ad Apost.*, Aug. 22, '51. Alloc. *In Consistoriali*, Nov. 1, '51.

(7) Alloc. *Jandudum cernimus*, Mch. 18, '61. *Quisquis cestrum*, Oct. 4, '47.

(8) Letter to the King of Sardinia, Sept. 9, '52.

ly the assertion that its abolition would benefit the Church. X. Falsely-styled "Liberalism"; and especially the assertion that the Church should compromise with it. The reader will perceive that Pius IX. condemns, in this *Syllabus*, the intellectual heresy of our day, Pantheism or Rationalism; the social heresy, Statolatry; and the religious heresy, the separation of civil culture from revelation. Perhaps it was natural that this document should have been qualified by one of the most distinguished of the *Italianissimi* as "The most insensate work ever produced by human pen" (1). Certainly, it is not surprising that the adepts of the Square and Triangle greeted it with the same manifestations of blind and impotent hate that the Jansenists of the seventeenth century showed, when they were pressed by the Bull *Unigenitus*. The "Liberals" had obscured the most elementary notions of morality and of right; Pius IX. presented them to the peoples in their divine lucidity, and consecrated anew the rights of man, of the family, and of the State. Such a document was to be expected from the Vicar of Christ; but let us not, therefore, minimize the courage of the act. The worldly-wise would have been pleased, had the Pontiff made concessions to the spirit of the age, or at least had he been reticent as to its errors; by the latter course, he might have gained friends to strengthen his tenure of the third diadem in his triple crown. But Pio Nono was Pope, as well as king; and it was his mission to unmask error and to stigmatize injustice. Again, by the Encyclical *Quanta Cura* our Pontiff gave a practical illustration of his Apostolic vigilance and authority to that portion of the world which was daily straining its eyes to catch a glimpse of the final crumbling of the papal edifice. In the literary laboratories of the Masonic Lodges the *Syllabus* was subjected to strange processes of mental alchemy; a feigned translation was concocted, in the preparation of which the literal sense was ignored, and the implied was diametrically contradicted; dictionaries having been scorned, rules of grammar inverted, and logic thrown to the winds. The most respectable of

(1) The deputy Mancini, in the parliamentary session of July 11, '67. See *Official Acts*, p. 1,298.

the anti-papal journals of the day (1) presented to its credulous readers, in its ostensible version, sixty flagrant perversions of what the Pontiff had really said ; and then, throughout the world, men were asked to believe that Pius IX. had definitively separated the Papacy and civilization. He was said to have condemned railroads, telegraphs, photography, etc., as engines of Satan. His Encyclical was styled "an expression of the irremediable decadence of a senile institution"; and he was said to have uttered "the last cry of a dying ambition which had always been foreign to the spirit of Christianity" (2). However, the senility of the Papacy was not observable when, three years after the publication of the criminated document, there thronged around their venerable Pontiff, on June 21, 1867, from all parts of the world, 512 bishops, more than 20,000 priests, and over 140,000 laymen, to celebrate the twenty-first anniversary of his coronation. Still less was that senility perceived, when the successor of Peter announced that he would soon convoke another General Council ; that to those who claimed Rome as a capital for Italy, he would reply by opening it as a capital for Christendom ; that there the representatives and organs of the human conscience would deliberate upon the future of humanity. The Apostolic voice which had spoken in the famed Encyclical had not been raised in vain ; for before they departed to their various dioceses, these 512 bishops said to the Vicar of Christ : "Convinced that Peter has spoken by the mouth of Pius, we receive and publish all that you have said, confirmed, and published for the maintenance of the integrity of the divine deposit of faith ; and our voices and minds are unanimous (*uno ore atque animo*) in rejecting everything which you have declared to be contrary to revealed truth, detrimental to salvation, or injurious to society."

There was developed in Masonic circles a kind of mild in-

(1) The *Journal des Debats*, on Jan. 1, 1865.

(2) See *Le Temps*, Jan. 6, 7, 10, 1865 ; the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1. The London *Times* was equally ignorant and diabolically mendacious ; and almost the entire American press, especially the Protestant "religious," joined in the insane chorus. It is to be noted that the Napoleonic government of France, while giving the utmost liberty to its Masonic brethren of the press in their mendacious enterprise of falsification of the *Syllabus*, prohibited the publication of its true text by the French bishops.

sanity in 1865, when Pius IX. formally renewed the decrees of his predecessors, condemning the notorious perverter of social and religious order (1). Some of the more fanatical sectaries devised a scheme whereby it would be made to appear that while Pope Pius IX. might condemn Freemasonry, Giovanni Mastai-Ferretti was in heart a devoted adept of Square and Triangle; that he had been initiated into the sacred mysteries of the Dark Lantern "*while visiting the United States of America.*" The Masonic organ of Sicily, *L'Umanitario*, published a letter from "the Freemasons of Messina to the Very Rev. Mario Aglotti, Vicar-Capitular of the Diocese," greatly lauding the virtues of the Abate Mastai of 1823, and showing how his piety led him to the true cult of the Great Architect of the Universe: "Under the pontificate of *Gregory XVI.*, Mastai-Ferretti was charged with a mission to America. . . . Having accomplished his mission, and having visited the episcopal dioceses, *he rested in Pennsylvania, in the city of Philadelphia.* His piety, his principles of rectitude, the Christian charity which adorned his heart, and the liberalism which permeated his character, procured for him many estimable and useful friends in that city; and since Masonry holds to her bosom the most intelligent, the most moral, and the most upright men of America, Ferretti found that very many of his new friends belonged to the Masonic Alliance. He often expressed a desire to enter the order; and after a time, he was initiated, and he promised solemnly to respect, love, and protect his brother Masons, and to aid them all in their needs. After

(1) This condemnation had been occasioned by an injudicious proceeding (to speak mildly) on the part of Mgr. Darboy, the over-conciliatory archbishop of Paris. The prelate, in accordance with his resolve to humor Napoleon III. in every possible way, almost to the point where schism would loom up before him, officiated at the funeral of Marshal Magnan in 1865. Magnan had been the grand-master of the order in France; and the brethren attended his obsequies officially, clothed in their regalia. As in duty bound, Pius IX. rebuked the archbishop; and the prelate replied that neither he nor his clergy had seen the Masonic insignia in the church. The Pontiff answered: "You knew very well that the deceased, during his life, had the misfortune to fill the proscribed office of Grand Orient, as it is called; and you must have easily foreseen that the members of the sect would attend the funeral, and that they would parade their regalia. For that reason you should have abstained from causing such grief to all true Catholics by your presence at the function." After this unfortunate act of so eminent a prelate, Pius IX. felt that he ought to show the world that the Holy See was not yet disposed to compromise with the Brethren of the Three Points; hence his denunciation of the sectaries in the Consistory of Sept. 25, 1865.

this oath, he was admitted to the first degree. Listen to the exact text of the words which the same Mastai-Ferretti pronounced in a loud voice in the Lodge: 'Indeed it is from you, illustrious men, that to-day I receive the light of truth. Until now, I was in the densest darkness. I am fully convinced that Masonry is one of the most beautiful associations in the world, and I am fortunate to belong to it.' He was very assiduous in his attendance at all the meetings; and he was most zealous in promoting the prosperity of the Alliance, and in propagating its salutary maxims. Admitted successively to the Companionship and the Mastership, and more than ever convinced of the sublime object of Masonry, Mastai pronounced, in another meeting, these words: 'I shall be a warm defender of this sublime order, whose mission is to moralize the universe, and to raise and defend abandoned humanity.' Our brothers in Philadelphia preserve very many documents and autographs of Mastai-Ferretti as a precious treasure; and they show them, as proof of his initiation, to all the foreign brothers who arrive in that city. Many travellers have seen them frequently." Great was the excitement among the more ignorant of the "profane," and great was the exultation among the adepts, when the Lodges of Messina communicated this presumed discovery. All the Masonic, Protestant, and Jewish journals of Europe and America gloated over the delectating morsel, in spite of the fact that, as the Catholic press showed, the mendacious story of the *Umanitario* refuted itself. In the first place, the Abbate Mastai-Ferretti was not sent to America by Gregory XVI., but by Pius VII. In the second place, he did not visit the United States. Notwithstanding these two flagrant and fundamental errors which were indicated by the Catholic journals of the time, the chief Masonic periodical of France, the *Monde Maçonique*, ridiculed "the unwary zeal of the religious journals," although it admitted that it might be well to "ask the Lodge in Philadelphia to transmit an authentic and certified copy of the record of initiation, so that the doubts of certain minds might be dissipated, and the religious journals be thus reduced to silence" (1). But five

(1) Thus in the issue of Aug., 1838, p. 226.

months afterward, the same *Monde Maçonnique* admitted that "unfortunately Masonry still has in its bosom certain advocates of pious frauds, the monopoly of which ought to be left to the devotees of La Salette and to the subscribers of *L'Univers*." And then it proceeded to conclude that "if the present Pope was made a Mason in any place, it was certainly not in Philadelphia"; since the editors had written for information to the Masonic authorities in Philadelphia, and had received from Richard Vaux, grand-master of the G. O. of Pennsylvania, a letter enclosing a report made on the matter at issue by John Thomson, the grand-secretary of the same G. O. The letter of Mr. Thomson, dated Nov. 30, 1868, had certified that the name of John Mary Mastai-Ferretti was not on the registers of any one of the Lodges in the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania; and that the name approaching nearest to that of the said Mastai, on the registers, was that of one Martin Ferrety, who was received in 1819, in the Lodge No. 157, at Havana in Cuba (1).

The pontificate of Pius IX. was signalized by several severe persecutions of the Church in other countries than Italy. We have already dwelt at length on the afflictions of Catholic Poland at the hands of "Orthodox" Russia; and we shall devote special dissertations to the German enterprise which was undertaken "in the name of civilization," and to the onslaughts of Masonry against Catholic liberty in Latin America. The Swiss imitation of the Bismarckian defense of "civilization" will be described when we treat of the "Old Catholics." Let us now cast a glance on the end of the mortal careers of the principal personages of the drama, the chief scenes of which we have beheld. We have touched on the death of the great *deus ex machina*, Cavour; and we have found reason to hope that, whatever his life was, his end was not that of the reprobate. Louis Napoleon died at Chisellhurst, in England, fortified by the Sacraments of the Church which he had injured, but never despised, on January 9, 1873. The triumph of Victor Emmanuel was of brief duration; he played the king in the capital of the

(1) *Monde Maçonnique*, Jan., 1869, p. 534.

Popes for but little more than seven years. The atmosphere of the Quirinal agreed with the *Re Galantuomo* in neither a moral nor a hygienic sense ; he seldom entered the palace, and still less frequently did he sleep in it ; nearly all his time was spent at Mandria, in the society of his morganatic wife, the Countess di Mirafiori, whom he had married in 1868. In December, 1877, the health of Pius IX. showed unmistakable signs of his approaching dissolution ; the Masonic journals declared that he was already dead, and that "the Jesuits and the cardinals were concealing the fact." Even the Italian government, despite its spies in the Vatican, credited the report of the demise ; and on December 31, Victor Emmanuel signed a regulation for the expected funeral. The court was to put on full mourning ; and the necessary gowns, etc., were ordered for the princess-royal (now Queen Margherita) and her ladies. On January 3, 1878, the king, being on the point of returning to Mandria, sent his friend and almoner, Mgr. Anzino, to the Vatican with instructions to inquire, in the name of "Victor Emmanuel," into the state of the Pope's health. Anzino was admitted to the pontifical presence, and when he stated the object of his visit, His Holiness looked steadily on him for a moment, and then said : "Tell Victor Emmanuel that I thank him for his interest ; but tell him also that he must think of his soul, for his hour has come. Let him think of his soul !" Victor Emmanuel was much affected by this message ; he deferred his journey ; and on the following morning he was found to be laboring under an attack of pleuritic fever. As soon as he realized his danger, he ordered Anzino to inform the Pontiff (1). The chief pastor

(1) From the day of his accession to the Sardinian throne, Victor Emmanuel had ever manifested remorse for his own vices and for his criminal weakness in yielding to the demands of the Freemasons. Strange to say, unlike his father, who became a Carbonaro in his youth, Victor Emmanuel never became a Mason ; although he was always willing to co-operate with them for the aggrandizement of the House of Savoy. He was a strange compound of religious sentimentality, debauchery, and dashing bravery. After his marriage to Rosina Mirafiori, however, his religious inclinations became somewhat more pronounced ; it was said that the pair recited the Rosary together every day. One day he said to Cavour : "I am willing to go with you as far as the gates of hell ; but I warn you that when we arrive there, you will enter alone." VILLEFRANCHE ; *Ubi supra*. p. 533.—MONTREVEL ; in the *Biographies of the Nineteenth Century*. Paris (Bloud et Barral), 1886.

of souls immediately gave to Mgr. Marinelli, his sacristan all the faculties necessary in the case, and despatched him to the Quirinal. The demons in human form who guarded the anti-chambers of the royal suite, consistent followers of the Dark Lantern, showed their devotion to freedom of conscience by refusing to allow the bearer of pardon to enter the room of the dying man. Meanwhile, Victor Emmanuel, who had no idea of being, said Louis Veuillot, "one of those madmen who buy with a final crime the glory of being enemies of God for all eternity" (1), was calling for Mgr. Anzino. The papal sacristan succeeded in communicating with the almoner, and delegated to him the faculties which he had received from His Holiness. According to all the Italian journals of the day, the king received the Last Sacraments, and charged Anzino to bear to the Pope his dying request for pardon. But many years had not passed, when it became the prevalent belief that Victor Emmanuel had lost consciousness, ere his almoner arrived at his bedside. While his former enemy was dying, the Pontiff was continually praying for him; and several times he cried: "Oh! If the good Princess Clotilda were with her father!" But the poor man did not gaze from his pillow of death on the sweet face of the holy daughter whom reasons of State had sacrificed to the wretched Prince Napoleon, the bastard Bonaparte who had been the bane of his cousin's life. During his dying moments, the monarch often asked for "The Children! The Children!" but the future king, Humbert, had ordered inexorably that the Countess Mirafiori and his half-brothers should not be admitted to the Quirinal.

Around the deathbed of Pius IX. we discern no shadow of doubt as to his future before God, or in the minds of men; his death, like his life, was a cheerful sacrifice to the will of God. Violent attacks of rheumatism had afflicted him during several months preceding the demise of Victor Emmanuel, and when the children of the Revolution bore the corpse of the finally disillusionized monarch in solemn procession through the streets of Rome, the forgiving Pontiff caused his easy-chair to be rolled to a window overlooking the

(1) In the *Univers*, Jan. 11, 1878.

scene, and when his gaze fell on the bedizzened token of human nothingness, he raised his trembling hands in a last prayer for his despoiler. February brought great improvement in the health of His Holiness ; and on Feb. 2, he was borne to the Hall of the Throne, in order to receive, from delegates gathered from every corner of the earth, congratulations on the recurrence of the seventy-fifth anniversary of his First Communion. The discourse which he then delivered, the 375th since his imprisonment in the Vatican, was his last ; and it was pronounced in the clear and resonant tone which had ever been one of his greatest charms. After the ceremony, he remarked that although all said that he had gained in health, he himself perceived no advance ; and indeed, on the early morning of the 7th, it became evident that Pio Nono would soon receive the reward of the good and faithful steward. At half-past eight, he requested his faithful and loving sacristan to administer to him the Holy Viaticum ; and during the ceremony, as well as during the following Extreme Unction, he himself recited the liturgical prayers. By this time all the cardinals then in Rome had arrived, and the dying Pontiff seemed to recognize them all ; he reached under his pillow, brought forth a little crucifix, and with it he blessed all who were in the room. At one o'clock, the death-agony began ; and during the recitation of the Prayers for the Dying, His Holiness pronounced the responses, although with some difficulty. When the Act of Contrition had been recited, he exclaimed, as though addressing God : "With Thy help ; with Thy help !" and then he cried : "We will enter into the house of the Lord." When the reader pronounced the words : "*Proficiscere, anima Christiana*—Depart, Christian soul !" the Pontiff echoed : "Yes : let us depart !" Shortly afterward, he expressed by signs that it grieved him to be unable to speak ; whereupon Cardinal Bilio asked him to at least bless the Sacred College. Then Pius IX. raised his right arm, and looking calmly around him, he gave his last benediction on earth. With the first sounds of the bells calling the faithful to the evening *Ave Maria*, the "Pope of the Immaculate Conception" went to his eternal reward. He had lived eighty-five years, and

had reigned longer by six years than St. Peter had reigned in Rome; but he should have survived at least for four, and perhaps for sixteen more months (chroniclers dispute concerning the length of Peter's pontificate in Antioch), ere he would have nullified the ancient saying that "no Pontiff would ever see the years of Peter."

---

## CHAPTER XVI.

### THE COUNCIL OF THE VATICAN (NINETEENTH GENERAL).

The Nineteenth General Council of the Church was convoked by Pope Pius IX. in his Apostolic Letter, *Jam vos omnes*, dated Sept. 8, 1868. We extract the following passages from this document: "In order that the government of the Church might be properly sustained, and in order that the entire Christian body might ever persevere in the same faith, doctrine, charity, and communion, our Lord Jesus Christ, in the first place, promised that He would be with His Church until the end of time; and in the second place, He chose, from among all, Peter alone, constituting him Prince of the Apostles, His Vicar on earth, and the head, the foundation, and the centre of the Church; so that, enjoying the prerogative of rank and honor, the fulness of authority, and sovereign power and jurisdiction, he should feed both the sheep and the lambs, confirm his brethren, govern the entire Church, and be 'the guardian of the gates of Heaven, and the judge as to what should be bound or be loosed, his sentence having full force, even in Heaven' (1). . . . It is known by all that the Roman Pontiffs have always, and with incessant care, defended the deposit of faith, the discipline of the clergy, the training of that clergy in holiness and learning, the sanctity and dignity of marriage; that they have constantly developed, more and more, the Christian education of the young of both sexes; that they have fostered in the peoples religion, piety, and good morals; and that they have ever contributed, by every means, to the tranquillity, order, and prosperity of civil society it-

(1) ST. LEO II.; *Sermon 2.*

self. . . . For a long time the world has known what a terrible tempest has afflicted the Church, and what immense evils civil society also is suffering. . . . In such a concurrence of calamities, the weight of which oppresses our heart, our divinely-given pastoral ministry imposes upon us the duty of resolutely bringing our whole strength into action, in order to repair the damage done to the Church, to procure the well-being of the entire flock of the Lord, and in order to repair the devastating onslaughts of those who labor, with unanimous accord, to destroy the Church herself in her very foundations, if such an object could be effected. . . . Therefore, having both day and night, in the humility of our heart, addressed our prayers to God, the Father of light, we have deemed it absolutely necessary to convoke this Council. For these reasons, relying upon the authority of God Himself, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and upon that of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, an authority which we also exercise on earth; we indicate, by the advice and with the assent of our brothers, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church; we announce, decree, and convoke by these Letters, a Holy Œcumenical Council, to be held in the coming year, 1869, in our illustrious city of Rome, in the Basilica of the Vatican." The Eighth of December, the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God, was designated for the opening of the Council.

Among all the governments of earth, that of "Holy Russia" alone placed any obstacles in the way of the bishops who joyfully hastened to obey the call of the venerable Father of the Faithful; the "Orthodox" autocrat forbade all the Catholic prelates of his empire to pay any attention to the Bull of Convocation. The so-called Catholic powers, however, had been studiously ignored by Pius IX. in the language of this Bull; for the first time in ecclesiastical annals an Œcumenical Council was projected without any request, on the part of the Holy See, for the co-operation of the secular powers of Christendom. When Pope Paul III. convoked the Council of Trent, he expressly requested the co-operation of the secular governments; especially of those

of France and the Holy Roman Empire. Pius IX. manifested a remarkable reserve in regard to the hostile or indifferent sovereigns of his day; allowing them to see plainly that he asked nothing from them but freedom for the synodals. A new era has commenced. Church and State are now separate; and both recognize the fact. Guizot would term the Church of to-day, "laic"; Cavour would term her, "free." Both terms, said Louis Veillot, are "hypocrisies in language," implying the admission that the State now has no religion, and wants none—another and more formidable hypocrisy, to cover a denial of God. So far as civic support goes, the Church is now a soul without a body; and in all matters of religion, the State is now a body without a soul. Why, then, should Pius IX. have asked the so-called Catholic powers to send their "orators" to the Vatican Council? What part could they have taken in a programme of debates on matters spiritual and moral? Nowadays governments have no right to speak to their subjects upon eternal salvation; they know no such thing. The so-called Catholic sovereigns of to-day are not, as their predecessors once were, "secular vicars" of the Vicar of Christ, "external bishops" of the Church. In fine, the present condition of the Church in so-called Catholic countries was well compared by Louis Veillot to the condition of a wife who has been repudiated unjustly by her husband. She is an innocent sufferer. She demands all that her marriage contract guaranteed to her—her wasted dowry, her civil rights, and her maternal privileges. But she asks for no divorce; nay, she insists that a divorcee should not and cannot be pronounced, since the interests of her children forbid such a procedure (1). Meanwhile, the Church waits patiently for justice; she can afford to wait, for she is really the spouse of Him who is patient, because He is eternal.

The Pontiff also invited the bishops of the separated Churches of the East to attend the Council: "We conjure and beseech you, with all the ardor that we are capable of feeling, to come to this general assembly of the bishops of

(1) *The Univers*, July 13, 1868.—*The Monde*, Aug. 8, 1868.

the West and of the entire world, just as your forefathers entered into the Second Council of Lyons, and into the Council of Florence; so that you may renew the olden ties of charity, and restore that peace of the early ages which time has destroyed, thus consummating a union which is so dear to our heart." But the heretics of "Orthodox" Russia dared not disobey their imperial master. As for those of the once venerable Constantinopolitan patriarchate, several bishops indeed manifested a velleity to accept the pontifical invitation; but when they learned that their patriarch had refused to receive the papal letter, they relapsed into their oriental lethargy. The patriarch of the Monophysite Armenians replied that he would attend the Council; but the promise was not fulfilled. Pius IX. would gladly have extended to the dignitaries of the innumerable sects of Protestantism the cordial invitation which he sent to the oriental separatists; but unfortunately the spiritual progeny of Luther, Cranmer, and Calvin, possessed no ecclesiastical status, whereas the prelates of the oriental separated Churches, although they were heretical as well as schismatical, were validly consecrated bishops. Therefore the Pontiff could do no more than urge all sincere Protestants to examine well into the reasons which impelled them to remain outside of the Catholic Church. A certain minister asked the archbishop of Westminster whether the Pope's general exhortation to Protestants implied that "dissident Christians" would be allowed to defend their theories in the Council. With an excess of good nature, Archbishop Manning submitted to the Holy See a matter concerning which there could be no question whatever; and the Pope replied on Sept. 4, 1869: "If the questioner were familiar with the faith of Catholics concerning the teaching authority given by the Divine Saviour to His Church, and consequently with the doctrine concerning the infallibility of the Church in matters of faith and morals, he would perceive that the Church cannot permit any discussion of errors which she has already carefully examined and condemned" (1).

(1) When treating of the Council of Trent, in our Vol. iv., p. 524, we refuted the claim of condemned heretics to be heard in a General Council.

The language and attitude of the Pontiff as he convoked the Nineteenth General Council; the promptitude with which the bishops of the Universal Church prepared to obey the summons of the "Servant of the Servants of God"; and the prayerful confidence with which the Catholic laity awaited the issue of the august assembly; certainly indicated no death agony on the part of the Queen who was enthroned on the Seven Hills. The vitality of the Papacy was so evident at this moment, that it elicited recognition from all the hostile intellects which were not irremediably diseased. On July 10, 1868, Emile Ollivier was constrained to avow in the Napoleonic Corps Legislatif: "This convocation of a General Council for 1869 is a grand spectacle, a new event. There is in it a courage, and there is also a grandeur, both of which compel my respect and my admiration; for I love a power which is strong, which has confidence in itself, and which manifests energetically and fearlessly the faith which animates it." Such a development of force in an institution which they had fondly fancied, or had feigned to fancy, to be decrepit and probably moribund, enraged the sectaries even to the verge of insanity. On the Good Friday previous to the opening of the Council, Masonic banquets were held in various cities of Europe for the express purpose of manifesting a diabolic hatred of the God-Man. To the accompaniment of blasphemies which are not to be transcribed, "sausages were flung at the head of Christ, and the representation of Calvary was smeared with scraps of pork" (1).

(1) RIVAUX; *Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. III., p. 605. Paris, 1883.—Speaking of Prince Napoleon (Jerome's bastard), who was a prominent figure at the Good Friday banquet in Paris, *Le Pays* well said: "Catholic France, military France, the France that prays, the France that fights, spurns such men." This Plon-Plon, the sole one of his name whose courage was ever doubted; this demagogue, whose training had been entirely that of German and Swiss Rationalism; had openly avowed his anti-Catholic principles in 1865, when, in his speech at the inauguration of the Napoleon monument in Ajaccio, he said: "Hitherto there has been entirely too much hesitation and prudence; France should have allied herself with Prussia and Italy a year ago, and openly. The hour has arrived when the flag of the Revolution, that of the Empire, must be widely unfurled. What is the programme of the Revolution? In the first place, it is war on Catholicism, a war which must be prosecuted unto the end. Secondly, it is the perfection of the grand national unities on the ruins of the factitious states, and of the treaties which founded those states. Thirdly, it is the triumph of democracy, founded on universal suffrage, but which must perforce be guided, for a century to come, by the strong hands of Cæsars. Finally, it is imperial France, at the head of European affairs: it is a war, a long war, as a condition and instrument of this policy. There you have the flag and the programme. The first obstacle to be con-

These ebullitions of Satanic hatred for the Spouse of Christ, excited by her supernatural vigor as indicated by the approaching General Council, might have been regarded as spasmodic and isolated cases, having no bearing on the disposition of Masonry in general toward that toleration of Catholicism which Catholics demanded, and which Liberalism pretended to accord. But the sectaries had resolved to make a demonstration so striking, that no doubt as to the sentiments of the Lodges should be possible. Certain Fathers of the Church have termed Satan the *Simius Dei*; they thought that just as the monkey delights in imitating the manners and actions of man, so the foul fiend, for his own fell purposes, travesties the works of the Lord of the Universe. Of course every heresy is, to some extent, a *Simius Dei*; but amid all of its puerilities Masonry has ever shown that its simian instincts are more inveterate than those of any other sect. It was in accordance with these propensities, therefore, that the Brethren of the Three Points convoked a Grand Council of their order, which was to be opened in Naples on Dec. 8, 1869, at the very moment when the bishops of Christendom would begin their labors for the glory of God under the encouraging smile of His Immaculate Mother. There was an appropriateness in the contrast between the two assemblies which probably escaped the notice of the Masonic energumens; the Anti-Council of Naples was merely an episode in that war between Mary and Satan which began in Eden when God announced to the serpent: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman." While more than seven hundred successors of the Apostles were kneeling with the Vicar of Christ, beseeching the Holy Spirit to direct the labors for which they had met, more than seven hundred votaries of the Dark Lantern, delegates from nearly all the Grand Lodges of Europe, Asia, Africa, the United States of America, Mexico, and Brazil, were inaugurating

quered is Austria, the most powerful support of the Catholic power in the world. Austria is the refuge of Catholicism and feudalism; therefore she must be crushed. The work was begun in 1859: it must be finished to-day. Imperial France must remain the enemy of Austria; she must be the friend and support of Prussia, the country of the grand Luther. . . . France must defend Italy, the centre of the Revolution in the world. The mission of Italy is to destroy Catholicism in Rome, just as it is the mission of Prussia to destroy Catholicism in Vienna. We must be allies to both Prussia and Italy."

their Saturnalia of rebellion against God and His Christ with blasphemies which caused even the most indifferent of the Neapolitans to shudder. Much against its will, the government of the Piedmontese usurper recognized that a continuance of the Satanic conventicle would precipitate a popular revolution in defence of the outraged honor of Jesus and Mary; and the police were ordered to disperse the violators of religious liberty and of common decency, and to prevent their future reunion. However, the object of the Anti-Council had been gained; the world, the flesh, and the devil had sent to the four quarters of the globe their protest against the submission of man to his Creator. The programme of the adepts had been arranged in advance; and before the enforced dissolution of their Anti-Council, they had adopted certain declarations which were sent immediately to all the official organs of Masonry in the world. One of these precious lucubrations reads as follows: "The undersigned delegates of the various nations of the civilized world, assembled in Naples as members of the Anti-Council, enact the following principles: They proclaim the liberty of Reason against Religious Authority, the independence of man against the despotism of Church and State, free education against teaching by the clergy; and they acknowledge no other foundation for human belief than science. They proclaim that man is free; and they insist on the abolition of all official Churches. Woman ought to be freed from the chains with which the Church and Law prevent her full development. Morality ought to be entirely independent of all religious interference." Another declaration is even more explicit in its declaration of war to the knife against Catholicism; and the reader will note how Catholicism seems to be regarded by these representatives of Masonry as the sole champion of the Divine Majesty on earth. "*Freethinkers recognize and proclaim freedom of conscience and of investigation. They regard science as the ancient basis of every belief; and therefore they reject all dogmas which are founded on any revelation whatsoever. They demand education through all its degrees—an education which shall be gratuitous, obligatory, exclusively laic, and material.*

ist. As for all that pertains to philosophical or religious questions, freethinkers regard the idea of God as the source and support of every despotism and of every iniquity. They regard the Catholic religion as the most complete and the most terrible personification (*sic*) of this idea of God; and they regard the Catholic dogmas as the very negation of society. *Therefore the freethinkers take upon themselves the obligation of laboring for the prompt and radical abolition of Catholicism, for its annihilation, by any and all means, even by revolutionary force*" (1). The two italicized passages of this declaration, when joined together, form the essence of the Masonic programme in every land where the sect has attained to political domination (2).

The number of the participants in the Vatican Council varied at different times. In 1869, the Rev. Apostolic Chamber issued an official list of those who, by right or by privilege, could sit in the assembly. These were: Cardinals, 55; Patriarchs, 11; Primates, 7; Archbishops, 159; Bishops, 755; Abbots *nullius*, 6; Mitred Abbots, 22; Generals and Vicars-General of Religious Orders, 29; being a total of 1,044. The same Chamber afterward gave a list of the synodals who attended on Dec. 20, 1869: Cardinals, 48; Patriarchs, 10; Primates, 4; Archbishops, 120; Bishops, 513; Abbots *nullius*, 6; Mitred Abbots, 13; Generals and Vicars-General of Orders, 29; a total of 743. But since the abbots and other representatives of Religious Orders have merely a consultative voice in a General Council, the number of synodals with deliberative voices present on Dec. 20, was 695. The principal item in the enumeration of these synodals is that of those who voted in the sessions of April 24 and July 18, 1870. On the former occasion, 667 were present; on the latter, 535. This difference of figures was due to the abstention of

(1) DESCHAMPS; *The Secret Societies and Society*, bk. 1, ch. 2, 10.—RIVAUX; *Loc. cit.*—*Pastoral of Mgr. Martin, Bishop of Natchitoches, Louisiana*, 1875.

(2) The latter declaration was probably prepared by Louis Andrieux, who was prefect of police in Paris from 1877 to 1881, and who distinguished himself in the enforcement of the anti-clerical laws of his day. He had represented the Lodges of Lyons in the Anti-Council. Shortly before the meeting, the Masonic journal, *L'Excommunié*, under date of Nov. 27, 1869, had said: "The candidate of *L'Excommunié*, the lawyer, Louis Andrieux, has been elected unanimously to be our delegate at the Council of Naples. The freethinking programme prepared by Citizen Andrieux shows that we will be represented in all the extent and energy of our convictions."

the opposing minority—a fact which will be explained in its proper place.

Immediately upon the meeting of the synodals, Pope Pius IX., by virtue of his Apostolic authority, furnished a regulation for the proceedings. The following passage from *The Right and Method of Proposing* (subjects for consideration), taken from the decree for the opening of the Council, explains this regulation: "Although the right and duty of proposing the subjects for treatment in the Holy Œcumenical Council, and the right of asking the opinion of the Fathers thereon, belong only to us and this Apostolic See; nevertheless, we do not confine ourselves to a wish that such Fathers as may have something of general interest to propose, should mention it with the utmost freedom. We even request them to exercise an initiative. But since it is certain that this privilege, if not exercised with proper regard to time and manner, might considerably jeopardize the order so necessary in synodal deliberations, we decree that propositions shall be offered in the following manner: I. They shall be reduced to writing, and submitted privately to a special Congregation to be instituted by us, and composed of certain of our brothers, Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, and of certain reverend Fathers of the Council. II. The propositions must refer to the general weal of Christendom, and not to affairs of any particular diocese. III. They must be accompanied by reasons which show their utility and opportuneness. IV. They must contain nothing opposed to the constant sentiment of the Church, or contrary to her inviolable traditions. Finally, the special Congregation, after the reception of the propositions, will carefully examine them, and then refer them, together with its opinion as to their admissibility, to us, that we ourselves may decide whether they may be presented to the Council." The prelates composing this important Commission were: Cardinals Patrizzi, Di Pietro, De Angelis, Riario-Sforza, Corsi, Rauscher, Bonnechose, Cullen, Barili, Moreno, Monaco La Valletta, and Antonelli; the Bishops: Jussef, Patriarch of Antioch; Valerga, Patriarch of Jerusalem; Guibert, of Tours; Riccardi di Netro, of Turin; Barrio y Fernandez,

of Valencia; Valdieso, of Santiago in Chili; Spalding, of Baltimore; Apuzzo, of Sorrento; Franchi, of Thessalonica; Gianelli, of Sardes; Manning, of Westminster; Deschamps, of Malines; Martin, of Paderborn; Celesia, of Patti. Besides this Commission, others were appointed as Judges of Excuses; Judges of Complaints and Dissensions; a General Congregation for Matters of Faith; one for Discipline; one for Affairs of Religious Orders; one for the Oriental Rites. The principal officers of the Council were: Guardians: The Roman Princes, Giovanni Colonna and Domenico Orsini, Princes-Assistant at the Pontifical Throne; a Secretary, Joseph, Bishop of St. Poelten; a Sub-Secretary, Mgr. Louis Jacobini; two Assistant Secretaries, Camillo Santori and Angelo Jacobini; two Promoters, Giovanni de Dominicis-Tosti and Filippo Ralli.

At the opening of the Council of Trent, Pope Paul III. made no such regulation as the one just described as made by Pius IX. for the guidance of the Vatican synodals; and in the former assembly, the question of the initiative of propositions or *postulata* caused a stormy dispute. The debate began under Paul III., subsided under Julius II., reopened under Pius IV., on occasion of the phrase *proponentibus legatis*, and terminated only in 1563, when Pius IV., in a letter to his legates, announced that the synodals could regard the clause as they pleased. The Council suppressed the phrase, but with the qualification, "saving always the authority of the Apostolic See"; and thus, in some sort, the members shared the initiative with the papal representatives. Now, in the Vatican Council such a struggle could scarcely have taken place; for from the very first day, the synodals yielded, excepting a minority which made some complaints, but whose firmness in its dogmatic notions was not, despite appearances, even as imposing as its modest numbers. These prelates contented themselves with a mild protest, and accepted the commissions appointed by the Pontiff; taking care, when the time arrived for a vote on the crucial matter, to shirk the combat, two of them only excepted, who distinguished themselves by their negative vote.

In the third session of the Council, the Pontiff published

his Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Filius*, which was divided into four Chapters, treating of God, Creator of all things ; of Revelation ; of Faith ; and of Faith and Reason. This Constitution has been rightly termed the most rationalistic document, using the adjective in its favorable sense, ever issued by Pope or Council. We give the Canons which accompanied the Constitution. First come the CANONS ON GOD, CREATOR OF ALL THINGS: I. "If any one denies the existence of God, Creator and Master of everything, visible and invisible, let him be anathema." II. "If any one shamelessly teaches that nothing but matter exists, etc." III. "If any one says that the substance and essence of God and of all things are one and the same, etc." IV. "If any one says that finite things, whether corporal or spiritual, or at least the spiritual things, are emanations of the divine substance ; or if any one says that the divine essence becomes all things by the evolution of itself ; or if any one says that God is the universal and indefinite Being who, *sese determinando*, constitutes the universality of things, distinct in genus, in species, and in individuals ; etc." V. "If any one does not admit that the world, and all things in it, whether spiritual or material, were produced, as to all their substance, by God from nothing ; or if any one says that God created, not by His will, exempt from all necessity, but just as necessarily as He loves Himself ; or if any one says that the world was not made for the glory of God ; etc." Then are read the CANONS ON REVELATION: I. "If any one says that the one and true God, our Creator and Master, cannot be known with certainty by the natural light of human reason (1), by means of created things ; let him be anathema." II. "If any one says that man cannot be, or ought not be instructed by divine revelation, concerning God and the worship due to Him ; etc." III. "If any one says that man cannot be divinely brought to a knowledge and perfection which are above his nature, but that man can and ought to arrive, by himself, at the acquisition of all truth, and attain to the possession of every good by a continual progress ; etc." IV. "If any one does not re-

(1) This condemnation would affect Huet, Kant, Bautain, Lamennais, and the Traditionalists, if they were living.

ceive the books of Scripture in all their integrity and every portion of them—*cum omnibus suis partibus*, according to their enumeration by the Council of Trent; or if he denies their divine inspiration; etc.” Then we meet the CANONS OF FAITH: I. “If any one says that human reason is independent, and that therefore God cannot command it to yield to faith; let him be anathema.” II. “If any one says that divine faith is not different from a natural knowledge of God and of morals, and that therefore it is not necessary, for divine faith, that the revealed truth be believed because of the authority of God revealing it; etc.” III. “If any one says that divine revelation cannot become credible through external signs, and that, consequently, men can be led to faith only by the interior experience of each one, or by private inspiration; etc.” IV. “If any one says that there can be no miracles, and that therefore all the narratives of miracles, even those in Holy Scripture, are to be classed among myths; or that miracles can never be known with certainty, and that the divine knowledge of the Christian religion cannot be satisfactorily proved by them; etc.” V. “If any one says that assent to the Christian faith is not free, but that it is necessarily produced by arguments of human reason; or that the grace of God is only necessary for living faith, which operates by charity; etc.” VI. “If any one says that the faithful and those who have not received the faith are in the same situation, and that therefore Catholics may reasonably doubt concerning the faith that they have received through the magistracy of the Church; that they should withhold their assent, until the credibility of faith is scientifically demonstrated to them; etc.” Finally, we have the CANONS ON FAITH AND REASON: I. “If any one says that there is no real mystery, properly so called, in divine revelation, and that every dogma of faith can be demonstrated and comprehended by a reason which has been trained rightly, according to natural principles; let him be anathema.” II. “If any one says that the teachings of human sciences should be received, even when those teachings are contrary to revealed doctrine; and that the Church has no right to proscribe such teachings; etc.” III. “If any one says that the progress of sci-

ence may sometimes rightly entail an interpretation of Catholic dogma in a sense different from that understood by the Church, etc." After these Canons had been read, the Pontiff said: "The Decrees and Canons contained in this Constitution have received the assent of all the synodals, without exception; and with the approbation of the Holy Council, we define them all as they were read, and we confirm them by our Apostolic authority." In reading this Constitution *Dei Filius*, the student will remember that there had been, before the Vatican Council, four systems in regard to the radical *critérium* of human certitude: I. The system of exclusive supernaturalism, defended principally by P. D. Huet, bishop of Avranches (d. 1721), and which accorded no value to reason, but recognized supernatural revelation as the sole criterion of certitude (1). II. The system of the *sensus communis*, advocated by Lamennais, and which found the sole criterion in the assent of the human race. III. The system of the Traditionalists, which was a blending of the two just mentioned, and recognized the intervention of human traditions as the sole certain means whereby the primitive revelation—itsself the origin of all human knowledge—was transmitted. IV. The system of Descartes, which recalls the teachings of Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, the Angelic Doctor, Malebranche, Fenélon, Bossuet, and many other luminaries. According to this system reason is indeed the prime motive of human certitude; demonstrating, as it does, the existence of God by means of its own, revealed to it by its consciousness. The reality of the primary cause being demonstrated, reason apprehends the existence of other motives of certitude, *e. g.*, supernatural revelation, and the general traditions of humanity. The definitions in the Constitution *Dei Filius* seem to endorse the Cartesian system.

We now approach that definition which will render the name of the Council of the Vatican familiar to Catholics unto

(1) A summary of Huet's system of general logic is contained in his sentence: "Philosophy can lead reason merely to a realization of its own weakness; and this experience causes it to wish for a guide who will lead it to truth. This guide is God; and faith consists in an entire reliance on the divine direction." *Huetism* must not be confounded with what is styled *Modern Huetism*, which derives its name from Francis Huet, who died in 1869, and who had successively evolved from Rigorism to Jansenistic Gallieanism, then to Richerism, and after the *Syllabus*, to Rationalism.

the end of time. We have said that with the exception of that of "Orthodox" Russia, none of the secular governments of Christendom prevented the bishops in their respective jurisdictions from obeying the summons of the Sovereign Pontiff; but it must not be forgotten that several of these governments, and notably those of nearly all the German states, had endeavored by every means short of open persecution to prevent the meeting of the Council. To some extent in France, and to a very great extent in Germany, there had existed among Catholics a school more or less hostile to the Holy See, ever since Gregory XVI. had condemned the writings of certain French publicists, and since Pius IX. had reprobated the attempt of certain German professors to withdraw all worldly affairs from the influence of Divine Revelation. These gentry became phenomenally active when, on the occasion of the Eighteenth Centenary of the Martyrdom of St. Peter, Pius IX. announced his intention of convoking an Œcumenical Council to the more than five hundred bishops then assembled in Rome (1). It was generally understood that the promulgation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility would be the chief object of the synodals; and immediately there descended on Europe a shower

(1) "If we look upon the Centenary only as a demonstration of moral power and of the superiority of the moral over the material order of the world, it has a deep significance. Pius the Ninth was at that moment in the crisis to which the Italian revolution of so many years had been advancing. All protection of the Catholic powers of the world, of whom France had been till then the mandatory, had been withdrawn. He knew that the Revolution would come to Rome again with more formidable power than in 1848. 'Verrà fin qui,' as he said in his farewell to the generals of the French army. In the face of all menace, and with the certainty of the coming revolution, Pius the Ninth had the year before convened the Catholic episcopate to meet in Rome in 1867. No event, excepting the Council of the Vatican, has, in our age, manifested so visibly to the intellect, and so palpably even to the sense of men, the unity, universality, unanimity, and authority of the only Church which alone can endure St. Augustine's two tests, *cathedra Petri* and *diffusa per orbem*—union with the See of Peter, and expansion throughout the world. The Centenary was a Confession of faith, without an accent of controversy. Even those who were not of the unity of the Church recognized it as such. Whosoever believed in Christianity, and desired the spread of our Lord's kingdom upon earth, could not fail to see in that great gathering the wide foundations laid by the apostolic mission. Even they who reject certain Catholic doctrines, hold the Creed of the Apostles, which has been guarded by the Catholic Church. Even they who rest their faith on scriptures alone, still more they who rest it upon fathers and councils, know that the custody of all these is in the Church which assembled on that day round the centre of its unity. The world-wide Church is the great witness upon whose broad testimony all Christians must ultimately rest. Take the Catholic and Roman Church out of the world, and where is Christendom?"—MANNING; *The True Story of the Vatican Council*, ch. 2. London, 1877.

of pamphlets which pretended to show that the proposed dogma was absurd in theology, contradicted by history, detrimental to the State, and destructive of human liberty. The pamphlets which appeared in France excited very little attention among the French Catholics, although in other countries the enemies of the Holy See flattered themselves that such publications showed that Gallicanism was still a living force. But in Germany there were very many Catholics whose defective logic rendered them easy victims of the sophisms and barefaced assertions with which diatribes like *Janus* attempted to vilify the See of Rome. *Janus* was the work of several persons ; but the directing hand in its production, and the one that wielded the pen when the most crucial matters were under treatment, was that of Döllinger, provost of the Chapter of Munich, a man of incontestable erudition, but one whose claims to ecstatic admiration were not always recognized outside of the German school which seemed to hold that ecclesiastical history had been *terra incognita* until the Bavarian canon revealed it to a thunderstruck world. Rome had not deemed it necessary to avail herself of the extravagantly lauded attainments of Dr. Döllinger when she was preparing for the Council, nor had she thought that the labors of the Conciliary consultors would be materially lessened by his presence among those coadjutors. Therefore it was that *Janus* was precipitated upon the world, and that, when the Church showed no signs of disturbance because of its appearance, the mask was dropped from the double face of the god, and he proposed some *Considerations for the Council*, in which he avowed himself a schismatic by the open denial that the Roman Church had any authority over the other Churches, and by the all but open declaration that he would not submit to any decisions of the imminent assembly which would not accord with his notions. It is not improbable that Döllinger was the author of the address which, under the date of April 9, 1869, and signed by Hohenlohe, the Bavarian prime-minister, was sent to all the governments of Europe, requesting those admirable judges in matters of religion to co-operate in preventing a definition of Papal Infallibility. "The sole dogmatic question which the *Jesuits*

are now agitating in Italy and Germany," remarked Hohenlohe, "and which Rome wishes the Council to decide, is that of the infallibility of the Pope. . . . I did think that one of the great powers ought to be the first to move in so grave a matter; but since nothing has been yet projected, I have deemed it well to ask for an understanding which will protect the interests of all of us." Two months afterward, Hohenlohe again approached the more important cabinets; and on this occasion he was supported by the Masonic government of Spain, which dared to flaunt in the face of the Pontiff the banner of Aranda, Pombal, and Choiseuil, declaring that France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Bavaria were ready to resist all ultramontane projects. Of course the Piedmontese usurpers of the pontifical sovereignty joined the anti-Catholic concert; the cabinet of the Quirinal addressed a diplomatic note to each one of the powers, requesting it to join in a general resolve to prevent the meeting of the prelates of Christendom. In its despatch to the French government, the cabinet of Victor Emmanuel was joined by that of Bavaria; the fantastic King Louis having descended from the nebulous regions of his predilection, in order to endorse the wish of Hohenlohe that Napoleon III. should remove the French brigade from the Eternal City, "in order to insure the freedom of the Council." Men like Döllinger and Hohenlohe should have foreseen that such proceedings, accompanied by every possible effort to decry beforehand the authority of the Church in General Council assembled, would inevitably defeat the intention of their authors. As Manning observes, "The effect of this deliberate, wide-spread, and elaborate attempt to hinder the definition of the infallibility of the head of the Church, by controlling the Council and obstructing its freedom, was as might be expected. It insured the proposing and passing of the definition. It was seen at once that not only the truth of a doctrine, but the independence of the Church, was at stake. If the Council should hesitate or give way before an opposition of newspapers and of governments, its office as Witness and Teacher of Revelation would be shaken throughout the world. The means taken to prevent

the definition made the definition inevitable by proving its necessity. It was no longer a desire or conviction of individuals, but a sense of duty in the great majority of the bishops. . . . Pius the Ninth had neither desire nor need to propose the defining of his infallibility. Like all his predecessors, he was conscious of the plenitude of his primacy. He had exercised it in the full assurance that the faith of Christendom responded to his unerring authority; he felt no need of any definition. It was not the head of the Church nor the Church at large that needed this definition. The bishops in 1854, 1862, and 1867 had amply declared it. It was the small number of disputants who doubted, and the still smaller number who denied that the head of the Church can neither err in faith and morals, nor lead into error the Church of which he is the supreme teacher, that needed an authoritative declaration of the truth" (1).

The reader who has accompanied us attentively through the course of this work, will find no difficulty in replying to such historical objections as may be made against the dogma of Papal Infallibility. As to objections of another nature, such as that this dogma makes a demi-god of the Pontiff; that it makes a peccable man infallible; that it reduces the authority of the bishops; that it attacks the rights of civil governments; we must reply that all these objections had as much force before the promulgation of the dogma as they now possess. The infallibility of the Pope is sim-

(1) Among the "Inopportunist" bishops who were insulted, during the Council, by the eulogies of such papers as the *London Times* and the *Augsbourg Gazette*, as though their opposition to the definition stamped them as more than half-Protestants, one of the most distinguished was Mgr. Ketteler of Mayence. The protest which this prelate felt bound to emit against the praise of men whose principles he despised, is worthy of attention, especially because of its judgment on Döllinger. "There was a time when I was a grateful disciple of the Provost Döllinger, and when I respected him sincerely. During several years I attended all his lectures at Munich. I was then of one mind with him on almost all the great questions of ecclesiastical history. At a later period, in 1848, we were associated together as deputies in the German Parliament of Frankfort. Even at that date, when all the great questions of our time were so frequently agitated, I think that I coincided with him in his political views. I recognize with grief that there is now a complete opposition between the opinions of the Provost Döllinger and my own as to the substance of the question which actually occupies our attention. The Provost Döllinger has been publicly pointed out as having co-operated with the author of that libel which appeared under the name of *Janus*, and which is directed against the Church; and we have no evidence that he has hitherto thought fit to declare, as an obedient son of the Catholic Church, that he does not share the opinions which animate that work. The book of *Janus* is not only directed against the infallibility of the Pope, but even against his primacy, against that great and

ply the infallibility of the Church more precisely accentuated. There are no *new truths* in the Church; the Roman Pontiff was as infallible before July 18, 1870, as he is now; he has been infallible since our Lord conferred the prerogative on St. Peter; the Vatican Council merely sanctioned a dogmatic fact which certain parties contested. And this truth was accepted as such at once by the minority which had abstained from voting; even by the two who acquired a little notoriety by their *non-placet*. All who withheld their *placet* as bishops, immediately pronounced their *credo* as obedient children of the Holy See. It is not our intention, nor is it within our province as a historian, to enter on a theological defence of the dogma of Papal Infallibility; but we may be allowed to adduce the reasons which determined four hundred and fifty of the Fathers of the Vatican Council to send to the Commission on Postulates a petition that the doctrine of the infallibility of Christ's vicar should be discussed in the Council: "The Sacred Scriptures plainly teach the primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, over the whole Church of Christ, and therefore also his primacy of supreme teaching authority. The universal and constant tradition of the Church, as seen both in facts and in the teaching of the Fathers, as well as in the manner of acting and speaking adopted by many Councils, some of which were Œcumenical, teaches us that the judgments of the Roman Pontiff in matters of faith and

divine institution in the Church to which we owe so manifestly, by means of her unity, the victories of the Church over all her adversaries in all ages. *Janus* is, moreover, a tissue of numberless falsifications of the facts of history, to which perhaps nothing but the *Provincial Letters* of Pascal can be compared for violation of truth. And not only has the Provost Döllinger failed up to the present time to disavow his co-operation with the author of *Janus*, but he is himself notoriously the anonymous author of the writing entitled *Considerations Presented to the Bishops of the Council on the Question of the Infallibility of the Pope*—a writing which is indeed much more moderate than *Janus*, but which is nevertheless so perfectly similar to it in general tone of thought, and betrays aim so exactly identical, that the world has justly inferred a most intimate connection between the authors of *Janus* and of the *Considerations*. . . . As to what concerns myself, and the notion that I may be one of those who agree with Dr. Döllinger as to the substance of the questions most earnestly debated at this moment, I formally declare that nothing can be less true. I am in agreement only with the Döllinger whose lessons formally flattered his disciples with love and enthusiasm for the Church and the Apostolic See; I have *nothing in common* with the Döllinger whom the enemies of the Church and of the Apostolic See now load with praises.—† WILLIAM EMMANUEL, BARON VON KETTELER, Bishop of Mayence. Rome, February 8, 1870."—From the *Vatican* of February 25, 1870.

morals are irreformable. In the *Profession of Faith* which the Second Council of Lyons emitted with the consent of both Greeks and Latins, we read: 'When controversies in matters of faith arise, they must be settled by the decision of the Roman Pontiff.' Moreover, in the Œcumenical Council of Florence, it was defined that 'the Roman Pontiff is Christ's true vicar, the head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians'; and that 'to him, in Blessed Peter, was given by Jesus Christ the plenitude of power to rule and govern the Universal Church.' And sound reason teaches us that no one can remain in communion of faith with the Catholic Church who is not of one mind with its head, since the Church cannot be separated from its head even in thought. Yet some have been found, and are even now to be found, who, boasting of the name of Catholic, and using that name to the ruin of those weak in faith, are bold enough to teach that sufficient submission is yielded to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, if we receive his decrees in matters of faith and morals with an obsequious silence, as it is termed, without yielding internal assent, or at most with a provisional assent, until the approval or disapproval of the Church has been made known. Anyone can see that by this perverse doctrine the authority of the Roman Pontiff is overturned, all unity of faith dissolved, a wide field opened to errors, and time afforded for spreading them far and wide. Wherefore the bishops, the guardians and protectors of Catholic truth, have endeavored, especially in our day, to defend in their synodal decrees, and by their united testimony, the supreme authority of the Apostolic See. But the more clearly Catholic truth has been declared, the more vehemently has it been attacked both in books and in newspapers, for the purpose of exciting Catholics against sound doctrine, and preventing the Council of the Vatican from defining it. Therefore, although many might have doubted the opportuneness of declaring this doctrine in the present Œcumenical Council, it would seem now to be absolutely necessary to define it. For Catholic doctrine is now once more assailed by those same arguments which men, condemned by their own conscience,

used against it in old times; arguments which, if carried to their ultimate consequences, would bring to the ground the very primacy of the Roman Pontiff and the infallibility of the Church itself; and to which, also, is frequently added the most violent abuse of the Apostolic See. Nay, more; the most bitter assailants of Catholic doctrine, though calling themselves Catholics, are not ashamed to assert that the Synod of Florence, which so clearly declares the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff, was not Œcumenical. If, then, the Council of the Vatican, being thus challenged, were to be silent, and omit to give testimony to the Catholic doctrine on this point, then Catholics would, in fact, begin to doubt the true doctrine, and the lovers of novelty would triumphantly assert that the Council had been silenced by the arguments brought forward by them. They would, moreover, abuse this silence on every occasion, and openly deny the obedience due to the judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See in matters of faith and morals, under pretext that the judgment of the Roman Pontiff is fallible on such points. Wherefore the public good of Christianity seems to require that the Holy Council of the Vatican, professing once again, and explaining more fully, the Florentine decree, should define clearly, and in words that can admit of no doubt, that the authority of the Roman Pontiff is supreme, and therefore exempt from error, when in matters of faith and morals he decrees and ordains what is to be believed and held by all the faithful of Christ, and what to be rejected and condemned by them. There are, indeed, some who think that this Catholic truth should not be defined, lest schismatics and heretics should be driven still further from the Church. But, above all other considerations, Catholics have a right to be taught by the Œcumenical Council what they are to believe in so weighty a matter, and one which has been of late so iniquitously attacked, lest this pernicious error should in the end infect simple minds and the masses of people unawares. Hence it was that the Fathers of Lyons and of Trent deemed themselves bound to establish the doctrine of the truth, notwithstanding the offence that might be taken by schismatics and heretics.

For if these seek the truth in sincerity, they will not be repelled. On the contrary, they will be drawn toward us, when they see on what foundations the unity and strength of the Catholic Church chiefly repose. But should any leave the Church in consequence of the true doctrine being defined by the Œcumenical Council, these will be few in number, and such as have already suffered shipwreck in the faith; such as are only seeking a pretext to abandon, by an overt act, that Church which, as they plainly show, they have already deserted in heart. These are they who have never shrunk from disturbing our Catholic people; and from the snares of such men the Council of the Vatican ought to protect the faithful children of the Church. For all true Catholics, taught and accustomed to render the fullest obedience both of thought and word to the Apostolic decrees of the Roman Pontiff, will receive with joyful and devoted heart the definition of the Council of the Vatican concerning his supreme and infallible authority."

These reasons for the opportuneness of the definition produced a deep impression on the minds of many of those prelates who were really sincere in their opposition; but outside of the Council, nearly the entire school of Dollinger continued to hug the delusion that beyond the sphere of "German science" there were no Catholics who were not unmitigated dunces (1). In France and in England, an agitation continued also among those nondescripts who termed themselves "Liberal Catholics," persons whose "Liberalism" did not forbid an association with Gallicanism, the child of Cæsarean despotism; in fact, just as in the seventeenth century certain men were Gallicans merely because they were unreasonably royalists, so in our day others were Gallicans because they were "Liberals"—an astounding union, but as real as strange. These modern Gallicans

(1) Manning cites a passage from the *Augsburg Gazette*, in which the following piece of bombast occurs: "If *German science* had not saved its position, and been able to establish a firm opposition in the Council, even in contradiction to its own will, and kept it alive, and if our Lord God had not also set stupidity and ignorance on the side of the Roman Court and of the majority, the governments would have been put to shame in the sight of the whole world. Prince Hohenlohe is the only statesman possessed of a deep insight into this question, and by degrees he has come to be regarded as belonging to the minority."—*Friedrich's Diary*, p. 202.

forgot that, as we have shown in previous dissertations, their pet theory was the product of the despotism of Philip the Fair; that Louis XIV. imposed it on France by force; that Napoleon revived it as a promoter of his ambition; and that every species of tyranny, whether of the throne or of the mob, has always regarded it as one of its best weapons. The most energetic of the champions of dying Gallicanism was Mgr. Maret, titular bishop of Sura; but probably the most influential among all the writers of this school was the learned and pious Oratorian, the Abbé Gratry, who essayed to combat the infallibilists with historical weapons, but only to be defeated by such scholars as Dom Guéranger, the abbot of Solesmes, and Amédée de Margerie. The enemies of the Holy See were elated when Gratry assumed the championship of the Gallican thesis; but they were undeceived as soon as the Conciliar decision was rendered. The biographer of the zealous Oratorian (1) transcribes the following letter, which may be regarded as representing the views of all those "inopportunist" whom the Judæo-Protestant press of that day so grievously misrepresented. "When the era of polemics was opened in the Church, I fought according to my conscience and my right. You approved my course, and I was gratified by the approval. Therefore, now that the decision has been rendered, I am sure that you approve of my submission. What course would be pursued to-day by St. Francis de Sales, by St. Vincent de Paul, or by Fénelon and Bossuet? You know, and we all know, that none of them would think for an instant of separating from the Church. You know very well that I would never entertain such a thought; and if I did harbor it, you and all of my comrades, without exception, would try to prevent its actuation. Now, without entering into a theological discussion, allow me to make one remark, as it were, incidentally. I fought against the idea of an *inspired* infallibility, and the decree of the Council has rejected that idea. I combatted a *personal* infallibility, and the decree establishes an *official* infallibility. I feared an infallibility which would be *scien-*

(1) *Father Gratry, His Last Days, and His Spiritual Testament*; by Father Adolph Perraud, afterward Bishop of Autun, and Member of the French Academy. Paris, 1872.

*tific, political, and governmental* : but the decree inculcates a *doctrinal infallibility* ; and *in matters of faith and morals*. And I do not wish to deny that I may have committed errors in my polemics. Undoubtedly I have erred in this matter, just as in others ; but when I have realized my fault, I have retracted, and I have not felt at all humiliated by the action." Such also were the sentiments of Mgr. Dupanloup, the recognized leader of the "inopportunist," when, as he was about to depart for Rome, he said to his flock : "Summoned by the Supreme Head of the Church, I now go to the Council. I go as a judge and witness of the faith. With the aid of Our Lord, I shall be a free, attentive, and firm judge,—one without any human respect ; and I shall be a vigilant and faithful witness. And when the Council shall have terminated, no matter whether its decisions prove conformable or not to my wishes, I shall return to you submissive to all the decrees, submissive without any effort, submissive with tongue and with heart, and as docile as the humblest sheep of my flock" (1).

(1) Justice to the "inopportunist" demands attention to the reasons which led them to believe that, considering the circumstances of the time, it was not expedient to define Papal Infallibility as an article of faith : I. No necessity or urgent reason exists for such a definition, because the whole episcopate and the whole priesthood of the Church, and the whole body of the faithful, few excepted, have always received, and at this present time receive, with veneration and docility, the doctrinal decisions of the Pontiffs, and recently those of Pius the Ninth. II. For the determination of all controversies, and for the solution of all doubts, the decree of the Council of Florence respecting the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff as universal doctor, together with the creed enjoined by Pius the Fourth, after the Council of Trent, is sufficient. III. In order to decide and to determine with exactness the question of the infallibility, it would not be enough simply to declare the Pope to be infallible. It would also be necessary to declare, and that by a decree, the form and the mode in which the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is to be exercised and known ; which would be a difficult question, and would involve the authority of the Holy See in many new and grave complications. IV. The making of such a definition would be exposed to this grave difficulty. Suppose the bishops not to be unanimous, what course should then be taken ? Suppose, again, that they were unanimous in declaring the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff to be a revealed doctrine, would they not, in the very act of defining the dogma, seem to profess that there is no authority in defining the faith inherent in the Episcopate ? V. Such a definition would not only be of doubtful utility. It would probably hinder the hope of reuniting the Eastern Churches to the Holy See, for the Greeks and Orientals recoil from every new word. It is well known what serious and endless controversies the single phrase *Filioque* has stirred up. For which reason, in the Profession of Faith enjoined by Gregory the Thirteenth for the Greeks, and by Urban the Eighth and Benedict the Fourteenth for the other Orientals, the very words of the Florentine decree, without any change or addition, were retained. VI. Such a definition might retard also the return, which we so much desire, of Protestants to the unity of the Church, inasmuch as the new dogma would excite and increase in large numbers a prejudice against the Catholic Church, and especially against the Roman Pontiff, thereby rendering it more difficult for them to understand and to embrace the faith, by raising a suspicion

On May 13, 1870, Mgr. Pie, bishop of Poitiers, presented to the Council, in the name of the Commission On Faith, a report on the *Schema de Primatu et Infallibilitate Summi Pontificis*. There was more than poetic justice in this spectacle of the successor of St. Hilary, a prelate whose invincible faith and heroic struggles were well worthy of comparison with those of the great Doctor, addressing to the Council the first solemn and official words in favor of the infalli-

that the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility is a novelty unknown in earlier ages. VII. This question might possibly raise divergencies among the bishops, who are now of one mind and heart in their reverence and obedience to the Holy See; a result which would be most disastrous. VIII. The defying of the Pope's infallibility might also cause doubts, or, what is worse, dissensions among Catholics who are otherwise sound, and willingly submissive, from conviction, to the authority of the Church; and that because certain historical facts and documents are not as yet sufficiently explained, so that in many countries the minds of men are not yet prepared for such a definition. IX. Such a new decree would be no remedy for the perversity of the few persons who reject the decisions of the Supreme Pontiff, and appeal from them to a General Council, as to a higher judge of controversies, forasmuch as their error comes not from the intellect, but from perversity of will. There is a difference also between a definition of the infallibility of the Pope and that of any other Christian doctrine. In the latter case, the authority of the Church may be sufficient to overcome any doubt. In the former it is the authority itself, the principle of all certainty in faith, which is in question. Would it not, therefore, be more prudent to spare the weakness of those who are not yet able to bear this definition? X. It may be feared also, lest, by a perversion of the true sense of such a decree, some may be induced to despise the authority given by Our Lord to bishops, especially in the condemnation of rash and pernicious opinions in philosophy and theology. XI. Again, it may be feared lest bishops, whom for some years the Holy See has been calling into activity, by discouraging them from sending to Rome in the first instance all doubts about books and matters of which it is their office to judge, might by such a definition be rendered more slack and backward in exercising their episcopal office of judges of doctrine. XII. Probably it would soon follow from such a definition, by reason of the nature of man, that not only matters of doctrine on which the supreme decision of the Church is desired, but other kinds of business also, would be sent to Rome for decision, so that everything would crowd in upon the centre of unity. And great as are the experience, prudence, and authority of the Roman Congregations, such a course would not be for the prosperity of the Universal Church; for the Church, as the Holy Ghost teaches, is a body; but the health of a body depends on the force and motion of all and each of the members. "If all were one member, where were the body?" (1 Cor. xii. 19). Nobody doubts that the chief member of the body is the head, and that in it, as in its centre and seat, the vital force and guidance reside; and yet not one will say that the soul resides in the head alone, which is rather diffused as its form throughout in the members of the whole body. Commenting on these arguments of the "inopportunist," Manning thus summarizes them: "Let that suffice which has been already declared and has been believed by all—namely, that the Church, whether congregated in Council or dispersed throughout the world, is always infallible, and the Supreme Pontiff, according to the words of the Council of Florence, is 'the teacher of the whole Church and of all Christians.' But as to the mysterious gift of infallibility, which by God is bestowed upon the Episcopate united to the Pope, and at the same time is bestowed in a special manner on the Supreme Pontiff, it may be left as it is. The Church, as all Catholics believe, whether in an Œcumenical Council, or, by the Pope alone, without a Council, guards and explains the truths of revelation. It is not expedient or opportune to make further declarations, unless a proved necessity demand it, which necessity at present does not appear to exist."

bility of the Roman Pontiff, and thus confirming to Catholic France the pre-eminently filial position in regard to the Holy See, which had been hers until a comparatively modern governmental France obscured her Christian glory (1). Many discussions ensued; and finally, in the Fourth Public Session of the Council, held on July 18, the question of Papal Infallibility was settled for all time. Three days before this consummation, it had transpired in Rome that Napoleon III. had declared war against Prussia; and the infallibilist prelates had besought the Pontiff to press the synodals to bring their labors to a conclusion. On the 15th, Mgr. Simor, primate of Hungary, accompanied by the archbishops of Paris, Milan, and Munich, and by the bishops of Dijon and Mayence, had urged Pius IX. to defer, or at least to modify the definition; but they had been told that circumstances forbade procrastination, and that the Council would permit no modifications in the decree which it had resolved to pronounce (2). On the 17th, fifty-five of the bishops, those who formed the anti-infallibilist minority, had announced their intention of abstaining from attendance at the crucial session; but four prelates, who had hitherto acted with the dissidents, the archbishops of Rheims, Avignon, and Sens, and the bishop of Viviers, had joined the majority. The ceremony of the definition was grand, but simple, as befitted the subject, and the place where the decision was promulgated. At eight o'clock on the morning of July 18, 1870, the synodals, to the number of 535, vested in their pontifical habiliments, took their accustomed places in the Conciliar Hall, that is, in the transept at the right of the Tomb of the Apostles in the Vatican Basilica. The Mass of the Holy Ghost was then celebrated; and as it finished, His Holiness and his court entered the assembly. All the shepherds of Israel then knelt; and the Supreme Pontiff recited the prayer *Adsumus, Domine, Sancte Spiritus*, after which came a series of hymns, litanies, and prayers, which lasted nearly an hour. During the Litany of the Saints, when the invocation *Ut*

(1) See our Vo'. iv., p. 229 *et seqq.*

(2) Letter of Cardinal Donnet to M. Alazarde, author of the *Life of Mgr. Delalle, Bishop of Rodez*.

*Domnum Apostolicum et omnes ecclesiasticos ordines in sancta religione conservare digneris* had been chanted, the Pontiff arose, and with the mitre on his head, and holding in his left hand the cross instead of a crozier (1), he blessed the synodals six times as he chanted: “*Ut hanc sanctam Synodum, et omnes gradus ecclesiasticos, benedicere digneris! Ut hanc sanctam Synodum, et omnes gradus ecclesiasticos, benedicere et regere digneris! Ut hanc sanctam Synodum, et omnes gradus ecclesiasticos benedicere, regere, et conservare digneris!*” and all the Fathers, in unison with the immense concourse of the faithful, took up the refrain: “*Te rogamus, audi nos!*” When the Litany had been finished, Cardinal Capalti sang the Gospel according to St. Matthew, XVI., 13, *et seq.* Then the Pope handed to Mgr. Valengiani, bishop of Fabriano, the text of the Dogmatic Constitution *De Ecclesia Christi*, the fourth chapter of which contained the decree on the pontifical infallibility; and ascending to the pulpit, the prelate read the document to the synodals, concluding with the formal question: “Most Reverend Fathers, do the decrees and canons contained in this Constitution please you?” Then each synodal was called by name, in accordance with his hierarchical dignity and his place in order of seniority, to pronounce his *placet* or *non placet*; the “scrutators” carefully recording each vote. When all had voted, the Secretary and the Prothonotaries of the Council approached the pontifical throne, and kneeling, announced to His Holiness that 535 Fathers had voted; 533 having declared *placet*, and only 2 *non placet*. The two prelates who distinguished themselves by their negative pronouncements, and whom Providence probably permitted to so act in order that it might be seen that the synodals enjoyed perfect freedom, were Louis Riccio, bishop of Casazzo in the late Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, and Edward Fitzgerald, bishop of Little Rock in the United States of America. When the result of the voting had been communicated to the Pontiff, he arose, and confirmed the decrees by his Apostolic authority.

(1) The Roman Pontiff alone, among all bishops, uses no crozier. It is said that this custom originated in the first centuries of the Church, in order to perpetuate the tradition, according to which St. Peter gave his crozier to St. Martial, that by its touch a companion of the latter might be restored to life.

The text of the Fourth Chapter of the First Constitution on the Church of Christ, which is a kind of introduction to the decree on the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, is as follows: "Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic Primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and Ecumenical Councils also have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: 'The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, Who said: Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church (1). These things which have been said are proved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic Religion has always been kept undefiled and her holy doctrine proclaimed. Desiring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion' (2). And, with the approval of the Second Council of Lyons, the Greeks professed that the Holy Roman Church enjoys supreme and full Primacy and pre-eminence over the whole Catholic Church, which it truly and humbly acknowledges that it has received with the plenitude of power from our Lord Himself in the Person of blessed Peter, Prince or Head of the Apostles, whose successor the Roman Pontiff is; and as the Apostolic See is bound before all others to defend the truth of faith, so also if any questions regarding faith shall arise, they must be defined by its judgment. (3) Finally, the Council of Florence defined (4): 'That the Roman Pontiff is the true Vicar of

(1) ST. MATTHEW, XVI. 18.

(2) From the Formula of S. Hormisdas, subscribed by the Fathers of the Eighth General Council (Fourth of Constantinople), A. D. 869.

(3) From the Acts of the Fourteenth General Council (Second of Lyons), A. D. 1274.

(4) From the Acts of the Seventeenth General Council of Florence, A. D. 1438.

Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church' (1). To satisfy this pastoral duty our predecessors ever made unwearied efforts that the salutary doctrine of Christ might be propagated among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care watched that it might be preserved genuine and pure where it had been received. Therefore the bishops of the whole world, now singly, now assembled in synod, following the long-established custom of Churches (2), and the form of the ancient rule (3), sent word to this Apostolic See of those dangers especially which sprang up in matters of faith, that there the losses of faith might be most effectually repaired, where the faith cannot fail (4). And the Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling Œcumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, defined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognized as conformable with the Sacred Scriptures and Apostolic Traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter that by His revelation they might make known new doctrine, but that they might faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And indeed all the venerable Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox Doctors have venerated and followed, their Apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error, according to the promise of the Lord which was made to the Prince of His Apostles: 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren' (5). This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and

(1) JOHN, xxi. 15-17.

(2) From a letter of St. Cyril of Alexandria to Pope St. Celestine I., A. D. 422.

(3) From a Rescript of Pope St. Innocent I. to the Council of Milevis, A. D. 402.

(4) From a letter of St. Bernard to Pope Innocent II., A. D. 1130.

(5) ST. LUKE, xxii. 32.

his successors in this Chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pasture of heavenly doctrine; that the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell. But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, we judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouchsafed to join with the supreme pastoral office."

The Definition of the Pontifical Infallibility was couched in the following terms: "Therefore, faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*—that is, when in the discharge of the office of Pastor and Teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church—is, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possessed of that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed that His Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church." It is difficult to comprehend how any statesman could have discerned any danger for the secular governments of Christendom in this Definition; how men like Gladstone, Bismarck, and Hohenlohe, could have fancied that the relations of the State with the Church would be of one kind, when a Pontifical Definition is obligatory on Catholics before the Church has assented to it, and of another kind when such a Definition needs the approval of the Church. To suppose that these statesmen were sincere in their anticipations of danger, would be to question their intellectual sanity; cer-

tainly their intelligence was not inferior to that of the Napoleonic Minister of Worship, Emile Ollivier, when he said to the bishop of Alger: "The question of papal infallibility is one of the internal affairs of the Church; it concerns her alone, and should be debated at Rome without interference." And is it not strange that none of these wise men of the world perceived that it was ridiculous for them, men who admitted neither the authority of the Roman Pontiff nor that of a General Council, to concern themselves as to whether the children of the Church recognized supreme authority in the Council rather than in the Pope, or in the Pope rather than in the Council? Were we to judge by the commentaries on the Vatican Council which Gladstone, Bismarck, Hohenlohe, and others of that ilk, emitted both before and after the assembly, we would believe that they credited the assumption which so many Protestants and infidels then cherished—that the Catholic Church had *deified* the Pope. "The Vatican Council," said the *London Times* of Feb. 17, 1877, "was so far the culminating yet utterly incomplete act in a drama elaborately arranged, step by step, to finish with the *deification* of the occupant of the See of Rome." Nor were such hysterics confined to the heterodox journalistic world; a polemical writer of some celebrity ventured to say in a work of some pretensions: "The same year which saw the overthrow of Cæsarism immediately after the plebiscite, witnessed also the Nemesis which overtook the spiritual pride of the Pontiff, now exalted to its highest pinnacle, and showed to him who arrogated to himself a *divine nature*, that God is a jealous God, Who will allow to none other the honor due to Himself" (1).

"In the Gospel of Jesus Christ," wrote Mgr. Dechamps, archbishop of Malines, "nothing is affirmed with such display of love and such wealth of expression, as the two dogmas which may be termed the heart and the head of the Church—the dogma of the Eucharist, and that of the supreme authority of Peter. It is not by veiling the first of these dogmas that the Church is to-day converting so many souls in Protestant England; on the contrary, these conver-

(1) GEFFKEN; *Church and State*, Vol. ii., p. 334.

sions are effected because the Church shows to her adversaries the heart of the God who lives in her tabernacles. And in the same manner the Church fears not to tear away the veil which unfortunate circumstances caused the Assembly of 1682 to throw over her face. The Church shows to all souls who seek God where they may find the words of eternal life in their fullness; and she makes this manifestation by the proclamation of that declaration, 'Thou art Peter, etc.,' with the same exultation with which she cites the words, 'I am the living bread which came down from heaven'" (1). Mgr. Mermillod, the illustrious victim of Swiss Protestant intolerance (raised to the Sacred College in 1891), said: "Jesus Christ has three existences,—His personal existence, which Arius contested; His sacramental existence, which Calvin denied; and that other existence, which completes the two others, and by means of which He continually lives, through His authority, in the person of His vicar. When the Council of the Vatican proclaims this third existence, it will finish the task of assuring the world of the possession of Jesus Christ" (2). But apparently these truths were not perceived by the survivors of Gallicanism and of German imperialism who proclaimed that a Definition of Papal Infallibility would disturb the peace and unity of the Church. These sincerely or affectedly timid souls had been accustomed to blame the supposed silence of Pope Honorius in the matter of Monothelitism as equivalent to formal heresy (3); and, nevertheless, they played the game of Sergius when they told Pius IX. that silence concerning papal infallibility should be the order of the day. St. Hilary would have reminded these gentry that peace and unity are certainly of inestimable value; but that "for the Church and the Gospel there is but one peace, 'that which resides in the truth which is in Jesus Christ.'" In all times we meet, observed the eloquent bishop who recently governed the see of St. Hilary, with certain insincere declaimers about peace and unity—"men who begin by separating

(1) Letter of Mgr. Dechamps, July 8, 1869, in the *Univers*, July 26, 1869.

(2) Discourse by Mgr. Mermillod in Rome, on the Octave of the Epiphany, 1869.

(3) See our dissertation on the alleged heresy of Pope Honorius, in Vol. I.

from the common teaching of the Church; who create a system, and form a school; and who, having begun hostilities against sacred tradition, then calmly appeal to the spirit of union in order to obtain at least a tacit recognition of their tenets. And there are always certain simple souls who, not perceiving the aggressive manœuvres of these schemers, are grieved and scandalized when the Church enters on a necessary defence" (1).

A favorite argument of the Catholic "inopportunist," before and during the Vatican Council, was based on their fear that a Definition of Papal Infallibility would render still more difficult the conversion of Protestants, schismatics, freethinkers, *et id omne genus*. Even had this fear been well-founded, it should not have prevented the promulgation of the dogma in question; since in order to avoid an accidental evil, it is not allowable to commit an essential one. The first duty of the pastoral charge, one that is incumbent without any thought of those who are outside the fold, is to foster the faith of the children of the Church; and the Council, inspired by the Holy Ghost (as every Catholic must believe), had deemed it necessary for the good of the Church to determine the dogma of infallibility with greater precision. And it must be remembered that, let things appear as they may, a Definition by a General Council can sin against charity no more than it can sin against truth. But is it true that the infallibility of the Pope renders the conversion of heretics, schismatics, and infidels more difficult than that conversion was in the days before the Council of the Vatican? Certainly rationalists and freethinkers are no better disposed toward the infallibility of the Church, than toward that of the Pontiff. These self-fanciedly strong-minded persons are restrained from submission to the Church either by crass ignorance, or by their pride, or by their passions. Were there a case of dogmatic difficulty in their minds, it would not be a question of infallibility, either of Church or of Pontiff; it would turn on the divinity of Our Lord, or on the existence of any supernatural order whatsoever. Rationalists, agnostics, etc., recognize no ecclesiastical infalli-

(1) Sermon by Mgr. Pie, delivered in Rome on the Feast of St. Hilary, 1870.

bility, because they will not admit that the Church is a divine institution ; if they regarded the Church as from God, they would concede her infallibility, and they would scarcely pause to ask whether that gift resided in the Church Universal, or in her head. But if they did inquire, probably they would prefer to find that the Roman Pontiff is the infallible teacher of things divine ; for, as the un-Catholic *Siccle* said, just before the Council : “ An exactly defined position is more appreciable than a state of confusion. And is not the infallibility of the Pope already a matter of fact ? And would it not be better to sanction as *de jure* that which is now *de facto* ? ” (1). As for the Eastern heretical Churches (whom an untheological phraseology styles “ schismatical,” merely because they possess a true priesthood), the Vatican Definition does not and cannot affect them. The oriental separatists hold aloof from Rome principally on account of the Catholic dogma of the Primacy of Peter ; if they could once resolve to trample on the pride with which Photius inoculated them, and to return to the Papal obedience which their ancestors acknowledged for eight centuries, they would not hesitate to proclaim the infallibility of the See of Peter. As for the effect which the doctrine of papal infallibility produces on Protestants, it is scarcely probable that if a Protestant of good faith once perceived that the Divine Saviour gave to His Church a monarchical government, he would not admit that the Pontiff is infallible as a teacher of religion. A fundamental error of all the Protestant sects is their view of the Church as a democracy ; like the oriental heretics, who see in the Church an aristocracy, Protestants reject the Catholic doctrine that the representative of Christ on earth is monarchical. Experience teaches that Protestants, once convinced of the general truth of the Catholic system, do not find the Vatican decrees an obstacle in their path to conversion.

The reader will scarcely expect us to devote time and space to a refutation of the stories of tumults, and even of violence, which the Protestant and infidel press of Europe and the United States described as having disgraced the

(1) Cited by Mgr. de Ségur, in his *Dogma of Infallibility*, p. 177. Paris, 1872.

Council of the Vatican. Only on two occasions, says Cardinal Manning, the ordinary calm and silence of the grave assembly were broken. "In its sessions no applause was ever permitted, no expressions of assent or dissent were allowed. The dead silence in which the members had to speak contrasted strangely with all other public assemblies. It was like nothing but preaching in a church. But on two occasions the speaker tried the self-control of his audience beyond its strength. Strong and loud expressions of dissent were made, and a very visible resentment, at matter not undeserving of it, was expressed. And yet nothing in the Council of the Vatican went beyond or even equalled events of the same kind in the Council of Trent. It is indeed true that one excess does not justify another; but the events prove that when men deliberate on matters of eternal import, they are more liable to be stirred by deep emotions than when they are occupied with the things of this world. When the prelates at Trent heard a speaker say that the archbishop of Salzburg claimed to confirm the elections of bishops, we read that they stirred up a mighty noise, crying: 'Out with him! 'Out with him!' Others repeated: 'Go out! Go out!' and others: 'Let him be anathema!' (1). Another turned to them, and answered: 'Be you anathema!' There may have been noise in the Council of the Vatican, but it did not reach this climax. Reference might be made to a certain debate on the 23d of March, in the year 1877, when the majesty of the Commons of England lost itself in clamor, chiefly because a majority declined to let a minority have its way. . . . It can be said with the simplest truth that not an animosity, nor an alienation, nor even a quarrel, broke the charity of the Fathers of the Council. They were opposed on a high sense of duty, and they withstood each other as men that are in earnest; if for a moment the contention was sharp among them, so it was with Paul and Barnabas; and if they parted asunder on the 18th of July, it was only for a moment, and they are now once more of one mind and of one heart in the world-wide unity of the infallible faith" (2).

(1) TREINER; *Genuine Acts of the Council of Trent*.

(2) The curious reader will find much information on this matter of discord among the

In our day the spirit of a pretended "Liberalism" has outlawed Jesus Christ, wherever it has predominated. It has banished His influence and His very name, so far as anything human or diabolic can banish them, from all national and social institutions over which it has succeeded in displaying its banner. It has overthrown the Christian basis of matrimony, and therefore has weakened the family tie; it has arrogated to its own exclusive hands the care and education of youth, and thus it has almost assured a succession of godless generations for the society of the future. The Council of the Vatican was convoked as a remedy for these and their innumerable consequent evils; its object was to unmask the enemy of Christian society, and to loosen the grasp of its Satanic hands. In proclaiming the infallibility of the Pope, this august assembly gave to the world a principle which regenerates authority; one which, in the course of time, will re-establish in society—so far as our fallen mortal condition will permit—order, peace, and unity. As Cardinal Antonelli well remarked, "the re-affirmation of the principle of authority in the Church and

synodals in the *History of the Vatican Council* by the Canon Eugene Cecconi, afterward archbishop of Florence, a work which was written by command of Pius IX., who communicated to the author all of the original documents. There is one lucubration, however, among those which were impudently exploited by the enemies of the Holy See during the first years which followed the Council, which we cannot pass unnoticed. This diatribe was entitled *Eight Months in Rome During the Vatican Council*, and it purported to be from the pen of an eye-witness who hid his identity under the pseudonym of *Pomponio Leto*. In Italy its frequent blunders caused it to be ridiculed, even by the opponents of the Holy See; but in England, and especially in Germany, it was hailed as an unanswerable argument against the Council. Who was *Pomponio Leto*? He must be a cardinal, replied all the schismatics *in posse*. And they ascribed the pamphlet to Cardinal Vitelleschi, who could not repel the insult, since he was dead. When the principal heterodox journals of England and Germany had rung the changes on the alleged disgust of Cardinal Vitelleschi with the decrees of 1870, decrees for which His Eminence had voted, the Marquis Angelo Nobili Vitelleschi, a brother of the deceased prelate, sent the following letter for publication in England:

"Rome, January 8, 1877.

"I am grieved beyond measure that there should be in England anyone who still persists in the will to believe that the author of the book entitled 'Pomponio Leto' was my lamented brother, Cardinal Vitelleschi. At the end of June last year, 1876, a protest was inserted in one English journal, signed by us, his brothers, in refutation of this odious calumny. I pray, however, that if thought fit, this renewed protest be inserted in some newspaper, by which I repel, on the part also of my brothers, this most false assertion. And I declare, with full certainty of my conscience, that Cardinal Salvatore Vitelleschi was not in any way the author of the said book; so that whosoever shall say the contrary falsifies shamelessly, and can only say it to outrage the Church of which my deceased brother was a member without reproach.

"(Signed) ANGELO NOBILI VITELLESCHI."

her head gives new strength and impulse to the civil power, which has the same divine origin and similar interests" (1). The Church has unhesitatingly torn off the veil which unfortunate circumstances allowed certain misguided men to throw over her, and thus to almost disguise her features; the work of the Assembly of the French Clergy in 1682 has been undone, and forever. Does the reader wonder how it came to pass that such eminent men as Bossuet denied the infallibility of the Pope? Well, few errors have not been received as truth by some eminent men. Luther and Calvin were not men of inferior mental calibre; and Saint-Cyran, Arnould, and Pascal, were pre-eminently intellectual. Gallicanism was born of the rage of Jansenists and parliaments against the Holy See. The former hated Rome because of her apostolic vigilance; and the latter hated her because she was the sovereign personification of that clerical element, of whose preponderance they were jealous. The two factions united to deceive Louis XIV., and to insinuate their spirit into that of many French bishops, and into that of the Theological Faculty of Paris. Fear of imaginary papal encroachments influenced the king; intimidations, promises of promotion, etc., affected many of the clergy. Grand as was the character of Bossuet, it was less grand than his genius. By approaching his weaker side, his tendency to what we may term monarcholatry, he was gained for the anti-papal cause; and if he did not write, he accepted the famous *Declaration of the Clergy*—a sort of Declaration of Independence, on the part of the king, against the Church; of the bishops against the Pope; and an assertion of the absolute rights of the crown over the bishops. In the conflict which followed, Louis XIV., more reasonable than his prelates, yielded, and withdrew his decree; but the bishops, led by Bossuet, persevered in their resistance. Finally, there appeared the celebrated *Defence of the Declaration*, generally (and perhaps mistakenly) attributed to Bossuet, which, according to Pope Benedict XIV., would have been put on the *Index*, had fear of schism not impelled Rome to leniency. As to the French ecclesiastics who have professed Gallican

(1) Instruction to the Papal Nuncio in France, Mch. 19, 1670.

principles in modern times, they have been actuated by national vanity, rather than impelled by distrust of the Vatican; and with very few exceptions, they have been more Roman than their theories. But Gallicanism is now a thing of the past, and it received its death-blow by an act which, according to its friends, was to endow it with renewed vigor.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### THE "OLD CATHOLICS" OR NEO-PROTESTANTS.

During several years previous to the convocation of the Council of the Vatican, anticipations of an imminent schism if the doctrine of Papal Infallibility were ever defined as a matter of faith, had been indicated in several countries by timid whisperings, and in Germany by open threats of rebellion. That an explosion of some kind, on the part of the religious freaks who vaunted themselves as "Liberal" Catholics, would take place on the first favorable occasion, had been made evident by the only partly-checked murmurs with which the promulgation of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception was greeted in 1854; by the unfounded and perhaps affected indignation which was displayed on account of the Mortara affair in 1857 (1);

(1) The Church has always held that once that Baptism has been received by an infant, no human power, not even that of the parents, has the right to relegate the child to the condition of infidelity or of heresy. The Church has always held that when the child of a Pagan or a Jew has received Baptism, that child is to be taken from the parental custody, if such procedure is possible. However, the Church has never lost sight of those parental rights which she has always defended against the usurpations of the State. Therefore it was that from time immemorial, in the States of the Church, in order to prevent any secret baptism of Jewish infants, the Jews were forbidden to employ Christian servants; and Christians were forbidden, unless in a case of imminent danger of death, to baptize a Jewish babe. The Roman Jews, especially those of the wealthier and more cultured class, frequently violated the Papal proscription in this matter; and in 1857 the government learned that the child of a Bolognese Jew, named Mortara, when apparently in danger of death, had been baptized by a Christian servant-maid. Pius IX. enforced the law. The boy was entrusted to the Regular Clerks who have charge of the church of St. Peter "in Chains" in Rome—the *Rochettini*; and in time, having manifested an ecclesiastical vocation, he mounted to the altar. If the Protestant, Masonic, and avowedly infidel press of that day had been consistent with its own principles, it would not have howled so lugubriously over this "violation of parental rights." In no country where the foes of Catholicism have power, do they hesitate to ignore these "parental rights" in the interest of heresy and infidelity. And we would note here that while the anti-Catholic and demagogic press, especially in England and the United States, feigned much sympathy; and the fanatics of Exeter and Faneuil Halls shed oceans of crocodile tears over the

but especially by the displeasure consequent on the publication of the Bull *Quanta cura* and its accompanying *Syllabus* in 1864. And the menaces of these "Liberal" gentry were not despised by those who were the most zealous in promoting the Definition, for they knew that after the Council of Nice, which had defined the Divinity of Christ, eighty bishops separated from the communion of Rome; that after the Ephesine Council, which condemned Nestorianism, and defined the Divine Motherhood of Mary, thirty bishops rushed into the outer darkness of schism and heresy; that after the Council of Chalcedon, which defined that there are two natures in Our Lord, all the Monophysites departed from Catholic unity; and that the definitions of the Council of Trent confirmed the separation of the progeny of Luther, Cranmer, and Calvin, from the Church of God. But like the Fathers of the first three, and of all other General Councils, the Vatican Synodals did their duty; they knew that just as the Arian, Nestorian, and Monophysite heresies were not consequences, respectively, of the Councils of Nice, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, so the Council of the Vatican would not be responsible for any revolt against its God-given authority. There can be no comparison between a General Council and a human legislature which calmly ignores truth when expediency insists on such action. A General Council must proclaim the truth; as Cardinal Manning well remarked in his *True Story of the Vatican Council*, any deviation from the truth, on the part of a General Council, would be an apostasy; "even silence as to the truth would be a betrayal of it." In the olden time some thought that Pope Honorius had been silent in regard to theological truth; and for this reason he was censured in the Sixth General Council (1).

wrongs of the Mortara family; not a word was said concerning the case of the Jewish boy, Rosenthal, a case in which parental rights were more flagrantly violated than in the Mortara affair. In 1867, this boy, Rosenthal, was taken from the Catholic Polish school "des Batignolles" in Paris, in which he had been placed by his father; and he was then confined by the defenders of parental rights in a Jewish asylum, despite his own protests and those of his father, the latter being prohibited to hold any communication with his son until he arrived at his legal majority. All this procedure was effected by order of the Jewish Consistory of Paris. See the *Courrier de Lyon*, Jan., 1868.

(1) See our Vol. i., ch. 35.

During the debates of the Vatican Council, many mentally short-sighted men, self-fancied good theologians, tried to induce Pius IX. to do that which Pope Honorius was said to have done; but Pius IX. remembered that truth was not to be treated lightly, even by a Roman Pontiff. The pontifical duty toward truth, said Manning, is to guard and declare it. "For this cause the Council of Trent defined every doctrine which had been unhappily denied or distorted in controversy from the year 1517. It ranged its decrees along the whole line of the Lutheran aberration. Was the Lutheran separation the consequence of the Council of Trent? After the close of the Council of Trent, the separations which were foreseen became complete; but from that hour the Council of Trent has renewed and governed the Church. . . . The Church has been reproached as Tridentine. No greater honor could be paid to the Council of Trent. The Church is Tridentine in the sense in which it is Nicene, and in which it will henceforward bear the stamp of the Vatican Council. Every Œcumenical Council leaves its impression upon it, and all these impressions are clear and harmonious. The Church is not like a *codex rescriptus*, in which the later writings obliterate or confuse the former, but like the exquisite operations of art in which the manifold lines and colors and tints are laid on in succession, each filling up what the other begins, and combining all into one perfect whole. But it is certain that after the Councils of Nice and of Trent, the Arian and the Lutheran separations made many to fear lest evil had been done, and to doubt the prudence of the Council. . . . But we must not measure all events by ourselves, nor must we make our own times so much the centre of all things as to think what is needless to us cannot be needed by others now and hereafter. Œcumenical Councils look not at individuals only, but at the whole Church, and not at what may be needed by any one so much as what the truth demands. When the generation of to-day is past, and they who may have opposed or reluctantly acquiesced in what was not familiar to their youth are passed away, when the definitions of the Vatican shall have pervaded the living world-wide

faith of the Church like the definitions of Nice and of Trent, then it will be seen what was needed in the nineteenth century, and what the Vatican Council has accomplished. Then, in due time, it will be perceived that never was any Council so numerous, nor were ever the dissentient voices relatively so few; that never was any Council so truly Œcumenical both in its representation and in its acceptance; that never were the separations after it fewer, feebler, or more transient; and that never did the Church come out from a great conflict more confirmed in its solidity, or more tranquil in its internal peace. . . . Facts win at last. The prophecies of separations which were to follow have come to naught, and the prophets are silent in the presence of visible unity. The Church is 'unresting, un-hasting.' It hears calmly the counsels of its adversaries and the compassion of those who wish it no good; but it holds its peace. Time works for it. If science can say: '*Homininum commenta delet dies, nature judicium confirmat,*' the Church can say: '*Cælum et terra transibunt, verba autem mea non præteribunt.*'"

It was not the Definition of Papal Infallibility that gave birth to the microscopic schism of the "Old Catholics," or, as they should have been styled, the "Neo-Protestants." The Definition was certainly the occasion for the manifestation of the petty monstrosity; but the parents were Prussian diplomacy and what was termed "German intelligence," the marriage of which at Munich, several months before the opening of the Council, was a conspiracy against the Church. The head of this conspiracy, if headship can be predicated of him who was but a willing instrument in the hands of Bismarck, was Döllinger, provost of the Cathedral Chapter of Munich, and for many years professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of the Bavarian capital. In days of a distant past, Döllinger had been one of that illustrious school which counted Joseph Görres among its leaders—a school which had extorted the admiration of even the Protestants of Germany, whom it kept within the bounds of decency. The provost had acquired a reputation as a professor and writer of ecclesiastical history; and Germans

regard certain passages of his works which defend the papal power which he afterward attacked, but which were written before an absurd adulation had turned his brain, as ornaments of their modern theological literature. Döllinger was seventy years of age when he conceived the idea of convoking a Congress of Catholic Theologians, which would convince all men that German theological science, and his own in particular, were truly phenomenal; and when the Holy See prohibited a continuance of such Congresses, because the provost and his adulators had seemed to forget that Christ had not confided the authoritative interpretation of His doctrine even to German professors, the entire "school of Munich" resented the prohibition as an insult to "German intelligence." Then the inflated professor began a series of public conferences on the temporal power of the Pope. The papal nuncio kindly attended at the first of these conferences; but when the prelate found that his presence was countenancing unjust criticisms of the government of the Pope-King, he left the hall. In order to defend the views he had expressed, Döllinger published a lengthy pamphlet, entitled *Church and Churches*, which did not help his ambition when the king of Bavaria named him for the see of Munich. Such was the man around whom were grouped all the elements which were hostile to the Holy See when the Council of the Vatican was convoked, and who was employed by Prussian diplomacy for its political purposes, and encouraged by Masourey for the actuation of its impious projects. Judging from a human point of view, one would have been justified in predicting a great measure of success for such a leader in the path of religious revolt. He had taught several generations of German ecclesiastics, many of whom then occupied eminent positions in the German hierarchy; and he flattered himself that so great was their admiration of his talents, so deep their affection for his person, that hundreds of them would follow when he would show the way. Then he was helped by what appeared to be a patriotic idea, a scheme which promised to work illimitable good for the German fatherland; he proclaimed the necessity, in the interests of Germany, of procuring religious

unity by removing from Catholicism everything that repelled Protestants from it, and which his judgment might regard as removable without injury to the deposit of faith. But when Döllinger raised his standard, he found that he had cherished an illusion in the matter of his personal magnetism. None of the German bishops rejected the decisions of the Vatican Council, although all of them had been strong "inopportunist"; and among the ecclesiastics of the second order, he raised for his diabolic enterprise a mere handful of recruits, very few of whom were remarkable for learning, and none of whom were noted for piety. The Prussian government had deluded itself with the fond hope that at least a portion of the German episcopate would draw so much encouragement from the Bismarckian intention to protect and reward all who would take a "patriotic" view of the dogma of Papal Infallibility, that they would shake the dust of the Vatican from their shoes, and enable the chancellor to found a National Church of Germany which would embrace Protestants and Catholics (and also Jews?). But the event proved that none of the German prelates believed in their own infallibility, as did the arrogant "German science" of the conspirators of Munich. Then a change came over the "patriotic" press of all Germany, and especially over the "reptile" press of Prussia. So long as the German bishops, in the exercise of that freedom which was allowed to all the synodals during the debates of the Vatican Council, had taken their stand with the "opposition," the official and Protestant journals had lauded their "truly German intelligence" and their sublime courage in resisting the "pressure of the court of Rome." As soon, however, as these same prelates bowed before the decision of the judges appointed by their Lord and Master, all good Germans were called to denounce their "besotted ignorance and pusillanimity." Then began that persecution which will engage our attention in the following dissertation—a persecution which the "Iron Chancellor" would never have undertaken, had not "Old Catholicism" appeared to him a powerful ally of that "historical necessity" which, according to him, was summoning Prussia to the height of power.

Frederick Fabri, one of the most fulsome of the flatterers of Bismarck, thus recognizes the intimate connection between "Old Catholicism" and "Borussianism": "That struggle (the so-called "War for Civilization") would have been difficult even for that great statesman in whose hands rests the future of more countries than Germany, if he had not been able to rely upon an ally in the religious camp. For this reason the 'Old Catholic' movement merits attention. Only by understanding that movement can we really comprehend the 'War for Civilization'; it explains how the ambition of the great statesman, who had just covered himself with glory by hitherto incredible exploits, was directed to new enterprises. The dream of many centuries, the unity of Germany, had been effected; the new empire had been constituted. Nevertheless, the best among our people deplored, as they had lamented for centuries, the religious dissensions of the Germans. Would it not be possible, after having put an end to political disorganization, to end all religious differences; to effect that long-desired separation of German Catholicism from Rome, and even to unite the discordant creeds in one National German Church?" (1).

From the day when the Prussian government took the arrogant professors of Munich under its protection in order to undermine, if possible, the authority of the Catholic Church in Germany, it manifested a paternal solicitude for the temporal welfare of the "patriotic" and "intelligent" tools of its policy. When the revolt had been proclaimed, the imperial chancellor deemed it wise to attempt a consolidation of the new heresy under the direction of a bishop who would be in reality an instrument of the German emperor. As a preliminary to this step, there was held in Munich, in 1871, a Congress of the "Old Catholics" for the purpose of discussing ways and means for procuring the formation of new parishes for their sect. Strange to say, Döllinger opposed this project; and when we read the speech which he delivered on this occasion, we feel that he was just then de-

(1) Cited by Mgr. Janiszewski, Auxillary Bishop of Posen and Gnesen, at one time Member of the Diet of Berlin, a Polish confessor of the faith in the Bismarckian persecution, in his *History of the Persecution of the Catholic Church in Prussia (1870-1876)*, p. 77. Paris, 1879.

bating as to the need of retracing his steps. "Once that you set up altar against altar; once that you oppose pastor to pastor, and commune to commune; you plunge into schism. If you tread the path which you are now laying out, you labor under a delusion when you assert that you still belong to the Catholic Church; for your acts will belie your words. You cannot claim rights which are utterly opposed to each other; but you attempt to do so, when you style yourselves members of the Catholic Church, and exercise her pastoral functions, while, at the same time, you assume the right of erecting separate parishes. If we are, and if we wish to remain members of the Catholic Church, we must recognize her actual constitution, her actual form, and to a certain extent, him who possesses the supreme authority. If we do not act thus, we become foes to a number of Catholic peoples. Our sole legal recourse must be defence. If any one does violence to our consciences, we have the absolute right to defend ourselves; but if we pass this limit, the whole world will tell us that we pretend in vain to belong to the Catholic Church. We will be told that our affirmation involves a patent contradiction; since at the same time we are founding a new Church, or, as the world styles it, a sect... I entreat you not to exhibit to the world such an inconsistency as is involved in a pretence of being Catholics, while you are founding a new sect... We ought to remain in the Church. I have passed all my life in studying the history of the Church; I know the beginning, course, and end of every sect and heresy. I know all the Churches well; not only the Catholic, but the Greek and Protestant, those of England and those of America; and I know whither division inevitably leads. Relying on this knowledge, I warn you not to form what the Catholic world styles a sect, and what will certainly be a sect." These words produced no impression in the minds of those who were already sectarians; and indeed they were soon ignored by the orator himself. In 1873 the "Old Catholics" held a Congress in Cologne, and chose Joseph Rein- kens, professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Breslau, for their bishop. This unfortunate, being unable

to find in the entire Catholic world a bishop sufficiently sacrilegious to consecrate him to the episcopacy, had recourse to the infinitesimal schismatical organization which still recalls the memory of Jansenism in Holland (1); and on Aug. 11, 1873, he was made a bishop by Heykamps, then the Jansenist bishop of Deventer. We have not been able to learn whether Heykamps assigned to his spiritual son any particular "title"; whether he regarded him as bishop of all Germany, or as merely a bishop *in partibus sacrilegorum*; but certainly the Jansenist prelate conferred no jurisdiction on Reinkens, since he himself did not even pretend to exercise any jurisdiction outside of Holland. The Roman Pontiff gave no jurisdiction to the prospective head of the "National Church of Germany." Whence, then, did the audacious leader of the "Old Catholics" derive his faculties? Undoubtedly from the man who made him a charge on the public purse, and who commissioned him as catechist-general for the German Empire. This source of jurisdiction was the recently proclaimed William I.; and by his attitude toward Reinkens he posed as the *Summus Pontifex Imperii*. "What a coincidence of facts," exclaims Mgr. Janiszewski, "deriving from the same principles, although separated by a distance of many centuries! The Roman emperors, in the days of Paganism, also held the office of supreme pontiff in religious matters. The object of the German government was evident. . . . It hoped that an episcopal authority, one able (ostensibly) to provide for all spiritual necessities, would prove to be an efficacious trap for the Catholics." And above all, Bismarck yearned for practical results. He had grown tired of the futile polemics of "German science" against the Church and the Papacy; and, as he said one day to some intimate friends: "I would cheerfully throw over all those erudite professors for one Kamienski" (2). That the unscrupulous chancellor had anticipated grand results from this creation of a phantom of a bishop for the sect at whose birth he had officiated as *ac-*

(1) See our Vol. IV., ch. 14.

(2) A subservient creature of Catharine II., who was rewarded with the see of Moscow.

*coucheur*, is evident from the following bombastic and inane utterances which his particular organ, the *North German Journal*, emitted shortly after the consecration: "According to the decrees of Eternal Wisdom, there must be a providential significance in the election of so grand a man to be missionary-bishop of all Germany. His consecration was performed in the ancient manner, conformably to the usages of the Church, and in the Apostolic Succession. . . . Just as the personality of Reinkens seems to indicate that he was created to be a reformer of the Catholic Church, so the time of his election and consecration was arranged by Providence in order to fructify the work of reformation, and to consummate, in his days, the religious unity of all Germany. . . . At the very moment, we may say, when the bishops of Prussia were refusing that obedience to the laws of the State to which they are bound by God and by their consciences, and when they were solemnly avowing their disobedience, Reinkens, that grand man who is so enthusiastic for all that is noble, and who is therefore devoted to the emperor and the empire, was elected and proclaimed *bishop of Germany* by a patriotic clergy and by seculars; and in the pastoral which he published immediately after his consecration, he declared that he would be a German bishop, with a German heart, and using the German language." The prognostications of this and other Bismarckian journals were falsified very speedily; and it is strange that acumen like that of the German chancellor did not perceive that an ally who cannot stand on his own feet is of little or no value. Only a semblance of life had been infused into the Neo-Protestants by the breath of a public opinion which had been created by fraud; by surrounding them with the dubious prestige of a "German intelligence" which boasted that it put the world to shame; and, finally, by rich governmental endowments and ostentatious governmental protection. The new sect began to show at once that it could not serve the cause of a German national religious unity; that it was incapable of preserving its own measure of religious truth. Not once did its members meet in synod without discarding some article of the faith which they had brought from their Mother Church, or

without abrogating some almost essential law of discipline.

On Oct. 7, 1873, Reinkens, as "a Catholic bishop in Prussia," took the oath of fidelity to the German emperor at the hands of Falk, the Prussian Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs and of Public Instruction. The imperial order, recognizing Reinkens as a "Catholic bishop," was couched in the form usually adopted in the recognition of legitimate bishops; but a change was made in the words of the oath before it was submitted to the schismatic prelate. Reinkens was made to swear not only that he would be faithful to his emperor and king, but also that he would obey "conscientiously *all* the laws of the State." Such a promise, which possibly could have been made with safety by a *Catholic* bishop in ordinary circumstances, since that prelate would naturally suppose that a State calling itself Christian would not command anything contrary to the laws of God, was, on the part of a man who knew well that the Prussian government was about to promulgate its diabolic "May Laws," an admission that he was merely a slavish creature of the cabinet of Berlin. Bismarck affected to be well satisfied with the docility of Reinkens, as manifested when the poor man took this oath; but the chancellor deliberately closed his eyes to the fact that by the recognition of a schismatic prelate as a "Catholic bishop," he himself had violated the laws of Prussia. At that time the relations between the Catholic Church and the Prussian government were regulated by the Concordat which was contained in the Papal Bull *De Salute Animarum*, a Bull which, by an imperial order dated Aug. 23, 1871, had been pronounced "a statute for the Catholic Church in Prussia, obligatory on all persons whom it concerned." This "statute" established eight bishoprics in Prussia, defining the limits of each diocese, and determining the manner in which the Cathedral Chapters, in concert with the government, should elect the bishops. It was the province of the Holy See to approve or annul the elections; and only when the Pontiff had approved an election, could the government, according to the "statute," acknowledge the elect as "a Catholic bishop." But in the case of Reinkens, the government recognized as a "Catholic bishop" a

ninth prelate, for whom, according to the "statute," there was no place in the Prussian hierarchy. And the government carried its audacity so far as to acknowledge as a "Catholic bishop" a man who had not been chosen, as the law demanded, by a Cathedral Chapter, but by a body which possessed no ecclesiastical status, and was mainly composed of seculars. Finally, the chancellor contemned the "statute," when he dared to introduce to the Germans as a "Catholic bishop" a man whom the Roman Pontiff had excommunicated by name. With reason, therefore, did Mallinckrodt thus reprove Falk, the agent of Bismarck, from his place in the parliament: "In the presence of the representatives of the State, and of the entire State, I accuse the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, the Minister who repeats continually that the laws of the State must be respected scrupulously, of having himself violated those laws. His crime is that of having, by an order of the cabinet dated Sept. 19, 1873, and countersigned by himself, recognized the bishop, Reinkens. I would make no objection if the Minister had recognized Reinkens as bishop of the 'Old Catholics,' or even if he had nominated ten such bishops; I would say nothing if he were to endow Reinkens with most extravagant revenues; but when he recognizes as a 'Catholic bishop' a man who has been chosen by the 'Old Catholics,' and when he thus ranks that man among the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, I declare that he violates the laws of Prussia."

From the day of its birth the new sect owed to the State the little of life which animated it; but not until July 4, 1875, did formal legislation sanction an endowment of the Neo-Protestant clergy. Bismarck had just procured the enactment of a law withdrawing from the Catholic clergy the subventions which had been secured to them by the Concordat of 1821, and which were merely a partial restitution of the property which had been stolen from the Church. The chancellor had avowed to the parliament that "he did not expect great results from the measure"—an admission which prompted the deputy of the Centre, Reichensperger, to charge the all-powerful Minister with

having effected the confiscation "simply in order to taste the sweetness of revenge." Of course the audacious deputy was called to order; but the parliament justified his remark when it endowed the "Old Catholics" from the funds just sequestrated from the Catholics. The new law gave to the sectarians, besides a liberal portion of the "dotations," the use of the Catholic churches and of the sacred vessels, as well as the right to bury their dead in the Catholic cemeteries—sacred places which were interdicted to the bodies of the excommunicated. The president of each province was to divide the sacred vessels between the Catholics and their enemies. If there were two churches in the parish, the same officer was to assign one to the Catholics, and the other to the sectarians. If there was but one church, different hours for divine service were to be appointed for each party. If it should happen that "a large number" of heretics were resident in the parish, and of course the president was to be the judge as to what constituted "a large number," then the parish was to be regarded as exclusively belonging to the dissidents. In illustration of the effects of this law, we may cite the case of the parishioners of Wiesbaden. They numbered 12,000, and they had only one church. Less than 250 "Old Catholics" applied to the president of the province to do them "justice" in the matter of the use of a church which had been built by Catholics for Catholic worship. The officer declared that thenceforth the sectarians should have the use of the church and of the sacred vessels, vestments, etc., from 11 A.M. to 1 P.M. The effect of this and of all similar decisions was to exclude the faithful entirely from the House of God; for on March 12, 1873, the papal nuncio at Munich had reminded the Catholics of all Germany that interdict descended on a church, chapel, or oratory, in which an excommunicated priest would have dared to celebrate Mass. Therefore, while their churches were being desecrated by heretics, and most probably by infidels who wished to make the number of the "Old Catholics" appear respectable, the Catholics of Wiesbaden, Koenigsberg, Dortmund, Hirschberg—to mention only some of the more flagrant instances of this outrage—were crowd-

ed in improvised chapels, assisting at Masses which were being celebrated by priests who were under the ban of the law, as we shall see in the following chapter.

While Germany was the fatherland of the New Protestantism, the pitiful abortion received a warm welcome in Switzerland; and just as it had owed its promise of life to the imperial authority in Germany, so it owed to the Masonico-Radical Swiss politicians of that day an ability to pose as something more than a purely national movement—as a Church apparently able to propagate itself in accordance with the commands of Christ. From 1866 the Swiss Radicals had steadily endeavored to Germanize and un-Christianize their country, and principally by means of the schools; their Paganizing programme had been designed to banish from every school all emblems of Christianity, every prayer to the Supreme Being, and everything which might convey a religious idea to the mind of a child. The autonomy of the cantons, however, proved to be an obstacle to the realization of this plan; and the Germanizing and Paganizing scheme would have been perforce abandoned, had not the birth of “Old Catholicism” seemed to prepare the way for its success. The plan of campaign now adopted was both simple and profound. Like Bismarck, the Swiss persecutors founded their procedure on the assumption that the decrees of the Council of the Vatican had changed the nature of the Catholic Church; but more logical than the Prussian, they feigned to regard the new religionists as Catholics, and the “Romanists” as separatists. The Swiss Catholic clergy, in spite of seduction and threats, remained faithful to the Holy See; but among the 50,000 priests of France it would have been indeed strange, if thirty or forty had not been found willing to incur excommunication, in exchange for “thirty pieces of silver.” It was with these thirty or forty unfrocked monks, or *curés* who had been interdicted by their bishops, and all of whom were foreigners, that the Swiss government essayed to found a National Catholic Church for the Helvetians. The campaign opened with the secularization of several abbeys in the northern cantons; and with the transfer of the Catholic Church in Zurich to

the sectarians. Then came the exile of Mgr. Mermillod, coadjutor to the bishop of Geneva; and the "deposition" of Mgr. Lachat, bishop of Bâle. The seventy-nine pastors of the Bernese Jura having declared, in writing, that they would remain faithful to their ordinary, they were driven from their parsonages, and finally from the republic. When it was found that France did not furnish apostates enough to supply the vacant parishes among the French-speaking Swiss, the government reduced these seventy-nine parishes to twenty-eight, and fined or imprisoned all who opposed the measure (1); then the foreign "Old Catholic" intruders began a semblance of such pastoral duties as could be performed where flocks were almost entirely wanting. In order to justify its robbery and other cruel treatment of the Catholics, the Swiss government pointed to the results of a plebiscite which it had caused to be taken in order to manifest the popular will, in reference to what it styled "a new organization of the Catholic religion in the Bernese Jura." It exultantly showed that while only eighteen thousand had voted for the "Romanist" side of the question, sixty-nine thousand had voted for the governmental measures; but it neglected to state that sixty-six thousand of its supporters in the plebiscite were Protestants, who certainly had no right to vote on a question in which the Catholic faith was involved (2). The same procedures were effected in Berne, in Geneva, and in all places which, formerly either French or Savoyard, the Helvetic Confederation had received, in 1815, from that notorious trafficker in nationalities, the Congress of Vienna; and whose religious liberty, like that of the Bernese Jura, the Swiss Federal Government had

(1) By this persecution of the Catholics of the Bernese Jura, the Swiss government violated the "Act of Union" of 1815, by which it engaged to grant perfect freedom of conscience, and all that it implied, to the Catholic Bernese, then transferred by the Congress of Vienna from France to the mercies of the Swiss. Of course, at the time of this contempt of international obligations, France was in no condition to punish the culprit.

(2) "Let us suppose, for instance, that in France, in order to determine whether the Protestant churches and the subventions from the State should be given to the Protestants who are called 'Liberal,' or rather to those who are faithful to the *Confession of La Rochelle*, recourse was had to the decision of the Catholic population, and that this naturally hostile majority therefore assumed to regulate the religion of the minority, a religion which it repels and detests. That is exactly what happened in Switzerland." VILLEFRANCHE; *Pius IX. His Life, His History, and His Times*, p. 467. Paris, 1878.

solemnly guaranteed. The robbery of the church of Notre Dame in Geneva was peculiarly aggravating; for not content with assigning to the Neo-Protestants the other Catholic church of the city, the government gave to them also an edifice which had been erected by means of subscriptions from every part of the Catholic world. The exiled Swiss clergy were received most fraternally in France. At first many of them had intended to pass the term of their banishment in Alsace, so recently French politically, and ever so French in heart; but Bismarck forbade their entrance into his master's new possession, and he induced the bordering cantons of Soleure and Bâle-Campagne to watch the frontier, lest some of the unfortunates should evade his orders. However, a portion of the ancient French-Swiss frontier still subsisted; and those Swiss who lived near to it, or who could possibly reach it on Sundays, had the happiness of hearing Mass, and of receiving the Sacramental aids which they then so sorely needed. In other parts of Switzerland, especially in the rural districts, the faithful were able to hear Mass, etc., whenever one of their hunted priests was able to reach them; barns and similar buildings taking the place of their stolen churches (1). Meanwhile the intruding "Old Catholic" priests were waiting in vain for congregations in the desecrated temples of the faith which they had forsworn; frequently they could not find a boy

(1) "Very frequently the exiled priests, thoroughly disguised, would appear at night, and for a few hours, among their parishioners. They would attend the sick, hear a few confessions, and celebrate Mass in some hut or cave; then, at the dawn of day, they would disappear. . . . Still more frequently, on Sunday morning, the high-roads leading to the French frontier would be crowded with entire families—the children toddling ahead, then the mothers marching bravely, and then the fathers guarding the rear of the procession—proceeding to the French frontier. They talked in whispers; every individual showed that spirit of recollection which is natural when a religious duty is being performed. Suddenly the groups arrive at a little village over which floats the Tricolor; they are in free, Christian, hospitable France. In the church, their proscribed and exiled pastor ascends to the altar. The chants of his parishioners accompany the tears of the exile; and when he turns to speak to his people, found once more, sobs answer sobs. Finally, the poor Swiss receive the blessing of their priest, and they bid him farewell; then they retrace their steps to their native soil, feeling that they are enchained once more, and that liberty is everywhere else but in their Jura. But protestations like these displease the Bernese prefect; he orders the imprisonment of all who presume to make these pilgrimages into France. The laws of free Switzerland allow all other kinds of public manifestations—processions of Freemasons, free-thinkers, with or without music and banners—but to prison with those who dare to go to France in order to pray!" VILLEFRANCHE; *loc. cit.*, p. 469.

who was willing to serve at the Sacrifice which they sacrilegiously offered. This state of affairs lasted until 1875, when the federal government requested the cantonal government of Berne either to prosecute the Catholic clergy according to law, or to allow them to appear in public like other citizens. There was little chance of a successful prosecution where no accusation of crime could be made; therefore the banishing edict was revoked. The priests of the Jura returned to their flocks; but not until the termination of Bismarck's "War for Civilization," according to which the Swiss Radicals had modelled their own anti-Catholic campaign, were some of their churches restored to them. But the hearts of the immense majority of their people had remained faithful to their legitimate pastors; and during the years that were to elapse before religious liberty would again be known in Switzerland, the Catholic clergy ministered to their spiritual children under difficulties similar to those which had surrounded the clergy of England before the Emancipation of 1829 (1).

Few as were the recruits mustered by the Döllingerites in Germany and Switzerland, still fewer were found in France; although before the decree *Pastor aternus* was promulgated, there had occurred on the soil of the Eldest Daughter of the Church several priestly apostasies which promised, according to the hopes of the school of Munich, to be followed by very numerous imitations. The most notorious of these priestly renegades was the ex-Carmelite, once known as Father Hyacinth, who then resumed his worldly name, Charles Loyson. A brief sketch of the career of this unfortunate will not be out of place. Charles Loyson was born in Orleans in 1827; but while still a child, his family removed to Pau, over the Academy of which city his father

(1) The following notification sent to a schoolmistress in 1876, that is, a year after the exiled clergy of the Bernese Jura were allowed to return, will demonstrate the condition of outlawry under which the Catholics of Berne still labored. "Mademoiselle: It is your duty, as an employee of the State of Berne, to do all in your power toward a realization of the State's desires concerning religious worship. If your conscience will not permit you to attend the church which is recognized and approved by the government, I leave you at liberty to frequent no church whatsoever; but since I wish that no bad example be given to the children who are in your care, I forbid you to ever go to the barn in which that dismissed priest officiates. I send you this warning, so that I may not be obliged to stop your salary. *The Inspector, W. ECKL.*"

had been placed as rector, when the government instituted Departmental Academies throughout the kingdom. In Pau, therefore, under the guidance of his father, the young Loyson made his classical studies, and he gave good promise of becoming, in time, an excellent poet. When eighteen years of age, he resolved to enter the ecclesiastical state, and he was admitted to the Grand Seminary of Saint-Sulpice in Paris. Having been raised to the priesthood in 1851, he taught philosophy in the Seminary of Avignon in 1854, and dogmatic theology in that of Nantes in 1856. Then he performed parochial duty for a year in the parish of Saint-Sulpice in Paris; and in 1857 he joined the Congregation of French Dominicans which had been recently founded by Lacordaire. He remained with the Dominicans, however, only two years; and he left them without having pronounced the religious vows. Then he betook himself to the Order of Discalced Carmelites, the rule of which is more severe than those of most of the monastic organizations; and after a novitiate of two years he made his solemn religious profession, assuming the name of Hyacinth. In later years, when Father Hyacinth had thrown his monastic tunic into the mud of disobedience, of apostasy, and of impurity, men wondered whether the poor wretch had not been dominated by ambition, when he took the three monastic vows; but it should have been remembered that if the Abbé Loyson had not been sincere at the time of his farewell to Saint-Sulpice—if he had looked forward merely to renown as an orator—he would have attained his ambition more easily as a Franciscan or as a Dominican, and with much less physical mortification as a Jesuit. We must suppose, therefore, that when, after his two years of novitiate, the Carmelite, Father Hyacinth, first appeared in the rôle of a preacher of “Conferences” in the cathedral of Bordeaux during the Advent of 1863, he was animated only by a zeal for souls. The course of sermons at Bordeaux, and another delivered during the Lent of 1864 at Périgueux, led many to almost believe that a successor to Lacordaire had been granted to the Church of the latter part of the nineteenth century; and when the certainly sympathetic orator preached the Advent sermons

of 1865 in the cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris, few were inclined to dispute the proposition. But in the following year, 1866, the conferences of Father Hyacinth on "independent morality"; and in 1867, those on "morality in the family"; seemed to be impregnated with a spirit of at least questionable orthodoxy. Louis Veuillot, the indomitable editor of the *Univers*, and easily the prince of modern journalists, attacked the preacher with such vigor and persistency, that the case attracted the attention of the Holy See. The Carmelite was summoned to Rome in 1869; he may have succeeded in justifying himself, as his friends asserted; but his short career as a preacher had terminated. A few weeks after his return from the Eternal City, he delivered a discourse before an international society of those innocents who hope that mere human reason will abolish war at some future time; and his audacious and foolish assertions completely justified the energy which Veuillot had displayed in attacking him. Among other sophisms and absurdities, he implicitly placed Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism, on the same plane; representing them as "the three great religions of the civilized peoples." His superiors soon commanded him to change his tone, or to abstain from public speaking. Then this monk, who had calmly and deliberately taken a vow of obedience to those superiors, wrote to the general of his Order a letter dated Sept. 20, 1869, announcing that he thereby abandoned all connection with the Carmelites, although, as he protested, he still regarded himself as a Catholic. By this doffing of the eowl without canonical dispensation, the monk Hyacinth was *ipso facto* excommunicated; and the Catholic world was prepared to hear that the foolish man "protested against the sacrilegious perversion of the Gospel," of which Rome was so flagrantly guilty. Nor were Catholics surprised when they heard that the ex-monk had discovered that "if France and the other Latin nations were victims of social anarchy, the principal cause of that misfortune was—not Catholicism, of course, but the manner in which Catholicism has been, for a long time, interpreted." In Sept., 1871, Loyson (he could no longer be styled "Father Hyacinth") attended the first Congress which

the "Old Catholics" held in Munich. Naturally the "victim of Roman intolerance" was received with an exuberance of apparent affection by men whom he apostrophized as forming "a protest against that condition of antagonism and hatred which the violent and the sophistical would make the normal state of Christian peoples." Having entered this mutual admiration society, Loyson necessarily saluted Döllinger as "his master," and as "the patriarch of science and of German consciences." It had now become too apparent that the ex-Carmelite had made shipwreck of his faith; and in the latter part of 1871, his brother, the Abbé Thomas Loyson, professor of theology in the Sorbonne, openly disowned him—a proceeding which Charles hypocritically declared to be "the last drop in his chalice of woe." Perhaps it was in order to assuage this grief that in 1872 he took to himself a "wife" in the person of an American widow whom his efforts, joined to those of the famous Oratorian, Gratry, had converted to Catholicism, and to whom, in 1868, he had given her first Communion in the chapel of the Ladies of the Assumption in Auteuil (1). Shortly after the celebration of this sacrilegious union, Loyson accepted an invitation to become the pastor of the "Old Catholics" of Geneva; but to his credit be it remembered that he refused to take possession of the magnificent new church which the exiled Bishop Mermillod had built with the offerings of the Catholic world, and that he never ceased, while in Geneva, to protest against the brutality of the German and Swiss persecutors of their Catholic fellow-citizens. Loyson remained in Geneva less than two years; he found that the lay Popes of Switzerland were more tyrannical than His Holiness of Rome. On Aug. 4, 1874, he severed his connection with the Neo-Protestants by the following letter which he sent to the Swiss Federal Council: "Gentlemen; attached as I am, from the depths of my heart, to the Church in which I was baptized, and the reformation of which, not its destruction, I desire; and convinced as I am by an experience which is at last sufficient, that the Liberal Catholicism

(1) On this occasion Father Hyacinth pronounced the discourse which was published in 1872, under the title: *The Catholic Reformation*.

of Geneva is neither Liberal in politics nor Catholic in religion; I have the honor of tendering to you my resignation of the pastorship of this city." A reliable author who knew Loyson well, and whose assertions are always characterized by a judicial calm, tells us that just before this resignation of his "Old Catholic" pastorate, Loyson had made a retreat in the Grande Chartreuse, the monks being unaware of his identity; and that his exactness and recollectedness had edified the entire community (1). If this be true, and certainly there is no intrinsic reason for denying the fact, we can only suppose that had the American widow not stood in his path, Loyson would then have shown that he still believed what he had preached in Notre-Dame, immediately after the publication of the *Syllabus*: "The Church is personified in the Bishop of Bishops, the Father of Fathers, the Roman Pontiff; I submit my words, as I submit my soul, to his supreme authority. Ah! I imbibed respect and love for the Holy See with the milk I drew from my Christian mother; and with the grace of God, I shall preserve this obedience intact and triumphant even unto the tomb." From the day when he spurned the yoke of the progeny of Calvin, the ex-Carmelite acknowledged no ecclesiastical supremacy. Returning to Paris, he found that the Ministry of the Third Republic, anti-clerical though it was, would not tolerate any public Conferences on his part; it was only in 1877 that he was allowed to give a series of "private reunions" in the Circus. For a time these exhibitions "drew well"; but in 1878, Loyson announced to the world a projected resurrection of the "Gallican Church." Since no assistance for the enterprise could be obtained in France, the self-appointed "rector" of the imaginary "Church" appealed to the Protestants of England and the United States, not one in a thousand of whom had the slightest conception of the meaning of "Gallicanism." But the scheme was evidently anti-Roman; therefore there was some response to the request for contributions which was made by the Anglican incumbents of Canterbury and Lincoln, by Dean Stanley of Westminster, and by many of

(1) 7 3 NOIR: *The Adaptation of the Dictionary of Bergier to the Intellectual Movement of the Last Half of the Nineteenth Century*, art. Loyson. Paris, 1882.

the Protestant Episcopal dignitaries in the United States. The new "Gallican Church" was inaugurated with considerable noise in a little *café-chantant* in the Rue Rochechouart; and curiosity gave to it a semblance of life for some months. In 1880 Loyson impudently demanded of the Municipal Council possession of the church of the Assumption for the purposes of his "religion"; but the Council thought that the desired building was too large for the "Gallican" congregation. During the short connection of Loyson with the "Old Catholics," he naturally followed their ritual in his religious services; thus while he still recited the Canon of the Mass in Latin, he used the vernacular for the other portions. But when he posed as a restorer of that Gallicanism which would have spurned him, he quite consistently invented a liturgy. As a foe to antiquity, he was obliged to discard every vestige of Latinity; therefore, he recited even the Canon of the Mass in French. He abolished the altar, and like the Protestants with their "Lord's Supper," he used a simple table, and always faced his congregation.

If we except the names of Döllinger, Reinkens, and Loyson, those of all the luminaries of "Old Catholicism" are already forgotten. Who now attaches any significance to the names of Friedrich, Schulte, Huber, Reusch, Langen, Michaelis, Weber, and Maassen, who prognosticated such glory for the Neo-Protestantism among the Germans and Swiss; or to the names of Michaud, Junqua, and Guettée, who declared that the best part of Catholic France would follow them in revolt? As for the few thousands who assembled for a time under the standards unfurled by these designing or deluded men, most of them either returned, ere long, to the true fold of Christ, or plunged into the abyss of infidelity; the few who continued to parade themselves as Catholics of the ancient stamp were either Protestants in disguise, or Catholics whose faith had been lost, to all intents and purposes, long before the Vatican Council was held. To-day the curious traveller may come across a few bands of so-called "Old Catholics" in Germany and Switzerland. Such aggregations now and again proclaim their existence among the more ignorant of the Germans and Slavs who dwell in our Far-

West ; but a short conversation with their members will show that they are either deluded followers of some excommunicated disgrace to his cloth, or else persons who are utterly ignorant of Catholic doctrine. Nor could any other condition of affairs be possible, since the fundamental idea of "Old Catholicism" is absolutely subversive of that Catholic faith which the Neo-Protestants claim to profess. They pretend to cling to every particle of the Catholic teaching as it was before the promulgation of the Vatican decrees of 1870. And nevertheless, they deny the infallibility of the Pope—a doctrine which has been proclaimed by the entire teaching body of the Catholic Church, of that Church which they affect to recognize as infallible in matters of faith and morals.



# CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

## CENT. XIX. (Part I.)

CHAP.	PAGE
I. The Pontificate of Pius VII . . . . .	1
II. The Pretended Divorces of Napoleon and Jerome Bonaparte. . . . .	56
III. The Struggle of Polish Catholicity with Russian "Orthodoxy." . . . .	72
IV. The Martyrdom of the Nuns of Minsk. . . . .	145
V. The Emancipation of the Catholics in the English Dominions. . . . .	159
VI. The Pontificate of Gregory XVI. . . . .	237
VII. Lacordaire and Lamennais. . . . .	272
VIII. Ozanam. . . . .	303
IX. Montalembert and the Struggle for Freedom of Education in France. . . . .	320
X. Dupanloup. . . . .	349
XI. Rationalism and its Consequent Aberrations of Modern Philosophy. . . . .	363
XII. The Revival of Christianity in Japan. . . . .	390
XIII. The "Oxford Movement." . . . .	434
XIV. The Carbonari. Mazzini and "Young Italy." . . . .	480
XV. The Pontificate of Pius IX. . . . .	505
XVI. The Council of the Vatican (19th General). . . . .	571
XVII. The "Old Catholics" or Neo-Protestants. . . . .	607









BW912 .P26 v.5  
Studies in church history,

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 8438