



Columbia University
in the City of New York

THE LIBRARIES



Gift of
Gen. William J. DorioVán

STUDIES

IN

CHURCH HISTORY,

BY

REV. REUBEN PARSONS, D. D.

“ 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. 2.

VOL. VI.
CENT. XIX. (Part II.)

SECOND EDITION.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,
NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

1901.

Imprimatur:

✠ MICHAEL AUGUSTINUS,

Archiepiscopus Neo-Eboracensis.

COPYRIGHT, 1900,

REV. REUBEN PARSONS, D. D.

Gift of
Gen. William J. Donovan
MAY 1 - 1958

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI.

CENT. XIX.—(PART II.)

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. The Bismarckian So-Called "War For Civilization.".....	1
II. Freemasonry in Latin America. Garcia Moreno, the "Modern St. Louis.".....	44
III. The Clerical Victims of the Commune of 1871.....	85
IV. The Third French Republic as a Persecutor of the Church.....	111
V. A Fighting Clergy and the Ecclesiastical Canons.....	132
VI. The Pontificate of Leo XIII.....	139
VII. Pope Leo XIII. and the Third French Republic.....	203
VIII. Pope Leo XIII. and the Home Rule Movement in Ireland.....	216
IX. Pope Leo XIII. and the English People. The Decision on Ang- lican "Orders.".....	225
X. Pope Leo XIII. and the Austrian Empire. The Questions of Mixed and Civil Marriages in Hungary.....	236
XI. Pope Leo XIII. and the German Empire.....	265
XII. Pope Leo XIII. and the Russian Empire.....	283
XIII. Pope Leo XIII. and African Slavery. The Apostolate of Car- dinal Lavigerie	291
XIV. Pope Leo XIII. and the Educational Question in Belgium.....	310
XV. Pope Leo XIII. and the Church in the United States of America: The School Question. "Cahenslyism." The Condemnation of So-Called "Americanism.".....	319
XVI. Pope Leo XIII. and Socialism. The Labor Question.....	354
XVII. The "International" and Anarchism.....	383
XVIII. The Vagaries of Father Curci, S. J.....	400

CHAPTER	PAGE
XIX. The Apostasy of Dœllinger.....	413
XX. Louis Veuillot.....	427
XXI. Cesare Cantù, Prince of Modern Historians.....	441
XXII. The Place of the Miraculous in History. The Miracles of Lourdes.	448
APPENDIX : Chronological Tables, showing the Roman Pontiffs. Principal Rulers, Councils, Ecclesiastical Writers, and Sectarians, During Century XIX..	493
SUPPLEMENT.	
I. The Identity of the Three " Magi " or Wise Men of the East.....	497
II. The Legend of the Wandering Jew.....	502
III. The Alleged Idolatry of Pope St. Marcellinus.....	510
IV. Consecrated Virgins Among the Early Christians.....	520
V. Some Salient Features of the Middle Age (Complement of Chap. I, Vol. II.)...	529
VI. The Conversion of the Franks. The Alleged Cruelties of Clovis and of St. Clotilda.....	585
VII. The Reign and Character of St. Louis IX. The Calumnies of Michelet on this Monarch.....	614
VIII. The Sieges of Rhodes ; Episodes in the History of the Soldier- Monks...	646
IX. The Fable of the Two-Wived Count of Gleichen.....	666
X. The Controversy on the Chinese Rites.....	671
XI. Heterodoxies of Russian " Orthodoxy ".....	687
GENERAL TOPICAL INDEX.....	717

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE BISMARCKIAN SO-CALLED "WAR FOR CIVILIZATION."

After the persecution of Mgr. Dunin, archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, and of Mgr. Droste-Vischering, archbishop of Cologne (1), the Prussian government accorded a period of rest to its Catholic subjects; and when the Constitution of 1850 had been wrung from Frederick William IV., the situation of the Catholics became at least tolerable, principally because of the creation of a "Catholic Department" in the Ministry of Worship and of Public Instruction—an institution, the benefit of which has been persistently exaggerated by German enemies of the Church, but which certainly enabled the Prussian Catholics to lay their complaints before their government. The Catholics of Prussia were grateful for this and other petty instalments of justice; and the Catholics of other German states so far forgot the almost constant history of the northern kingdom as to believe that it could desire to treat their religion with something approaching to equity. When the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 had been declared, and the Bavarian Diet was hesitating as to the course to be pursued by the Cabinet of Munich, one of the most influential leaders of the Catholic party, Peter Reichensperger, persuaded his colleagues to vote for the Prussian alliance. No more convincing proof than this fact can be needed to demonstrate that the Catholics of Germany trusted the government of Prussia at that time. But they did not know the spirit of that government, remarks one of its victims (2), as it was

(1) See our Vol. v., p. 254 and p. 257.

(2) *History of the Persecution of the Catholic Church in Prussia (1870-1876)*, by Mgr. Janiszewski, Auxiliary Bishop of Posen and Gnesen, Formerly Member of the Diet of Berlin. Paris, 1879.

known by the Polish subjects of the Hohenzollern—by those heroic Poles, whose complaints against the government of Berlin the deluded German Catholics were then wont to deride. The Catholics of Germany seemed not to realize that their co-religionists of the Rhenish Provinces were treated with comparative gentleness, simply because of their geographical position ; because of their proximity to the French frontier. “It was a great fault on our part,” said another victim, Mgr. Ketteler, bishop of Mayence, in the preface to one of his writings, “to have believed in the stability of the Prussian Constitution, in the rights which it plainly allowed us. We were blamable for having believed that in Prussia justice could triumph over the inveterate prejudice against Catholics, and over party passion. We were deceived ; but the fault is not one which should cause us to blush.” As for William I., the Catholics had indeed felt some anxiety when he mounted the throne in 1861, and precisely because of his Masonic affiliations ; but like his chancellor, William I. was apt at dissimulation. At as late a period as 1870, just after the new German Empire had been proclaimed at Versailles, and when the dogs of persecution were about to be unleashed against his too faithful Catholic subjects, the “pious and loyal” emperor-king feigned an affectionate interest in the independence of the Holy See which no Catholic monarch of the time manifested. Replying to an address from the Knights of Malta of the Rhenish Provinces and of Westphalia, he said : “I regard the occupation of Rome by the Italians as an act of violence ; and when this war is ended, I shall not fail to take it into consideration, in concert with other sovereigns.” But the reverberations of the last cannonades of the Franco-German war had scarcely died away, when the blindly loyal Prussian Catholics found themselves denounced, threatened, and finally crushed ; and many of the priests and Sisters of Charity, who were brutally thrust out of the empire, had just been decorated by the persecutor in testimony to their heroic care for the German wounded, both Protestant and Catholic, during the recent struggle.

At that time Catholics wondered, and ever since those days they have wondered, as to the earthly reason for this

persecution. Of course, the prime motive was to be sought in the implacable hatred of the powers of hell for the Church of God; but by what arguments had Satan induced "German intelligence" to become his instrument in the attempt to render the Hohenzollern successful in a task which had been impossible to the Hohenstaufen? Some discerned the cause of the persecution in the revolutionary principles adopted by Prussia before 1866, and which were then applied—principles which logically implied the direst consequences (1). Others ascribed the madness of the "Iron Chancellor" and of his imperial tool to the arrogance which had resulted from the war in which Germany, aided by the anger of God against France, had been so unexpectedly successful—an arrogance which seemed to ask: "Who is our God?" These latter speculativists deemed it not unnatural that Prussia, born of sacrilege, should have conceived the idea that to her was reserved the "historical mission" to complete the work of Luther. However, the Prussian government itself, its official and its "officious" press, and its agents among the deputies of parliament, endeavored to justify the barbarous "War for Civilization," firstly, because the Vatican Council had defined the dogma of Papal Infallibility; secondly, because the Catholic Church had "assumed an attitude of aggression against the laws of the State"; and thirdly, because the Catholics had contributed to the formation of the parliamentary party which was styled the Centre, and which Bismarck stigmatized as a "mobilization against the State." In regard to the first excuse, first formulated by Bismarck in a despatch dated May 14, 1872, and which was acclaimed by "German intelligence" as though it believed that the Roman Pontiff was about to lead several millions of soldiers who would force all heretics and Jews to obey his behests, we need only say that less than four months before he wrote this despatch, that is, on Jan. 30, the chancellor had declared that it was the duty of the State to abstain from all interference in the dogmatic teachings of the Church. On this occasion, during a parliamentary discussion as to whether the "Lutz

(1) JANISZEWSKI; *loc. cit.*, p. 11.

Law," subjecting the pulpit to police supervision, should be applied also to primary schools, Bismarck said: "The Prussian government is very far from wishing to enter on any dogmatic disputations concerning the changes (*sic*) in the teachings of the Catholic Church; for every one of those teachings, which are received by so many German citizens, ought to be sacred for both the nation and the government." As for the second excuse, the pretense that the Church was guilty of "aggressions" on the authority of the State, the chancellor never pretended to substantiate his charge; when summoned in parliament to produce his proofs, he simply replied: "Search in your hearts, gentlemen!" and the Liberals exploded with laughter, because of what they deemed a side-splitting joke. The most bitter reproaches, on the part of the Catholic deputies, never induced the persecutor to defend his course with anything else than bare assertion; hence it was that in the session of Feb. 4, 1874, Mallinckrodt thus reproved the Minister of Public Instruction: "The deputy, Reichensperger, in his last discourse on this matter, frequently asked the Minister for proofs of his allegations, but the Minister thought proper to remain silent. As for me, I must regard this course as worthy of an intelligent man; but only in the supposition that the Minister could give no satisfactory reply. But in spite of this silence, the government, realizing that it ought to show the world that it is obliged to defend itself, and knowing that it cannot justify its conduct, continually advances, in all of its arguments for new laws, innumerable assertions which it presents as axioms. Thus to-day, in the first paragraph which treats of its motives, it tells us of 'proceedings which are hostile to the State,' of a war 'which is forced on the government,' and of 'means which the State must adopt in its own defence.' There is as much truth in all these axioms as there was in the famous announcement of the wolf to the lamb in the ancient fable." The third excuse, the pretended crime of the Catholics in helping to form the party of the Centre, a party which was composed of Protestants as well as of Catholics; every man of sense in Germany knew well that the object of the Centre was not to curtail the prerogatives of

the new empire, but solely to uphold the principles which are preservative of true liberty and real civilization, principles which Bismarck had threatened from the moment of the triumph of Germany over France. After the war with Austria in 1866, it became evident to all the conservatives of Prussia that the royal chancellor had taken Cavour for his model; and after the Franco-German war, when a false Liberalism began to dominate all Germany, the fears of the conservatives were augmented, although many still retained some confidence in that William I. who had so persistently talked about God in all his telegrams from the battle-fields of France, and in that Bismarck whose conservatism had been so absurdly extravagant since 1848. But the mask soon fell from the faces of both emperor and chancellor; and then, in the spring of 1871, a few of the principal conservatives (1) met in Berlin, and drew up the following programme of political action: "I. To defend as a fundamental principle, the federal character of the German Empire (*Justitia fundamentum regnorum*), and consequently to prevent, by every possible means, any change in the federal character of the Constitution of the empire, and to yield not one particle of the independence of the several states, unless such concession should be absolutely necessary for the integrity of the said empire. II. To uphold, as far as possible, the moral and material welfare of all classes of the population; and to endeavor to procure Constitutional guarantees for civil and religious liberty, and above all for the rights of religious associations, against the violence of the legislature. III. Guided by these principles, the party (of the Centre) will deliberate on all subjects presented in the imperial parliament; but its members will always be free to vote in a sense contrary to that of the majority." Certainly there was nothing in this programme which could justify the Bismarckian assertion that the Centre was a "mobilization against the State."

What were the true causes of the pretended "War for Civilization"? The prime author of the persecution was

(1) Savigny, Windhorst (of Meppen), Mallinckrodt, Probst, Reichensperger (Olpe), Löwenstein, and Vrajtag.

Eismarck; but it is certain that the idea of such a movement would not have been conceived even by that self-confident personage, had he not found the way for it already prepared—had he not found in nearly every German Protestant, Jewish, and infidel mind, a number of notions which had attained the dignity of axioms, and which had only waited for Prussian development in order to actuate themselves in a persecution of the Catholic Church. The first of these notions was that of the omnipotence of the State, the Cæsarism of ancient Paganism, which regarded the people as existing for the State or emperor, ignoring the rational conception that the State or emperor should be for the people. "These instinctive ideas which dominated in Prussia after the Reformation," says Janiszewski, "were soon systematized by German philosophy; Fichte effected much in this regard, but the Pantheism of Hegel, with its theory of an absolute State, perfected the system. That which the French Revolution actuated in a moment of delirium, German philosophy reduced to precision, recognizing as a supreme being a certain *absolute* which, according to the various systems, is sometimes ideal, and sometimes material. This absolute idea, this supreme *something* with various names, is by its own nature without reason and without consciousness. Thus Hartmann, one of the latest philosophers of that school, called its teaching 'the philosophy of that which has no consciousness of itself.' That which the Christian world has always termed 'God' is, according to that school, an ideal unity, a *Universal All* which has an existence only in the imagination of its adherents. This creation of the unregulated mind of man is, to speak clearly, a complete deification of man: and since, according to this system, the State is collective individualism endowed with power, it follows that the system is the deification of the State. The relation of man to the State is that of a drop to the ocean in which it is lost. . . . No wonder that with such theories for a foundation of philosophy, we hear men demanding a National Church! If God is confined within the limits of a nation, of a State, how can the Church, established for His glorification, be universal? . On theories like

these rests all science in Protestant Germany, and especially in Prussia. On these principles are based history, the natural sciences, political economy, and above all, Public Law. From the chairs of the Universities these ideas spread into the *gymnasia*, where professors and students, often in good faith, advocate principles and opinions whose baneful nature they do not perceive, believing that through them they will attain the light of true civilization. This doctrine has penetrated all Prussian intelligence, especially in the bureaucracy, from the Ministers down to the ushers; and the journalists propagate it among the people, without understanding it themselves. The enlightened men of Prussia have been trained in these ideas (1). I know not whether the authors of the persecution really proposed to annihilate Christianity; but it is indubitable that, starting from such principles, and holding such opinions concerning the State, they struck at the heart of Christianity." Based as it was on the principles just described, it is not strange that "German science" should have entertained an extravagant idea of "the historical mission of Prussia," that mystical thing which was known as "Borrussianism," and which was interpreted according to his own whims by every heterodox politician, Protestant theologaster, and socialistic dreamer in Prussia, although all of these united in denying the right of existence to any school of thought which opposed their fantastic doctrinarianism. It was this "Borrussianism" that threw Austria out of Germany in 1866 (2); and under the guidance of Bismarck it became the chief instrument in the latest German persecution of the Church. And it may be well to note here that in Bismarck, the chief among the

(1) In his famous book entitled *The Reptile Fund*, Henry Wütke, professor in the University of Leipsic, cites a remark made in the public court at Mayence, on Dec. 19, 1873, by the imperial procurator, Schoen: "The emperor is a sacred person, whose majesty is superior to all the laws of the State."

(2) "During many years, the Prussian journals, and those which were sold to Prussia, used the phrase, 'The Mission of Prussia in Germany,' to hide the greed of conquest which tormented the Cabinet of Berlin. After the victory of Prussia (over Austria) in 1866, most of these journals went into transports of joy because Prussia had happily realized the 'unity of Germany.' But a third of the Germans had been excluded from Germany, and these gentry prated about the unity of Germany. This unity of Germany, as it really exists, means that the lesser sovereigns have become Prussian prefects." WÜTKE; *The Reptile Fund*, French Transl., p. 158.

latest apostles of "Borrussianism," such a thing as *German* patriotism was an unknown quantity during the greater part of his active political career. After 1848, he belonged to the Prussian party which was known as the "Junkers," a party which was so exclusively Prussian, that it hated the mention of German unity, and was wont to distinguish itself by fastening the German cockades to the tails of dogs. Alluding to this "Borrussianism" of the "Junkers," Mgr. Janiszewski declared in the Diet of Berlin, and not one voice contradicted him, that Bismarck, the vaunted German patriot, had hitherto been one of those who lamented: "What a pity it is that no one has yet invented a Prussian language, so that we may not be obliged to speak in that beggarly German tongue!" (1). Unless one remembers the deep significance of this "Borrussianism," he will be unable to account for the wicked absurdities of the "War for Civilization"; with its meaning well fixed in his mind, he will be surprised by none of the extravagancies which it originated.

(1) "Bismarck was generally known as an ardent Prussian patriot, as a votary of the House of Hohenzollern; but never as a *German* patriot. He wished to see Prussia, and its reigning family, great and powerful; as for Germany, he regarded it as a neighbor which might be easily conquered, and thus become a means for the aggrandizement of Prussia. Because Bismarck, at a convenient moment, raised the standard of German nationality, are we to consider him a German patriot? Did he not act similarly in Bohemia and Hungary, during his war against Austria? His love for a nationality lasted as long as his interests demanded such affection. The *Memoires* of General La Marmora demonstrate the Prussian patriotism of Bismarck; he always placed Germany in the rear. If Germany was to have been governed by the House of Hapsburg or by that of Wittelsbach (Bavaria), would the patriotism of Bismarck have upheld German unity? Would he not rather have used every means to prevent that unity, as he did in 1848 and the ensuing years? A true patriot considers only the unity of the nation; he places provincial or dynastic interests in a secondary position. If we Poles were to-day so happy as to be able to unite the fragments of our dismembered country, would we dispute as to what family should wear the crown of Poland? Would we, merely for a matter of minor importance, rebel from the unity of Poland seven or eight millions of our brethren, as Bismarck did in the affair of the Austrian-Germans? The sole object of Bismarck was to clothe all Germans in the Prussian uniform, and to put a Prussian helmet on every German head. It was no patriotic enthusiasm for Germany that impelled the chancellor to war on the Catholic Church; he was impelled by the deeply-rooted ideas of Prussia concerning its 'historical mission,' and by the Prussian greed of glory, which had been excited by its recent and unexpected successes. This intellectual and psychological disposition, raised to the superlative by success, so blinded Bismarck, that he persuaded himself that the 'historical mission' of Prussia—or, as it would be termed in Christian language, the 'providential mission'—reposed entirely on his shoulders; that he alone was called to conquer the enemy of the State-Absolute, an enemy which no power of earth had yet been able to subdue. *Quem Deus punire vult, dementat.*" JANISZEWSKI; *loc. cit.*, Ch. 2.

Besides the theory so generally received in Prussia concerning the State-Absolute, and the fantastic notion of a "historical mission" on the part of the Brandenburgers, there were other causes of the "War for Civilization." One of these was Protestant hatred of Rome; but that sentiment externates itself so naturally, whenever opportunity is offered, that we are absolved from any necessity of showing, at any great length, how it influenced the chancellor during the prosecution of the most tremendous of his enterprises. Of course there are not wanting publicists who would have us believe that the prime motive of Bismarck, when he entered on the "War for Civilization," was not the destruction of the Catholic Church in Germany; that his great object was the annihilation of the Centre, the parliamentary party which formed the chief obstacle to the success of his policy of centralization. And it is true that he once remarked to Ketteler, bishop of Mayence: "You and your party desire to undo the work of my policy. You compel me to war on the Church; but we shall see who will prove to be the stronger" (1). But we cannot forget that as far back as 1859, Bennigsen, one of the accomplices of Bismarck, wrote: "All goes well; now we have but one citadel to storm—that of Ultramontanism" (2). And in the supposition that the persecution of the Church was undertaken merely as a means for crushing the Centre, how can we account for the fact that six months before the formation of the Centre, that is, on Oct. 24, 1870, the crown-prince, the future Frederick III., wrote in that private diary which was afterward published by Geffken: "Bismarck tells my brother-in-law that after this war we shall enter on a campaign against Infallibility?" A few days before the crown-prince made this entry, that is, on Sept. 13, the chancellor, talking to the mayor of Reims on the influence of the Latin peoples whom he hated so virulently, exclaimed: "Once that we have settled with Catholicism, they will all disappear." But not to multiply proofs that Bismarck's persecuting spirit antedated the birth of the Centre, we note that

(1) The Paris *Univers*, Nov. 13, 1878.

(2) **BAZIN**; *Winthorst, His Allies, and His Adversaries*, p. 41. Paris, 1896.

the Polish Jew, Lasker, the founder of the "National Liberal" party, avowed in the Reichstag, in Nov., 1873, that he and his friends had arranged with Bismarck in 1869 for an immediate war on the Catholic Church; and that hostilities had been deferred, merely because German unity was not yet completed. These testimonies lead us to reject the belief that hatred of the Catholic Church was not the primary motive for the "War for Civilization"; but we do not deny that Bismarck regarded a religious war as a distraction for his political enemies—one that would enable him to avoid many parliamentary quarrels. And for the purpose of attracting to himself the dog of Liberalism, what bone could he throw into its gaping jaws, which would be more toothsome than Catholicism? Again, a war on the Church would afford the absolutistic chancellor an opportunity for the destruction of the comparatively liberal Prussian Constitution of 1850, which contravened his projects in many instances. And now, before we dismiss this subject of the causes of the "War for Civilization," we must not fail to notice the close alliance which then, as ever, subsisted between the Prussian government and Freemasonry. General Selazinski spoke the exact truth when, in his *Freemasonry and Christendom*, which was printed in Berlin with the authorization of the Grand Lodge of Germany, he said: "Among all the European powers which have concerned themselves with Masonry, only two have been consistent: Prussia, which has always protected our order; and the Papacy, which has ever opposed it." William I. had been an ardent Mason since 1840. On Nov. 5, 1853, while he was still heir-apparent, he officiated, in his capacity of Protector of all the German Lodges, at the initiation of his son, the future Frederick III.; and in his salutatory discourse, he said to the young adept: "Be a firm support to this order! If you are such, you will not only assure your future, but you will have the grand satisfaction of having propagated around yourself that which is beautiful and true" (1). When the "War for Civilization" had been well inaugurated, the organs of Masonry deemed

(1) The Masonic *Berliner Tageblatt* for Oct., 1882.

it wise to forego their customary policy of reticence concerning the campaigns and victories of the order; they could not restrain their joy as they pictured to themselves a speedy "destruction of *the infamous one*," and they called on the earth to witness that the adepts of the Square and Triangle had taken the chief part in the foundation of the new German Empire, and in the "glorious" war then being waged against the Papacy. Thus the *Rhenish Herald* of Oct. 25, 1873, proclaimed: "We are justified in asserting that it was the spirit of Freemasonry which, in the last arraignment of Ultramontaniam, pronounced sentence through the ever-memorable letter of His Majesty to the Pope. The ideas of the Emperor William, who, as every one knows, is a Freemason, do not date from yesterday; nor have those ideas been inspired only by his actual counselors, as certain parties would have men believe. Long ago, when the emperor was in the flower of his age, he announced those ideas in a session of our order, at a time when the world held a very different opinion in regard to him. On that occasion, he gave utterance to sentiments which befitted a prince and a man; and he has proved himself faithful to them. If he now fulfils his promises, future ages will praise him." A few days after this interesting effusion was published, the *Freemason's Journal* of Leipzig perorated as follows: "When Freemasonry is thus brought into the presence of two antagonists, that is, in presence of the emperor who, in his fraternal capacity, protects our order, and in the presence of the Pope, who curses it and would sink it into hell, it can and ought take but one side. It must range itself on the side where it is loved. . . . Together with the emperor, we are progressing toward freedom of mind without subjection, toward a pacification of society without any distinction of creeds, and toward an abolition of all egoistic prejudices. . . . That venerable hero is our Brother (William I.); he is bound to us by an indestructible chain. The ideal pursued by our order associates him with us; with us and for us, he handles the Mallet of force, the Square of wisdom, and the Compass of a common inspiration which serves to regulate, according to an ideal type, acts which are worthy

of man. . . . We are confident that all our Brethren are animated by these sentiments, and that they will not forget, in the banquets which are given on stated occasions, to kindle three fires in honor of, and for the love of, the noble old man who knows how to combat the powers of darkness which would destroy our projects."

The first information concerning the hostile intentions of the Prussian government in their regard was conveyed to the Catholics by a sequence of articles in the *Gazette of the Cross*, a journal which was practically owned by Bismarck; and very soon, that is, during the first months of 1871, all the subsidized press—those journals which now came to be known as the "reptile press"—began to ring the changes on the impudent lies of the chancellor. The world was informed that, having vanquished "her external enemies," Germany had now determined to conquer "her internal foes"; namely, the Ultramontanes who, by their acceptance of the decrees of the Vatican Council, had "caused a lamentable division in the Catholic Church, and were thus endangering the peace of the empire." It was not the intention of His Majesty, the world was assured, to disturb the "real Catholics" (so the chancellor styled the handful of Döllingerites); the enemy was that "Jesuitism" which had become insupportable, since the declaration of Papal Infallibility. The first attack on the Catholics, or on *Jesuitism*, as the lying Minister described it, was the suppression of the Catholic Department in the Ministry of Worship on July 8, 1871—a measure which was equivalent to a declaration that thereafter the government would pay no attention to any grievances which the Catholics might suffer. The next blow was directed against a dogma of Catholic faith, and against ecclesiastical jurisdiction. A priest named Wolmann, professor of religion in the Catholic College of Braunsberg, having persisted in rejecting the Vatican decrees, his ordinary, the bishop of Ermland, had excommunicated him. In spite of the protests of the parents of the students, the Minister of Worship threatened with expulsion all the lads who would not take their lessons in the Catholic faith from an excommunicated man. The third enterprise was directed against "the abuses of the pulpit." A

law was proposed in the German Reichstag by the Bavarian Minister, Lutz, an avowed patron of the "Old Catholics," according to which imprisonment for perhaps two years was to be the punishment of any priest who, in a church or elsewhere, in a sermon or in any kind of speech, should "disturb public tranquillity." This law, sacrificing to "Borussianism" the liberty and honor of all the German clergy, was rushed through the Reichstag on Nov. 28. In Feb., 1872, the same Reichstag was asked to consider a law which would deprive the clergy of their right of surveillance over primary schools; the law was passed, and the consequences were terrible. In some places, the new government inspectors forbade the children to use the "superstitious" salutation, "Praised be Jesus Christ!" universally given by German Catholics where we are satisfied with a "How d'y do?" In many districts the crucifixes and holy pictures were thrown out of the schools, and were replaced by portraits of their Sacred Majesties, the emperor and empress. In nearly all schools the little pupils were taught that the Biblical stories with which their Catholic teachers had loaded their memories, were mere fables. Some inspectors gave to young girls themes for composition, which were more "patriotic" than moral; thus, a favorite subject was: "What are the sentiments which ought to agitate the heart of a young woman, when she sees an officer of hussars?" (1). From the middle of May until the end of June, the imperial government occupied itself with measures for the expulsion of all Jesuits and their "affiliated orders" from the empire. The impudence of the design was so patent, however, that it became necessary to show that the governmental action was caused by the "pressure of public opinion." On Sept. 22, 1871, the "Old Catholics" had proclaimed, in their Congress of Munich, that the good of the State demanded the expulsion of the Jesuits. "It is notorious," said the Döllingerites in the sixth article of their programme, "that the said Society of Jesus is the cause of the dissensions at present troubling the Catholic Church. This Society uses its powerful influence in order to propagate in the hierarchy, among the clergy, and among the people, tendencies which are *contrary*

(1) JANISZEWSKI; *loc. cit.*, p. 115.

to civilization, dangerous to the State, and anti-national. It preaches a false morality, and it strives for power. Therefore we are of opinion that peace, happiness, and unity in the Church, as well as amicable relations between the Church and civil society, are impossible, if an end is not put to the baneful proceedings of this Society." It was to this declaration of a few excommunicated recalcitrants that Bismarck pointed, when he asserted that even among Catholics, "public opinion" called for the banishment of the Jesuits. That the same action was demanded by "public opinion" among Protestants, was said to be evident from the fact that a representative body of Protestants, who had met at Darmstadt eight days after the "Old Catholic" pronouncement, had adopted a resolution condemning the Jesuits in the strongest terms. In the parliamentary debates to which this "public opinion" gave rise, it was evident that the ministerial orators were attacking the Catholic Church, although the Jesuits alone were mentioned; one of these declaimers, Windthorst of Berlin (never to be confounded with his uncle, Windthorst of Meppen), in a moment of passion, exclaimed: "There is no other way. *Erasez l'infâme!*" By a vote of 181 against 63, the German parliament banished from the empire "the Society of Jesus, as well as all the orders or congregations affiliated to it." In vain the Catholics of Westphalia and of the Rhenish Provinces appealed for relief to the much-vaunted justice of the emperor; the "pious and loyal" William I. refused to receive their deputation, and on July 4, 1872, he signed the infamous decree. The reader will note that this ordinance was framed so as to affect not only the Society of Jesus, but also "all the orders or congregations affiliated to it." This provision accentuated the malice of the chancellor and his worshippers. There never have been, and are not now, any orders or congregations in "affiliation" with the Jesuits; the sole connection between the sons of Loyola and the members of any other society is that which must subsist among all the children of the Church. But Bismarck chose to affect the crass ignorance which is frequently found among Protestants, as they unwittingly compliment the celebrated Society by an application of the term "Jesuit" to every uncompromising Cath-

olic; and the event proved that when the chancellor proclaimed the same punishment for the Jesuits and their "affiliated orders or congregations," he prepared the way for the banishment, at his convenience, of any religious who might incur his displeasure.

The incidents which we have just narrated were mere pre-
ludes to the "War for Civilization," on which the German enemies of the Church had already resolved, and which was solemnly declared in May, 1873, by the promulgation of those enactments which have rendered the name of Falk infamous, but which are often designated as the "May Laws." Some time before Bismarck entered on his greatest enterprise, Friedeberg, a professor of law in the University of Leipsic, who was afterward made a privy-councillor to Falk, had published a work entitled *The German Empire and the Catholic Church*, in which he had detailed, with an effrontery which was almost Satanic, a plan for the complete extirpation of Catholicism in Germany, for the greater glory of Prussia, and of free thought. Friedeberg disagreed with the doctrinarians who thought that the power of Catholicism could be diminished by a separation of Church and State. On the contrary, said Friedeberg, such a separation would be of great profit to the Church; since in our day Catholicism is in perfect accord with the people. Were the Church of Rome, he added, as free from governmental surveillance in Prussia as she is in the United States of America, her power in Prussia would be more than doubled. Again, observed the professor, Protestantism in Prussia would suffer greatly, if Church and State were separated; indeed, without the aid of the State, Protestantism would perish in Prussia. Let the State continue, therefore, to aid its most valuable ally in its struggle with Catholicism. Finally, insisted Friedeberg, a separation of Church and State in Germany would injure the "Old Catholics," the men whom Prussia had encouraged to revolt with her promises of pecuniary and other aid. Then Friedeberg thus resumed his plan: "We have indicated our reasons for not wishing, at the present, for a separation of Church and State; and we have also pointed out the path, on which the State should enter. If, as we think, the Church

must one day be cut away from the social body, we should begin now to prepare for that operation, so that it will injure or weaken the State as little as possible. In the meantime, let us put a ligature on the artery through which runs the blood of the Church—that artery which communicates to the Church the strength and life of the State. We should isolate the ecclesiastical limb gradually, accustoming the State to do without it, so that when the amputation is finally made, the loss of the limb will not be perceived. There will not be much blood lost, and the wound will cicatrize quickly.” Such was the plan adopted by Bismarck; the Church was to be cut away from the social body; but the operation was to be performed so dexterously, that the patient should not screech too fearfully, and the State should not receive too serious a shock. Had the Catholic Church been an institution of the State, like Prussian Evangelical Protestantism, with the sovereign for its supreme pontiff, then Friedeberg, Bismarck, and Falk would have been numbered among the “great men” of the world. Very little study of the “May Laws” is required for the conclusion that they were well designed for the accomplishment of the intention of Friedeberg—“to asphyxiate the Church, and to dry up her vital source.” The first of these laws, enacted by the Diet of Berlin on May 11, 1873, concerned the education of the clergy, and the nomination to ecclesiastical offices. It ordered that no person could exercise ecclesiastical functions in Prussia, unless he was a German; unless he had been educated according to the terms of the law; and unless he was perfectly acceptable to the government. The education of all prospective priests was to be conducted by the State. The aspirant was to take his bachelor’s degree in a government *gymnasium*: during three years he was to study what the State designated as theology in a German University; and an examination by officers of the State was to finally pronounce on his fitness for the priesthood. Every ecclesiastical educational establishment was to be subject, at all hours and in every matter, to governmental surveillance. No nomination to a parish or to any care of souls could be made by a bishop without the approbation of the civil authority.

The second law, enacted on May 12, concerned ecclesiastical discipline; and its spirit was that of the preceding ordinance. The Roman Pontiff could have no voice in any matter concerning discipline in any diocese or parish of Prussia; for all disciplinary ecclesiastical matters were declared to pertain exclusively to German ecclesiastical authority, exercised with the permission of the government. And the last appeal in all cases of ecclesiastical discipline was to be made to a royal tribunal, sitting in Berlin; this court was to dismiss bishops and priests, as though they were so many sub-prefects of the State. The third law, enacted on May 13, prohibited any ecclesiastical censure of any act commanded by the State. All public excommunication was absolutely forbidden. The fourth law, enacted on May 14, ordered that when any person wished to change his religion, he should signify that desire to the Minister of Public Worship, who would charge him one *marck* for a permissive license. Our limited space forbids citations from the protests issued by the Prussian bishops against these laws, or from the many eloquent speeches condemning them which were pronounced in the Prussian parliament by Mallinckrodt, Windthorst (of Meppen), and other valiant members of the Centre. The efforts of these champions were of no avail; the united forces of Protestantism, Freemasonry, "Borussianism," Judaism, and "German intelligence," had decided "to crush the infamous one," even though their weapons constituted a serious danger for public liberty. In a cynical discourse which was worthy of his school, Wirchow, one of the most prominent representatives of materialistic "German science," admitted quite cheerfully that the May Laws were "arbitrary in the extreme, and dangerous to liberty"; but, he added: "Since we need not fear that the Centre will soon attain power, and since these arbitrary laws injure the Catholic Church alone, we ought to adopt them." This admission that the May Laws would injure "the Catholic Church alone" is very significant; for the reader must know that those ordinances ostensibly affected the Protestants as well as the Catholics. Falk had announced, however, that the enactments had been made to apply to Protestants "for

the sake of symmetry"; that is, that the government wished to present the appearance of impartiality, knowing full well that the Protestants of Prussia had been accustomed so long to State-slavery, that it was a matter of small consequence to them when they were loaded with a few more chains. And two other facts must be considered. Nothing in the Falk Laws affected the conscience of a Protestant, even of a sincere one; and even though the sectarian conscience had been affected, it would have regarded as too heavy no sacrifice which might purchase the degradation of the Catholic Church. Some curious persons asked Falk why it was that the Jews were not included among those affected by his Laws; the reply was that "the government did not perceive any practical necessity" of including the children of Abraham. Had he dared, the Minister would have assigned the true reason for the Jewish exemption—the plethoric purses of the Jewish magnates, without whose aid the power even of Bismarck would have vanished into thin air.

We need not insult the intelligence of the reader by any lengthy disquisition on the absurd lie uttered by Bismarck, when he termed his war on Catholicism a "War for Civilization." Even a tyro in the study of history knows that in the combat against truth and virtue, error and sin never wage war under their own names; that from the time of Lucifer's rebellion down to the exploits of the Commune of Paris, evil has always clothed itself in the mantle of enlightenment and progress. Even "German science," in which Bismarck was an adept, is forced to admit that to the Catholic Church alone is due the fact that the modern Germans are not now barbarians; and that to the Catholic Church alone did the original Prussians—a Slavic, not a Germanic tribe—owe their liberation from the degrading idolatry to which they had been victims for centuries after the other European barbarians had become civilized under the shadow of the Cross. And truly phenomenal impudence was requisite for the assertion that a state of war existed between parties, only one of whom was armed, and with the weapons of confiscations, imprisonment, and exile, while the resistance of the other consisted only of fidelity to God's law, and of invincible patience

under persecution. Some publicists have qualified the phrase "War for Civilization" as a convenient euphemism; but that which it meant was a downright lie. "In the entire course of this affair," observes Mgr. Janiszewski, "the government and the pseudo-liberal party cared nothing for law, truth, or justice; they thought of nothing but the attainment of their object. The means could be of any nature, since it was the Catholic Church that was to suffer. At different periods, different passions and vices have dominated other passions and vices; the inheritance of our time is *falsehood*. It was on falsehood that the plan of the war of Prussia against Austria (1866), and that of the war against France (1870), were based; it was falsehood that characterized the entire conspiracy against the Church. Falsehood, systematically developed and abundantly rewarded, took possession of the press, and not a ray of truth was allowed to reach the people. The German language itself was travestied. Such words as 'culture,' 'instruction,' 'civilization,' 'liberty,' 'science,' 'Liberalism,' 'Ultramontanism,' 'progress,' and other expressions which often seduce simple minds, received, in this chaos, meanings which sound reason and logic never dreamed of attributing to them." It was but natural that such should be the course of a party which brazenly avowed that it despised mere principles. Thus that most "intelligent" Progressist, Wirchow, when told in the parliament that the May Laws violated the Prussian Constitution, brutally retorted: "I care not to bother my brains in an effort to save mere principles, since the government now abandons such things in order to act in accordance with the desires of its party." Mere truth was a matter of no value to the "man of blood and iron" who affected to scorn everything that savored of the Middle Age; to the Minister who dared, on June 16, 1873, to inform the Reichstag that he "wished to be excused from listening to any more talk about the pretended rights of the people—mere reminiscences of days long vanished, and which merit no other designation than that of declamatory phrases."

On Jan. 19, 1874, Falk asked the Prussian Diet to pass three additional draconian enactments. It had become evident that the imprisonment or exile of all the Catholic bish-

ops would soon render the Catholic dioceses vacant in the eyes of the Prussian government; and that only the apostate, Reinkens, would be recognized by His Imperial and Royal Majesty as a Catholic bishop. It was necessary, therefore, to provide for the administration of the prospectively vacant sees. The second law was a complement of that of May 11, 1873, which prescribed the method and nature of the education of the clergy, and also regulated all appointments to the care of souls. The third law concerned the banishment of the recalcitrant clergy; and this measure was to be voted not only by the Prussian Chambers, but also by the German parliament—a proceeding which would make it a law of the German Empire. The representative of Bismarck informed the Chambers that the object of this third law was to crush the opposition of the Catholic clergy to the May Laws; to “prevent any illegal exercise of ecclesiastical functions”; that is, to prevent any bishops from performing any duties pertaining peculiarly to their office, and to prevent all priests from saying Mass, hearing confessions, or preaching, without the express permission of His Sacred Majesty’s officers. This law was passed on May 4th. Every ecclesiastic who had already been “dismissed” because of a violation of the May Laws, or who would thereafter be “dismissed,” would be punished, by “internment,” or by “externment,” or by banishment, if he dared to officiate in any manner. The “interned” were transported to some place which the police designated; frequently to some fortress, as in the case of the bishop of Paderborn, who was “interned” in the fortress of Wesel. “Externment” signified expulsion from certain provinces. Thus, the valiant Polander, Mgr. Ledochowski, archbishop of Posen and Gnesen, besides two years of imprisonment, suffered exclusion from Posen and Silesia. Banishment entailed the loss of all civic rights. Mgr. Melchers, archbishop of Cologne, was imprisoned with a horde of robbers and cut-throats for six months, and then he was exiled (1). Mgr. Eberhardt, bishop of Treves, died in

(1) When Mgr. Melchers, on his entrance into his prison, was asked to give his name and occupation, he naturally replied: “Paul Melchers, archbishop of Cologne.” The governor retorted: “You were an archbishop at one time; but the government has deprived you of that title.” Then the prelate replied: “The government cannot take from

jail. The Polish prelate, Mgr. Janiszewski, auxiliary-bishop of Posen and Gnesen, was successively fined, interned, imprisoned, and exiled. Another Pole, Mgr. Cybichowski, auxiliary of Gnesen, merely for having presumed to consecrate the Holy Oils without the permission of the government, was imprisoned for nine months, and then he was deported to Silesia. On May 20th, the parliament passed the law which Bismarck and his imperial master (or pupil) deemed capable of checking the audacity of those who regarded the "dismissed" bishops and pastors as still endowed with spiritual jurisdiction. The Cathedral Chapters were ordered, in case "dismissal" had left their dioceses without bishops, to name administrators within ten days; if the Chapters refused to name such administrators, the government would appoint commissioners who would *take the place of the bishops*. Where parishes were vacant, the parishioners were to elect their new pastors. It is interesting to note that while very many of the so-called "conservative" Protestants openly disapproved of the laws of May 4th and May 20th, 1874, they nevertheless voted for them. One of their leaders, Minnigerode, did not hesitate to avow: "In spite of grave doubts and grave scruples, I cannot allow the Prussian government to be defeated by the Ultramontanes. In spite of the perplexities of my conscience, I shall vote for the law, in order to help the government." Another prominent "conservative" Protestant, Miquel, said: "We cannot leave the Prussian government in an embarrassed condition; we are obliged to aid it." These avowals of the least rampant of the German Protestant representatives are certainly eloquent; but if there was any need of demonstrating more forcibly that in the "War for Civilization," justice counted for nothing, and that servility to the State was the dominant trait of such of the German Protestants as still retained some faith in Christianity, the following words of Wellet Vehlingsdorf should

me a power which it did not give to me; but if my title of archbishop does not satisfy you, I have another profession."—"What is it?" asked the officer. "I am good at plaiting straw," was the answer. The name of "Paul Melchers, straw-plaiter," was then entered on the register; and while he was incarcerated, the plaiting of straw was the archbishop's task. BAZIN; *loc. cit.*, p. 110.

have sufficed: "Those who voted for the May Laws must now bear the humiliating consequences. They must reconcile themselves to this double-edged sword, with which the government is armed; they must even try to sharpen it, in order to save the honor of the State. It is now too late to discuss as to what will be the denouement of this combat; but one thing remains—to uphold the government. . . . I feel the sorrowful conviction that, as things are now, the most direct path toward domestic peace is a determination of all parties to rally around the State, and to support it, *independently of their convictions.*" Then addressing the Centre, the champion of inconsistency said: "We assure you that we have firmly resolved *never to go to Canossa* (1); and that we shall continue the battle with more energy, in order to end it more quickly."

In 1875 five new laws were enacted for the further enslavement of the Church: one regulating the administration of ecclesiastical revenues; one suppressing all the allowances made by the State to bishops; one assigning a part of the revenues of the Catholic Church to the "Old Catholics"; one against convents and religious congregations; and one suppressing the paragraphs in the Prussian Constitution which guaranteed religious liberty to Catholics. Truly, the time seemed to have arrived for the performance of the operation foreseen by Friedeberg—the "amputation of the Church from the social body." By the first law it was enacted that the revenues of each parish were to be administered by a body of laymen who were to be chosen by the parishioners. The pastor was to have no voice, either in the election of the administrators, or in their debates. In the case of Catholic parishes, the bishop was to have a nominal direction; but he was always to refer his decisions to the prefect of the province, and that officer could reverse those decisions without appeal. A radical difference was established between the Catholic method of election of administrators, and that of the Protestants. No Protestant could vote until he was twenty-four years old; a Catholic could vote when he was twenty-one. Again, care was taken

(1) For the meaning of this phrase, see our Vol. II., p. 150.

that only the better elements in a Protestant parish should control the funds; no one could be an elector who led an irregular life, who did not fulfil his religious duties, or who gave any scandal to his fellows. The contrary provision was made for the Catholic parishes; every adult male, even the most dissolute and irreligious, providing that he bore the name of Catholic, was to be an elector. This fact alone showed that the Prussian government had determined to excite discord between the Catholic clergy and their flocks—" *Inimicus homo hoc fecit.*" When the time arrived for the signing of the second law, the one withdrawing the subventions hitherto accorded to the clergy and religious corporations by the State, the emperor hesitated; but the insistence of the chancellor prevailed. The iniquity of this enactment will be comprehended only by him who reflects that the abolished subvention had never been a donation from the State to the Church; it was simply a miserable apology for a partial restitution, by means of a petty interest (less than one per cent.), of the property which the Protestants had stolen from the Church—a method like that adopted for the same reason in France, Spain, and certain Latin-American countries where the Brethren of the Three Points have robbed the Church of all her immovable property, and of all the movable that was attainable (1). Let the reader,

(1) When Archbishop Ledochowski was notified, four months after the adoption of the May Laws, that his usual revenue from the State would not be paid to him until he had appointed to the parish of Vielen a pastor whom the government would find acceptable, the prelate sent this protest to the president of the province: "I protest against the aforesaid ordinance, for the reason that the endowment of the archbishopric of Gnesen-Posen is based on a treaty concluded with the State, and is merely a *partial compensation for the Church property which the State has appropriated.* In proof of this it may suffice to refer you to the declaration made by Ladenberg, then Minister of Public Worship, in his explanations of the Prussian Constitution of Dec. 15, 1848. All the provinces acquired by the State in later times (during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) received solemn guarantees regarding the support of their ecclesiastical establishments; as you may see in the proclamation addressed, on May 15, 1857, to the inhabitants of the Grand Duchy of Posen (*Collection of Laws*, p. 45). Hence it was that during the negotiations with the Apostolic See for a new arrangement of the relations between Church and State, these endowments were not regarded as favors, but as *obligatory payments of fully acknowledged debts.* It was because of this indebtedness that no State took upon itself the duty of endowing the bishoprics; and it declared that such was the Church's title, not only during the aforesaid negotiations, but afterward, at the time of the publication of the Concordat of 1821 (*Official Prussian Gazette*, Aug. 11, 1831). The State is obliged to pay this debt, and promptly; for such payment is demanded by the dictates of strict justice, and by the respect due to the State's own honor. Therefore I reserve to myself the right of taking

however, note carefully that this law, by which the German emperor sanctioned a robbery as contemptible as it was imprudent, was enforced with one exception. Any ecclesiastic who would record a written oath to the effect that he would obey *all* the laws of the State, and who would thus avow implicitly that he was ready to form part of a German National Church, was to receive the subvention hitherto accruing to the holder of his benefice. Fortunately there were very few of the German clergy, and none among the bishops, who bartered their ecclesiastical independence, and pronounced themselves willing to plunge into schism, for the sake of the mess of pottage tendered by the "loyal and pious" emperor. In Silesia especially the clergy spurned the governmental bribe; out of 1,200 priests, only five accepted it. But faithful above all others were the priests of the Polish provinces of Prussia; out of 800 clergymen in the archdiocese of Posen, only two were derelict. The third law ordained that when there were any "Old Catholics" in a parish, they should enjoy all the ecclesiastical revenues, and should have the same rights as the Catholics to the churches, sacred vessels, cemeteries, etc. If there were two churches in a parish, the omnipotent prefect was to leave one to the Catholic pastor, and give the other to the schismatics; if there was only one church, the royal officer was to determine the hours for the "Old Catholic" services. In case there should prove to be "a large number" of schismatics in a parish, the prefect was to give to them the entire control of religious matters; and of course the same prefect was to determine the meaning of "a large number." The police were instructed to enforce all decisions of the prefect without delay. The fourth law declared that "all Catholic convents and religious congregations were prohibited in all the dominions of the Prussian monarchy." Six months were accorded to all monks, friars, nuns, etc., for their dispersion; but in the case of teaching orders, the Minister of Public Worship was allowed to defer their expulsion from their institutions for four years, if he could not im-

the proper measures, at the proper time, for the recovery of the sums that are due to me, as archbishop of Gnesen-Posen."

mediately find proper substitutes for them. An exception was made for the Sisters of Charity who were engaged in the service of the sick. They were allowed to remain in their hospitals; but it was stated that at any time a simple royal decree might expel them also, and that in the meantime they were to be constantly under police surveillance—a measure which indicated that Bismarck placed these devoted religious on the same level with the women of the street. These four laws of 1875 should have contented the most ardent defenders of "German civilization"; certainly such enactments ought to have promised what Friedeberg termed "the asphyxiation of the Church." But there remained the task of crowning the edifice which "German intelligence" had so cunningly erected. The Articles XV., XVI., and XVIII. of the Prussian Constitution of 1850, which guaranteed a just autonomy to both Protestants and to Catholics, were to be suppressed. In reality, this action of the persecutors signified but little; already, at the time of the passage of the May Laws, the Articles in question had been so modified, that they were rendered absolutely nugatory (1)—so nugatory, that Prof. Gneist, one of the most fanatical admirers of Bismarck, exclaimed: "These new Laws ought to be regarded as the *Decalogue* of the Prussians." It was thought to be prudent, however, to leave to the Catholics no possibility of an interpretation of the written law of Prussia in their favor; and the conciliatory Articles disappeared from the Constitution. Religious liberty had been unknown in Prussia since the promulgation of the May Laws; and by their abolition of the Articles which proclaimed it, the members of the parliamentary majority showed that they were not yet lost to every sense of shame.

At the opening of the parliamentary session of 1874, the "pious and loyal" William I. gave utterance to this sage observation: "The May Laws have not at all paralyzed religious sentiment; therefore the resistance of the bishops is

(1) As accepted, under oath, by Frederick William III. in 1850, Article XVIII. was as follows: "The right of nomination, of presentation, of choice, and of confirmation for ecclesiastical offices, so far as they are made to belong to the State, and to be based on patronage or other legal titles, is suppressed." The tinkering of 1873 preserved these words intact; but these were added: "Nevertheless, the laws of the State regulate the course to be pursued in regard to education, the nomination to offices, and dismissal of ecclesiastics and of pastors; and they fix the limits of disciplinary authority."

unjustifiable." Reichensperger thus replied to the imperial sophist: "In order to save the honor of the government, I am willing to believe that it is convinced on this point. But such a justification of these laws is dangerous, nay, it is monstrous; for the government thereby arrogates to itself the rights of a supreme judge in matters of religion. It decides as to what constitutes a religious life, and as to what menaces that life; and by its decision it finds itself contradicted by all the bishops and by all the members of the Catholic Church. . . . Do you not perceive that Christianity is deprived of the right of existence, when the laws say that the Gospel cannot be preached without the permission of the civil authority; that no Sacraments can be administered without the consent of the president (of the province)? If the law says that no religious function can be performed without the permission of the president, I fail to understand how you can doubt that the law denies the existence of the Church, and places the secular power in her place. No Christian doubts that the Catholic Church received her mission from her Divine Founder; from Him who brought Christianity into the world without the consent, and even in spite of the prohibition of the Jewish Sanhedrin, of King Herod, and of Pilate; from Him who commanded His Apostles to preach the Gospel throughout the world, without regard to the threats of men, even amid persecutions and even unto martyrdom, and to preach it until the end of time (*Cries of "Oh! oh!" from the Left*). Reflect, gentlemen, if only for a moment, on this idea which seems so extraordinary to you. As for me, I am firmly convinced that these laws can receive the votes of only those who deny the divine mission of the Church, and of Christianity in general. They who recognize this mission must respect it, and not aid the usurpations of the secular power in preventing its accomplishment; but if the contrary be the case, let them avow openly: 'We are no longer Christians.'" The reader will not expect us to cite at length any of the powerful discourses with which the Catholic orators of the Centre defended the Catholic cause in the parliament, although some of those discourses, especially those of Mallinekrodt, some-

times remind us of those of Berryer, Montalembert, Falloux, and Dupanloup. We shall give merely an extract from one of the speeches of Mallinekrodt, and one from a discourse by Windthorst. During the discussion of the law on the banishment of the clergy, Mallinekrodt thus addressed the Reichstag: "If it is true that we betray our country because we cling firmly to the centre of Catholic unity, then it must be said that our ancestors, and yours also, denied their country, even from the days of St. Boniface. You say that the May Laws ought to be enforced, because they exist; but I insist that the May Laws ought to be abrogated, because they are useless. Which argument is the more conclusive? I hold that the existence of these laws proves nothing; their meaning should be investigated. . . . You believed that your combat would be waged merely against the bishops, and against aged and feeble men; you thought that the priests would rush, *en masse*, into your camp. Your calculations deceived you; experience has shown that the clergy are firmly united with their superiors. You thought that it was only with ecclesiastics that you would be obliged to contend; but whoever has eyes, and is willing to use them, sees that you must deal also with the laity. In our Western provinces you behold that firm determination, that attentive calm, with which, at the first sign, the masses rushed to the doors of the prisons, in order to bid farewell to their pastors, and to assure them that so long as the pastoral crozier remains in their hands, even should the time come when the machinations of our government would deprive the faithful of all pastoral succor, the bishops may count on the persevering fidelity of the Catholic people to Holy Church. Gentlemen, if you have occasion to witness these facts, I think that you will begin to understand that this matter is not a strife with particular individuals, but a combat between two fundamental principles—between the Catholic Religion and a philosophy which is without a Christian foundation. The openly avowed opposition of Prince Bismarck, so strikingly displayed during this struggle, may be very powerful; but it is merely a transient phenomenon. Undoubtedly, Bismarck is a powerful personage; but in face of this

war of principles, he is weak as a reed. If you wish, gentlemen, to attain your object by this miserable law of banishment, your calculations are false; and you simply prove that you know nothing concerning the force of Christian convictions. It is a remarkable fact that suffering engenders a desire to suffer; when we see our pastors persecuted, imprisoned, exiled, do you think that we will be wanting in the courage to share their lot? You will be obliged to employ more trenchant weapons; but reflect well as to the choice of those weapons. In the meantime, we shall meditate on the immortal motto: '*Per crucem ad lucem.*'"

On the same occasion, Windthorst thus reprov'd Falk and the Bismarckian majority in the parliament: "What danger menaces the State, if a priest celebrates Mass, or performs any other one of his functions—if, on the field of battle, or during an epidemic, the priest assists a dying man, consoling him, and aiding him as he passes into eternity? ... Do you wish to decree absolutely that no person can receive the Sacraments, unless he receives them in the manner which may seem proper to each and every successive Minister? We are told that the performance of religious duties is free; but I can see no liberty in the imprisonment of the clergy, when they exercise religious functions which do not concern the State. You say, gentlemen, that you desire peace; but do you conscientiously believe that peace can be obtained by the means which you propose? I can assure you that in spite of what the Minister terms the keenness of his weapons, you will not attain your object; for Catholics and believing Protestants are convinced that no sacrifice, not even that of life, is too great for the attainment of religious freedom. ... You have the power to torment us, to render our condition miserable indeed; you can wound our hearts; but you cannot take from us our faith. If you close all our churches, we will assemble in the forests, as the Catholics of France were wont to assemble, during the rule of the Jacobins." The address which closed the discussion on the part of the Catholic champions was delivered by a Polish deputy, the Abbé Respadek. Even since the treaties of 1815, in spite of those treaties, and in spite of

the words of the royal Hohenzollern, the Prussian government had ever continued that oppression of its Polish subjects which it had initiated at the time of the first partition—an oppression which could not fail to justify the old Polish proverb: "So long as the sun warms the earth, the Pole will never be a brother to the German." The world was not surprised, therefore, when it perceived that the persecution accompanying the "War for Civilization" had fallen on the Duchy of Posen with a severity much greater than that with which Bismarck afflicted the Catholics of any other province. It was the heart of a Catholic, of a priest, and of a Pole, that spoke in these words of Respadek: "Gentlemen, we have lost a very great portion of what constitutes the happiness of a nation. But three treasures have remained to us intact; a love of truth, our national honor, and our fidelity to our altars. These treasures, gentlemen, cannot be taken from us, either by the threats of the powers above us, or by the temptations of the powers beneath us. We submit humbly to the decrees of Providence; we submit to the laws of human justice; but you need not ask us to submit to a power that does not respect our consciences. If you wish to realize the truth of what I say, look at Cell No. 25 in the prison of Ostrowa (1); look at the fifty priests who are imprisoned or exiled, and the many others who are reduced to misery; and then remember well that among us there are hundreds of others who will undergo the same fate, if this persecution continues. Gentlemen, you may persecute a nation which preserves its faith; but you cannot dishonor it. You may thrust into prison a bishop who is armed only with the Gospel; you may condemn him by your laws; but you cannot conquer him."

Now for a brief account of the manner in which the May Laws were enforced. The first act of violence, after the expulsion of the Jesuits, was the closing of the seminaries, firstly, in Posen, and afterward in the diocese of Paderborn, and in others. In Posen, the Prussian government had not waited for the May Laws in order to make a radical attack on the religion of its Polish subjects. Many years previously, it had violated the treaty of partition and subsequent com-

(1) The cell occupied by Archbishop Ledochowski.

pacts by prohibiting the Polish language in the schools and in the courts of justice ; but it had allowed religious instruction to be given in their mother-tongue to little children. Shortly after the beginning of the " War for Civilization," however, it had revoked this " concession " ; and when Mgr. Ledochowski, surmising that the emperor had not realized the baneful effects of the revocation, memorialized His Majesty, the " pious and loyal " William declared that the decree was of his own conception. Then the prelate caused the lambs of his flock to be assembled, outside of school hours, and in special localities, for the usual catechetical instruction ; but the police broke up the classes. Then the children were taken into the churches ; but the catechists were fined, and the parents were informed that if their children were taught the Catechism in Polish, they would be dismissed from the schools. When the May Laws had been adopted, the seminary of Posen was closed, because the archbishop would not allow the president of the province to arrange its course of studies " according to the spirit of the law," as the officer told the archbishop in his letter of Aug. 21. In the diocese of Munster, the preparatory seminary of Gaesdonk was closed ; in the diocese of Culm, that of Peplin ; and the same fate overtook all the Catholic boarding-schools in Paderborn, Treves, Munster, Breslau, Bonn, and Posen. The next victims of the May Laws were the female religious. In Posen, the religious of the Sacred Heart had been suppressed before the publication of the law against convents ; nor was the governmental action incomprehensible in this instance, since the authorities chose to consider these Sisters as " affiliated " to the terrible Jesuits. But what crime had the cloistered Carmelite nuns committed ? In spite of the universally admitted fact that these religious held no communication with the outside world, they also were exiled. At Osieczna, in Posen, the Oratorians had a " House of Retreat," whither the archbishop was wont to send those of his clergy who needed to devote some time to penance and serious meditation. The president of the province summoned Father Brezinski, the superior of this establishment, to furnish him with a copy of the rule of the house. Brezinski replied that he would consult the

archbishop; and for this "crime," he was fined 100 thalers. As there was not so much money in the house, the officers levied on four pigs; and when it was found that the animals did not belong to the culprit, his room was searched for some portable property of value, and about ten thalers' worth of clothes were confiscated for the benefit of the imperial-royal treasury. Then the priests who were in retreat, four in number, were interrogated as to the reason for their "imprisonment"; and they were told that they were free. Only one consented to depart without the permission of his ordinary. Of course a legislation so elastic as that which bore the name of Falk, one that pretended to give to a governmental agent the power to dispense ecclesiastics from a performance of the canonical penances imposed by their bishops, arrogated to itself the right of fining and imprisoning bishops *ad libitum*. Quite consistently, therefore, in Article XV. of the law of May 11, it was decreed that no ecclesiastical superior could make any appointment without the approbation of the provincial president; and that any violation of this provision should be punished by a fine of from 200 to 1,000 thalers, or by a "corresponding length of imprisonment." The Article XVIII. of the same law prohibited a bishop from allowing an ecclesiastical office to remain vacant for more than one year; this "crime" was to be punished by a fine of 1,000 thalers, and the fine could be repeated *ad infinitum*, until the vacancy was filled. In the course of a few months, the archbishop of Posen was condemned to pay fines to the amount of 30,000 thalers; and as he did not possess such a sum, his horses were seized, then his carriage, then his furniture, and when an official declaration showed that his person alone was then seizable, he was incarcerated. The lot of a priest, unless he preferred apostasy, was as painful as that of a bishop; his "punishment" was generally aggravated by the malice of the police and of his jailers. Thus, when the pastor, Grokowski, and two other priests were imprisoned, care was taken to give each one of them a Jew as his cell-mate. Seldom, indeed, were the confessors allowed to purchase, with their own money or with that which the pitying faithful sent to them, better food than that furnished

by the prison authorities, even though they were sick almost unto death; and in many instances, meat was given to them only on Friday, when, of course, they would not eat it. We have alluded already to the imprisonment of the archbishop of Cologne, and of the bishops of Paderborn, Treves, and Munster. In some places, even women and children were the victims of the May Laws. Thus, in Munster, when the ladies of the diocese sent a dutiful address to their persecuted bishop, each signer was arrested and fined. In Posen, on several occasions the police arrested children who, by command of their parents, had gone to the cathedral to be examined in religion by the archbishop. We have noted that the Prussian government called upon every Chapter to elect an administrator, in the case of a "dismissal" of the bishop. Without exception, the Chapters of all the afflicted dioceses refused to obey; and the governmental commissaries were avoided as though they were lepers. Each imprisoned prelate had appointed a delegate, who was known only by the priests; and in no case were the efforts of the government successful, although it adopted every means to discover the identity of the bishop's representative. In Posen, 40 deans were examined on this point; and when it was found that none of them would betray the secret, 36 were incarcerated. In some places, the government installed pastors of its own choice in the churches; but the people would not accept the ministrations of these unfortunates. Thus, when the imperial commissary summoned the Catholics of Vielen, in Posen, to the church, in order to announce to them that the acts performed by a priest not acceptable to the government were "null and void," out of 3,300 parishioners, only four attended, and two of these were functionaries of the State. In the parishes of Krobia and Buk, not one Catholic appeared before the commissary. In fact, there was not a parish in Prussian Poland, into which an apostate priest had been intruded by the government of the "pious and loyal" William I., which did not afford the spectacle of a shepherd without a flock. The excommunicated renegade was in possession of the parish church; but at his Mass not a person attended, and he was never asked to baptize, to offi-

ciate at a marriage, or to pray for the dead. The Catholic world, therefore, was not surprised when, on Nov. 24, 1873, the president-in-chief of Posen, by command of the Cabinet of Berlin, ordered Archbishop Ledochowski to resign his diocese. "The example of such resistance and disobedience has led his clergy to perpetrate the same crimes," declared the Prussian official; "marriages are blessed by ecclesiastics who perform the offices of the Church illegally, and the government can no longer tolerate such confusion. In the interests of public order, the government cannot allow this archbishop to occupy a position, in which he exercises an influence prejudicial to the State." The reply of Ledochowski to this impudent assumption was worthy of Poland and of the prelate (1); and we shall quote some of its more prominent passages: "From the day when the government declared war on the Catholic faith in all the regions subject to the sceptre of His Majesty, I have frequently been forced to believe that the present officers of the State have no knowledge of the holy faith which we profess, and that they are incapable of understanding the duties which that faith imposes on us. It is precisely because of this ignorance that the president-in-chief orders me, in the aforesaid proclamation, to lay aside my archiepiscopal dignity; and he threatens that if I do not comply with his order within eight days, the secular tribunal of Berlin will pronounce my deposition. My episcopal office, together with its duties and its rights, has been given to me by God, through the hands of His vicar on earth. . . . No secular power can abrogate my mission. . . . As for a voluntary resignation of my archbishopric of Gnesen-Posen, undoubtedly such a proceeding could take place in certain circumstances, if the consent of our Holy Father were accorded; but I believe that the government knows me too well to suppose that I would be guilty of such a deed in the present condition of things. I would be unworthy of the spiritual dignity which God has conferred on me, were I to abandon my flock willingly, at the very moment when it is in danger of becoming the

(1) See the article by Count Tarnowski, entitled *The Prussian Government and Archbishop Ledochowski*, in the *Polish Review* for Aug., 1874.

prey of incredulity, heresy, and schism. . . . You mention, Mr. President-in-chief, certain of the principal acts of my pastoral ministry, and you adduce them as justifying the demand you have made. I would never have dared to enumerate these proofs of my conscientiousness in the fulfilment of my episcopal obligations; they are the fruit of the grace of God, which aids man in the accomplishment of the most difficult duties. You render the same testimony to the merits of my clergy, and of the people confided to my paternal care; and this testimony, recorded in your official publication, will cause the entire world to honor my priests and the faithful of my two archdioceses. Only two of my priests denied the faith, and perhaps they did not know what they did; and among the laity, are there many more who have perjured themselves before God and His Church? . . . The president-in-chief makes a great mistake, when he thinks that the invincible constancy of my clergy and people in upholding the principles of Catholic truth, and their perseverance in duty amid the horrors of persecution, are my work, the result of my influence and authority. No, sir; they are the fruit of divine mercy and grace." On Feb. 4, 1874, Mgr. Ledochowski was confined in the prison of Ostrowa, where he was treated with the utmost rigor. On March 15, 1875, Pope Pius IX. evinced his admiration of the heroic confessor by raising him to the Sacred College. On April 15, he was dismissed from prison, but was ordered to leave the empire. He then fixed his residence in Cracow; but the demonstrations of the Austrian Poles in his honor frightened the Cabinet of Vienna, then very anxious to please Prussia, and he was requested to leave Galicia. Proceeding to Rome, he continued to direct the affairs of his diocese; and during several years Bismarck caused him to be condemned again and again to imprisonment *in contumaciam*. It was said that the chancellor impudently attempted to procure his extradition from the usurper in the Quirinal; but if that move was made, Pius IX. checkmated it by lodging His Eminence in the Vatican, where he found safety until 1884, when Pope Leo XIII. prevailed upon him to resign his archdiocese, and to become the papal Secretary of Me-

morials. In 1892 he was made Prefect of the Propaganda.

The weapon on which Bismarck had chiefly relied for his combat with the Church—a weapon which, although untried, was apparently trusty—and which promised more of success than he could hope to attain by his more vulgar arms of starvation or imprisonment, was "Old Catholicism." The school of Munich, the result of the marriage of "German science" and ecclesiastical insubordination, had told him that the proclamation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility would be the signal for a revolt against Rome on the part of the majority of the German clergy; and that in all probability, his most difficult task would be the selection, from among so many available candidates, of a primate for that grandest conception of "German intelligence," a German National Church. But "Old Catholicism" disappointed the sanguine chancellor; when he examined its microscopic proportions, probably he wondered that such an abortion ever came into existence. But the war on the Catholic Church was in full career; and it was not for the chief exponent of "Borussianism" to be the first to weaken. So thought the "man of blood and iron" for several years; "*he would never go to Cauossa,*" although some of the best specimens of "German intelligence," men of his own party, insisted, in the sixth year of the struggle, that the true interests of the fatherland called on him to make peace with the Queen of the Seven Hills. Even the *Gazette of the Cross*, which had so complacently announced the first signs of the foolish contest, did not hesitate to say, on Aug. 11, 1878: "It is because of the 'War for Civilization' that every kind of moral and material misery is seen in every corner of the German Empire. It is only by abandoning the 'War for Civilization,' and by abandoning the ideas that caused it, that we can escape from our embarrassments. Such is our opinion; it is becoming more general every day; and where there is a will, there is a way." The *Gazette* was a Protestant journal; but at that time, nearly all the German Protestants who retained any belief in Protestantism, all who were not freethinkers, called on Bismarck, in the name of Protestantism itself, to retrace the steps he had taken in this lamentable path. The combat had caused the

more damage to Protestantism than to Catholicism. The Protestants had gladly acclaimed the law which rendered civil marriage obligatory and sufficient, because they thought that the infamous enactment would affect the Catholics more severely than it hurt themselves. But while statistics did not show any decrease of religious marriages among Catholics since the beginning of the persecution, at least half of the unions among Protestants had been conducted in Pagan fashion. In the Protestant Synod of Essen, held in 1877, Schultz, a superintendent-general, made this lamentable avowal: "In the province of Saxony, there is not a town of any considerable size, in which from forty to fifty per cent. of the marriages have not been contracted without the blessing of the (Protestant) Church. In one manufacturing city of 18,000 inhabitants, out of the 150 marriages, only 13 were blessed by the (Protestant) Church, and these would not have been so blessed, had not the parents exerted all their authority, and had not the ministers made many sacrifices to gain their point." The Protestants had also rejoiced when the Bismarckian legislation declared that Christian parents should no longer be obliged to procure the baptism of their children. In the fifth year of the persecution, the statistics showed that every child of Catholic parents had been baptized; but among the Protestants, only one in three had been baptized in Berlin and in Königsberg, and only one in five in the provinces (1). When this result of the May Laws became known, the government ordered all its military and civil officers, under pain of dismissal, to contract their marriages before some minister of religion, and to procure the baptism of their children. Does history furnish an instance of governmental self-stultification analogous to this decree of the champion of "German intelligence"? A law for the entire kingdom is promulgated; and after a long experience of its effects, Bismarck finds that it is so wicked and absurd that he must fain order all of the employees of the State, an enormous number in Germany, to ignore it. Common sense would have dictated the abrogation of the iniquitous law; but its maker could not "go to Canossa."

(1) JANISZEWSKI; *loc. cit.*, p. 417.

Meanwhile, atheism congratulated itself on its foresight in having supported the mighty chancellor; and the Catholics found consolation in the hope that "God had permitted the persecution for the decomposition of Protestantism, and in order to lead believing Protestants into the true Church" (1). Much, however, as Bismarck detested Catholicism, he did not love Protestantism sufficiently well to prevent its dissolution by following a course which, as he fancied, would prevent the consolidation of the German Empire, then so energetically pressed by Socialism. The usually perspicacious statesman did not perceive that his policy tended, by more ways than one, to the end which the Socialists had in view; that Socialism is perfectly logical, if the principles of Liberalism, as Bismarck understood it, are well founded. "Liberalism," said Mgr. Ketteler, "makes of the State a God here present; and nevertheless it talks about Religion and the Church. That is sheer nonsense. Socialism cries out: 'If the State is God, the historical development of the Christian religion is an immense fraud. I, Socialism, wish to hear no more talk about religion, Church, or worship.' Liberalism wishes to deprive marriage of its religious character; and nevertheless it tries to preserve it under the form of a civil union. Again Socialism cries out: 'If God has not regulated marriage, we want no regulations by men; our wills are our law; our passions constitute our right, and let no man interfere with them!' Liberalism says: 'The law of the State is absolute; the Church, the family, the father, have no rights other than those which the State grants to them through its legislative bodies. As for property, however, that is inviolable.' But Socialism retorts: 'Nonsense! If the State is the sole source of right and of law, it is also the source of property. We call for a revision of the laws on property and on inheritance.... Away with all your economical principles which tend to concentrate wealth in the hands of the few!'" (2). Shortly after Bismarck had entered on his disgraceful campaign, the Socialists held a Congress at Ghent. One of the leaders, Liebnicht, made this obser-

(1) *Our Present Duties*, by Mgr. Conrad Martin, Bishop of Paderborn. Paris, 1878.

(2) *The War for Civilization*, p. 11-15.

vation: "The Ultramontanes have more influence than we have over the minds of the people; but now the parliament has delivered us from that enemy." And another leader, Bebel, declared: "The Ultramontanes are our mortal enemies." Bismarck, however, began his war on Socialism by attempting to exterminate these mortal enemies of the pest; and he ought not to have been surprised, when, having urged the Centre to vote for the law against Socialism, he heard from Windthorst: "How can we extinguish the fire, when you are continually nourishing it?"

From what we have said concerning the May Laws, the reader will readily understand that any concession on the part of the Holy See was impossible; and that since the German chancellor refused to abandon any of his arrogant and absurd pretensions, the "War for Civilization" seemed destined to last until the disintegrating forces of Socialism would have destroyed the power which knew not how to avail itself of its sole means of salvation. But an unexpected circumstance showed both parties to the struggle that peace might not be far distant. On May 13, 1878, a Socialistic workman, one Hædel or Lehmann, attempted the life of William I. The aim of the miscreant was not true; but the shock produced a deep impression on the mind of the monarch, and he remarked to the author of the May Laws that probably the contemplated crime was due to the fact that the people had been robbed of their religion. A few weeks afterward, on June 2, another Socialist, a certain Dr. Nobiling, made a second attack on the emperor-king, wounding him seriously in the face and arm, and forcing him to relinquish the reins of government, for a time, to the crown-prince. This second danger augmented the imperial disgust with the "War for Civilization"; and the feeling became predominant, when, on the occasion of the inauguration of the *Germania* monument at Niederwald on the Rhine, it was discovered that a mine had been prepared for the destruction of the entire imperial family. If we add to these facts the revelation made at the recent elections, that Berlin alone counted 56,133 resolute partisans of Liebknecht and Bebel, we will comprehend the significance of the many invitations

which Bismarck extended to Mgr. Masella, the papal nuncio at Munich, to visit Berlin. The Holy See was certainly gratified by this advance on the part of him who had said that he "would never go to Canossa"; but the dignity of the nuncio forbade a journey to the Prussian capital under the circumstances then subsisting (1). The chancellor then suggested Kissingen, a neutral place, for the desired interview; he was accustomed to repair thither annually for the sake of the waters, and the prelate might like to try the "cure," and at the same time to have a little talk about matters which interested both Rome and Germany. The nuncio found it convenient to visit Kissingen, and several interviews were held by the two diplomats. But saving the fact that the ice was broken, nothing came of these meetings; for while Bismarck offered to send an ambassador to the Vatican, he insisted on a recognition of the May Laws by the Pontiff. Shortly after this tentative attempt at reconciliation, negotiations were resumed at Vienna, between Mgr. Jacobini, papal nuncio at the Austrian court, and Count Hübner, acting for the chancellor. Mgr. Jacobini was one of the most conciliatory of men; and Hübner became convinced that if the prelate and his master were to meet, the latter would obtain his desires. Gasten, in the duchy of Salzburg, was selected for another trial of Bismarckian cajolery or intimidation; but the conciliatory Jacobini informed the chancellor that the Holy See would never recognize the May Laws. Not until 1880 did Bismarck resume his approach toward Canossa. Then he introduced in the Landtag his first modification of the May Laws. While retaining the power of maintaining or abolishing, at its own good pleasure, the royal commissaries whom it had charged with the duty of administering the temporalities of dioceses, the government renounced its usurpation of the right to depose ecclesiastics; and in 1881 it recognized, without forcing them to take the obnoxious oath of absolutely universal obedience, vicars-general for the dioceses of Paderborn, Osnabruck, and Breslau. Bismarck even recognized the

(1) Justin McCarthy, in his *Life of Leo XIII.*, appreciates the reason for which Mgr. Masella declined to go to Berlin: "It was quite clear to a man of Pope Leo's experience and observation that if he were to send his Munich nuncio to Berlin, the news would go all over the world that the Holy See was suing for peace with Prussia."

Pope's appointment of Mgr. Kopp to the see of Fulda, and that of Mgr. Korum to the see of Treves. However, the new bishops, disposed as they were to yield to the chancellor in all reasonable matters, found themselves so trammelled, that Windthorst styled them "bishops *in vinculis*." Such was the condition of ecclesiastical affairs when Windthorst forced the hand of the government by his proposition to grant freedom to the Catholic clergy "in everything concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass and the administration of the Sacraments." This instalment of justice having been rejected by two thirds of the deputies, and the same fate having befallen a proposition to restore their olden "dotations" to the clergy, Bennigsen, the leader of the National Liberals, declared that all such projects were very inopportune, since "Rome was then very nearly vanquished. Let us have but one or two years of patience, and we will gather the fruits of our excellent policy, for we will have conquered the Pope." But the elections of 1882 showed that the Liberal leader had erred; the Centrists gained several seats, and Rome manifested no signs of yielding to the governmental pretensions. Another step toward Canossa was taken on May 31, 1883, when it was decreed that a deposed bishop might be "pardoned" by the emperor, and might then resume the administration of his diocese; that the Minister of Worship might dispense candidates for ecclesiastical offices from "legal formalities"; that ecclesiastical students should not be obliged to undergo those State examinations which had been proclaimed as the best guarantees against superstition and fanaticism. This enactment was certainly a great relief to the harried clergy; but not one of the deposed bishops was "pardoned" by William I., until after the visit of the crown-prince (the future Frederick III.) to Leo XIII., when that "favor" was accorded only to the bishops of Limbourg and Munster. It is evident that Bismarck, realizing that the more severe features of his "War for Civilization" should disappear, still trusted to be able to save the principles for which he had contended; those principles would be abandoned, only when the May Laws would be abrogated. This truth was so evident to Wind-

thorst, the leader of the Centre, that when Mgr. Galimberti, then nuncio at Vienna, advised him to use his influence with his party in favor of a less vigorous opposition to the chancellor, His Little Excellency, as the Catholics affectionately termed their chief champion, replied: "I shall accede to your request most willingly; but not before the May Laws have been formally withdrawn. They do indeed swear to us that these laws will no longer be applied; but while that assurance may suffice for to-day, who will answer for the morrow? The freedom of us Catholics is a right. Can we abandon it to the caprice of a Minister?" And here let it be noted that this refusal of the Centre to hearken to the recommendation of Mgr. Galimberti, who was known to have merely echoed the views of Pope Leo XIII., was an excellent refutation of that falsehood which the school of Bismarck had so assiduously circulated in justification of its persecution of the Catholics; namely, that the Roman Pontiff held in his hands the political opinions and the votes of the German Catholics. And the firmness of Windthorst was rewarded when, by suggesting the pontifical arbitration in the affair of the Caroline Islands, the chancellor showed that he was willing to advance a little further on the road to Canossa. The proceedings connected with this arbitration afforded to Bismarck an opportunity of treating directly with the Holy See; and the first consequence of the *rapprochement* was the governmental consent to the filling of the then vacant sees of Cologne and Fribourg. It was then that Cardinal Ledochowski, yielding to the wishes of the Pontiff, resigned a diocese to which he could scarcely hope to return; and the provost of Königsberg, Dinder, was made archbishop of Posen. Then Mgr. Kopp, bishop of Fulda, was called to a seat in the Upper House of Prussia; and although the traditions of the German Church seemed to forbid such a course, the prelate thought that circumstances dictated his acceptance of the position (1). Bismarck had confidence in

(1) A seat in the Upper House had been offered, at various times during this century, to several bishops; but it had always been declined. Frederick William IV., the brother of the emperor William I., and the most just of all the Hohenzollern, would gladly have seated several bishops among his legislating nobles; and he approached Mgr. Geissel, then archbishop of Cologne, in the matter. The prelate replied: "So long as the bishops can sit in

Mgr. Kopp; but his object in ranging him among the peers was to obtain a means of treating with the Centre without any intervention of his own personality. On May 21, 1886, another modification to the May Laws was decreed. The State renounced its examination of clerical students, re-establishing the theological schools as they had been before 1873, but requiring their superiors to furnish to the Minister of Public Worship their statutes and the names of their professors. The Pope was recognized as the superior judge in ecclesiastical affairs; and the royal court which had sat in Berlin since 1873, for the purpose of deciding those affairs, was suppressed, thus exhibiting no longer the anomaly of a Protestant tribunal fining or imprisoning Catholic priests who had refused absolution to persons who were unworthy, or who had celebrated Mass or attended the dying without governmental permission. Finally, the elections of Feb., 1887, having convinced Bismarck that the power of the Centre was growing instead of diminishing, he determined to make such further modifications of the obnoxious laws as he deemed apt to conciliate a party, whose aid he sadly needed. These modifications were presented in five Articles; and when they were examined by Windthorst in the name of the Centre, the perspicacious leader decided as follows: The first Article ought to be rejected, he contended, because although it allowed the existence of diocesan seminaries, it gave to the State a very badly defined right of surveillance over the teaching in those institutions—an indefiniteness which bade fair to invite trouble of various kinds. The second Article, treating of the right of Veto, should be partly amended, said Windthorst, and partly rejected; it was condemnable as an entirety. The third Article, acknowledging the disciplinary authority of the Church, was welcomed by the great Centrist. The fourth Article, recognizing the right of the Church to inflict canonical punishment on her subjects when they violated her laws, was of course approved. The fifth Article, which permitted the return of certain religious orders or congregations, and excluded others, was

the Upper House only by royal favor, they will never wish to sit there." BAZIN; *loc. cit.*, p. 217.

sternly criticized. The eminent juriconsult said: "Among the demands which Catholics will never cease to make, is that for the freedom of the religious orders and congregations. We shall say nothing here concerning the Society of Jesus, and the orders which are alleged to be affiliated to it; their return must be considered by the Reichstag, for it was a law of the empire that crushed them. But we must declare at once that there are two objections to the law which is now proposed. The first objection arises from the fact that permission to return is granted solely to the orders or congregations which are either devoted to the care of souls, or are given to offices of charity, or lead a contemplative life." Then the government is reminded of the moral, economical, and material losses which have been entailed upon the Catholic populations by the expulsion of the teaching orders. The second objection to Article V. is derived from the state of utter dependency on the government in which the restored orders will be, if the law is passed. Windthorst concluded his report with this declaration: "It is indubitable that this project cannot be regarded as a final revision of the existing politico-ecclesiastical legislation; and until such revision is effected, it will be futile to talk about a durable peace between the Church and the State." The arguments of its leader convinced the entire Centre; but it soon transpired that Pope Leo had written to the archbishop of Cologne, manifesting a willingness to be content, *for the present*, with the governmental concessions. Then the Centre yielded; not deeming it good policy to be more exigent than the Roman Pontiff in matters concerning which he was certainly the better judge. The new law was enacted; and thenceforth the State exercised its "right" of Veto on the appointment of a pastor, only so far as the *title* of pastor was involved. The government merely insisted that the bishops should appoint to pastorships no priests who already labored under civil condemnation. The ordinaries were to be no longer obliged to fill vacancies within a stated period of time; and if a pastor were condemned to prison, the pastorship was not to be regarded as *ipso facto* vacant, as the May Laws had prescribed. Disciplinary measures were no longer to be notified to the

governors of the provinces. The Law of May 20, 1874, concerning the administration of vacant dioceses, was cancelled. Toleration was to be extended to religious orders which were devoted to the contemplative life, to exercises of Christian charity, or to the education of young girls. With these final modifications, the "War for Civilization" practically terminated; as its instigator and conductor avowed, nothing of his scheme remained, save "ruins and rubbish." Bismarck had arrived at Canossa.

CHAPTER II.

FREEMASONRY IN LATIN AMERICA.—GARCIA MORENO, "THE MODERN ST. LOUIS." *

The first Masonic Lodge in Spain was established in 1726; the first Lodge in Madrid was opened in 1731. Not having been condemned by the Church until 1738, the Brethren of the Three Points enjoyed twelve years of perfect freedom for the diffusion of their poison, ere its deadly nature was perceived by the Spaniards. Lodges were soon founded in all the principal cities; and when, in 1756, the government of Ferdinand VI. awoke to a sense of its duty in reference to the sectaries, they had multiplied to such an extent, and their nefarious doctrines had been so widely spread, that very little good was produced by that celebrated prohibitory edict which Masonic apologists affect to stigmatize as "the greatest and most cruel persecution of their order." When Charles III. left Naples in order to mount the Spanish throne in 1759, many of his courtiers were adepts of the Square and Compass; for the Neapolitan court had been a hot-bed of Masonry for many years. With the advent of these Italian brethren, the most prominent of whom was the Marquis of Squillace, the Lodge of Madrid found its power greatly increased; and from that day the influence of the sectaries on the policy of the Spanish government has been almost permanent. Much of this success was originally due to the fact that in those days the Spanish Lodges, like those

* This chapter appeared in the *Amer. Cath. Quarterly Review*, Vol. **IXIII**.

of the Two Sicilies, depended from the Grand Lodge of London, and to the analogous fact that the English cabinet encouraged the propagation of Masonry in both Spain and Portugal for its own political and commercial interests. Keene, the English ambassador at Madrid, devoted most of his energy and time to the Masonic propaganda; and when Charles IV. ascended the throne, nearly all the commerce of Spain was in English hands. Under Charles IV., many of the highest functionaries of the kingdom and not a few ecclesiastics were votaries of the Dark Lantern. Even the Inquisition was invaded by the sectaries. Llorente, the secretary of the dread tribunal, was one of the most active Masons of his day; and to his perversion is due that shallow diatribe which the average Protestant regards as a "History" of the institution which is his most persistent nightmare (1). The power of the sectaries had become so great in 1800, that Urquijo, the Prime Minister of Charles IV. and a Mason of high degree, thought that the time had come when Spain might definitely cease to have any relations with Rome, and he issued a series of edicts tending to that end. Fortunately the king hearkened to the representations of Pius VII., and revoked the schismatical decrees; but the Masonic influence was not easily thwarted. Urquijo and his brethren devised a plan for the un-Christianization of their country; he proposed to import several hundred thousands of Russian and other Jews into Spain, and to give such pecuniary aid and political encouragement that in time they might dominate the Christian element in the kingdom (2). The French invasion prevented the actuation of this design; and it was already forgotten when, in 1869, after the enforced abdication of Isabella II., the eminent Mason, Zorilla, endeavored to actuate a similar plan. Zorilla proposed to the government of the temporary Regency (Marshal Serrano) that an invitation to settle in Spain should be extended to many thousands of English Protestants. "These immigrants," he insisted, "*must all be English Protestants*"; and unpatriotically ignoring the fact that modern Spain had owed to Irish Catholic immigrants much of the

(1) For an account of Llorente and his book, see our Vol. II., p. 402.

(2) LA FUENTE; *Ecclesiastical History of Spain*, Vol. IV., p. 144. Madrid, 1873.

military power that she still possessed, he added: "Spain (*i. e.*, Spanish Freemasonry) *has no use for Irish Catholics.*" In 1880, another luminary of Freemasonry, Sagasta, then Grand Master of the Grand Orient of Spain, and unfortunately Prime Minister of Alfonso XII., affected feelings of commiseration for the Russian Jews, against whom the Slavs, maddened by the poverty to which Hebraic usury had reduced them, had risen in wicked riot. The tender-hearted statesman urged Alfonso XII. to pay the travelling expenses of 80,000 of the Russian and Polish Jews if they would settle in Spain, and to give to each head of a family or adult unmarried man a share of the public lands, all necessary implements, etc., and a guarantee of support until they were able to sustain themselves—that is, until the greater part of the lands of their Christian neighbors would have fallen into their clutches (1). Alfonso XII. declined to promote the Masonico-Jewish project; but, nevertheless, the brethren anticipated much power for their order during the reign of the weak son of Isabella II. In the *Bulletin of the Symbolic Scotch Grand Lodge*, Jan., 1882, we read: "In Spain cruel trials have frequently been the portion of Freemasonry; tolerated and proscribed alternately, the lot of the Spanish brethren has never been an enviable one. We were a little anxious as to the course that Alfonso XII. would pursue in our regard; but we are satisfied, since his promises to enforce *liberty of conscience* have been fulfilled. The advent of the illustrious Grand Master, Praxedes Mateo Sagasta, to the Prime Ministership, assures to Freemasonry the power of exercising its *mission of benevolence*, and of diffusing its *enlightenment*." Sagasta had just given a proof of his desire to "enlighten" the Spaniards by an endeavor to make civil marriage the law of the land, and by a declaration that "if that law entailed a rupture with Rome, the government of Alfonso XII. would draw inspiration from the conduct of Charles III., and would give an example of firmness against the *obstinacy* of the Church" (2). Sagasta's project for the

(1) DESCRAMPS: *Secret Societies and Society*, Bk. iii., ch. 6, § 1. Sixth edition. Paris, 1882.

(2) *Association Catholique*, Jan. 15, 1882.

demoralization of Spanish society was perforce postponed to a more propitious moment ; for the resistance of the Catholic deputies was then seconded by the fear, on the part of the government, of a Carlist rising in defence of legitimacy.

In just proportion with the increase of Masonic influence in Spain, the educational establishments of the kingdom had become corrupted. In many of the ecclesiastical institutions, during the reign of Charles III. (1746-1788), heretical doctrines were openly taught. Estalla, rector of the Seminary of Salamanca, and an avowed Freemason, taught a "natural religion," and therefore atheism, to the future religious teachers of the people ; and the authorities of the seminaries of Osma, Cordova, and Murcia soon imitated his audacity. In the time of Charles IV. (1788-1808), and for many years afterward, the once glorious Chapter of St. Isidore paraded its "enlightenment." In accordance with the system of Aranda (1), it endeavored, nearly a century before Bismarck's similar enterprise in our day, to relegate to the regions of the past all doctrines which it chose to consider as " Jesuitical," and it did not hesitate to inoculate its students with the poison of Locke and d'Alembert. Incredulism and immorality, therefore, were not then the foreign exotics which they had hitherto been ; although, just as in the Spain of to-day, the immense majority of the people remained true to their faith, and the nation was then, as now, the most moral of all the nations of continental Europe. The Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella and of Philip II. was a thing of the past ; the Spain of Aranda, Urtijo, Campomanes, Jovellanos, and others of that ilk—all graduates of Masonry—was preparing the catastrophe for the Spain which we know, the Spain of Espartero, Prim, O'Donnell, Castelar, Zorilla, Sagasta, and other Masonic pygmies, who fancied, each in his turn, that the mantle of Cardinal Ximenes had fallen on his shoulders (2).

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

(2) The reader who desires to learn how the ecclesiastical authorities in Spain were prevented, during the latter part of the eighteenth century and during the first years of the nineteenth, from displaying the energy which was necessary for a successful combat with Freemasonry, will do well if he studies the work by Henry Bruck, Professor in the Seminary of Mayence, entitled, *The Secret Societies in Spain*. Mayence, 1881.

A natural consequence of the spread of Freemasonry in Spain was its introduction into the Spanish-American colonies. According to the *Monde Maçonnique* (1), an organ of the Dark Lantern which has every facility for the acquisition of information concerning this and similar matters, there were, at the outbreak of the revolution against the mother-country, ninety-nine Lodges in Peru alone. That these and other Lodges were the instigators of the insurrections of 1815-1830, and that they simply obeyed the orders given by the heads of European Masonry, when they so acted, was deliberately stated by the Protestant diplomat, Count Haugwitz, in the memorial which he presented to the European sovereigns who formed the Congress of Verona in 1822; and as his assertion was not contradicted by the Masonic half of the assembly, it may be regarded as strictly true (2). Nearly

(1) In the issue for March, 1875.

(2) Some passages from this memorial by Haugwitz, who was the Prussian Prime Minister of that day, ought to interest the reader. "Now that I am at the end of my career (he was then seventy years old, and had been in the Prussian cabinet nearly forty years), I think that it is my duty to draw your attention to the aims of those secret societies whose poison threatens humanity to-day more than ever. Their history is so intimately intertwined with my own that I cannot refrain from giving some details. . . . I had scarcely attained my majority when I found myself occupying a distinguished place in the highest grades of Masonry. Before I could even know myself, before I could understand the situation into which I had rashly plunged myself, I found myself entrusted with the chief direction of a part of Prussian, Polish, and Russian Masonry. As far as its secret labors were concerned, Masonry was then divided into two sections. The first affected to aim at a discovery of the philosopher's stone; its religion was Deism, or rather Atheism; its directive centre, under Dr. Zinndorf, was in Berlin. The second section, the apparent head of which was Prince F. of Brunswick, was very different. In open antagonism with each other, these two parties united in order to obtain the domination of the world, to subjugate every throne—such was their object. It would be superfluous to tell you how, in the satisfaction of my ardent curiosity, I mastered the secret of each of these sects; the truth is that the secret is no mystery for me. And that secret disgusts me. It was in 1777 that I assumed the direction of some of the Prussian Lodges; it was three or four years before the convent of Wilhelmshaus, and the invasion of the Lodges by Illuminism. My sphere of action embraced the brethren scattered through Poland and Russia. Had I not seen the fact with my own eyes, I would not believe it possible that governments could close their eyes to such a disorder as a state within a state. . . . Our object, like that of the olden Templars, was to dominate over thrones and sovereigns. . . . There appeared a book entitled *Errors and Truths*. This work produced a sensation, and it impressed me deeply. . . . At once I thought I would now learn what was hidden under the emblems of the Order; but according as I penetrated further into the dark cavern, deeper grew my conviction that there was something very different in the last recesses. The light came when I found that Saint-Martin, the author of this work, was really one of the coryphees of the Chapter of Slon. . . . Then I acquired the firm conviction that the drama which began in 1789, the French Revolution, the regicide with all its horrors, had not only been long prepared, but that it was the result of our association, of our oaths, etc. . . . Those who know me can judge of the effect which these discoveries produced on me. . . . My first care was to communicate my discoveries to King William III. Both of us were convinced that all of the Ma-

all of the Spanish commanders-in-chief in America during the years 1815-1830 were Freemasons; hence the numerous understandings with the rebel leaders, and hence, notably, the capitulation of the Spanish army at Ayacucho, in Peru, in 1824 (1). When the Spanish-American colonies had become independent states, then the halcyon days of Spanish-American Masonry, if we are to judge from a Masonic point of view, entered on their course. "Then," says the *Monde Maçonique*, "a love of enlightenment and of liberty arose at once, together with independence, as though from a propitious soil." The entire political history of most of the Spanish-American republics, and much of that history in the others, shows that while the soil may have been "propitious," its Masonic cultivators produced no other crops than chronic revolutions and all their attendant miseries. As for the "love of enlightenment" which the Lodges claim to have manifested in every land of Latin-America during the periods when the civil power has been in their hands, it cannot be denied that if Satanic hatred of Catholicism and of its works be a test of "enlightenment," then, indeed, the Dark Lantern is more luminous than the sun of justice and of truth. It may be observed, however, than in Spanish and Portuguese-America, just as in other Christian lands, "love of enlightenment" has not been the impelling motive of Freemasonry in its war to the knife against the Church. In the eyes of Freemasonry, the crying sin of the Church is not that she is ignorant rather than enlightened, despotic rather than liberal; her unparadonable fault is that she is the Church of Jesus Christ. As

sonic grades, from the lowest to the highest, were destructive of all religious principles, conducive to the execution of the most criminal designs, and that the lowest grades were used as mere mantles to cover the iniquities of the highest. This conviction, snared with me by the king, caused me to renounce Masonry absolutely; but the king deemed it prudent to abstain from an open rupture with the Order." When Haugwitz's memorial had been well discussed by the sovereigns assembled in Verona, the Prussian king alone refused to take measures against Freemasonry; and from that day the Lodges regarded Prussia as the sole continental State willing to accomplish their work, *fas aut nefas*. The emperors of Austria and Russia determined to act as energetically as their Masonic surroundings would permit. Alexander I., the Russian czar, had hitherto protected Masonry, but now he proscribed it; in 1816 he had expelled the Jesuits from his empire, but in 1824, as we have seen, he sent General Michaud to Rome to prepare the way for the return of Russia into the Catholic fold. He died mysteriously as soon as the errand of Michaud was made known. Was that death the work of Masonry?

(1) See the cited work by Bruck for several Spanish authorities for this assertion.

M. de Champagny well said : " There has ever been, from the beginning of the world, but one single war between the Church, whether patriarchal, Mosaic, or Christian, and that Proteus which was styled Paganism in ancient times, which appeared as Mohammedanism in the sixth century, which was disguised as Protestantism in the sixteenth century, which masqueraded as Incredulism in the eighteenth, and which now combats as the Revolution " (1); and Freemasonry is the personification of each one of these pests. The Satanic sympathies of Freemasonry, whatever may be the individual sentiments of some of its adepts, are especially evinced in Latin-America; for not one of the Masonic " Powers " in those regions interrupted its relations with the Grand Orient of France, when that great and shining exemplar of all the Masonic virtues erased from its Constitution the name of God and all mention of the immortality of the human soul (2).

Elsewhere we have alluded to the peculiar tactics adopted by Freemasonry in its war against Christianity in Portugal (3); to the deliberate attempt to corrupt the entire Portuguese clergy—an enterprise the plan of which had been sketched originally by Weisshaupt as calculated to subjugate the German priesthood, and which was recommended afterward by the Roman *Alta Vendita*, as promising to place a Carbonaro on the throne of Peter (4). This Satanic method of warfare had attained a measure of success in Germany and in Tuscany in the last years of the eighteenth century; and, as we have seen, it did not fail entirely when it was waged in Portugal in later days. With light hearts, therefore, the Brethren of the Three Points undertook in Brazil the most important campaign which they have ever conducted in Latin America. Their first victory entailed the capture of no less a personage than Dom Pedro, the son and heir of John VI. In 1814 John VI. returned to Portugal, whence the Napoleonic invasion had driven him; but Dom Pedro remained in Brazil and became a Mason. It is not improbable that it was the advice of his fellow-sectaries that induced Pedro to prefer an independent sceptre of

(1) *The Power of Words*, p. 31. Paris, 1880.

(2) See our Vol. IV., p. 436.

(3) *Ibid.*, Vol. v., p. 267.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 493.

Brazil to a double crown of Brazil and Portugal (1). In a letter written to his father on July 15, 1822, he advised the old monarch to imitate him, since, as he argued, "the Portuguese were very foolish when they felt such horror for so philanthropic an institution" (2). In 1826 Dom Pedro was made Grand Master of Brazilian Masonry, and during his entire reign he endeavored to establish the order firmly in his dominions. No open attack, however, was made on Catholicism during this reign, and the same prudence was observed during the greater part of the reign of Dom Pedro II. (1831-1889). But during all these years the Freemasons were insinuating themselves not only into all the religious confraternities which abound in Brazil as well as in Portugal, but also into the priesthood, and even into the episcopacy. For many years before the persecution which we are about to narrate, it was with the greatest difficulty that any person could be admitted into the Confraternity of Mt. Carmel, or into the Third Order of St. Francis, unless he was previously enrolled in some Masonic Lodge (3); and we can perceive the significance of this alarming fact if we remember that as in Portugal, so in Brazil, few persons of any respectability did not belong to one of these or similar confraternities, so great and manifold were the religious and social advantages reaped by their members (4). Certainly it seems strange that the adepts of Square and Triangle waited until 1872 to doff the mask which had hitherto hidden their hideousness (5). Perhaps they had not been sure of the ap-

(1) CLAVEL; *Pictorial History of Freemasonry*, Pt. ii., ch. 3.

(2) This letter is given in its entirety by Meneacci, in his *Documents for the History of the Italian Revolution*, Vol. ii., p. 67.

(3) DESCHAMPS; *loc. cit.*, Bk. iii., ch. 35, § 1.

(4) The riots which occurred in Porto, in Portugal, in 1862, and in which the war-cry was, "Down with the Sisters of Charity!" were instigated by the Third Order of St. Francis. These wonderful disciples of the Seraph of Assisi, in the letter of dismissal from their hospital which they sent to the Daughters of St. Vincent, protested that "their determination was caused by no unfavorable opinion of the Sisters." Such a remark was superfluous. They were Freemasons, and that fact explained their action.

(5) In May, 1872, the *Bulletin of the United Grand Orient of Brazil* thus manifested the designs of the order: "We are fighting to fulfil the grand humanitarian and social mission which has been reserved for our order in the universal country which is afflicted by errors a thousand years old. . . . Our reason, our intelligence, tell us that we are progressing toward perfectibility, and the chief point is to regulate our march so as to arrive at the goal more surely. . . . Hidden behind the screen of so called religious beliefs, the Black Men (the priests) propagate the fatal principle of obligatory ignorance, in

probation of the emperor, Dom Pedro II., a sovereign who would have liked to serve God without displeasing the devil ; but it is certain that just before the persecution, when Dom Pedro was about to return from his travels in North America and Europe, it was common talk in Brazil that the stay of His Majesty in Italy and in the United States had rendered him bitter against the Holy See, and that the Brazilian Church might expect trouble. Villefranche narrates that one morning in 1872, at about seven o'clock, just as Pius IX. had finished his Mass, word was brought to His Holiness that the emperor of Brazil, who was then visiting Victor Emmanuel, desired an audience. In spite of the early hour, the Pontiff consented to receive Dom Pedro. When the Brazilian had made his obeisance, the Pope said : "Well, what can I do for Your Majesty?" Dom Pedro replied : "I beg Your Holiness not to call me 'Your Majesty' ; at present I am the Count d'Alcantara."—"Very well," said the Pope, "what can I do for the Count d'Alcantara?"—"I have come," replied Dom Pedro, "to ask permission to bring *the King of Italy* to Your Holiness." Villefranche says that Pius IX. arose, and with his eyes flashing, he cried : "There is no use in proposing such a thing to me. When *the King of Piedmont* restores to me my states, I may consent to receive him, but not until then shall I do so." The same interview is narrated somewhat differently by the Brazilian authority on whose report of the Masonic persecution Deschamps relies as being of such unimpeachable value that "it would be rash not to accord it full confidence." According to this authority, when Dom Pedro had made his impudent request, the Pontiff calmly said : "My little Count, you understand nothing about these things ; so don't talk about them." The pontifical retort, says the Brazilian friend of Deschamps, cut Dom Pedro to the quick, and he determined to punish Pius IX. "One thing is certain," adds this authority ; "before the emperor's return from Europe, it was circulated everywhere in Brazil that His Majesty had

order to perpetuate their sacerdotal authority. . . . The people will now tear off the bandages of slavery which the oppressors of the human conscience have placed over their eyes. . . . The advantages of *modern civilization* will now take the place of the routine of centuries."

become ill-disposed toward the Church ; that he was greatly excited against her, and that she might expect much misfortune. These rumors, I repeat, were heard everywhere before the return of the emperor, and events justified them."

Whether or not this rumor was well-founded, the spring of 1872 was signalized by a declaration of open war, on the part of Freemasonry, against the Church of the immense majority of the Brazilians. At that time Brazilian Masonry was divided into two factions, each having its own Grand Lodge—the one being of monarchical spirit, and the other being essentially radical and revolutionary. The Grand Master of the first faction was Rio Branco, the President of the Cabinet. On March 3d the Rio Branco Masons gave a banquet to their leader, in order to congratulate him on some measures which he had induced the Parliament to vote ; and one of the features of the celebration was a discourse *by a priest*. The speech was reproduced by the most important journal of the empire, the *Commercio*, and the full name, position, titles, etc., of the orator were carefully detailed. The audacious ecclesiastic was immediately suspended by his bishop ; and then, from every corner of Brazil, were heard the howls of "the friends of Brazilian liberty." Herod and Pilate shook hands ; on April 16th the "Conservative" Grand Orient (the *Lavra Dio*) invited the Radical Grand Orient (the *Benedictinos*, so called from the place of its meeting) to sink all political differences in order to wage a more successful war against the "Black Men." That this union might be the more impressive, both Orients announced in the newspapers that on a certain day the Brethren would have a solemn Mass of Requiem offered for one of their number who had just died "impenitent and unabsolved." The defiance of episcopal authority was unmistakable ; but unfortunately the bishop of Rio Janeiro neglected his duty, and the Mass was celebrated with all the pomp of Masonry. Having thus vindicated their claims to popular respect in the capital, the sectaries turned their attention to the provinces. Mgr. Vital Gonçalves de Oliveira, a prelate of sweet character and of great tact, had just been installed in his diocese of Olinda, when the journals announced, on June 27th, and in the name of the united Grand

Orients, that on the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul a Mass of thanksgiving would be celebrated in the Church of St. Peter, in commemoration of the foundation of the Lodge of Olinda. In spite of his gentleness, Oliveiro was of stamina very different from that of the bishop of Rio ; therefore, he immediately wrote to each pastor in his diocese a reminder that no priest could officiate or assist at a function which was avowedly Masonic. The clergy refused to do the bidding of the Orient ; but the Brethren were not discouraged. On July 3d the newspapers told the public that a Mass of Requiem would be offered in the Cathedral for the repose of the soul of a recently deceased Brother, and that the Lodge of Olinda would attend with all its insignia. Again the clergy did their duty ; and then the Masonic journals called on the people to protest against the wickedness of the priests "who would not pray for the dead." The bishop of Olinda was asked to refute the following argument : "Why does the bishop so limit Freemasonry as to prevent it from appearing officially at the religious functions in his churches ? Masonry is a holy institution ; the proof of this assertion lies in the fact that there are many Masons among his clergy, even in his Chapter, and also in the confraternities. The Freemasons are excellent Catholics ; for the same hands which carry the mallet in the Lodges carry the sacred banners and images in religious processions." On December 28th Mgr. Oliveiro sent a circular to all his clergy, calling on them to procure either an abjuration from all the Masonic members of the confraternities, or a resignation of their membership (1). It was found that in some of the confraternities there were no Freemasons ; but there were too many of the societies which proved that the sectaries had not belied them, and these were disciplined by the interdiction of their spe-

(1) The reader must know that in this term "confraternities" were included in Brazil as in Portugal, not only organizations like those to which that name is given in other countries, but also those bodies which had been instituted by Pombal for the administration of the business affairs of the parishes, but principally in order to attenuate the authority of the bishops. These parochial "confraternities" were very different from our Boards of Trustees, or the French *Conseils de Fabrique*, or the Italian *Fabrice* ; they not only handled the parochial funds, but they arranged all festive celebrations, and invited whom they pleased to assist at them. They wore special costumes, and attended all marriages, funerals, and very many civil functions.

cial chapels. As was to be expected, and as the Masons had hoped, the censured confraternities continued to hold their accustomed services in their interdicted chapels, one of their number presiding when no priest could be induced to officiate. They also continued to attend, in their special regalia, at all the parochial services in their churches. In the diocese of Para everything happened as in that of Olinda; and the parish clergy of each diocese were notified by the rebels that if the confraternites were not allowed to appear in church and to receive the Blessed Sacrament "in their Masonic capacity," the said confraternities would remove the sacred vestments from the churches, and would take possession of the keys of the Tabernacles. The threat was fulfilled; and whenever a priest was summoned to give the Holy Viaticum to the dying, he was obliged to humiliate himself before the president of his Masonic confraternity, unless time allowed him to go to the Tabernacle in the episcopal residence, or to that in one of the convents. In none of the parishes of Olinda and Para was Mass now offered; and the interdicted confraternities confiscated to secular purposes (or to their individual pockets) the funds which had been placed in their care for the celebration of Masses for the Dead, or for other pious intentions. These diabolic outrages could not continue in a Catholic community without much risk of life and limb on the part of the perpetrators; the people are not always as patient as their spiritual advisers. It became necessary, therefore, for the "Masonic Catholics" to invoke the aid of the civil authority against the Canons of the Church. They appealed to the Parliament, not having reflected that the deputies of the people might sustain the authority of the bishops; but their mistake was perceived by the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, a notorious Freemason, and he advised them to appeal to his tribunal. The advice was followed; and with Masonry as a judge in a case to which it was a party, the issue was not doubtful. On June 12, 1873, an imperial decree ordered the bishops to withdraw the interdict which they had pronounced against the confraternities; the government alleging that the Papal condemnation of Freemasonry was of no value, since it had never received the royal *executur*,

or, in plain language, since His Brazilian Majesty had not accorded to it his gracious approbation. By a strange coincidence, at the very moment that the decree of Dom Pedro II. was placed in the hands of Mgr. Oliveiro, he received also the Papal Brief, *Quonquam dolores*, in which, under date of May 29th, Pius IX. approved all that he and the bishop of Para had done in the matter of the Freemasons, and ordered him to communicate this approbation to the entire Brazilian hierarchy. The bishop of Olinda, therefore, wrote to the emperor: "Sire, I hold now in one hand your order to raise the interdict which I have inflicted, and in the other hand I hold a Brief in which His Holiness commends all that I have done in that matter. Your Majesty shall judge whether I am free to obey your commands." Oliveiro immediately published the Papal Brief throughout his diocese, and the government summoned him to answer for the "crime" of publishing a document from Rome without the royal permission. But when it was learned that all the bishops in the empire had been equally guilty, the trial was postponed indefinitely, and other and more radical measures were taken against the principal offender. On January 2, 1874, an imperial commissary presented himself at the residence of the intrepid prelate in Pernambuco. When informed that the officer was charged with the unpleasant task of arresting him, Oliveiro replied that he would yield only to force. Then the commissary laid his hand on the bishop's arm—the conventional sign that force was being used—and the prisoner asked to be allowed to retire to his private rooms for a few moments. Permission having been accorded, Oliveiro withdrew. When seated in his chamber, he rapidly wrote a protest against the governmental proceedings. Then he put on all his pontifical robes, and went to his private chapel. After a moment of prayer, he opened the door, and asked the waiting commissary: "*Quem queritis?*" Then he read his protest, and followed the officer to the man-of-war which was to convey him to Rio. Having arrived in the capital, he was confined in the arsenal for three days, and then he was visited by certain officers, who asked him what he had to say in answer to the charges which they read to him. No answer could be made; for, as a Catholic

bishop, Oliveiro could not admit the competency of a secular tribunal in religious matters. But he asked for paper, wrote a few words, and sealed the document. When the judges who were to try his case assembled, they were very anxious to learn the nature of his pleading; but when the important paper was opened, it was found to contain: "*Jesus autem tacebat.*" On February 21 the daring criminal was condemned to four years of hard labor in a fortress; but Dom Pedro deigned to alleviate the sentence by exempting his victim from the hard labor. Immediately after the disposal of the case of the bishop of Olinda, that of Mgr. Macedo, the bishop of Para, received the same treatment, and ended in the same manner. After two years of imprisonment, both prelates were graciously "pardoned" by the emperor. But the bishop of Para was destined to undergo many more painful experiences at the hands of the Masonic apostles of "enlightenment and liberty." The most notable of these sufferings was that which was entailed by his condemnation of the Confraternity of Our Lady of Nazareth; an institute which, founded in 1842 for noble purposes of mutual edification, had latterly fallen almost entirely into the clutches of Masonry. In October, 1877, this association was celebrating one of its feasts with a grand procession, when suddenly the spectators were shocked by the sight of pictures of entirely naked women, and of other representations even more obscene, amid the images of Jesus, Mary, and the saints (1). The episcopal condemnation of this sacrilege, accentuated by an interdict of the chapel of the culpable confraternity, entailed legal proceedings which lasted for more than two years, and finally the Masons gained their cause; for the president of the province, Goma y Abreu, was an adept. On the night of the day when it had been decided that the sacrilegious organization should retain possession of its chapel, the brethren passed in procession before the palace of the bishop, insulting him with hootings and groans. The religious images were carried, as usual, in this procession; but the character of the participants was shown by the fact that nearly all wore their hats and had cigars in their mouths; and in order that the victory

(1) Thus the Paris *Univers* of November 10, 1879, quoting the *Diario de Belem*.

might be more clearly understood as one of Masonry, the rooms of the Lodge of Para were grandly illuminated during the festivities, and the brethren furnished the populace with an expensive exhibition of fireworks, the chief features of which were Masonic emblems (1). But in spite of the apparent triumph of the Lodges over the bishops of Olinda and Para, the more perspicacious of the brethren could not fail to perceive that their outrageous violations of law and justice, to say nothing of their open scorn of all that most Brazilians held as dearer than life, were drawing to the clergy the sympathies of all honest men, and were tightening the bond of unity between the hierarchy and the priests. Therefore it was decided in the superior councils of the Dark Lantern that there should be a cessation of the high-handed proceedings of the previous seven years ; that there should be a recourse to the more prudent wiles of European Masonry ; that, in fine, the order should endeavor to gain possession of the family, and to control the education of the young. This resolution was foreshadowed in the address which Saldanha Marinho, the Prime Minister, delivered on the occasion of his installation as Grand Master of the United Grand Orient of Brazil : " I now assume, before you and before Brazil, the onerous duty of defending zealously those grand social ideas, the realization of which is the aim of every free people. . . . I have always opposed the logic of truth to the subtleties of *Jesuitism* ; the serenity of my conscience to the sophisms of hypocrisy ; the rights of free reason to the excesses of fanaticism ; the spread of healthy teaching to the propagation of error and obscurantism. . . . Strong though he may be in the possession of truth, no one man can succeed in this propaganda of generous ideas ; and here is revealed the power of our order. You have already demonstrated your good will and your zeal by a generous supply of the resources which are necessary for the success of the mission which I have undertaken ; and, thanks to that aid, during the last seven years I have sent into the farthest corners of the empire, and even into foreign lands, the echo of our complaints and aspirations, and our demand for the restoration of rights which have been

(1) *The Univers* of December 31, 1879, quoting the *Boa Nova de Para*.

suffocated by the armies of fanaticism and superstition. . . . The task which we have proposed to ourselves, and not merely in the name of Masonry, but for its sake, since the upholding of these principles involves the very existence of the order, is to procure the institution of *civil marriages*, so as to free our fellow-citizens from the tyranny of an exclusive and intolerant Church; and, secondly, to obtain the *secularization of all cemeteries*, thereby protecting the mortal remains of the dead from the insults of a religious sect which pretends to extend its power into the domain of the Infinite" (1). But Saldanha Marinho relinquished his portfolio in 1880; and the new cabinet, beyond an enforcement of the principle of governmental supervision of education, evinced no desire to aid the Masonic propaganda. So "clerical," in fact, did the new administration show itself, that it even ventured to allow the Capuchins to undertake the evangelization of such of the Brazilian tribes as were still Pagan. The bishops were allowed comparative freedom in the exercise of their pastoral duties; and large numbers of the deluded sectaries, who had learned from the recent persecution that Masonry was not an inoffensive and merely benevolent association, made their formal abjurations. The advent of the Republic, proclaimed in 1889, gave great encouragement to the Brethren of the Three Points, and the laws were all revised in a Masonic sense; but hitherto the fervent Catholicism of the nation has prevented any open and extraordinary persecution of the Church.

While the "Liberator," Simon Bolivar, was fighting for the independence of Columbia (2), the civil administration of the country was in the hands of the vice-president, General Santander, a democrat like the president, but a man of pronouncedly Masonic heart. Bolivar would have willingly allowed the Church to live at peace in a free state; but Santander could perceive no happiness in a state which did not hold the Church in slavery. By means of a Lodge which he founded in Bogota, entitled a "Society for Enlightenment,"

(1) *Journal of Belgian Masonry*, Dec. 8, 1879.

(2) Such was the name given in 1810 to the republic formed by the confederation of Venezuela, New Granada and Equador.

and of which he caused himself to be elected "Venerable," he spread the poison of a bastard Liberalism among the people, inoculating them with the notion that they would never be really free, until Columbia possessed a truly Liberal Constitution, and that such a panacea would never be obtained unless they ceased to elect to the Congress men who were "reactionaries, fanatics, and secret partisans of the Spanish Government." In 1821 an imposing majority of Freemasons greeted General Santander when he met the new Congress in Cucuta. The first act of the precious body was to abolish the article of the Constitution which declared that the Catholic religion was that of the State; and the pretext was the non-necessity of such a declaration in a Catholic republic. When the leader of the minority, Dr. Banos, announced that his party could not vote for an enactment which was "radically vicious," he was instantly expelled from the Congress. Of course the Congress voted for the abolition of the Inquisition, which had been dead, to all intents and purposes, for many years; and it also decreed that the right of censorship should be vested in the government alone—a power which Santander immediately exercised by authorizing the publication of the works of Voltaire, Helvetius, Diderot, Bentham, as well as of many immoral pamphlets. The Congress also prepared the way for a schism, that favorite engine of Satan when heresy is not immediately possible. The Holy See had allowed the Spanish sovereigns to exercise a *jus patronatus* in the nomination of bishops and in the administration of the ecclesiastical revenues, and the Congress pretended to have inherited this right from the defunct government. Then, in order to banish the last effects of "centuries of intellectual slavery," the Congress imposed a new plan of studies on the universities, and even on the ecclesiastical seminaries. One of the obligatory text-books was the work of the materialist and atheist, Bentham; and when a certain eminent professor, Dr. Margallo, stigmatized this author as impious, he was thrown into prison. Restrepo, the historiographer of Columbia and a friend of Santander, is constrained to say of this republican tyranny: "This congressional legislation made a *tabula rasa* of the customs, as well as of the religious convictions, of the

nation ; in a word, it was a complete anomaly in face of the sentiments of the people. Therefore the simple announcement of another session of this Congress caused as much consternation as though an earthquake or a hurricane had been predicted. In fact, such Congresses, being composed almost exclusively of lawyers and of lads who were crammed full of French theories (those of 1789), had but one object—to impregnate Columbia with the doctrines of Voltaire and Rousseau” (1). Had the Masonico-Liberal administration given to the people some material compensation for the impieties with which it deluged the land, the spirit of the world might have triumphed in Columbia ; but brigandage, devastation, military executions for pretended royalism, and rapine of every kind, became the order of the day. This condition of affairs caused every lover of order and of common decency to call on Bolivar, the man who had liberated them from the “yoke of the Spaniards,” to free them from the more intolerable yoke of Masonic Liberalism ; some begged him to restore the Spanish domination ; others, and the most respectable of all, suggested that he might don a crown as “Emperor of the Andes.” These clamors reached Bolivar immediately after his great victory of Potosi, obtained on April 1, 1825, and by which he had liberated Peru. He prepared immediately to proceed to Columbia, and in the meantime he forwarded a proclamation announcing his journey : “The noise of your discords has reached me, even in Peru, and I return to you with an olive-branch in my hand. If your disorders do not cease, anarchy and consequent death will triumph over the ruins of Columbia.” During the ensuing three years the efforts of the Liberator to endow his compatriots with peace and prosperity were continually thwarted by the Santanderist Masons ; the Lodges had resolved to rule or to bury Bolivar and Columbia in the same tomb. But a crisis arrived on Sept. 25, 1828, when, at the hour of midnight, a band of these partisans of liberty and enlightenment assailed the presidential palace, and with daggers in hand, forced their way to the bedroom of Bolivar, crying for his death. The attempt

(1) *History of Columbia*, cited by Berthe in his *Garcia Moreno, President of Ecuador, Avenger of Christian Right, and its Martyr*. Paris, 1887.

failed ; the president had escaped by a secret passage. The leading assassins were shot ; and Santander, convicted of complicity, was banished. Then the Liberator issued the following decree : “ Considering, firstly, that the State would be soon brought to ruin if impunity were accorded to criminals and rebels, I resume the dictatorial power with which the people invested me. Considering, secondly, that *Secret Societies have the planning of political revolutions for their principal object, and that their baneful character is sufficiently manifested by the mystery with which they surround themselves, I order the suppression of all such societies, and the closing of their Lodges.*” Then, exhorting the clergy to inculcate unceasingly the principles of Christian morality, he continued : “ It is because the country has abandoned correct principles that a spirit of madness has taken possession of it. In order to neutralize the wicked theories which have utterly demoralized the people, let the clergy preach obedience and respect to all.” Finally, being persuaded that the youth of Columbia were being poisoned by the doctrines then in vogue in the universities, he decreed that the entire curriculum should be revised in a Christian sense, and that a profound study of religion should be introduced, “ so that the young men of the nation might have weapons wherewith to combat impiety and their own passions.” Nothing but sad experience and the ascendancy of truth could have wrung these admissions from Bolivar ; for during his early years he had advocated the principles of 1789 almost to the point of deifying the Revolution. The adepts of Square and Triangle never forgave the Liberator for his declaration of these Christian sentiments ; and, had they not expected much from the day when his partisans would be obliged to appeal again to the polls for the approbation of the electors, he would have paid for his temerity with his life. In the meantime the people were made to believe that every vote cast for a partisan of the dictator would be a vote for a Columbian monarchy, and when the elections had been held it was found that the Masonic candidates had triumphed in nearly every instance.

On January 13, 1830, the new Congress assembled ; and in spite of the entreaties of his friends, and although the

Diplomatic corps promised its unanimous support if he would retain his dictatorship, the Liberator resigned his office, never, as he protested, to assume it again. "And now," he wrote to the Congress, "*let my last official act be to recommend Congress to protect continually our holy religion, the fruitful source of the blessings of heaven; and to entrust Congress to restore its sacred and imprescriptible rights to public instruction, which has been made a cancer for Columbia. . . . Fellow-citizens, I must say, and with the blush of shame on my brow, that while we have won our independence, it has been won at the expense of every other blessing. . . .* For twenty years I have served you as soldier and as magistrate. During that long period we have freed our country, procured liberty for three republics, repressed many civil wars, and four times I have resigned to the people the supreme power which they confided to me. To-day I fear that I may be an obstacle to your happiness, and therefore I resign, for the last time, the magistracy with which you have honored me. The most unworthy suspicions have been expressed in my regard, and I have been unable to defend myself. A crown has been offered to me frequently by men who are now ambitious of supreme power, but I always refused that crown with the indignation of a sincere republican. I swear that a desire for a throne has never stained my soul. Columbians, I conjure you to heed my last entreaty. Be united, and do not become the assassins of your country!" On May 8th Bolivar departed from Carthagena, with the intention of sailing for Europe. While waiting for the ship which he was not destined to board, he heard of the dismemberment of the Columbia which he had founded. Venezuela had become independent under the presidency of General Paez. The three departments of Ecuador, namely, Quito, Cuenca and Guayaquil, had become autonomous under the rule of General Flores. His dearest friend, Marshal Sucre, the victor of Ayacucho, had been assassinated by his rivals—a crime which caused the Liberator to say: "It is the blood of Abel that has been shed." He heard also that the students in Bogota—lads who were pupils of Masonic instructors—were amusing themselves by

making a target of his portrait. Perhaps he was not surprised when General Urdaneta, having made a kind of *coup d'état* in order to save the remnants of Columbia, sent to him a deputation, entreating him to resume the dictatorship. His reply was: "A gate of bronze separates me from power—legality. I cannot assume an authority with which another has been invested." His friends begged him to think of his dying country; but he replied: "*There is no hope for my country. Such is my conviction, and my despair.*" The moral agony which such reflections entailed on Bolivar brought him to the tomb. Having been taken to the city of Santamarta, where his friends thought that he might obtain sufficient strength to enable him to prosecute his European trip, the bishop told him that he was at the point of death. He received the Last Sacraments with edifying fervor, and died in his forty-eighth year on December 17, 1830, a victim of Masonic treachery and of Masonic essential lack of patriotism.

The Republic of Equador, born of the dismemberment of that ephemeral creation of Bolivar, the Republic of Columbia, was subjected for many years to the pretendedly "Conservative Liberalism" which found its fit exponents in men like Flores, Rocafuerte, and Roca. This Liberalism exhibited the sovereignty of the people as its essential principle; but its Conservatism consisted in preserving itself in power, even in spite of the will of the nation. The hybrid did not trouble itself to persecute the Church, so long as the Church showed herself willing to serve as its obsequious servant. Under the rule of Urbina and Robles hypocritical Conservatism disappeared, and unblushing Radicalism seemed destined to consummate a ruin which was already more than half completed. But a new era dawned for Equador in 1861, when Garcia Moreno was elected to the too frequently prostituted presidential office. In his first message to the Congress the new president asked that body to adopt a Constitution which would be Catholic in every sense of the term—one which would furnish "the sole means of regenerating the country by an energetic repression of crime, by giving a solid education to youth, and by protecting the

holy religion of our ancestors, so that by the aid of that religion we may procure a realization of reforms which neither government nor laws can effect by their own unaided efforts." The draft of a Constitution which Moreno submitted began with the declaration that the Holy Catholic and Roman Religion was the sole Religion of the State. But the Freemasons, who, in spite of the generally Catholic result of the recent elections, had obtained a few seats in the Congress, could not miss this opportunity of protesting against "a retrograde legislation." One of the sectaries, a priest, declaimed a discourse of Mirabeau in theatrical style, concluding with the sage observation that "since God is as visible as the sun, it would be an injurious superfluity to recognize Him officially." Such reasoning did not convince the deputies; the entire Constitution was adopted, and Moreno found himself free to endow Equador with the blessings of a truly liberal and Christian government. Our limits do not permit any detailed narrative of all that was effected for his country by this "modern St. Louis." The loud-mouthed praters about popular enlightenment should have admired him; for when they murdered him, the free schools of the republic numbered 500, with 32,000 pupils, whereas under the Masonic government there had been only 200 schools, with 8,000 pupils. The spirit which animated Garcia Moreno is indicated in the message which he had prepared for the Congress as he was about to enter on his third term of office, when the Masonic assassins sent him to his reward in heaven: "Only a few years have elapsed since Equador repeated every day the lament which the Liberator, Bolivar, expressed in his last message to the Congress of 1830: 'I must say, and with the blush of shame on my brow, that while we have won our independence, it has been won at the expense of every other blessing.' But since that time, having placed our trust in God, and having abandoned the course of impiety and apostasy which entices the world in this epoch of blindness, we have reorganized ourselves into a thoroughly Catholic nation, and therefore each day has beheld an increase of happiness and prosperity in our beloved country. Once Equador was a body from which life

was departing; it was being already devoured, just as a corpse is devoured by a multitude of those hideous insects which the license of putrefaction allows to develop in the darkness of the grave. But to-day, obeying the Sovereign Voice which commanded Lazarus to issue from his tomb, Equador returns to new life, although she still retains the winding-sheet of death, that is, some remnants of the misery and corruption in which she was once wrapped. In order to justify my words, I need only render an account of our progress during the last two years, referring you to the special reports of each ministerial department for documents and details; and, in order that you may perceive the extent of our progress during this period of regeneration, I shall compare the present conditions with those which once obtained. And I shall institute this comparison, not for our self-glorification, but in order to glorify Him to whom we owe everything, and whom we adore as our Redeemer, Father, Protector, God. . . . To the perfect liberty which the Church now enjoys among us, and to the apostolic zeal of our virtuous pastors, we owe a reformation of the clergy, an improvement in morals, and so great a diminution in the number of crimes, that in our population of more than a million there are not enough of criminals to fill our penitentiary. To the Church we owe those religious organizations which constantly produce such happy results in the education of the young, and in the care of the sick and the poor. . . . If I have committed any errors, I ask your pardon a thousand times; but I am sure that my will has not been at fault. But if, on the contrary, you find that I have succeeded in my endeavors, attribute all the merit, firstly, to God and the Immaculate Dispenser of the inexhaustible treasures of God's mercies; and, secondly, to yourselves, to the people, to the army, and to all the members of the administration who have seconded my efforts so admirably."

A strange document, truly, in the closing years of the nineteenth century—a document which could never have emanated from a Cavour or a Bismarck, a Gambetta or a Thiers, a Metternich or a Von Beust, a Palmerston or a Gladstone. But all the messages of Garcia Moreno to the

Equadorian Congress had sounded the same notes, and all of his governmental acts had accorded with his professions. When Victor Emmanuel completed his series of sacrilegious robberies by the seizure of the Papal capital in 1870, Garcia Moreno was the sole potentate in Christendom who protested against the iniquity. Immediately after the news of the crime had reached Quito, the president of Equador dictated to his foreign secretary the following protest, which was sent at once, according to constitutional formality, to the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs: "The undersigned, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Equador, has the honor of addressing the following protest to His Excellency, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of King Victor Emmanuel, because of the melancholy events which occurred last September in the capital of the Catholic world. Since the very existence of Catholicism has been menaced in the person of its august head, the representative of Catholic unity, who has been despoiled of that temporal dominion which is the necessary guarantee of his independence in the exercise of his divine mission, Your Excellency will admit that every Catholic, and with much more reason every government which rules over a considerable number of Catholics, not only has the right, but is also bound to protest against this hideous and sacrilegious crime. However, before raising its voice, the Government of Equador waited for protests on the part of the more powerful states of Europe against the unjust and violent seizure of Rome; and it waited for what would have been much more gratifying—that His Majesty, King Victor Emmanuel, would voluntarily do homage to the sacred character of the noble Pontiff who governs the Church by restoring its stolen territories to the Holy See. But the Equadorian Government waited in vain; the monarchs of the old continent remain mute, and Rome continues to suffer under the oppression of Victor Emmanuel. For this reason the Government of Equador, in spite of its feebleness, and in spite of the enormous distance which separates it from the Old World, now feels its duty by protesting before God and before men, and especially in the name of the Catholic people of Equador, against the wicked invasion of Rome and the subjugation of

the Roman Pontiff—deeds which have been perpetrated in violation of repeated promises, and which are now disguised by derisory guarantees of independence which do not hide the ignominious servitude of the Church. The Equadorian Government protests, finally, against the consequences which the Holy See and the Church will suffer because of this shameful abuse of power. While addressing this protest to you by formal order of His Excellency, the President of this Republic, the undersigned still trusts that King Victor Emmanuel will repair the injuries which he has inflicted in a moment of madness, before his throne is reduced to ashes by the avenging fire of the Revolution" (1).

Not content with this personal protest, Garcia Moreno urged all the governments of South America to follow his example; but, as he afterwards said: "I had little hope that our sister republics would respond to the invitation; I merely wished to fulfil my duty as a Catholic by giving the greatest possible publicity to our own protest. Columbia replied in moderate terms, but negatively; Costa Rica answered negatively, and in an insolent manner; Bolivia informed me very courteously that she would consider the matter carefully; Chili and Peru did not condescend to acknowledge the receipt of my communication. But, after all, what does it matter? *God has no need for us in order to accomplish His designs, and He will accomplish them in spite of hell, and in spite of the emissaries of hell, the Freemasons, who are more or less masters in every land of South America, saving our own*" (2). The Brethren of the Three Points were not then masters in Equador, but their perennial efforts to obtain the supremacy were redoubled when Garcia Moreno so nobly stigmatized the chief masterpiece of their craft in the nineteenth century.

In 1873 the sectaries were spurred to a definitive enterprise by a realization that Equador was indeed lost to them unless "the modern St. Louis" was deprived of power. Garcia Moreno, a president of an American republic, and in this enlightened nineteenth century, had proposed to an American Congress that the land which it represented should be solemnly consecrated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus; and

(1) *El Nacional*, of Quito, January 18, 1871.

(2) BERTHE; *loc. cit.*, Vol. II., ch. 2.

the Congress had passed the resolution without discussion, and unanimously. In the beginning of April, 1873, the bishops of Equador met in the Third Plenary Council of Quito, and Moreno informed them of his desire that they would do their part toward consecrating the republic to the Sacred Heart. On April 13th the synodals decreed that "the greatest happiness of a people being the preservation of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith, and since that preservation depends on the mercy of God, the nation should humbly seek the Heart of Jesus in order to obtain that blessing. Therefore the Council of Quito solemnly offers and consecrates the republic to the Sacred Heart, supplicating that Heart to be the protector, guide, and defender of this country, so that it may never wander from the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith, and that all the inhabitants of Equador, conforming their lives to that faith, may find in it their happiness in time and in eternity." As soon as this decree was conveyed to the president he laid it before the Congress, and that body immediately decreed: "Considering that the Third Plenary Council of Quito has by a special decree consecrated the republic to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, placing us all under the protection of that Heart, it befits the representatives of the nation to associate themselves with an act which is so conformable to their eminently Catholic sentiments. Considering that this act, so efficacious for the preservation of our faith, is also the best means of assuring the prosperity and progress of the State, the Congress decrees that the republic, consecrated forever to the Heart of Jesus, adopts that Heart as its Patron and Protector. The Feast of the Sacred Heart shall be hereafter a civil holiday of the first class, and shall be celebrated in every cathedral in the most solemn manner possible. Furthermore, in order to excite the zeal and piety of the faithful, there shall be erected in every cathedral an altar dedicated to the Sacred Heart, in front of which there shall be placed, at the expense of the State, a slab commemorative of the present decree." As we have said, this decree was passed unanimously. On the day appointed for the public ceremony of the consecration, while the function was being per-

formed in each of the five other cathedrals of the republic, the president and Congress proceeded in grand state to the cathedral of Quito. After the archbishop had promulgated the decree in the name of the Church, Garcia Moreno repeated it in the name of the Republic of Equador. Has any ruler of modern times thus brought before the minds of his people the days of Charlemagne and of St. Louis? The "apostle of ignorance and of superstition" was sentenced to death in the secret councils of the Dark Lantern; but, as usual in the execution of Masonic sentences of the highly placed, the "removal" was to be made to appear as the natural result of the *crimes* of the victim. Incendiary pamphlets were scattered broadcast throughout Equador, all exhibiting Moreno as a fit subject for popular execration. Thus, the infamous Moncayo described him as a cruel hypocrite: "He avows himself a partisan of the *Syllabus*, in order to commit crimes at his convenience. Communicating and shooting; proscribing, scourging, and confiscating,—such are the offerings which please the God of the Jesuits." From Lima there came a pretended "History of Equador," in which the following Masonic instigation to murder was read: "In that nation which has exterminated so many tyrants there is still energy enough to deliver it from this most detestable despotism. Let the ferocious terrorist and his accomplices tremble before the justice of the sovereign people! The young, the crowds, need no general to lead them to the combat. When suffering attains to a certain degree of intensity, a martyr arises to lay the oppressor low." In a diatribe entitled, "A Perpetual Dictatorship," the impious Montalvo accused Moreno of having driven many women of the street to suicide, because they preferred death to a residence in the asylum of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. The consecration to the Sacred Heart, said Montalvo, had turned Equador into a convent of idiots, with a permanent scaffold on the premises (1). From time to time the Masonic journals

(1) The charges of Montalvo were so absurdly calumnious that Charles Weile, who had been consul of the United States in Quito, was constrained to write to the *San Francisco Chronicle*: "These accusations cause a smile of pity and contempt on the part of all who have known Garcia Moreno. Having resided in Equador very many years, and being perfectly acquainted with all that has recently occurred there, I know well what I say;

throughout South America published accounts of Moreno's assassination, undoubtedly with the idea of impressing upon the popular mind the necessity of such a catastrophe. Thus, on October 26, 1873, twenty-two months before the real murder, a despatch from Guayaquil informed Peru that Moreno had just "fallen under the dagger of his aide-de-camp, Colonel Salazar, who had been helped by a crowd of persons who were hostile to the Jesuits. Twenty-three Jesuits perished with the president, and the people would have killed the Papal nuncio as well, had he not succeeded in escaping to the mountains." Moreno was frequently warned from reliable sources that the Lodges had decreed his death, and that he should never go abroad without an escort. He always replied that if the Masons had decreed his assassination, no human means would prolong his life; that, however, he was in the hands of God. In reply to one of these warnings, he said: "I have already learned from Germany that the German Lodges have instructed those of America to move heaven and earth to overthrow the government of Ecuador. Probably Grand Master X. is concerned in this instruction; but if God extends His mercy to us, what have we to fear, even though our power is equal to zero, when compared with the power of that clay-footed Colossus?"

In July, 1875, Moreno wrote the following letter to Pope Pius IX.: "Most Holy Father, I implore your blessing, having been chosen again, without any merit on my part, to rule this Catholic republic during the coming six years. The new presidential term does not commence until August 30th, when I take the oath to the Constitution, and then I shall dutifully inform Your Holiness officially of the fact; but I wish to obtain your blessing before that day, so that I may have the strength and the light which I need so much in order to be unto the end a faithful son of our Redeemer, and a loyal and obedient servant of His infallible Vicar. Now that the Masonic Lodges of the neighboring countries, instigated by Germany (1), are vomiting against me all sorts of atrocious

and I do not exaggerate when I declare that to me Garcia Moreno appears to be the most illustrious man that South America ever produced."

(1) During the infamous Bismarckian "War for Civilization," it was the general belief among the Catholics of South America that the German chancellor was the prime mover of

insults and horrible calumnies; now, also, that the Lodges are secretly arranging for my assassination; I have more need than ever of the Divine protection, so that I may live and die in defence of our holy religion, and for the dear republic which I am called once more to rule. What happiness can be mine, Most Holy Father, so great as that of being hated and calumniated for the sake of our Divine Redeemer? And how great a happiness your blessing will be to me if it procures for me from heaven the privilege of shedding my blood for the God who shed His own for us on the cross!" On the evening of August 5th a priest demanded audience with the president, stating that his business could not be deferred. When in the presence of Moreno, he said: "You have been warned that the Freemasons have decreed your death, but you have not been told when the sentence will be executed. I come to tell you that your days are numbered; that the conspirators have resolved to murder you as soon as opportunity offers. Probably the deed will be committed to-morrow; therefore, take your measures accordingly." Moreno quietly answered: "I have received many similar warnings; and, after mature reflection, I have come to the conclusion that there is but one measure for me to take, and that this measure is to keep myself in a state wherein I shall be fit to meet my God." Then he proceeded with his work, which was the preparation of the message, some passages of which we have given. At six o'clock on the following morning, August 6th, the Feast of the Transfiguration of Our Lord, Moreno assisted at Mass, according to his daily habit, in the Church of St. Dominic (1); and he received Holy Communion, undoubtedly fully prepared to recognize the Holy Eucharist as, in all probability, the Viaticum for his momentous journey. Having returned to his residence, he spent some time with his family, and then gave some finishing touches to his message. Shortly after midday he left

all the Masonic manoeuvres in their regions; that he took this means of adding to the embarrassments of the Holy See, while he was endeavoring to constitute a German National Church. Certainly the word of the well-informed and calmly judicious Garcia Moreno gives more than plausibility to the belief.

(1) Moreno never missed his daily Mass; and every day he read a chapter of the New Testament and one of the *Imitation*. Every evening he recited the Rosary, generally with his family.

his palace, followed at a little distance by an aide-de-camp, his intention being to read his message to the Congress. On the way he entered the cathedral, and prayed before the Blessed Sacrament for nearly an hour. Leaving the house of God, he turned his steps toward the Government House, on the opposite side of the Great Square; but he had walked only a few yards when seven assassins rushed on him. One of the murderers cried: "Die, strangler of liberty!" and as the martyr of liberty fell, pierced by six bullets and by fourteen dagger-strokes, he cried in clear voice: "I die, but God does not die—*Pero Dios no se muere*" (1). From among the innumerable panegyrics on Garcia Moreno we select the following tribute from the pen of Louis Veuillot: "Garcia Moreno was superior to vulgarity, indifference, and forgetfulness; he would have been above hatred, if God could permit that virtue should not entail hatred. It may be said of Moreno, that he was the most *antique* of all moderns; he was a man who did honor to humanity. It was not sufficient for him to be one of Plutarch's characters; he entertained an idea of grandeur which was vaster and more just than that of Plutarch. Alone, unknown, but sustained by faith and his great heart, he effected all that Plutarch describes his worthiest heroes as having effected; and he did all this in accordance with his natural character, and by a careful observance of a rule which he had planned for himself. But he did more; continually aiming higher, he dared to attempt a task that our epoch deems impossible. In the government of Equador he was a man of Jesus Christ. Let us salute

(1) The crime of 1875 was not the first that Masonry perpetrated against the life of Moreno. Shortly after the final catastrophe, the Roman *Civiltà Cattolica*, the calmest and most unsensational periodical in Europe, narrated how, in the fall of 1869, a certain Equadorian scientist received satisfactory proof that the Lodges had even at that time resolved to murder the great president. This gentleman had studied in various European universities; among others, in that of Berlin. When about to return home, where a professorship in the University of Quito awaited him, he called on one of his Berlinese professors in order to bid him farewell. The young man had won the admiration and affection of the German, who was highly placed in the councils of the Dark Lantern. When the old Freemason learned that his friend was about to accept a professorship to which he had been appointed by Garcia Moreno, whom the youth greatly admired, he remarked that there was no sense in accepting favors from a man who would be dead before the ambitious lad arrived in Equador. The words produced no deep impression in the mind of the hearer; but when he arrived in Guayaquil he learned that the president had just escaped assassination, and that very foolishly the chief criminal, Cornejo, had been punished merely by banishment for eight years.

this noble figure, the most beautiful of modern times ; it is worthy of history. A man of Jesus Christ ; that is, a man of God, in public life ! And he was, as the phrase runs, a man of his time ; he studied the sciences of his time, he appreciated its habits, he understood its customs and laws ; but, nevertheless, he was never aught else than an exact follower of the Gospel, a faithful servant of God ; and he made his people, who had been Christian indeed, but were being devoured by Socialism, a people faithful in the service of God. It was a little republic of South America that showed this wonder to the world. Moreno was a Christian, and one of a stamp not at all affected by our modern rulers ; he was one of those leaders of whom the nations have lost all remembrance ; he was a dispenser of justice, such as the seditious and the conspirators of our day seldom meet. In Moreno there was something of Medicis, and something of Ximenes. He was Medicis, less the trickery of that prince ; he was Ximenes, less the cardinalial scarlet. Of both Medicis and Ximenes he had the genius, the magnificence, and the love of country. What is wanting in the glory of Garcia Moreno ? Nothing. He furnished a unique example to the world amid which he lived ; he was an honor to his country ; and perhaps his death was the greatest service that he rendered to his people. He showed the human race what valor and faith can effect when they are united to enlightened patriotism " (1). On Sept. 20, 1875, Pope Pius IX., in one of those eloquent Allocutions in which the Captive of the Vatican was wont to unmask the designs of the persecutors of the Church, described the work of Masonry in France, Germany, and Switzerland ; and then turning his discourse to South America, he said : " Amid all these governments thus delivered to the delirium of impiety, Equador has been miraculously distinguished for its spirit of justice, and for the indomitable faith of its president. But alas ! even in Equador there are not wanting some impious men who consider it an insult to their pretended modern civilization that there should be found a government which, while devoting itself to the material welfare of

(1) In the *Univers*, September 27, 1875.

its people, endeavors at the same time to assure the moral and spiritual progress of that people. These valiant men decided to murder their illustrious president; and he succumbed to the steel of the assassins, a victim of his faith, and of his Christian love for his country."

Freemasonry did not attain to power immediately after it had murdered Garcia Moreno; Borrero, the successor of the martyr, was a Liberal, but nevertheless a good Catholic. But in 1877 a creature of the Lodges, a drunken soldier named Vintimilla, was raised to a dictatorship, and a carnival of Masonry was initiated. A decree for the secularization of education, that is, for an atheistic training of the young, was issued immediately; and when the pastors, with the bishop of Riobamba at their head, protested against the iniquity, another decree pronounced the penalty of banishment against "ecclesiastics who alarmed consciences." Mgr. Chica, the archbishop of Quito, announced to the government: "Come what may, I shall continue to resist the propagation of error. Such is my duty, and with the grace of God I shall be faithful to it." Fifteen days after this protest, on Good Friday, March 30th, the archbishop officiated at the Mass of the Pre-sanctified in the cathedral. He had scarcely taken the wine of ablution when he was attacked by horrible convulsions, and died within an hour. The autopsy showed that twelve grains of strychnine had been given to the prelate. Of course, the assassins were never punished. The remains of the archbishop had scarcely been placed in the tomb, when Vintimilla ordered all the pastors in the republic to celebrate, on April 19th, Masses of Requiem for the souls of "all the *martyrs of holy Liberalism* who had fallen since March 19, 1869"—this date being that of a famous insurrection against Moreno. To this decree the bishops opposed an order forbidding "a scandal to the Catholic people"; and as nearly all the Equadorians applauded the action of the prelates, the dictator perforce contented himself with an oath of revenge. In quick succession came a revocation of the Concordat which had guaranteed the liberty of the Catholic religion, a suppression of all the ecclesiastical salaries, and the exile of many pastors. The bishop of Guayaquil died with all the symptoms of

poisoning, and the bishop of Riobamba escaped assassination by fleeing to the mountains. The people of Equador were on the verge of revolution, when Vintimilla resolved to change his policy. The exiled priests were recalled, and the bishops were made to understand that the government desired peace. This "treachery" on the part of their creature enraged the Masons; the Catholics could not rely on the sincerity of their recent enemy; and in 1883 a revolution, in which both Liberals and Conservatives took part, overthrew Vintimilla. From that time until the Masonic eruption under Alfaro, the sequels of which still persevere in the form of nearly every conceivable kind of persecution of the Church, the Brethren of the Three Points allowed Equador to rest in comparative peace.

The sad distinction of having succumbed, perhaps pusillanimously, to Masonic machinations more frequently than the other South American Republics, belongs to Brazil and Equador. But in all the other states the Church has found, at least in our day, much reason for sorrow. In Argentina the Government asked the Holy See, in 1875, to send some missionaries and some female religious who would labor in the outlying regions of the republic, where there was a dearth of spiritual and civilizing agencies. Pius IX. immediately arranged with the superiors of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales, the now wide-spread society which had been founded in Turin by Don Bosco, for the departure of ten Salesians for the promising field; and he ordered twelve Sisters of the Congregation of Our Lady *della Misericordia*, the mother-establishment of which is in Savona, to set out for the same destination. In the audience of farewell which His Holiness accorded to the little band, he necessarily reflected on the iniquities recently perpetrated by Masonry in countries which were sisters to Argentina, and in order to encourage the new apostles, he said: "This time I am not sending lambs to a pack of wolves. You are going to a country where the authorities are favorable to you, and God will fructify your labors." But scarcely had the Salesians and their auxiliaries landed in Argentina, when they learned that the Masons, enraged because of a.

failure to induce the Congress to enter on a course of Satanic enterprise in regard to Catholicism, had incited the populace of Buenos Ayres to an anti-Jesuitical riot, massacred several of the Jesuit professors who were instructing the Argentine youth in the sciences apparently dear to the Masonic heart, and levelled the college to the ground. Nor did Chili—hitherto, perhaps, the most pronouncedly Catholic state in Latin America—escape the contagion. In 1875 the Grand Lodge of Chili, ruled by English and German merchants and speculators, drew up a plan for the “complete secularization”—that is, for the atheization—of the social institutions of the republic. This scheme, entitled a “Plan of Work for the Grand Lodge of Chili,” was published by that excellent Masonic authority to which we are indebted for so much of our knowledge concerning the enterprises of the Brethren, namely, the *Monde Maçonnique*, in its issue of January, 1876. In the third Article of this plan it is ordered that: “The Section for Instruction shall attend to: 1st, the foundation of secular schools; 2d, to the furnishing of aid to every society (especially the Protestant *colporteurs*) which gives gratuitous instruction to the poor (that is, which tries to deprive the poor of their faith); 3d, to contribute to the prosperity of all the scientific, literary, and artistic institutions in the country (provided that there were any which were not Catholic); 4th, to give popular conferences for the spread of such knowledge as tends to facilitate the progress of humanity.” The Section for Benevolence was to occupy itself: “1st, with the foundation of hospitals (as though Chili needed hospitals); 2d, with aiding directly or indirectly all such institutions *when they do not pursue egoistic and sectarian objects* (that is, when they are not Catholic).” . . . The Section for Propaganda was to: “1st, defend and make known the veritable sentiments of Freemasonry (then why not abolish “the secret” ?); 2d, to try to introduce into all public institutions the principles of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity; and especially to labor for a separation of Church and state, *for the establishment of Civil Marriage* (1), for the abolition of all privileges, for the

(1) Civil marriage, with its necessary consequence of divorce *ad libitum* and the ulti-

secularization of all charities (so as to provide fat salaries for the distributors, attendants, etc.); 3d, for the help of all victims of *religious intolerance*." In spite of the efforts of the English and German residents in Chili, this Masonic programme failed; but in 1881 the Masonic *Chaîne d'Union* (p. 437) encouraged the Brethren with this information: "Brother Jose Vergara, Minister of the Interior, has been chosen Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Chili. We cannot doubt that, under the direction of this eminent Brother, the Chilian Lodges will recover all their activity, which is now so repressed by the clerical party. *In Chili it is really the English and German Lodges that do the work.*" Nevertheless, hitherto the sterling Catholicism of the Chilian people has refused to accept the enlightenment which emanates from the rays of the Dark Lantern.

Venezuela has held its own fairly well in face of Masonic aggression, although during the three presidential terms of Guzman Blanco (1873-1887) the Brethren continually flat-

mate destruction of the very idea of the family, is ever one of the dearest objects to the Masonic heart. Voltaire, Helvetius, d'Alembert, Rouillé d'Orfeuil and all *ejusdem farinae* insisted upon the destruction of every trace of a sacramental idea in matrimony, and the Constituent Assembly of 1790 actuated this theory when it proclaimed the equality of bastards and legitimate children. In this Assembly Cambacérés, the future atch-chancellor of Napoleon and future Grand Master of French Masonry, declared: "There is a law which is superior to all others, and that law—the law of nature—tells us that illegitimate children have all the rights which some would take from them. . . . All children, without any distinction, have the right of succession to those who have given existence to them. The differences heretofore subsisting between these classes of children are merely effects of pride and superstition, and they are ignominious and contrary to justice." During the rule of the Paris Commune of 1871, as we learn from Maxime du Camp, in his *Convulsions of Paris*, the Central Council applauded the Citizen Gratien when, at a reunion in the Hotel de Ville, he thus perorated: "If we wish to give to all an equal and a revolutionary education, we must destroy the family. The child is not a property of a father and mother; the child belongs to the State." Ragon whose *Interpretative Course* was approved by the Grand Orient of France in 1840 as "the work of a profoundly instructed brother," says: "The indissolubility of marriage is contrary to the laws of nature and of reason. . . . Its corrective is divorce; divorce is now among our customs, waiting for the day when it will be found among our laws." Louis Napoleon, in his *Napoleonic Ideas*, when recounting the mistakes of the French governments that preceded his own, numbered as one of those errors their failure to admit the right of divorce in their jurisprudence. Since such are the sentiments of Masonry in regard to marriage and the family, we were not surprised when we read in the *Official Municipal Bulletin of Paris* of September, 1882, that on the preceding August 12th, at a distribution of prizes to the schools of the Fourteenth Arrondissement, Brother Schmidt, an assistant to the mayor, told the young girls that it was the duty of French mothers "to make their children hate that religious cosmopolitanism which debases our earthly country beneath a hypothetical religion which is hidden somewhere in the vault of heaven," and that children should be taught to despise "that humility which impels a man to kneel before another who is no more infallible than himself."

tered themselves that Venezuelan Catholicism was moribund, thanks to the poison which the Liberalism of Blanco, the "Protector of the Masonic Order in the Republic," allowed them to administer to the people. Under date of March 29, 1874, the Grand Lodge of Venezuela sent "to all the Lodges in its jurisdiction" a circular, the barefaced mendacity of which has rarely been excelled in any of the documents which, after the dagger, have ever been the chosen weapons of South American Masonry in its campaigns of "popular instruction." We shall quote a few gems from this official pronouncement. "Having been called to regenerate Venezuela, and being filled with faith in the principles of Masonry, Brother Guzman Blanco has resolved to take the Masonry of Venezuela as his co-operatrix, and he presents himself as its declared and decided protector. . . . The Grand Lodge regards as enemies of Masonry all who make war on Masonic associations; all who do not respect the dignity of the country; all who try to suffocate the reason of man; all who try to dominate by means of ignorance; *all who foment fanaticism and superstition.* . . . Masonry holds that truth rests on science, and on science alone; Masonry repels absolutely all fanaticism and superstition, warring on them inexorably by means of instruction. . . . He is not a true Freemason who does not support the government which represents the people of Venezuela in the combat *against the pretensions of the Vatican to a sovereignty on Venetian soil*—a sovereignty which would be superior to that of the Venezuelans themselves. The question is as to whether Venezuela is bound to receive the inspirations of the Vatican—of that power which recently *ordered its representative in Paris to see that in all the churches of France prayers were addressed to the Supreme Being for the ruin of the Republic and the restoration of the Monarchy*; of that power which has always insisted on ignorance as the principal support of the Holy See and of all thrones. . . . *You perceive how detrimental to all its servants this influence of the Vatican must be, since it leads them to the most criminal perjury.* . . . *The great majority of Freemasons are faithful Christians, fulfilling all the duties which the Church imposes on them, although they do not re-*

nounce the exercise of their reason, since that reason is sacred to them, being an emanation from the Supreme Being. . . . *During many centuries the Church of Rome prevented the diffusion of knowledge, and punished as heretics all who penetrated the secrets of nature, and revealed those secrets to other men. During many centuries the Church of Rome denounced the education of the masses as prejudicial to both ecclesiastical and civil tyranny; and the Holy See appealed to all sovereigns, in the name of their own existence, to combat liberal principles. . . . Against this injustice Masonry has fought from the first days of its existence, and the hour has now struck for all our Brethren to work for the manifestation of truth in its entirety.*” With the President of the Republic (we should say, its *dictator*) as the gracious Protector of Venezuelan Masonry, it is not strange that the Venezuelan people were afflicted, during the entire period of their suffering under the incubus of Guzman Blanco, with laws which “manifested (Masonic travesty of) truth in its entirety”; and that the usual Masonic persecution of the clergy became the order of the day. Only one of the Venezuelan bishops was derelict. Mgr. Guebara, archbishop of Caracas, having refused to swear fidelity to the Masonico-Febronian enactments, was exiled, and his see was offered to the bishop of Guayana, an aged, weak, but ambitious prelate, who signified his willingness to commit spiritual bigamy. Pope Pius IX., under date of July 8, 1874, wrote to the unfortunate man a strong but fatherly reproof, dwelling on the wickedness of the new laws to which the bishop of Guayana had sworn fidelity, and stigmatizing the hypocrisy with which the weakling had assured the Holy See that “he would have liked to refuse the archiepiscopal dignity on account of his age and feebleness.”—“One fact modifies our grief,” said the Pontiff; “you have not yet consummated the proposed usurpation; you have caused a great scandal, but you have not yet become formally an intruder. You remind us that you are an old man. Think, therefore, of the judgment which you must soon undergo. What will you reply to Jesus Christ, when He demands an account of your stewardship and upbraids you for having rended His seamless garment? . . . Dignities, wealth,

the favor of the powerful, form a vain paraphernalia which will soon be taken from you ; reflect on the punishment that awaits you, if you persist in preparing the way for schism and apostasy. . . . Hasten, venerable brother, by a public and immediate retractation of your wicked oath, to remove the stumbling-block of scandal which you have placed in the path of the faithful ; hasten to redeem your lamentable weakness by an apostolic firmness of soul and by an intrepid defense of the rights of the Church."

Peru has suffered much anxiety because of the intrigues of Masonry, supported by the funds at the disposal of the so-called "missionary" bodies which are so plentifully endowed by gullible Protestants in the United States ; but of open persecution Peru has experienced but little. During the first years of the pontificate of Pius IX., the Masons endeavored to incite a war with the Holy See on the subject of episcopal and parochial appointments ; but in 1874 the Pontiff checkmated the Brethren by according to the presidents of Peru the right of patronage which his predecessors had granted, in the olden time, to the kings of Spain : "Pius, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, for the imperishable remembrance of this matter : Among the singular favors which God has conferred on the Peruvian nation, none is so striking as the gift of Catholic truth which the Peruvians have carefully preserved from the day when they first received it from the preachers of the Gospel, and which they have cultivated so well that from among them have risen several heroes whom the Church has regarded as worthy of the honors of her altars. . . . To this zeal in preserving Catholic unity have been added many other acts performed by the governmental authority. Thus the endowments of dioceses already existing have been liberally augmented, and those of new dioceses have been readily accorded ; aid has been given to the seminaries, and to the colleges which missionaries have founded for the propagation of the faith ; similar generosity has been exhibited in providing for the diffusion of sound doctrine by the endowment of parishes among those (savages) who have been converted to the faith ; and finally, considerable sums have been expended in the

restoration and ornamentation of old churches, and in the erection of new ones. . . . Wherefore, wishing to condescend to the prayers which the Peruvian government has addressed to us through its representative, and following the example of our predecessors who have ever granted special favors to those who have deserved well of Christendom, we have resolved, after consultation with certain cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, to concede by our Apostolic authority that hereafter the President of the Republic of Peru, and his successors, shall enjoy that right of patronage which, by the favor of the Apostolic See, the kings of Spain enjoyed in Peru before that country was separated from the rule of the Spanish crown. . . . The President of the Republic of Peru, and his successors, shall enjoy the right of presenting to the Apostolic See, whenever an archiepiscopal or episcopal see is vacant, the names of certain fit and worthy ecclesiastics ; so that, according to the regulations prescribed by the Holy Canons, the canonical institution may be effected. . . . Nevertheless, the candidates thus presented shall enjoy no right of episcopal administration, until they shall have received the Apostolic Letters conferring their institution. . . . The said President shall also enjoy the right of presentation to canonicates *de officio*, and to parishes, providing that the canonical regulations concerning *concursum* and examination shall have been observed. . . . Finally, the Presidents of Peru shall receive, in all the churches of the Republic, the same honors which were formerly accorded to the kings of Spain, because of the right of patronage which was granted by this Holy See." Hitherto the exercise of this right of patronage seems to have prevented any extraordinary manifestations, on the part of the Peruvian government, of greed for ecclesiastical property, or of jealousy of ecclesiastical privileges.

At the present moment, no country of Latin America is so subjected to the nefarious influences of Masonry as is our neighbor, the Republic of Mexico. In 1867, the *Freemason's Journal* of Leipsic published a correspondence from this sectary-ridden land, which ascribed to the votaries of the Dark Lantern the "credit" of all the revolutions which have

cursed the country ever since the "yoke" of Spain was discarded (1). In fact, the Masonic writer gave a mere paraphrase of the report "On the Form of Government which Mexico Ought to Adopt," which was accepted by the Assembly of Notables which undertook, in 1863, to give to their country some semblance of a stable and Christian government (2). Whatever may be our opinion concerning French intervention in the affairs of Mexico, or concerning the weak scion of the Hapsburgs who vacillated between the conservatives and the "liberals" until resolution was of no use, who condescended to humor Masonry by signing a Concordat which the Holy See was obliged to condemn,—it is certain that the Assembly of Notables represented all that was respectable in Mexico, both for morality and for education. The solemn utterances of such a body, spoken in the face of expectant America and Europe, are worthy of attention. Alluding to the separation from the mother country, the notables insisted that "if, at that time, Mexico had not forgotten her ancient institutions, undoubtedly she would have reached the height of prosperity; but she knew not how to profit by her emancipation, and she abused her independence." The Federal Constitution, "an imperfect imitation of that of the United States," contended the notables, "proved to be the ruin of Mexico"; but the evil was increased and confirmed "by the establishment of Masonic Lodges"—those of the Scotch Rite and of the Rite of York. "These secret societies, by their conspiracies, and by means of poison and the dagger, decided the destiny of the country, and played with the lives of the citizens." It was because of the inspiration of the Lodges, declared the notables, that in 1828 the city of Mexico beheld the governmental authorities supervising the pillage of the Grand Bazaar, sanctioning attacks against private property. "From the Lodges came the iniquitous laws of banishment decreed against all persons of Spanish birth"; laws which affected so many innocent persons, which destroyed commerce by banishing capital, and which ended in the public sale of exemptions from the

(1) This correspondence was reproduced in *Le Monde* of July 14, 1867.

(2) This report was published in the Paris *Moniteur* of Sept. 13, 1863.

decree of exile. "The highest positions in the republic are frequently occupied by common highwaymen. The public treasury is constantly depleted. The property of the Church is wickedly confiscated, and with no profit to the country." With the fall of Maximilian came dark days indeed for the Catholics of Mexico; but not until November 24, 1874, was the "Separation of Church and State" effected in a manner which was calculated to satisfy Masonry while it waits for the moment when it will be able, as it fondly trusts, to sweep from Mexican soil the last trace of Catholicism. By the new law, which has hitherto been inexorably enforced, no officer of the government (civil or military), no body of troops, no corporation of any kind, can assist officially at any religious service. No holidays, save the purely civil, are recognized by the State; but "Sunday may be observed as a day of rest from labor." All religious instruction and all acts of religious worship are prohibited in every establishment of the State. "No act of worship or of a religious nature can be performed outside of the churches, under pain of a fine of from 10 to 200 piastres, or of imprisonment for from two to fifteen days. A fine of from 100 to 200 piastres is incurred by an ecclesiastic every time that he appears in public (outside a church) in an ecclesiastical dress, or with any insignia of his office. All services in the churches are to be constantly under the eyes of the police." No religious institution can acquire real estate or capital which is derived from real estate. By the nineteenth article of this law even the Sisters of Charity were attacked; they were forbidden to wear any distinctive costume, or to live in community (1).

(1) In Feb., 1899, we learned that the Congress of the United States of Columbia had recently so far abjured connection with Masonry as to officially proclaim the Supreme Sovereignty of Our Lord Jesus Christ. May the spirit of Garcia Moreno continue to animate the lawgivers of the land in which Bolivar could discern no germ of political salvation! The decree of the Columbian Congress reads as follows: "Article 1. The Republic of Columbia, at the termination of the century in which it achieved its national freedom and sovereignty, but fulfills its duty in recognizing in an explicit manner the divine and social authority of Jesus Christ and in rendering thanks to Him for the benefits it has received from His hands: and by means of the medium of this law so attests. Article 2. In testimony of this acknowledgment, a monument shall be erected in the Cathedral of Bogota with ecclesiastical permission." By way of counterbalance to the consolation experienced because of this decree, we read in the Chicago *Record* of Aug. 8, 1899, the following illustration of the monumental ignorance of our Protestant countrymen concerning affairs in Latin America. Mr. Curtis, a staff correspondent of the *Record*, thus speaks

CHAPTER III.

THE CLERICAL VICTIMS OF THE COMMUNE OF 1871.

When the last act of the Franco-German war of 1870-71 had closed, and Paris, conquered by famine, had agreed on an armistice with the Teuton on Jan. 29, 1871, a National Assembly, elected on Feb. 8, entrusted the executive power to Thiers, with the understanding that peace was to be secured. When the harsh conditions had been accepted by the Assembly, and the Germans had retired to the districts which they were to occupy until France would have paid the last sou of the five milliards of francs by way of indemnity, the new government fixed its seat at Versailles, in order to be free from the danger of a *coup de main* on the part of the revolutionists, native and foreign, with whom the capital was thronged. The wonted buoyancy and energy of the French soon renewed the march of commercial and industrial activity, and the outer world was congratulating the sorely-tried nation on its new lease of prosperity, when it was afflicted by an insurrection which reminded humanity of the horrors with which, in 1793, the first acclaimers of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, signalized their accession to power. The government had made the grievous mistake of not disarming the National Guard; and the dominant revolutionary element in that body waited for an occasion to challenge the comparatively conservative power of Versailles. This occasion was furnished when Thiers ordered the removal of certain cannons to the arsenals. The mob arose; some of the troops fraternized with the new *sans-culottes*; Generals Lecomte and Thomas were murdered;

of ex-President Camaano, of Equador: "He was a devout adherent of the Church and a believer in the ancient policy. When he came to Washington in 1889 as a delegate to the international American conference, he brought with him a written *Indulgence* from the Archbishop of Quito for all the sins he might commit for twelve years. This extraordinary advantage over the rest of mankind was given as a reward for his devotion to the Church, and was much envied by the delegates from other countries."

and Thiers, not wishing to deluge the streets of Paris with fraternal blood, withdrew all the troops to Versailles, saving only those in garrison at Mt. Valerian. Then came the proclamation of the Commune, effected by men who were the dregs, not only of France, but of Italy, Germany, Russia, and America; as even the arch-revolutionist, Jules Favre, complained to the representatives of the European powers: "All the wretches of Europe were gathered in Paris; the capital was the rendezvous for every wickedness on earth" (1). This Commune of Paris was to be the model for all France; the new republic was to consist of a federation of 40,000 communes; but how different they were to be from those mediæval Italian republics which first rendered that form of government historical! A mockery of an election was held; and the destinies of the secular capital of civilization were entrusted to such apostles of anarchy as Delescluze, Felix Pyat, Raoul Rigault, Vermorel, Ferré, Courbet, etc.,—men whose hatred of society was as intense as their contempt for religion. The army at the disposal of the Commune numbered 150,000, all well provided with munitions of every sort, including artillery; and at the very birth of the movement, it had obtained possession of all the forts on the left bank of the Seine, excepting Mt. Valerien, thus fitting itself with strength to withstand a long siege. The greater part of the generals of the Commune were foreigners—men to whom the designation of filibusters would have been a fulsome flattery; more than twenty thousand of the same ilk were in the ranks; the distinguishing features of all were irreligion, immorality, pillage, and diabolical cruelty. When a number of citizens attempted to make a demonstration in favor of order on the Place Vendôme, the troops of the Commune dispersed them with fusilades. The Sisters of Charity and Christian Brothers were expelled from their schools, and persons without any conception of morality were appointed to teach the rising generation; of course the crucifix was torn from the wall of every school-room, and every mention of the name of God was prohibited. Both public and private property were pillaged, and every form of

(1) Circular to the Foreign Ambassadors and Ministers; June 6, 1871.

disorder made the once beautiful capital a hell on earth. Finally, hoping to thus escape from the vengeance of at least human law, the Communist leaders ordered the seizure of the archbishop of Paris, a number of clergymen, and several eminent seculars, who were to be held as security for the absolute pardon of such of themselves as would fall into the power of the government of Versailles. On May 21, after two months of regular siege, the national troops, commanded by Marshal MacMahon, who had recovered from the wound received at Sedan, entered Paris by the gate of Auteuil; and then ensued a frightful street battle during eight days and eight nights,—no parallel to which can be found in modern history. Already the madmen of the Commune had pulled down the great column of Napoleon in the Place Vendôme, heedless of the fact that the Germans outside the city must have rejoiced at the disappearance of a monument which commemorated so many of their crushing defeats at the hands of the French; and now the hellhounds determined to destroy Paris itself. While the national troops were fighting their way, inch by inch, into the heart of the city, organized hordes fired the Tuileries, the palace of the Ministry of Finance, that of the Legion of Honor, the Cour des Comptes, the Palace of Justice, the Hotel de Ville, many magazines, and entire blocks of residences. Many churches, notably Notre-Dame and the Sainte-Chapelle, and very many celebrated monuments, had been specially marked for visitation by the *pétroleurs* and *pétroleuses* of every age (for even little children were pressed into this service); but fortunately the rapidity of the Versaillais advance prevented the actualization of the design. Shortly before the advent of the Commune, one of its coryphees, that Cluseret who afterward tried to belittle the courage and talent of the American generals under whom he was supposed to have learned something of the art of war, had written to his friend, Varlin, of the Department of Finance in the Commune: “I do not know whether we shall ever possess Paris; but if we do have it, we must blow it up.” Providence had decreed that utter malediction should not be the lot of the city that it had chastised; and the homeward route was now taken by the 500,000

citizens who had fled from the pestilential breath of the children of the "International." To say nothing of the loss of life which the short reign of the Commune cost the city of Paris, the pecuniary damage which it entailed on the citizens was thirty times greater than that which had accrued from their resistance to the Germans; for the indemnities paid by the municipality for losses under the Commune amounted to nearly seventy-five millions of francs, while the losses caused by the German guns were covered by a little over two millions (1). It is not our purpose to detail the horrors of the Commune; the student will expect from us no more than a succinct narrative of the murder of Mgr. Darboy and of the other priests who merited from heaven the same blessing. Having given that narrative, we shall show that Freemasonry is pre-eminently responsible for what was one of the most salient crimes of the nineteenth century.

"What can you do to me? Take my furniture? It is not mine; it belongs to the State. Take my books? Well, they are mine, and they are my dearest possessions; but I can do without them, and they will scarcely profit you greatly. Take my life? If you kill me, you will not destroy the principle which I represent; you will simply strengthen it." Such were the intrepid words which Pierre-Georges Darboy, archbishop of Paris, addressed to the revolutionary mob which invaded his residence after the catastrophe of Sedan; and content with the manifestation of their insolence, the future Communists retired from the episcopal presence. And when the insurrection of March 18, 1871, had raised the Jacobins to power, and a band of pillagers and cutthroats, fresh from the sacking of the School of the General Staff, forced an entrance into his palace, the prelate calmly asked: "What do you desire, my friends? My head? Here it is." Again the partisans of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity retired; but in a few days all Paris knew that the Commune had decreed the imprisonment of its archbishop. On April 4, the Tuesday of Holy Week, the prelate presided at the weekly meeting of his council; and when the business had been transacted, he remarked: "Whenever, after our sessions,

(1) See the Report of the Prefect of Police, in the *Ami du Peuple*, May 25, 1872.

we have been about to separate, gentlemen, I have always said : ' We shall meet next week, if we are still here below.' To-day I may repeat the proviso with more earnestness than I have heretofore felt." The words were scarcely uttered, when two officers of the Commune appeared in the room, and one, a captain named Révol, shouted to the archbishop : " Follow us ; you must answer for a volley of musketry that has just been fired on one of our patrols from the house of the Jesuits." Accompanied by his vicar-general, the Abbé Legarde, the destined martyr was conducted to the Prefecture of Police, where, as His Grace afterward narrated in his prison, the following " interrogatory " was held. " For more than eighteen hundred years," growled Raoul Rigault, the procurator of the Commune, " you people have been crushing freedom of thought in the name of Jesus Christ. Now the turn of free thought has come." Then the archbishop learned that he was charged with having " monopolized " the property of the people. " What property ? " asked the prelate. " The churches, man ! " replied the procurator ; " the ornaments, the vases, and all that." Then Rigault made out the form of commitment, designating the prisoner as " ex-archbishop of Paris." Mgr. Darboy refused to recognize the qualification by appending, as was customary, his signature to the document. " You can no more unmake an archbishop," he insisted, " than you can make one. Even though I were in Pekin, I would still be archbishop of Paris ; therefore forty Communes can never make me sign that paper." Then the prefect erased the obnoxious term, and substituted " Mr. Darboy, who styles himself archbishop of Paris." On the night of Holy Thursday our prelate was transferred to the prison of Mazas, where he was destined to remain for forty-six days. A few days after the arrest, Dr. Demarquay, a surgeon whose devotion to the soldiers had won for him such love as the Communists were capable of cherishing, appealed to Rigault for the freedom of the archbishop ; but the savage replied : " Impossible, citizen-doctor ! The *criterium* of our revolution is ' Death to the priests ! ' " And when the surgeon persisted, Rigault cried : " Enough ! I know you to be an excellent physician ;

but if you continue to interest yourself in these rascals, I shall have you shot" (1).

Visiting his archbishop one day at Mazas, the Abbé Bayle remarked that if His Grace was put to death by the Commune, he would be regarded as a martyr; that the Church had proclaimed St. Thomas of Canterbury a martyr, and there was as much of politics in the case of the English prelate as in that of His Grace of Paris. "One thing is certain," replied Mgr. Darboy; "If I am condemned, it will not be as an individual, but as archbishop of Paris." But the Commune pretended that our prelate, and also all the other "hostages" who were arrested at the same time, were to be executed in retaliation for alleged massacres of Communist prisoners taken by the national forces. This calumny was repeated by the Judæo-Masonic press of all Europe; and re-echoed by nearly all the secular and Protestant journals of America, ever ready to palliate, if not to justify, the crimes of the priest-eaters. When our archbishop was informed of this atrocious invention of the Commune, he wrote a letter to Thiers, protesting against the execution of Communist prisoners, if such execution had occurred. The Commune allowed the letter to be carried to its destination by one of the priestly hostages, the Abbé Bertaux, *curé* of Saint-Pierre de Montmartre, on condition that the messenger would return to his cell and to his probable death. Bertaux was faithful to his promise (2), and brought the reply of Thiers, which declared most solemnly that the accusation of the Commune was "absolutely false" (3). Of course the *Official*

(1) LAMAZOU; *The Place Vendôme and La Roquette*. Paris, 1880.

(2) The Abbé Bertaux owed his escape from death at the hands of the Commune to the efforts of Mlle. le Marasquier, a simple but valiant dressmaker whom the abbé had educated. Alone and with no other protection than that of heaven, she ventured to appeal to Rigault; and either by her eloquence, or by her modest assurance, or by force of her beauty, she obtained the freedom of her friend. Shortly afterward, however, the abbé died from the effects of his imprisonment. RAVAILHE; *A Week of the Commune of Paris*. Paris, 1880.

(3) We subjoin this correspondence. The letter of Mgr. Darboy, dated at Mazas, April 8, is as follows: "Mr. President, yesterday, after an interrogatory in this my prison at Mazas, my questioners assured me that in the recent combats the national troops had committed acts of barbarity on the National Guards (the Communist forces); that wounded men were killed, and prisoners massacred. And when I hesitated to credit these assertions, I was told that they were based on official information. Therefore I wish, Mr. President, to draw your attention to a matter of grave moment which perhaps is unknown to you, and to beg you to see what can be done in such in-

Journal of the Commune published neither the letter of Mgr. Darboy, nor that of Thiers—an abstention which may have been an excuse for the silence of the sympathizing journals of foreign lands. On April 18, Mr. Washburne, Minister of the United States of America to France, received the following note from Archbishop Chigi, the papal nuncio, who, like all the other ambassadors and ministers to France, Mr. Washburne alone excepted, then resided at Versailles, the seat of the legitimate government of the republic (1): “My dear colleague, allow me to ask you in confidence to receive kindly the four canons, ecclesiastics of the metropolitan church of Paris, who will call upon you in order to entreat you to protect their archbishop who is now imprisoned by the insurgents of Paris. Permit me to join my prayer to that of these good priests, and to assure you of my gratitude for all that you may feel yourself able to attempt for the preservation of the life of Mgr. Darboy.” Mr. Washburne accordingly waited on Cluseret, then Minister of War for the Commune. In his recital of his experiences during the Commune, Mr. Washburne tells us that Cluseret expressed his sympathy for the archbishop (?); but at the same time, said the Communist, so great was the exasperation of the Parisians at that time, that no one would

mentable circumstances. . . . No one can find fault with me for interceding with those who can moderate or terminate the present contest. Humanity, religion, both counsel and command my interference; but I can interfere only by supplication, and I do address you with confidence. My prayer goes forth from a heart which has pitied many miseries during the last few months; it goes forth from a French heart which bleeds on account of my suffering country; it goes forth from a priestly and episcopal heart which is ready for every sacrifice, even for that of life, in favor of those whom God has given to me as compatriots and diocesan. I conjure you, Mr. President, to use all your influence to terminate our civil war; and at any rate, to moderate its features to the utmost of your power.” The reply of Thiers, dated at Versailles, April 14, is as follows: “My Lord, I have received the letter which you sent me by the hands of the *curé* of Montmartre; and I hasten to reply with that sincerity which I shall ever practice. The assertions mentioned by you are absolutely false; and I am astonished that so enlightened a prelate as yourself, My Lord, could have given any credence to them even for one instant. Our army has never committed, and never will commit, the hideous crimes which are imputed to it by men who either are conscious calumniators, or are blinded by the atmosphere of mendacity surrounding them. . . . I repel these calumnies, My Lord; I declare that our soldiers have killed no prisoners. . . . Receive, My Lord, the expression of my respect, and of my grief because of your being a victim of that system of hostages which is borrowed from the Terror.” GUILLERMIN; *Life of Mgr. Darboy, Put to Death in Hatred of the Faith*. Paris, 1888.

(1) Mr. Washburne had transferred his legation to Versailles, placing it in charge of Mr. Hoffman, his secretary. His reason for remaining in Paris was found in the many American interests then in the capital.

dare to propose the liberation of the prelate. The American protested against "the barbarity of imprisoning a man like the archbishop who was accused of no crime, and of allowing no friend to go near him." Then Mr. Washburne demanded permission to visit the prelate, to inquire into his needs, and to provide for them. The result of this action of Mr. Washburne was a permission accorded by Rigault for the Minister "to communicate with Citizen Darboy, archbishop of Paris." This privilege was accorded in the morning of April 23, and Mr. Washburne immediately repaired to Mazas. He found the prelate unshaved, haggard from sickness, but cheerful and prepared for the imminent catastrophe. Not a word of bitterness did the archbishop utter against his persecutors; on the contrary, writes the Minister, he implied that they were not as bad as some painted them. He said that he awaited patiently "the logic of events." Mr. Washburne observes that his visit was the first that Mgr. Darboy had been allowed to receive since his incarceration. When the Minister had departed, the archbishop wrote a letter which he enclosed in another to Mr. Washburne, thanking him for his visit, and requesting him "to send the accompanying missive to its destination by means of his secretary, who was going to Versailles. The address of the person to whom it is written will be furnished by His Excellency the apostolic nuncio, or by the bishop of Versailles. If the indicated person has already left Versailles for Paris, the secretary of the American Minister will please destroy the letter, or bring it back to me when he returns to Paris." This important letter was meant for the Abbé Lagarde, vicar-general of the archbishop; and it was connected with a matter which sheds much light on the identity of those who, after the Masonic conspirators of Paris, were responsible for the murder of the hostages. It ordered the vicar-general to return immediately to Mazas, "no matter what was the state of the negotiations with which he had been charged"; and it complained that "ten days were more than sufficient to enable the government (of Thiers) to decide whether it would agree to the proposed exchange. The delay, added the prelate, "compromised him

seriously, and might entail fatal consequences." The reader must know that on March 19, the ideal coryphæe of the Commune, the infamous Blanqui, had fallen into the hands of the Versaillais ; and that a month afterward the Communist leaders had offered to exchange him for the archbishop and four other hostages (1). Thiers had submitted the Blanqui matter to his ministers, and the offer of exchange had been rejected. Writing to Mr. Washburne on May 12, the nuncio says that Thiers "had declared that although he would like to see the archbishop and the Abbé Deguerry (the *curé* of the Madeleine) restored to liberty, he could not assume the responsibility of exchange. He added that Blanqui was to be judged again, and that if a sentence of death was passed, the president might commute it ; but that it was beyond his power to grant the liberty of the prisoner, especially before the trial. This reply to Mgr. Darboy was reduced to writing three weeks ago, and the Abbé Lagarde was requested to carry it to His Grace, sealed as it was ; but the vicar-general positively refused to carry it in that condition, saying that he could not bear a sealed reply to a letter which he had brought unsealed. Therefore the reply of M. Thiers is still in the office of the Minister of Worship ; they will not send it by any other than the Abbé Lagarde, and he will not take charge of it. M. Thiers assures me that there is no danger to the lives of the archbishop and the other ecclesiastics ; but I do not share his confidence on that point." On May 10, not knowing the state of the negotiations with Thiers in reference to an exchange, Mr. Washburne suggested to the archbishop that he should write to the presi-

(1) On this occasion Mgr. Darboy wrote to Thiers the following letter : " Mr. President, I have the honor to lay before you a communication which I received last evening, and I ask you to accord it the immediate attention which your humanity and wisdom will deem appropriate. A man of great influence, one who is bound by political ties and by an ancient friendship to M. Blanqui, is endeavoring to effect his liberation. For this purpose he has submitted to the commissioners the following arrangement. If M. Blanqui is freed, liberty will be accorded to the archbishop of Paris, to his sister, to the president Bonjean, to the *curé* of the Madeleine, and to the Abbé Lagarde, vicar-general of Paris, the bearer of this letter. The proposition has been accepted (by the Commune), and I have been asked to recommend its acceptance by you. Although my interests are involved in the matter, I venture to submit it to your favorable consideration. Now that there exist too many causes of dissension among us, and since there is presented an occasion for a compromise which regards persons and not principles, would it not be well to thus contribute to peace ? "

dent an argument for the compromise. The prelate accordingly drew up a "Memorandum" based on the dictates of prudence and of common sense, from which we extract the following passage: "The present question is not one between the government and the Commune; it is between the government and the above-mentioned persons (the intermediaries). These latter have agreed that freedom shall be granted to the archbishop, and to four or five other prisoners—to be designated by M. Thiers—if the release of M. Blanqui is assured; and this assurance is to be guaranteed by the Minister of the United States, authorized thereunto by M. Thiers. In regard to the liberation of M. Blanqui, would it not be feasible, instead of ordering it officially, to furnish him with the means of escaping, it being, of course, understood that he will not be again molested, unless he should commit some new crime. By such a procedure the government would avoid official relations with the Commune." Through the intermediary of the American Minister, this "Memorandum," and accompanying letters from the archbishop and the Abbé Deguerry, were received by Archbishop Chigi, and by him were delivered to Thiers; but they effected no change in the mind of the president, and the nuncio so informed Mr. Washburne, conveying to him at the same time, conformably to the orders of Cardinal Antonelli, "the heartfelt thanks of the Holy Father for all that he had done, and all that he had wished to effect, in favor of the unjustly afflicted archbishop." On May 19, Mr. Washburne again visited the illustrious victim, and informed him of the failure of the negotiations. He found the prelate suffering from an attack of pleurisy; but good humor and resignation still neutralized the poverty of the miserable cell.

Various judgments have been emitted by competent and unbiassed minds in regard to the conduct of Thiers in this matter. It seems certain that Mgr. Darboy himself charged the president, rather than the Commune, with the guilt of his murder. An officer of the Commune who assisted at the execution, if we are to believe the Abbé Moreau (1), told the Abbé Crozes that at the very moment of the

(1) MOREAU; *Recollections of the Little and the Great Roquette*. Paris, 1882.

catastrophe, the archbishop remarked to M. Bonjean, pointing to the Communist soldiers: "Those men are not the most guilty; Thiers is the culprit." General Ambert afterward wrote: "The first duty of the government was to protect the lives of the priests. It should have accepted all the exchanges proposed. We were assured that we would have the last word, and we needed to fear no consequences. Under various pretexts the clergy were abandoned to the Commune" (1). Maxime du Camp says: "All was in vain; there was an obstinacy which the event showed to be culpable. The head of the government insisted that he could not parley with the insurgents, and that besides, the lives of the hostages were in no danger—an opinion which was not shared by either Mgr. Chigi or Mr. Washburne. The dismissal of Blanqui would have added no new perils to the situation; he would have been merely one fool the more in the Hotel de Ville which was already a madhouse" (2). And Emile Ollivier opined: "The release of Blanqui would not have augmented the forces of the insurrection. There was no question of a negotiation between a regular government and a horde of bandits—a thing which could not be considered; Mr. Washburne would simply have taken Blanqui into his carriage, and would have returned with the archbishop. Thiers, with an inexplicable hardness of heart, refused to allow this arrangement; in spite of all the representations of Mgr. Chigi and of Mr. Washburne, he affected to believe that Mgr. Darboy was in no danger" (3).

"Do not reject the Cross!" Archbishop Darboy had written in one of his admirable works: "It is the mystery of salvation. If you have not the courage to seek it, at least accept it when it is sent to you. You will find happiness in it. By sheer force of gazing on it, you will understand it; if you carry it, you will love it; and loving it, you will find Jesus Christ. To find Jesus Christ is to find a joy which neutralizes every sorrow; a consolation which assuages every pain; a treasure which recompenses for all misery; a

(1) *Heroism in Soutane*. Paris, 1876.

(2) *The Convulsions of Paris*. Paris, 1882.

(3) *The Church and the State at the Vatican Council*. Paris, 1878.

source of bliss which destroys all capability of suffering" (1). And when, on the evening of May 22, the prelate and the other hostages had been transferred to the prison of La Roquette, he drew a representation of the cross and the other instruments of the Passion on the door of his cell, inscribing underneath: "*Robur mentis viri salus*—Jesus crucified; behold the 'strength of the soul, the salvation of man'" (2). On May 23 and 24, His Grace enjoyed, for the first time since his arrest, the company of his priestly companions; and when the physician of the prison proposed to effect his removal to the infirmary, adding that perhaps he would then be in less danger, he begged to be left with his brethren. On May 24, Father Olivaint carried the Blessed Eucharist to the archbishop, and the other priests communicated each other. As only a very few of the Sacred Particles could be smuggled into the prison, the lay hostages perforce contented themselves with Spiritual Communion (3). Meanwhile, the mob of Paris, furious because of the continued triumphs of the National army, were clamoring for vengeance on the hostages. The leaders of the Commune had abandoned the Hotel de Ville, and such of them as did not flee from the city—Delescluze, Ranvier, Ferre, etc.—readily gave the order for the massacre of six of the condemned. At half-past seven in the evening, the noise of a platoon grounding arms was heard at the door of La Roquette; and a rough voice exclaimed: "Attention, citizens! Let each one of you answer to his name! Citizen Darboy!" The archbishop calmly replied: "Present"; his door was unlocked, and he confronted

(1) *Reflections on the Imitation of Christ*, BK. III., ch. 56. Paris, 1852.

(2) DU CAMP; *loc. cit.*, I., p. 321.

(3) From the first day of their arrest the hostages had been forbidden to hold any religious exercises; but while this prohibition debarred the priests from a celebration of the Mass, it did not prevent several of them from confessing. At length the devotion of a pious heroine, Mlle. Delmas, directress of the Home for Abandoned Children, procured for the destined martyrs the Bread of the Soul. Having heard of their need, Mlle. Delmas obtained permission to augment their starvation rations by a gift of some fresh rolls; and in one of these a priest found a paper, on which was written: "Courage! To-morrow you will receive the Supreme Consolation. You will receive a pitcher of cream, and at the bottom of the pitcher you will find what you desire." On May 15, the pious ingenuity of the maiden succeeded for the first time. She had unfolded her design to a priest, and had received from him a tin box, hermetically sealed, and containing several consecrated Hosts; and she consigned the precious gift, hidden in the cream, to the hands of Father Duconray, who had been summoned to receive the refreshments.

his assassins. Then the same scene was enacted successively at the cells of President Bonjean, the Abbé Deguerry, the Jesuits Clerc and Ducoudray, and the Abbé Allard. When all the victims were assembled, the archbishop prayed on his knees for a moment, and then gave his blessing to his companions. The order to march was given; and amid the howlings and blasphemies of a mob which the Communist guards did not pretend to repress, the road to the place of execution was traversed. At one moment of the journey, Mgr. Darboy, whose sickness had rendered him very weak, began to walk rather slowly; and one of the guards clubbed him with the butt-end of his musket so severely, that only the arm of M. Bonjean saved him from falling to the ground. Finally the fatal spot was reached; and while the priests were giving the last absolution to each other, the guards hurried them into line. There was one volley from a platoon; then some isolated shots; and the sacrifice was consummated—another instance of the degree of blind ferocity to which men may degrade themselves, when they bid farewell to every sentiment of religion. Mgr. Darboy was assassinated in the name of liberty; and on his way to death, among the insults which were hurled at him, he heard insensate invocations of that frequently prostituted blessing. Well did he reply: “Do not profane that word! We are the friends of liberty; we who die for the faith and for liberty.” From among the many orations which this sad but glorious event occasioned in Christendom, we submit to the reader the following reflections by Mgr. (afterward Cardinal) Pie, bishop of Poitiers: “When popular fury fell, in other times, on men of the sanctuary, a pretext for that fury might have been found in the fact that those men were involved in the social dissensions of their day. For instance, when, in the Middle Age, Gualderic, bishop of Laon, was murdered by rebels to the cry of ‘The Commune!’ an explanation—not an excuse—for the crime was found in the extreme ardor displayed by the prelate in his personal resistance to the citizens. But in this case, the victims were of such a character that in the person of each one of them, just as in the person of their Divine Master, were accom-

plished the words of Scripture : '*Odio me habuerunt gratis.*' Those humble religious, those charitable priests, had not appeared on the battle-field or on the theatre of civil discord, unless in order to succor the wounded and assuage the suffering of all alike ; the praise of their devotedness was on every tongue. The archbishop never pronounced other than words of moderation and of paternal indulgence in regard to those of his children who wandered ; he ever insisted that they were more unfortunate than culpable. . . . But wherever human perversity intrudes itself, we can discern the economy of the divine intentions. It was necessary that all this carnage should be raised to the height of a sacrifice ; and in order to have a sacrifice, a priest, a sacrificer, is necessary. Listen to the beautiful words of St. Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, as he speaks of the martyrdom of his predecessor, St. Pothinus : ' Divine Providence has ordained that in the great sacrifices of our country, a pontiff shall never be wanting.' Modern nations are daughters of Calvary ; they can be redeemed again only by the merits of a redeeming blood. Recently there was a question of the fate of France ; it was necessary, therefore, that the other victims of the fold should be joined by him who offered daily the sacrifice of the Body of the Saviour, and that having been dragged before profane tribunals, he should offer a new sacrifice to Christ in his own person. . . . And since all were murdered in hatred of God and of Christian truth, as the accusers and assassins declared without equivocation ; and since the victims offered the homage of their lives to God and Jesus Christ ; all arose with the same palm in their hands, and with the same crown on their brows."

The next clerical victims of the Commune were the Dominicans of Arceuil. For several years the College of Albert-le-Grand, conducted by the Teaching Third Order of St. Dominic which had been founded by Father François-Eugene Captier at the instigation of Lacordaire, had enjoyed a reputation inferior to that of no French institution of secondary education. Three hundred students were being trained in the ways of science and religion ; in the paths of good citizenship for France, and in those which lead to man's

eternal happiness ; when the war with Germany caused Father Captier, then the prior of Arcueil, to dismiss his students, and to offer his college as a military hospital to the government. Three of his Dominican professors joined the armies in the field as nurses, while the others remained at Arcueil as aggregates to the General Society for Aid to the Wounded. During the siege of Paris, these Dominicans of Arcueil received and nursed over twelve hundred of their wounded countrymen, rivalling even the Brothers of the Christian Schools, whose heroism and patience amid the woes of the capital excited the admiration of infidel as well as Christian. Studies were resumed at Arcueil when the German war had terminated ; but the advent of the Commune again suspended the courses, and once more the zeal of the Dominicans was directed to a mitigation of the evils of war. The insurrection had entered on its third month of rapine and slaughter, when a battalion of Communists fixed its quarters in the chateau of the Marquis de la Place, adjoining the College of Albert-le-Grand. On May 17, the chateau, which had been transformed into a hell of bacchanalia rather than into a barrack, burst into flames ; and the colonel, one Serisier, a drunken journeyman-carrier, proclaimed that the fire must have been caused by Versailles agents, and that none other than the Dominicans of the college could have been those agents. On May 19, two battalions surrounded the college ; and Serisier, accompanied by a Prussian named Thaller and two other Communist officers, forced their way to the presence of Father Captier, announcing the arrest of the entire community. Summoning to his side all of his fellow-Dominicans, the auxiliary professors, the Sisters of St. Martha who had charge of the domestic arrangements of the institution, the lay servants, and the few students who had chosen to remain in the college to aid in caring for the Communist wounded, the prior thus addressed these last : “ My sons, you perceive what awaits you. You will be interrogated ; but you will certainly reply with the same sincerity that you would use toward your parents. Remember what your parents recommended to you when they confided you to our care ; and whatever may

happen, remember that you must become men who can live and die like Frenchmen and Christians. Farewell! May the blessing of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, descend upon you, and remain with you forever, forever!" The prisoners were soon ordered to set forth; the Sisters and other women were packed into the carriages and wagons belonging to the college, and were taken to the prison of Saint-Lazare; they were ordered to say nothing on the journey, to make not even a sign to the spectators of their misery, under pain of being immediately shot. The priests, lay professors, and male servants, were marched to the fort of Bicêtre between two detachments of soldiers; then they were searched and interrogated amid derisive and revoltingly obscene outbursts on the part of the "apostles of humanity"; and at length they were confined in a casemate, where they remained for six days without beds and with very little bread and water, and subjected to the continuous insults of human demons who succeeded each other at the window. During the night of May 24, the garrison of Bicêtre spiked the guns of the fort, and retired, having perceived that the Nationals were advancing steadily in their direction. The hope that this movement excited in the minds of the prisoners was soon dissipated; for early in the morning of the 25th, a Communist officer ordered them to join a column which was about to retire to Paris. When they arrived at the Gobelins, they were kept for an hour in a courtyard in which shells from the Nationals were frequently dropping; but as the Gobelins proved untenable, they were conducted by their retreating guardians to the disciplinary prison in the Avenue d'Italie. Here they met again their original jailer, the ferocious Serisier, who started them on the road to a neighboring barricade, with a determination to force them to fight for the Commune. Rifles were tendered to them; but Father Cotrault cried: "We cannot bear arms, for not only are we priests, but we are neutrals, because of our status as hospitalers." The blasphemies of Serisier were checked by an advance of the Nationals on the barricade; the order to retreat to the next barricade was given, and the Dominicans were sent back to

the prison in the Avenue d'Italie. All Paris knew at this time that in a few hours the reign of the Commune would terminate; but Father Captier and his companions felt that they would stand before their Eternal Judge before the happy moment arrived. Therefore they confessed to each other, and serenely waited for death. At four o'clock in the afternoon, a cry arose outside the prison that the regular army was in sight; and the voice of Serisier was heard crying for "volunteers to smash the skulls of those priests." A row of murderers, male and female, was immediately formed on each side of the avenue; and Bobéche, a thief whom the Commune had made chief-keeper of the prison, was told to send the victims into the street. The order was given, and crying to his brethren "*Allons, mes amis, pour le bon Dieu!*" Father Captier moved to the door. But Father Cotrault had already gone forth, and had fallen under the fusilade, ere his superior succumbed. Three other Dominicans, Fathers Bourard, Delhorme, and Chatagneret, met successively the same fate; and they were followed on the road to heaven by six secular employees of their college. By some means several of the servants succeeded in escaping into the neighboring houses (1). "Why was it," demands Pellissier, "that cruel hands dragged a religious from his modest refuge? How was it that men could interrupt the work of a humble educator of youth, whose presence in the little village of Arcueil was an honor and a benefit to all of its inhabitants? What was there in the austerity of religious life to provoke envy and rage? Had the Dominicans ever insulted the miseries of the people by their luxury or pompousness? Did poverty, sickness, the miseries caused by war, ever encounter more ready and persevering sympathy than that displayed by these friars? To all these questions drunken and ferocious assassins could make no answer; and therefore they retorted with outrage, blows, and death. But to all these questions reason and morality give a reply which we must record and remember. The

(1) LECUYER; *The Martyrs of Arcueil*. Paris, 1871.—PERRAUD; *Funeral Oration on Father Captier*. Paris, 1882.—PELLISSIER; *The Glories of Christian France*. Paris, 1890.—D'ARSAC; *History of the Commune of 1871*. Paris, 1885.

spirit of the Revolution is the spirit of evil; it has a horror of good in all its forms. Order is a good; religious education is a good; charity and prayer are good. Whenever the spirit of the Revolution does not encounter the material obstacle of armed force, it must destroy and murder; it changes its name without changing its nature, now calling itself Jacobinism and then the Commune; it excited a thirst for blood equally in the Cabochians of the fourteenth century, in the knitting-women of the guillotine, and in the *pétroleuses* of 1871. It profits us nothing to close our eyes so that we may not see; we can only fall the sooner under the blows of the spirit of the Revolution, the devourer of men, and the destroyer of states. Tigers are not tamed; they are entrapped and caged. Let us do even better. Since God has made man a curable being, let us not wait until rage has attained its culminating point; let us devote ourselves to the child who may become an honest man; education, Christian education by means of the priest, is the infallible remedy for the evils from which we suffer—from which perhaps France will die" (1).

We have already seen how two Jesuits, Fathers Ducoudray and Clere, received their palm at the time when Archbishop Darboy was similarly rewarded; now we shall speak of the murder of three other sons of St. Ignatius, Fathers Olivaint, Caubert, and De Benzy, who, together with eight secular priests and forty-one laymen, were immolated by the Commune on the day following that on which the Dominicans of Arcueil suffered (2). "Shall I term him a martyr? An entire panegyric is found in that appellation." Such was the climax, borrowed from St. Ambrose of Milan, of an historical article on the Jesuit, Andrew Bobola, written by Father Olivaint in 1854; and only a few years were to pass, ere the panegyrist furnished to Catholics a reason for the same question in regard to himself. On April 4th, Father Oli-

(1) *Ubi supra*, p. 383.

(2) For details of this act of the tragedy, see the *Acts of the Captivity and Death of Fathers P. Olivaint, L. Ducoudray, J. Caubert, A. Clere, and A. De Benzy, of the Society of Jesus*. By Armand de Ponlevoy, of the Same Society. Paris, 1894. Sixth Edition.—*Peter Olivaint, of the Society of Jesus, His Life, Works, and Martyrdom*. By Mme. M. M. Chatillon. Paris, 1876.—*Peter Olivaint, Priest of the Society of Jesus*. By Charles Clair, of the Same Society. Paris, 1878.

vaint, superior of the Jesuit house in the Rue de Sèvres, was semi-officially warned by a member of the Commune to whom he had done some pecuniary favors, that his institution would soon be visited by officers of the insurgent government, who would search the establishment for hidden arms and ammunition. He immediately ordered the removal of the two Sacred Particles still remaining in the tabernacle, all the other Hosts having been consumed that morning in anticipation of the Communist inroad; and the two Particles thus reserved were placed, with accompanying lights, one each in the cells of Fathers Olivaint and Lefebvre, to satisfy the devotion of the community, and perhaps to serve as Viaticum for some of the members. As the community was about to partake of the evening Lenten "collation," there appeared at the portal a commission from the Commune, with orders for a search of the house. Rushing to their cells, Fathers Olivaint and Lefebvre immediately concealed their Viaticum on their bosoms, and then faced the investigators. Of course the search was futile; but the Communist delegate shouted: "We are cheated; but we understand these Jesuitical tricks. Therefore, you, M. the superior, and you, M. the procurator, are arrested by order of the Commune. I give you only time enough to take from your rooms what is necessary." Father Lefebvre wished to accompany his brethren, Olivaint and Caubert, to the Conciergerie; but the delegate ordered him to remain in guard of the house "in the name of the Commune." While confined in the Conciergerie, Olivaint and Caubert were allowed no communication with each other; but they had the great consolation of receiving the Holy Communion on April 13th, owing to an enterprise like that which we have already described as being accomplished afterward at Mazas. On April 14, Olivaint and Caubert were transferred to Mazas, where they were subjected to the strict cellular system, with the sole alleviation of being allowed, after May 5th, to read the Journals which were authorized by the Commune. On May 22, our two Jesuits were sent to La Roquette, and two days afterward they congratulated Mgr. Darboy as he walked forth to martyrdom. On May 26th, together with Father de Bengy, a

Jesuit whom they had found in La Roquette on their arrival, eight secular priests (1), and forty-one laymen, they were led to the street. Surrounded by *gens d'armes*, the procession was ordered to march to Belleville, and it obeyed with alacrity until it arrived at the Rue de Puebla. Here there were assembled hundreds of armed ruffians, female as well as male, most of the latter either fresh from the galleys or deserters from the National army, and all drunk unto madness. With cries of "Give us those *calotins*!" (2), this horde joined the guards of the Commune, and to the accompaniment of blasphemies which have seldom been heard outside of hell, the victims arrived at the Mairie of the twentieth *arrondissement*. Here a halt was ordered for twenty minutes, "so that the clericals might make their wills," as Gabriel Ranvier, one of the leaders of the mob, told his followers, to their inexpressible glee. The twenty minutes having elapsed, the Communist guards and the furious mob arranged a kind of triumphal march, and pushed the *calotins* along the Rue de Paris; a female creature, dressed as a vivandière, now headed the procession with drawn sword, trumpets sounded the charge, and young men played with their rifles after the fashion of a theatrical drum-major. Nearly all the laymen among the doomed were soldiers of the National army; and to a man, they conducted themselves in a dignified manner, being cool and collected as though they were under the eyes of their own officers, and all listening eagerly to the encouragement which their priestly companions tendered to them unto the last. At the intersection of the Rue de Paris with the Rue Haxo, the energumens began to slap the faces of their victims, and even to spit on them, and to crush their features with stones. Suddenly a butcher, Victor Bénot, colonel of the guards of Bergeret, the chief incendiary of the Tuileries, shouted: "Kill!"; and the massacre began. The first man to fall was an old priest who flung himself in front of a soldier, in order to intercept a

(1) Radigue, Tuller, Ronchouse, and Tardien, of the Congregation of Picpus; Planchat, chaplain of the *Œuvre du Patronage*; Sabatier, Vicar of Notre-Dame de Lorette; the Abbé Selgneret of Saint-Sulpice, and the Abbé Benoist.

(2) Alluding to the skullcap (*calotte*) which is sometimes worn by tonsured persons, when they preserve the tonsure, and fear to catch cold.

bayonet-thrust that was aimed at the youth. Most of the military victims obeyed, when they received the order to jump over a low wall, so that the Communists might have the excitement of shooting them in the act; but the priests calmly refused, as one of them protested, "to play the mountebank while dying, although they were ready to die for their faith." The massacre lasted a full hour. On the following day, the Commune was definitively vanquished.

Had the Catholics of France been in the least remiss in an exhibition of patriotism during the German invasion, the senseless rage of the Commune against the clergy would have been less inexplicable; but nothing was more certain, as Jules Simon was constrained to admit, "than the devotedness and self-abnegation manifested by the clergy during the recent trials of France." Guérault, the editor of the anti-clerical journal, *L'Opinion Nationale*, did not hesitate to avow: "Whatever may be our philosophical and religious opinions, it is but just to admit that in the present crisis the Catholic clergy have shown themselves national and patriotic. Those *curés* of Brittany who accompanied and encouraged their parishioners on the field of battle; those chaplains who succored the wounded under the fire of the enemy; were good Frenchmen, worthy citizens. Certainly this is not the time for us to outrage their dearest sentiments." Even the Voltairian *Constitutionnel* drew this parallel between the faithful and the disciples of the Sage of Ferney: "In the front ranks of the army, at the advanced posts, in the very face of the cannons, whose bravery was the most marked? Who marched to the assault of Villejuif, at Châtillon, at Bourg, at Montretout? Who consoled France for the disasters of the Army of the Loire? It was the brave men of Brittany, the Vendéans, the Poitevins, the peasants of Perigord and the Gironde, the Pontifical Zouaves—sons of our old French families, men nourished in the respect for God and for Christianity. Priests and Sisters of Charity were mentioned in the orders of the day; and the troops were told to look upon Charette, Cathelineau, Dampierre, Saillard, etc., as examples of courage. Let Materialism show its heroes!" And even Renan thus

enlarged his Catholic adversaries: "The Legitimist and Clerical party has given us a good example. It could have felt little sympathy for the government which was born of the revolution of the Fourth of September; but nevertheless, it rushed bravely to arms, and it served that government because of its essential object, national defense. All the factions of the republican party have not shown the same spirit of abnegation." The authority of Bismarck in the premises may be questionable; but since he was then preparing his "War for Civilization," the pretext for which he exhibited in the alleged impossibility of true patriotism in a Catholic breast, we may adduce this observation: "The republican party is the least patriotic of all the parties in France. Influenced by the International, the idiots proclaim the world as their country. During the siege of Paris, the ferocious republicans of Belleville, of Montmartre, and of Ménilmontant, were a real type of cowardice. In the whole war, not one notable republican was hit by our bullets. If men like Flourens and Delescluze were killed, it was while fighting against their fellow-countrymen. On the contrary, men like De Luynes, Chevreuse, Dampierre, the Pontifical Zouaves, the *mobiles* of Brittany, resisted us heroically" (1). In fact, as M. Saint-Genest remarked: "Under the sway of Gambetta, all parties fought except the friends of Gambetta; every party fought to the bitter end, except that party which had invented the phrase '*guerre à outrance!*'" (2). Since we have touched on this contrast between the patriotic acts of the Catholic party in France and the inane mouthings of the so-called republicans, it may be well to note that these latter gentry prevented the success of each sortie which the besieged army of Paris made against the Germans; for less than a half of that army was at the disposal of General Trochu, it being necessary to retain more than half of it to hold the traitors in check (3). Nor can we forget that when Thiers, on Oct. 31, thought that he was about to save the integrity of French territory,

(1) *Letter to a Baron*, Nov. 16th, 1871.

(2) In the *Figaro*, Paris, July 3d, 1875.

(3) *Constitutionnel—Journal des Debats*, Nov. 13th, 1870.—*Courrier de Lyon*, Dec. 5th, 1870, and March 16th, 1871.

Bismarck, having in mind the demagogic rumblings in Paris, sarcastically asked him: "In the name of what government do you speak—in the name of that of to-day, or of the one of to-morrow?" Finally, General Trochu declared to all France: "It is a matter of public notoriety that the Germans had accepted the conditions of the Government for the National Defense in reference to the armistice proposed by the neutral powers, when the fatal and abject events of Oct. 31 restored hope to the Prussian policy, and thus compromised a situation which was honorable and worthy" (1).

Now for a brief account of the connection of Freemasonry with the Commune. In the *Inquiry into the Acts of the Government Established for the National Defense* (Gambetta's), which was undertaken by a parliamentary commission, and the results of which were published to the world, we read (Vol. iv., p. 538) the following testimony of M. Bourgoïn: "It appears to me that three elements impeded the national defense from the very beginning, and finally prepared the events of March 18 (the explosion of the Commune). These three elements were *the Masonic Lodges of Paris*: the Socialists known as Positivists; and the International. . . . The Freemasons introduced themselves into all the commissions, even among the delegates of the butchers; they perorated in the Lodges, they paraded at funerals, they sat in the municipal and governmental commissions. Every thought of national defense was laid aside." But in spite of the Masonic activity, the elections of February 8, 1871, resulted in the assemblage in Bordeaux of a large majority of Christian and royalist deputies—a fact which indicated the probability of a restoration of the legitimate monarchy in the person of Henry V., the single-minded prince whose royalty was obscured under the title of Comte de Chambord. This probability was a menace to all the conquests of the Revolution; and all of its coryphees, no matter of what faction, from the Jacobin masters of Paris to Thiers and Bismarck, conspired to avert it. The explosion of March 18, says Deschamps, "was undoubtedly the work of the Jacobins and Socialists;

(1) *Proclamation of General Trochu*, Nov. 14th, 1870.

but it received the immediate support of all the Masons of Paris and of the provinces, who designed to profit by this movement in order to deprive the National Assembly of its power, or at least to obtain, as a kind of compromise, a definitive proclamation of the Republic" (2). On April 26, when the Commune was in full blast, a large assembly of Masons was held at the Châtelet; and having chosen the famous Floquet as "orator," they voted this resolution: "Having exhausted every means of conciliation with the government of Versailles, the Masonic Order has determined to plant its banner on the ramparts of Paris; and if one ball touches that banner, the Masonic brethren will march with one accord against the common enemy." Then the assembly proceeded to the street, where it was joined by ten thousand other Masons, all wearing the regalia of the order; and marching to the Hotel de Ville, they there saluted, by the mouth of their "orator," Thirifocque, the government of the insurrection in these words: "The Commune is the grandest revolution that the world has ever witnessed; it is the New Temple of Solomon, the defence of which is the duty of Freemasonry." Then the citizen Lefrançais, a member of the Commune, harangued the brethren, stating that for many years his heart had been thoroughly Masonic, since he was a member of the Scotch Lodge No. 133, one of the most republican Lodges in the order; for a long time he had known that the object of the order was identical with that of the Commune." Then a delegation of the members of the Commune solemnly accompanied the triumphant adepts to the "temple" in the Rue Cadet. On May 5, after Thiers had received the Masonic delegates, and had refused to recognize the government of the Commune, the "Confederation of the Freemasons of Paris" addressed the following manifesto to the brethren: "Brothers in Masonry! Now we can resolve on nothing else than to fight, and to cover the cause of right with our sacred ægis. Arm yourselves for defence! Save Paris, France, and humanity! Paris, ever at the head of human progress, in this its supreme

(1) *The Secret Societies and Society; or, the Philosophy of Contemporary History*, Vol. II., p. 421. Avignon, 1882.

crisis calls on all the Masons throughout the world in these words: 'Aid me, ye sons of the widow!' This appeal will be heeded by every Freemason; all will unite in common action, protesting against the civil war which has been instigated by the supporters of monarchy. . . . Masons! You have deserved well of the Universal Country; you have assured the happiness of the peoples in all future time. Live the Republic! Live the Communes of France federated with that of Paris!" It is true that a few members of the Grand Orient emitted an equivocal and faint-hearted protest against the overt acts of the Lodges of Paris, alleging the brazen and ridiculous lie that Masonry never interfered in politics; but the perfunctory utterance was evidently made by way of precaution against the consequences of failure, and its effect on the brethren is well evinced by a note in the *Official Journal of the Commune*, published during the first days of May, stating that "The Freemasons intend to see that the decrees of the Commune are strictly obeyed; a bureau has been established in each *mairie*." In fact, just as in the days of the Terror, all the Lodges of Paris were transformed into so many Jacobin Clubs and Committees of Public Safety. And when the National army had entered Paris, and the Commune had resolved to leave to France only the ruins of her capital, there appeared the following exhortation, addressed on May 22, in the name of the Grand Orient, to all the adepts: "Freemasons of all the rites and of every grade! The Commune, the defender of your sacred principles, called you to her aid; you obeyed the summons, and your venerated standards have been torn by the bullets and shells of their enemies; you replied heroically. Continue with the aid of all our brethren and of all of our apprentices; the instructions, which you have received in our venerated Lodges, dictate to each one of you the sacred duties which he must fulfil. Happy are they who die gloriously in this holy struggle." Finally, for many years after the fall of the Commune, the Masonic powers in other countries openly manifested their sympathies with the defeated Communists of France. Thus, we read in that superexcellent Masonic authority, the *Chaine d'Union* (May, 1872) that on the preced-

ing April 17, the Grand Lodge of London gave a banquet in honor of the fallen Commune, at which attended the famous Bradlaugh among other notable English brethren, and La Cecilia among several distinguished Italian adepts (1). When many of the captured Communists, condemned to deportation by the national government, arrived in New Caledonia, they found consolation in the Masonic Lodge *L'Union Calédonienne*, which had been founded in the time of the empire by the governor, Guillain. It was through means of this Lodge, tolerated, asserts Deschamps, by secret instruction from Thiers, that Rochefort made his escape. The inquiry into the evasion, made by Admiral Ribourt, proved that the necessary funds had been furnished by the Lodges to one of the brethren who was an employee in the administration of the colony. Concluding these reflections, we would observe that uncertainty still reigns concerning the extent of the sympathies and relations of Bismarck with the Commune; but it is certain that the leaders of the Commune made many offers of service to the enemy of France, if he would engage to support their desperate cause. The following remark of Chuseret to Hatzfeld, an agent of the German chancellor, found in the relation which the Communist general himself published, is certainly suggestive: "Let us put aside *the affair of the archbishop*, and speak only of the interests which your government has in common with the Commune of Paris. If the government of Versailles triumphs, there will be a desperate effort to re-establish the monarchy; and no monarchy could even attempt to maintain itself in France, without promising revenge on you" (2).

(1) Under date of June 11, 1871, the London Correspondent of the *Moniteur Universel* spoke of the sympathy entertained for the defeated Communists by a very large portion of the English people; and he added: "One would have a very incorrect idea of the propaganda of the International, were he to suppose that it succeeds only in the lower strata of English society. In many literary circles the doctrines of the Commune find defenders, and especially among the adepts of Positivism."

(2) Cited by the *Gazette de France*, May 30, 1873.

CHAPTER IV.

THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC AS A PERSECUTOR OF THE CHURCH.

“The republican form of government is that which divides us the least,” said Thiers in the first days of 1871. A bitter enemy of the legitimate royalty, and therefore unwilling to play the game of a Monek; an inveterate skeptic, and therefore unable to pose as a Washington; entertaining a velleity in favor of the younger and traitorous branch of the Bourbons—the so-called House of Orleans—because its cause was that of an alliance between the Revolution and a veneer of respectability; the ex-Orleanist Minister should rather have avowed that he advocated the republican system, because it alone then furnished him an opportunity of becoming the head of the State. During the entire political career of this chameleon-like statesman, if the grandeur and prosperity of France ever engaged his attention, it was after a merely secondary fashion; power for himself, to be attained by any and every means—no matter how iniquitous and disgraceful, was the sole end of his policy. With reason did Lamartine thus apostrophize him: “In you there is no principle; but there is a passion—the passion to govern, to govern alone, to govern always, to govern with and against all, to govern at any price.” It was this unscrupulous lust of power (it was too ignoble to merit the name of ambition) that led Thiers to associate himself with men whom he had hitherto termed “furious madmen”—men whose alliance, as he said, could be nothing else than “a cheating game on both sides; a game in which each player was a liar in the mind of his neighbor; a compromise which rendered all engaged in it unworthy of public respect.” No wonder, therefore, that when, on May 24, 1873, Thiers tendered his resignation of the presidency to the National Assembly, hoping that it would not be accepted, this truly able man, after forty years of governmental experience which could not endow him with the

faculty of organization, was relegated to private life (1). When the reins of power were assumed by Marshal MacMahon, eleven hours after the resignation of Thiers, the lovers of law and order conceived great hopes for France; and the ever-sanguine partisans of Legitimacy fancied that Henry V. would soon mount the throne of his ancestors. The trust of the Legitimists seemed well-founded indeed, when, on Aug. 5, the Comte de Paris, head of the hitherto rebellious Orleans branch of the Bourbons, repaired to Frohsdorff, the residence of the Comte de Chambord, and formally acknowledged that prince as King of France and Navarre, thus tendering an *amende* for the treachery of Philippe Egalité, and for the usurpation of Louis Philippe. It is generally supposed that the failure of these royalist anticipations was due to the too straightforward letter, in which the Comte de Chambord declared that he would never ascend the throne as "King of the Revolution"; that he would decline a sceptre which would be a symbol of principles which he detested. It is certain that this letter caused a division in the royalist ranks; that the so-called "Liberal" Catholics could not bring themselves to place principle above fancied utility. But it is more than probable that the failure of the royalist restoration was chiefly due to the machinations of Bismarck and of the Masonic Order (2). The administration of Pres-

(1) Thiers died suddenly, while seated at dinner with his wife, on Sept. 3, 1877. Whether he had ever made his First Communion, is doubtful. Certainly during the greater part of his life he was an avowed Deist, somewhat after the fashion of Voltaire. However, in his later years he frequently insisted on his Catholicism; and at the beginning of his last will and testament these words were written: "I am a Catholic, and wish to die a Catholic." Therefore, when Mme. Thiers requested that a Christian funeral should be accorded to her husband, no objection was made by the authorities of the Church. VILLEFRANCHE; *Adolphe Thiers, in the Illustrious Persons of the Nineteenth Century*, Paris, 1882.

(2) The publication of the Arnim documents showed that Bismarck regarded it as the interest of Germany to prevent a coronation of Henry V. as king of France; that the astute and phenomenally unprincipled chancellor felt that with the restoration of her legitimate monarchy France would recover her ancient glory. In the despatches revealed by the Arnim affair, we read that "Germany need fear nothing from either the Republic or the Empire"; that "it is to the interest of Germany that France remain weak and without allies"; that "the Republic, and if not the Republic, the Empire, will furnish the least probability of a resurrection for France"; that "a monarchical France would be a danger for Germany." Dr. Busch tells us that Bismarck exclaimed to him one day at table: "No Bourbons or Orleans in France!" The action of Freemasonry in this matter of Henry V., is scarcely regarded by the Masonic powers as a secret. The Masonic Journal *La Révolution Française*, May 12, 1879, says that when there was a probability of the acclamation of Henry V., "Gambetta prepared and organized throughout all France, and even in the army, an in-

ident MacMahon, although supported by a Conservative majority in the Senate, was in continual warfare with the Radical majority in the Chamber of Deputies which followed the lead of Gambetta. And this Radical majority of the lower house was persistently encouraged by all the "official" journals of Germany, and by the entire Masonic press of the world. In 1877, when monarchical hopes were again reviving, the subsidized Bismarckian journals continually insisted that France, not yet recovered from her wounds of 1870-71, would feel the effects of another German invasion, if the imminent election should be favorable to the marshal's policy; and all these articles were carefully detailed to the voters by the sectarian agents. Ten days after the triumph of the Radicals at the polls, that is, on Oct. 24, 1877, the Supreme Council of the Scotch Rite of Masons gave a grand banquet to all the brethren who had been sent by their respective Lodges, in every land, to congratulate the adepts of France. Brother Jules Simon offered a toast "to the triumphant Republic advancing in the future

urrection, in comparison with which that of March 18 would have been mere child's play." It was proved, before the tribunals of Autun and Dijon, that during the monarchical agitation of 1873 the Masons of Saone-et-Loire planned to kidnap the Marchioness de MacMahon, a relative of the marshal-president, and to hold her as a hostage for the permanence of his republicanism. The chief of this conspiracy was Boyset, Venerable of the Lodge in Chalons, and a deputy in the National Assembly. This latter fact prevented his trial. In the *Echo de Saone-et-Loire*, Oct. 15, 1874, we read that two of the conspirators the brothers Bontemps, who were leaders in the International, were willing to promote the advent of a spurious monarchy, rather than the legitimate one of the elder Bourbons; and that accordingly they tendered their services and that of their fellow-sectarians to the Orleans princes. The Masonic *Chaine d'Union*, Jan., 1874, cites the *Monthly Bulletin of Italian Masonry*, issued by the Italian Grand Orient, as having recently said, when treating of a probable restoration: "We can perceive that it is of the utmost importance that all the Masonic societies be subjected to a uniform impulse and discipline, so that they may act more efficaciously in the interests of right and of liberty." The same Masonic *Chaine d'Union*, to which we are deeply grateful for so much of our information concerning its supporters, gives us in its issue of July, 1882, a discourse pronounced in the Lodge *Free Thought* of Aurillac on March 4, from which we cull these morsels: "You know that it is to the grand Revolution of 1789 that we owe the political reforms which have changed the face of not only Europe, but of the entire universe (*sic*). But who prepared, who directed; in a word, who made that Revolution? You, gentlemen, you—Freemasonry, the daughter of the Reformation. . . . And after the Revolution and the Empire, Freemasonry continued the work of the liberation of the peoples. Persecuted by the Restoration, it was not unconcerned with the Revolution of 1830. Then it fought Louis Philippe, who was to be, as Lafayette said, the best of republicans, but who was merely the king of the upper *bourgeoisie*. . . . Finally, on May 16 (1877), I see you again at work. When treason had raised to power the enemies of the Republic, you rushed into the breach, and you fought the foe foot by foot, forcing him finally to a capitulation in which you buried all hopes of a monarchical restoration."

without impediment." Brother Van Humbeck, Grand-Master of the Belgian Masonry, and Minister of Public Instruction in his then sorely-trying country, "congratulated France on the point at which she had arrived" (1). And what was this point? In October, 1872, a year before there was any talk of a monarchical restoration, there had been held in Locarno a "convent" of the representatives of Continental Masonry. The Orient of Rome was represented by Filippo Cordova; that of Naples by Franchi; that of Palermo by La Vaccara; that of Florence by Andrea Giovanelli; that of Turin by Alberto Mario; and that of Genoa by Quadrio. The Lodges of France were represented by Felix Pyat; those of Hungary by Kossuth; those of Switzerland by Klapka; and those of Prussia by General Etzel. The questions for consideration were proposed by the Prussian, who presided at the sessions: 1. Would democracy be benefited by a war between the France of Thiers and Italy? 2. How could a provisional government, under the dictatorship of Gambetta, be established in France? 3. What new religion ought to be substituted for Catholicism? (2). It is evident, therefore, that five years before the electoral condemnation of the policy of MacMahon, Freemasonry had decreed the eventual supremacy of its protegee and tool, Gambetta; and certainly the phrase "provisional government under the dictatorship of Gambetta" fitted well the course of that disciplined parliamentary majority which neutralized such good intentions as President MacMahon may have entertained. After a multitude of concessions to the Masonico-Radical spirit of the deputies, MacMahon finally refused to accept a measure which would have disorganized the army; and when his determination was met with the cry "submit or resign," he chose the latter course on Jan. 30, 1879. With the advent of Grévy as President, the French Republic entered on a new phase of existence; the comparatively conservative cabinet of MacMahon was dismissed, and in the new one the Ministry of Public Instruction was assigned to Jules Ferry. On March 15, Ferry laid before the deputies two bills which

(1) *Chaine d'Union*, Nov., 1878.

(2) *L'Univers*, Nov. 12, 1872.—PACHTLER; *War Against Throne and Altar*, p. 158.

were aimed at an entire destruction of that Freedom of Education, for which the Catholics of France had so persistently fought, as will be remembered by the reader who has accompanied us in our studies on Lacordaire, Ozanam, and Montalembert. One of these bills modified the composition and the duties of the Superior Council for Public Instruction, and of the Academic Councils, inasmuch as it conferred on the State all authority in the matter of teaching. The other bill, which directly concerned freedom in the matter of imparting secondary and superior instruction, accorded to the State an exclusive right to examine candidates for academic degrees; it deprived all private institutions of the title and privileges of a University; and by one of its articles, the celebrated Article VII., it pretended to take the right of teaching from every religious congregation which was not "authorized" by the government.

The Ferry Laws, as history will term these tyrannous measures which signalized the accession of Grévy to the French presidency, were merely the result of the work undertaken by the *Ligue de l'Enseignement* or Educational Association which had been founded in 1866 by Jules Macé, with the active support of Robert, director-general under Duruy, then the imperial Minister of Public Instruction. The object of this league was to render all instruction gratuitous, obligatory, and above all, secular; the modicum of freedom of instruction then subsisting, a privilege which the laws of 1833 and 1850 had allowed the Catholic institutions to exercise in their brave endeavors to compete with a governmental University which enjoyed a revenue of fifty-eight millions of francs, was to be entirely abrogated. This association numbered among its active members not only nearly all the professors of the University, but also a majority of the imperial prefects, procurators, and other functionaries. Macé proclaimed that his league "would reduce to practice the principles proclaimed in the Lodges"; and it is interesting to note that three years afterward, in the Masonic Congress of Metz, it was this same Macé who moved that the name of God should be expunged from the statutes of Masonry—a project which was finally actuated by the Grand

Convent held in Paris on September 14, 1877, after consultation with all the Lodges in the obedience of the French Grand Orient (1). Shortly after the birth of the league, the *Monde Maçonique* (April, 1867) said: "We are happy to be able to announce that the league founded by Brother Jean Macé, and also the project of a statue to Brother Voltaire, have excited the sympathies of all our Lodges. Certainly no two subscriptions could be more in agreement than that in favor of Voltaire, which means the destruction of prejudice and superstition, and that for the league, which means a new society founded only on science and instruction. All the brethren understand this." And in his circular of July 4, 1870, the Grand-Master Babaud-Larivière said: "We are all of one mind in regard to the principle of gratuitous, obligatory, and lay instruction." On September 24, 1878, at the banquet given by the Grand Orient on the occasion of the Universal Exposition, the Adjunct-Grand-Master of the Belgian Grand Orient, Bourland, thus perorated amid universal applause: "The obstacle to the intellectual development of France, that which is killing her, that which is killing us, that which is killing the entire world, is ignorance and fanaticism—the idea that the world should belong to him who is most daring in weakening the intellectual faculties, in brutalizing man. Let us arise against this pretension! Rome, together with Ultramontanism, ignorance, and all else that comes from Rome, must perish, because of a development of an education *which will lead to morality*" (2). In order to obtain funds for their campaign against all religious teaching in schools, the Masons organized the *Œuvre du Sou des Écoles* or School-Penny Collection throughout the republic; and in order to inspire the people with an enthusiasm which would result in contributions, every kind of festivity was brought into requisition. Thus at the grand festival given by the Lodges of Bordeaux in the public gardens on June 24, 1879, as we learn from the *Monde Maçonique*, "Just as the last banners of the processions (of Corpus

(1) The statutes of the Grand Orient of France had hitherto given as the basis of Masonry "the existence of God, the study of morality, and the practice of all virtues." The new statute assigned: "Absolute freedom of conscience and human solidarity."

(2) *Monde Maçonique*, November, 1878, p. 346.

Christi) were re-entering their respective sacristies," the ceremonies of irreligion were begun; and in the evening the adepts exhibited a piece of fire-works "which presented 'The Works of Masonry' as its title, and reminded the 17,000 spectators of the object being pursued by the Order." Quite properly, therefore, had Macé said in a general meeting of his league on January 18, 1879: "The destiny of our association is so intimately united with that of the republic, that the sole imminence of that senatorial majority, which was to consecrate republican institutions definitively, suffices to precipitate the movement which is directed principally by us." The movement was precipitated on March 7 by the proposition of the laws prepared by Jules Ferry, a Masonic luminary whose brutal materialism had been manifested two years previously when the Lodge *Clémentine Amitié* of Paris gave a banquet in honor of the anniversary of the reception of Littré and Wyruboff into its bosom: "The Masonic fraternity is something superior to all dogmas, to all metaphysical conceptions, and not only to all religions, but to all philosophies. I mean that sociability is sufficient unto itself; that social morality has its guarantees and its roots in the human conscience; that it can live by itself; that at length it can throw away its theological crutches, and march untrammelled to the conquest of the world. You are the most precious instruments for the cultivation of the social sentiment, for the development of social and *lay* morality. . . . It is of the essence of Masonry to free man from the fear of death. To this so-ancient fear, to this slavery which it is so hard to crush, you oppose the strengthening and consoling sentiment of the continuity and perfectibility of the human species. . . . When one is animated by this conviction, one has conquered for himself every liberty" (1). Scarcely had Ferry presented his bills in the Chamber, when Masonic

(1) *Chaîne d'Union*, 1877, p. 181.—These remarks of Ferry remind us of the Italian sectarian utterances of Brother Mauro Macchi, deputy in the Italian Parliament and a member of the Supreme Council of the Italian adepts, when he wrote to the *Masonic Review* in February, 1874: "The key-stone of the system which opposes Masonry has always been and is the ascetic and transcendental sentiment which turns the attention of men beyond this life, and induces them to consider themselves as mere travellers on earth, urging them to sacrifice everything for a happiness that will begin in the graveyard. Until this system is destroyed by the mallet of Masonry, society will be mainly composed of poor weaklings who think of nothing but happiness in a future life."

Conferences were convened throughout the republic for the purpose of creating or augmenting a popular yearning for the blessings of irreligious education. At the Conference held in Marseilles on April 5, Brother Gambini, Venerable of the Lodge *La Parfaite Sincérité*, drew the attention of his frenzied brethren to : " Brother Jules Ferry, Minister of Public Instruction, endeavoring to render education *essentially laic*, although he is surrounded by nameless intrigues and assaults on the part of the clerical hordes. . . . But if Brother Jules Ferry is accomplishing a work which is essentially Masonic, it is the duty of us Masons to aid him in the fulfilment of his mission. Let him know that he is sustained by an army in reserve which, although it is calm because it is conscious of its power, is ready nevertheless to defend his work with its life " (1). During the summer of 1879, Ferry made a tour through the south of France, in order to enable the Brethren of the Three Points to incite popular demonstrations which might neutralize the opposition of all that was sensible and religious to his projects. Having read the many addresses which were ostentatiously presented to him by the Lodges, we quote as representative of them all, some passages from that of the Lodges of Toulouse : " The Masons of Toulouse extend to you a welcome, and tender the sentiments of respect which they feel for a Minister who sustains, with persistent courage, so difficult a combat against the eternal enemies of civil society. Democratic France, laboring France is with you ; and Freemasonry cannot forget that the Minister of Public Instruction is one of her most distinguished sons. Freemasonry will assist you, dear brother, with all the means in her power ; for she well understands that. . . it is necessary that French youth be delivered from the schemes of the Jesuits. . . . Inform the government, dear brother, that especially in this matter, the Masonry of Toulouse is on its side."

The introduction of the second of the Ferry Laws, that which practically suppressed the free Faculties and Universities created in virtue of the law of 1875, excited sentiments of horror and indignation among the Catholics of France.

(1) *Chaine d'Union*, May, 1879.

When it was discussed, during June and part of July, eloquent voices pleaded for freedom of teaching and of the religious orders ; but hatred of religion led the deputies to pass Article VII. by a vote of 330 out of 515, and to pass the law as an entirety by a vote of 362 out of 521. In the Senate, however, the propriety and justice of Article VII. were fiercely contested ; and the Catholic cause was reinforced by the very unclerical Jules Simon and Laboulaye. The senatorial vote could not be taken before March 9, 1880 ; and then the iniquitous article was defeated by a majority of 19, the rest of the law being accepted. The deputies adopted the amendment of the Senate. The law concerning the Superior Council and the Academic Councils had been slightly modified, and then passed in February. The rejection of Article VII., as the reader may easily have foreseen, had not been regarded by the Masons and other radicals with equanimity. Determined to withdraw the youth of France from "the clutches of the Jesuits and other teaching orders," they re-suscitated the memory of several laws which had fallen into desuetude—laws which were even contrary to the so much vaunted principles of 1789, and which had been abolished by non-use and by a law of 1850. On March 29, 1880, there appeared decrees of the president, based on laws of 1790 and 1792, on the Napoleonic Concordat, and on the Organic Articles which Napoleon had added to that Concordat. These decrees accorded to that "non-authorized" association which "was styled 'of Jesus'" a delay of three months, within which term it was to withdraw from all establishments that it occupied on French territory. A similar delay of three months was granted to all other "un-authorized" organizations, during which said bodies "might apply to the government for an approbation of their statutes and rules, and for a legal recognition of their establishments which then existed *de facto*." The execution of these decrees began on June 30, the officers having received instructions to finish their work before November. However, several of the affected colleges continued to exist, despite these enactments, owing to the zeal of wealthy Catholics who bought the confiscated properties, and installed therein professors

who were not *congréganistes* or members of any order, but who were devoted to the sacred cause of religious education. By the procedure of March 29, 1880, the French Republic declared open war on the Catholic Church; and why should it not have so done, when the Lodges pronounced the incompatibility of Catholicism and Republicanism? On May 9, Courdavaux, professor in the Faculty of Letters at Douay, gave a Conference on the Sacred Scriptures (!) before the Lodge *L'Étoile du Nord* of Lille, in which he said: "The distinction between Catholicism and Clericalism is purely official, a subtlety necessary for the exigencies of the platform; but here in the Lodge, we may proclaim the truth that Catholicism and Clericalism are one and the same thing. And let us add this conclusion. No man can be both Catholic and Republican; it is impossible" (1). It is refreshing to note the attempted justification of the cabinet to which he belonged, made by Cazot, then Minister of Justice. In an address to the Lodge *L'Écho du Grand-Orient* of Nimes, Cazot said: "According to a phrase that is familiar to you, we have entered on an era of difficulties. It is not yet closed. We have many combats before us; for instance, the magistracy is to be reformed, so that it may be neither servile nor factious. The law must be respected by all, and especially by those who, under the vain pretext of defending a religious liberty whose founders and apostles we are, and of which they are the worst enemies, pretend to obey only a foreign sovereignty, refusing to bow before the sovereignty of their country" (2). We must not forget, however, that for a moment after the first enforcements of the decrees against the "un-authorized" teaching orders, there seemed to be promised an escape from the storm. The superiors of the afflicted communities had sent to the government a declaration couched in very moderate terms, and approved by the French episcopate; and Grévy, supported by Freycinet, then Minister of Foreign Affairs and President of the Council, had shown a disposition to be contented with that

(1) The *Chaîne d'Union* of June, 1880, published this Conference as worthy of the highest praise.

(2) *Chaîne d'Union*, 1880, p. 237.

Declaration. The debates on this subject occupied the cabinet on Sept. 16, 17, and 18 ; and precisely on those days the Grand-Orient was in solemn session. The consequence of this coincidence was narrated by the *Moniteur Universel* on Sept. 22 : " One of the Masons of the ' Convent ' (of the Grand-Orient) was told last Saturday about the negotiations which M. de Freycinet had held with the Vatican concerning the Declaration of the congregations. He replied : ' If the president of the Council has negotiated with the Pope, he will leave the cabinet.' And on the next day, as the Mason had prophesied, M. de Freycinet was forced to resign his portfolio." On Sept. 23, a new cabinet was formed, and Jules Ferry was constituted its head. The war against everything religious continued. The hospitals were deprived of the services of the Sisters of Charity ; a law establishing divorce was introduced in the Chamber ; cemeteries were secularized ; military chaplaincies were abolished ; it was proposed to subject seminarians to military service ; public religious processions were prohibited ; new laws were enacted for the purpose of concentrating more thoroughly in the State all instruction of youth. The enforcement of the Ferry Laws, primarily directed against the Jesuits, but applied also to the other orders whose members devoted themselves to teaching the young, was an occasion for the most revolting abuses of the governmental authority ; in many instances, even the honor of the army was compromised by its use in the siege of convents and monasteries. Under the influence of the emotions excited by these scandals, many French Catholics were then disposed to find fault with Pope Leo XIII. on account of his silence in the premises ; many blamed the Pontiff for his sympathy with, if not his instigation of the conciliatory Declaration emitted by the superiors of the persecuted communities. But let us remember that from the very beginning of the anti-Catholic campaign undertaken by the Third Republic, the Holy See had realized that the circumstances were such as called for a persistent exercise of the patient prudence which is the most salient characteristic of the Papal Court. Let us remember, with one of the most judicious of the critics of the pontificate of Leo

XIII. (1), that His Holiness had deemed it wise to abstain from any demonstration which might have compromised the interests of the Church in France, by throwing obstacles in the way of the relatively conciliatory advances which Freycinet seemed to be ready to make. "But the Pontiff had emitted his complaints and protests in a diplomatic manner; and he was about to repeat them in a more solemn style, when there appeared the semi-official proposition in regard to the Declaration (of the religious superiors). As for that document, there was no reason for disapproving it; not only did it contain nothing contrary to principle, but it gave rise to a hope that the persecution would terminate. When these anticipations failed of realization, and when the Pontiff perceived that reticence was no longer a duty, he issued his eloquent letter to Cardinal Guibert, dated Oct. 22, 1880." In this letter, Leo XIII. gave great praise to the conduct of the French Catholics, both clerical and lay, and he lauded the heroism of the hundreds of French magistrates who had abandoned their positions, rather than execute the decrees of the persecutors. In reference to the Declaration of the superiors, he reminded the superfluously zealous among the Catholics that it ought to be sufficient for them to know that "the Declaration had been prepared by the authority, by the instigation, or at least by the permission of their bishops." Then the Pontiff recalled for the benefit of the zealots the principles on which the permissibility of the Declaration was based; that is, the well-understood fact that the Church is opposed to no form of government—that the Church seeks only the good of religion in all of her relations with the civil power. "No one can deny," added the Pope, "that in all things which are not unjust, the powers that exist are to be obeyed, so that there may result a preservation of that order which is the source of public security." The Pontiff was careful to observe, however, that from what he had presented as the duty of Catholics toward the republican government of France, "it did not follow that in obeying the existing powers, they should necessarily

(1) T'SERCLAES; *Pope Leo XIII., His Life, His Religious, Political, and Social Acts.* Paris, 1894.

approve whatever might be wrong in the constitution or administration of the government."

On March 28, 1882, there was promulgated a law concerning primary instruction which rendered that instruction obligatory in the case of all children who were between six and thirteen years of age; but the instruction was not necessarily to be received in the institutions of the State—a privilege which favored, of course, only those Catholics whose pecuniary condition enabled them to patronize the private schools, which received no subsidies from the government. During the discussion of this law in the Senate, Jules Simon, ultra-radical though he was, was sufficiently generous to venture to move an amendment to the effect that the children of the State schools should be taught "their duties to God and their country"; but the president of the commission charged with the examination of the law, one Schælcher, cried: "I cannot accept that amendment, since I am an atheist." The Catholics of the smaller towns and villages frequently succeeded in partially obviating the curse of the prohibition of religious instruction in their public schools; the Municipal Councils enjoyed the right of naming the members of the School Commissions, and they often named ecclesiastics as such members. The cabinet of Freycinet was replaced during seven months by that which was organized by Duclere; and Duvaux, its Minister of Public Instruction, was apparently content with what his predecessors had effected to the detriment of the Church. But on Feb. 21, 1883, President Grévy assigned to Ferry the task of forming a new Ministry, and of course the champion priest-eater hastened to resume his favorite occupation (1).

(1) As a Minister of Public Instruction, Ferry possessed strange notions concerning the moral needs of the daughters of France. Whereas most of the giants of his school ever desired that their wives and daughters should be religious women, Ferry took care, when re-organizing the Normal School for Girls at Versailles, to not only appoint as its president a Protestant (the widow Jules Favre), but also to establish as its professor of Moral Science a notorious infidel, Joseph Fabre. In his *Elements of Philosophy* this trainer of future wives and mothers wrote: "Morality can and ought to be taught independently of God (p. 258). . . . The contrary doctrine would justify the poisoning of Socrates; it would renew the great scandal of the cross of Jesus; it would exalt Nero and Domitian; it would rekindle the pyre of Giordano Bruno; it would repeat the horrors of St. Bartholomew's Day (p. 260). . . . The pretended demonstrations of the existence of a God are insufficient" (p. 357).

Throughout France, innumerable pastors were deprived of their "salaries," merely because some informers, perhaps notorious liars, had denounced them as violators of unjust laws. The cross was torn from the gates of the cemeteries in Paris, and in many of the other large cities. Since the Masonic designs were often thwarted by the "undue" moderation of some magistrates in applying or interpreting the persecuting enactments, Ferry engineered through the Chamber a law which suspended for three months the irremovability of the judges; and immediately their office was taken from all the magistrates whose integrity and independence gave umbrage to the Lodges. More than six hundred magistrates were thus dismissed. During 1884 the ecclesiastical budget, never too large, since it was equal to about the half of one per cent. on the value of the property stolen from the Church, was greatly diminished; the Chapter of Saint-Denis was suppressed; and the allowances of the archbishop of Paris and of many other prelates were reduced to derisory amounts. The year 1885 witnessed no new persecutions, other than the withdrawal of "salaries" from some hundreds of pastors who were accused of influencing their voting parishioners at the previous elections. In 1886, however, the work of the Educational League was completed. We have seen that the Ferry Laws of 1879 banished all members of religious organizations from the teaching staff of the secondary and superior schools; it remained for Paul Bert to deliver what was perhaps the most effective of all blows against Catholicism in France, by means of an elaborate bill which completely laicized primary education. Bert had always frankly avowed his object. During the discussion on the Ferry projects in 1879, he had been appointed to draw up a report for a commission which rejoiced in such members as the Masonic luminaries, Louis Blanc, Lockroy, Laetelle, Constans, Spuller, Floquet, and Duvaux. In this report he had said: "Instruction must be laic, *exclusively laic*: no teacher can be taken from among the members of any religious association, whether that association be authorized or not. . . . The commissioners have not wished to trouble themselves, as legislators, with the eternal dis-

putes of metaphysicians (on such subjects as God, the immortality of the soul, etc.). . . . We have concerned ourselves principally with the discipline of intelligence, being sure that when natural science has taught the child how to observe, when physical science has taught him how to prove, when mathematical science has taught him how to draw consequences, we shall have formed a mind which will be free from prejudices, and one not easily seduced by sorceries and superstitions. By the study of natural phenomena, the child will be superior to foolish terrors, and to unworthy credulities (such as belief in future punishment) . . . he will never hope for a sudden miracle to cure the evils of society, any more than he would ask it to cure his physical troubles. The saviours will never seduce him " (1). When Bert's bill on primary education had been presented to the deputies, such orators as the Count de Mun, Lamarzelle, and Bishop Freppel, combatted it most vigorously, and as a last resort endeavored to draw some of its poison by apposite amendments ; but the Chamber passed the measure as the Lodges had drafted it. The Senate modified it but slightly ; and when the law was promulgated on Oct. 30, 1886, it was found that all members of a religious community were to disappear from the primary schools, as they already had been expelled from the others ; and that thereafter no religious could teach in a public school. Such was the remedy which Bert and his brethren prescribed for a society which was afflicted with the disease of Catholicism. Article VII. had failed ; but the Bertian substitute was a preventative, said its author, " against the phylloxera of modern society." Therefore it was that at a banquet of the General Council of Yonne, he offered the toast : " I drink to the inventor who gave us the sulphate of carbon to banish the phylloxera of the vine ; and I also drink to the framer of that Article VII. which would banish the phylloxera of Catholicism."

Having given a succinct account of the chief causes

(1) In this report Bert proposed that the following provision should be enacted by the Assembly : " The municipalities shall become owners of all legacies or donations which shall have been made to schools or asylums on condition that they should be directed by religious."

which have contributed to render the name of the Third French Republic so distressing to the ears of all faithful children of the Spouse of Christ, we shall devote a special chapter to one of the most lamentable features in the anti-Catholic legislation of that government—that which instituted compulsory military service on the part of the clergy. Now we would ask the attention of the student to the Encyclical *Nobilissima Gallorum Gens* which Pope Leo XIII. issued in June, 1884—a document which portrays the history of the relations during the previous few years between the Apostolic See and France; which recapitulates in a most solemn manner the evils inflicted on the Church by those who guide the destinies of the Eldest Daughter of the Church; and which finally indicates the causes of those evils, and assigns their remedies. Naturally the Pontiff begins by reminding the world of the Christian glories which have pre-eminently distinguished France; of the praises which, more than any other nation, France has received from the Sovereign Pontiffs; of the gifts which France has received from God in the natural order; and then His Holiness laments that “sometimes France has forgotten herself, and has neglected the duties which God imposed on her.” However, the Pontiff consolingly remarks, “France has never given herself entirely to such madness, nor has she forgotten herself for a long time.” But now, we are reminded, in the entire extent of Christendom there circulates the poison of wicked doctrine—a doctrine which aims at the complete destruction of every Christian institution; and in France the evil presents itself in the guise of a heterodox philosophy which has given birth to a spirit of immoderate liberty, and in the form of a secret society which has sworn the death of Catholicism. The Pope insists that “no State can be prosperous, if virtue and religion are languishing”; for without the idea of God, authority and law lose their force, governments become tyrannies, the governed become rebels—such are the consequences of a forgetfulness of God. Again, unless society has recourse to God, its Protector, it cannot hope for His blessing. History demonstrates this fact, and most especially is the fact

shown by the history of France during the last hundred years. Then the Father of Christendom shows how for the family, the basis of society, it is necessary that a Christian education be given to the child; and how it has been on account of this necessity that the Church has always condemned the theory of a "neutral" education. Uninfluenced by a belief in a God who is Creator, Rewarder, and Punisher, the young will never bend beneath a rule that commands even a decent life; habituated to a refusal of nothing to their passions, the young will easily be a source of trouble to the State. Confining his reflections thenceforward more especially to the needs of the State, the Pontiff reminds us that among men there are two societies which are thoroughly independent, each in its own sphere. These societies are the temporal and the spiritual; but we must not forget that there are certain "mixed matters" in which each of these societies naturally has an interest, and concerning a regulation of which they must both come to an agreement. This need was understood in France by the civil authorities, after the subsidence of the revolutionary turmoils in the beginning of the nineteenth century; and therefore the two powers, spiritual and temporal, agreed on that Concordat, in which Pope Pius VII. showed so much condescension in favor of the French government. The results were happy, both for the Church in a revival of the Christian traditions, and for the State in the receipt of a promise of tranquillity. Such a result, remarks His Holiness, is much to be desired in these days of revolutionary enterprise; now, more than at any other time, the State ought to ask for the beneficent intervention of the Church. Nevertheless, the Head of the Church is compelled to admit that the acts of the French government are now of such a nature that they indicate an imminent rupture of the Concordat; and he calls attention to his letters to Cardinal Guibert in reference to the persecution of the religious orders, as well as to his letter to President Grévy on the general hostility of the republic to the Church. Then the Pope praises the courage of the French bishops in the present circumstances, and he especially commends their efforts for the establishment of

Catholic schools, despite the enormous revenues of the governmental establishments, against which they must contend. He repels as a calumny the Masonic assertion that in these efforts lies a proof that the bishops are enemies of France; he insists that in defending the interests of souls, the prelates are simply performing their duty. And the Pontiff grows warm in his commendations of the zealous and charitable French priesthood, as well as in his acknowledgment of the heroic courage of so many of the French laity. On June 27, Leo XIII. addressed a Brief to the bishop of Perpignan, accentuating the counsels given in this Encyclical, and especially deploring the political divisions among the French laymen—divisions which prevented their presenting a united front at the polls, and thus crushing the Masonic hydra which was strangling France. The so-much-needed union, says the Pontiff, will easily be consummated, if Frenchmen will take their motives from the Encyclicals issued by Pius IX. and by himself, but especially from the *Syllabus* promulgated by his predecessor. "Let Frenchmen do away with disputes, the objects of which are merely private interests—interests which are of secondary importance, when compared with matters which belong to a more elevated order." We shall find occasion to give some attention to these counsels of Leo XIII. to the French laity, when we come to treat of the general trend of his pontificate.

It has been well said that the history of the modern Revolution is but one enormous lie, and one perpetual hypocrisy; and certainly the record of the dissension between the Church and the Third French Republic does not indicate that the latter institution is an exception. Mendacity and hypocrisy were needed indeed for the assertion that the persecuting decrees of Ferry, Bert, and Co. were merely actuations of "existing laws." All that was most honest among the liberals of France manifested its disgust toward this hypocrisy. Laboulaye cried: "They exhume the edicts of the olden kings, the decrees of the Reign of Terror, those of the Cæsars, etc. . . . All is acceptable to the democrats, when they desire to strangle liberty, or to hunt the Jesuits. As for those ordinances which recognized liberty of con-

science, religious liberty, freedom of teaching, the right of association, all these do not exist for our democrats. 'All for them; nothing for any others,' but especially 'nothing for religion!'—That is their watchword." And the injustice of such procedures caused Jules Simon to say, concerning the majority of his brethren: "To-day the republicans imitate the adversaries whom they once combatted; it seems to me that when they attain to power, they have learned only how to proscribe. . . . Do not make us say that you do not love liberty, whenever it troubles you. You do not love liberty, unless you are willing that your adversaries should have it. If you love liberty only for yourselves, you do not love it, you do not even know what it means; you are unworthy of understanding it" (1). It was an easy task for two veritable luminaries of French jurisprudence, M. Rousse of Paris and M. de Demolombe of Caen, to demonstrate in two masterly juridical *Consultations* on the decrees of March 29, 1880, that the plea of those decrees being founded on "existing laws" was a cowardly hypocrisy; and their declaration was endorsed by more than two thousand lawyers, among whom were all of the most illustrious and most disinterested members of the French bar and magistracy (2). Certainly the Masonic conspirators against the Church could not have trusted greatly in any "existing laws," when they devised their new Article VII.; and it was only when the Senate had rejected that article as too despotic, that men were informed of these "existing laws"—ordinances which "existed" with so little of vitality, that in order to give any force to them, two new decrees were made as substitutes for the condemned Article VII. In their search after "existing laws" which might crush the "clericals," the democratic despots raked among the rubbish of that past which they continually cursed. They seized on all the arbitrary decrees and violent measures of the two Napoleons,

(1) It was this plea for true liberty that caused the most distinguished and most learned man in the republican party to become an object of detestation to his olden comrades. Smarting under their ingratitude, Jules Simon said: "It is we who defend the republic—we who are trying to preserve it from the stain of despotism: and it is precisely because of that effort that we are, I will not say discussed, but reviled and outraged."

(2) RIVAUD: *Course of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. iii., p. 674. Paris, 1883.

and hailed them as proper chastisements for the slaves of Rome ; thus, as some one wrote at the time, presenting the picture of "Democracy licking the mud from the boots of the Empire." They even stirred up the debris of the royalist Restoration which they anathematized more bitterly than they cursed the two Empires ; hoping to find their hatred justified by the acts of a government which they proclaimed as "clerical." They found a number of ordinances which were hostile to freedom of education, and which the Universitarian monopoly and the threats of revolutionary liberalism had extorted from two feeble monarchs ; and with these testimonies they essayed to convince the world that even the government of the Restoration, "clerical" though it was, had for its own safety been compelled to restrain the Jesuits and their similars (1). Their task was easy when they peered into the pile of documents bequeathed to France by the men who had travestied the Principles of 1789 ; here they were rewarded by the discovery of laws which were not only sanguinary, but more despotic and irreligious than any which Satan had ever breathed into the mind of man. Certainly these records, stained with the blood which, as Taine observed, "is the soul of the Revolution," ought to have satisfied the seekers of "existing laws" ; but they must needs recur to the philosophistic, Masonic, and Jansenistic parliaments of the eighteenth century. "These democrats," reflects Paul Féval, "experience no shame in donning the old ducal wig of Choiseul, the favorite and accomplice of the Pompadour. They loudly applaud the judicial crimes of those parliaments now styled by history 'the parliaments of Choiseul-Pompadour' ; and they are happy in being able to imitate, and to resuscitate those despots of the robe." When a similar enterprise, but one projected on a much smaller scale, was essayed in 1825, it was no more moderate anti-clerical than Pierre Leroux, who said : "That man does not understand liberty who demands an execution of the

(1) "In this case the lie is so barefaced that it might be considered a wicked pleasantry, a revolutionary *gaminerie*. For the revolution was wont to amuse itself with its victims. We all know the little chant sung by the cannibals in the Café de Foy at the Palais Royal, while they squeezed the blood from the heart of Berthier, and then drank it : 'There can be no feast, if the heart is absent.'" RIVAUX ; *loc. cit.*, p. 677.

olden parliamentary decrees against the Jesuits; I shall say more—he himself is guilty of Jesuitism.” Of course, having whetted their appetites with the morsels dragged from the graves of the Second Empire, the Restoration, Napoleon I., the Revolution, and Louis XV., the democrats of the Third Republic hastened to regale themselves with the drippings from the caldron of Gallicanism, as it was prepared during the reign of Louis XIV. Undoubtedly these gentry had no more accurate idea of the meaning of Gallicanism than that which is entertained by the average Protestant; but they knew that Gallicanism had been used by the great Louis XIV. as an engine of war against some temporal claims of Rome, and therefore they determined to imitate the prince whom they especially abhorred. Then we heard of dragoons being directed against harmless old men of prayer and against convents, the sole defense of which was the crucifix; then we read of the siege of the Abbey of Frigolet, so bravely conducted by a republican general. The prospect of such scenes caused that serious republican, Dufaure, to declare in full Senate: “In the programme openly displayed by an eminent republican deputy, a distinguished orator of the Chamber, I find that there are projected against the Catholics all of the measures indicated in those edicts of Louis XIV. which accompanied or followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.” Commenting on this appropriation of weapons from a Gallicanism which his comrades did not understand, Jules Simon said: “The Most Christian monarch had at least an excuse in his faith; but you, you who represent free thought, and who therefore do not claim to be the sole depositaries of absolute truth, you cannot pretend to share in a doctrinal unity. It will be said of you that you use repression for the sake of negation.” But Paul Bert, the champion of the Third Republic in its deliberate contempt of logic, did not quail before this arraignment by Jules Simon. With phenomenal cynicism he accepted the allegation: “Yes; *we are the negation*. Protestantism, Jansenism, all other heresies, are merely partial negations, half-measures of days long vanished. We are a negation which is total and radical.” And then, as though

he had heard St. Augustine's cry: "Catholicism is integral truth," that is, a real and total *affirmation*, Bert added: "The question between us (the Church and the Third Republic) is one of life and death." No wonder that Gambetta felt that he was justified in proclaiming: "Clericalism is our enemy.

CHAPTER V.

A FIGHTING CLERGY AND THE ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS.

In 1889 the Third French Republic resolved to drive the clergy into the army, its ostensible purpose being an enforcement of an equality of all the citizens before the law, but its real intention being to weaken that "clericalism" which Gambetta, its most brilliant champion, had designated as "the enemy," to be combatted with tooth and nail. Then a novel lesson in ecclesiastical jurisprudence was given to the Catholic world by the Chamber of Deputies. Hitherto it had been generally understood that the Church, so "*abhoret a sanguine*—is so averse to the shedding of human blood," that she does not allow her priests, or even her simple clerics, to enter the military service, unless as chaplains or nurses, or in similar guise. The name of the new professor of Canon Law was Hanotaux. According to this parliamentary canonist, neither ecclesiastical tradition nor the Canons are opposed to the enrolment of priests and seminarians in the fighting ranks of the army. Does not the great Jansenist leader, Saint-Cyran, so insist? Is not the Abbé Houssey, the editor of that one-time famous *Tribune of the Clergy* which was so Catholic that the French bishops were constrained to condemn it, of the same mind? With these "authorities," then, to support his audacity, our deputy proclaimed to his amazed but admiring colleagues that the Catholic episcopate and priesthood stultified themselves when they branded the infamous project as destructive of clerical discipline, as scandalous and sacrilegious, and as expressly condemned by the Canons. In order to arm ourselves against the presumed effective engines with which the

confident deputy was equipped by Saint-Cyran and others of that ilk, we shall open the immense arsenal of controversial weapons furnished by the *Collection of Canons*. But first we must anticipate the thought of the reader, who probably has been recalling to mind some of the instances of clerical, aye, of even episcopal fighting with the sword of the flesh in the halcyon days of old. In the first place, these instances are by no means as plentiful as is frequently supposed; and even though they all, and a hundred times their number, were capable of verification by the light of history, they would stand forth, not as being in accord with law and custom, but rather as abnormal examples born of peculiar circumstances. From the very beginning of the early Middle Age, the piety of the great and wealthy had endowed the churches and monasteries with lands; the interest of sovereigns had prompted them to give the rank of temporal lords to men upon whose fidelity they could depend. Therefore nearly every bishop and abbot was a feudal dignitary, and subject, as such, to the same obligations, either personally or by substitute, as the secular noble; giving, of course, before he received his investiture, *hominium* or homage to his suzerain. Undoubtedly there were many inconveniences in the system, and also many abuses which gave rise, in the eleventh century, to the vexatious question of Investitures; but it was considered, in the beginning, that the inconveniences were more than counterbalanced by the elevation of the prelates to a position among the temporal rulers of the earth. And in nearly every case the obligation of a military service was discharged by a lay substitute, styled, for that purpose, the prelate's "man." Again, very many abbeys were frequently usurped by laymen, who assumed the title of abbots, and personally fulfilled an abbot's temporal duties. In such cases it should not be surprising to find a record stating that such and such an abbot fought in such and such a campaign. And even in the case of some abbots who were canonically elected, we read that sometimes they were impelled, by the exigencies of the feudal system, to provide themselves with military protectors, if they wished to escape spoliation. Recourse, therefore, was had to some powerful

secular lord, who would lead the vassals of the abbey in war, receiving, in reward, some of the abbatial territories in fief, and bearing as his standard the abbatial insignia (1). In these instances we also encounter allegations of military experience on the part of abbots. Certainly the appearance of clerics in the military ranks must have been quite exceptional, even in the early Middle Age, since the olden annals inform us that veneration for the sacred character of the priesthood caused the soldiers to flee in terror from a field which had been stained by such a sacrilege as the killing of a minister of God. We read in the *Capitularies* of Charlemagne a prohibition of soldiering on the part of clerics, and the emperor seems to have thought that priestly combatants were not a source of strength to an army: "Those nations and princes have never been victorious in the long run, who have allowed priests to fight in their armies. Certain rulers in Gaul, Spain, and Lombardy, have thought that they could grant such permission; but the audacious sacrilege brought about their defeat and the loss of their patrimonies. I would rather be victorious at the head of a few professional warriors, than be forced to retreat with a large number of unpermissible soldiers."

But let us consult the Canons of the Church, if we desire to penetrate her mind on this subject. In the year 453, the Council of Arles declared that clerics who entered upon military service were properly deprived of their benefices, that is, in popular parlance, they were suspended. Pope Innocent I. ordered the fathers of the Council of Toledo, in 406, to refuse Holy Orders to all who had served in the army; and he wrote to the same effect to Victricius, bishop of Rouen. In 538, the Council of Orleans excommunicated clerics who, having doffed the military insignia, resumed them. In 743, a German Council, held at Ratisbon, forbade "the servants of God" to march against the enemy, unless as celebrants of the Divine Mysteries, and it allowed each prince to have in his train, for that purpose, two bishops and a certain number of chaplains. We find St. Boniface and Archbishop Egbert of York prohibiting, in 747, the English

(1) BOUTARIC, *Military Institutions of France*. Paris, 1863.

clergy to bear arms. The *Capitularies* of 789 insist that clerics carry no weapons; even the army chaplains are bound by this regulation; the parish-priests will send "their men" to the king's aid, well equipped, but they themselves must be content with praying for the national welfare. In 816 the Council of Aix pronounced military dignities incompatible with the ecclesiastical state. A Council of Meaux deposed, in 845, every priest who accepted military employment. Archbishop Herard of Tours decreed deposition and imprisonment against any clergyman taking part in an armed sedition. When Charles the Bald and Louis of Germany excused themselves to Pope Nicholas I., for not sending their prelates to a Council, alleging in extenuation of their remissness that said prelates were then engaged in operations against pirates, the Pontiff replied: "The duty of the soldiers of Christ is to serve Christ; let the soldiers of the world serve the world." Several English Councils depose an ecclesiastic who has killed a person; and he must fast for ten years, five of which are to be on bread and water. Excommunication is pronounced against clerics who bear arms, by Councils at Rheims in 1049, at Rome in 1078, and at London in 1175 and 1268. The prelates of Hungary, assembled at Buda in 1279, forbid all fighting to priests, unless in defense of their churches or country; and even in those cases, they must not attack, and they must never combat in person. Finally, the General Council of Trent (1545-63) confirmed all these prohibitory enactments, taking care, also, not to recognize in ecclesiastics the right, which many canonists have claimed for them, to repel force by force.

No Catholic can be at a loss to understand the aversion entertained by the Church at the prospect of her priests shedding human blood, for he realizes how pure should be the hands, how gentle the disposition of him who handles the Body of Christ. And so possessed is the Church by this idea, that she turns aside her ministers from everything that may tend toward a deadening of their sensibilities. Thus she interdicts their presence at duels, and even at capital executions, unless, in the latter case, they attend in the capacity of strengtheners and consolers of the condemned in

their dread emergency. Neither can they assist at surgical operations, if curiosity is the impelling motive. They are not even allowed to hunt; but the reader need not take scandal if he meets, some day, his pastor enjoying a bit of recreation with the aid of a fowling piece, or mayhap evidencing, in a practical way, some little sympathy with the joys of the gentle Isaac Walton. When the fathers of certain Councils prohibited hunting to the clergy, saying that "Esau was addicted to it because he was a sinner," probably, in their own minds, they added the qualifying clause, "saving all due respect to St. Hubert," whom our reader knows as a famous sportsman. Indeed, some decrees expressly state, and all canonists so interpret the law, that only hunting *cum strepitu* is forbidden to ecclesiastics, that is, the species of dangerous and noisy diversion which goes by the name of "the chase."

But some innocent may wonder how we are to account, if the Church is so determined in this matter, for those Military Religious Orders, such as the Templars, the Hospitallers, the Knights of Calatrava, etc., which the Church herself founded, in the ages of faith, for the defense of Christendom against the ferocious and uncivilizing hordes of Islam. Such an objection would betray a knowledge of history such as is derived from the theatre or the novel, rather than from proper and reliable sources. In his entrancing novel, *The Talisman*, Scott evokes from his imagination the figure of a soldier-priest, a grand-master of the Templars; and represents him as entering upon an administration of the Sacraments, when fresh from the battle-field. This is but one among a hundred instances of gross ignorance of Catholic laws and customs, evinced by our charming Wizard of Fiction. The Military Religious Orders were certainly religious organizations in the strict sense of the term, their members being bound by the solemn monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. But their fighting members, the chevaliers, were not priests. A man could be a Templar or a Knight of St. John, or such like, just as to-day he can be a Benedictine, a Dominican, a Jesuit, or some other kind of religious, without entering the priesthood. Each of these

religious military associations was composed of three classes of brethren: the knights, who performed military duty; the chaplains, who ministered to the spiritual needs of the community; and the squires, pages, grooms, and menials, who followed the chevaliers to the field, if so commanded (1). The Military Religious Orders, therefore, furnish no argument for those who contend that the Church could consistently allow her priests to enter the fighting ranks of an army. But do not the bellicose Pontiffs, such as St. Leo IX., and Julius II., and the many scarlet-hatted commanders, such as Vitelleschi, Albornoz, and D'Aubusson, militate against our position? Not at all. St. Leo did not himself draw the material sword when he fought the battle of Civitella in defense of his people, and of the patrimony of the Church, but remained in prayer on an eminence overlooking the field (2). As to Julius II. and such of the cardinalial commanders as were in Holy Orders (for many of these latter, though cardinals, were laymen), we do not read that they themselves personally entered the melee; and this absence of testimony in favor of the contrary supposition is a sufficient justification of our position.

There is a poetico-religious aspect in which one may profitably view the picture furnished us by the anti-clericals now dominant in the government of France, of a forced association of priest and soldier in barrack and field. There is a kind of natural grandeur in the idea, but which the Masonic lodges, of course, did not perceive when they conceived what is one of the most grotesque efforts of modern statecraft. Both priest and soldier are the most magnificent ideals which can be offered to the admiration of men; there is a strange identity of sublimity between these principles apparently so contrary; with both priest and soldier the greatest glory is attained by sacrifice. The soldier devotes his life to his country; the priest dedicates his to the good of souls. Each is the protector of civilization. The soldier is the apostle of the God of battles; the priest is the apostle of the God of

(1) *Lives of the Grand-Masters of the Holy Order of St. John of Jerusalem, Written by the Knight-Commander, Brother Jerome Marulli.* Naples, 1626.—See also the *History of the Templars*, by Dupuy. Paris, 1630.

(2) See our Vol. ii., ch. 10.

peace. But we are wandering; the idea of a Christian soldier has invaded our imagination, and alas! not every French barrack can produce a Drouot. And it is not a Christian soldier that the Third Republic, perhaps in punishment for its other crimes, is ambitious of forming. It pretends that the new law will render priestly vocations more sincere; but we do not know that the French Chamber is such an adept in things of the sanctuary, that it can truthfully exclaim, "*experto crede*," especially since it assigns as a reason for its confidence the belief that the ecclesiastical ranks will now lose definitively the many (?) who would have become priests, merely to escape the conscription. And on the other hand, this fancied judge of priestly character flatters itself that many of the clerical recruits will become hardened by their military experience, and will therefore adopt what it styles "republicanism" for a religion. Let us hope that the sanguine expectations of a sagacious Catholic publicist (1) may be realized, and that though some of the clerical conscripts may become "hardened" even unto roughness, "they will not adopt the principles of Masonry, but will be hardened in their faith and their apostolate." How easy it would have been, had the anti-clericals been animated by a mere modicum of sincerity in what does duty for the heart in their breasts, to have utilized the pretendedly-needed services of the few ecclesiastical recruits in a sphere which they would have willingly entered, and for which the military history of France has shown that they are pre-eminently fitted! And for a time it did appear that the hospital and ambulance service was to be again benefited by their well-proven and admitted devotion; but at last the Senate (what a grand name for such little men!) determined that the clerics should be soldiers, and the priest-eaters were satisfied.

(1) D'ARGILL; *The Centenary of 1789*. Paris, 1889.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PONTIFICATE OF LEO XIII.

On Feb. 18, 1878, ten days after the demise of Pope Pius IX., sixty-one cardinals entered into Conclave (1). One of the first acts of Their Eminences was to forward to each member of the diplomatic corps accredited to the Vatican a protest against the Sardinian usurpation of the Pontifical States, and against all of the necessarily consequent measures which were injurious to the Church. The ensuing election was effected with unusual celerity, being consummated on the third ballot. It was thought by many that this haste was due to the determination of the cardinals to avoid any interference on the part of the German and Italian governments, as well as to a wish to establish a precedent which would eventuate in a disappearance of the "Right of Veto" on the nomination of some particular candidate, allowed by the Holy See to certain Catholic powers. It is certain that Bismarck had conducted, during several years, diplomatic intrigues which were expected by him to result in a subordination of the freedom of the electors to his wishes (2). Nor were these intentions of the German chancellor restricted to the confines of his own bosom, and to a participation on the part of his agents; many were the anonymous pamphlets which then appeared in Berlin, Munich, and Prague, advocating a German and Italian interference in the next Conclave as a matter of right, and most of these works bore intrinsic evidence of an inspiration from the cabinet of Ber-

(1) We give the names of the electors, arranged according to their nationality: *Italians*: Amat, Di Pietro, Sacconi, Guidi, Billio, Morichini, Pecci, Asquini, Carafa di Traetto, Antonucci, Panebianco, De Luca, Buonaparte, Ferrleri, Berardi, Monaco la Valetta, Chigi, Franchi, Oreglia di Santo Stefano, Martinelli, Antici-Mattei, Giannelli, Simeoni, Bartolini, d'Avanzo, Apuzzo, Canossa, Serafini, Parocchi, Moretti, Mertel, Caterini, Consolini, Borromeo, Randi, Pacea, Nina, Sbarettili, Pellegrini. *Frenchmen*: Donnet, Regnier, Pitra, Bonnechose, Guibert, Caverot, Falloux du Coudray. *Spaniards*: Moreno, Benavides, Garcia Gil, Paya y Rico. *Portuguese*: Moraes Cardoso. *Austrians*: Schwarzenberg, Simor, Mihalowitz, Kutschker. *Pole*: Ledochowski. *Germans*: Hohenohe, Franzelin. *Belgian*: Dechamps. *Englishmen*: Howard, Manning.

(2) LUCIUS LECTOR; *The Conclave; Its Origin, History, and Organization*, ch. 13. Paris, 1894.

lin (1). The Bismarckian schemes had not been ignored by the semi-official journals and periodicals of the Vatican; in the *Osservatore Romano* of June 29, 1872, we read: "We do not know how much truth there may be in the rumors to the effect that the Holy See has announced to the privileged governments that it will no longer tolerate the "Veto" which, through sheer condescension, it has hitherto permitted those powers to enjoy. If the reports are well-founded, the Church has simply taken measures of precaution against the snares prepared by certain of her enemies. At the time when the Holy See conceded a limited kind of 'Veto' to France, Spain, and Austria (2), the governments of those countries were essentially Catholic; and then heresy and indifferentism were not regarded by those cabinets as worthy of an equal footing with Catholicism. Can we suppose that the Church will ever entrust her interests, even indirectly, to men like Thiers, Andrassy, Zorilla, or to some more wretched miscreant (a Bismarck, for instance)? Because of this impossibility the Holy See repulsed the efforts of certain sovereigns who wished to take part in the Council of the Vatican."

(1) In 1888, as if in anticipation of the Conclave which will elect a successor to Leo XIII., certain German pamphleteers re-opened the agitation, originally excited by their party, concerning the "Right of Veto." In a series of documents which he transcribed from the Archives of the Vatican and of Vienna, Dr. Wahrmond endeavored to find a basis for an opinion to the effect that time had given to the exercise of the "Right of Veto" the prerogatives of a veritable "right founded on custom." Such a pretention found many valiant adversaries; even in Germany, erudites like Lingens and Sägmüller showed that the general spirit of Canon Law opposes the exercise of the "Veto" in question, even when that privilege is a prerogative of truly Catholic princes.

(2) Certain authors have claimed the right of the "Veto" for Naples and for Portugal. They have asserted that King John V. of Portugal (1706-1750) obtained it in a Papal Bull; but no edition of the *Bullarium* contains the document. The claim of the Neapolitan monarch is advocated by the Germans, Philipps (*Church Law*, Vol. v., p. 868), and Schulte (*System of Canon Law*, p. 199); but their theory is demolished by the testimony of King Ferdinand I. In the instructions given to Cardinal Ruffo, when that prelate was about to depart for the Conclave of 1823, the monarch wrote: "Since the *express* right of exclusion does not belong to the crown of the Two Sicilies, that right being reserved to the courts of France, Spain, and Austria, we trust in your dexterity to use every means which your talents may suggest, so that you may be able to exercise a *tacit* exclusive, by means of your adherents and friends" (CIPOLLETTA; *Political Memoirs*, p. 138). Probably the reason for the advocacy of the Neapolitan claims by certain German authors, some of whom style themselves Catholics, lies in the fact that His Majesty of Sardinia claims the succession of the Neapolitan Bourbons, and would therefore have a right to an "exclusive," in the event of the Neapolitan claim being supported. It is amusing to hear the German Sägmüller proclaiming that the right of King Humbert, as well as that of the German emperor, to the "exclusive," is an "open question" (*Papal Elections*, p. 42).

Certain German publicists have insisted that the "Right of Veto" is part of the "Right of Regalia" which, as they claim, is inherent in every civil sovereignty (1); and they contend that sovereigns have a special right to this "Veto," because of the dangers that the election of a hostile Pope might entail upon their peoples. Thus, for instance, Ley, in *The Exclusive which the Emperor Exercises*, published in Barthel's *Legal Works* (2); and Hammer, in his *Right of a Catholic Prince in Sacred Matters*, in Schmidt's *Treasury* (3). These sentiments are mere echoes of Puffendorfian theories, theories which persistently ignore the value of positive stipulations; and they were revived in a pamphlet published in Munich in 1872, entitled *The Rights of Rulers in the Conclave*. This pamphlet was generally ascribed to the pen of Count Greppi, the Italian representative at the Bavarian court. Bismarck had just begun his "War for Civilization"; and as was afterward revealed by the Arnim affair, had formed the design of hurling the forces of Cæsar against the Papacy. All the German governmental journals acclaimed the just-mentioned pamphlet; for the death of Pius IX. seemed then to be imminent. It was the appearance of this incendiary lucubration that impelled Windhorst to pronounce, on June 14, 1872, these words in the German parliament: "It is now a question of life or death. They are trying to organize a National Church, to separate us Catholics from the Holy See, and in the next Conclave, to destroy or to travesty the Papacy." Of course, in combatting the Cæsarian pretensions, some Catholic authors have been carried away by enthusiasm, and have been guilty of gross exaggeration. This fault was especially noticeable in France, during and after the days of the greatest of Bismarck's enterprises; but the reaction against the ideas of the "War for Civilization" produced even among Italian Catholic publicists a few who were like the Frenchmen who "were more Catholic than the Pope." This small but enthusiastic school discerned in the "Right of Veto" only a usurpation of the right of the Church—an abuse which the Church tolerated, just as the individual often submits to

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 211.

(2) Bamberg, 1771.

(3) Heidelberg, 1774.

the tyranny of superior force. Such is not the doctrine of the traditional Roman school. This school denies that any sovereign possess, in the matter of this "Veto," any right, properly so-called; but it admits that there was good reason wherefore the Church allowed the "Veto" to be introduced and exercised by certain princes. This school admits the right of a sovereign, one who is a true son of the Church, to present to the Conclave, if he has received the permission, a "friendly remonstrance" against the election of a cardinal who, in the prince's judgment, might jeopardize the good relations between that prince and the Holy See. As the idea is expressed by Moroni, who is a good representative of Roman ideas, whatever one may think of the *Historical Dictionary* which was composed when historical criticism was not the science which it is now, the privileged sovereign's action in the premises is a mere "tolerated custom." In fine, as the *Civiltà Cattolica* remarks, the exercise of the "Veto" never entailed on the cardinal-electors any obligation *in justice*: but it did entail a sort of obligation *in prudence* (1). Before we dismiss this subject of the "Right of Exclusion," we must remind the reader that said privilege is not founded in written law; no Bull, no Conciliar enactment, no pontifical document, have ever been adduced as its justification. It became a custom, probably in the latter part of the Middle Age. No work treating of its origin is of earlier date than that by Adarzo de Santander, bishop of Verona, printed in 1660; and not before the eighteenth century were any really critical investigations in the matter undertaken.

It is not improbable that the true reason for the brief duration of the Conclave of 1878, nearly the shortest in history, was not so much any anticipation of possible interference on the part of the foes of the Holy See, as it was the consequence of the fact that almost at once one of the preferred nominees seemed to nearly all the electors to be the choice of Providence. When the first ballot was taken on the morning of Feb. 19, twenty-three votes were cast for Cardinal Gioacchino Pecci, *Camerlingo* of Holy Roman

(1) Series viii., Vol. vii., 1872.

Church, while the next favorite candidate received only seven. At the second ballot, taken the same day, the votes for Cardinal Pecci amounted to thirty-eight; and on the following day, the third ballot showed that the election was consummated, Pecci having received forty-four votes, more than the necessary two-thirds. Cardinal Donnet, who sat by the side of Pecci during the voting, used to say that when the name of the cardinal-chamberlain was announced with startling repetition, the future Pontiff shed abundant tears, and his trembling hand refused to retain its grasp on his pen. The Frenchman picked up the pen, and handing it to his pallid colleague, he whispered: "Courage! This is not a question of you; the interests of the Church and the future of the world are concerned" (1). When the moment arrived for his assumption of the name by which he was thereafter to be known in the annals of the Church, the new Pontiff announced that he assumed the name of Leo XIII.

Gioacchino (Joachim) Vincenzo Raffaele, sixth child and fourth son of Count Luigi Pecci by his wife, Anna Prospero Buzi, was born on March 2, 1810, in Carpineto, a little town in the region once inhabited by those Volscians with whom Rome was obliged to contend so persistently in her early days. The Pecci family had been distinguished in the annals of Carpineto since 1531, when Antonio Pecci immigrated thither from Siena, to which republic his ancestors had gone from Cortona about the year 1300. Genealogists who have traced the history of the Pecci, remark that in each generation the family has ever been noted for integrity, prudence, patriotism, and love of religion. The biographers of Leo XIII. dilate on the number of Pecci whose history is intertwined with that of the Sienese republic; we shall merely note that undeniable as are the civic and social glories of the Pecci, their most solid reason for complacency is found in the fact that, like so many of the olden patrician families of Papal Rome, they have contributed a notable quota to the most noble of all aristocracies, that of the saints of the Church of God. Blessed Pietro Pecci, the founder of the

(1) T'SERCLAES; *Pope Leo XIII.: His Life, and His Religious, Political, and Social Acts*, Vol. 1., ch. 5.

Hermits of St. Augustine, a Spanish order by its origin, was a grandson of a Pecci who had emigrated from Siena to the Land of the Cid, and had received the religious habit in Avignon at the hands of Pope Gregory XI., who approved the Constitutions of his order. Then we meet, if we happen to visit Carpineto, the portrait of Blessed Margaret Pecci, vested with the habit of the Servites of Mary. And finally, the records of the Society of Jesus show us, among the many indubitable martyrs whom the Church has not formally recognized as saints, the name of Bernardino Pecci, who sealed with his blood the story of his labors in India for the propagation of the faith (1). On the side of his mother's family, Leo XIII. was descended from a historical personage who claimed indeed to be of illegitimate imperial stock, but who was incontestably plebeian (2). In a *Chronicle of Cori*, dedicated to the Conservators of Rome in 1631, it is recorded that "In the olden time the Prosperi were named Rienzi, because of their descent from Cola di Rienzi, the tribune of the Roman people" (3). Commenting on the genealogical tree of the Pecci, the Belgian biographer of Leo XIII., Mgr. T'Serclaes, pleasantly remarks that the drop of revolutionary blood which coursed in the veins of Leo XIII., joined to the Pontiff's descent from the Siense republicans, might lead some Liberal to announce that it was mere "atavism" which led His Holiness to desire an amicable arrangement with the Third French Republic.

The early studies of the future Pontiff were made in the Jesuit College of Viterbo; and the correspondence of the professors with the Count and Countess Pecci shows that the boy was extraordinarily pious, as well as brilliant and solid in matters of study (4). The bishop of Viterbo, Mgr.

(1) T'SERCLAES; *loc. cit.*, Vol. i., p. 11. (2) See our Vol. II., p. 551.

(3) Angelo, son of the tribune, fled to Cori, and found in that region a family which was known as the Prosperi. *Popular Life of Leo XIII.*, published in the Roman Review, *La Palestra del Clero*.

(4) It is interesting to note that while Gioacchino was still a mere child, he manifested that love and grasp of pure Latinity which distinguished his mature years. He was twelve years of age when Father Vincent Pavani, the Jesuit provincial, visited the college of Viterbo. Gioacchino, who was then called by his second name, Vincent, addressed to the guest the following tasteful epigram:

" *Nomine Vincenti quo tu Pavane vocaris
Parrulus atque infans Peccius ispe vocor;*

Lolli, writing to the countess when Gioacchino was twelve years old, said that if God preserved the boy's health, he would be "an honor to himself, to his family, and to his country." In 1824, Gioacchino and his brother, Giuseppe, were summoned to Rome for the purpose of bidding farewell to their mother, who had gone to the Eternal City for superior medical attention. When the fond parent, vested in the habit of the Third Order of St. Francis, had gone to her reward, Giuseppe entered the Society of Jesus; and Gioacchino resumed his studies in the Roman College, which had lately re-opened its doors, and was managed by the sons of St. Ignatius. Having completed a brilliant course of rhetoric, Gioacchino began his ecclesiastical studies under the tuition of such professors as Perrone, Patrizi, Kollman, and Van Everbrœck. One of these professors, Patrizi, after fifty years of teaching, had the happiness of seeing his pupil seated on the Chair of Peter. While following the courses of the Roman College, our young Abbate resided with an uncle in the Palazzo Muti near Ara Cœli; but nothing can be more fantastical than the picture drawn by a certain biographer, when he represents the future Pope as frequenting the drawing-rooms of society while he bemoans the debasement of Italy, and is preparing to enter the priesthood merely because he is sick of the world (1). His time was devoted to study; and all his correspondence, as well as the testimony of his tutors and companions, shows that he was conservative in regard to the political affairs of his day, and that he was sincerely respectful to all legitimate authority. In 1832, the Abbate Pecci took his degree of Doctor in Sacred Theology, and entered the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics, an institution especially created for the training of such students as aspire to the positions which are open to the Roman *prelatura* (2). As a student of this, as it may be styled, diplomatic training-

*Quas es virtutes magnas Pavane secutus
Oh! Utinam possim Peccius ipse sequi."*

(1) BOYER D'AGEN; *Leo XIII. In the Eyes of His Contemporaries*. Paris, 1892.

(2) Mgr. Giuseppe Pecci, a prelate who had enjoyed the confidence of Pius VI., was made Commissary of the Apostolic Chamber by Pius VII.; and when he was about to die, he gave all of his personal property for the foundation of a *prelatura di famiglia*, or scholasticism in the Academy for Noble Ecclesiastics, to be perpetually in the gift of the Pecci family.

school, Abbate Pecci made a further course of Civil and Canon Law at the *Sapienza* or Roman University. When he graduated from the Academy, its protector, the illustrious Cardinal Pacca, who had carefully watched the progress of the young Carpinetan, induced Pope Gregory XVI. to name him to the "domestic prelaey" in 1837, although he had not yet received Holy Orders; and at the same time he was appointed a Referendary of the *Segnatura*, and a member of the Congregation *del Buongoverno* or Commission for Good Government. In this latter capacity young Pecci was of great assistance to Cardinal Sala (1), when, immediately after his promotion, the cholera appeared in Rome, and His Eminence was placed at the head of the sanitary commission for the systemization of succor in the midst of universal panic. On Aug. 16, the Monsignore wrote to his brother, Giovanni Battista: "If I also am to be included among the victims, I bow to the decrees of the Most High, to whom I have already offered the sacrifice of my life, in expiation of my sins; but nevertheless, I am perfectly calm." When the pest had disappeared, Mgr. Pecci prepared for his ordination. On Dec. 17, he received the subdiaconate; and on Dec. 24, the diaconate, after which ceremony he wrote to his protector, Cardinal Sala, a letter from which we take the following passage: "After my fifteen days of strict retreat, the Feast of Christmas approaches; and my spiritual director allows me a moment of relaxation, in which I may think of what does not pertain entirely to the affairs of the soul. . . . I trust that my joy will continue, and that it will be increased when I receive the priesthood; but so far I am filled with fright when I consider the sublimity of that office, and when I reflect on my unworthiness. Let not Your Eminence forget to pray for me, and to ask others to do likewise. I assure you that I wish to be a *good priest*." These words edified the cardinal, but he began to fear lest the writer might form an intention of entering on the life of a religious, when he read: "I wish

(1) This cardinal was the Sala who had been the faithful companion and counsellor of Cardinal Caprara, when that diplomat was engaged in regulating the affairs of the French Church with the First Consul; and his admiration and affection for Pecci led him to proffer many wise counsels to the debutant in a career which demands even more tact than wisdom.

to serve God, and to show zeal for His glory, as that phrase was understood by St. Ignatius." His Eminence immediately replied: "You must not abandon the career on which you have entered, and in which you can render important services to the Church and to the Holy See." On Dec 31, 1837, Cardinal Odeschalchi, the cardinal-vicar of Gregory XVI., conferred the priesthood on the future Leo XIII.

Two months after his ordination, Mgr. Pecci entered upon his first essay in the government of men. Gregory XVI. must have had great confidence in the justice and energy of the young prelate, when he appointed him to the government of Benevento, one of the most difficult positions in the Papal States. This Duchy, completely surrounded by Neapolitan territory, had belonged to the Holy See since the eleventh century; and at the time of which we now write, it had become a nest of brigands and of Neapolitan smugglers, all more or less openly sustained by noble and apparently respectable persons. The new delegate arrived at his post in an almost dying condition; a pernicious fever, contracted as he was crossing the Pontine marshes, had fastened on his ever delicate constitution. But after a few weeks of struggle, he shook off the malady, and his first measures proved to the titled and untitled disturbers of the province that the knell of their insolent domination had sounded. Realizing that smuggling was the chief source of all the troubles which his predecessors had experienced, since it was the contraband trade which furnished adventurers ever ready to become either revolutionists or brigands, he visited Naples in order to concert measures with the royal government for united action against the common enemy. Ferdinand II. agreed to the demands of the delegate; and confident that the frontier would now be guarded, the prelate began military operations against brigands and contrabandists. His energy infused spirit into the hitherto pussillanimous papal troops; and one by one the strongholds of the inferior order of criminals were forced, and their defenders captured. But there remained the superior order of malefactors—the rich and noble proprietors who, in return for protection extended, had always received a lion's share of the profits

made by both brigands and contrabandists. One day the delegate received a visit from one of these rascally gentlemen, a marquis who pretended that his feudal rights had been violated by the papal military, and by the collectors of the pontifical custom-house. To the violence of the nobleman's anger, Mgr. Pecci replied with his usual equanimity that all papal subjects were equal before the law; and when he was told that the marquis would proceed immediately to Rome, there to exert a powerful influence to procure the dismissal of one who cared so little for feudal privileges, he calmly remarked: "Remember, my lord, that you cannot reach the Vatican without passing Castel San Angelo." This allusion to the imprisonment which the report of the delegate would undoubtedly secure for him, induced the marquis to moderate his tone: but shortly afterward his castle was carried by storm, and all of his brigand-guests were captured. This fact will serve to indicate the spirit with which Mgr. Pecci administered justice during his delegation of Benevento; and every other department of his office was supervised with the same zeal. In 1841 Gregory XVI. rewarded the young prelate with the difficult delegation of Spoleto; but almost immediately he was transferred to that of Perugia, then one of the most important offices, from a political point of view, in the pontifical dominions. During his administration of the delegation of Perugia, Mgr. Pecci had the satisfaction of knowing that, in spite of the political agitations of the time, on more than one occasion it was remarked that the prisons contained no delinquent of any sort whatever.

During the first days of 1843, Mgr. Pecci was notified that he had been appointed to the nunciature in Belgium, and that he should prepare immediately for episcopal consecration, he having been assigned to the titular archdiocese of Damietta. He was consecrated by Cardinal Lambruschini, the secretary of state, in the basilica of St. Lawrence in *Panisperna*; and on March 19, the Feast of St. Joseph, the patron of Belgium, he embarked at Civita Vecchia, arriving in Brussels on April 7. At the time of his appointment, Mgr. Pecci had no more knowledge of the

French language than that furnished by its analogies with its sister, the Italian tongue, and with the Latin, their common mother ; but he had begun the study of the language which he knew to be indispensable. Before the steamer which carried him to France had begun to plough the Mediterranean, and when an illness forced him to pause at Nîmes for a fortnight, he profited by the delay to take some regular lessons. Hence it was that when he arrived in the Belgian capital, he could easily make himself understood in the principal language of the country. The spirit which animated this young nuncio of thirty-three years was that which was counselled by Cardinal Lambruschini in the letter of instructions consigned before the departure of the prelate : “ By the mercy of God there is accorded in Belgium, in regard to the Catholic religion, and to the exercise of episcopal authority, a liberty which is sadly wanting in several kingdoms. It should be the strict duty of the nuncio to protect this liberty ; and in order to accomplish this end, the nuncio must manifest no indiscreet zeal, and above all, he must show no spirit of party.” Tact, not mere cunning, but a wise and Christian prudence, seems to have been the pre-eminent characteristic of Archbishop Pecci, even at this early period of his life. Archbishop Fornari, the nuncio at Paris, whose long experience had made him an excellent judge of men, was at this time a constant correspondent with the archbishop of Damietta ; and in some of his letters there are indications that on one occasion he had availed himself of his greater experience and of his recognized affection for Pecci to disapprove of certain procedures on the part of his friend. The reply of Mgr. Fornari to the explanation furnished by Mgr. Pecci, an explanation which was as moderate as it was sincere, shows how he had been impressed by the discretion of his younger colleague : “ Allow me, my lord, to assure you with all frankness, and without any offence to your modesty, that your letter is a veritable lesson to me. During several years I have been aware of your virtue, and I have ever admired it ; but this instance has really edified me. You might, for many good reasons, have told me to attend to my own affairs, and not to meddle with those of others ; but instead

of so doing, you thank me for my remarks, and with truly Christian humility, you say that my letter has gratified you. To tell the truth, I had already repented of my observations, I had realized my imprudence; and nevertheless you thank me. I am grateful to you for the manner in which you have regarded my indiscretion; and it proves that your nunciature will be entirely successful, since God exalts those who humble themselves. Pardon me, therefore, my lord, and bless the God who has given you so much virtue. And may God grant that I be not content with admiring that virtue! May I receive the strength to imitate it!" The scope of our work precludes any details of the participation of Mgr. Pecci in the politico-religious affairs of Belgium during his nunciature; we merely note that when, in 1845, the Belgian court was informed that Pope Gregory XVI. had determined to confer the bishopric of Perugia on the archbishop of Damietta, all Belgium grieved for his departure. Not satisfied with investing the prelate with the Grand Cordon of his Order, King Leopold I. handed to him a letter to the Pontiff, which is very interesting as a judgment on its subject, emitted by the deepest politician among all the rulers of his day: "I desire to recommend Archbishop Pecci to the benevolent protection of Your Holiness. For every reason he merits that consideration. Very rarely have I beheld so sincere a devotion to duty, intentions so pure, and actions so straightforward. His residence in this country has been most beneficial, because of the eminent services it has enabled him to perform for Your Holiness. I beg of Your Holiness that he may be asked to render an exact account of the impressions which the ecclesiastical affairs of Belgium have produced in his mind; for he judges wisely in all matters. Your Holiness may accord to him your entire confidence." Certainly, this testimony of Leopold I., a profound judge of men, and one who, although a Protestant, knew the Belgian Church thoroughly, is a refutation of the insinuations made, in after years, by that eminent Freemason, Frère-Orban.

Having taken leave of the Belgian court, Archbishop Pecci deemed it wise, before taking possession of his see, to widen

his experience of men and things by a short visit to England. He spent a month in London, and was received in audience by the young Queen Victoria. He then passed some weeks in Paris, and conversed with Louis Philippe; then he set out for Rome, where he was received most kindly by the lately-enthroned Pius IX. When the new Pontiff had read the letter of the Belgian monarch, he sent the following answer: "Mgr. Pecci, recently nuncio to Your Majesty, has handed to us the letter which Your Majesty addressed to our predecessor of dear and regretted memory. This beautiful testimony which Your Majesty proffers in favor of Mgr. Pecci, now bishop of Perugia, is very honorable to that prelate; and he shall certainly experience the consequences of your royal good offices, just as though he had gone through the regular course of nunciatures." On July 26, 1846, Archbishop Pecci took solemn possession of the see which he was to occupy until within a few months of the death of Pius IX., and in which he had an appropriate share of all the tribulations, as well as of all the joys, which we have described as attendant on the pontificate of the Pope of the Immaculate Conception. These thirty-two years of episcopate, occupying all of the mature manhood, and part of the old age of the future Pontiff, were a long and thorough preparation for the Supreme Pastorate of the entire Church of Christ; nor was that preparation too long for the formation of such a Pope as the world was to venerate in Leo XIII. It would be a gracious task to recapitulate all the evidences of his pastoral solicitude which Archbishop Pecci manifested during this time; but we must refer the student to the many excellent biographies of our Pontiff, notably to the one written by Mgr. T'Serclaes, for proofs that while exercising his apostolate in the beautiful city of Umbria, he constantly showed that he was animated by a heroic charity toward God and man. On Dec. 19, 1853, Mgr. Pecci was enrolled in the Sacred College; and two years afterward Mgr. de Mérode, writing to his father in Belgium, said: "I have just been in Perugia, to visit Cardinal Pecci and the two institutions managed by the Brothers (of Charity) of Malines, and the Sisters (of Notre-Dame) of

Namur, whom he has called to his diocese for that purpose. In spite of his apparent coldness (1), this good cardinal is a man of immense zeal. He has placed his seminary on the very best footing; and he is restoring his cathedral. He is re-animating all the ancient institutions, with which this city is filled." In 1849, when the hordes of Garibaldi became masters of Perugia after their repulse at Rome by the French, the Austrians under the Prince of Lichtenstein advanced to occupy the city. Of course the fearful excesses of the modern *sans-culottes* were to be stopped, but the archbishop dreaded the effects of a foreign intervention on his people; therefore he visited the Austrian camp, and prevailing on the commander to renounce his project, the pontifical authority was soon restored without effusion of blood. In 1860, when Perugia became the scene of the comedy of the "voluntary" annexation of Umbria to the dominions of the *Re Galantuomo*, a comedy which was played under the managership of the Marquis Pepoli of Bologna, the prudence of Cardinal Pecci, without any sacrifice, on his part, of the rights of truth, conciliated the respect of the agents of the usurping power. When the Piedmontese Minister, Minghetti, sent a circular, on Oct. 26, 1861, to all the bishops of the Papal States, calling on them to acknowledge the government of Victor Emmanuel, it was Cardinal Pecci who composed the address of fidelity to Pius IX., which was signed by all the bishops of Umbria. Great were the sufferings of the chief prelate of that Umbria which was so pre-eminently Catholic, as he saw the land afflicted by "the blessings of modern civilization"; as he witnessed the license of the press, the systematic corruption of youth by governmental agencies, the laicization of religious institutions, the expulsion of religious orders, the ruin of Christian families under the pretext of civil marriage, the protection given by the government to suspended priests, the interference of the government in the collation of benefices, and the enforced

(1) This qualification of "apparent coldness," applied to the cardinal by Mgr. de Merode, will be understood by all who knew the nature of the pontifical Pro-Minister of War. He was a man of intensely ardent temperament, and the prudence and sedateness of His Eminence might well have seemed "coldness" to him. See *Frederick Francis de Merode*, by Mgr. Besson, p. 121.

enrollment of ecclesiastics in the military service. Writing to his family on December 1, 1860, His Eminence said : " We are now in the midst of the fire ; and God knows when we shall escape. It would be inexact to say that my health has not been affected by the vicissitudes through which we are passing ; but the grace of God has been with me, and in all critical moments I have received strength and courage." On Sept. 21, 1877, Pius IX. appointed Cardinal Pecci *Camerlingo* of Holy Roman Church, an office which entailed the resignation of his diocese, and his residence in the Eternal City (1). To the great grief of himself and of the Perugians, the archbishop departed for Rome, where, in less than five months, he was to be acclaimed as Vicar of Christ on earth.

When Leo XIII. ascended the papal throne, it became evident immediately that his intellectual and moral personality already dominated the most virulent adversaries of the Holy See. Rattazzi, that statesman whom Thiers termed the " most clearsighted " in the world, wrote to the *Gazzetta d' Italia* : " This Pecci is a man of undoubted calibre ; one who possesses great force of will, and who can be very severe in the exercise of his prerogatives ; and nevertheless he has the most agreeable manners in the world. While he was at Benevento, he showed great capabilities, and he proved that he was of decisive and inflexible character. On many occasions I spoke concerning him with King Leopold I., a prince whose correctness of perception surpasses that of any sovereign in Europe, and who had studied and appreciated Pecci during his nunciature in Belgium. We talked about Pecci's great prudence, and about his dignity and incorruptibility, those qualities which inspire in our governmental function-

(1) The word *Camerlingo*, according to Ducange, was once used in reference to not only papal, but also imperial treasurers. Now, however, just as during the last few centuries, the cardinal-*camerlingo* is the president of the Apostolic Chamber, and he exercises the temporal authority during the interval between the death of one Pope and the election of another. During that period, which is termed the *interpontificium*, the *camerlingo* is the first personage in the Roman Court, since all the properties of the Holy See are then administered by the Apostolic Chamber. Then the *camerlingo* coins money bearing his name and arms : and when the Pontiff was king *de facto* as well as *de jure*, the *camerlingo* used to appear in the streets of the capital, during the *interpontificium*, attended by the Swiss guards. During the first eight days of the *interpontificium*, the *camerlingo* can issue edicts as though he were the Pope-King.

aries an insurmountable fear of his person. His devotion to the Holy See is illimitable; his inflexibility, very nearly obstinacy, leaves no room for even a suspicion of his ever harboring a weakness. There is no sense in denying that Pecci is one of those priests who must be esteemed and admired—a man of extraordinary political farsightedness, and a man whose knowledge is still greater." In the pamphlet entitled *Pius IX. and the Next Pope*, published in 1877 by Ruggiero Bonghi, who had been Minister of Public Instruction in the Minghetti cabinet, these words of appreciation had been uttered: "Cardinal Pecci is undoubtedly one of the most striking characters in the Sacred College; probably no one of his colleagues has so much energy, and at the same time, so much moderation. He has always been brilliant in his studies, he has performed his duties well, and he is more than an ordinarily good bishop. The ideal cardinal is a sublime personage; but it may be said of Pecci that he has made a reality of the conception." *L'Italie*, which, although printed in French, was then at least the *semi-official* organ of Italian diplomacy, thus spoke, just after the election of our Pontiff: "It must be admitted that to-day the tiara is very heavy, and that the mission of the new Pope is not an easy one. But in the judgment of all men, Leo XIII. is a man of firm will, of enlightened piety, and esteemed both for his character and for his virtues." All of these authorities pretended to agree with the innocents who thought, just as others had thought in the case of Pius IX. during the early days of his pontificate, that the new Pope would reconcile incompatibilities, that he would proclaim his hearty acceptance of "accomplished facts"; that there would be an alliance between Christ and Belial. The sectarian leaders recognized the absurdity of such anticipations; but it suited their purpose to cultivate them among the less virile of the Catholics, and they even hoped that such a suspicion would deprive Leo XIII. of the sympathies of the more sturdy of his children. But in his first Consistorial Allocution, delivered on March 28, 1878, the Pontiff landed the policy of his predecessor; and he proclaimed that the Head of the Church was no longer free, he having been forcibly deprived of the

temporal power which is necessary for the free exercise of his Apostolic ministry. It was in his first Encyclical, however, that Leo XIII. declared categorically that any reconciliation between Rome and the Revolution is impossible. The Encyclical *Inscrutabili* appeared on Easter Sunday, 1878; and while in it he touched on nearly all the points which formed the subjects of his posterior Encyclicals, he laid special stress on the necessity of the temporal power, declaring that he would never cease to insist on a restoration of the Holy See to that condition in which Divine Wisdom had placed it, and renewing all the condemnations pronounced by Pius IX. against the violators of the rights of the Roman Church. Great was the disappointment of the unitarians when they read this Encyclical. Even the moderate *Nazione* said: "The new Pope does not curse or even menace any one; and in this fact lies the sole difference that subsists between him and Pio Nono. As for the condemnation of all the conquests of modern intelligence, Leo XIII. is as absolute, inexorable, almost cruel, as was his predecessor. In this long document, you will not find one word, one idea, which will imply that the Church can ever become reconciled with modern civilization." The radical *Riforma* found the papal pronouncement "sweet in form, but absolute and uncompromising in substance."

Leo XIII., like his predecessor, had insisted, from the beginning of his pontificate, that the position of the Pope in Rome was "intolerable"; and on July 13, 1881, the world was furnished with an object-lesson which confirmed the assertion. With the consent of the municipal authorities of Rome, it had been decided that in the dead of night the mortal remains of Pope Pius IX., then resting temporarily in St. Peter's, should be transferred to the place designated for his ultimate sepulture by the late Pontiff himself—the Basilica of St. Lawrence, outside the walls. The government of the Quirinal, as though it wished to accentuate the declaration of Leo XIII. concerning the "intolerability" of the papal position in Rome, had refused to permit any solemn ceremonies during the transfer. By some means the intention of the Vatican authorities became public property; and there-

fore when midnight arrived, and the modest procession of a hearse and three carriages set forth from the Basilica of the Apostles, over a hundred thousand faithful Romans (so the radical journals admitted) were ready to accompany the corpse of their revered Pio Nono to its last resting-place. Along the route of the procession, hundreds of houses were suddenly illuminated; windows were thrown open, and flowers were thrown on the hearse. This posthumous triumph of the grandest victim of the Revolution, of the Pope of the Immaculate Conception, of one of the chiefs of the earthly foes of Satan, could not but enrage the powers then dominant in the City of the Popes. The men who were just then preparing to apotheosize Satan, the sectarians who were proclaiming that the Mazzinian motto *God and the People* should be changed to *God is the People* (1), had organized a band of madmen for a demonstration of hell's impotent rage against an honor paid to the Pontiff who had hailed as Immaculate the Blessed Woman who had crushed the head of the Serpent under her heel. From various quarters numbers of ruffians attacked the procession, vomiting insults too gross for repetition by us, and insisting on the throwing of the body of Pius IX. into the nearest sewer, or at least into the Tiber. The police prevented the actuation of this illustration of the deference of the unitarians for the Papaey; but they offered no interference with the insults which were hurled on the processionists until the Church of St. Lawrence was reached, nor

(1) To-day the blasphemies of Freemasonry in Italy are not directed against the temporal power of the Pope alone, nor even against the Catholic Church alone; the sectarians now openly, as they always did secretly, direct their blasphemies against God. There was much to be admired in Mazzini (See our Vol. v., ch. 14), virulent enemy of the Pope-King though he was; and he would scarcely recognize his sentiments in the ebullitions of his heir, Alberto Mario, the editor of *La Lega della Democrazia*, as this enterprising humanitarian places an accent over the *e* in the famous motto, thereby making it hail the people as God. Before Mario had made this venture, the Masonic *Proletario* had emitted, in 1879, the declaration that "God is the greatest enemy of the people, since He curses labor." After the shock occasioned by this blasphemy, the dupes of Freemasonry must have been prepared for the frenzied acclamations of the Brothers of the Three Points, as they endorsed, throughout the month of February, 1882, the infamous praise of Satan which Carducci vomited for their delectation in the Alfieri Theatre of Turin: "Look on him, ye peoples, as he passes; behold Satan the Great! He moves onward on his chariot of fire, blessing as he goes. Hail, Satan! Satan, the Rebel, hail! May our sacred incense and our prayers ascend to thee! Thou hast conquered the Jehovah of the priests!" We would here observe, however, that justice to Carducci requires us to remember that a grander mind than his had already tried to rehabilitate the fell monarch of hell; in the *Journal des Debats*, April 25, 1851, Renan had essayed the task.

did they prevent the wounding of many of these by continual volleys of stones and other missiles. In the Allocution which our Pontiff delivered on August 4, he cried : " Let the Catholic world consider the measure of security which we now enjoy in the Eternal City ! Certainly it is evident that our residence in the Vatican becomes more hazardous every day." The Pontiff insisted, however, that the immense majority of the Romans, not the foreigners who had followed the Sardinian court into the capital of the Popes, had been pained by this outrage equally with himself ; he had one great consolation in " the love and the religion of the Roman people, who, solicited and even entrapped in every way, nevertheless persevered in obedience to the Church, and in a courageous fidelity to the Pontiff, omitting no occasion of testifying to the virtues which were rooted in their hearts." The true Roman people, and indeed the majority of the Italians, hastened to assure the Pontiff of the horror with which the recent outrage had filled their souls ; a protest, bearing several millions of signatures, arrived at the Vatican, and on October 16, over 20,000 pilgrims, from every part of Italy, saluted Leo XIII. in his palace-prison as " the first of Italians." " Let not one of you," the Pope replied to their address, " yield to the force of events, habituating yourselves by a culpable indifference *to a state of things which neither we ourselves nor our successors shall ever accept.*" It was while the impressions produced by the scandal of July 13, 1881, were still fresh in his mind, that Leo XIII. composed the Encyclical *Etsi nos*, which he published on February 15, 1882. After a description of the efforts to unchristianize Italy, put forth by the sectarians by means of the suppression of religious orders, by the confiscation of ecclesiastical property, and by the secularization of matrimony and of instruction, the Pontiff reminded the Italians that it was to the Popes that they owed the fact that they had not become the prey of barbarians and of Mohammedans ; that it was to the Popes that they principally owed their pre-eminent position in the world of art ; and that it was to the Popes that they owed that peace which comes from a unity of faith. This civilizing and pacifying power the Church and the Roman

Pontiffs have never lost, and precisely because that power is a necessary effect of the Catholic doctrines. On the contrary, they who pose as enthusiastic defenders of Italy, even while they inundate her with perverse teachings, are destroyers of their country. History, and very recent history, shows the excesses to which these wicked doctrines lead. If Italy has not yet experienced these excesses so much as some other countries, it is because the true faith has so profoundly penetrated the masses of the people ; but woe to Italy, if she allows herself to be seduced ! Then, more ungrateful than other peoples, she will suffer more terrible punishments. The Pope now proceeds to indicate the remedies for the desolation which he has depicted ; and in the first place he calls on the Italians to shake off that lethargy, in which, unaccustomed to the struggles of modern times, they are habitually wrapped. They must found Catholic societies for the young, for the working classes, and for the poor. They must sustain the Catholic press, and combat all anti-Catholic journals. All good writers, of whom there is an abundance in Italy, should act in accordance with a pre-determined plan ; they should use language both calm and easily understood ; and all wealthy Catholics should encourage these writers. Finally, the Pontiff calls on the Italians to contribute largely to the support of the ecclesiastical seminaries, now so prostrate under the blows of the robbers ; and he asks them to imitate the Catholics of France, who acted so nobly when they were victims of similar injustice.

In the years 1881 and 1882, there happened two incidents which showed most eloquently the value of the assurances given to the world by the government of the Quirinal, to the effect that the spiritual authority of the Pope, and the extra-territoriality of the Vatican, were secure under its protection. On Jan. 28, 1881, the Court of Cassation confirmed a decision of the Roman tribunals, according to which the government could close, destroy, or devote to other purposes, any church in its dominions ; the cardinal-vicar of His Holiness or any diocesan prelate might protest, but the court decided that though the Italian government recognized the independence of the spiritual power, the State could

dispose of everything connected with divine worship at its pleasure. Truly an audacious proceeding; but it was no more barefaced in its audacity than the expulsion of thousands of nuns from their convents, and the confiscation of the dowries which, on the occasion of their profession, their families had given for their sustenance. A proof of the insincerity of the promise that the Vatican and its precincts should enjoy the privilege of extra-territoriality, an assurance that was given immediately after the crime of Sept., 1870, was furnished in 1882, when an engineer named Martinucci, having been dismissed from the service of His Holiness, applied to the civil tribunals of Rome for an order compelling the Pontiff to pay some alleged arrears of wages. The courts perforce denied the application; but they asserted their competence to judge in that and similar cases, thus openly nullifying the Law of Guarantees, which acknowledged the "sovereign rights" of the Pope, and denied to the royal government any right to exert power within the limits of the Vatican. Certainly Pius IX. was not unreasonable, when, on the occasion of the tender of the Guarantees for his acceptance, he replied: "Victor Emmanuel guarantees all this; but who guarantees Victor Emmanuel?"

We have alluded to the confiscation of ecclesiastical and religious property by the Italian unitarian government. That measure is so necessarily a concomitant of any Masonic advent to power in a Catholic country, and its *raison d'être* and its consequences are so well understood by the Catholic reader, that we need say no more, while treating of the pontificate of Leo XIII., than that this confiscation was nearly universal. A few religious institutions were allowed to preserve a semblance of ownership over their property; but in practice that preservation was derisory. All those favored institutions were required to convert their property into Italian governmental bonds; in other words, the government put into its coffers so much good money as its agents deemed necessary to give it, after a replenishment of their own pocket-books; and the victims received the alleged value of their property in pieces of paper which were of very problematical value at their best, and might be worth nothing

at any time. Among the institutions which were affected by this financial chicanery, was the Congregation of the Propaganda, so pre-eminently Catholic and international, and which is truly the right arm of the Holy See in all missionary countries. No other light than that which emanates from the Dark Lantern could have discerned in the Propaganda an Italian institution, one supposed to be properly subject to Italian quasi-confiscatory proceedings; three-fourths of its revenues were derived from France, and Italy furnished but a small portion of the balance. An appeal was made to the tribunals, while Leo XIII. protested, through his nuncios, to all the courts with which the Holy See preserved official relations; but the Court of Cassation, on June 29, 1884, decided in favor of the government. Of course the Pontiff had known that the appeal of the Propaganda would be useless; hence in order to protect the interests of the missions in the future, he had ordered, on March 15, that no more funds for the propagation of the faith should be sent to Rome, but that said funds should be thereafter managed by eleven procurators in Europe, three in Asia, one in Africa, seven in North and South America, and one in Oceanica.

In 1881 the directing spirits of Italian Masonry conceived the project of a Universal Masonic Congress, to be held in the Eternal City in the following year. The design was announced in Nov., 1881, by *Le Monde Maçonique*, and the *Rivista Massonica* thus explained the reason of the Congress: "The Revolution went to Rome, in order to fight the Pope, face to face; in order to bring together, under the dome of St. Peter's, the champions of human reason; in order to give gigantic proportions to Freemasonry, by assembling its members in the very heart of the capital of the world. There Freemasonry will pitilessly attack all religions which profess a belief in a God and in the immortality of the soul." The frankly logical declarations of this and similar announcements, an exhibition of a daring logic which is peculiar to the Masons of the Latin race, terrified the less logical minds of the would-be "conservative" Masons of England and Germany; those of England refused to commit themselves to an impiety which was too glaring, and

those of Germany yielded to the pressure of Bismarck, who sympathized with the fear of the Italian cabinet that the Pope might be forced to abandon Rome—a proceeding which the men of the Quirinal have always dreaded, not only because of the pecuniary loss which it would entail upon Italy, but because of the probability that it would ultimately result in a forcible restoration of the temporal power (1). The latest ambition of the sectarians was the cause of several important utterances on the part of Leo XIII. which will interest the student. On Feb. 15, 1882, in the Encyclical *Etsi nos*, the Pontiff said: “Rome, the most august of Christian cities, is opened to all the enemies of the Church; profane innovations of every kind stain her soil; here and there temples and schools are dedicated to heresy. It would even seem that during the current year Rome is to be the scene of a solemn gathering of the leaders and representatives of that sect which is the most virulent of all in its hostility to Catholicism. There is no mystery as to the reasons which have militated for the choice of Rome as the scene of this demonstration. The sectarians wish, by means of this outrageous provocation, to satiate their hatred for the Catholic Church; they intend to bring their incendiary torches nearer to the Roman Pontificate, by an attack on its place of residence. . . . More prudent than the children of light, these sectarians have already dared much; although inferior in number, they are powerful, because of their cunning and wealth, and they have succeeded in kindling among us a conflagration of miseries. Therefore let all the lovers of the Catholic name understand that the time has come for an abandonment of lethargy; let them realize that men are never more easily oppressed than at the time when they sleep in cowardly indolence.” And on Oct. 17, 1882, in his address to the Italian pilgrims, His Holiness said: “The sects, ever attentive in their warfare on the Church of Jesus

(1) In September, 1870, through the medium of Diamilla-Muller, Victor Emmanuel conducted a series of intrigues, the object of which was to prevent Pius IX. from retiring to a foreign country. These negotiations are detailed in the curious work entitled *The Secret Policy of the Italian Government*, ch. 12. Turin, 1880. As for the object of the more earnest and more logical Masons in 1881-'83, the expulsion of the Pontiff from Rome, it was plainly proclaimed by Alberto Mario, in his *Legge della Democrazia*, Oct., 1881.

Christ, and ever ready, if they could succeed, to banish Catholicism from the face of the earth, are now growing in number, power, and audacity. Their aims are directed especially against Italy, where the Catholic faith is so deeply rooted, and whence, from the seat of the Supreme Pastor, the Catholic world receives the spirit of Jesus Christ and the benefits of the Redemption. Therefore, in all the Congresses which these sects have held this year in many cities of Europe, their eyes have been directed on Catholic Italy, and they have determined to hold a Universal Congress in the centre of Catholicism, and to deliver a blow on the foundation-stone of the Christian edifice, as a haughty defiance of the Church herself. . . . Thus it is that the specious promises, made from the beginning (of the revolution) for the purpose of deceiving the simple, that the Catholic religion would be preserved intact in Italy, that the person of the Roman Pontiff would be respected, and that the exercise of the spiritual power of the Papacy would be secured—all these promises have been belied by events, and are now confronted by open hostility against the Church and her head. . . . Remember, my children, that there is in Italy and in Rome a party which threatens to invade our Apostolic palace, and to reduce us to a captivity more unendurable than exile.” The Universal Congress of Freemasonry was not held in Rome; but when Francesco Crispi attained to power, the sectarians displayed an increase of energy. On Oct. 10, 1890, the Grand-Master of the United Orients of Italian Masonry, Adriano Lemmi, sent the following instruction to all the Lodges in his jurisdiction: “The edifice which the brethren are now erecting will not be regarded as complete, until Italy makes a present to humanity, in the shape of the rubbish which will be left by the destruction of *the great enemy*. The enterprise advances rapidly. . . . The fidelity of the Brother of the Thirty-third Degree (Crispi), who is at the head of the political power, is a guarantee that the Vatican will fall, under the blows of our vivifying mallet (*sic*). But it is necessary that, at the coming elections, at least 400 of our brethren be chosen as deputies for the Legislative Chamber. . . . Our efforts will be strenuously combatted by the

leader of the priests and by his vile slaves. . . . The Grand Orient invokes the Genius of Humanity, to the end that the brethren put forth all their energies in order to separate the stones of the Vatican, and to then use them in the erection of the temple of an emancipated nation." And in the discourse which he pronounced in Bologna, during his electoral tour of 1892, the same Grand-Master explicitly avowed the Masonic guilt of all the charges which Leo XIII. made against the sect: "In order to form itself, the Italian State must combat all religions; *it must oppose the Earthly City to the City of God.* When that State addresses the people, its word can be no other than a human word—the word of science and of right. In that State, the type of a lay State will be incarnated in the school, in the family, and in every manifestation of public life. There must be no more thought of a sacramental basis for the family; *there is but one sacrament—love.* Once that we admit civil marriage, we necessarily open the door to divorce. *And why should we maintain a Ministry of Worship? If any believe in a future life, let such persons provide such a Ministry for themselves!* Let such persons buy their Indulgences, when they think that they need them! The State ought not be, and cannot be their go-between. But I hear some say that all this implies a thorough revolution in every order of the State. It does imply that revolution; *and such is the way in which we must march.*" After such manifestations of candor, it would be unjust to accuse Masonry of hypocrisy; and it would be equally unjust to Leo XIII. and his last ten predecessors (from Clement XII., who first condemned the sect, down to Pius IX.), to charge them with misrepresentation of the aims of the votaries of the Dark Lantern. It had been believed by many innocents, even in Italy, as well as in these United States, that in attacking Pius IX. and Leo XIII., the sectarians warred only on the sacerdotal monarchs of the Roman States; but in his discourse at Genoa, Lemmi proclaimed exultantly that the hatred of his order was cherished in regard to the *teaching-priest*, as well as for the *priest-king*: "Yes, my dear brothers; we must fight not only against that pretender in the Vatican who plots against the unity of our

country, but—and let us at last proclaim it before the world!—against that Pontiff who poses as the champion of the disinherited classes in order to more easily enslave them under the yoke of fanaticism. . . . Against that Pontiff we must wage unrelenting war. Nor does our order require merely aspirations from you; it wants acts, now that it finds in front of itself an enemy who does not hide himself; an enemy who is never idle; an enemy who brazenly descends into the arena of civic struggle.” At Milan, the Grand-Master thus perorated: “Although the Papacy is now a mere phantom wandering among some ruins, it emits some *éclat* from the Vatican. It defies the world with its Cross, its *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas, its *Syllabus*; and a numerous multitude prostrates itself and adores. . . . We declare war against this clerical conspiracy; and it must be a war without mercy. All those who invoke the past are partisans of clericalism and foes of Freemasonry” (1). To these and many similar ebullitions of the Masonico-Liberal guides of the destinies of “New Italy,” Leo XIII. responded in a letter to the Italians, dated Dec. 8, 1892: “In a matter of such importance (resistance against the wiles of Masonry), a matter in which seduction is now so easy, the Christian must beware of the first step in the road of danger; he must avoid the slightest danger, and eschew every occasion of fall; he must, in fine, follow the evangelical counsels, preserving in his heart the simplicity of the dove and the wisdom of the serpent. Let the fathers and mothers of families beware of admitting into the intimacy of their firesides persons whose religious sentiments are not above suspicion. Let them inquire whether under the guise of a friend, a teacher, or a physician, there be not hidden an emissary of the sect. Alas! into how many families the wolf has penetrated, while he wore the semblance of a lamb!” To these counsels of the Father of the Faithful, the Grand-Master replied in an instruction from Naples: “The Law of Papal Guarantees is a permanent menace for the country; Freemasonry has continually clamored for its abolition. A law which establishes privileges, and which secures a monstrous impunity to

(1) *Unità Cattolica*, Aug. 6, 1892.

parricide, is essentially tyrannical. And parricides are never wanting. From the Vatican a vast conspiracy spreads itself throughout Europe; unions of every kind are multiplied, and thousands of fanatics acclaim the Pope-King. . . . The Quirinal and the Vatican are now face to face; now the long conflict between Pontiff and Prince is to be settled definitively; we will not leave the settlement to posterity. The rights of laymen are about to rise superior to ecclesiastical usurpations."

We should now proceed to a consideration of the relations between Pope Leo XIII. and the various peoples of Christendom; but some of those relations were of importance sufficient to demand special chapters for their treatment. Spain furnishes the sole material for our present consideration. Unlike his immediate predecessors, Leo XIII. had very little trouble with the Spanish government. With the Spanish bishops, priests, and people, since their history has been nearly always synonymous with devotion to the Holy See, he could have expected no difficulty. However, there occurred two incidents in Spain, during this pontificate, which are interesting; one because it illustrates an important point of ecclesiastical jurisprudence, and the other, because, although not very extraordinary in itself, it helped to illustrate the retreat of Bismarck on Canossa. The first incident arose from a misconception, on the part of an eminent Spanish journalist, of the prerogatives of a Papal nuncio in face of the bishops of a country, to the government of which he is accredited. Ramon Nocedal, editor of *El Siglo Futuro*, an excellent Catholic journal, was an ardent Catholic himself, but possessed of a zeal which often impelled him to indiscretions. Like all good Spaniards, he detested the Masonic regime, under which, for the punishment due to their sins, God has permitted the Iberian peninsulars to languish during the greater part of the last hundred years; therefore, when he read that Mgr. Rampolla del Tindaro, the nuncio at Madrid, had declared publicly that his relations with the Spanish cabinet were most cordial, the fiery Carlist could not contain his indignation. He did not remember that a nuncio, like all other ambassadors, could very properly say, when

speaking diplomatically, that things personally and really unpleasant were *officially* enjoyable. The *Siglo Futuro* told its readers that the relations between the Spanish Masonic government were very uncordial, and that they could be of no other nature. This manifestation of Carlistic and Catholic zeal might have been regarded as mere imprudence; but Nocedal contended that the authority of the bishops was superior to that of the nuncio in things which bear on the relations between Church and State, and that a nunciature is merely a diplomatic mission which is often a mere network of human considerations, and that the bishops were not bound to defer to the words of the Apostolic envoy. The consequence of this ebullition was a communication from Cardinal Jacobini, dated April 13, 1885, in which Mgr. Rampolla was directed to make it known that the theories of the *Siglo Futuro* were dangerous, as being redolent of that pest of Catholic Germany, Febronianism. As the cardinal-secretary wrote, the Pope is the supreme pastor of all bishops, as well as of the clergy and of the laity; therefore he has the right to interfere in diocesan affairs, when he deems it necessary to so interfere. The nuncios are delegates of the Holy See, in the form and measure assigned by the Pontiff to their respective missions; therefore it is incorrect to say that their mission is purely diplomatical. A nuncio is not subject to the bishops of the country to which he is delegated; and consequently, added the cardinal, "the bishops have no right to determine his prerogatives, and still less can they emit a judgment as to the legality of his acts. On the contrary, those acts must be respected by both the bishops and their subjects," who always have, however, the right of appeal to the Holy See in case of abuse. And the cardinal was careful to note that "when certain acts of a nuncio are known to the Holy See, and they are not condemned, they may reasonably be regarded as emanating from the Holy See itself." The relations between the Church and the State interest every Catholic in the world, and therefore they pertain to the competence of the Head of the Church, and consequently to the competence of his delegates, the nuncios; it is incorrect, therefore, concludes Jacobini, to say that in

this matter the authority of the bishops is superior to that of the nuncios. "The exact contrary is true." When this decision was received by Nocedal, he immediately and gracefully submitted; and Mgr. Rampolla publicly congratulated him, saying that "a loyal manifestation of reverence for the Holy See, far from humiliating its author, exalts him." The second incident in the Spanish affairs of this pontificate, to which we would call the attention of the student, is that of the "arbitration," or as it really was, the *mediation* exercised by Leo XIII. in the dispute between Spain and Germany concerning the Caroline Islands. The Germans, inflated by the result of their recent war with France, had taken possession of the Caroline Islands, that archipelago of the Pacific which, situated to the south-east of the Philippines, had been first visited in 1526 by the Portuguese, Diego da Rocha, and later by the Spaniards, Villalobos, Legaspi, and Querosa, finally receiving from the Spaniard, Lazeano, its present name in honor of the king of Spain, Charles II. (1661-1700). For more than a century, the Spanish government had cared so little about the Carolines, that it had ceased to appoint a governor but no European power had ever challenged the Spanish right of sovereignty, based as it was upon the right of first occupancy by the Portuguese, and the posterior cession of the Portuguese right to the Spaniards, in accordance with the line of demarcation already drawn by Pope Alexander VI. in 1493, a decision which both parties regarded as binding in honor and in conscience. But the possibility of a Panama canal finally awakened the government of Alfonso XII. to the prospective commercial and strategetic importance of the Carolines; and in Feb., 1885, the Spanish man-of-war "Velasco" anchored in the harbor of Yap in order to prepare a residence for a Spanish representative. However, the covetous eye of the German chancellor had marked the archipelago as a future basis of political and commercial enterprise; and a few months after the arrival of the "Velasco," a German gunboat steamed into the Spanish port, and in brazen defiance of the Law of Nations, the rule of the Teutons was proclaimed. The insult fired the indignation of all the inhabitants of Spain—all factional differences being

forgotten in a universal determination to vindicate the national honor. The reason for the German piracy is evident; why its author should have suddenly sought for a means of avoiding its consequences, and even of striking the flag so impudently flaunted, was and is a mystery even to the wisacres of the European and American press. But suddenly the world was informed that the cabinet of Berlin had determined to submit its "difference with that of Madrid" to the arbitrament of the Pontiff. That at the culmination of the nineteenth century—that sacrosanct child of the Revolution, the guiding spirit of the chief Protestant power in the world should endeavor to appease international grievances by an appeal to the wisdom and justice of the Pope of Rome, was an event calculated to arouse the Brethren of the Three Points to preternatural efforts of protestation. But the fact was patent; all that the Lodges could effect by way of a minimization was the circulation of a rumor that the choice of Leo XIII. as arbitrator was due to a misunderstanding which was caused by a falsified despatch. And while the adepts were raging to no purpose, our Pontiff received, on Oct. 2, 1885, a letter from the German emperor, requesting him to arbitrate in the Hispano-German question. Leo XIII. replied that he would not undertake, in the present circumstances of Christendom, to "arbitrate" between the the two powers; but that he would "mediate." His Holiness realized that the part of an arbitrator was to pronounce a judgment which would have the force of law on the disputants; whereas the office of a mediator was to propose an amicable arrangement between the parties. The two cabinets agreed with the pontifical suggestion; and the Pontiff, after an inspection of the respective briefs, and after a study of the documents in the Vatican which illustrate the history of Spain, proposed for the signature of the Spanish and German plenipotentiaries a document which recognized the ancient right of Spain over the Carolines, but assuring protection and many privileges to German subjects in those regions. The agreement was signed on Dec. 13, 1885, in the apartments of the Cardinal-Secretary of State in the Vatican; and immediately the secular press of Europe and America

true to its Masonico-Jewish inspirations, endeavored to minimize the importance of the event, now by ridicule, and then by misinterpretation. As an excellent specimen of these commentaries we reproduce that which was emitted by the effervescent Bohemian Jew and naturalized Frenchman, Heinrich Opper, better known as Henri de Blowitz, the name which he adopted when he began to affect French society: "Bismarck suddenly found himself stuck in the mud of that pitiable affair of the Carolines; he was dumbfounded by the Spanish paroxysms, for all his calculations, all his cool combinations, were upset by the tropical explosion. Not for an instant did he dare dream of so grotesque an enormity as a war with Spain for the Carolines. And nevertheless, all Spain was on its feet, looking straight at the giant, and preparing for him his first rebuff. It was then that in the brain of this Macchiavellian pachyderm, when he could neither advance nor retreat, there was born an archaic idea which excited the surprise of the world. With truly elephantine irony, Bismarck requested Leo XIII. to arbitrate between Spain and Germany. Then there filtered outward *the atom of weakness* which fermented in the condescending mind of Leo XIII.; then the Pope, magnifying the task with which he was entrusted, began to dream of a revival of the days when the Holy See was arbiter of everything. And the increasing height of the Pontiff displayed itself solemnly over this petty question." More sensible was the judgment emitted by Professor Geffcken, who, in spite of his want of sympathy with Leo XIII., allows us to perceive the importance of the pontifical intervention, when viewed from a standpoint of the principles involved, and of the consequences that might ensue. "On the part of the chancellor, the appeal to the Pope was unfortunate, since it fortified the Ultramontane pretensions. A short time previously, Windthorst, the leader of the Centre, had declared publicly that the Pope governed the world; and Bismarck, by a recourse to the mediation of the Pontiff, really endorsed this claim. And this was the Bismarck who had said that the Pope was endangering his own salvation; the Bismarck who had treated the Pope as

merely the equal of an Armenian patriarch. The Catholic masses naturally concluded that even the great chancellor could not get along without the aid of their Holy Father; and that opinion was confirmed by the letter which Leo XIII. sent to Bismarck when he forwarded to him the decoration of the pontifical Order of Christ (1). Conceived in most flattering terms, this letter reminded the chancellor that his strength depended on the co-operation of the Catholic Church, whose influence for the maintenance of order can be fully exercised only when she is truly free. The consequence was that Germany abandoned that which she had officially claimed as hers by right; and by her acceptance of the supreme arbitration of the Pope, she established a dangerous precedent" (2).

Turning our attention now to the Far East, we find that the most notable of the "Acts" of our Pontiff in those parts was the institution of a regular ecclesiastical hierarchy for the whole of Hindustan, in place of the apostolic-vicariates which had so long been a necessary substitute for the ordinary and regularly canonical authority. In a letter addressed to all the bishops in India, dated June 24, 1893, His Holiness, after expressing his love for the vast country which was once the theatre of the heroic labors of St. Thomas the

(1) "Leo XIII., Pope, to His Serene Highness, Prince Otho von Bismarck, greeting. The recent dissension concerning the Caroline Islands having been happily terminated by the acceptance of the conditions proposed by us, we have expressed our joy to His Majesty, the German emperor; and we now wish to express the same feeling to Your Serene Highness, since it was you that suggested our mediation. We wish to acknowledge that it was, in great part, due to your zeal that the difficulties in our way were banished; for from the beginning to the end of the matter, you always seconded our efforts. Therefore we tender to you our thanks for having furnished us an occasion of laboring in the interests of peace. History indeed shows that such labor is not new to the Holy See; but a long time has passed, since such an intervention was proposed to a Roman Pontiff, although there is no kind of business more appropriate to the nature of our Pontificate. Free from all prejudice, you judged the situation rather according to truth, than according to the opinions and inclinations of others; and you did not hesitate to confide in our impartiality. By so doing, you obtained the approbation of all men who are not dominated by prejudice; above all, by the Catholics of the entire world, who are necessarily pleased with the honor done to their father. All men agree that your political sagacity has contributed to the creation of a powerful German Empire, and it is natural that the solidity and prosperity of that empire, based upon force, should be the chief object of your desires; but your perspicacity must have noticed the number of means which are at the disposal of the power confided to us, for the maintenance of political and social order, especially when that power is allowed its full liberty of action. In order that you may henceforward possess a testimony of our sentiments, we name you a Knight of the Order of Christ, and send you herewith the proper insignia."

(2) *Leo XIII. In the Eyes of Germany*, p. 47.

Apostle and of St. Francis Xavier, thus communicates the object of his Brief: "We desire, in accordance with our duty, and to the utmost of our power, to extend to this large portion of the earth the fruit of our aspirations to heaven. Therefore we have reflected on a method of reorganization of the Christian influence in the East Indies; and finally, we have decided on certain arrangements for the good of the Catholic religion. In the first place, as regards the right of patronage once enjoyed by the Portuguese in the East Indies, we have concluded a lasting arrangement with His Most Faithful Majesty of Portugal; and thus there will be an end to those dissensions which have so long existed among the Christians of Portuguese India. We had already deemed it prudent to make veritable dioceses out of those communities which had hitherto constituted vicariates-apostolic, thus subjecting those districts to the general Canon Law; and therefore it was that by our Letters-Apostolic of Dec. 1, 1886, we established in India a hierarchy consisting of eight ecclesiastical provinces, namely, those of Goa—the patriarchal see, and those of Agra, Bombay, Verapoly, Calcutta, Madras, Pondichery, and Colombo. In a word, we have endeavored to effect in India whatever we thought likely to conduce to the development of faith and piety." On several occasions during the course of our work, we have had occasion to allude to the matter of Portuguese India and the claims of the Portuguese crown; some details in regard to the dissensions, to which Leo XIII. alludes in this letter, will interest the reader. The right of patronage, conceded by the Holy See to the crown of Portugal in the sixteenth century, embraced the right of nomination to existing bishoprics; that of refusal for the creation of any new dioceses; that of presentation to all benefices; and an obligation, on the part of every missionary to Hindustan, to become a Portuguese subject if he was not such already, and not to go to his mission without the consent of the Portuguese government, and that obtained, to sail only on a Portuguese ship. Of course most of these rights, which had been conceded by Rome only on condition that Portugal would protect and

aid the Indian missions, in time became impracticable, if not oppressive; and to add to the inconveniences, Portugal lost the greater part of her Indian territory, and did not keep her promises to the Holy See in regard to the remainder. Pope Gregory XVI. tried to remedy the evils which beset the Church in the territories over which the Portuguese, though they had lost all civil power therein, still claimed ecclesiastical influence. He instituted vicariates-apostolic, placing their incumbents under the immediate jurisdiction of the Holy See, and determining exactly the limits of each ordinary's authority. The Portuguese government, then, as we have seen, a Masonic creation, resisted these reforming measures of the Pontiff; it was aided by its creature, the archbishop of Goa, and then began the "Schism of Goa," sustained by a number of Indo-Portuguese priests, and a fair number of seculars. When the first schismatic prelate of Goa died, his successor ordained about six hundred wretches whom he scattered among the missions, where they scandalized Catholic, heretic, and pagan alike by their immoralities. Shame induced the Portuguese to conclude a Concordat with Pius IX., embodying several remedial clauses; but of these only one, that which recognized the jurisdiction of the Goan prelate over all the rebels to the authority of the vicars-apostolic, did not remain a dead letter. However, this Concordat terminated the schism, although it entailed the evil of a double jurisdiction, that of the vicars-apostolic over the Catholics who had remained faithful during the schism, and that of the archbishop of Goa over the reconciled schismatics. Leo XIII. determined to put an end to this anomaly, especially since the Goan priests were destitute of every priestly virtue. By order of the Pontiff, in 1884, Cardinal Jacobini informed the Portuguese government that the Holy See could no longer tolerate the condition of affairs in India; but the Masonic reply brought no encouragement to the Pope. Finally, our Pontiff made an eloquent appeal to the king himself; and His Faithful Majesty took the matter into his own hands, to the great disgust of his Masonic cabinet, thus enabling Leo XIII. to inform the Indian bishops that he had concluded a

favorable and "lasting arrangement with the Portuguese sovereign."

In an apposite dissertation on Christianity in Japan (1), we have seen how Leo XIII. established a regular hierarchy in that now enterprising empire; we must now allude to a negotiation which is in progress in China as we write (June, 1899), and which will probably have an important and favorable effect upon the progress of the true faith in the Middle Kingdom. In 1881 the Chinese government had caused word to reach the Holy See, not in diplomatic, but nevertheless trustworthy fashion, that it would be pleased if His Holiness would appoint a nuncio to Peking. No notice of this overture was taken; but in 1885, when the Chinese emperor had received a letter from the Pontiff, asking His Majesty to protect the Christians in his empire, the rumor of an early diplomatic relationship between the courts of the Vatican and Peking gained consistency in the latter city; and in January, 1886, Mr. Dunn, the Director of the Anglo-Chinese Customs, presented to the Holy See credentials empowering him to negotiate for the creation of the desired nunciature. It transpired afterward that behind Mr. Dunn, as he worked for the residence of a Papal nuncio in Peking, was the strength of the Triple Alliance, supported by England. This very fact, which was known by the French government, may have influenced that government to oppose the project, when the Vatican, out of deference to the susceptibilities of a nation which had been, from time immemorial, the universally acknowledged protector of all Christians in the East, asked for its views. This protectorate of all things Christian in the East has ever been one of the chief glories of France, although in our day it has been changed to a merely political and commercial interest. But whether the government of France was royal or republican, Catholic or atheist, the average Oriental felt like his ancestors of the Middle Age in regard to the ægis of France. To break up this French influence in the East was a sworn end of the alliance between Germany, Italy, and (wonderful to relate) Austria; an opportunity to destroy it

(1) V. l. v., ch. 12.

in China was furnished by the meditated appointment of a Papal nuncio to China, for with that official on the ground, the French ambassador would have no reason for interfering in Chinese Christian matters. Once that the religious hegemony of France in China would be broken, it would not be difficult to cause the weakening of French prestige to be felt in the Levant. Leo XIII. knew that the scheme was meant as a trap for France; and he was determined that the interests of France should not suffer, much as he might desire the nunciature to be a thing of fact. He assured the French government that the Holy See gladly recognized the French protectorate over the Christians in the Orient; but the head of the French cabinet of the day, Freycinet, persisted in his refusal to countenance any change in the *status quo* of the relations between the Vatican and the court of Peking. Therefore the Pontiff temporarily resigned himself to an abandonment of his design; and in the meantime the men of the Triple Alliance, sustained by England, put forth every effort to win the confidence of the Catholics throughout the world, but especially in the Holy Land and in all the Eastern Missions. Every means was adopted to "foster vocations" among the German Catholics for these missions, in order to overcome the immense preponderance (about nine-tenths) of the French element. The Propaganda was asked to believe that the German Lutherans were dying with zeal for the propagation of the Catholic faith; the Franciscans in Palestine were loaded with favors. Then came the opera bouffe "pilgrimage" of William II. to Jerusalem, during which the imperial cerebral gyrations were meant to convey the impression that French influence in the Orient had yielded place to that of a new line of Barbarossas. Then Cardinal Kopp and other clerical emissaries were sent to Rome by the imaginative Kaiser, with intent to cajole the eminently practical Leo XIII.; but a pontifical letter to Cardinal Langenieux, sent in August, 1898, showed that the Pope appreciated the imperial policy at its true value, although that policy had been endorsed by the German Catholic party, which, without a Windthorst to guide it, had, as we have frequently noticed, succumbed.

to the wiles of Berlin. Twelve years had elapsed since the first attempt of the Triple Alliance to supplant the French influence in Peking, when, aided by the fortuitous prominence which a recent massacre of two German missionaries in Shan Tung gave to German interests in those parts, the Alliance repeated its enterprise. Our Pontiff agreed to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the court of Peking; but he checkmated the Alliance, and won the sympathies of the French Republican government by his proviso that there should be in Peking not a nuncio, but an apostolic-delegate, who, with powers like those of the apostolic-delegate in Constantinople, should recognize the sole protectorate of France over the Chinese Catholics (1).

Amid the multifarious and nearly continual annoyances which are entailed upon the Holy See by its subjects of the Oriental Rites—annoyances which the authorities of the Propaganda have come to consider as mere matters of routine, so natural do they appear, there occur, now and then, some events which are not only consoling to the Father of all the Faithful, but which seem to indicate that the day

(1) At this time there was issued an imperial decree guaranteeing protection to Catholics throughout the empire. The *Missions Catholiques* of Lyons gives the full text, which consists of a preamble and five articles. The preamble runs thus: "Churches of the Catholic religion, the propagation of which has long been authorized by the imperial government, being now erected in all the provinces in China, we are desirous of seeing the people and the Christians live in peace, and in order to render the protection of the Christians easier, it has been arranged that the local authorities shall exchange visits with the missionaries, under the conditions specified below." The first three clauses of the decree are devoted to fixing the rank in which Catholic missionaries shall be held by the imperial officials. Bishops are declared equal in rank to viceroys and governors; vicars-general and archpriests to judges and treasurers, and priests to prefects. Ecclesiastics, having business with the government, can call upon officials of equal rank. The fourth and fifth clauses fix the manner in which, when matters arise which call for adjudication between the civil and the ecclesiastic authorities, action shall proceed. The government authorities are bidden to conduct all negotiations without unnecessary delay and in a conciliatory manner; and the missionaries, both bishops and priests, are commanded to "exhort the Christians to strive to do good, in order to maintain the good repute of the Catholic religion, and act so that the people may be content and grateful." Another feature of the decree is that it recognizes the Holy Father as a sovereign. It bestows upon him the designation of *Kiao-Hoang*, which means "Emperor of Religion." Mgr. Favier of Peking, who, being on the spot, is certainly qualified to speak of the importance of this decree, declares that in consequence of its promulgation, Catholic bishops "possess to-day a rank and power which they have never had up till now in China." He adds that while the edict may not exempt the Catholic missionaries wholly from persecution on the part of rebels and bandits, it assures them of the government's good will and protection, and he declares that already—the edict was issued March 15, 1899—a very large increase has taken place in the number of Chinese conversions, whole districts, in some instances, embracing the faith.

is not distant when the puerile vanity of the Christian East will have succumbed to the truth which it once so triumphantly proclaimed. One of these consolations was given to Leo XIII. by the end of what had been termed, during several years, the "New Schism of the Armenians." This "new schism" had originated at the time of the Vatican Council. In the course of our work, we have frequently observed how religious questions in the East are complicated by those on nationalities, and how careful the Catholic priest must be, lest he offend either national obstinacy or local susceptibility. Now, when the Vatican Council was being held, every effort was made by the "opposition," especially by that part of it which was represented by Strossmayer, bishop of Sirmium, to draw the Armenian synodals into its embrace. When the crisis arrived, Strossmayer and his companions submitted to the inevitable; but the more innocent Armenians—more innocent, because less educated—returned to their homes with passions excited almost to the point of schism, although they had signed the decree of Papal Infallibility. When they had arrived in their respective dioceses, they found that a large number of their compatriots had joined in rejecting the authority of Mgr. Hassoun, their legitimate patriarch (1); they endeavored to stem the tide of revolt, but under the leadership of Baltarian, archbishop of Diarbekir, and of Gasparian, bishop of Cyprus, the "new schismatics" had gained much headway. Before long, a monk named Kiupelian became the head of the movement, assuming the title of civil head of the Armenians, and procuring illicit consecration as patriarch of Cilicia. But in the course of a few years, the poor monk experienced

(1) The origin of this revolt must be ascribed to the discontent of many Armenians, because of the bull *Reversurus* issued by Pius IX., on July 4, 1867, and regulating the method of episcopal elections among this excitable people. At first the Bull produced the desired effect; but when it was misinterpreted, trouble ensued. The Armenian religions of St. Anthony, most of whom ought to have been superior to the petty passions of their uneducated compatriots, since they had been trained either in Rome or in Venice, openly renounced their allegiance to Mgr. Hassoun; and they were imitated by the Armenian hotbeds of Constantinople. In vain Pius IX. tried to reduce the rebels to an observation of the dictates of common sense; encouraged by the representative of Victor Emmanuel in Constantinople, and by Bourée, the French ambassador, they refused to hear the Pontifical envoy. Consequently, on March 30, 1870, Pius IX. excommunicated them.

so much trouble with his schismatic followers, that he resolved to abandon the paths of a deceitful ambition ; and he threw himself at the feet of his patriarch, begging to be received again into the communion of the Chair of Peter. Then he addressed the Sublime Porte, as custom and even necessity demands in the Turkish Empire, renouncing all his usurped titles and privileges. On April 20, 1879, Kiupelian knelt before the throne of Leo XIII., and entreated His Holiness to restore him to the communion of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Roman Church. Then, still kneeling, he read in a clear and firm voice a recantation of all his errors ; whereupon the Pontiff, signing to him to arise, addressed him in these terms : “ It is a great consolation to a father to be able to press to his heart a son whom he had deemed lost.” Then the Pope congratulated the convert on his courage in abandoning the honors of earth for the cause of religious truth, and he proceeded : “ While granting to you full and ample pardon, we hereby make in your regard, by our Apostolic authority, an exception to the general rules of ecclesiastical discipline, allowing you to retain the titles, insignia, and honors of the episcopal dignity which you received from bishops who had deserted the fold of Catholic unity.” The closing words of the Pontifical discourse were : “ The Eastern Churches are indeed dear to us. We admire their ancient glories ; and how happy we would be, if we could behold them resplendent with their olden grandeur !” As a sequel of this recantation of Mgr. Kiupelian, the Turkish sultan, Abdul-Hamid, hearkening to the representations of our Pontiff, reinstated Mgr. Hassoun in all the rights which the “ new schism ” had taken from him ; and the Armenian Catholics received nearly all the churches which the schismatics had invaded. In 1888, the “ new schism ” disappeared entirely, thanks to the exertions of Mgr. Azarian, the Armenian Catholic patriarch of Constantinople, who persuaded the two remaining bishops, as well as the priests and notable laymen among the schismatics, to recant, and who induced the sultan to withdraw the legal sanction which he had accorded to the new community. While we have our attention directed toward the Orient, it is well to

note that in 1892, the Pontifical heart of Leo XIII. was cheered by a letter from Mgr. Audon, archbishop of Ounmiah, of the Chaldean Rite, informing His Holiness that abjuration of schism and heresy had been made in the beginning of June by Mar Chimoun, the patriarch of the Nestorians—a prelate, in whose family the Nestorian Patriarchate had been perpetuated during many centuries. Mgr. Montety, the delegate-apostolic in Persia, wrote that this example of the patriarch had been followed by hundreds of conversions; and that while he was writing, Mgr. Audon, accompanied by the mitred-abbot of the monks of St. Hormisdas, was travelling through the mountains of Kurdistan, absolving entire villages, and confirming them in the faith. A Nestorian bishop had just written to the delegate, saying: “Soon we shall all be sons of one father.” The student must know that these converted Nestorians, like all their predecessors, did not enter the Latin Rite; this Rite has always been prohibited to the Orientals by the Holy See, so anxious is Rome to testify her respect for ancient and approved Liturgies, and to preserve those Liturgies as witnesses of the faith of the times in which they were composed. The Nestorian converts entered the United Chaldean Rite; and when it was observed that priestly conversions were very numerous, the authorities of the Propaganda congratulated themselves that just two years previously they had begun to print the *Chaldean Breviary*, which hitherto had existed only in manuscripts—very faulty ones also, and not easily obtainable.

Before we withdraw our attention from the Orient, we must notice an event which occurred in Bulgaria in 1896, to the great scandal of even lukewarm Catholics, to the delight of all Eastern Schismatics, and to the amusement of free-thinkers; the so-called “conversion” of the two-year-old Boris, prince-royal of Bulgaria, to the Bulgarian offshoot of the Greek Schism. In 1887, the National Assembly of Bulgaria elected as successor to Prince Alexander, who had abdicated in 1886, Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, a son of Duke Augustus of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha by the Princess Clementine, daughter of King Louis Philippe of

France. From the day of his arrival in his principality, Ferdinand realized that his continued tenure of its crown depended on the good will of the Russian autocrat. No means seemed so well adapted for the attainment of that good will as his perversion to the State-Church of Bulgaria which communicates with the "Orthodox" Russian Establishment; but it would appear that the audacity of the Coburger was not without limits. However, in the beginning of 1896, it was rumored throughout Europe that Ferdinand, a Catholic prince, had expressed a willingness to allow his elder son and heir to be confirmed and educated in the Greek Schism; and it was soon known that the child's mother, Princess Mary Louisa, daughter of the exiled Duke of Parma, had written to the Pope, asking whether she could not leave a husband who was practically a renegade, and at the same time save her son from the danger menacing him. The Pontiff's reply was that she should remain at her husband's side, and trust all to God. But suddenly Prince Ferdinand himself asked for an audience with His Holiness. Of course it was granted; and this presumably sane man, a person of education and of at least apparently Catholic convictions, brazenly requested the Head of the Catholic Church to grant him permission to hand over his two-year-old son to schismatics and heretics for a religious training. It is safe to say that no more sublime piece of effrontery was ever acted in the Vatican; and it is also safe to say that Leo XIII. replied in terms befitting his office. What the pontifical words were, Ferdinand took care not to tell; but as soon as he returned to his capital, he issued a manifesto to the Bulgarians, declaring: "In pursuance of the promise given from the throne to the representatives of the nation, I have used every possible endeavor, and have striven with all my strength, to remove the difficulties which oppose the attainment of the ardent desire of the entire nation that the heir-apparent should enter the fold of the National Church. After having fulfilled my duty in showing respect toward those with whom it rested to smooth away these difficulties, and after having seen the disappearance of my hopes without finding, where I had expected, a wise comprehension of

Bulgaria's needs, I have resolved, of my own initiative, and true to the oath given to my well-beloved people, to surmount all obstacles, *and to lay on the altar of the Fatherland the greatest and heaviest of sacrifices.* I therefore announce to all Bulgarians that, on the 14th of the present month, the Feast of the Purification, the rite of Holy Confirmation will be administered to the heir-apparent, Prince Boris, Prince of Tirnova, according to the usages of the National Orthodox Church." The manifesto was read by the Bulgarian Prime Minister to the National Assembly. The correspondent of the London *Daily News* wrote from Sofia that the manifesto came as a surprise. "It is not possible to decide whom the Prince alludes to when he says that his hope to find a wise and ready understanding for the wants of Bulgaria has not been fulfilled. This may refer either to the Pope or to the Princess; more likely to the latter, from what is reported of what happened yesterday. The Bulgarian Prime Minister, Stoiloff, had an audience of Princess Mary Louisa, to whom he expressed the devotion of the Bulgarian people, its thanks for her charitable work, and for the favorable influence she had had upon social life. He assured her that the nation fully valued the battle she was fighting with her convictions. The Princess leaves Sofia on Friday, with her younger son, and goes to Vienna. After a short stay there, she leaves for Nice, in the neighborhood of which she will remain for some time. The Prince and Princess, it is asserted, are fully convinced that it is best for the Princess to leave Sofia; everybody hopes she will some day return." With their usual want of knowledge concerning Catholic matters, most of the English, American, and German journals soon stated that the Princess had asked the Pope to annul her marriage with the Coburger, as though the scion of the Bourbons did not know that even apostasy cannot dissolve Christian matrimony. The fact is that in order to encourage the heartbroken wife and mother, Leo XIII. informed her that he would not proceed to any open and *nominatim* excommunication of her husband; but the poor woman knew too well that the wretched weakling had incurred the censures of the Church, *ipso facto*, and being

moved also by a desire to safeguard the spiritual future of her younger son, she proceeded with him to Vienna. Ferdinand had enough of decency, perhaps even of remorse, to abstain from force in order to prevent the loss of his wife and second heir; the separation has continued, and will continue until Ferdinand undoes the fell work of his puerile ambition, if indeed the schismatics allow him to undo it.

Turning our attention now to the more particularly doctrinal features of the pontificate of Leo XIII., as those features have been enunciated by his many Encyclicals, we may say that probably the first place, in order of importance, should be assigned to the Encyclical *Æterni Patris*, issued on Aug. 4, 1879, and intended to assure the triumph of Thomistic philosophy. For several years there had been, among the Catholic educators of every land, marked symptoms of a general return to the old scholastic system, as incarnated in its most illustrious representative, St. Thomas of Aquino; and with that system, to its essential concomitants, unity of philosophical conception, severity of method, and a positive yet temperate manner of discussing the relations between body and soul. During the Perugian episcopate of the future Leo XIII., there had flourished in that diocese and under the auspices of His Eminence a school of Peripateticism, at the head of which was the future cardinal, Joseph Pecci. This school of Perugia, together with Liberatore, Signoriello, and other writers of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, was the most aggressive and the most logical of all the phalanxes in the army of the latest philosophical Renaissance. Of course the Dominicans had preserved what was their real cult of the Thomistic system; and the appearance of the works of their great Zigliara showed that the Friars-Preachers were ready to make that cult a vivid and not a somnolent worship. Other countries than Italy, though in a very minor degree, had also turned to St. Thomas as the one philosophical guide for moderns. Spain furnished Gonzalez; Germany had her Kleutgen; and even France and Belgium, so devoted to Descartes, showed a few zealous Thomists. But it must be admitted that in the generality of Catholic schools, St. Thomas and Peri-

pateticism were almost unknown quantities; and even in Rome, in the hearing of the illustrious school represented by the Jesuits of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, other Jesuits, following the lead of Tongiorgi, taught in the Roman College a system which was pregnant with concessions to others. After years of meditation, Leo XIII. raised the banner of unadulterated Thomism. The student will not expect us to adduce the reasons given by the Pontiff for his action; suffice it to say that he declared of the Angelic Doctor: "There is no part of philosophy which he does not treat with equal intelligence and solidity. Distinguishing carefully reason and faith, and uniting them amicably together, he has so safeguarded the rights and dignity of each, that reason, raised by him to the highest summits, can mount no higher; and as for faith, she can expect from reason no greater help than she has received from St. Thomas." In the year following the publication of the *Æterni Patris*, our Pontiff proclaimed the Angelic Doctor patron of all Catholic Universities, Colleges, and Schools. On Oct. 15, 1879, in a letter to Cardinal de Luca, Prefect of the Congregation of Studies, he announced his intention of founding in Rome an Academy which would be devoted to the defence and explanation of the Thomistic philosophy; and he also declared his purpose of publishing a new and complete edition of the works of St. Thomas, according to the edition of St. Pius V., now become exceedingly rare. In order to encourage the students in Rome to prosecute their Thomistic indagations *con amore*, the Pontiff announced that thereafter there would be held, at stated times in his presence in the Vatican, public disputations on scholastic subjects; and in accordance with that promise, students from all the Roman Colleges had the honor of breaking philosophical lances, from time to time, before one of the best philosophers of our day. In a Brief dated Dec. 25, 1880, and addressed to Cardinal Dechamps, archbishop of Malines, Leo XIII. expressed his desire that a chair of Thomistic philosophy should be established immediately in Louvain, in order to oppose a solid defence against the materialistic attacks which were favored by "that unbridled liberty of speaking and writing

which now reigns in Belgium, and which engenders the most detestable opinions." In Louvain, as well as in the Universities of Lille, Fribourg, and Washington, and in all the more considerable of the ecclesiastical seminaries of the Catholic world, the voice of the Pontiff was heeded, and there the doctrine of the Angel of the Schools now reigns triumphant (1).

The Encyclical *Arcanum*, which appeared on Feb. 14, 1880, has for its subject that most abused of all social institutions in our day, Marriage. After the preludes which would naturally occur in such an instruction, His Holiness says in regard to Christian Matrimony: "There cannot subsist a true and legitimate matrimonial contract, which is not, at the same time, a Sacrament; for Christ raised marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament." The Pope then proceeds to show how the materialistic theories concerning marriage are not only false, but pernicious, since they prevent the good which God had in view when He endowed matrimony with graces which would render the family happier and more virtuous. The burdens of marriage, continues His Holiness, often appear to be intolerable; and then the civil authority intervenes, granting divorce, a fruitful source of miseries, of misfortune for children, of shame for women, and of license for all. History shows, remarks the Pontiff, how well the Popes have deserved of humanity by defending the sanctity of marriage against powerful sovereigns like Henry VIII., Napoleon, etc. The Pope is careful to add that the Church does not deny that the State has the right to legislate concerning the purely civil effects of matrimony; she clearly recognizes the distinction between the two powers, civil and

(1) The following remarks of Mgr. T'Serclaes on the effect of the *Æterni Patris* are worthy of the reader's attention: "Peace is now established in Catholic schools; burning dissensions agitate minds no longer. Even heterodox philosophers applaud the intellectual activity which prompted the decree of Leo XIII., and which has affected them so adversely. Nowadays no one thinks that he can dismiss the arguments of the Scholastics with some smart saying or some jocosity concerning Aristotle. Everyone understands that in the doctrines of the Stagyrite and of St. Thomas are found the highest forms of human thought. Men now study both these authors. For very many, this study has only value as a scientific curiosity. For others, it is a kind of research for philosophical truth. For all, it constitutes an evolution of non-Catholic thought in the direction of Christian philosophy. And this is an immense result of the initiative taken by Leo XIII." *Loc. cit.*, Vol. I., p. 271.

ecclesiastical, demanding only that neither one interfere in the province of the other.

The Encyclical *Sancta Dei Civitas*, dated Dec. 3, 1880, is devoted to the obligation, on the part of the faithful, of aiding the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, founded at Lyons in the beginning of the nineteenth century, and of sustaining also the kindred works, the Society of the Holy Infancy, and that for the Schools in the East. It was upon this last work that Leo XIII. chiefly relied for the success of his many plans for the restoration of the East, the cradle of our faith, to the true fold. The Encyclical *Militans Dei Ecclesia*, issued on March 12, 1881, proclaimed a Jubilee; and called on the Universal Church for prayers on account of the present "intolerable position" of the Holy See in its ancient capital. "The Head of the Church," cries the Pontiff, "is deprived of his rights, and is embarrassed in a thousand ways in the exercise of his supreme ministry; he possesses now only a shadow of royal majesty, which has been left to him as though to deride him." Leo XIII. describes in moving terms the recent spoliations of ecclesiastical property in the Eternal City—spoliations which extended even to the property of the Propaganda, which every preceding revolution had spared. He speaks of the oppressive laws sanctioned by the intruding government, the obstacles put in the way of educating the young, the profanation of churches, the erection of Protestant temples; and he concludes that "all our courage, and all our human care, will be vain, if heaven does not send us opportune succor."

The Encyclical *Diuturnum*, published on June 29, 1881, was one of the most important documents issued in this pontificate, since it dealt with civil governmental authority. The Pontiff begins with the principle that in every society an irrepressible necessity calls for a ruling authority. No rebellion, though it were arrogance incarnate, ever succeeded in actuating the idea of no one person or authority being obeyed. Nevertheless, ever since the religious innovations of the sixteenth century, men have succeeded in lessening greatly the force and majesty of authority; in fact, since the so-called Reformation, an exaggerated liberty has gradually

come into vogue, and men have invented all sorts of systems on the origin and constitution of society. At length it happened that certain philosophists of the eighteenth century insisted that all authority comes from the people "in such fashion that the possessor of authority is only a delegate of the people, and can be deprived of his authority by the people who delegated him. Catholics think differently, and derive authority from God, who is its natural and necessary principle." The Pope does not deny that the leaders of a society may, in certain cases, be chosen by the multitude; but by this choice "the right of government is not given—authority is not conferred; it is the person who will exercise the authority that is designated." In all this teaching there is no question of political forms; the Church can approve of a republican or any other form of government, if it is just. Therefore the people have a right, provided they do not violate justice, to adopt that government which best suits their character and favorite institutions. After a refutation of the theory of a "Social Compact," Leo XIII. shows the advantages of the Catholic doctrine; and in the first place, the security enjoyed by a government whose subjects obey from conscientious motives. The sole reason for a refusal of obedience, in the case of such subjects, would be a manifest opposition between orders received and the natural law or the commands of God. "But in this case, it is the authority of the ruler that is null; it becomes null, when it violates justice." The Church has always tried to introduce her doctrine on the nature of the civil power into the practical lives of men. Therefore the early Christians obeyed the Pagan emperors who persecuted them; they refused obedience only when the divine law was involved. After the civil power had become Christian, and the Church had become the recognized moving spirit of civil society, the Church gave to the civil power a species of consecration when the Roman Pontiff instituted the Holy Roman Empire; and that institution would have proved most beneficent for both Church and State, if princes and peoples had remained faithful to the intentions of its founder, the Roman Pontiff. So long as harmony reigns between Church and State, the

Church effectually pacifies the people when they rebel against the State ; and she bears to the rulers the complaints of the people. What have the false ideas on the civil power produced ? Nothing but seditions, license, carnage ; and now all is tending toward Anarchy, Communism, or Nihilism. Governments have no power of sufficient efficiency to resist these excesses ; severe punishments avail nothing, for, as St. Thomas and experience teach, fear only causes the victim to wait for an occasion to revolt against its inspirer. Recourse must be had to a principle of obedience more elevated than fear ; and that principle is conscience, the fear of God. Leo XIII. terminates his Encyclical with an invitation to rulers to profit by the powerful assistance of the Church, and to protect the Church, were it only for the good of the State.

The Encyclical *Humanum Genus*, dated April 20, 1884, resumes the motives which have inspired the Church in her condemnation of Freemasonry. As we have already described these motives in our special dissertation on the diabolical sect (1), and as the same motives have been continually placed in evidence during the course of our work, we need not now repeat them. Leo XIII. declares that he wishes not to accuse each Mason in particular, nor even each one of the Secret Societies, of all the crimes which are committed by the societies in general. Among the adepts, there are some who ignore the veritable objects of their organizations ; and among those who well realize what those objects are, there may be some who do not approve certain consequences of their principles, while others may not dare to apply those consequences. Be this as it may, rightly contends the Pontiff, we must judge Freemasonry by its principles, rather than by a few particular facts. Then the Pope discourses on Naturalism, the principles of which Freemasonry reduces to action ; and he refers to the deliberations in the Grand Orient of our day concerning the advisability of retaining among the statutes of the order that which recognized the existence of God—deliberations which resulted in a schism among the sectarians (2). As a matter of fact, the Pope might have added, Atheism or Pantheism, on the part of a

(1) Vol. iv., ch. 18.

(2) *Ibi*, p. 436.

candidate for Masonry, is no bar to his initiation in any Lodge in the Masonic world. The Pontiff lays much stress on the efforts of Masonry to transform the civil laws, wherever it attains to power, in a Naturalistic sense; especially in the matter of divorce, and of indifferentism in the education of youth. Attention is also drawn to the Naturalistic principle, so eagerly propagated by Masonry, that all authority must be rejected which is not derived from man himself. In conclusion, Leo XIII. renews all the condemnations of Freemasonry, emitted by his predecessors.

The Encyclical *Immortale Dei*, issued on Nov. 19, 1885, may be regarded as a development of the *Diuturnum*. Leo XIII. reminds us that when Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. (the latter chiefly in his *Syllabus*) condemned certain modern governmental theories, the pontifical reprobation was not visited upon any particular form of government, considered in itself; nor was that reprobation intended for any greater or less share of the people in governmental matters—a share which is often useful, and sometimes obligatory. Nor from these condemnations by Gregory XVI. and Pius IX. should any one pretend to conclude that the Church is opposed to real liberty; nor should it be supposed that the Church condemns the *political toleration* of false religions, when such toleration is demanded by a necessity of obtaining some great good, or of avoiding some great evil. The Church approves the liberty which fosters prosperity, and which protects the State against arbitrary violence. The Church has ever encouraged the precautions taken against the tyranny of rulers; she ever protected municipal franchises, as well as all measures which secured in equal measure the honor and happiness of all citizens. Instead of being an enemy of modern inventions, the Church favors everything which tends to develop science and progress. Leo XIII. calls on Catholics to heed the judgment emitted by the Holy See in regard to those modern false liberties, the evil fruits of which are evident to every observer. Undoubtedly a government which tyrannizes over its Catholic citizens can be tolerated with difficulty; but “the principles on which that government is based may be such as admit of no rejection.” It is very

necessary, insists the Pontiff, that Catholics should share in the administration of municipalities, were it only in order to procure a Christian education for their children. His Holiness would like to see all Catholics, in the emergencies of to-day, forget intestine discords, and turn all their energies to the advancement of the Church and of true civil progress.

The Encyclical *Libertas*, published on June 20, 1888, begins appropriately with the name which produces so many throbs, sometimes exultant, more frequently despairing, in the human heart; for the document deals exhaustively with the theories of true and of false liberty, and its sole object may be said to be a proof that when the Church is charged with being the foe of liberty, "the reason of that accusation is to be found in the erroneous idea of liberty which the accuser has formed." Of all the Encyclicals of Leo XIII., this one lends itself least readily to the process of synopsis; but the Pontiff himself, at the end of the document, saves one such labor to some extent, when he specifies the various gradations of modern Liberalism. He regards as the worst kind of Liberalism that which refuses, in both public and private life, all obedience to God. Next to this species, he finds the greatest wickedness in those Liberals who would submit indeed to the Natural Law, but who repudiate Revelation, at least in the social order; and this class of Liberals, just like the first, cries loudly for an entire "separation of Church and State"—a pernicious error, in their interpretation of the phrase, since the two powers, although of different dignity and different ends, were meant by God to aid each other. These "separationists of Church and State" are of two classes. Some would have governments act as though there were no such an institution as the Church, leaving religion among such matters as are purely private. Others deny to the Church the rights belonging to a real society, allowing to her simply the right to exhort and entreat her members, recognizing in her no legislative or coercive power; and these gentry quite consistently subject the Church to the State, precisely as they subject all other societies. Besides these Liberals who are avowed "separationists of Church and State," there is a third class composed of persons

who do not approve the specious maxim, but who contend that the Church ought to be less uncompromising in her attitude toward the spirit of the day. To this class the Pontiff replies that their demand would be reasonable, if there were a question of arrangements which might be consonant with truth and justice; but that the Church, the divinely-appointed guardian of truths which are necessary for all times and circumstances, can never keep silence when error and injustice are offered for the veneration, or at least for the approval of men. "It follows from what has been said," continues the Pope, "that it is not permissible to accord freedom of the press, of thought, of teaching, and of worship, as so many rights inherent in the very nature of man; although all these liberties may be granted for just reasons, on condition that they do not degenerate into license" (1). This Encyclical was completed by another, beginning: *Sapientie Christiane*, dated on Jan. 10, 1890, and treating of the principal duties of Christians, but also manifesting the principles which have regulated the policy of Leo XIII. in the various countries of Christendom—principles which have inspired the advice which he has given so frequently to Catholics of every nationality, although at the same time he adapted them to the particular necessities of each case.

On Oct. 15, 1890, Leo XIII. addressed to the Italians an Encyclical in their own language, warning them of the dangers attending the present religious situation in their land. "If there were a question of our person alone," says the Pontiff, "if we did not see Italy menaced in her faith, and rushing to her ruin, we would bear all outrages in silence." Then he dilates on the plan of the sectarians, "not a new plan, unless it be new in its audacity, in its ferocity, and in its rapidity of execution"—the destruction

(1) The London *Saturday Review*, one of the most sterling Protestant periodicals in England, said of this Encyclical: "After a careful reading of this long document, we have not discovered one idea which all sincere Christians might not accept. . . . When we think of the vast influence of the Catholic Church, and of the obedience of its numerous hierarchy to the instructions of its supreme head, we must believe that these words of Leo XIII., so firm and so logical, will produce happy results in the multitude of the faithful. In a time when faith is so cruelly attacked, it is consoling to read this Encyclical, so full of dignity, and to observe that it does not contain one word of bitterness or of reproach, and that it has not a trace of fanaticism or of narrow-mindedness."

of the temporal power of the Pope the abolition of religious orders, the enforced conscription of ecclesiastics, the robbery of Church property, the secularization of everything ecclesiastical, the enforcement of civil marriages, and exclusively lay instruction of the young. In Italy, "all the laws which can outrage the Church, all the measures which can trammel her, are first proposed, discussed, and carried in the Masonic Lodges. To ensure the passage of such enactments, it is sufficient that they be known as injurious to the Church." The Pontiff declares that "it is necessary for the world to realize that the struggle between the Papacy and the Italian Revolution is of an essentially religious nature"; and that now it is the first duty of every Italian to defend the inestimable treasure of his faith, "no matter at what cost, and under the pain of eternal damnation." Then the Pope details the methods appropriate for the war which the Italians must wage; and perhaps the chief among their weapons, after prayer, is to be the Catholic press. As a counterpart to the present false and dangerous situation in Italy, the Pontiff draws a picture of an Italy reconciled with the Holy See. He exhibits a restoration of a spirit of duty, now unknown; a solution of social questions facilitated; "public liberty substituted for license"; civil concord re-established. As for Rome especially, "placed again under the peaceful and paternal sceptre of her Pontiff, she would be once more that which Providence and the centuries made her; that is, instead of being reduced to the rank of a capital for a particular kingdom, the prey of a dualism of two sovereign powers which is contrary to her history, she would be again the capital of the Catholic world, grand with all the majesty of religion and of the supreme priesthood, the mistress and model of civilization for all the nations."

On July 16, 1892, Leo XIII. addressed an Encyclical to the bishops of Italy, Spain, and the two Americas, in praise of the great Italian sailor and discoverer, Columbus. The people of the United States of America were then preparing for a grand World's Fair, which was to honor the fourth centennial of the discovery of the New World; and our Pontiff wished to show that the Holy See always took part in

the glorification of great and honorable enterprises. "Without doubt," said His Holiness, "the Church reserves her special honors for supernatural virtues, since they are connected with the eternal salvation of souls; but nevertheless, she does not despise the other virtues, nor does she fail to appreciate them at their worth. . . . Certainly God is admirable in his saints; but the traces of His divine strength also appear in those who have been distinguished by brilliancy of soul—in men whose elevation of mind and sparks of genius could have come only from their Creator." Then in the name of the Catholic Church, the Pope speaks of the discoverer of America as "*Columbus noster*—our Columbus"; for it was the religious motive, the Catholic faith, that inspired the grand enterprise. "Deeply engraved in his heart was the resolution to open up new lands to the Gospel"; for we know that as soon as he appeared before the Spanish sovereigns, "he assured them that they should not hesitate to patronize his ambition, since their names would be immortal, if they helped to carry the name and teachings of Jesus Christ to those distant regions." And when his prayers had been heard, "he attested that he had besought God that the Spanish sovereigns, aided by the divine grace, would persevere in their intention to send the Gospel to those new countries. Finally, Columbus declared that he intended to ask Pope Alexander VI. for some apostolic men who would preach the faith in the new regions. One can imagine the joy with which Columbus wrote to Raphael Sanchez, the first who returned from the Indies to Lisbon, that 'they should render to God never-ending thanks for His having deigned to bless their enterprise, seeing that now Jesus Christ could rejoice in heaven and on earth because of the salvation of innumerable peoples who were but recently going to perdition.'" This was the spirit, says the Pontiff, which sustained Columbus "amid the contrary opinions of the wise, the refusals of princes, the tempests of the ocean, and the continuous vigils which often menaced his life. Then there were the combats with the savages, the conspiracies of the wicked, the perfidies of the envious, the calumnies of his detractors, and finally the chains with

which the innocent man was loaded." The Pope shows Columbus as the worthy accomplisher of the divine plan: "When about to brave the ocean, he orders the adventurers to perform acts of expiation for their sins; he prays the Queen of Heaven to direct the course of the ships; and before giving the order to make sail, he invokes the august name of the Most Holy Trinity. Then, during the voyage, when the crews murmured, he knew that he was in the presence of God, and he preserved his tranquillity of spirit. His intention was manifested in the names which he gave to the newly-discovered islands; and whenever he was about to land on one for the first time, he took possession of it in the name of Jesus Christ. Wherever he landed, he immediately planted the sacred sign of the Cross; and he was the first to chant in the new territories that sweet name of the Redeemer which he had so often sung to the accompaniment of the murmuring waves during his trying voyage. Whenever he founded a Spanish colony, the first building erected was a church, in which all of the popular feasts could be celebrated with august ceremonies.'"

On Nov. 18, 1893, our Pontiff published his Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, treating of the excellence of the Sacred Scriptures, and of the Protestant and Rationalistic methods of so-called criticism in their regard. After a development of the saying of St. Jerome that an ignorance of the Scriptures is an ignorance of Jesus Christ, the Pope details the solicitude ever manifested by the Church for the explanation of Holy Writ to the people, beginning with the olden "Apologists" and the schools of Alexandria and Antioch, and ending with the Scholastics, "among whom the palm belonged to St. Thomas of Aquino," and the many Catholic scholars whose labors were facilitated by the invention of the printing-press. The Protestant idea of private interpretation is refuted by the Pontiff; but he lays greater stress on the Rationalistic theories, which, in last analysis, so many of the modern Protestant Biblicists adopt. These votaries of the "higher criticism" are more radical than were the original Protestants; and it must be admitted that they are far more logical. "They discern in the Scriptures only

fictions and human inventions; according to them, the Bible gives us pure fables or lying histories. They find no prophecies or divine oracles, but either predictions composed after the events, or simple intuitions of the human mind. In fine, they would attribute the Gospels and the Apostolic writings to authors very different from those to whom they have been assigned." The Pontiff devotes some space to practical instruction of the professors who must train ecclesiastical students in methods adapted to a refutation of this so-called system. As for the comparatively recent development of these theories, the "perverse art so injurious to religion, an art which has been dignified by the name of 'higher criticism,' and which consists in judging of the origin, integrity, and authority of each book, only by what is termed internal evidence; it is certain that in historical questions, such as that of the origin or preservation of the Scriptures, the testimony of history ought to weigh more than any other. As for the internal evidence, it possesses, as a rule, only value sufficient to warrant its use by way of confirmation." The Pontiff calls attention to the difficulties which are so often adduced from the natural sciences by so many heterodox critics. "There would never be any disagreement between the theologian and the physicist, if each would remain within his own domain, taking care to follow the advice of St. Augustine 'to affirm nothing rashly, and not to present the unknown as certainly known' (1). . . . When scientists advance certain proofs for an assertion, the interpreter of Scripture ought to be able to prove that the said assertion does not at all contradict the Bible, if the Bible is properly understood; and let the interpreter remember that very often things are advanced as certain by the scientists, only to be afterward rejected with equal certainty by their successors." Undoubtedly, admits His Holiness, it may happen that the meaning of a certain passage in the Bible seems to be doubtful. "In order to solve the difficulty, the authorized rules of interpretation will avail much; but it is absolutely forbidden to restrict inspiration to only some parts of the Scripture, or to admit that the sacred writer

(1) *In Gen., Op. Imperf., IX.*

was himself deceived. In fact, there can be no toleration for the system of those who, in order to escape these difficulties, dare to say that in the Scriptures divine inspiration affects only matters of faith and morals. These persons seem to believe that when there is a question of the genuineness of a text, we should not inquire as to what God said, but rather seek for the reason of His saying it. All the Scriptures recognized by the Church as canonical were written, in their entirety and in all their parts, under the dictation of the Holy Ghost. It follows, therefore, that either the Catholic idea of divine inspiration is perverted, or God is represented as the author of error, by those who assert that there can be anything false in the authentic texts of Holy Writ." The Pontiff warns all Biblical scholars and all physicists that God, the Author of Nature, is also the Author of our Holy Books; and that consequently in those writings there cannot be any real contradiction of the truths of Nature. When there seems to be a contradiction, "you must try to compel its disappearance, either seeking from wise theologians the more probable sense of the passage in question, or examining more carefully the force of the arguments which militate against it. Nor should you despair, if the apparent contradiction still persists; for since truth cannot contradict truth, you may be certain that an error has crept either into the interpretation of the sacred text, or into the contrary thesis. At any rate, let the decision be suspended; it has often happened, as we have said, that some science would make much ado about some one of its objections against the Scriptures, only to see the objection abandoned as absurd in later times."

Now that we approach the end of our review of the pontificate of Leo XIII., the moment when the reader will expect from us a judgment as to the calibre of this "*Lumen in Cælo*" of the nineteenth century, we find that we prefer to question the gentlemen of the Liberal school concerning that judgment. Let us listen, in the first place, to that valiant Spanish republican, Castelar. Writing to Boyer d'Agen, on April 11, 1892, in reply to that editor's request for an article on this subject, to be inserted in his work on *Leo XIII. in the Eyes of His Contemporaries*, the most eloquent of all modern

Liberals emitted the following, among other noteworthy reflections: "To-day, when the Church realizes that it is her mission to furnish religion to free peoples, and when she calls the French Catholics to peace and harmony by an acceptance of the Republic, a man who has been a democrat during his entire life finds that all is now accomplished which he announced in our immortal Constituent Assembly of 1879: 'No, deputies,' said the writer of these lines in the session of May 5, 'I do not belong to the world of theology and of faith. I think I belong to the world of philosophy and of reason. Nevertheless, if it happens that I ever return to the world that I have left, I shall not embrace that Protestantism whose iciness freezes my soul, freezes my heart, freezes my conscience—that *Protestant religion which is the eternal enemy of my country, of my race, of their history.* Indubitably I shall return to the beautiful altar which once inspired the grandest sentiments which I have ever experienced during the entire course of my life; I shall once again kneel with both knees before that Most Holy Virgin who calmed my first passions with her tender smile; I shall once more fill my entire being with the perfume of the holy incense, with the strains of the organ, and with the pictures on the stained glass which showed me the golden wings of the angels who were the continual companions of my soul in its infancy. And at the hour of my death, deputies, I shall ask for a refuge in the arms of the Cross, in those arms which are stretched to-day over that little spot of earth which is to me the most beloved and most venerable on earth—the grave of my mother (1). . . . I must tell you, deputies,

(1) Here Castelar notes that the *Diario de Sesiones*, from which he quotes the report of his speech, observed that this passage was received by the entire Cortes with frenzied applause, so true is it that every Spaniard must be a Catholic, at least in heart. And he adds: "I note this applause, not from any puerile vanity as an orator, but because I wish to show that when I thus expressed my sentiments in regard to the Catholic religion, I struck the key-note which dominated the hearts of us democrats (of Spain), as they yearned for a reconciliation between the spirit of modern progress and their religious belief, the true source of spiritual life." Castelar was a Freemason during the whole of his political life; his death (May, 1899) was sudden; but we may well hope that at that dread moment an Act of Contrition was made by the grand genius who dared to express such sentiments as those in the text in the face of a Cortes (republican) which was nearly entirely Masonic. From the day on which Castelar stigmatized the Protestant system as "the enemy of his country and his race," and declared that he hoped to die at the feet of Mary, and "in the arms of the Cross," throughout the world the Protestant, Masonic, and Judæo-Masonic

that I felt myself impelled to return to the religion of my ancestors—a religion which I have never totally abandoned, no, never!—at the very moment when, by the providence of God, Leo XIII was raised to the pontifical throne' (1). . . . The following words, taken from a discourse which was pronounced on Oct. 2, 1880, are so applicable to the present situation, that it seems impossible that twelve years have passed since they were spoken: 'Everything leads us to suppose that the Papacy, in the person of the venerable Leo XIII., tends toward a reconciliation. Well, let us also seek for reconciliation. . . . I understand how a certain Ghibelline emperor can flatter the persistent Germanic aspirations by flaunting the pictures of Arminius and Luther in the face of Rome; but I cannot understand a similar conduct on the part of a French Republic. The sentiments now triumphant in the religious dissensions of France terrify me, because of their Jacobin character; and the Jacobin character terrifies me because another Robespierre must be inevitably the predecessor of another Napoleon. If our respect for liberty prevents our taxing interest, profit, and exchange, that same respect for liberty should prevent our imposing a tax on prayer, piety, and repentance.' I quote these olden expressions of mine in order to show the true enthusiasm and tenacity with which we desired a policy such as Leo XIII. has formulated; and in order to show our hope that the same policy will be continued in a wise successor of this Pontiff, and then be transmitted to the coming century, so that there may ensue a better condition of religious affairs than this century has

press discerned in the former idol a man of no admirable qualities whatever. Of course the *volte-face* was to be expected on the part of such gentry; but we were not prepared to read in a periodical edited by a self-avowed Catholic, a similar judgment on the repentant Freemason. In the *Cosmopolitan* for Aug., 1899, in the columns devoted to "Men and Events" which are presumably editorial, the death of the great republican received this notice: "The man who died was a pessimist, a truckler to power, a considerer of his own comfort and success. The noble manhood which had been given up to the defense of republicanism and the rights of the people died ten years before the physical Castelar expired. High ideals, noble aspirations, willingness to sacrifice life for his countrymen, had long since disappeared."

(1) Here Castelar notes how, when he was Chief of the Executive in the short-lived Spanish Republic, he tried to procure harmony with the authorities of the Church; and he recalls with satisfaction that this conduct entailed for him the loss of the presidency of the State. "And I reveal no State secret," he added, "when I declare that I gained the enmity of the French republicans on account of my severe and constant condemnation of their persecution of the clergy and of all religious ideas."

been able to produce. Human thought will never realize all the moral felicity, all the spiritual light, all the practical utility, which will accrue to the nations of Latin race from the blessing given by a Roman Pontiff who honors liberty and democracy." Such was the judgment emitted by Castelar on the pontificate of Leo XIII. When Canovas del Castillo was asked by Boyer d'Agen to commit his impressions on the subject to paper, he wrote: "If some good Catholic were to undertake to imagine a Pope who would conform to the type desired by him, and who would also be capable of fulfilling the obligations which these difficult times impose on the Supreme Pontificate, could that Catholic evoke a fitter candidate than the one whom Providence has given to the Church in the august person of Leo XIII.?" We have seen already the estimate formed by that eminent coryphæe of the Italian Revolution, Rattazzi, Thiers' "most clear-sighted statesman in the world," concerning the personality of our Pontiff. Let us now hearken to a petty peroration by Crispi. On Feb. 26, 1892, this luminary of the Lodges wrote: "Until 1887, I had supposed that Leo XIII. would be reconciled with Italy. Regarding him as a superior man, I could hope that he would govern the Church with independence of spirit, pretending no longer to any civil power, and submitting to the laws of the State, in accordance with the commands of the Divine Redeemer. . . . But I became more and more convinced that the Jesuits, on whom Leo XIII. had conferred new privileges, are sufficiently strong to acquire domination over the grandest intelligences. Then I remembered a saying of an eminent statesman whom I had met in Berlin, fifteen years before. The remark was to the effect that when a man dons the tiara, be he Liberal or Reactionist, he is soon conquered by the *Curia Romana*; and if he does not yield, he will probably be conquered materially—in his person." In a note to this sage communication, Crispi gives to the ecclesiastical world the startling information that "during the first years of his pontificate, Leo XIII. presented himself as a Thomist, but thereafter he was a Jesuit—a real contradiction, and undergone simply because of his yearning for temporal power." Another

famous *Italianissimo*, Giovanni Bovio, relieves himself of his bile with this emission: "In our day a wise Pope is no more possible than a holy one would be. A timidly enterprising or a skeptically resigned-to-everything Pope might be possible; and at the very most, we might have an able Pope. Leo XIII., whose wounds are still fresh, is not resigned, and he is not sufficiently enterprising; for Italy and all Europe have entered on a new order of things, and they look upon the bawlings of the Pope as upon the squallings of a baby. Leo is astute, for the atmosphere of the Vatican, during the last six centuries, would corrupt even a St. Celestine; but can it be said that Leo is truly able? . . . What has he done? He has called to his side the worst of counsellors—the Jesuits; and exalting those whom the best Popes scarcely tolerated, he has shown that he does not know that in our day it is a waste of time to follow the policy of the Jesuits. But if we consider the advanced age of Leo, we must believe that he will never succeed in escaping from the influence of 'the black Pope'; and therefore his pontificate will leave no traces. He will leave behind him too many Encyclicals, and not one monument."

We have just heard the judgments of two classes of Liberals on Pope Leo XIII.; and certainly they differ vastly from each other, as might be expected when one class is at least honest, and the other is palpably mendacious, slimy in its hypocrisy, and beastly in its ferocity. Many large volumes would not contain all the eulogies of Leo XIII. as priest, Pontiff, and statesman, which have been pronounced during the last few years by Catholic publicists of renown; nearly all regard him as the grandest figure offered to the admiration of humanity in the latter half of the nineteenth century. It were a gracious task to endow our work with greater value by recording in it some of these tributes to a glorious pontificate; but as we have already exceeded the limit of length necessarily determined for these dissertations, we shall now adduce the judgment emitted by one of the many prominent prelates who have grasped the significance of both the Leonine personality and the Leonine pontificate—Cardinal Satolli. Undoubtedly, Cardinal Satolli is personally

devoted to Leo XIII., probably more tenderly devoted to him than any other member of the Sacred College ; but not for that reason should his testimony be charily received, for, as Justin McCarthy says when commenting on the words that we are about to quote, "we cannot take account of any great statesman's life and public career, unless we pay some attention to the opinions of his devotees. It must reckon for something that a man was able so to impress his devotees." While Cardinal Satolli was still apostolic-delegate in the United States of America, he thus summarized the purpose and results of our Pontiff's reign: "It would seem as if from the time when Leo XIII. succeeded Pius IX., he had formed a grand plan, in which he took cognizance of all the needs of humanity, and determined on the provisions he would make for those needs during the whole course of his Pontificate. We can best distinguish this design of the Pope in three particular directions. Firstly, in the Holy Father's ardent zeal for the development of studies. Secondly, in the continued interest which he has shown in social science. And thirdly, in his untiring efforts to bring peace into the Christian countries by the spread of civilization, the teaching of religion, and the promotion of concord between Church and State. With regard to studies, Pope Leo has already reared a monument of imperishable fame by the successive acts of his Pontificate. Early in his reign he turned his attention to the encouragement of the study of classical literature, of philosophy and the natural sciences, of theology and the kindred branches of sacred sciences, such as Biblical knowledge and ecclesiastical history, and of judicial sciences, especially of Roman Law and Comparative Civil Law. To accomplish his aim he founded new chairs and new institutions in Rome for these various departments of literary and encyclopædic knowledge, and called to his assistance some of the most eminent and learned professors. With regard to sociology, it is another of the Holy Father's glories that at this latter end of the nineteenth century, his Encyclicals are regarded as so many admirable parts of a grand doctrinal system, comprehensive and universal, embracing all the social sciences, beginning with the fundamental

theorems of Natural Law, and going on to the consideration of the political constitution of States, and of every economic question. The whole world knows how well the Pope's Encyclicals have carried out his plan, and how, for this reason, they have their own peculiar character, by which they are distinguished from the pontifical utterances of other Popes, even those of his immediate predecessor, Pius IX. Turning again to his policy of pacification, the ecclesiastical history of his pontificate, the civil history of Europe, the universal history of the human race, will in the future necessarily accord pages of the highest praise to Leo XIII. Germany, Belgium, France, and Spain profess their boundless gratitude for the peace-giving interventions of Leo XIII. in many grave and critical emergencies, and for acts which have been of the greatest moment to those nations. Asia also and Africa will be found joining in the chorus and lauding Leo, who has so often and so resolutely labored to re-awaken those old and fossilized portions of the earth to a new life of Christian civilization. Nor will America, throughout its length and breadth, withhold its tribute of loyal and generous esteem, veneration, and gratitude to Pope Leo for those acts of his pontificate which have at various times been promulgated, and by which he has shown his confidence and hope in the grand future of this mighty nation."

Much has been written about the personal appearance and manners of Leo XIII. ; and as in the case of Pius IX., whose external and mental characteristics were so different, no man who has described them has been satisfied with the picture that he produced. Undoubtedly there is much in the atmosphere of the Vatican, in the religious and historical associations surrounding the sublimest personage on earth—be his personality what it may—that renders human language comparatively weak, when it essays a verbal narrative of the emotions experienced in an audience with a Roman Pontiff, or even during one of the sublime functions at which the Pontiff officiates, or is simply present. But laying aside all that may be derived from the poetical or from the historical, there is no doubt that the presence of Pius IX. evoked feelings of positive filial affection for him,

as well as sentiments of personal veneration, in all who conversed with him during one blessed quarter of an hour. That something akin to this feeling, as well as sentiments of unbounded admiration of his intellect, was consequent on anything like a personal relation with Leo XIII., is certain. Theobald Chartran, the eminent French artist who painted the best portrait of our Pontiff that exists, the portrait concerning the accuracy of which His Holiness wrote a very neat and complimentary distich (1), thus recorded the impressions produced in his mind by the many successive sittings, to which the only half-willing Pontiff submitted: "When I was first received in private audience by Leo XIII., a few days after his elevation to the pontifical throne, I was a pensioner of the Academy of France, and therefore very young, and quite prone to grand enthusiasms. And nevertheless, when I found myself, last summer (1891), again in the presence of this grand figure, after an interval of thirteen years, my emotions were far more agitating than they had been on the previous occasion. Since 1878, the personality of the great Pontiff has swayed the world so powerfully, although genially, that I may defy his adversaries—alas! too many—to refuse homage to his vast intelligence. But let us speak, at first, of the physical appearance of Leo XIII. His height, the supreme distinction of his entire person, his countenance at once energetic and mild, his spiritual and delicately-drawn lips, his hands so thoroughly aristocratic, his deep but melodious voice, and above all, those eyes so full of youth, life, and will; in fine, a very unique combination makes the wonderful Pontiff the most completely interesting model that an artist could desire. You will easily understand how I was moved in the presence of this venerable man whom I regard as the most ideal personage of his century, when to my description you add what others can portray with better effect—the immense influence exercised by Leo XIII. over the men of his day, and especially over those who approach him. . . . The intense admiration which I had already felt was

(1) "*Effigiem subjectam oculis, quis dicere falsam
Audeat? Huic similem vix jam pinxisset Apelles.*"

changed, now that I was admitted to an intimacy with His Holiness, to veritable worship; I was captured, as to eyes, and as to heart. To the joy of being able to study this entrancing physiognomy at my ease, was now added the still greater joy of hearing, during long hours at a time, the Pontiff's warm and vibrating tones—the joy of listening to some of his innermost thoughts, and to some of the grand projects conceived in that powerful brain. I would like to say much more, and I could do so; but I fear that I might not express my feelings well, and that I might say too much" (1). The picture drawn by Justin McCarthy is even more interesting than that presented by the French artist; for the Irish writer is not only a sincere Catholic layman like Chartran, but he is also more of the man of the world: "Pope Leo XIII. is a man of a singularly graceful and imposing presence. He is generally described as very tall, but his slender form gives him the appearance of being much taller than he really is. He is a man not much above the middle height, but very slight and stately. His face is as bloodless as that of a marble statue. He dresses in white, and the white of his robes is only of a different tone from the pallor of his face. Many a visitor to Rome has been reminded, when seeing him, of the late Cardinal Manning, whom we all knew, and whom everybody who really knew, respected, revered, and loved. Even now, despite his advanced years, the Pope moves with a quick and easy tread, which has no suggestion of creeping old age about it. His feet glide easily along the floor, and lift easily from the floor. He enters readily and simply into conversation, and has the native-born sympathy which enables him to come at once into a cordial and thorough understanding with his visitors. It can hardly be necessary to say that he is brought into constant communication with men and women from all parts of the world; and I have never heard of any one who did not go away impressed with his geniality and his graciousness. Among the many commanding figures in the Europe of our days, his is one of the most commanding. I have seen a good many great

(1) Letter to Boyer d'Agen, April 11, 1892.

men in my time. I have been acquainted with Gladstone, and I have talked with Bismarck, and with Cardinal Newman; and I can recall to memory the presence of the Emperor Nicholas of Russia, and I knew Charles Sumner, the great American orator and abolitionist, and I have often seen and heard M. Berryer, and the late Prince Consort. But no picture has impressed me more than that of Pope Leo XIII. I remember well a conversation I had with the late Cardinal Manning, many years ago, and before I had the privilege of being able to call him my friend, when he looked back upon the early days of England, and talked in his sweet, regretful, and dreamy way of the time 'when saints yet trod the soil of England.' I do not expect any English Protestant to accept the views of Cardinal Manning, but an English Protestant may yet feel touched to reverence even by views which he does not accept as his own. I always think of Leo XIII. as one of those figures which must have been more often seen in the days when saints walked the earth—as, indeed, some saints do walk the earth even now."

CHAPTER VII.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC.

We have already shown that the Third French Republic will be described by future historians as having merited a prominent mention among the more virulent of the innumerable persecutors of the Church. Now we shall devote some space to the manner in which Leo XIII. endeavored to solve the politico-religious questions which necessarily agitated the Catholics of France, as they found themselves confronted by their naturally royalist predilections, and at the same time by an evident necessity of procuring peace for the French Church. Commenting on the position assumed by our Pontiff on the social question in general, and on the political question in France, an eminent writer whom Catholics do not claim as their own, Melchior de Vogué, thus describes

what he would regard as adventurous daring on the part of a Chief Pastor of the Roman Church: "Think of the amount of decision that he must have possessed. Think of the crushing pressure which his habitual *clientèle* must have exerted, in order to make him continue to act what seemed to be the necessary *rôle* of a Head of the Church—the part of a chaplain of a cemetery, appointed to the pious guardianship of political tombs in the shadow of the sanctuary. When he was eighty years of age, Leo XIII. issued forth from that cemetery; he threw himself into the world of the living, in order to combat adversaries who thought that their ownership of the world could not be challenged. He had appreciated the words of his Master: 'Let the dead bury their dead!'. . . Nothing will cause him to hesitate. The manifestations of his idea succeed each other with a progressive increase of vigor, and with a lucidity which, considering his great age, confound us. In his Encyclical on the condition of the working-classes, of course, he has not solved the social problem—who will solve it?—but he has explained it more precisely than it has ever been explained, and he has frankly espoused the cause of the weak. And in the same spirit, in his Encyclical to the Catholics of France, he approached the political problems with as much practical moderation as doctrinal hardihood" (1). Having made all due allowances for certain absurdities so apodictically enunciated by M. de Vogüé, we may say that his picture of Leo XIII., as the Pontiff advised the Catholics of France to "rally" around the flag of the Republic, was that which presented itself to the most judicious minds, not only of France, but of the entire Catholic world. The sole object of Leo XIII., when he counselled the French Catholics to accept the Republic, was to secure the true interests of religion; but his endeavors were more or less opposed by two very different classes of Catholics. In the first place, there were still in France many royalists of that stamp which the reader has probably regarded as peculiar to the old families of the Faubourg Saint-Germain; and these traditional servants of the monarchy of Clovis and St. Louis,

(1) Cited by T'Serclaes, *loc. cit.*, Vol. II., p. 310.

whose religion and whose royalism seemed to be the same thing, or at least inseparably united, could not for a moment conceive the possibility of an unchristian French monarchy, or of any religious condition of affairs which would not be firmly based on royalty. To these noble relics of an age long vanished, the Pontiff said: "Preserve your admirable fidelity to the legitimate monarchy, if you will; but do not impede the paramount interests of religion by a political attitude which I believe to be destructive of those interests." Then there was another class of Catholics, whose acquaintance we made when we treated of Gallicanism, and of the relations between Louis XIV. and the Holy See—politicians who were almost as un-Catholic as the Febronians of Germany; that is, men who were impregnated with Regalism and with a Liberalism of their own manufacture; men who willingly relegated religion to a rank inferior to that in which they placed the government of their preference. To these gentry Leo XIII. said: "Remember that religion can be the obsequious servant of no human being or institution. Feign no longer to speak in her noble name. Assume not to defend her with weapons which disgrace her, only to exalt yourselves." Of course there was a third and less prominent sort of Catholics, composed of persons whose practice, if not whose theories, was a mixture of those of the other classes. Some time before our Pontiff essayed to unite these classes into a strong party for the defence of religion, the Count de Mun, then deputy for Morbihan, took the first step in that direction when he thus defined the duties of his Catholic compatriots in the circumstances of the day: "We must defend the indubitable rights of the Church, and her necessary liberties. . . we must cast into utter oblivion the wretched men who have outraged all our religious sentiments, and who have made a war on God the object of their policy. . . . No other ground, at least in my mind, is so appropriate for the union of all good citizens; no other ground offers, either a more just cause, or more legitimate weapons, or a better chance of success." And then he summoned all Catholics to "raise the banner of the Cross" (1). The impressions pro-

(1) Letter to Admiral Giquel des Touches, Sept. 6, 1885.

duced by this initiative were thus indicated by *L'Univers* : "The openly religious journals have saluted the letter with joy ; the hostile ones have replied with violent attacks ; certain others have organized a conspiracy of silence " (1). The *Osservatore Romano*, then a semi-official organ of the Pontiff, applauded "the courageous endeavor to procure the salvation of France by making religion the basis of the labor which will be needed in order to raise the country from the degradation to which the Revolution has reduced it." After the elections of Oct. 5, in which the Catholics gained many seats in the Legislature, Count de Mun made another appeal to his co-religionists, inviting them "to march in the advance-guard with renewed energy and unity. The Catholic party will thus be formed on the field of battle, and on the day after the fight we shall be able to organize it, and make of it a rampart for social order " (2). This hint that the Catholic party might soon be an independent organization, and not a mere auxiliary of the Conservative forces, caused several of the royalist leaders to oppose the Count de Mun as endangering their cause ; but the accessions to his ranks more than counterbalanced the defections. However, the political disunion among the Catholics was increased. The Count de Mun had proclaimed that his party would agitate for freedom of worship and of Catholic teaching ; and that its social programme would insist on a revision of the testamentary laws, upon a legal amelioration of the lot of the workingman, and on a revival of the olden corporations or mediæval trades-unions. "In order to carry out this programme," said the count, "we must form a compact and powerful party, which will have its authorized representatives in Parliament." Out of 77 important Catholic and Conservative journals, 35, with *L'Univers* and *La Croix* at their head, favored the Count de Mun ; but 42, headed by *Le Monde*, opposed the formation of a distinct Catholic party. Most of the French bishops preserved silence in the matter ; but several, among whom the most loud-spoken were Freppel of Angers, and Thibaudier of Soissons, reproved the new leader

(1) Oct. 3, 1885.

(2) Letter to the *Univers*, Oct. 11, 1885.

as though he desired "to fasten the cause of the Church to that of an earthly monarchy"—a thing which the count combatted with every force of his soul, and which Freppel and his friends, albeit quite unconsciously, were certainly promoting. Great was the surprise of both factions of the Catholic party, when, on Nov. 9, little more than a month after his announcement of his great ambition, Count de Mun sent to the press a declaration that "in order not to cause a division among the Catholics, he renounced the project of the organization which he had meditated." It was generally understood, both in Rome and in France, that the sole reason for this action was an expression of a wish, on the part of Leo XIII., that for the moment the controversy among the Catholics should cease. The Pontiff himself was considering the details of a project for political unity among all the honest men of France; and in the meantime, the good cause could only be injured by acrimonious discussions, such as too many editors and pamphleteers were fomenting. The plan which Leo XIII. was excogitating differed very notably from that of Count de Mun. In the first place, Count de Mun always avowed himself an ardent royalist; and although he desired that the Catholic party should be independent, he intended that it should be an ally of the Conservative and dynastic forces. Leo XIII., on the contrary, was to ask all honest Frenchmen to unite, without any royalist preoccupations, in an acceptance of the constituted Third Republic. Secondly, Count de Mun considered in his programme many social questions, which, however minutely and exhaustively the Pontiff may have treated them elsewhere, he did not touch in any of his appeals to the French on the matter of their political duties. The opposition experienced by Count de Mun showed Leo XIII. that the valiant successor of Montalembert had undertaken a task which was above the forces of any layman; it remained to be seen whether the Supreme Pastor could conquer the obstacles which impeded the great design. The first clear indication of the wishes of Leo XIII. in this matter was furnished by the famous toast pronounced by Cardinal Lavignerie at a banquet given to the officers of the French fleet then in the

harbor of Algiers, on Nov. 12, 1890. This toast, followed by the *Marseillaise*, played by the White Fathers, whom the cardinal had founded for the extirpation of African slavery, produced consternation in the ranks of the royalists. We subjoin some of the salient passages of this discourse: "In the presence of that past which still bleeds, and of the future which ever threatens, our great need is unity; and allow me to tell you that unity is the sincere wish of the Church, and of all her pastors in every grade of the hierarchy. Undoubtedly the Church does not ask us to renounce either the souvenirs of a glorious past, or those sentiments of fidelity and of gratitude which honor all men. But when the will of a people is clearly affirmed; when in the form of a government there is nothing—as Leo XIII. has recently proclaimed—which is opposed to the principles which alone can give life to Christian and civilized nations; when, in order to save one's country from the abyss which yawns before her, it is necessary to adhere conscientiously to her form of government; then the moment has arrived for the sacrifice of all that honor permits one to sacrifice. . . . It would be folly to hope to support the columns of an edifice, without entering into the edifice itself, were it only to prevent the would-be destroyers from completing their work of madness." Two days after he had fired his bombshell, the cardinal sent to each one of his clergy a copy of his speech; and in the accompanying letter, he alluded to certain instructions of Leo XIII. concerning the participation of Catholics in public affairs, and drew this conclusion: "It is the duty of Catholics, and conducive to their honor, not to allow the present situation of the Church in France to be prolonged; and for the fulfilment of that duty there is but one practical means, the course advised by the Sovereign Pontiff—to take part resolutely in public affairs, not as adversaries of the established government, but, on the contrary, as claimants of all the rights of citizenship in the republic which governs us. This adhesion ought to be a work of resignation, of reason, and for us Catholics, after the formal instructions which I have cited, a work of conscience." The storm excited by these words of Cardinal Lavigerie, a prelate so

universally admired and revered, impelled several French bishops to write to the Holy See, in the hope of discovering whether or not His Eminence had voiced the sentiments of the Holy Father; and when Cardinal Rampolla had sent an apposite letter to the bishop of Saint-Flour, His Eminence of Algiers forwarded to each of his clergy a circular, in which we read the following recommendations: "The Holy Father has officially undertaken the work already begun; he has entered upon it in the letter from His Eminence, Cardinal Rampolla, which I have sent to you, and in which you must have perceived three principal points, on which I myself have reflected on several occasions. The first is the reiterated affirmation that the Church is hostile to no particular form of government. The second is the advice to Catholics, considered as such, to separate their political cause and political actions from those of the old parties. The third is the advice given to Catholics to unite closely on the ground of their religious interests, simply for the vigorous defence of those interests." Shortly after the issuance of this circular, Lavigerie received from the Pope a Brief, dated Feb. 9, 1892; and it so formally approved of the cardinal's course, that His Eminence deemed it proper to communicate it also to his clergy. The Pontiff had assured the cardinal that all that His Eminence had done in the premises had corresponded perfectly with the needs of the time, and with the tokens of his devotion to the Apostolic See (1). Among the adhesions to the policy enunciated by Lavigerie, that of Mgr. Isoard is noteworthy as containing a protest against the assumption of the Radicals that Radicalism and the French Republic must necessarily be synonymous terms. "You are not the Republic," apostrophized the bishop of Annecy; "you are not France. You are not masters, and we are not subjects. We ask nothing of you; we ask not to communicate with you; we have no need of you. The constitution of every republican State gives to everyone of its citizens the right of place on its soil; and we take our place. If we did not take that place long ago,

(1) "*Studia et officia tua . . . optime congruebant rationi temporis, expectationi nostræ, et aliis quæ jam elideras testimoniis de egregia tua erga nos voluntate.*"

it was because many Conservatives and many Catholics deemed it better to attempt the impossible task of changing the form of government." Very many of the French bishops, however, refused to follow the initiative of His Eminence of Algiers; and the bishop of Bayeux, in a pastoral to his people, thus described the variations in episcopal opinion: "These differences turn on no point of doctrine, but merely on the manner of regarding a particular political situation. All the bishops perceive the peril now menacing France; all denounce the sect which persecutes Christianity; all proclaim that the present question is more important than any merely political question. In fact, the question is: shall France remain Christian? All the bishops reject the idea that the Church is necessarily attached to any one form of government, and that she naturally anathematizes all other forms. All the bishops agree concerning the strict obligation of all Catholics to unite for the defence of their religion; but here, and here alone, there is a diversity of opinion, some of the bishops holding that without abjuring their past, and without abandoning their hopes, the Catholics may unite for the defence of religion under the direction of the bishops, subordinating their particular sympathies to the superior interests of the defence incumbent on them. Others, however, believe that these superior interests require a loyal adhesion to the present government. . . . As for myself, I think that the Church would compromise her ministry, were she to identify herself with either a monarchical or a republican policy." While the bishops and the leaders of the Catholicity were debating, they should have remembered the adage, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*. The Brethren of the Three Points plainly manifested their fear lest the Catholics should shake off their political lethargy, and become the determining factor in the government of the French State; for nothing is more certain than the imminent ruin of Masonic domination in that State, whenever the Catholics of France furnish a united parliamentary phalanx for the defence of civil and religious liberty. In a discourse at Vic de Bigorre, delivered on April 20, 1891, Jules Ferry said: "The evolution of the Catholic party cannot be regarded with disdain; if that evolution is

well managed, and if there is sufficient intelligence to follow it out, it may become a very redoubtable engine of war." In the Masonic "convent" of 1891, M. Thulié, President of the Council in the Grand Orient of France, perorated in this fashion: "It is certain that Clericalism is trying to plant its standard in our camp, in order to more easily throttle the Republic; but, just as we did in 1877 and 1889, we Freemasons will rise in a body, crying: 'We are here, and you shall go no further!' Brethren, I drink to the Assembly which has so well replied to the hypocritical attempts of the Clericals to invade our Republic." On the same occasion, Brother de Serres reminded the adepts of the words of the cold-blooded Brisson: "Our worst enemies are not the most Clerical of the journals, but rather such journals as *Le Temps* and the *Journal des Débats*, who have masked as republicans for a long time." Masonry, therefore, feared a coalition of the honest men of France; but, nevertheless, no less a personage than the Count d'Haussonville, head of the "royalist group," emitted at Nimes, on Feb. 8, 1891, the following declaration: "Let us not be afraid, gentlemen, to use exact language. France desires a king; a king alone can peacefully restore France to her proper place in Europe. . . . It is to this complement of her destiny, or rather to this return of her prosperity, that France aspires; and it is because she has a confused idea that the Republic will never give this blessing to her, that she is now a prey to miserable prognostications." And on July 19, the same Catholic champion insisted that a "determined resistance" should be opposed in the electoral field to all the Catholic *republican* candidates, although, of course, the simple Catholic candidates should be sustained. In this emergency, the semi-official *Osservatore Romano* took occasion, while addressing M. de Cassagnac, the leader of the Catholic imperialists, to also rebuke the school of Count d'Haussonville: "M. de Cassagnac should remember that sincere defenders of religion ought not mix religious interests with those of their party; they should not make use of religion in order to oppose systematically the existing government. True Catholics know that in matters of this kind they owe complete sub-

mission to the Sovereign Pontiff and his representatives, especially in regard to the relations between the Church and the State—relations which, in France, are regulated by the Concordat. We trust that M. de Cassagnac will reflect on the fatal consequences of his published theories." Such advice might naturally have produced unimportant results ; but greater promise of French Catholic harmony was given when the five cardinals of France, on Jan. 16, 1892, after a vivid arraignment of the Third Republic at the bar of history and of common justice (1), counselled the French Catholics "to terminate their political dissensions, and planting themselves squarely on constitutional ground, to look especially to the defence of their threatened faith. . . to accept frankly and loyally the political institutions them in vigor, while resisting, at the same time, every usurpation of the secular over the spiritual power . . . to be faithful to their electoral duties, the fulfilment of which by all honest men would secure a national representation which would legislate for the reforms so necessary for public tranquillity." Sixty-six bishops endorsed this document ; but even then the desired political union of the French Catholics was not effected. The time for a Pontifical intervention had come ; and on Feb. 16, 1892, Leo XIII. issued his Encyclical to the French people, a document which many have regarded as signaling an embrace of Democracy on the part of the Holy See, finally disgusted with the monarchs of the earth, but which others, and probably with

(1) The following were the complaints of the Church against the Third Republic, as enumerated by the five cardinals. The abrogation of the laws allowing public prayers and encouraging the observance of the Lord's Day. The banishment of the crucifix from the schools. The prohibition, given to the soldiers, to attend religious services in a body. The obstacles thrown in the way of the bishops, in the matter of their relations with the Holy See, and in the matter of ecclesiastical nominations. The new jurisprudence which sanctioned the "marriage" of priests. The suppression of the revenues of canons, and of very many vicars ; and the progressive reduction of the entire ecclesiastical budget. The arbitrary fines which deprived the clergy of the greater part of their miserable subsidy. The ruinous civil administration of vacant dioceses. The expulsion of religious from their convents, and in the cases of exempted convents, such exceptional and tyrannous taxes as inevitably entailed the death of the communities. The banishment of religion from the programmes of the Universities. The laicization of the primary schools, including the prohibition of entrance to any priest, and the exclusion of any catechetical instruction. The suppression of all scholarships in the seminaries. The enforced enlistment of seminarians in the army. The abolition of military chaplaincies. The laws favoring divorce. The secularization of all hospitals. Innumerable difficulties thrown in the way of persons who desired to leave money for pious purposes.

better reason, have considered as destined to be a cause of an eventual return to her historic paths, on the part of France. The Encyclical began with an assurance of the continual and pre-eminent love of the Pontiffs for the people of France ; and then the Pope asserted the principle that religion must be the necessary foundation of all social stability. His Holiness then refuted the calumny that attributes to the Pontiffs "a desire to obtain a political domination over the State"—a calumny which was advanced even in the case of the Divine Founder of the Church. The struggle which the Church is now called to sustain, said the Pope, is the same as it ever has been, "and it is scarcely modified, even in form." In order to defend the cause of the Church, "close union is necessary"; and the French were informed that here His Holiness alluded to "the political differences among them concerning their proper attitude toward the existing Republic." Every form of government, insisted the Pope, is good, providing it conduces to the public weal ; but "Catholics, like all other citizens, are at full liberty to prefer one form of government to another, precisely because none of these forms are opposed to the dictates of sound reason, or to the maxims of Christian doctrine." Coming then to the domain of facts, Leo XIII. remarked that while principles never change, "they frequently assume a character of contingency, being affected by the circumstances in which they are applied"; and the French were asked to remember that "whatever may be the form of government in a nation, it cannot be considered as so definitive, that it can never be changed"; the Church alone enjoys the privilege of immutability in her constitution, whereas we know, concerning human organizations, that "time, the great transformer of all things here below, works radical changes in their institutions." When such changes have entailed anarchy or other disorder on a nation, "social necessity compels that nation to provide for itself ; and this necessity justifies the creation and existence of a new government, let its form be what you will." The civil power, considered as such, is from God (*I Rom., XIII, 1*) ; and once established, it is permitted, and may be necessary, to accept it," and this

great duty of respect and of dependence will be obligatory, so long as the public weal demands its fulfilment, because the common good is, after God, the first and last law of society." These principles, continued the Pope, explain the wisdom of the Church, when she maintained relations with each of the many governments which have been established in France during the last hundred years; "this attitude of the Church forms the safest guide for the conduct of French Catholics in their civil relations with the Republic, the existing government of their nation. Let them banish the political dissensions now weakening them; let them use all their energies for the restoration of the moral grandeur of their country!" His Holiness assured the French that he did not forget the anti-Christian character of the Third Republic; but it was precisely because of the iniquity of their present rulers, that "putting an end to all dissensions, all honest men should unite in order to combat, by every legal and proper means, the progressive abuses of their Legislature." The Pontiff terminated his Encyclical with the wish that "his words might dissipate the prejudices of many men of good faith; and that they might facilitate a pacification which would end in a perfect union of all the French Catholics, so that they would defend successfully the cause of '*Christ who loves the French.*'" In his anxiety to seminate his ideas, if possible, at every fireside in France, Leo XIII. took the unprecedented course, on the part of a Roman Pontiff, of allowing himself to be "interviewed for publication" by an editor of the *Petit Journal*, not a Catholic paper, but the one possessing the largest circulation in the world; and by such a proceeding our Pontiff, far from demeaning himself by adopting the chief weapon of the day in order to serve humanity, acted just as St. Gregory VII., Innocent III., or Sixtus V., would have acted, had they lived in our days (1). Leo XIII. thus popularized,

(1) This interview was held shortly before the appearance of the Encyclical, and was published at the time when that document was first read in France. It may be regarded as a kind of commentary by the illustrious author himself. The editor of the *Petit Journal* guaranteed the absolute authenticity of the detailed conversation, both as to substance and as to form. It ran as follows: *Editor*: "We would be grateful, Holy Father, if you would inform us as to whether the continuous efforts of the Holy See for a settlement of our constitutional disputes have any relation with the views of Your Holiness

so to speak, the important Encyclical in places where such documents seldom or never entered. All the French bishops, either explicitly or tacitly, accepted the counsels of Leo XIII. ; and when some of the recalcitrant royalists insisted that if Mgr. Freppel were still alive (he had died in 1891), he would have kept aloft the standard of the Lilies in defiance of Rome, Mgr. Sauve, one of the best theologians in France, an ardent legitimist, and an intimate friend of the late bishop of Angers, wrote a defence of the prelate, which he terminated with these words : "I have no doubt whatever that if the late Monseigneur of Angers were with us to-day, he would be in line with all the bishops of France, and that,

in regard to the external affairs of our country ; whether, that is, Your Holiness wishes to assist in the work of all our patriots, the strengthening of France." *Pope* : "My desire, like the wish of the Church, is for the happiness of France. France is a nation with a vivid spirit and a generous character. If sometimes she does not follow the right road, the one most conducive to her true interests, she quickly repairs her error, when she learns the truth. I greatly desire, and I do so consistently, in spite of all opposition, that dissensions disappear in France, and that there may be among you nothing which will foster weakness. I believe that all French citizens should unite, although each may preserve his private preferences ; but in the domain of action, there should be an eye only for the government which France has given to herself. The republican form of government is as legitimate as any other. I lately received the president of the Committee on Organization of the World's Fair in Chicago, who requested the co-operation of the Holy See in that great American enterprise. Now, the United States of North America are a republic, and in spite of the inconveniences inseparable from unlimited liberty, they grow greater every day, and the Catholic Church has developed there, without any contests with the State. There the Church and the State agree well, just as they should agree everywhere, neither encroaching on the rights of the other. There liberty is the foundation of the relations between the civil power and the religious conscience. Everywhere the Church asks for liberty, before anything else. Let my authoritative voice be correctly understood, so that my objects and my attitude may not be travestied. Whatever the Church enjoys in the United States, she ought to enjoy, with much more reason, in republican France. I talk in this same fashion to all Frenchmen who come to see me ; I want them all to know my real sentiments. I regret that certain highly-placed personages have not yet dared to publish, as they ought to have done, the efforts which I have made for the peace and prosperity of your noble nation, the nation ever regarded by me as the Eldest Daughter of the Church. I shall persist in this course, and I shall encourage all who enter on it. It is in order to facilitate this task that the Church should attend to her veritable mission, the moralizing of souls, the indoctrinating of them with a spirit of sacrifice and of devotedness. At the same time, she interests herself in the condition of the weak ; my declaration concerning the rights of the working classes ought to render more easy the internal pacification of France, by reducing to a small minority the number of those who have no other pre-occupation than to trouble minds, and to impede the union of their countrymen—a union without which France cannot accomplish her grand destinies. It is by means of the solid internal constitution which I desire for France, that in spite of her enemies, she will fully regain her olden pre-eminence. I am pleased to learn that France earnestly desires peace in spite of her enormous military resources, and of the grand courage of her sons. If she continues unflinchingly to cherish this wisdom and this patience ; if she knows how to banish the dissensions which arrest her development and paralyze her influence ; if she decides to abandon entirely the works of chicanery and of persecution ; she will soon re-occupy the glorious place in the world which once was her own."

docile to the voice of Leo XIII., he would exclaim: 'Rome has spoken; the cause is finished.' And I dare to assert that he would use his great influence with the Count of Paris and his partisans to determine them to follow the counsels of the Holy Father." In the commentary on the Encyclical which Mgr. Sauve published at this time, he indicated, for the benefit of all the ultra-royalists who misinterpreted the real significance of our Pontiff's advice, what was to be his own course, as an unflinching legitimist and an uncompromising Catholic. Having promised that he would not admit the intrinsic legitimacy of the Third Republic, he pledged himself "to abandon all attempts for a monarchical restoration; to undertake no royalist propaganda; to not only renounce all *illegal* acts detrimental to the existence of the Republic, but to abstain, out of religious deference to the desire of the Pope, from even any *legal* enterprises which might procure the substitution of the monarchical for the republican form of government." Such, and perhaps a smaller one, was the sacrifice which Leo XIII. demanded from the French royalists.

CHAPTER VIII.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE HOME RULE MOVEMENT IN IRELAND.

Although the reader is probably conversant with the general features of the subject, and although he must know that Leo XIII. did not condemn the Land League and the principle of Home Rule, as was asserted by the entire Masonic press, and by all the foes of Irish liberty, we propose to consider briefly the reason for the Pontiff's intervention in the political affairs of Ireland, and the nature of that intervention. Probably the most satisfactory commentary on this intervention is that given by Justin McCarthy in his short but admirable biography of the Pontiff; and for the benefit of those who have not read that work, we subjoin some passages which will illustrate our subject (1). Our

(1) "The condition of Ireland was, indeed, beginning to command the attention of the

purpose is to bring into bolder relief certain features which Mr. McCarthy has left in shadow. The Land League, formed in 1879 for the purpose of procuring a reduction of farm-rents in Ireland, and for a facilitation of an acquirement of freeholds on the part of the tenants, had for its most practical and immediately-resulting feature the fact that when a tenant was unjustly threatened with ejection, he was sustained by all the other members of the League. A very slight acquaintance with Irish history will prevent any sane mind from feeling surprise at the sympathy extended by the immense mass of the Irish clergy, following the initiative of the archbishop of Cashel, to the new patriotic movement. Scarcely a year, however, had elapsed since the foundation of the League, when the violence of a considerable section of the Irish press, an extravagant development of the ever-to-be-remembered system of "Boycotting," and numerous outrages on the part of a mysterious society of "Moonlighters," gave to the Parnellite engine so ultra-revolutionary an aspect,

whole civilized world; and it need hardly be said that the sympathy between the Papacy and the Irish Catholics had been close and constant for generations and for centuries. There were two great agitations going on in Ireland—one political, and one agrarian—but the two working together, and forming between them a complete national movement. The political movement was for Home Rule; the agrarian movement was, roughly speaking, for the abolition of despotic landlordism, and the creation of a peasant proprietary all over Ireland. . . . The Pope did at last intervene—not directly, and not by way of any Papal fulmination; but the Vatican decidedly issued an opinion and a warning to the Irish people on the national movement, the political and the agrarian; and the intervention was received with a chorus of applause from the landlord class, and the Conservatives and the anti-Nationalists of Ireland. The counsellors of the Pope naturally relied a good deal upon the representations and the advice of the English Catholics. Now the English Catholics belong almost always to the higher classes in social life. They belong for the most part to the landlord order, and their sympathies would naturally go with the claims of their own order. Then, again, the English Catholics, as a rule, have no sympathy with the Irish national cause—the cause of Home Rule. I do not mean to say that this is true of all the English Catholics. I know far too well for that. I know that the sympathies of men like Lord Ripon, and Lord Acton, and Lord Ashburnham, and many of the most distinguished of the English Catholic priesthood, are cordially with the principle of national self-government for Ireland. But, as a rule, neither the cause of the political reforms which Ireland claims, nor that of the agrarian reforms which Ireland has so long needed, can be said to have the sympathy of the English Catholics. Now it is in the very nature of things that a good deal of the ideas of the English Catholics must have made a way into the councils of those who advised Pope Leo. For a long time, too, the Archbishopric of Dublin had been in the hands of men like Cardinal Cullen and Cardinal MacCabe—good men, pious men, learned men; but men who shrank in alarm from any agitation that seemed likely to be troublesome, and who were apt to hear the first thunder of approaching revolution in every rising sound of popular agitation. It must be owned that Ireland was passing through something very like a national revolution. . . . No doubt some wild things were said on national platforms, and in the terrible death-struggle between the landlords.

that Pope Leo XIII. deemed it wise to address a warning letter to Archbishop MacCabe of Dublin. This salutary caution, dated Jan. 3, 1881, began with the recognition of the deplorable condition of the great mass of the Irish people, a state of affairs which had endured for centuries, but which, as a rule, the Irish had borne with exemplary patience, sustained by their invincible constancy in the Faith. The Pontiff reminded the archbishop, and through him the Irish nation, that during the long course of its terrible sufferings, his predecessors had never ceased to warn it not to depart from the paths of moderation and justice, even when those sufferings appeared to justify revolution; and he besought the bishops of Ireland to restrain their flocks within the bounds of legality, since it was evident that within those bounds the Irish cause would ultimately conquer, with the least possible additional misery for the people. The Irish bishops communicated and explained the pontifical letter to their diocesans; and in a meeting held at Maynooth, they drew the attention of the people, but especially of the English Govern-

and the tenants some wild deeds were done on both sides. If the tenants had no just claim in what they demanded, then it has to be pointed out that every recent Government, Liberal or Tory, has abetted them since in their unjust demands; for every Government has yielded more and more to their claim, and has proclaimed that each subsequent concession was a concession to the cause of justice and of order. The truth had at last begun to be offletally recognized, which John Stuart Mill preached in vain thirty years before, when he insisted that the Irish land-tenure system was entirely exceptional and apart, *and such as no civilized legislation, except that of England, would tolerate*. . . . There had always been an agrarian agitation in modern Ireland; but up to the formation of the Land League it was crude, unorganized, sporadic, spasmodic—each locality, each group of tenantry, acting for itself, upon its own impulse, and by its own ways. The effort and the purpose of the Land League was to consolidate all the agrarian agitation of Ireland into one system, acting under directions from headquarters. Such a movement, under the guidance of men like those who directed it, might be trusted to be a check on disorder and crime: not a stimulant to disorder and crime. But it is easy to understand that, to observers at a distance, it may have seemed at first—as it did seem indeed to some observers close at hand—the methodising and embattling of all the forces of agrarian revolution. It was in reality a strike of the tenantry against an intolerable system. To the counsellors of the Vatican it seemed, as at one time it seemed to Mr. Gladstone, a rebellion against the most sacred principles of social law. The Vatican intervened, and Mr. Gladstone also intervened. . . . To the advisers of the Pope it undoubtedly appeared that they were only uttering a much needed appeal in favor of law and order, social and moral. To the majority of the Irish Nationalists it seemed that the Vatican had come to the help of Mr. Gladstone and of the English Government in the effort to stamp out a great national and patriotic agitation. At that time Mr. Gladstone had not become fully acquainted with the realities of Ireland's condition and of Ireland's needs. *No one can doubt—no calm observer among Irish Nationalists ever doubt—the absolute good faith and sympathy of the advice which the Vatican gave to Ireland. To the authorities in the Papal Court, nothing that could happen to Ireland seemed so terrible as that Ireland should commit crime.*"

ment (which had drawn great comfort from the document), to that part of the letter which expressly avowed that the Irish grievances were *entirely legitimate*. The prelates insisted, before the world, that the land laws of Ireland created and fostered a continual danger for peace; and they declared that reformative legislation alone would restore order. In their reply to His Holiness, they thanked the Holy See for the letter to His Grace of Dublin, and they declared that they shared the pontifical grief for the few violences which compromised the cause of a people who were clamoring for their rights. But they besought the Holy Father not to give implicit credit to the interested reports of these violences which were circulated by the organs of the oppressor. During the stress of difficulties caused by the "Act of Coercion," introduced in parliament by Gladstone, and tyrannically applied by Forster, the attitude of the Irish clergy was as moderate as the Pontiff could have desired; and His Holiness expressed his satisfaction by enrolling Archbishop MacCabe in the Sacred College on March 27, 1882. But the Land Act of 1881 had proved to be almost entirely nugatory; for in the year which followed its application, there were 17,341 evictions, and consequently a large increase of agrarian outrages. Therefore our Pontiff wrote another letter, under date of Aug. 1, 1882, in which he declared that the condition of the Irish people gave him "more anxiety than consolation," because of the continuous miseries of the island, and because of the consequent and frequent abandonment of many to the dictates of unreasoning passion, "as though it were possible for a hope of public happiness to be found in dishonor and crime." The Irish had a perfect right, said His Holiness, to struggle for their rights; "we cannot suppose that what is granted to all other peoples should be denied to the Irish; but they should remember that the useful is subject to the laws of justice, and that it is shameful to defend even the most just of causes with unjust means." It is not surprising that this pontifical letter was almost barren of results among a people who were then groaning under the goad of the Coercion Act, and who had just seen Parnell and their other chief champions shut up in Kilmainham Jail. Their zeal

in subscribing to the "Parnell Testimonial Fund," designed to defray the expenses of the defence of their leader in his forthcoming trial, did not diminish; nor would the Holy See have wished it to grow less, had the original object not soon included the provision—secret, but no less evident—of a fund wherewith to produce and sustain an open "rebellion." In consequence of this apprehension, the Cardinal-Prefect of the Propaganda addressed a circular, on May 11, 1883, to all the Irish bishops, prohibiting the priests from taking any part in the subscription; but taking care to subjoin: "It is perfectly proper for the Irish to try to better their miserable lot; it is not wrong for them to contribute money for that purpose." It was in this year 1893 that occurred the much-talked-of mission of Mr. Errington to the Vatican—a mission which was not at all "official," but which could well be termed, in diplomatic parlance, "officious," and concerning which a Roman gentleman of reliability, one who was well versed in the secular affairs of the Vatican, did not hesitate to write: "Mr. Errington, a Catholic and an Irishman, proved to be *no honor to this double qualification*. After many endeavors to negotiate in the sole interests of those who wanted the agitation to end without any cessation of Ireland's miseries—men who hoped to deprive the Irish people of that Pontifical sympathy which has always been accorded to the victims of tyranny and injustice, Errington ended by throwing off the mask in an impertinent and mocking letter, published in the *United Ireland* of Aug. 1, 1885" (1). Justin McCarthy thus comments on this Errington mission: "The mission, as it was sometimes called, of Sir George Errington, then Mr. Errington, to Rome, was a ridiculous incident in a serious story. Mr. Errington was then a member of the House of Commons, and of that group of Irish representatives whom Mr. Gladstone, with unintentional humor, once called 'the nominal Home Rulers.' He was a man of position and of education, but he certainly was not a striking political figure. He was more a Liberal than a Nationalist. He was well liked in society, but had made no mark whatever in the House of Commons. Somehow or

(1) CASOLI; *Chronicle of the Life and Pontificate of Leo XIII.*, p. 322. Rome, 1890.

other the late Lord Granville allowed himself to be persuaded for a moment that Mr. Errington had great influence with the Vatican; and that it would be a good thing to make use of that influence in order to secure for the English Government the help of the Pope in the struggle against the Irish national agitation. The facts of the whole story never came fully out, although many attempts in and out of Parliament were made to get the full tale told. Mr. Errington undoubtedly was under the impression that he had a formal authority from Lord Granville. Lord Granville was under the impression that he had nothing of the kind. It was admitted that a letter of recommendation had been conceded to Mr. Errington, but it was denied that the letter imposed on him, or entrusted to him, any manner of diplomatic authority or function. There was a great deal of question and answer, statement and counter-statement, denial and qualification, until at last the English public began to get tired of it. Finally, a letter of Mr. Errington's, never intended for publication, found its way somehow into the newspapers, and proved that Mr. Errington himself had not taken his mission very seriously. Then the whole subject soon passed, in England at least, away from the attention of the public. In Ireland, however, the national feeling still remained for a time unsatisfied and excited. There was a good deal of anger among the Nationalists because of the manner in which Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville were supposed to have acted. It was firmly believed by many persons, for a time, that the English Government had insidiously endeavored to bring influence to bear upon the Vatican, in order that the Pope might be prevailed upon to censure the Nationalist movement in Ireland. Assuredly nothing could have been more unwise on the part of any English Government than to make such an attempt; but Pope Leo was the last man in the world likely to allow himself to be drawn into such a piece of diplomatic artifice. Let it be added that Mr. Gladstone was the last man in the world likely to make such an attempt. I am satisfied that on the side of the Vatican, and on the side of the English Government, there was absolute good faith and high purpose. The one mistake made by

the Government was in paying any attention whatever to Mr. Errington, or in allowing him or anybody else to suppose for a moment that he had been entrusted with any diplomatic mission. There is every reason to believe that as the Pope became more closely acquainted with the realities of the Irish struggle, he came to take a more liberal view of the objects which inspired it, and of the men who guided it. The sympathies of the Pope with the Irish Nationalist cause grew and grew as that cause more and more justified itself. Only the other day, the Pope sent his blessing to Mr. Dillon, on the wedding morning of the man who had taken so prominent a part in the political and the agrarian agitation throughout Ireland." Again reminding the reader that we have not proposed to give even a sketch of this momentous period in the history of Ireland, since an abundance of trustworthy sources of information are at his command; and that our sole object is to note the relations of Leo XIII. with the Irish movements of his day; we now touch on his course in reference to the "Plan of Campaign," instituted in 1888 by Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien. This method of warfare on the tyrannous landlords of Ireland, conceived in minds which were at least sincere, seemed at first to be both pacific and invincible. All the farmers in a given estate, rich as well as poor, were to form a kind of "solidarity"; each tenant was to contribute to a common fund, to be held by a chosen commissioner, the sum of money which he could afford; this commissioner was to treat with the landlord or his agent; and if the landlord hearkened to the representations of his farmer-tenants, and agreed to a reduction of rent, such as was demanded, then he would be paid by the representative commissioner. If the landlord refused the compromise, he was to receive no rent; and if he did not capitulate, his sole alternative was the ejection of all his tenants. And where would he find new tenants? While the landlord was considering this conundrum, the ejected tenants would be supported, at least to some extent, by the sums that they had entrusted to their commissioner. Certainly this "Plan of Campaign" was attractive; but nevertheless, the Holy

See could not approve of the universal "Boycottage" which it involved. Notwithstanding this objection, the Pontiff appointed to the see of Dublin, on July 3, 1885, Mgr. Walsh, one of the most pronounced Nationalists in Ireland; and the question of "Boycotting," so far as its morality was concerned, seemed to be in abeyance until 1887. Then the Pontiff appointed Mgr. Persico, a prelate of experience, a Capuchin who had been vicar-apostolic of Agra in India, and afterward bishop of Savannah in the United States of America to make on the spot a severe and minute investigation into the affairs of poor, long-suffering Ireland. According to the slow-and-sure fashion of the Roman *curia*, Persico worked during a year before he submitted his report; and then, on April 13, 1888, there was emitted by the Holy Office a decree which condemned the "Plan of Campaign," as well as the system of "Boycotting," as contrary to Christian morality. We give the condemnatory passage of the decree, as noted in the circular which announced it on April 20: "The following question has been submitted to the Most Eminent Lords Cardinals who, together with me (Cardinal Monaco La Valletta), form the Tribunal for Inquiry into Heretical Depravity: *In the disputes between tenants and landlords in Ireland, is it permissible to make use of the means, commonly termed 'Plan of Campaign' and 'Boycotting'?* After a long and careful consideration, Their Eminences unanimously replied: '*It is not permissible.*' This solution of the question was approved and confirmed by the Holy Father on the 18th of this month." Great indeed was the commotion excited in Ireland by this decree; and the bishops, assembled in Dublin for the purpose of allaying the excitement, could only draw attention to the fact which is elementary in the mind of every Catholic, namely, that the Roman Pontiff is supreme in all definitions on moral questions. At the same time, however, for the consolation of the complaining victims of English tyranny, the bishops asked the people to observe that the Head of their Church had assured them (the bishops) that the decree of the Holy Office "did not pretend to interfere in any manner with the Irish National Movement; that, on the contrary, said decree

was intended to remove every obstacle to the success of that Movement." The Pontiff himself hastened to reassure his faithful children in Ireland by his Encyclical *Sepe nos*, issued on June 24 of the same year. His Holiness told the Irish that they ought not to need an assurance of the love of the Holy See for them; but he deemed it necessary to remind them of their duty of obedience to the pontifical decisions in matters of morality. "Our office," he declared, "will not allow us to permit so many Catholics, whose salvation is entrusted to our care, to follow in a dangerous path which would lead to destruction, rather than to a betterment of their condition. We must consider things as they are; and Ireland should discern in this decree our love for her. Nothing can be so fatal to any cause, be it ever so just, as to be defended by violence and injustice." Catholic to the core, the Irish, almost to a man, obeyed the voice of the Head of the Church; and it required monumental impudence indeed for the assurance emitted by that "Austrian diplomat" whom we shall soon meet in the *Contemporary Review* as the apologist of certain German Catholic friends of the Triple Alliance, to the effect that the Irish refused to accept "the doctrine of the Vatican, based on the principle that the Holy See has the right to interfere in all kinds of political questions." The assertion that the Holy See was or is averse to Home Rule for the Irish people was well refuted by Cardinal Manning when, in his discussion with Gladstone in 1890, he showed how Leo XIII. could have obtained the re-opening of formal diplomatic relations with England, had he been willing to oppose Home Rule for the sister-kingdom—an offer which he spurned with indignation (1). And let us not forget that the system of "Boycotting" and the "Plan of Campaign," the sole features of the Irish Movement which our Pontiff opposed, "were never adopted by the National Organization, and they were rejected by Parnell, the recognized head of the National Party, and by Gladstone" (2). Would the hypercritics of the Leonine policy have wished our Pontiff to be more of a Nationalist than the Nationalists themselves?

(1) See the *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1890, p. 745.

(2) See the *Dublin Freeman's Journal*, May 25, 1888.

CHAPTER IX.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. THE DECISION ON ANGLICAN "ORDERS."

If the student has carefully assimilated what we said concerning Anglican "Orders" in our dissertation on the Protestantization of England, as well as our reflections on the Gunpowder Plot and on the Emancipation of the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, he will be equipped for an appreciation of the short disquisition now awaiting him, without any preamble on our part. Nearly all intelligent persons in Great Britain knew, in 1885, that the Pope of Rome had granted an audience to Lord Halifax, the president of the "English Church Union," and the prominent champion of what a few Anglican Ritualists somnoriferously acclaimed as "Corporate Reunion" with Rome. But great was the astonishment of all good Protestants, when there appeared in the English journals a letter dated at St. Peter's in Rome on April 14, 1895, and accounting for itself in these opening words: "Leo XIII., to the English people who seek the kingdom of Christ in the unity of the faith." The most important of the passages of this document read as follows: "Some time since, in an Apostolic Letter to princes and people, we spoke to the English as well as to the other nations; but we now address the English by a special communication, wishing to testify our sincere affection for their illustrious race. This desire has been nourished by the great yearning of our heart for a people whose glorious deeds in the olden time the Church has always praised. And we have often been affected by conversations with Englishmen who testified to the kindly feeling of the English people toward us personally, and to their anxiety for peace and eternal salvation through unity of faith. God is our witness how keen is our wish that some effort of ours might tend to assist and further the great work of obtaining the reunion of Christendom; and we render thanks to God who has so far prolonged our life,

that we may put forth some efforts in this direction. But since, as is but right, we place our confidence of a happy issue principally in the wonderful power of God's grace, we have, with full consideration, determined to invite all Englishmen who glory in the Christian name to this same work, and we exhort them to lift up their hearts to God with us, to fix their trust in Him, and to seek from Him the help necessary in such a matter, by assiduous diligence in holy prayer." The Pope describes the work done by St. Gregory for England, "those great and glorious events in the annals of the Church, which must surely be remembered with gratitude by the English people." The solicitude of Gregory for England was inherited by all the Pontiffs who succeeded him. Their care for England was soon rewarded, "for in no other case, perhaps, did the faith take root so quickly, or was so keen and intense a love manifested toward the See of Peter. That the English race was, in those days, wholly devoted to this centre of Christian unity, and that, in the course of ages, men of all ranks were bound to it by ties of loyalty, are facts too abundantly and plainly testified by the pages of history to admit of doubt or question. . . . In the storms which devastated Catholicity throughout Europe in the sixteenth century, England also received a grievous wound, for she was unhappily wrenched from communion with the Apostolic See, and thus was bereft of that holy faith in which, for long centuries, she had rejoiced in perfect liberty." The Pope speaks of the prayers offered up for the return of England to the Catholic faith. "We, indeed," he says, "long before being raised to the Supreme Pontificate, were also deeply sensible of the importance of holy prayer offered for this cause, and heartily commended it. For we gladly recall that while we acted as nuncio in Belgium, we became acquainted with an Englishman, Ignatius Spencer, himself a devout disciple of St. Paul of the Cross; he laid before us the project he had already initiated for extending a society for pious people to pray for the return of the English nation to the Church." The Pope tells of the results which followed that effort. "Very many Englishmen were led to follow the divine call, and among

them not a few men of distinguished eminence, and many, who, in doing so, had to make personal and heroic sacrifices. Looking at all this, we do not doubt that the united and humble supplications of so many to God are hastening the time of further manifestations of His merciful designs toward the English people. Our confidence is strengthened by observing the legislative and other measures, which, if they do not perhaps directly, still do indirectly help forward the end we have in view, by ameliorating the condition of the people at large by giving effect to the laws of justice and charity. We have heard with singular joy of the great attention which is being given in England to the solution of the social question, of which we have treated with much care in our Encyclicals, and of the establishment of benefit and similar societies whereby, on a legal basis, the condition of the working-classes is improved. . . . Everyone knows the power and resources of the British nation, and the civilizing influence which, with the spread of liberty, accompanies its commercial prosperity even to the most remote regions. But, worthy and noble in themselves as are all those varied manifestations of activity, our soul is raised to the origin of all power, and the perennial source of all good things. . . . The time cannot be far distant when we must appear to render an account of our stewardship to the Prince of Pastors; and how happy, how blessed should we be if we could bring to Him some fruit, some realization of these our wishes, which He has inspired and sustained. In these days our thoughts turn with love and hope to the English people, observing, as we do, the frequent and manifest works of Divine Grace among them; how the number of those religious and discreet men, who sincerely labor much for reunion with the Catholic Church, is increasing. . . . With loving heart we turn to you all in England, desiring to recall you to this holy unity. We beseech you, as you value your eternal salvation, to offer up humble and continuous prayer to God, who, with gentle power, impels us to the good and the right, and without ceasing to implore light to know the truth in all its fulness, and to embrace the designs of His mercy with single and entire faithfulness. . . . The time

is not far distant when thirteen centuries will have been completed since the English race welcomed those apostolic men sent, as we have said, from this very city of Rome, who, casting aside the pagan deities, dedicated the first fruits of the faith to Christ, our Lord and God. This encourages our hope. It is, indeed, an event worthy to be remembered with public thanksgiving. Would that this occasion might bring to all reflecting minds the memory of the faith then preached to your ancestors—the same which is now preached. . . . We humbly call upon St. Gregory, whom the English have ever rejoiced to greet as the apostle of their race, on St. Augustine, his disciple and his messenger, on St. Peter and St. Paul, those special patrons, and above all, on Mary, the Holy Mother of God, whom Christ Himself on the cross left to be the Mother of mankind, to whom your kingdom was dedicated by your forefathers under that glorious title, ‘The Dowry of Mary.’ All these with full confidence we call upon to be our pleaders before the throne of God, that renewing the glory of ancient days, He may ‘fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost.’” There were few manifestations of displeasure in England, when this letter was read; its thoroughly Christian tone, its utter want of any spirit of aggressiveness, its indication that the writer hoped merely that God would warm the hearts of Englishmen to a desire for reconciliation with the Mother Church, prevented any of those ebullitions which a communication from “the Scarlet Woman” would have produced in the early days of Wiseman’s episcopate (1). The letter produced even a consider-

(1) “This letter,” says Justin McCarthy, “must have done good in England, if merely by showing to even the most anti-papal populations here, that the Pope after all is not anti-Christ, but only a man and a brother. From the days when Pope Pius IX. was denounced from every Protestant platform in Great Britain, and when Cardinal Wiseman, driving in his carriage to deliver a lecture in the Philharmonic Hall in Liverpool, was pelted with stones by a crowd, what a distance we have traversed! Let it be admitted that the improved tone of public feeling on both sides has been brought about in the first instance by the statesmanship, the temper, and the demeanor of Pope Leo himself. Never was there in modern history a time when the mind of Protestant Englishmen was so set against the Papacy, as the time when Pope Leo succeeded to Pope Pius IX. Never since the Reformation was there a time when the public heart of England was filled with a more general kindness and cordiality toward the head of the Roman Church than that which prevails now. The Pope has shown himself a lover of all men, and he has won in return the regard, the confidence, and the affection of all men who, whatever their creed,

able amount of charitable feeling toward the Roman Pontiff, and such a sentiment might eventuate in a more undesirable consummation; therefore it was to be answered by those who sometimes claimed to be able to speak in the name of the Royal Establishment. The incumbent of Canterbury published a "Pastoral," in which he undertook to treat of "a certain friendly advance made from a *foreign Church* to the people of England, without reference or regard to the Church of England." Having introduced the subject of union, as being desired by "almost all the Christian bodies known among us, including the Roman communion," the prelate warns Anglicans of a peril which he discerns "in any haste which would sacrifice part of our trust, and in narrowness which would limit our vision of Christendom." Then we are treated to an observation which would be worthy of a schoolboy: "The Roman Communion in which Western Christendom once found unity has not proved itself capable of retaining its hold on nations which were all its own. At this moment it invites the English people into reunion with itself, in apparent unconsciousness of the position and history of the English Church. *It parades before us modes of worship and rewards of worship the most repugnant to TEUTONIC CHRISTENDOM, and to nations which have become readers of the Bible.*" Then the prelate accurately defines the Anglican position in regard to union with Rome, and he plainly implies what any tyro in Catholic theology could tell Lord Halifax and his fellow-dreamers of "Corporate Reunion," that all conversions from English Protestantism must be individual—that a reunion *en masse* is impossible, since Rome cannot recognize the English Establishment and her American daughter as churches, as organizations possessing a priesthood and the correlatives of a priesthood. If the Holy See would only recognize the incumbent of Canterbury and his companions as Christian bishops, all might be well, says this representative Anglican: "*Recognition might have lent a meaning to the mention of reunion.* But, otherwise, what is called

are open to the claims of reason, of statesmanship, and of common philanthropy. The Pope's appeal to the English people may have greater and deeper results hereafter, but, happen what may, it has done much already to win English sympathy."

reunion would not only be our farewell to all other Christian races, all other churches, but we are to begin by forgetting our own church, by setting aside truth regained through severe sacrifice, cherished as our very life, and believed by us to be the necessary foundation of all union." Probably the general sentiment of the Anglican party, when both the papal letter and its reputed answer had been read, was voiced by the London *Daily Chronicle*, when it said that the gist of the Pontiff's appeal was simply the declaration, "You are not of my flock; God pity you!" But such an appreciation of the intention of Leo XIII. is an injustice to His Holiness. Justin McCarthy grasps the situation when he says: "The truth is, that the Pope expressed in his letter exactly what he wanted to express; his cordial affection for the English people, and his earnest wish that they might be brought back to the old Church. The season must have seemed to him appropriate to the expression of such a wish. Many great and prominent High Churchmen were avowedly looking to some sort of possible reunion between spiritual England and spiritual Rome. Many sermons had been preached from Anglican pulpits, which breathed this spirit in all sincerity. The time seemed fitting to the Pope to utter a pious wish, were it only a wish, to utter also a prayer, that such a reunion might be accomplished on the only terms which to him could make it a genuine reunion. It is hard to see how any impartial critic could say that the tenor of the Pope's letter was only, 'You are not of my flock; God pity you.' It reads to me much more like, 'Be of my flock; God bless you.' The Pope could have accomplished nothing by issuing a sort of command to the English people. He could have accomplished nothing by merely imploring them for their own sakes to become Catholics again. By merely expressing his pious hope, his pious wish, at all events he expected to touch some chord of sympathetic feeling in the mind and heart of English Protestantism, which might bring out the first impulse toward a future reconciliation."

While the English mind, or at least that of such Englishmen as take any interest in religion of any form, was being agitated by the appeal of Leo XIII. for religious unity, it

became known that the Holy See, yielding to the request of many Ritualists, and to the persistency of two French enthusiasts who hoped to thus "smooth over" the way of conversion for many English and American Protestants, had consented to examine again the "question" of the validity of Anglican "Orders." We have already treated this matter exhaustively, from a historical point of view (1); we touched only incidentally on the matter, as viewed from a theological standpoint. In the Apostolic Letter, dated Sept. 13, 1896, in which our Pontiff gives his decision, the subject is treated only with regard to the constant practice of the Church in reference to converted Anglican "bishops" and ministers, and with regard to the Anglican form of "Ordination." Why the Holy See should have contravened its custom of not reconsidering a matter which had been already decided, can be understood only in the supposition that it wished to avail itself of an opportunity to lay before Anglicans the utter futility of their claims to the Apostolic Succession. The accomplishment of this task is the object of the Apostolic Letter, only some portion of which our space will allow us to give: "For some time, and especially in these last years, there has been a controversy as to whether the Sacred Orders conferred according to the Edwardine Ordinal possessed the nature and effect of a Sacrament: those in favor of the absolute validity, or of a doubtful validity, being not only certain Anglican writers, but some few Catholics, chiefly non-English. The consideration of the excellency of the Christian priesthood moved Anglican writers in this matter, desirous as they were that their own people should not lack the twofold power over the Body of Christ. Catholic writers were impelled by a wish to smooth the way for the return of Anglicans to holy unity. Both, indeed, thought that in view of studies brought up to the level of recent research, and of some documents rescued from oblivion, it was not inopportune to re-examine the question by our authority. And we, not disregarding such desires and opinions, and above all, obeying the dictates of Apostolic charity, have considered that nothing should be left untried that might in any way tend to preserve

(1) See Vol. iii., p. 492, *et seqq.*

souls from injury or procure their advantage. It has, therefore, pleased us to graciously permit the cause to be re-examined so that through the extreme care taken in the new examination all doubt, or even shadow of doubt, should be removed for the future. To this end we commissioned a certain number of men noted for their learning and ability, whose opinions in this matter were known to be divergent, to state the grounds of their judgments in writing. We then, having summoned them to our person, directed them to interchange writings and further to investigate and discuss all that was necessary for a full knowledge of the matter. We were careful also that they should be able to re-examine all documents bearing on this question which were known to exist in the Vatican Archives, to search for new ones, and even to have at their disposal all the documents on this subject which are preserved by the Holy Office—or as it is called the *Supreme Council*—and to consider whatever had up to this time been adduced by learned men on both sides. We ordered them, when prepared in this way, to meet together in special sessions. These to the number of twelve were held under the presidency of one of the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church appointed by ourselves, and all were invited to free discussion. Finally we directed that the acts of these meetings, together with all other documents, should be submitted to our Venerable Brethren, the Cardinals of the same Council, so that when all had studied the whole subject, and discussed it in our presence, each might give his opinion.” Then the Pontiff shows how the commission inquired into the practice of the Church in the premises, as illustrated ever since the dawn of Protestantism in England; and having reviewed the evidence, His Holiness says: “*It must be clear to every one that the lately-revived controversy was settled definitively long ago by this Apostolic See (by Julius III., Paul IV., and Clement XI.); and that it is to the insufficient knowledge of these documents that we must perhaps attribute the fact that any Catholic writer should have considered it still an open question.*” Then His Holiness proceeds to an examination of the Anglican Ordinal (1); also of the

(1) “ In the examination of any rite for the effecting and administering of a Sacrament.

mind and aim of those who composed that Ordinal—a point which we have already considered when treating of the dawn of the English Reformation. Finally, the Pontiff concludes: "All these matters have been long and carefully considered by ourselves and by our Venerable Brethren, the Judges of the Supreme Council, of whom it pleased us to order a special meeting on the FERIA V., the 16th day of July last, upon the solemnity of Our Lady of Mount Carmel. They, with one accord, agreed that the question laid before them had been already adjudicated, and with the full approval of the Apostolic See, and that this renewed discussion and examination of the issues had only served to bring out more clearly the wisdom and accuracy with which that decision had been made.

distinction is rightly made between the part which is ceremonial and that which is essential, usually called the matter and form. All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite, that is to say, in the matter and form, it still pertains chiefly to the form, since the matter is the part which is not determined by itself but which is determined by the form, and this appears still more clearly in the Sacrament of Orders, the matter of which, in so far as we have to consider it in this case, is the imposition of hands, which indeed by itself signifies nothing definite, and is equally used for several orders, and for Confirmation, but the words which, until recently, were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly ordination—namely, "Receive the Holy Ghost," certainly do not in the least definitely express the sacred order of priesthood or its grace and power, which is chiefly the power "of consecrating and of offering the true Body and Blood of the Lord." (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII. *De Sacr. Ord.*, Can. 1.) In that sacrifice which is no "nude commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the cross." (*Ibid.*, Sess. XXII. *De Sacrif. Missa*, Can. 3.) This form had, indeed, afterward added to it the words, "for the office and work of a priest," etc., but this rather shows that the Anglicans themselves perceived that the first form was defective and inadequate. But even if this addition could give to the form its due signification, it was introduced too late, as a century had already elapsed since the adoption of the Edwardine Ordinal, for as the Hierarchy had become extinct there remained no power of ordaining. In vain has help been recently sought for the plea of the validity of Orders from the other prayers of the same Ordinal. For, to put aside other reasons which show this to be insufficient for the purpose in the Anglican rite, let this argument suffice for all; from them has been deliberately removed whatever set forth the dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite. That form consequently ought not to be considered a prior sufficient for the Sacrament which omits what it ought essentially to signify. For in the formula, "Receive the Holy Ghost," not only were the words, "for the office and work of a bishop," added at a later period, but even these, as we shall presently state, must be understood in a sense different to that which they bear in the Catholic rite. Nor is anything gained by quoting "Almighty God," since it in like manner has been stripped of the words which denote the *Summum Sacerdotium*. It is not here relevant to examine whether the episcopate be a completion of the priesthood or an Order distinct from it, or whether when bestowed as they say *per saltum* on one who is not a priest, it has or has not its effect. But the episcopate undoubtedly by the institution of Christ most truly belongs to the Sacrament of Orders, and constitutes the *Sacerdotium* in the highest degree—namely, that which by the teaching of the Holy Fathers and our Liturgical customs is called the "*Summum Sacerdotium Sacri Ministerii Summa*." So it comes to pass that as the Sacrament of Orders and the true *Sacerdotium* of

Nevertheless we deemed it better to defer our decision in order to afford time, both to consider whether it would be fitting or expedient that we should make a fresh authoritative declaration upon the matter, and to humbly pray for a fuller measure of Divine guidance. Then, considering that this matter of practice, although already decided, had been by certain persons, for unknown reasons, recalled into discussion and that thence it might follow that a pernicious error would be fostered in the minds of many who might suppose that they possessed the Sacrament and effects of Orders, though these are certainly wanting, it has seemed good to us in the Lord to pronounce our judgment. Wherefore, strictly

Christ were utterly eliminated from the Anglican rite, and hence the *Sacerdotium* is in no wise conferred truly and validly in the Episcopal Consecration of the same rite, for the like reason, therefore, the episcopate can in no way be truly and validly conferred by it, and this the more so because among the first duties of the episcopate is that of ordaining ministers for the Holy Eucharist and sacrifice. For the full and accurate understanding of the Anglican Ordinal, besides what we have noted as to some of its parts, there is nothing more pertinent than to consider carefully the circumstances under which it was composed and publicly authorized. It would be tedious to enter into details, nor is it necessary to do so, as the history of that time is sufficiently eloquent as to the animus of the authors of the Ordinal against the Catholic Church, as to the abettors whom they associated with themselves from the heterodox seats, and as to the end they had in view. Being fully cognizant of the necessary connection between faith and worship, between the law of believing and the law of praying, under a pretext of returning to the primitive form they corrupted the liturgical order in many ways to suit the errors of the reformers. For this reason in the whole Ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the Sacrifice of Consecration of the *Sacerdotium* and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifices, but as we have just stated, every trace of these things which had been in such praise of the Catholic rite as they had not entirely rejected, was deliberately removed and struck out. In this way the native character or spirit, as it is called, of the Ordinal clearly manifests itself. Hence if vitiated in its origin, it was wholly insufficient to confer Orders. It was impossible that in the course of time it would become sufficient, since no change had taken place. In vain those who from the time of Charles I. have attempted to hold some kind of sacrifice or of priesthood, have made some additions to the Ordinal. In vain also has been the contention of that small section of the Anglican body formed in recent times that the said Ordinal can be understood and interpreted in a sound and orthodox sense. Such efforts, we affirm, have been and are made in vain, and for the reason that any words in the Anglican Ordinal as it now is which lend themselves to ambiguity cannot be taken in the same sense as they possess in the Catholic rite. For once a new rite has been instituted in which, as we have seen, the Sacrament of Orders is adulterated or denied, and from which all idea of consecration and sacrifice has been rejected, the formula, "Receive the Holy Ghost," no longer holds good, because the spirit is infused into the soul with the grace of the Sacrament, and the words "For the office and work of a priest or bishop," and the like no longer hold good, but remain as words without the reality which Christ instituted. Several of the more shrewd Anglican interpreters of the Ordinal have perceived the force of this argument, and they openly urge it against those who take the Ordinal in a new sense, and vainly attach to the orders conferred thereby a value and efficacy they do not possess. By this same argument is refuted the contention of those who think that the prayer "Almighty God giveth of all good things," which is found at the beginning of the ritual action, might suffice as a legitimate form of Orders, even in the hypothesis that it might be held to be sufficient in a Catholic rite approved by the Church."

adhering in this matter to the decrees of the Pontiffs our predecessors, and confirming them most fully, and, as it were, renewing them by our authority, of our own motion and certain knowledge *we pronounce and declare that Ordinations carried out according to the Anglican rite have been and are absolutely null and utterly void.*" To the immense majority of Anglicans, persons who had no conception of the meaning of the term "priest," people whose "parson" was merely a talker on religion established for the sake of good order and respectability in the State, this Papal decision had no meaning. To another class of Anglicans, persons whose notion of a "priest" was that of a something more genteel than a Non-Conformist preacher, a something to be classed with a "so cute" ecclesiastical millinery, their supposedly poetical incense, and their mystifying vestments, the Papal pronouncement was merely a blow to an unintelligent pride—the Pope had dared to say that their pastor was to be revered no more than a Presbyterian or Methodist dominie (1).

(1) That Dr. Potter, the present head of the Protestant Episcopal "diocese" of Southern New York, belongs to this second class of Anglicans, would seem to be indicated not only by his recent (1899) "ordination" of the anti-Biblical Dr. Briggs, but also by the following extract from the Annual Address which he delivered, on Sept. 30, 1896, before the Diocesan Convention of the ministers of his jurisdiction, as his deliberate appreciation of the Pope's decision on the validity of Anglican Orders: "A year ago I referred in this place to the courteous communication addressed to those in another land, who are of our spiritual lineage and ancestry, by a venerable Roman ecclesiastic, of whose kindly purpose nobody, I suppose, had any smallest doubt; and I endeavored to point out how vain and illusory, from any such standpoint as he then occupied, were the hopes and aspirations which he then expressed. Since then he has made them even more so by describing all other chief pastors than those who are his own curates as '*a lawless and disorderly crew*' (in what Papal document can we find this exhibition of a very un-Roman style?), and by pronouncing all other orders than those derived from the See of Peter as invalid and worthless. It is a declaration. . . . made *in large ignorance of the facts*, and from a somewhat narrow and provincial vision of the situation, (but this) does not wholly take away from the value of this unshrinking frankness; while one cannot but hope that its effect upon those (the self-styled "Anglo-Catholic" party) whose *fatuous and unmanly procedure* has invited and provoked it may be deep and lasting. Anglican churchmen and American Christians of the same lineage have nothing whatever to hope from the Italian prelate who makes bold to call himself the Vicar of God. It is matter for profound thankfulness that they have not. . . . Dismissing at last *that superincumbent mass of mediæval and modern historical ignorance, historical distortion, and historical imposture which survives to-day as the Latin tradition*, and which has for centuries buried out of sight the primitive and apostolic foundations, men will return to those scriptural and universally accepted symbols to which that oldest branch of the Church Catholic—the branch which is Eastern and not Western—still adheres, and on which the best learning and the purest faith of *Anglo-Saxon Christendom* equally rest. There is much to be learned by all of us before we may hope to see the dawn of a better day for the divided ranks of Christendom . . . but believe me, when that day dawns, *it will not be in answer to any beckoning from an Italian prelate—or not, at any rate, until he, or those who may come after*

But to a very small class of Anglicans, those who believed in a "sacrificing priesthood," and who knew that without that priesthood no organization could be a Church, could have valid Sacraments, could be, as it were, a continuation of Christ's incarnation in regard to the individual soul, the decree of Pope Leo XIII. was a bitter disappointment. It caused them to meditate as they had never yet meditated.

CHAPTER X.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE AUSTRIAN EMPIRE. THE QUESTIONS OF MIXED AND CIVIL MARRIAGES IN HUNGARY.

Among the injustices which Pope Leo XIII. has been obliged to suffer at the hands of certain German Catholic publicists, is the charge that his hostility to the Triple Alliance has led him to sacrifice the interest of Catholicism in Germany, and especially in Austria. The Pontiff, said these gentry, could hope for no aid from the Triple Alliance in the matter of a restoration of the papal temporal power; but he could hope for aid from France, and therefore he flattered the French Republic, even to the detriment of the Church in France. Such assertions come naturally from Professor Geffcken; they do not astound us when they are proffered by the anonymous "Austrian diplomat" of the *Contemporary Review*: but they are sadly inappropriate in the pages of prominent organs of the German Centre. Certainly those editors were not of the calibre of Montalembert, who was *Catholique avant tout*, and who would never have asked the Italian Catholics to accept "accomplished facts," and to shake hands with the school of Crispi. And this politico-religious evolution was demanded in the interest of the Triple Alliance; for by it that unnatural compact would have been strengthened, since the Papacy and the Italy of the Quirinal would have kissed in a rapture of "patriotism." The *Contemporary Review* loaned its pages

him, have unlearned pretensions so unscriptural as to be grotesque, and surrendered claims which the growing enlightenment of mankind makes daily more and more pathetic and ridiculous."

to the partisans of these theories ; and the curious reader will find their mouthings refuted in the *Civiltà Cattolica* (1), if his study of the Pontificate of Pius IX. has left him still in need of such mental pabulum. Concerning the "Austrian diplomat" of the *Contemporary Review*, whose ravings were until quite recently endorsed by many German Catholic friends of the Triple Alliance, the Abbé Kannengieser, an Alsatian polemic who knows well the French, German, and Italian worlds of which he treats (2), emits some noteworthy reflections as he places the Austrian essayist on the same plane with two famous ecclesiastical rebels of our day : "Dœllinger and Curci ! These celebrated men personify, to some extent, the opposition to the papal temporal power which a certain class of Catholics has manifested during the last thirty years. They were priests ; but they attacked the royalty of the Vatican with a violence, and often with a bad faith and a perfidy, which were borrowed from the worst enemies of the Church. Dœllinger had begun his campaign ten years before the invasion of Rome, at first in a fashion of dissimulation, but in time and by degrees with increasing audacity in each successive book or article, until finally he indicated his disgust with not only the temporal power, but also with the spiritual authority of the Holy See, with Catholicism, and with Christianity itself. At this time Curci was one of the most intrepid defenders of the *Royal Vatican* ; but very soon he also entered on the way of apostasy. His first bombshell—it is with design that I use his favorite expression—was exploded in 1874 ; and certainly the pure gold of his early writings had changed to the vilest of metals. Curci was then already decrepit on the verge of the grave ; but he furnished to the Church the sad spectacle of an ungrateful son striking his mother. Before long, to these two names we were obliged to join that of an Austrian diplomat who, proclaiming himself a Catholic, published in a Protestant periodical of England an odious pamphlet which assailed the policy and the person of Leo XIII. This diplomat pretended to

(1) Especially in the issue of Dec. 17, 1892.

(2) *The Adversaries of the Temporal Power and the Triple Alliance.* Paris, 1893.

be a most faithful son of the Pontiff, 'his real and well-beloved superior'; but, nevertheless, he dared to issue 'the most perfidious diatribe which has been written against the Sovereign Pontiff' (1). A Catholic of this stamp is worthy of figuring in the company of Döllinger and Curci; the three publicists have a community of thought, and complete each other admirably. Their harmony is perfect. Döllinger had called for the fall of the Pope-King; Curci echoed the demand; and the Austrian diplomat upbraids the Pope for not accepting their invitation with gratitude. This is all pre-eminently natural; since here we find in evidence representatives of the nations composing the Triple Alliance. Curci was an Italian; the writer in the *Contemporary* was an Austrian; and Döllinger was a German. It is possible that this coincidence is merely fortuitous; if so, the journals of the Triple Alliance will inform us. Accidental though it may be, it is interesting, and it should be noted. One thing is certain. The blows struck against the papal temporal power (in our day) have not come from that impious France, before whose gaze the three allied nations so modestly veil their faces; nor from that schismatical Russia, for whom the treasury of anathemas is too small; nor from that heretical England, for whose sake, as the men of the Triple Alliance tell us, Leo XIII. sacrificed the poor Irish. The Pontiff is despoiled of his dominions, held a prisoner in the Vatican, simply because such is the good pleasure of the Triple Alliance. It is the Italy of Curci, the Germany of Döllinger, and the Austria of the diplomat of the *Contemporary Review*, that have desired and procured the loss of the papal temporal power; the governments of these three countries are the responsible causes of the 'intolerable situation' (2) in which the Vicar of Jesus Christ now finds himself." There is not a word of exaggeration in these sentiments of Abbé Kannengieser; and in complement of

(1) These two citations are words of Father Brandi, S. J., the author of the admirable refutation of the pleas of the partisans of the Triple Alliance which was published in the *Civiltà Cattolica*. To the student who has not access to this periodical, we would observe that a French version of Brandi's work, due to the pen of M. Vetter, was published by Lecheleux of Paris in 1892.

(2) Such are the words with which Leo XIII. has frequently qualified the present circumstances of the Holy See.

them we would adduce the following appreciation of the Austrian diplomat's ideas which was formed by the judicious editor of the *Civiltà Cattolica*: "According to this diplomat, the Supreme Pontiff is 'an idealist,' an egotist who thinks more of his own immediate profit than of the general good; a man who transforms ends into means. He uses his power 'in order to develop the Catholic, to the detriment of the man and of the citizen. He uses his children as so many players of the ignoble rôle of political Mamelukes, 'traitors to their party, and for reasons which are absolutely foreign to politics, and often opposed to the demands of common sense.' And then we are told that the Pope's policy 'is deficient in that power of scent which is so usual with Italian diplomatists.' This deficiency gives color 'to the acensations of the Pontiff's enemies, to the effect that he is only a politic courtier toward the powerful, despising the weak, abandoning the unfortunate.' But there is more; in the mind of this anonymous writer, 'the venerable and well-beloved superior' is a monster of iniquity. 'He favors and caresses an atheistic government (that of France), every one of whose acts are inspired by a diabolical hatred for our religion; and, what seems to be almost incredible, he systematically places at the service of that government the most noble sentiments of Catholicism, in order that France may continue to prosper, and to insult our religion.' "

The otherwise Catholic German sympathizers with this doctrine, most of whom have now seen their mistake, were very eloquent in their praises of the orthodoxy of Austria-Hungary; and undoubtedly that empire is substantially Catholic, and some of its institutions still bear the stamp of Catholicity. But unfortunately, Josephism, Freemasonry, and Judaism have too frequently and too extensively tampered with that vast governmental machine which was a work of the Age of Faith. In our day, one would remain within the limits of truth, if he asserted that the Catholic appearance of many of the Austrian institutions, and the external respect for religion in those regions, are too much like that which a shadow is to a substance; in fact, we may apply to the religious spirit of modern Austria-Hungary nearly all

that we have predicated of that same spirit in modern Portugal (1). In the Hapsburg empire, as Mgr. T'Serclæus observes, "We see in a land where the inhabitants are deeply religious, and where the legislation *appears* to be Catholic, nearly all the journals in the hands of Jews or of other enemies of the Church. We see the schools delivered to a heterodox neutrality, under the control of atheistic teachers. We see Catholic interests defended in parliament only by a petty number of champions, who are badly organized. And we see a clergy, rich indeed, but victims of an inactivity and a powerlessness which are astonishing in a land where there is so much faith" (2). Such, in brief, was the religious condition of Austria-Hungary when Leo XIII. ascended the steps of the papal throne. In 1888, he convoked a General Chapter of the Benedictines, so powerful in those regions. He commanded the monks to legislate for an exact observance of poverty by an abolition of the abuse allowing an individual Benedictine to have his own *peculium*: the "common life" was to include meals, all exercises of piety, and the recreations; the monks were to have no domestics who did not belong to the order. The Pontiff also extended his reforming hand to the Franciscans, who are very numerous in Austria-Hungary. He insisted on an exact observance of their rule of poverty; the friars resisted, and the entire Jewish press of Vienna and Buda-Pesth took up the bad cause with virulent attacks on Roman despotism. In this contest the government remained neutral; but it did not show the same spirit in the agitation concerning mixed

(1) See our Vol. v., p. 267.

(2) Speaking of the attitude of hesitancy and incoherency which seems to be common among modern Austrian Catholics, Kannengieser says: "It is well known that energy is not their dominant virtue. Subjugated at once by the Jews and the Liberals, they yield to the influence of the air that they breathe, and are swept along by the current that is created by the foes of the Church. They should have a thousand motives for an antipathy toward that official Italy which has deprived them of Lombardy and Venice, and which foments Irredentism in the southern provinces of the empire. Naturally they should sympathize with the Holy See in the conflict now being waged between the Vatican and the Quirinal. But some strange play of fortune has ranged the Austrians on the side of the Revolution, against the Papacy. Of course I do not speak of the zealous Catholics who hold Congresses, and whose number increases every day. The diplomat of the *Contemporary Review* is a striking proof of this inexplicable anomaly; and his example ought to open the eyes of even the blindest. Sympathy for revolutionary Italy is dangerous. The cause of the Papacy cannot be betrayed with impunity in favor of the persecutors of the Church; sooner or later, the felony is punished, and often by a loss of faith."

marriages, which began, or rather was revived in 1890. The reader should know that for many years a Hungarian law, sanctioned by that government which certain German Centrist critics of the Leonine policy would have us regard as "very orthodox," commanded that all the children of a mixed marriage should be educated, according to their sex, in the religion of the father or of the mother. Such a law no Catholic could observe; every Catholic knows that when the Church tolerates a mixed marriage she does so only when the heretical party has solemnly promised that all the resulting offspring shall be baptized and trained as Catholics. In the case of a Hungarian mixed marriage, before the year 1890, the law could be evaded, whenever the heretical party was conscientious; said party could simply avow that he or she wished the child to be a Catholic. But the Masonico-Jewish element, then dominant in the Hungarian governmental councils, decided that a parent should not have a voice in the religious training of his or her children, unless perchance the wish was favorable to Satanism, or to something of similar stamp. Therefore, in 1890, Czaki, the Hungarian Minister of Worship, decreed that whenever a Catholic priest baptized the offspring of a mixed marriage, he should furnish the Protestant minister of the locality a certificate of said baptism within eight days; then, in case the priest had violated the law by baptizing the daughter of a Protestant mother, or the son of a Protestant father, the government, by means of the intervention of the Protestant minister, would see that the infant received a Protestant training. Instantly there was a conflict between the Church and the State; no Catholic pastor could connive at an abandonment of a Catholic child to the miseries of heresy, and innumerable priests were "suspended" by the secular autocrat, and sent to jail for a month, the punishment to be repeated for every new offence. Strange to say, during nearly the whole of this conflict there were found many bishops who regarded, or feigned to regard as a mere "civil" act that which was demanded by the government; but the holy indignation of their priests forced these prelates to retract their assertion, and Mgr. Samassa, the archbishop of

Erlau, was sent to Rome for the purpose of laying the matter before the Pontiff. The infamous Czaki law was condemned by His Holiness; and this condemnation furnished the German Centrist hypercritics of the Leonine policy with material for their charge that the Pope was more severe with "orthodox" Austria-Hungary, than with the infidel French Republic.

The contest in regard to mixed marriages in Hungary began with the introduction of Protestantism into the Kingdom of St. Stephen; and in accordance with the Catholic law on the subject, in every case of such a contract, the Protestant party was at first compelled to sign a promise, called *Reversalia*, whereby he or she engaged to educate all the resultant children in the Catholic faith. But in the beginning of the eighteenth century, there was born a custom, among Protestant prospective brides of Catholic husbands, of exacting from their too frequently subservient swains a document of *Reversalia* drawn up in favor of heresy. In vain Maria Theresa prohibited this practice; and when that would-be philosopher, the "sacristy-sweep" Joseph II., ascended the throne of the Holy Roman Empire, one of his first acts as King of Hungary was to publish what he styled an "Edict of Toleration," whereby he abolished the *Reversalia*, both Catholic and Protestant, and decreed that whenever a Catholic woman espoused a Protestant, only her daughters were necessarily to be raised as Catholics. Even this wicked concession did not satisfy the Protestants of Hungary. They continually distorted the edict so as to procure greater latitude for themselves; and in a decree of May 24, 1782, the imperial weakling complained of their "abominable impudence." But his disgust did not prevent Joseph II. from sanctioning, in 1790, a law which declared that sons of a Protestant father and a Catholic mother *might* be educated as Protestants—a provision which was immediately distorted by interpreting the *might* as *must*, and which was actuated in that sense wherever and whenever the Protestant element was sufficiently strong. During the years which elapsed between the death of Joseph II. (1790) and the year 1840, the Hungarian clergy were almost uni-

versally derelict in this matter; instead of insisting on the *Reversalia*, most of them asked for no promise whatever in regard to the future progeny, when they were about to officiate at a mixed marriage. But in 1840, thanks to the energy of Mgr. Scitowsky, bishop of Rosnavia (Rosenau), and of Mgr. Lajtsak, bishop of Nagy-Varad (Grosswardein), the clergy began to observe the laws of the Church. Quite naturally, the revolution of 1848 confirmed and extended all the losses which the Church had thus far suffered in Hungary. But the Catholics found no reason for complaint in the Twelve Points, voted on March 15, whereby all religions were pronounced free and equal (1); although indeed it seemed strange that the Greek Schismatics and the Protestants should be entirely autonomous in their religious affairs, while the Latin and Greek Catholics were kept in a state of dependence on the State. We have said that in 1840 the Hungarian clergy began to observe the law of the Church concerning mixed marriages; but unfortunately this beginning was neither universal nor hearty. Often the Catholic party to a mixed marriage gave to the Protestant one *Reversalia* couched in the Protestant sense, and the pastor closed his eyes to the fact; the bishops were just as conveniently blind, and naturally the priests did not feel that they should be more courageous than their prelates (2). Such a state of affairs should have satisfied the Hungarian Protestants; but in 1868, thanks to the Dualism which rendered the Austrian laws against Freemasonry inoperative in the Kingdom of Hungary (3), the

(1) In Hungary some religions are "received" or recognized by the State, while others are not "received," but tolerated. Before 1848 there were three "received" Churches; the Catholic, the Greek "Orthodox," and the Protestant. The Church of the United Greek Rite was recognized in 1848.

(2) KANNENGIESER; *Jews and Catholics in Austria-Hungary*, p. 213. Paris, 1895.

(3) The fact of these laws existing on the statute-books of Austria must not lead the student to believe that Freemasonry has been seriously and permanently hampered in that empire since the sect fell under the ban of the Church. But when the Hungarian authorities practically recognized the Masonic Order as a beneficent and civilizing agency, they lifted to the plane of respectability a sect which the weak among the good had avoided, but which the same lukewarm Christians might thereafter join. A brief description of the rise and progress of Masonry in Austria-Hungary will be of value to the reader. Francis I., the husband of Mary Theresa, allowed a few Masonic Lodges to be established in his dominions; and during the reign of Joseph II., in 1776, the Grand Lodge of Germany, established in Berlin, sent a delegate, Sudthausen, to affiliate these Lodges to itself. This delegate was received in audience by the philosophistic emperor, and he succeeded in

Judæo-Protestant element became so influential in the Hungarian parliament, that it was able to procure the passage of a law declaring: "All the male children of a mixed marriage must follow the religion of their father, and all the daughters the religion of their mother.... Every arrangement contrary to this law, let it be of any nature whatsoever, is null and void." Instead of protesting against this iniquitous enactment, nearly all the bishops of Hungary, whose "orthodoxy" the German critics of our Pontiff's policy so earnestly extol, followed the example of Cardinal Haynald, the intimate friend of the Minister of Worship, Baron Eötvös, in affecting to credit the assurance of that statesman that the enactment was of no practical importance, and would not be enforced. "With the exception of Cardinal Simor (archbishop of Gran) and his friends," said Kannengieser in 1895, "none of the Hungarian prelates seemed to

inspiring the conceited sovereign with an idea of rivalling Frederick II. of Prussia as a protector of a glorious and powerful order. During the next quarter of a century, Masonry developed in the Austrian empire so well, that in 1794 there were forty-five Lodges of the different rites (See the *Zirkel*, organ of the Lodge *Humanitas* in Vienna, July 1, 1874). But Joseph II. was disappointed in his proteges. The war with Turkey, which disturbed his last years, was the work of the Dark Lantern, having been excited by the Prussian adept, Herzberg in concert with the English premier, Pitt. At the same time, the leader of the Hungarian Masons, Count Forgatzek, went to Berlin in order to prepare with Herzberg a Hungarian insurrection: and he was aided by the Illuminati, then guided by Martinowicz, the provost of Edenburg (See the *Universal Biography* of Michaud, art. *Martinowicz*). In 1789, Joseph II. tried in vain to undo his foolish work by subjecting the Lodges to police surveillance. In 1794, Francis II. prohibited the order absolutely, and exacted from every public functionary an oath that he belonged to no secret society. Probably it was to this act of Francis II. that the peoples of the Austrian Empire owe, to a very great extent, their preservation of the faith to this day; certainly it was to this act that was due the origin of the Masonic watchword, "*Delenda est Austria*," the motto which was to be proclaimed when success had attended the cry, "*Lilia pedibus destrue*." This interdiction of Masonry persisted throughout the reigns of Francis II. and of Ferdinand I.; but the order subsisted by means of students, professors, merchants, and others whose travels enabled them to join foreign Lodges, especially those of Prussia and Saxony. Immediately after the revolution of 1848, a Lodge was instituted in Vienna, and was entitled *St. Joseph*; its Venerable was a professor in the Academy of Engineers, Dr. Ludwig Lewis. But the restoration of the empire brought a revival of the anti-Masonic edicts, and the brethren were obliged, for a time, to work in the dark. In 1866 came the promise of glorious days for the Brethren of the Three Points; Sadowa filled them with a joy which they cared not to conceal. Immediately they began a combat against the Church, which was frustrated only by the will of Francis Joseph (See Deschamps, *Secret Societies*, Bk. II., ch. 11); and by means of the press of Vienna, every journal of which, with the exception of the *Vaterland*, had succumbed to their gold or promises, they began a campaign for the unification of Germany under the agis of the Hohenzollern. In this latter task they were assisted by the gold of the Jews, natural foes of the Christian name, and therefore partisans of everything which promised to injure the Church which is the sole effective champion of that name. The ministry of the Saxon, Von Beust, suppressed the oath against secret societies which the public officials were then still obliged to

comprehend the aggressive nature of the fatal law of 1868. None suspected that it was to be the basis for an implacable war against the Catholics. For more than twenty years the Masonic Lodges, inspired by the Jews, took advantage of this law in order to harass the Church, and to inaugurate that Hungarian 'War for Civilization' which has just entered into its decisive phase. This law was a temporary weapon, used by the Masons until the day when, throwing off their hypocritical disguise, they attacked every Christian denomination with their Bill for the introduction of Civil Marriage."

The credit of this enterprise of Civil Matrimony for the Hungarians belongs to Koloman Tisza, who became Minister of the Interior in the Wentheim cabinet in 1875, and of whom the chief Protestant organ in Germany, the *Kreuzzeitung*, was to say, ere long, that he was "the great intriguer who systematically sowed the seeds of evil which have already produced such frightful crops." In order to actuate his infernal design, this "Calvinist Pope," as he was styled, relied on two allies who were worthy of him—Freemasonry

take; and although the statutes still prohibited Masonry, there was formed in Prague a "society"—it was not termed a "Lodge"—entitled *Amicitia*. The Lodge *Humanitas* of Vienna began to hold its meetings at Neudorf, in Hungary; and it was officially recognized by the Hungarian authorities in 1872. Already, in 1869, this Lodge had begun to publish its official journal, the *Zirkel* or "The Compass." Other Masonic organizations, however, did not feel the need of taking Hungary as a base of operations; at first in Vienna, and then in many other provinces, there were instituted *International Circles of Freemasons*, the organ of which was the *Allgemeine Oesterreichische Freimaurer Zeitung*. When the year 1874 arrived, the Cisleithan provinces of the empire counted ten different Masonic "societies"; and although the emperor succeeded sometimes in compelling his ministers to check the growing audacity of the brethren, we find the *Chaine d'Union*, in 1881 (p. 437), quoting the *Zirkel* of recent date to prove that Masonry was then very active in the realm of the Hapsburgs. As for Masonry in Hungary, 1848 saw a Lodge called *Kossuth* established in Pesth; and in 1861, a new Lodge was projected, but not founded, by Edward Caroly, Stephen Estherasy, Julian Teleky, Bela Bay, George Comaromy, and the two counts, Theodore and Coloman Czaky. Not until the campaign of Sadowa had been fought, however, did Masonry make much progress in the Kingdom of St. Stephen; then the constitution of the Dual Monarchy enabled the brethren to show themselves in the light of day, and very soon the sect attained to the dignity of a quasi-official position in the State. Thus in 1874 the Minister of Finance deliberately addressed the Grand Orient of Pesth, asking it to contribute to the expenses of the charitable institutions of the capital, and the *Zirkel* congratulated the brethren on the governmental recognition of the order as a social force. The policy of Hungarian Masonry needs no elucidation; the history of the last thirty years shows the significance of the following words emitted by the *Chaine d'Union* in March, 1874: "Thanks to the activity of our brethren who now occupy the highest political positions, we are confident that we shall destroy the influence of that Ultramontanism which has hitherto dominated the reigning House of Hapsburg; and success in that matter will enable us to enlighten Austria."

and the Jews. "With the aid of these two forces," says Kannengieser, "he felt sure of victory over Catholicism; it was certain that he could count on their thorough devotion. The Lodges regarded him as an excellent instrument; and the Jews seemed to recognize in him flesh of their flesh, blood of their blood. And indeed there must have coursed some Israelitic blood in the veins of this arrogant Calvinist with manners which were now falsely humble, and then rabidly impertinent. When one saw him in the tribune with his tall but bent figure, his white beard covering his breast, his emaciated countenance, his frame wrapped in dirty and threadbare garments; and when one heard him snuffling a dull and monotonous discourse; one felt that a Jew had awakened in the Magyar, after a sleep of many generations." Scarcely had Tisza entered the Wentheim cabinet, than he became President of the Council; and in this capacity he scourged Hungary for fifteen years, substituting everywhere the Judæo-Masonic for Catholic influences, and trying with diabolic persistency to un-Christianize the ancient "Marianic Kingdom." One of his most impudent essays was his Bill providing for the "Marriages of Jews with Christians"—a Bill which might have produced the desired effects, without any mention of his Jewish protectors in its title, but which intentionally blazoned the fact that at length the Israelite was, in very truth the superior of the Magyar. In the Chamber of Deputies, the members of which had been "elected" under the law of 1876, which was a mere engine for ministerial corruption, the Bill met but little opposition; but in the Upper House it was rejected. Then the Judæo-Calvinist "reformer" undertook to change radically the composition of the Upper House; he succeeded in 1883, and found himself assured of a servile majority for all of his anti-Christian projects. Little by little he now "laicized" the University of Buda-Pesth, appointing free-thinkers to all the chairs; he confided the administration of ecclesiastical property to Freemasons; and nearly all the governmental offices were filled with Protestants and Jews, preferably with the latter. In 1879 the law of 1868 on mixed marriages was reinforced with this disposition: "Whoever, in opposition to

the provisions of the law of 1868, receives into another religious denomination a minor of less than eighteen years of age, is liable to a penalty which may be imprisonment for two months, and a fine of 300 florins." Fortunately the Hungarian magistracy had not been, as yet, so far Masonicized or Judaicized as to willingly obey the behests of the triumphant sectarians; and in the many hundreds of cases where the governmental police and the Protestant ministers dragged Catholic pastors before the tribunals to answer for the "crime" of having baptized the child of a mixed marriage, the accused were immediately dismissed. The law of 1879, contended the magistrates, did not cover the case of baptism. It spoke of a conversion, of a passage from one Christian denomination to another—a thing which does not happen in the baptism of a babe, since before his baptism an infant belongs to no Christian denomination whatsoever, being as yet a pagan. Until 1890 the Tisza cabinet did no more than fulminate menaces against the Catholic pastors; but being determined to attain distinction in his "War for Civilization," the President of the Council finally called to his aid Count Albinus Czaky, a man whose hatred for the Catholic clergy was notorious (1). Having been appointed Minister of Worship, Czaky issued, on Feb. 26, 1890, the rescript which ordered every priest to deliver to the Protestant pastor of the locality, within eight days, a certificate of each baptism conferred by him on children of mixed marriages. The decree also enjoined that all recalcitrant priests should be taken, not before the ordinary magistrates, but before the prefect of police, who would be, of course, a creature of the cabinet of the day. The reader may imagine the consternation of such of the Catholic clergy as were determined to do their duty. If they obeyed the law, and gave to the Protestant ministers the certificates demanded, by that very fact they proclaimed, according to the law, that the children in question were Protestants; and from the dawn of reason in those children, they would be obliged to attend Protestant schools, and to receive consequently an heretical

(1) Czaky was nominally a Catholic; but from his mother, a Slovak Lutheran, he had imbibed a strong prejudice against the Church, and furthermore, his wife was a Calvinist.

education. By this official declaration of war against the Catholic Church, the "Calvinist Pope" had gained a great triumph; but his official participation in the ensuing combat was of short duration, for scarcely had the rescript been communicated to the bishops, when a ministerial crisis deprived him of power. Tisza had foreseen, shrewd politician as he was, that at any moment he might be relegated to private life; and it was with the design of leaving a successor who would prosecute his plans, that he had brought Czaky into the cabinet. But when the feeble Francis Joseph was requested to charge Czaky with the task of forming a new ministry, the monarch strangely dared to prefer another deputy of the Liberal majority, Count Julius Szapary, a Moderate of the school of Deak. Czaky, however, was retained in the cabinet, and the spirit of Tisza continued to predominate. Szapary was a gentleman in every proper sense of the term, a man of experience, loyal to his country and to his sovereign, and desirous of being faithful to the Church. Throughout his administration he proved that his own intentions were of the best; and it is not improbable that if the Hungarian bishops had been men of the school of Sts. Hilary and Thomas à Becket, and not of the school of Febronius, he would have dismissed the representative of the Judæo-Calvinists, and his success in regard to ecclesiastical matters would have equalled that of his civil administration (1). It cannot be supposed that the Hungarian prelates favored mixed marriages in their hearts; we must believe that some of them were actuated by a desire of pleasing the government from which they expected promotion and other honors, and that others were merely animated by a desire of avoiding every uncomfatableness. By whatever motives they were guided,

(1) During the administration, or rather dictatorship of Tisza, the Lutheran Saxons of Transylvania were the objects of an oppression, on the part of his Judæo-Calvinist functionaries, which was said to have been more unendurable than the much-decried system of Gessler in Switzerland. Pre-eminent among these functionaries was the distinguished ex-Garibaldian, Gabriel Bethlem; and when Szapary became premier, he deprived Bethlem, Desiderius Banffy, and other petty tyrants, of their offices. The Saxons, in fine, were treated so justly by Szapary, that they left the ranks of the opposition, and joined the governmental majority. Szapary was equally successful with the Serbs of Hungary, who had been oppressed by Tisza. Had time permitted, he would have gained the sympathies of the Roumanians.

when they met in conference, on April 12, 1890, in the palace of Cardinal Simor at Ofen, the primate was immediately convinced that the majority of his colleagues were supporters, if not accomplices, of the Judæo-Calvinist cabal. Simor suggested a collective protest from all the bishops to the Minister of Worship; but he found that none shared his apostolic sentiments. Would that the firmness of Cardinal Simor had been equally apostolic! His weakness induced him to consent to the miserable compromise of sending a circular to all the pastors, enjoining a submission to the ministerial rescript, until the Holy See should decide in the matter. When this circular was received by the clergy, they must have felt as though their prelates had ordered them to commit murder until the Pontiff interfered for the safety of their victims. But the pastors had been taught by a sad experience of the results of the law of 1868; and now they were almost a unit in their determination to obey the laws of the Church. More than a hundred meetings of the clergy were held throughout the kingdom, and nearly unanimous resolutions for resistance were adopted—a declaration of righteous insubordination, to which the supine or recreant bishops were obliged by mere decency to close their eyes. The primate now asked the Holy See to decide two questions which could have been properly and immediately decided by the veriest tyro in his seminary: “Could the Hungarian clergy obey the rescript of February, 1890; and could the bishops grant dispensations for mixed marriages, while that rescript remained in force?” On July 7, Cardinal Rampolla replied in the negative to both of these questions; and the prelates were told to communicate the decision to all their parochial clergy, “so that they might understand how much the law of 1868 and the rescript of 1890 were at variance with Catholic principles.” Had the cardinal-primate obeyed the order of the Holy See, it is very improbable that Czaky and his comrades would have lifted the gauntlet which he would thus have flung at their feet. Czaky gave proof of an unwillingness or unreadiness to have the issue thus neatly drawn; he rushed at once to Vienna, and prevailed on Francis Joseph to bring his imperial influence to bear on Simor, in the interests of tempor-

ization. The monarch yielded; the primate temporized; the Roman decisions were not published. Meanwhile, Czaky was engineering for a certain majority in the Chamber of Deputies; and in November his friends adopted a motion declaring the legality of the law of 1868. The House of Magnates was to act on the motion on December 18; and the primate suddenly resolved to publish the pontifical decisions in time for the members to learn their duty. He convoked the bishops for a meeting on December 16, intending to present for their signatures an already prepared collective pastoral which would dutifully promulgate the papal pronouncement; and it was understood that from his place in the House of Magnates, on the day of the discussion, His Eminence would defend the Catholic position. The meeting of the bishops was held, but no decisions were published; the Upper House discussed the Czaky measure, but the cardinal-primate remained mute. On the previous day, the imperial influence, again invoked by Czaky, had persuaded Simor to continue in what his apologists term the path of temporization, but which nearly approached the broad and headlong road of disobedience to the pontifical authority. In accordance with the attitude of their primate, Count Zichy and Bishop Schlauch, in behalf of the Catholic party—the immense majority—in the House of Magnates, declined “to discuss the religious question”; and Czaky triumphed. Four weeks afterward, the otherwise pious and zealous Cardinal Simor ceased to be tempted to temporization; and Czaky assigned the administration of the primatial office to Mgr. Samassa, archbishop of Erlau, trusting that the Holy See would confer the primacy itself on one who had been hitherto as wax in his hands. But Mgr. Samassa was to be of little service thereafter to the Judæo-Calvinist conspirators; in the first place, because the task now became repugnant to his instincts or to his conscience, and secondly, because the priests and the laity had now taken the great matter into their own hands. Throughout the kingdom the parish priests had preferred imprisonment to priestly degradation; and in the elections of 1892, the people showed that such devotion was appreciated. As for the appoint-

ment of Mgr. Samassa to the primatial see of Gran, the Holy See was superior to all the innumerable intrigues which were devised in the politico-ecclesiastical circles of Hungary in order to effect that purpose; and after ten months of consideration, the Pontiff appointed an almost unknown Benedictine monk, Nicholas Vaszary, the abbot of the monastery of Martinsberg.

On Nov. 22, 1892, the Judæo-Calvinists having resolved to free themselves from even the *laissez-faire* Catholicism of Count Szapary, a new cabinet, under the presidency of Weckerle, a creature of Tisza, undertook to govern Hungary. Weckerle was a Rationalistic Lutheran, and a German. Three of his colleagues, Szilagyi, Count Louis Tisza, and Count Bethlem, were bitter Calvinists; the others did not profess Calvinism, but they owed their political advancement to the Lodges and to Tisza. The new cabinet immediately announced its programme to the Chambers. They were to consider projects for the entire emancipation of the Jews (1), for freedom of worship, and above all, for compulsory civil marriage. The first and second articles of the programme caused no sensation; but when the third was announced, the leader of the Nationalists, Count Albert Apponyi, declared that his party would be found in opposition. Three of the most influential among the ministerial deputies, among whom was an ex-president of the Chamber, Pechy, *curator* of the Evangelicals in Hungary, announced their abandonment of the Liberal party, because they regarded civil marriage as injurious to society. But this parliamentary opposition was comparatively trivial, when the conspirators contemplated the horror excited among the populations of the kingdom by their designs against the sanctity of the marriage tie. Perhaps the Tisza clique was not surprised when the Greek Schismatics showed themselves no less hostile than the Latin and Greek Catholics to

(1) The reader must remember that France was the first country in Europe to grant civil rights to the Jews. She effected this enfranchisement by a decree of the Constituent Assembly on Sept. 27, 1791. Denmark followed in 1849; England in 1849 and 1858; Austria-Hungary in 1867; Italy in 1869 and 1870; Germany in 1869 and 1871; Switzerland in 1866 and 1874; and Bulgaria in 1878 and 1879. As yet, Russia, Spain, Portugal, and Roumania do not see their way to this enfranchisement.

its pet measure ; but even the Lutherans, especially the Saxons of Transylvania, although their deputies had joined hands with the Szapary cabinet, insisted on preserving their traditional matrimonial legislation. Of course the Catholics, against whom the design was specially aimed, were more sensitive than others to the indignity with which they were menaced ; therefore it is not strange that when the primate convoked the bishops for the consideration of a plan of action, the hitherto negligent prelates manifested a proper Catholic zeal, and condemned obligatory civil marriage as a profanation of a Sacrament. To the pastorals which the bishops now issued, to the sermons which the pastors preached, to the murmurs of the populations, Weckerle frequently replied in the parliament that he would not abandon his design ; therefore in the session of the Upper House, held on May 9, 1893, on the motion of Count Geza Szapary, the magnates adopted, by a majority of 25 votes, an order of the day which severely blamed the government. Certainly there was hope that in a kingdom where the Catholics numbered ten millions to the three millions of Protestants and Jews combined, where the sovereign and the Upper House were Catholic, the Catholic cause would triumph. But again the bishops of Hungary were derelict ; after the emission of a few pastorals, and very ordinary discourses in the Upper House by the bishops of Vessprim and Nagy-Varad, the prelates relapsed into their olden lethargic silence. Seven months after the episcopal conference which had excited so many consolatory anticipations, the editor of the *Katholikus Szemle* of Buda-Pesth wrote to the Abbé Kannengieser : “ What did we not hope for after that conference at Ofen ? We thought that on the horizon we perceived an aurora of a veritable Catholic renaissance. And to-day all that enchanting mirage has vanished, and we are sunk into the swamp up to the necks. Our bishops might have played a magnificent part ; they were sure that the priests and the people would support them. But it is not easy to break loose suddenly from a compromising past ; *Cardinal Haynald was not the sole bishop who had relations with the Freemasons*. . . . When such is the state of affairs, is it strange

that we have sunk so low ; that the enemies of the Church dare so much, since they can rely upon the connivance of the episcopate? Whence will come our liberator? If the ardent words of a man of God could penetrate into our episcopal chanceries, rest assured that happy days would soon dawn for the Kingdom of St. Stephen." Such was the emergency which incited Leo XIII. to write his Encyclical *Constanti Hungarorum* in 1893 ; and he took care to date it on Sept. 2, the two hundred and seventh anniversary of the deliverance of Ofen from the Turks. We give a synopsis of this important document : "With great grief we have learned that besides other laws, concerning which we have already complained to you (1), and which are very detrimental to the Catholic faith, there have been enacted and enforced among the Hungarians ordinances which have entailed grave injury on the Church and her interests ; and if we may judge by the general trend of political affairs in your empire, those enactments will soon cause much more damage than they have already inflicted. . . . In the first place, in order to obviate these perils, both clergy and laity must obey the Holy See in all things ; and in the second place, the faithful must be enjoined to avoid, as much as possible, the evil of mixed marriages, so dangerous to the faith of those contracting them." Among other practical instructions, the Pope insists on a better education of the people, in both the religious and the worldly sense ; on the holding of frequent Catholic Congresses, and on the immediate establishment of an efficacious Catholic press. "The time for serious efforts of this sort has come ; cost what it may, you must oppose writings to writings, if you desire to remedy the evils which afflict you" (2). Speaking of catechetical instruction in the schools, His Holiness insists on its being given by the pastors themselves ; "and do not think," he adds, "that your activity in the development of your schools has been so great, that it can bear no increase." Then the Pontiff turns to the point which must ever occupy a pre-

(1) In his Encyclical of Aug. 22, 1886.

(2) At this time, only two journals in Vienna, the *Vaterland* and the *Deutsches Volksblatt*, were not either owned by Jews, or edited according to their spirit.

eminent position in a Papal Encyclical which deals with wickedness of a government, for which, in the last analysis, the people are responsible: "The good example of a priest is weighty indeed; therefore let each one of your clergy exhibit himself, to the eyes of his people, as an incarnation of virtue and continence. Let no priest pay more attention to civic and political matters, than is absolutely necessary. Undoubtedly, as St. Gregory the Great advises us, we ought not so occupy ourselves with the interior life, as to neglect entirely the external; especially when there is a question of defending religion, or of furthering the general good—things which owe ought to consider, adopting for their attainment all the proper resources which may be furnished by the circumstances of time and place." The Pope lays great stress on the folly and even wickedness of the "political priest"; *and he fears that many bishops and priests, under a pretext of the prosperity of their flocks, may pay more attention to earthly than to heavenly things.* "Well did St. Gregory the Great say: 'For the sake of charity, we may sometimes mingle in the affairs of the world; but for the gratification of a taste for them, we should never approach them, lest they soil our minds, drag us down by their weight, and cause our souls to prefer them to the things of heaven' (1). . . . If you labor energetically with united hearts for the good of religion, God will be with you; and we believe that you will have the support of your sovereign, the Apostolic King, who has given so many proofs of his love for your nation, from the very beginning of his reign." In this Encyclical the Pontiff showed himself as the diplomat, no less than as the theologian and the shepherd of souls. No people in Christendom are so jealous of foreign interference as the Hungarian; but Leo XIII. knew how to respect all legitimate susceptibilities, while scorning to repress the reproof which had been merited by the sleeping guardians of the Temple. He opened the eyes of the Hungarian bishops tenderly but determinedly; and no unguarded point in his own lines of defence invited the attack of the Liberal forces. Henceforth the Liberal press could not

(1) 2. *Reg. Past.*, II., ch. 7.

hope that simple minds would credit the impudent assertion that the projected ecclesiastical laws affected no dogmas of the Church ; that even the bishops regarded the prospect of those laws with a well-justified equanimity.

It could scarcely be expected that the prelates of Hungary, hitherto so persistently supine, would be suddenly transformed into so many Lions of the Tribe of Judah ; but the arousing effect of the Encyclical on many was soon visible. On Dec. 7, Mgr. Zalka, bishop of Raab, sent to each of his parish-priests the following instruction : “ Write to the deputy representing your district that he must resist the ecclesiastical policy of the government. Make him understand that the new laws will entail evils much greater than those which the government hopes to avoid. We shall never abandon the principles of the Church of St. Stephen, and we shall never consent to the imposition of Protestant ecclesiastical law on more than nine millions of Catholics. Marriage is a Sacrament, and indissoluble ; the Church alone can legislate concerning invalidating impediments ; to the Church alone belongs all matrimonial jurisdiction.” This document might have been imitated with great advantage to their cause by the other prelates of Hungary ; but they preferred to emit a collective pastoral, which was read in all the churches on Jan. 6, 1894, and which was, indeed, a mastrely instruction. “ In presence of the danger threatening our flocks, we have assembled before the holy relics of our King, St. Stephen, in order to devise means for the dissipation of that danger. For a long time the Church has been obliged to combat a legislation which ignored the rights of parents concerning the souls of their children. In reply to our protests, there have been designed new measures destined to rivet more firmly the chains which had been placed on Catholic consciences. . . . We, the bishops of Hungary, have pushed our condescension and our conciliatory spirit to the uttermost limits ; and now we find that we can go no further in that path—that we must defend the rights of the Church. . . . It is the duty of the faithful to fight for the Church ; to shirk that obligation is a proof of cowardice. The greatest danger for the Church is in the apathy of her children ; for

such indolence forms the strength of her adversaries. Undoubtedly, the gates of hell will never prevail against the Church; but through the fault of Catholics entire nations may be lost to her. Therefore, be not ashamed of the Gospel! Arm yourselves for the liberty of your religion; manifest your faith bravely; combat perseveringly; always showing, however, moderation and respect for the civil authority. Together with your bishops and your other leaders, protest against the projected laws, and in such a fashion, that your parliamentary representatives will understand and fulfil their duty. Your combat will be defensive, not aggressive; when we demand that our religious belief be respected, we merely repel attack. It is impossible for us not to profess the ancient faith of our ancestors, not to proclaim our devotion to the Church—to that Church which, during the last ten centuries, has made Hungary, has been her benefactor, her educatrix, her mother, and whom we cannot deny without crime. We do not attack the civil power; but that power is limited by the divine laws, and we cannot allow it to pass those limits. We are not enemies of progress. The present onslaught on the Church is not progress, but a retrogression; a State cannot be built on the ruins of Christian ideas. . . Follow the examples of your ancestors. Above all, pray that the spirit of God may inspire our legislators in this grave emergency." In accordance with the injunctions of this pastoral, many mass-meetings of Catholics were held throughout the kingdom; so great was the throng which came from the surrounding country into Buda-Pesth for that purpose, that the capital ceased, for several days, to wear the appearance of a Jewish city. But the sectarians also held their mass-meetings; as the Protestant *Kreuzzeitung* said: "The Masonic Lodges of Pesth, which are all directed by Jews, have decided to agitate in favor of the new ecclesiastical laws. The expenses of the campaign will be defrayed partly by the government, and partly by Jewish contributions" (1). On March 4, there paraded the streets of the capital, according to the Liberal organs, 100,000 men who loudly proclaimed their devotion to the

(1) Issue of Jan. 26, 1894.

policy of the Weckerle cabinet. Sad to relate, among those who officially reviewed the motley crowd of Radicals, Socialists, Freemasons, Jews, and Calvinists, were seen a few magnates. Orczy, Theodore Andrassy, John Palffy, Stephen Esterhazy, and Karolyi were in those anti-Catholic ranks; and if the reason for so strange a fact be sought, probably the correct answer will be found in these words of Kannengieser: "If one could have read the minds of some of those Jews who passed in review before those noble lords, and if he could also have consulted the mortgage-records, he would have solved the enigma very quickly. Many of the estates of the nobles are unfortunately in the hands of the Jews (1); and it was noticed on the fourth of March that certain magnates walked arm in arm with men whom their dignified ancestors would not have recognized. Certainly, such a fall was not foreseen by the heroes who spilled their blood at Varna, at Nohacs, at St. Gothard, in order to save the Kingdom of St. Stephen from the Mohammedan yoke." Finally the Hungarian parliament proceeded to a vote on the question of obligatory civil marriage. On April 9, the Deputies passed the law by a majority of 175. On May 7 the debates began in the House of Magnates, and when the vote was taken on the 10th, it stood 139 against the law, and 118 for it. But at length a sufficient number of the magnates were induced to join the Judæo-Masonic combination; and on June 21, the conspirators gained their point by a majority of four. What had caused this change? The great German Liberal organ, the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, replies that "the Weckerle cabinet could boast of having the influence of the court on its side" (2). The *Neue Freie Presse* said that "the monarch remained absolutely neutral"; that is, he aided the anti-Catholic hosts, albeit unwillingly, as we know. Certainly it was a sad reflection for the

(1) The Jews in Hungary form scarcely five per cent. of the population; but they have succeeded in becoming owners of at least half of the soil. Out of 3,192 great proprietors, 1,031 are Jews. Of the lessees of the State lands, sixty-seven per cent. are Jews. The majority of the smaller estates are mortgaged to Jews. The worlds of finance and commerce belong to the Jews. Nearly all the journals of Buda-Pesth are owned by Jews. But they do not wish to be styled Jews; a rescript issued by Czaky ordered that they should always be termed Israelites.

(2) Issue of June 22, 1894.

Catholic friends of Francis Joseph, when they contemplated the absence of everyone of the twenty-one archdukes from Buda-Pesth while the crucial vote was being taken; and when they saw only two out of the eleven great dignitaries of the court deposit their ballots. However, the Catholics were not discouraged. The immense majority thought that the emperor would never sanction the iniquitous law; and in the meantime they resolved to encourage the imperial resistance by an energetic campaign throughout the country—a campaign in which they would have the assistance of those bishops who had responded to the call of Leo XIII. But judge of the dismay of the Catholic party, when, in the beginning of September the primate of Hungary, Cardinal Vaszary—that Benedictine monk on whom the Pontiff had so confidently relied—ordered his clergy to abstain entirely from “politics.” That this order was meant to minimize the opposition to the ministry, was the belief of both Catholics and Liberals; the latter openly congratulated His Eminence, by means of the mayor of Gran, who waited upon him at the head of a Masonic delegation, on his “loyalty and prudence.” The event proved that the primate had no intention of betraying the Catholic cause; that he had yielded to the entreaties of Francis Joseph, trusting that the sovereign would withhold his signature from the obnoxious law. The Catholics knew how to excuse their primate; but another prelate, the archbishop of Erlau, Mgr. Samassa, committed himself so overtly to the side of the Judæo-Calvinist cabinet, that he almost paralyzed the Catholic action. Addressing the “Delegations” (1) on Sept. 19, Samassa introduced the subject of the next Conclave, thus affording something like a picture of a son, while his father was still living, urging strangers to seize the estate; but such indelicacy was not surprising on the part of a prelate who had but recently figured in the Masonic funeral of Kossuth, walking behind the coffin of that Calvinist arch-revolutionist, the bosom-friend of Mazzini. “The question of the Conclave,” observed Samassa, “may soon be a present one, and we

(1) The “Delegations” are commissions composed of sixty members, that is, twenty senators and forty deputies, who meet alternately in Vienna and in Buda-Pesth, in order to discuss important matters in a “Council of the Empire.”

ought to occupy ourselves with it; for while it is true that the Papacy is an ecclesiastical institution, it is of great importance to the State, since to-day the Supreme Pontiff is more powerful than he was when he disposed of crowns." Then the prelate, choosing to ignore the fact that the last Conclave, as well as common sense, showed that the "right of exclusion" is a thing of the past, reminded the government of its supposed duty to so arrange matters that Austro-Hungarian influence might be brought to bear in the selection of a successor to Leo XIII. Samassa then put two questions to the cabinet: "Is the Ministry determined to use all its power to the end that the Conclave may perform its duty with complete independence; and has the government resolved to exercise its 'right of exclusion'?" The cabinet was but too willing to reply, using Kalnoky as its mouthpiece, that it had good reason to believe that the king of Italy would respect the freedom of the next Conclave, just as he had respected that of the last one; and that he (the Minister) did not believe that the emperor had any intention of holding his "right of exclusion" in abeyance. This "slap in the face of the Papacy, given by an archbishop," as the interpellation of Samassa was rightly termed at the time, could not have been the result of a sudden impulse; all parties agreed in regarding it as a deliberate effort to place difficulties in the path of the Holy See. At any rate, the unity of action which was so necessary to the Catholic party, and which had already been weakened by the counsels of Cardinal Vaszary, was now nearly destroyed; and the Weckerle cabinet was able to hope for an early actuation of its entire anti-Christian programme. In fact, on Dec. 10, the emperor-king gave his approbation to the anti-religious laws: the Marianic Kingdom was destined to become a modern "Liberal" State. For a moment the primate and other bishops had recovered their courage, and had sent their blessings to the Congress of 10,000 Catholics which met at Szehes-Fehervax on Nov. 13, and founded a new Popular Party; but ere that party could be organized, Weckerle had forced the hand of Francis Joseph, and Hungary was endowed with the benefits of an

atheistic civilization. Weckerle now resigned his office ; but when seeking for a new Hungarian premier, Francis Joseph had eyes for none other than partisans of Weckerle, and from among these he selected Baron Banffy, a fanatical Protestant, and the supreme *curator* of the Evangelicals of Transylvania. For his Minister of Worship and of Public Instruction, the new premier chose Dr. Wlassics, a professor in the Masonicized University of Buda-Pesth, and a Radical whose policy the Liberal Hanzak thus foreshadowed : ' Let us remember the speeches made by Wlassics during the debates on the politico-ecclesiastical laws. He manifested the most extreme Radicalism ; and we would not be surprised if the programme of the Banffy-Wlassics cabinet embraced a complete secularization of the Church.' The bishops now published a pastoral in which they insisted that they had used every possible means to prevent the triumph of the enemies of the Church ; they drew attention to their supplications to the emperor-king, to their collective pastoral condemning civil marriage, and to the unanimity with which they had voted against the Bill in the House of Magnates. But no sooner had this pastoral been heard by the faithful, than Mgr. Bubics, bishop of Kaschan, issued a pamphlet in which he tried to explain the teachings of the collective pastoral in a sense diametrically opposed to that which the other prelates had intended ; and not to be outdone in Liberalism, Archbishop Samassa published a commentary on the teachings of Leo XIII. in which he travestied their meaning. Meanwhile, the organization of the new Popular Party was being effected under the guidance of Count Ferdinand Zichy and Count Nicholas Esterhazy ; and as its first consequences Catholic journals were founded in many cities, Catholic clubs were opened, and the existing Catholic societies were greatly developed. It soon became evident that at the next elections a large majority of foes to the new ecclesiastical laws would be sent to the parliament. Then the Judæo-Masonic machinery was set to work ; and in scores of places, when the day of election arrived, the governmental inspectors rejected Catholic votes by the hundreds (1).

(1) As an instance of this Liberal method of ascertaining 'the will of the people, we may

The governmental majority in the House of Deputies was thus assured ; and with that moral influence as a support, Banffy made his approaches on the House of Magnates. However, the overwhelming sentiment of the country, which the efforts of the Popular Party had placed in evidence, had strengthened the determination of the majority of the Magnates to preserve the Catholic character of the Kingdom of St. Stephen ; and two days before the momentous question was again debated in the Upper House, the Hungarians read an Allocation which Leo XIII. had pronounced on March 18 for their encouragement. With consummate tact, His Holiness had omitted to complain of the many tergiversations of the Hungarian bishops, and had apparently remembered only such of their actions as were praiseworthy ; and he had said : “ The bishops of Hungary have now employed every means to ward off the evil which menaces their Church. The priests have labored with them, and they have been helped also by the members of parliament who wish to preserve the faith of their ancestors. But unfortunately these efforts have been vain, and the enemies of the Church have triumphed. Let it be seen by those whose duty it is to see, how contrary to justice it is to advocate for Catholic matrimony a legislation which the Church has so often condemned ! It is but proper for the State to regulate the effects of mar-

cite the case of the two elections in the district of Neutra, held in March and April, 1895. Count John Zichy, the candidate of the Popular Party, had received assurances from nearly 1,500 voters that their ballots would be cast for him. When these electors, residents of the rural districts around Neutra, arrived at the walls of the city, the Liberal “ clique,” as the Protestant *Kreuzzeitung* termed the men in power, refused them entrance, although a violent storm (it was March 20) was raging. Surrounded by a cordon of military, the wielders of a “ free ballot ” were kept outside the walls from seven in the morning of the twentieth until the same hour of the next day. During this interval these “ free citizens of a free State ” were not allowed to betake themselves to any shelter, nor were they allowed to search for any food. When Zichy heard of this outrage, he brought to the unfortunates 1,500 large loaves of bread ; but the inspector of elections, Tarnoczy, determined to use starvation as a weapon to force the Catholic voters to return to their homes, confiscated the food. When an affectation of decency finally compelled Tarnoczy to admit the drenched and shivering starvelings—not one had abandoned his intention of voting—he managed to prolong the balloting for twenty-one hours, during which many fainted, and probably would have died, had their Hungarian peasant frames not been phenomenally strong. When it was found that the entire 1,500 had voted the ticket of the Popular Party, the inspector threw out 1,226 ballots. But the fraud had been so barefaced, that the administration candidate did not dare to accept his election : and another balloting was ordered. The same result, however, was proclaimed, and the government candidate now ventured to take his seat.

riage in the civil order ; but it belongs to the Church alone to legislate concerning the marriage bond, since Christ gave to His Church the power of raising marriage to the dignity of a Sacrament." On March 23, the irreligious laws were again rejected by the Magnates ; the accepting votes being 112, and the repelling, 127. The "clerical" majority was small indeed ; and during the next few weeks it was weakened by the death of Mgr. Schopper, by the loss of his seat by the Jesuit, Esterhazy, and by the imperial nomination of a Liberal named Toths. The *coup de grace* was given to the Catholic confidence, when His Apostolic Majesty yielded to the persistence of Banffy, and imitating the trick of British monarchs in similar contingencies, created ten new peers, all of them sworn creatures of the Judæo-Calvinist cabal. By this act, Francis Joseph allowed the crown of St. Stephen to fall into the mud, over which it had been suspended from the very beginning of his reign (1) ; but calm and judicious observers have discerned a blessing for the Hungarian Church in this apparently triumphant issue of the anti-Catholic conspiracy. Cardinal Maury told the politicians of his day that it was "a dangerous thing to make martyrs" ; and already the bishops of Hungary are giving evidence of a possession of that sacred fire which recently they needed so lamentably. And the Hungarian laity have begun to realize the melancholy truth of those words which Jules Simon, the most honest of

(1) When we reflect on the innumerable instances of weakness on the part of Francis Joseph in regard to the Masonic and other irreligious enterprises which have signalized his reign, we fail to understand how he could have found sufficient stamina to enable him to refuse to return in Rome the visit which King Humbert made him in Vienna. This persistent refusal was certainly an eloquent testimony as to his personal sentiments concerning the rights of the Pope-King. It is not improbable that the influence of the empress was responsible for this admirable delicacy on the part of her husband. In spite of the vagaries—natural to a member of the Bavarian Wittelsbach family—which sometimes prompted her to actions like that of placing a wreath on the tomb of Heine, the Jewish prophet of moral filth, the Empress Elizabeth, like her sisters, the "Angel of Gaeta" and the Duchess d'Alençon, was a devout Catholic. To have visited a "King of Italy" in the Pope's palace of the Quirinal would have broken her heart. In the *Life of Francis Joseph* which Canon Wächtler published in 1891, we read a letter written by Her Majesty to Queen Margaret, in which, after alluding to the punishments which have overtaken the persecutors of the Roman Pontiffs, she said : "The very thought of crossing the threshold of the Quirinal, when things are as they are, fills me with fright. I deeply regret that I cannot return the visit of my royal sister. The fault is not mine ; but of those who govern in favor of material interests which are transient and deceitful." The authenticity of this letter was denied by many of the zealous partisans of the Triple Alliance ; but who will believe that a respectable ecclesiastic would dare to publish a forged letter, under the very eyes of the aggrieved party ?

all modern Liberals, was addressing to his countrymen at the very moment when the Marianic Kingdom was being besmirched: "Repeat as often as you please that in 1880 you did not wish to enact an atheistic law; that you desired only to free the political world from clerical influence. I would like to believe you, for I war on no man. But look on that brutal fact—a boy of twenty hurling his dynamite into a crowd. You kill him; but death is not so powerful as you think. Poor sick society, that recurs to the chopping-knife for a cure! *It is to God that it must turn!*"

In his admirable papers on *The Jews in Hungary*, published in the *Correspondant* of 1883, Father Ollivier emits these reflections concerning the influence of the Jews in the Kingdom of St. Stephen: "Unfortunately for the people of the Arpads, there is such a person as the Hungarian Jew. He is of a race but poorly defined—a graft on the German and the Slav; but he is intrenching himself firmly, and the fault lies at the door of the Hungarians themselves, especially of the nobility. It is now a long time since the saying, 'In every magnate's household there is a Jewess' became current in Hungary. The traditional beauty of the daughters of Juda has worked more ravages among the Magyar nobles, during the last few centuries, than were ever effected by the sabres of the Turks. Israel was careful to use this resource against the Christians; it used the weapon without shame and without measure, and the Christians opened their doors to the Jewesses with an imprudence which has been cruelly punished in our days. The famous saying has recently been changed so as to read: 'Every magnate's household has its Jew.' In Pesth, when one lounges before the shops of the Varsi-Utesa, he gazes with stupor on the riches displayed in the windows—necklaces, brooches, cinctures, weapons, harness, all glittering with gold and precious stones, and all having their legends and historic importance. All these objects are for sale; for now they belong, by right of conquest, to Jews. In the olden time when the Magyar lost the aigrette from his helmet, or when his sword was not discerned at his side, men knew that his head-dress had fallen off or his sword been broken in some battle against the Turks,

the Germans, or the Tartars. But now the combats are fought at the gambling-tables, and the Jew is always behind the combatants. The body-stripper is on this battle-field, just as he was on the ancient ones ; but what a pity that he should be so encouraged ! In the days of old this body-stripper was compared to a vulture whom night brought to the field of carnage, and whom the army-followers beat off with sticks ; but to-day, the light of day serves the human vulture, and the follower kisses the hand which locks up the knight. Undoubtedly this is a matter of taste ; but it does not please me to see the Hungarian nobles tributary to the Jews, and preparing the subjection of the Hungarian people to the same domination." Apropos of this reflection concerning the estates of the Magyar nobles, we notice that the *Deutsche Volksblatt* of Vienna, in its issue of June 16, 1871, states that during the previous seven years the Rothschilds had become owners of the estates of more than sixty of the greater nobles of Bohemia ; that then the real estate of the Rothschilds in Bohemia was eight times more valuable than that possessed in that kingdom by the imperial Hapsburgs. The reader will note that the ownership of these estates gives right, not only to seats in the Bohemian Landtag and the Austrian Reichsrath, but also to many ecclesiastical "rights of patronage." Continuing his observations, Father Ollivier says : "The clergy resist this invasion, and it is fortunate that ecclesiastical property is inalienable, and cannot pass into the hands of the Jews. There remains therefore for the weak some guarantee of that protection which the magnates cannot afford. But let the Hungarian nobles beware ! When their last acre of land is exchanged for the last loan from the usurer—and that day does not seem distant—they will cease to be of any use to the State, and their history will terminate with a disgraceful page. Already they are not necessary ; to many they appear superfluous. Nobility has its reason of existence much more in the services that it renders, than in the benefits it has conferred, and in the popular estimation one ceases to be noble when his name, no longer representing any grandeur, is banded in the antechamber of a courtesan, or in the cloakroom of a

gaming-house. God help the descendants of the founders of Hungary, for they know not now how to help themselves!" (1).

CHAPTER XI.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE GERMAN EMPIRE.

In the dissertation wherein we demonstrated that Bismarck adopted all the force of his slavish bureaucracy, and all the would-be subtleties of "German science," in the interests of religious persecution, we described, at least incidentally, the relations that subsisted—such as they were—between Leo

(1) Concerning the vital question of Anti-Semitism which is now engaging the attention of the Austrian populations, even in a greater degree than it occupies the minds of Russian, German, and French publicists, much light has recently been shed by the very un-Catholic Arnold White, in his *Modern Jew* (New York, 1899). "The cause of the people's fury against the Jews in the Middle Age," notes this author, "as it has been at all times since, was the unlawful usury and the profits made from all classes of people by Jewish intrigue and cunning. Numerous grievances were at that time brought by the citizens of various towns before their government. Only in those days people were not clear about this, namely, that, in the Jews they had to deal with a foreign nation and an alien race, and therefore religion had to be used as a characteristic." What the Austrian Anti-Semites really desire is thus expressed: "They want to see the influx of Jews into various districts limited by lawful means, because they feel it to be hurtful. They seek, therefore, to obtain a revision of the laws, by which the Jews may be made to experience certain restrictions." And again—the author quotes from the Anti-Semite Catechism: "The Jews, under the mantle of religion, form in reality a political, social, and commercial company, which, guided by uniform principles, and with a secret understanding between themselves, aims at the subjugation and exploitation of non-Jewish peoples. The Jews in all countries and in all languages are in this aim at one, and work for its accomplishment unanimously. It is therefore impossible for the Jews in the country, where they happen to dwell, ever to take an honest interest in the lot of their non-Jewish compatriots. In short, a Jew can never cherish an honest patriotism; he is always, and above all, conscious of being a member of the 'chosen' Jewish nation; and if he poses as German, French, or English, it is, at most, a calculated hypocrisy. From within the pale of his peculiar community, the Jew looks out upon all Gentiles as his enemies, whom he has to combat with cunning and treachery. While conforming to his peculiar moral law, the Jew considers himself above all other codes, and holds himself prepared to transgress all laws of the land, but always in such a manner that the abuse cannot be brought home to him. The Jews consider themselves the natural aristocracy of mankind, and believe, on this ground, that they should be masters of the world." Touching the latter assertion, Major Osuan Bey reports in his book *The Conquest of the World by the Jews*, how an eminent Jew at a gathering of Jewish elders at Cracow, in the year 1840, said: "So long as we do not have the newspapers of the whole world in our hands to deceive and blind the people, our mastery remains a chimera." When, in the year 1852, the French Masonic luminary, the Jew Cremieux, issued a summons to the founding of *The Israelitish Alliance*, he wrote: "Our nationality is the religion of our fathers—we know no other. The Jewish doctrine must, one day, cover the whole earth. Success is certain. Every day wfil the net which Israel casts over the globe extend itself. Let us make use of all opportunities: our power is great, let us learn to employ it. What have we to fear? The

XIII. and the arrogant chancellor. Let us now observe that when our Pontiff mounted the Chair of Peter the Bismarckian enterprise had been in full career for more than six years; and as we have seen, the event had shown that it had become necessary for the chancellor to ignore his confident declaration that he "would never go to Canossa." The sole question then agitating the minds of both William I. and his Minister turned on the possibility of a discovery of the particular road to Canossa which would be the least humiliating to their respective susceptibilities; and in a letter to the emperor, dated April 17, 1878, a letter which was first published by Mgr. T'Serclaes in 1894, Leo XIII. clearly and calmly indicated the ground, and the sole ground, on which the Holy See and the German Empire could arrive at an

day is not far off when the wealth of the world will belong exclusively to the Jews." Certainly the spectacle afforded by the monarchy of the Hapsburgs of to-day justifies the glee of Cremieux. Now the dual monarchy contains more Israelites than any other country in Europe, with the exception of Russia. In the territories at present included in the Austrian or Cisleithan Kingdom there were in the reign of Maria Teresa 200,000 Jews; in 1890 there were 1,143,305. In Hungary, under Joseph II., in the last quarter of the last century, there were but 25,000 Jews; the number has now reached 1,000,000. In the year 1890, out of 1,214,363 inhabitants in Vienna, 118,495, or about ten per cent., were Jews. Buda-Pesth contains some 150,000; Prague possesses more than thirty synagogues. In Galicia the Jews have not diminished in number, in spite of the fact that many annually leave the country; on the contrary, in the last twenty years they have increased 34 per cent. In Austrian Silesia they have increased 64 per cent. in the same time; in the Bukowina, 74 per cent. The Jews now form 11.7 per cent. of the population of Galicia, 12.8 per cent. of that of the Bukowina, and 16 per cent. of the population of Silesia. A fifth part of the land in Galicia belongs to Jews. In the Bukowina, 22 per cent. of the great landed proprietors are Israelites, and the remaining real estate is, for the most part, encumbered with debts to them. Although the Jews form hardly 5 per cent. of the total population of the Austrian or Cisleithan Kingdom, one-third of the professors are of Jewish origin. Of 280 teachers in the Vienna University, in the same year, about 30 per cent. were Jews. The Buda-Pesth Polytechnic, in the same year, had 578 scholars, of whom 201 were Jews; the Comas Academy, 599 scholars, of whom 480 were Jews. In the *Gymnasien* (classical schools) and *Realschulen* (high schools) of Hungary, 20 per cent. of the pupils were Jews, although they constitute but 4.5 per cent. of the population. In the Austrian *Gymnasien* and *Realschulen* the Jews furnished 18.5 per cent. of the attendance. In the intermediate schools (*Mittelschulen*) only 22 per cent. of the scholars were Christians, and 77 per cent. Jews. On the other hand, of the 6,274 pupils at the technical schools in Vienna, only 110 were Jews, an indication of their aversion to handicrafts as a means of livelihood. At the end of 1887, out of 660 attorneys in Vienna, 350 were Jews. At the end of 1889, out of 999 members of the Vienna Stock Exchange, 883 were Jews. Of the Vienna houses in the old parish districts, 70 per cent. are the property of Israelites. Of military doctors in 1877, 7 per cent. were Jews; in 1889, 23 per cent.; whilst, of the doctors admitted to practice in 1889, 39 per cent. were of Jewish origin. Finance and commerce are, practically, in Israelite hands; were it not for the assistance of Jewish bankers, most of the manufacturers could not carry on their business. Throughout Austria-Hungary the press is almost exclusively in the hands of Jews. "Have you any Christians on your staff?" the editor of the great Buda-Pesth newspaper, the *Pester Lloyd*, was asked. "I think we have one," was the reply.

agreement. If the reader has been one of those indiscreet zealots who tried, at that time, to convince themselves that Leo XIII. was guilty of inordinate condescension to the cabinet of Berlin, we would submit to his consideration the following passages of the pontifical communication: "We find ourselves under the necessity of calling the attention of Your Majesty to a matter which is of pre-eminent interest to the Catholics who are subject to your sceptre. Your Majesty asks us to remember the happy past, when the good sense of the German people led to an obedience to the supreme authority of the State; and then, deploring the attitude now presented by the Catholic priesthood, Your Majesty asks for the intervention of our authority, in order that the above-mentioned blessings may again be enjoyed. Now, on our part, we ask Your Majesty to note that if there is any difference between the past and the present conduct of your Catholic subjects, the sole reason for that difference will be found in that civil legislation which has pretended to change the divine constitution of the Church, and which has forced Catholics, in spite of themselves, to consider the sad alternative of refusing obedience to the new laws of Your Majesty, or of obeying the laws of God and of His Church. Let it be ordered, without any prejudice to the sovereign authority of Your Majesty, that the Catholic priesthood and people be free to observe the laws of their Church. And since the new civil legislation in Germany has suppressed those fundamental articles which guaranteed the perfect independence of the Catholics, let Your Majesty, in his magnanimity, restore a state of things which was as conducive to the tranquillity of consciences, as it was to the true interests of the State. If this be effected, Your Majesty may rest assured that on our part nothing will be wanting for the restoration of harmony between the two supreme authorities." But this road to Canossa was no less uninviting to the cabinet of Berlin, than had been the others which the chancellor had pretended to discern as awaiting the German Minister who would extend the olive-branch to Rome; and even when Falk had been retired from office, and the more moderate Puttkamer had taken his place, the Catholics of Germany were told

that "it was their obstinacy, their pigheadedness in not respecting the laws of the State, that caused their sufferings." However, as we have seen, the German chancellor finally entered on the road to Canossa; and in 1882, the road had been so far traversed, that a Prussian Minister-Plenipotentiary was accredited to the Vatican. It is well to note that when Bismarck was interpellated in the Reichstag, as to the reason for accrediting to the Vatican a diplomatic representative from Prussia, and not from Germany, the chancellor replied that he regarded the Catholic Church as an institution of the country, that is, of Prussia; but that there might soon be a representation of Germany at the Papal court. By this avowal Bismarck admitted that he had abandoned his theory that the Church was a foreign institution; in other words, the "man of blood and iron" now condemned the principle which had actuated the "May Laws," and he was ready to go to Canossa by proxy. In 1885, Bismarck manifested a further inclination for reconciliation with the Holy See, when he agreed to the selection of Pope Leo XIII. as arbitrator in the matter of the difference between Germany and Spain concerning the Caroline Islands; but it is not impossible that the chancellor had thought that this deference would so mollify the pontifical heart, that His Holiness would endeavor to implant some ultra-imperialistic sentiments in the German clergy. However, in the letter which the Pontiff wrote to the chancellor on this occasion, it was clearly shown that diplomatic sweets do not induce the Holy See to temporize in matters involving the liberty of the Church; it became more evident than ever that if Bismarck desired peace with Rome, it would be necessary for him to break the chains which he had fastened on the German Church. This truth was accentuated when, on January 6, 1886, the Pope wrote to the Prussian bishops a letter in which he declared: "We have ever assured the government that we wish to meet all its desires, whenever those desires are compatible with the divine law and the dictates of our conscience." On all points which are essential, however, adds His Holiness, he will remain invincibly steadfast: "For although we desire peace most sincerely,

we cannot controvert the ordinances of God ; if the defence of these ordinances demands the sacrifice, we are ready, following the example of so many of our predecessors, to suffer the last extremities." This Apostolic firmness conquered ; and William I. immediately took the first decisive step in the way of conciliation. Mgr. Kopp, the bishop of Fulda (afterward archbishop of Breslau, and a cardinal), was called to the Prussian House of Lords ; and at the same time, the government abandoned its "discretionary powers." Other concessions followed successively ; and in the debates which ensued in the parliament, one is surprised on hearing the author of the "War for Civilization" perorating in favor of the first victims of that war, as he combats the opposition of Gneist, Virchow, Richter, and other priest-eaters who had so powerfully seconded his ignoble efforts. When a "scientific" demonstration of the dangers of peace with Rome was attempted by Gneist, the chancellor replied : "I regard the picture drawn by the deputy as somewhat exaggerated. He will admit with me that before 1871, the Catholics enjoyed those same rights which now we are trying to restore to them ; and nevertheless, at that time we, the Evangelicals, raised no complaints because of any derogation from our rights." When Virchow insisted that the government was imprudent in its onward march in the way of concession, Bismarck answered : "We recognize the validity of the law ; but if we wish to force its application, we will be compelled to a continual course of rigorous proceedings. We will raise the conflict to the rank of an institution. As for me, I shall no longer help in doing violence to our Catholic compatriots." On May 10, 1886, the Reichstag passed the "Fourth Law for Peace," and on the following day William I. signed the document which practically terminated the "War for Civilization." Thus it came to pass that this Bismarck, who, according to a despatch of the Prince of Reuss, then (1880) ambassador of Germany in Vienna, had declared that a revision of the May Laws was "an egregious foolishness which he had never encouraged by a single word," finally besought the Reichstag to deliver him from the last remnants of those laws. "To this pass had come the Man of Iron," remarks

Geffcken ; "the man who had declared that he would never go to Canossa. This rhodomontade, which is cut into the marble of a monument which was erected in his honor at that time, is now a piece of bitter irony. Bismarck, who knew so admirably how to practice the advice, '*fecisti, nega*' (in other words, 'lie, lie always!') afterward pretended, in order to cover his defeat, that he had never wished for more than an equitable arrangement of the relations between Church and State, and that 'other hands' meddled with his plan. It is a pity that those 'other hands' cannot be discovered ; for the chancellor was never known to be dominated by any other person whomsoever" (1).

Some of the first official acts of William II., who, after the short reign of Frederick III., had succeeded to the sceptre of his grandfather in 1888, gave promise of a due deference to a proper respect for the rights of the Holy See, as well as an indication that the new reign would not be signalized by any attempts to renew the "War for Civilization." The official announcement of the accession of William II. was received simultaneously by the courts of the Vatican and of the Quirinal : the young emperor, desirous of avoiding a question of precedence between the Roman Pontiff and the sovereign who posed as King of Italy, and wishing not to appear to definitively (so far as he could) solve that Roman Question which has not yet been solved, had ordered that Leo XIII. and Humbert should each receive the notification of the new reign at the same moment, by different and special envoys. And when he opened the Prussian *Landtag*, the new emperor-king announced : "It is with great pleasure that I perceive that our recent politico-religious legislation has modified the relations between the States and the spiritual head of the Catholic Church, in a manner that is acceptable to both parties ; and I shall exert myself to preserve religious peace in my dominions." Shortly after this declaration, it was announced that William II. was about to visit his ally, King Humbert, in the Eternal City ; and naturally the party of the Quirinal desired to interpret the event in a sense hostile to the never-dormant claims of the Pope-King—a desire

(1) *Leo XIII. in the Eyes of Germany*, Edited by Boyer d'Agén.

which was thwarted by a declaration, on the part of the coveted guest, that he would also visit Pope Leo XIII. in his palace of the Vatican. Naturally the Pontiff expressed his willingness, even his desire, to welcome a Christian sovereign to the foot of the Apostolic throne; but by means of his secretary of state (then Cardinal Rampolla del Tindaro), he informed His German Majesty that the desired audience could be granted only on condition that there should be an exact observance of the etiquette instituted by Pius IX., and approved by himself, for the guidance of all sovereigns who would desire to visit both the Roman Pontiff and the Savoyard who was then resident in the stolen Papal palace of the Quirinal. Such was the real meaning of the warning which, though couched in the mellifluous terminology of modern diplomacy, was conveyed to William II., German Emperor. When His Majesty would wish to pay his respects to Pope Leo XIII., he should start, not from the stolen Quirinal, at the portals of which Papal palace he would have alighted, on his arrival in the capital of the Popes; he should proceed to the residence of the Prussian ambassador to the Holy See, a locality which, like that occupied by all embassies, enjoyed the prerogatives of extra-territoriality, and from that neutral spot he should proceed to the palace-prison of the Head of the Catholic Church. Of course the arrangement was, in a sense, a diplomatic fiction; but the deepness of its meaning was well understood by the *Italianissimi* and by the German emperor, and that potentate was so anxious for the friendship of Leo XIII., that he could not avoid a course which necessarily entailed mortification on the heir of Victor Emmanuel. Accordingly, on October 12, 1888, William II. proceeded to the Palazzo Capranica, the residence of Schlotzer, the Prussian Minister to the Vatican; and there the emperor and his suite entered, not carriages belonging to the Savoyard of the Quirinal, but state-carriages which had been brought from Berlin for the purpose, and then he went to his interview with the Roman Pontiff. On his arrival in the court-yard of San Damaso, the emperor was received with the ceremonies usually adopted when sovereigns visit His Holiness. Having entered the palace, having

ascended the *scala regia*, and having traversed the antechambers connecting with the private apartments of the Pontiff, the emperor found Mgr. Marini ready to welcome him at the door of the room in which he was to meet the spiritual sovereign of Christendom. Marini informed the Pope that the German emperor desired an audience; and instantly His Holiness appeared on the threshold, and extending his hand to his guest, he drew him into his private chamber, where he invited him to be seated. Leo was far more at ease than the emperor; for the witnesses of the first instant of the meeting narrated that as William took the hand of the Pontiff with his own right hand, he dropped his helmet from the left. Particulars of this momentous interview are wanting, unless in the minds of those who credit the journalistic utterances of the day concerning matters which must be necessarily unknown; probably the following narrative, given by the *Civiltà Cattolica*, of all European periodicals the least addicted to exaggeration and journalistic hysterics, is the most authentic: "The Holy Father, after an exchange of the usual courtesies, opened the interview by expressing a regret that he had not been able to receive William II. under more favorable circumstances; that is, in the same manner in which Gregory XVI. had received William IV. of Prussia, and in that in which Pius IX. had welcomed the Prussian prince-royal in 1853. His Holiness deplored the situation to which he was reduced; and he observed that even the visit of His Imperial Majesty had caused the so-called Liberal press to make remarks which were most injurious to the Holy See. Replying to these observations, the emperor alluded to the great prestige enjoyed now by the Papacy in Europe; and he declared that the name of the present Pontiff is everywhere venerated. As for the criticisms of newspapers, His Majesty insisted that they were not worthy of consideration. 'Nevertheless,' replied the Pope, 'the position of the Pontiff is now such, that I cannot return Your Majesty's visit, unless I am willing to compromise the Papal dignity.' Then the Holy Father began to dilate on the increasing audacity of the anarchists, and on the absolute necessity of restraining such enemies of society; but scarcely

had he introduced this subject, when the interview was abruptly interrupted by the unannounced entrance of Prince Henry, the brother of the emperor. This painful incident quite naturally prevented His Holiness from continuing the subject which he had introduced (1); but before the audience terminated, he said a few words concerning the religious affairs of Germany." Such is probably the most authentic account of this memorable interview which is now obtainable. The extent of the emperor's responsibility for his brother's exhibition of a gross defiance of an etiquette which obtains even in the palaces of merely secular sovereigns—an etiquette which is prescribed by the most elementary principles of politeness for observance in the house of another—may never be known. For the credit of his race, it may be charitably supposed that the German emperor had not deliberately designed one of those would-be impressive *coups de théâtre* which time has shown to be so dear to his heart. We may be allowed to believe that the "incident" was simply a consequence of that megaloccephalous condition in which so many Germans found themselves after their unprecedented triumph over France. Nor is it improbable that the disgraceful episode was merely an illustration of that German and "Anglo-Saxon" Protestant spirit—essentially boorish—concerning which the members of the pontifical household, as well as every guardian of the treasures of intellectual and artistic Rome, recite so many indignation-exciting stories. Pope Leo XIII. could not have been utterly surprised by the Hohen-

(1) It is uncertain whether the palm for boorishness in the matter of the interruption of this audience should be awarded to Prince Henry, the scion of the Hohenzollern, or to Count Herbert von Bismarck, the heir of the Man of Iron. What appears to be certain, after an analysis of all the rumors of the day, is that before leaving the Quirinal, the Germans had reflected that probably the Pope would introduce some subjects which they might prefer to ignore; that in order to save the emperor from any consequent inconvenience, it had then been arranged that Prince Henry should so time his arrival at the Vatican as to be able to enter the audience-chamber thirty minutes after the imperial entrance. So things were carried out; but when Henry presented himself at the entrance of the Pope's private apartment, the chamberlain on duty barred his way, quietly informing him that His Holiness was engaged. The noble Hohenzollern loudly proclaimed his identity; but the chamberlain kept the wand of office stretched across the doorway. Then Herbert, the son of his father, came to the rescue of the imperial intruder: and when the official insisted on performing his duty, the boor exclaimed; "Do you know who I am? I am Herbert von Bismarck!" The Roman replied: "Ah! that explains your conduct, but it does not excuse it." However, the chamberlain was thrust aside, and the worthy descendant of Frederick II. stalked into the pontifical presence.

zollern exhibition. One day, as he was proceeding to the palace gardens for his usual promenade, he passed through the Vatican Library. As he entered each hall, the whisper that His Holiness was present was passed around, and every student arose and genuflected. In one of the halls, a number of manuscripts, for the study of which he had obtained a special pontifical permission, was engaging the attention of the famous epigraphist, Mommsen. The Schleswicker heard the notice of the Pope's entrance, but he simply shrugged his shoulders with implied contempt; a more civilized investigator told him to arise, but the barbarian shrugged again, and settled more firmly in his seat (1). The remembrance of innumerable facts like this of Mommsen prepared our Pontiff for the otherwise astounding news that Herbert von Bismarck was retained in the society of men who claimed to be gentlemen. In the meantime, the German emperor had demonstrated his own idea of the meaning of the term "gentleman," by an exhibition of the value at which he estimated his promises. He had agreed to return from the Vatican to the Prussian embassy, thus observing the same diplomatic fiction which he had respected on his way to the Papal audience; but as soon as he arrived in the courtyard of San Damaso, he ordered his coachman to drive him direct to the Quirinal. However, when William II. returned to Berlin, he did not show that his interviews with the men of the Quirinal had rendered him more favorable to a renewal of the "War for Civilization." When the members of the *Evangelische Bund* urged him to a persecution of their Catholic compatriots, protesting that they knew well "how to distinguish between the sincere piety of many Germans and the spirit of Jesuitism which daily grows more rampant in the Roman Church"; finishing with the assertion that "the right of legitimate defence commands us to fight against Jesuitism"; he replied that while he appreciated the efforts of the League for the spread of Protestantism, "he trusted that the members, both in their writings and in their words, would never be wanting in respect for the faith of their adversaries,

(1) MASSON; *Rome During the Holy Week*. Paris, 1891.—BOYER D'AGEN; *Leo XIII. In The Eyes of His Contemporaries*, p. 186. Paris, 1892.

and that they would accord that tolerance which proceeds from respect." In 1893, William II. visited the Pontiff in his palace for the second time; and on this occasion there occurred no *contretemps* like that in which Prince Henry and the young Bismarck had distinguished themselves in 1888. The ostensible reason for this second trip to Rome was a desire to congratulate their "Italian Majesties," Humbert and Margaret of Savoy, on the anniversary of their silver wedding. Again we quote from the *Civiltà Cattolica*: "William II. departs from the Quirinal; he separates from those who term themselves masters of Rome, effacing, so to speak, every trace of his connection with them, and entering into his own territory—for as such does international law regard the locality where his envoy-extraordinary to the Holy See resides. Having arrived at the Palazzo Capranica, he sits at table with princes of the Church, some officers of the pontifical court, and the gentlemen of his own suite. The members of the *de facto* government and all their adherents are rigorously excluded, just like so many strangers. When the repast is finished, the German empress arrives accompanied by a lady of her court; she is dressed in black, with a black veil on her head (1), as etiquette prescribes. She also, in order to be received in the Apostolic palace of the Vatican, has left her hosts of the Quirinal, and has come to the Prussian legation. The carriages, the horses, the liveries, all the paraphernalia of the *cortège*, are not Italian; still less have they come from the court of the Savoyard sovereigns. It is necessary that the visit to the Holy Father be made in such fashion that it may appear clearly that the German monarch proceeds directly to the Vatican; therefore the entire equipage has come from Berlin. . . . 'A more picturesque *cortège* could not be desired,' said the *Corriere della Sera*. But whither are their Imperial Majesties proceeding with all this pomp and solemnity? What is the object of this public demonstration? All Rome can tell you. Their Imperial Majesties are going to

(1) Many English and American journals, ignorant as usual in regard to everything papal, asserted that the German empress had ~~refused~~ to subject herself to this etiquette. Had she been so foolish, she would not have been received in audience by the Pontiff.

the Vatican; they are about to render homage to that personage whom the dominant faction, the official press, the Ministers and the deputies, every day term 'the enemy of his country,' the 'conspirator,' the 'cancer of Italy,' the 'knife which transfixes the Italian heart.' . . . The emperor and empress are introduced into the presence of him who has sat in Rome during nearly nineteen centuries; of him whose kingdom, older and more glorious than any in Europe, has seen and will see the births and deaths of so many republics, kingdoms, and empires. The sovereigns bow respectfully before the grand and venerable Leo, the vigilant guardian of order and of social peace, the legitimate representative and energetic defender of the principle of authority, the Vicar of Him who is the King of Kings." After about twenty minutes of conventional conversation, the empress introduced and presented to His Holiness the ladies who had accompanied her; and then she withdrew in order to visit the palace and the Basilica of St. Peter, leaving her imperial husband to private conversation with the Pontiff. The private audience of the emperor lasted for more than an hour; and the papal attendants remarked that whereas the face of William II. had exhibited great anxiety when he entered the pontifical cabinet, it appeared radiant when he issued forth. After this audience, the German emperor went directly to the Prussian legation; and at the lunch which was served for him and several cardinals, he presented a magnificent snuff-box to Cardinal Ledochowski, the intrepid Pole who had been the chief victim of the Bismarckian "War for Civilization," saying, as he made the peace-offering: "Your Eminence, may the past be forgotten!" Cardinal Rampolla del Tindaro, the papal secretary of state, received the decoration of the Black Eagle; and as the *Berliner Tageblatt* afterward observed, since that honor was usually conferred only on monarchs, and was never given to others, unless they were Ministers whom the Prussian sovereign wished especially to distinguish, the fact was to be regarded as one of great political importance. These circumstances, reflected the Italian Liberal *Corrispondenza Verde*, "together with the conditions which the emperor

was made to accept, ere he could enter the residence of Leo XIII., lead us to suppose that the silver wedding was, in the eyes of the guest of the princes of Savoy, merely a pretext for his visit to the Leonine City." Naturally the Italian "officious" journals protested against this view of the matter; but they all admitted, with the *Nazione*, that the emperor's visit to the Vatican "was a political event of the first importance." Some agreed with the *Tribuna*, that it was "a cloud interposed between the young emperor and the Italian people"; others again echoed the complaint of the ministerial *Folchetto*, that "it was strange to see a sovereign, a guest of the king of United Italy in Italian Rome, going to salute an old man whom the (Masonic), Italian sentiment of (the new and fictitious) Rome loves not but rather regards as the incarnation of all that threatens its rights." There were certain journals, principally German, which ascribed the imperial deference to a cherished hope that His Holiness would induce the German Centre to vote for the military bill which Bismarck had introduced into the Reichstag. One of the chancellor's organs complacently remarked that if the ministerial measure were carried, it might be recorded, like all Pontifical Bulls, as "given at St. Peter's in Rome." Probably the reader remembers that in the first days of 1893, Bismarck proposed to augment the peace-effective of the German army by 83,000 men; and that the government rejected the amendment of the National-Liberals which allowed an increase of only 49,000. In this emergency, a prominent Centrist, Baron von Huene, of his own accord (*Windthorst* was now dead), entered into negotiations with the ministry, on the basis of an army increase of 70,000 men, to be effected in three or five years. It was generally believed that the Centre would support Huene's overture, if it were rewarded by an abolition of the law against the Jesuits; but when the decisive moment arrived, the immense majority of the Centre voted against the bill. However, twelve of the most prominent of the Catholic Centrists, probably "seduced by the new turn of the imperial policy, and by their relations with the court" (1), voted with the

(1) T'SERCLAES: *loc. cit.*, Vol. ii., p. 231.

government. This secession caused but little embarrassment to the Centre ; it is worthy of mention principally because its spirit accounts for the course pursued during the ensuing few years by certain German Catholics in reference to the policy of Leo XIII. Nor was this spirit entirely wanting in Dr. Lieber, the re-organizer of the Centre, who would otherwise have been worthy of the succession to "His Little Excellency," the noble Windthorst. During the debates in the Reichstag on the Centrist motion to recall the Jesuits, Lieber repelled the charge that the *Curia Romana* pursued a course which was hostile to German interests ; but, declared this lay theologian, "if the *Curia* were to embrace the Russian and *Francophile* policy, the infallibility of the *Curia* would not prevent German Catholics from fulfilling their duties toward the German people and empire" (1). We are accustomed to the tiresome reiteration of murmurs about the *Curia Romana* in the land which produced Lutheranism, Febronianism, and Josephism ; but there are few German truly Catholic publicists who would not recognize nonsense in any talk about "the infallibility of the *Curia*." Even Paolo Sarpi, the most venomous foe of the *Curia*, never insinuated that it claimed infallibility. If the Centrist leader intended to use intelligible language, he intended to convey the idea that the infallibility, or rather the authority of the *Pope*, would never prevent German Catholics from doing their duty toward their government. Lieber may have been addressing the gallery—the gallery of ignorance, and of Protestant prejudice ; but he must have known that even the political duties of men are often embraced by that morality, of which the Church is the guardian. As for the matter of the Triple Alliance against that of France and Russia, which was the cause of aberration on the part of Lieber and many other Centrists, the fear of an active papal attachment to either was necessarily unfounded. In the words of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, "The Holy Father is superior to all the agreements and alliances of the day, just as the interests of the Church are above all the designs and desires of temporal governments. He who lowers the Papacy to the rank

(1) Cited by T'Serclaes, *ubi supra*.

of politicians, does not understand the Papacy. Leo XIII. is above both the Franco-Russian and the Triple Alliance. However great may be the love which, in spite of her rulers and politicians, he feels for Catholic France, he will never sacrifice the interest of other Catholic peoples" (1). It was because of mistaken or feigned apprehensions like those of Lieber that certain organs of the German Centre, at this time, attacked the Catholic press of Italy, because the latter did not advocate an abandonment, on the part of the Italian Catholics, of their policy of abstention in political affairs. These gentry hoped, in fine, to effect a "reconciliation" between the Vatican and the Quirinal, and thus to strengthen the Triple Alliance to the detriment of France. But these same German Catholic journals knew that the Italian Catholic press was merely obeying the injunctions of the Pontiff; and furthermore, they should have known that, as Mgr. T'Serclaes observes, "the Pope could not modify his policy in order to please the Triple Alliance; and that this Alliance, which might have been otherwise a matter of indifference to him, as are other political alliances, was necessarily to be regarded by him as hostile to the Holy See, since it contributed to the perpetuation of the existing condition of affairs in Rome, to the detriment of the pontifical independence."

The present and future condition of the Church in Bavaria furnished material for continual anxiety in the mind of Leo XIII. during the early years of his pontificate. While the people were still thoroughly Catholic, the official circles were almost entirely either Josephist or Rationalist, and the once well-promising University of Munich had for four years been a mere vehicle for the dissemination of "German science" (2). On Dec. 22, 1887, our Pontiff addressed to the Ba-

(1) Issue of Jan. 6, 1894.

(2) In 1825, King Louis I., who had just mounted the Bavarian throne, determined to reorganize the University of Landshut, which had become intellectually deficient, and a hotbed of infidelity. Following the advice of Christian scholars like Ringseis, the monarch adopted a programme of studies which excited hope for the future of their country in the minds of the Bavarian clergy, and he transferred the University from Landshut to Munich. This University then became a "mixed" establishment, having both Catholic and Protestant Faculties of Theology; but the king expressly ordained that no unchristian teaching should ever be tolerated. Besides that of Munich, there were also established the exclusively Catholic University of Wurzburg, and the exclusively Protestant one at

varian bishops a most touching expression of his solicitude in regard to their flocks, in his Encyclical *Officio sanctissimo*. Alluding, in general terms, to the attacks of the Bavarian government on the rights of God and His Church, His Holiness reminds the clergy of their duty to bear in silence all that can be suffered without prejudice to truth and virtue, taking care, however, to be prudent in their toleration of evil, and not seeming to countenance it in any way whatever. When he approaches the subject of education, the Pontiff exhorts the faithful to establish Catholic schools "wherever the public schools are neutral." He repeats his often-given warnings against Freemasonry, that sect which, of all others, is "so hostile to the Church of God, but which knows how to dissimulate, even under the appearances of piety and of charity when such a course can aid its seduction of men, and especially of youth." The Pope tells the Bavarian Catholics that he realizes full well the difficulties under which they labor; but he foresees that they will triumph over their enemies, if they will only be united, "and use those legal means which their adversaries adopt, when they wish to enact laws which are opposed to the freedom of the Church." Having forwarded this Encyclical to the Bavarian bishops, Leo XIII. requested the Baron Franckenstein, President of the Upper Chamber of Bavaria, and then leader of the Centre in the German Reichstag, to repair to Rome, in order that His Holiness might confer with him concerning the relig-

Erlangen. In choosing the professors of the University of Munich, care was taken to ignore most of the olden professors of Landshut, some of whom were pronounced infidels, while most of the others were of very inferior calibre. The selection of the new Faculties was entrusted principally to Ringseis; and among the first whom that diplomat induced to try their professorial fortunes in the Bavarian capital were the famous representatives of Catholic and Protestant philosophy, Baader and Schelling. Steps were then taken to procure the services of the great Görres, who was then residing in France, having been expelled from that Prussia which his eloquence had saved from ruin. The government of Prussia, however, feared the oratorical powers of its victim, and endeavored to induce Louis I. to turn a deaf ear to Ringseis, Clemens Brentano, and other able judges who begged for the appointment of Görres. Fortunately the cabinet of Berlin assumed a dictatorial attitude; whereupon the Bavarian sovereign defied the Prussians by inviting the patriot to his capital. With the acquisition of Görres the Catholic influence in the University of Munich predominated. The Protestants boasted indeed of men like Schelling, Raumer, Thiersch, and Oken; but Görres was a host in himself, and he was supported by Baader, Ringseis, Klee, Mœhler, Moy, Philipps and the two Döllingers. father and son. From that time until the early sixties, when the unfortunate younger Döllinger began to exhibit the tendencies which were to eventuate in the catastrophe of his life, the Catholic world could find small cause of complaint in the University of Munich.

ious affairs of the Bavarian kingdom, and of the whole empire. Franckenstein availed himself of this honor; and when he reported the particulars of the conference to the Bavarian Catholic "group" in the Reichstag, that body replied, through its president, Ruppert: "This intervention of the Holy Father is an act of the greatest importance; the mere fact that the August Pontiff should place himself in relation with our group shows his esteem for it. The words of the Supreme Pontiff are concise but eloquent. By his wish for the Centre to continue its combat, His Holiness approves its course in the past, and indicates its course in the future. Union being the greatest of forces, the Pontiff exhorts the Bavarian Centre to maintain that union. By dint of perseverance, and by means of a firm support of the Holy See, our group will not fail to attain its object—the liberty of the Church, and the consolidation of Christian principles." Animated by these sentiments, the Bavarian bishops addressed to the prince-regent a respectful but firm remonstrance against the continuance of the last vestiges of the Bismarckian "War for Civilization" in Bavaria. The prince, still under the influence of his little Bismarck, Lutz, refused to receive this remonstrance officially; but the prelates gained their point by means of the post, whereupon His Highness requested them not to communicate the document to the public—a favor which they deemed it prudent to grant. Several months afterward, Lutz replied to the episcopal representations with a letter which merited the encomium of the prince-regent as being a firm defence of "the rights of the crown." These royal rights were supposed to have been vindicated by a refusal to give a Catholic character to the secondary schools of the kingdom, and to the Universities of Munich and Wurzburg; by a persistence in the banishment of the religious orders; and by a continuance of the absurd abuse of the royal *placet*, even in matters of Catholic faith. The "rights of the crown" were supposed by Lutz and his royal master to be reinforced by a new declaration that the "Old Catholic" sect formed a part of the Catholic Church; and by an insistence on the validity of the Edict of Religion of 1827, which had annulled most of

the provisions of the Concordat of 1818. Leo XIII. could not allow this ministerial pronouncement to pass unnoticed; and on April 29, 1889, in a letter which complimented the Bavarian prelates on their energy, he declared that the Bavarian premier had advanced doctrines which were contrary to the Catholic faith. It was quite natural, therefore, that in a grand Catholic Congress held in Munich on the following Sept. 23, there should have been adopted an address, signed by 16,000 members of the assembly, praying the prince-regent to satisfy the ever legitimate demands of the Church. It is strange that the scion of the House of Wittelsbach did not deign to reply to this appeal from the most devoted friends of his family; although shortly afterward he gave assurances of his royal protection to a Protestant "missionary" association which was named after the most bitter enemy of his dynasty, Gustavus Adolphus. However, the action of the Congress of Munich was seconded by the Catholic party in the parliament; and after much tergiversation, Lutz so far yielded as to promise that he would ask the Federal Council to recall the Redemptorists, who had been banished because of their pretended affiliation to the terrible Jesuits. As for the royal *placet*, a presumed necessity ere any doctrinal decision of the Church could be obligatory on a good Bavarian, the premier would continue to uphold the heretical claim; as for the status of the "Old Catholics," he would regard them as members of the Catholic Church, until the Holy See had "formally pronounced them separated from its communion"—as though the anathema of the Vatican Council had not been sufficiently formal. But the Catholic parliamentary opposition remained indomitable; and finally the minister declared his willingness to regard the "Old Catholics" as excommunicated, not because they did not receive the dogma of Papal Infallibility—a doctrine which had not received the *placet* of His Bavarian Majesty—but "because they did not believe in the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin." The Catholic party accepted the ministerial decision, although of course it carefully noted that it rejected the ministerial reasoning; the sectarians now lost the governmental pecuniary aid which alone gave

to them some semblance of vitality, but the principle of the royal *placet* remained intact. The prince-regent evinced his chagrin because of this partial victory of the "Ultramon-
tanes" by informing the archbishop of Munich that another Congress of Munich would be regarded as a danger to public tranquillity. A few days after this petty ebullition, His Highness lost the services of Lutz. Seized by a mortal illness, this nominally Catholic minister, who had educated his children in heresy, and who had used all his power to un-Catholicize Bavaria, requested and received the Sacraments of the Church.

CHAPTER XII.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE.

If the reader has accompanied us carefully during our investigations into the vicissitudes of the Church in Russian Poland (1), he has undoubtedly arrived at the conclusion that the spirit of Russian "Orthodoxy," like that of Freemasonry, is essentially brutal, and even sanguinary, whenever there arises a question in which the interests of Catholicism are involved. And nevertheless, from the beginning of his pontificate, Leo XIII. cherished not only the hope of inducing the Colossus of the North to grant religious freedom to its Catholic subjects, especially to that portion of Poland which it dominates, but also an idea that he might eradicate from the "Orthodox" Schismatic mind those prejudices against the Holy See which are perhaps more political than religious, and which are due—be it said with all consideration for Russian susceptibility—to a not unpardonable ignorance. Probably the confidence of the Pontiff was similar to that entertained by the perspicacious Cardinal Consalvi, when he said to Pope Leo XII.: "Our gaze must be ever fixed on the vagaries of the Russians, but reason commands us to be persistently patient in their regard. If they are ever to return to our communion, they will return of their own accord ;

(1) In our Vol. v., ch. 3.

and we may be sure that if this immense mass continues to grow, it will encounter the dangers which all political obesities eventually meet. Catholicism alone, Most Holy Father—and I say it with happy tears of gratitude to God—Catholicism alone can never be too extensive” (1). No statesman in the world appreciated true patriotism—even a sacred thing when the civil rights of a citizen are involved—more exactly than did Leo XIII.; and it was because he believed that in Christendom there can be no true patriotism which is not Christian, that he held with Tchadaieff—one of the best minds produced by modern Russia, although Nicholas I. officially pronounced him a fool—that “Christian reason cannot endure any kind of blindness, especially that of national prejudice, since this prejudice is the most inimical to unity among men” (2). Conscious of his own respect, as Pontiff and as man, for the principle of nationalities, when properly understood, Leo XIII. made in all sincerity implicit overtures for an amicable understanding with the Russian court, as soon as he mounted the pontifical throne, when he notified that accession to Alexander II. In the following year, the Encyclical *Quod apostolici*, issued against Socialism, was received probably with greater pleasure by the friends of the Russian government, than by any other class in Christendom; for the Slavic spirit, ever prone to extremes, had become permeated by the Socialistic doctrines, and had begun to actuate them with a ferocity and a resolution hitherto unknown in European revolutionary manifestations. Russian society was then trembling, down to its very foundations; the decrees of the Nihilists were executed with an infernal ability which seemed destined to triumph over both autoeracy and bureaucracy. Alexander

(1) ARTAUD: *Life of Leo XII.*, Bk. 1, p. 170.

(2) Count Dimitri Tolstoy, whose bitterness against Catholicism we have already described (Vol. v., ch. 3), is an excellent illustration of the Russian “orthodox” idea of the mutual repugnance of Catholicism and the spirit of nationality. Speaking of the noblest female character produced by modern Russia, he said: “My reason is pitiless; it can never pardon Madame de Swetchine for having changed herself from a Russian into a French woman, as she herself declared. Of course we understand that the change was subject to the distrust of Catholicism for every nationality whatsoever.” See the article by Gagarin in the *Correspondant* of June 25, 1860. If Catholicism is so hostile to the principle of nationalities, why did Dimitri Tolstoy show himself so venomous towards Polish Catholicism?

II. perceived too well that he could hope for no aid from the corruption and venality of his civil administrations. Nor could he rely on any active religious propaganda on the part of his vicious and ignorant "Orthodox" clergy, as a defence against the subversive enterprises of the sectarians. Still less could he appeal to the intelligence of the educated young men of Russia, from whose ranks the Nihilists were chiefly recruited; for each college or university was either a hot-bed of infidelity or a swamp of indifferentism. Thrice within ten months the imperial life was attacked; and after the last attempt, Feb. 17, 1880, the czar and his advisers thought it would be well to admit once more, at least into Poland, the counsels of the Roman Pontiff. As a beginning, permission was given to Canon Satkiewitch, then administrator of the diocese of Warsaw, to receive the Encyclical *Quod apostolici*: and he was requested to send a copy to each of the Catholic pastors, with instructions to explain the document to their flocks. Not one Catholic had been convicted of Nihilism, terrible as had been the persecution in Poland, and grievous as the burdens of the Catholics still were. Why did Alexander II., of whose "Orthodox" zeal we have had abundant and sickening proof, grant this concession? He could scarcely have supposed that the Catholics, after a patient endurance of confiscation, knout, freezings, and Siberia, would now, when persecution had become less violent, suddenly develop into incendiaries and assassins. It is more natural to suppose that the czar admitted the Papal Encyclical into his dominions trusting that its arguments might have some effect on his "Orthodox" subjects.

In his Encyclical *Grande Munus*, issued on Sept. 30, 1880, our Pontiff recalled all that his predecessors had effected for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Slavic race. He reminded men that it was through Sts. Cyril and Methodius, sent by Rome, that the Slavs had received the faith and civilization; and he asked the "Orthodox," so attached to their special liturgy, to remember that the Holy See had expressly approved the action of those apostles, when they introduced the use of the ancient Slavic language into their

religious services. And in order to show that he cherished no idea of "Latinizing" the Catholics of the Greco-Slavonic Rite, a calumny ever studiously propagated by the Schismatic leaders (1), the Pope declared that thereafter the founders of the Greco-Slavonic Rite, the glorious Sts. Cyril and Methodius, would be honored by the celebration of their Office throughout the Catholic world. This pontifical declaration produced an excellent effect among the Slavs; and on July 5, 1881, His Holiness received a deputation of more than 1,200 persons, representing every Slavic nationality, excepting that of Muscovy, which would never, of course, be allowed to share in such a demonstration, unless, perchance, it were intended as a Pan-Slavic aspiration toward the yearning bosom of Holy Russia. In his remarks to this deputation, Leo XIII. used very guarded terms, carefully avoiding anything like an indication of rancor toward the Russian government; and although the interests of "Orthodoxy" had been seriously menaced by his recent restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in Bosnia and Herzegovina (2), and by his creation of three United-Greek vicariates-apostolic in Bulgaria, the Pontiff soon experienced the satisfaction of learning that among the more enlightened of the Russians a warm feeling in favor of Catholicism was being developed. Undoubtedly this sentiment was not shared by the official Russians, the creatures and instruments of the Holy Synod; as a Protestant journal of the day remarked, "loud lamentations were heard in St. Petersburg and Moscow, just as in Constantinople and Athens," because of the newly-enkindled energy of the United-Greek propaganda in the Slavic provinces of Austria, in Bulgaria, and in Turkey—a propaganda which Leo XIII. was about to aid by his foundation of free scholarships in the seminary of Adrianople, and by his establishment of a new seminary in Salonica. But that in unofficial Russia many

(1) For the deep significance of the terms "Latinization," "Polonization," etc., when used by "Orthodox" writers, see our Vol. ii., p. 135.

(2) The cabinet of St. Petersburg regards all the missionary efforts of the Church in Bosnia, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Roumania, and Roumelia, as so many manifestations of an able policy which would make the Papacy the guide of the Slavic current which Holy Russia claims as her own appanage. The Holy Synod affects to discern in the pontifical "diplomacy" a desire to create a union of all Slavic Catholicism, under the protection of Austria, a power whose governmental policy is now no more Catholic than that which is devised in Berlin.

sincere hearts were then beginning to yearn for ecclesiastical union with Rome, was afterward admitted by one of the principal organs of the "Orthodox" Church, the *Thera*, which had the hardihood and the honesty necessary for the utterance of the following language: "The higher ranks of society in St. Petersburg, being like an immense lever in this matter, tend toward giving an impulse to an ecclesiastical union of the East with the West. In proof of this assertion, we can adduce, without fear of contradiction, the authentic testimony of very many Russians, even of one august member of the czar's own family. In fact, these same persons have begun the work of uniting the Eastern to the Roman Church. The intellectual and the social *élite* of Russia regard this event as the salvation of Russian society, the remedy for all our social evils" (1). It cannot be supposed that such journalistic gossip would have produced any effect in the pontifical mind; but the visit of the Russian chancellor, Giers, to the Vatican on Dec. 5, 1882, followed by the restoration of the venerable Mgr. Felinski to his archiepiscopal see, had encouraged Leo XIII. to hope for better days, at least in Poland. We may imagine the dismay of the Pontiff who had believed in the supposedly lenient tendencies of Alexander III., when he learned that the bishop of Wilna, guilty of having censured two of his clergy, because of their apostasy, had been suddenly summoned to the capital, and then, without any opportunity for an appeal to the czar, had been exiled to Siberia. During the next few years, the Russian government frequently manifested a velleity to discover some *modus vivendi* with its Catholic subjects; but not until 1888 were the advances serious, and then they were made through the Russian ambassador in Vienna. But no sooner did it transpire that probably the Pontiff and the czar were arriving at a solution of their difficulties, than the entire Masonic press of Europe emitted a howl of virtuous horror and outraged patriotism. Rome was about to sacrifice the religious and national interests of Poland, cried the sectarians; Rome was about to sanction the introduction of the Russian language in the Polish churches, and therefore Rome was to be the

(1) Cited by the *Moniteur de Rome*, Jan. 15, 1893.

prime Russifier of Poland. The truth of the matter was that in 1883, Giers had endeavored to procure the consent of Cardinal Jacobini for the use of Russian in the non-liturgical services of the Polish Churches, and in the teaching of the catechism; but *the Pontiff had categorically refused* to allow a Russification which would have endangered the faith of the growing generation of Poles. And the same categorical refusal was given in 1888. Defeated on this point, the cabinet of St. Petersburg endeavored to obtain from the Pope an approbation of the Russian law which prescribes that all the children of a mixed marriage shall be educated in the schism. The refusal of this demand did not cause a break in the negotiations; it cannot be supposed that the Russian statesmen ever dreamed that the Head of the Catholic Church would hand over the little ones of his flock to perdition. A Russian ambassador, Iswolski, was accredited to the Vatican—a terrible blow to such of the Centrists of Germany as, Catholic though they were, would have delighted in an estrangement of Russia from the Pope, simply because Russia was the secret ally of France, and because they were upholders of the Triple Alliance. The negotiations of 1888 and 1889 were, in two respects, triumphant for Leo XIII. He gained the re-opening of diplomatic relations with the czar; and he was allowed to fill the long-vacant sees of Wilna (1), Tiraspol, Plock, Lublin, Mohilow. In these negotiations, is there anything which might justify the accusation, brought by German publicists like Professor Geffcken and the "Austrian diplomat" of the *Contemporary Review*, to the effect that by such "unworthy compromises" Leo XIII. sacrificed the true interests of Catholicism to his "dream" of a restoration of the papal temporal power? Since Geffcken unblushingly adopts as his own the brazen lie of the "Austrian diplomat" representing Leo XIII. as addressing the czar as "Patriarch of the North," we are not surprised, even though we are sickened, when he thus explodes: "Leo XIII. did not hesitate to sacrifice Catholic interests in Russia, that he might gratify the secret ally of the French

(1) The exiled bishop of Wilna was permitted to return from Siberia, to resign his diocese, and to leave the empire with a pension.

Republic. The attitude of all previous Popes, when brought face to face with the czars, had been firm and worthy. Thus, Gregory XVI. feared not to talk to Nicholas, the persecutor of the Church in Poland, just as Ambrose spoke to Theodosius; and the autocrat of the North listened to him in silence (1). To-day, the Church in Poland is fallen so low, that in comparison with her, the Polish Church of the days of Nicholas I. was free; now she is reduced to the level of a Department of State. Entire dioceses are suppressed; Catholics are excluded from every public employment; their churches are closed, and when they try to enter for worship, they are knouted, and then sent into exile. In a word, these Catholics are reduced to the alternative of apostasy or Siberia." We have described the condition of the Church in Poland under the sway of Nicholas I.; and the reader shall judge whether the lot of the Polish Catholics was, as the German professor audaciously asserts, less painful than that of their descendants, so cruelly "sacrificed" by Leo XIII. "German science" has seldom exhibited effrontery like this of the much-lauded ex-professor of International Law and Statecraft in the University of Strasburg, as he depicts Leo XIII. as willingly perpetuating the miseries of unfortunate Poland—as playing the game of a petty politician, and for the sake of a mere "dream." The *Civiltà Cattolica* did not think that a notice of this ebullition would compromise its dignity; and since that Roman periodical is as excellent a guide in matters of propriety, as it is in those of fact, we shall imitate its course, so far as to condense its argumentation (2). If the curious student would peruse the five large volumes which contain the authentic records of the relations between the cabinets of the Vatican and St. Petersburg, during the first fifteen years of the Leonine pontificate, he would find that each page of those records gives the lie to Professor Geffcken, and to the few German Catholics whose foolish zeal for the Triple Alliance led them to endorse his ravings. In these volumes we have all the instructions given by the Pontiff to the Polish and

(1) See our Vol. v., p. 101.

(2) In the numbers for Dec. 17, 1892, and Jan. 7, 1893.

Russian bishops, and all the correspondence with the Russian government, etc. Among the results of the Leonine policy toward Russia, we find provisions made for many vacant dioceses; advantages gained for the Catholics of the Caucasus; an agreement in 1882 which was of great benefit to the Catholic seminaries in the empire, as well as to the Ecclesiastical Academy in St. Petersburg; and a formal promise, made on the part of the Russian government on Dec. 24, 1882, by Boutenieff, its *chargé d'affaires*, that the persecuting decrees of 1865 would be suppressed. In 1890, Leo XIII. addressed to the newly-appointed bishops of Poland, to those prelates who are represented by Geffcken as creatures of a cowardly and self-seeking policy on the part of the Pontiff, an exhortation to defend to their utmost the rights of the Church, to work for the prosperity of their flocks, and to promote harmony with the civil authorities *when the imperial laws were not contrary to the laws of the Church*. Certainly this record is not that of a Pontiff who, as the infamous Crispi asserted, "would have sacrificed not one, but ten Polands, in order to win the friendship of the czar" (1).

(1) Thus in an interview for the *New York Herald* cited by T'Serelaes, *loc. cit.*, Vol. i., p. 503.

One of the most salient events of Russian history during the pontificate of Leo XIII. was the oppression of the Jewish subjects of the autocrat—a persecution which was far more bitter than any which the children of Israel have suffered elsewhere in our day, but which American Protestants generally feign to ignore, since it was principally the work of that bitter foe of the Holy See, Pobiedonostzev, the procurator of the Holy Synod and practical Pope of Holy Russia. Arnold White, in his recent work on the *Modern Jew* which we have already quoted, is but too willing to discover palliatives for the Russian tyranny. He insists that not only is the confinement of the Jews in the fifteen provinces of Western Russia known as the Pale, and in the Polish provinces, an act of consummate statesmanship; but that no other policy is compatible with the development of Holy Russia on national lines. The Polish Jews are phenomenally prolific. For a hundred years they have multiplied as no people on earth have multiplied; Russian statesmen of to-day, when reflecting on this fact, are compelled to regard themselves as trustees for a peasantry numbering 100,000,000 souls who are intellectually undeveloped and as backward in civilization as were the English of the seventeenth century. The Russian peasant, especially when drunk, falls an easy prey to the astute and temperate Oriental race, which exploits his vices and plays with ease upon his superstitions and his prejudices for the purpose of gain. It must be remembered, moreover, that the peasants, although ignorant and credulous, are industrious, faithful, and devoted to the Czar. The Jews, on the other hand, are cosmopolitan; Russian neither in blood, religion, nor instinct. It is, according to Mr. White, a sober statement of fact that, if all careers in the Russian Empire were thrown open to the Jews, not a decade would pass before the whole Russian administration would be in their hands. "What Czar in his senses," asks Mr. White, "what sane Russian

CHAPTER XIII.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE. THE APOSTOLATE OF CARDINAL LAVIGERIE.

Among the innumerable efforts of the Roman Pontiffs to procure the utter abolition of human slavery, a prominent place will be assigned in history to the Encyclical *In plurimis*, addressed by Leo XIII. to the bishops of Brazil on May 8, 1888. Having expressed his joy because of the many emancipations with which the Brazilians had honored his sacerdotal jubilee, five months previously, the Pontiff appeals to the bishops to use every proper means to procure the abolition of slavery in their country. He goes over the ground already traversed by Gregory XVI. in the bull *In Supremo Apostolatus Fastigio* as he shows how the Church ever opposed the nefarious traffic in human beings; and then he draws attention to the lamentable fact that while there is no longer any importation of African slaves to any of the American countries, the abominable trade, with all its

Minister would permit his country to commit suicide by ceding the civil administration to a Jewish minority? England does not invest the Bengali with power in India because he passes difficult examinations with the greatest ease. Yet this is precisely what is involved in the antidotes of education so glibly described by Anglo-Saxon doctrinaires, who condemn Russia, without understanding the difficulties with which she has to deal, but who do not treat their own racial problems on abstract principles." Mr. White insists that the rich Jewish bankers who took the Russian loan are largely responsible for the fact that the Russians now deny on the one hand the existence of any serious grievances on the part of the Israelites in Russia, and assert on the other hand, that the administrative regulations which are put in force are no more than are needed to effect the separation of the Orthodox Russian from the descendants of the enemies of Christ. "If a tithe of the unanswered charges made against the Russian Government in respect of their anti-Semitic policy were true, the attitude of the great Jewish banking houses in their financial dealings with Russia would be incomprehensible. No one could have conceived it possible that, in 1894, not long after the time of the Guild-hall meeting and of the appearance of *Darkest Russia*, the richer Hebrew banks of the West would consent to supply the persecutor of their race with funds, partly to be employed in paying the administration that humiliates, debases, and oppresses their co-religionists." As was well remarked by M. W. Hazeltine in a review of White's work published in the *New York Sun*, the Jewish bankers, by lending money to Russia, might have imposed upon the Czar's Ministers such conditions as would secure for the Jews of the Pale some immunity from needlessly hostile treatment at the hands of the officials and adequate protection from the equally hostile peasantry. But the Russian loan was taken by Jewish capitalists, and Mr. White was told at St. Petersburg by reliable persons in the administrative sphere that no private conditions were made such as might ameliorate the lot of the wretched Jews of Russia.

horrors, still flourishes in the Dark Continent : " According to the testimony of reliable travellers in Africa, at least 400,000 persons are dragged into slavery every year, and one half of that number perish on their way to the markets." During his entire pontificate, Leo XIII. continually thought of Africa, the horrors of its slave trade, and the dangers for European civilization which are even now, perhaps, preparing in those regions. He realized well the truth of the warning pronounced by Cardinal Lavigerie in the *Gesù* at Rome, shortly before the publication of the letter to the Brazilians : " During the last hundred years there has been working in those regions (the Soudan) a social and religious transformation, to which Europe has obstinately closed her eyes, but which will very soon threaten the shores of the Mediterranean. That wave of invasion which engulfed this Rome herself and all her empire, fifteen centuries ago, will not be the last in history. If the work now begun in Africa is allowed to progress, there will be an invasion from that land no less terrible than that of the Huns, Vandals, and other barbarians. Strange phenomenon! Mohammedanism seems to be preparing in Europe and in Asia for its last sleep, while in Africa it is renewing its strength in blood. The danger is nearer than you think. Believe an old pilot, who knows the shoals and tempests of barbarism." Like the many Popes of the olden time who spent the greater part of their Pontificates in preparing those victories over Islam which were to enable Christian Europe to enjoy some more centuries of political existence, Leo XIII. would have warred on Mohammedan Africa—but with the weapons of the Gospel. Through the indomitable energy of Cardinal Lavigerie, one feature of the desired crusade was soon to be seen in full career ; the grand archbishop of Carthage was to obey, to the letter, the instructions which His Holiness gave to him on Oct. 17, 1888 : " We have given you a grand and arduous task ; you must oppose all your courage and all your energy to the reign of slavery on African soil. You have undertaken, with an ardor that manifests your greatness of soul, a work in which the salvation of men is at stake." The names of Leo XIII. and Cardinal Lavigerie

are not to be separated, when the historian glorifies the anti-slavery crusade which the latter organized; as His Eminence wrote to the anti-slavery committees on July 22, 1890: "I have simply obeyed; it is to the Supreme Pontiff that belongs all the honor of this campaign."

Charles Lavigerie was born at Bayonne, on October 31, 1825. As he himself expressed the idea, he was a Basque, "and therefore could be obstinate when necessary." He soon manifested an inclination for the priesthood; and when, in his fifteenth year, his father presented him as a candidate to the bishop of Bayonne, he replied to the question as to why he wished to enter the sacerdotal state, that he wanted to be a country pastor. Admitted to the Preparatory Seminary of Saint-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet, in Paris, he had as companions Langenieux, Foulon, La Tour d'Auvergne; and his master was Dupanloup. In 1843 he entered the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice, and was ordained in 1849 by Mgr. Sibour. In 1853 he received the doctorate in theology at the Sorbonne, and was made professor of Latin Literature at the École des Carmes. In 1854 he was appointed adjunct professor of Ecclesiastical History in the Sorbonne, and in 1857 he became titular of the same chair; among his colleagues were Maret, Gratry, and Freppel. But the Abbé Lavigerie taught history only for a brief period; he was soon summoned to tasks which were to constitute him a maker of history. In 1856 he was chosen director of the Work of the Eastern Schools, founded in 1855 under the auspices of such men as Lenormant, Ozanam, Montalembert, Gagarin, De Falloux, and De Broglie, for the promotion of Catholic interests in the Levant; and his professorial duties did not prevent his devoting much time to collecting funds for this noble enterprise. When the Syrian massacres of 1859 and '60 occurred, he collected over three million francs for the sufferers, and himself departed for Syria to superintend the distribution of the offerings. At Beyrout he established an orphan asylum for four hundred girls, under the care of the Sisters of Charity; and at Zahleh an asylum for boys, which he confided to the Jesuits. Eighteen Catholic bishops of the East afterward sent an address to the Supreme Pontiff, attributing to the

director of the Work of the Eastern Schools the greater part of the benefits which French charity had conferred upon their flocks. In 1861 the position of Auditor of the Rota for France being vacant, Pius IX. tendered it to the Abbé Lavigerie; and for a year and a half he was enabled to familiarize himself with the details of the pontifical administration, and to perfect his knowledge of Italian, which was to be, at Algiers and at Tunis, the language of many of his future diocesans. However, the director of the Work of the Eastern Schools did not forget the child of his predilection; indeed, he had accepted the auditorship only on condition that it should not interfere with his interest in Oriental Christianity, and that he should be allowed to form a branch of the Work in the Eternal City. He was constant in his endeavors to induce the Catholics of the West to imitate the solicitude of Pius IX., who had just then established a Special Congregation of the Propaganda for Oriental Affairs; appointed a consultant of this new Congregation, he organized at Civita Vecchia a committee to further the interests of the Bulgarians. In 1863 Mgr. Lavigerie was named bishop of Nancy. Pius IX. would have consecrated him, but, being prevented by sickness, he delegated the function to Cardinal Villecourt.

Mgr. Lavigerie was bishop of Nancy, when, in November, 1866, he received a letter from Marshal MacMahon, then governor-general of Algeria, begging permission to present his name to the emperor, Napoleon III., for the then vacant see of Algiers. The prelate replied: "Having reflected maturely, and having prayed for light from God as to my answer to the unexpected offer of Your Excellency, I now express myself in all frankness. I would never have voluntarily entertained the thought of quitting a diocese which I dearly love, and in which I have begun numerous works; and if Your Excellency had requested me to accept any diocese more important than that of Nancy, my reply would be a negative one. But I entered upon the episcopate as upon a work of sacrifice. You offer me a painful and laborious mission, an episcopal see in every way inferior to my present position, and which entails upon me an abandonment of all

I hold most dear ; and you think that I, better than another, can fulfil its duties. A Catholic bishop, my dear Marshal, can make but one reply to such a proposition. I accept the dolorous sacrifice ; and if the emperor appeals to my devotion, I shall not hesitate, cost me what it may." By a Bull of July 25, 1866, Pius IX. erected the diocese of Algiers into an archbishopric, giving to it as suffragans the newly created sees of Oran and Constantine. Mgr. Lavigerie entered upon his archiepiscopal duties on May 16, 1867. His experience as director of the Work of the Eastern Schools had convinced the archbishop that the absence of a Christian spirit in the administration of Algeria accounted for the slow progress of French influence in the colony. And in his eyes Algeria was merely the gate through which Divine Providence was to send the means whereby to convert and civilize two hundred millions of barbarians. In his first pastoral letter he wrote : "To render Algerian soil the cradle of a grand, generous, and Christian nation—in a word, of another France, daughter and sister of our own, happy in marching in the paths of justice and honor by the side of the mother-country ; to spread around us, with that ardent initiative which is the gift of our race and of our faith, the true light of the civilization of which the Gospel is the source and the law ; to gather Northern and Central Africa into the life of Christendom ; such, in the designs of God and in the hopes of our country and of the Church, is your providential destiny." Twenty years had not elapsed when the author of this language resuscitated the ancient see of Carthage, excited all Europe in favor of the slaves of the Dark Continent, established his apostolic missionaries around the Great Lakes, and received from the Supreme Pontiff the title of Primate of Africa.

Probably the happiest, certainly the most consoling, day of the apostolic life of Mgr. Lavigerie was that on which the Roman Pontiff revived the primatial see of St. Cyprian, and, after twelve centuries of interruption, restored the glorious tradition of the Councils of Carthage (1). But very different

(1) It is not strange that Mgr. Lavigerie should have entertained the thought of writing the history of this ancient Church. His idea was to adapt the work of Morcelli, *Africa*

are the circumstances surrounding the present Church of Carthage from those which influenced its ancient prelates. In our day the irreconcilable enemy of that Church and of civilization is Islamism ; and to combat this enemy the new archbishop bent all his energies. He was the first Algerian prelate to make any serious efforts in this direction. The French Government had hitherto opposed all attempts to convert the Mohammedans ; even to-day it assumes the entire expense of their worship ; and under the empire and the royalty it went so far as to compel the Kabyles to the strictest observance of their religious precepts, even organizing and subsidizing the pilgrimages to Mecca, although it prohibited the bishops of Algiers from acceding to the entreaties of the Kabyles to establish Sisters of Charity among them. The arrival of Mgr. Lavigerie in Africa found in full force this ultra-protection of the Mohammedan cult on the part of the colonial authorities ; they ever cherishing the illusory hope of creating an " Arab kingdom " devoted to France, and separating as much as possible the Europeans from the aborigines. To this system the archbishop opposed that of assimilation, a progressive fusion of colonists and natives in a French nationality ; and since such a project could not be realized so long as the Arabs were Mussulmans, he openly declared his design to prepare their conversion to Christianity. And this preparation was accompanied by no preaching or discussion ; it consisted in devoted and gratuitous care of the sick, and in giving a rudimentary education and a taste for manual labor to such children as parents would consign to the care of the White Fathers. Twenty-four years after Mgr. Lavigerie collected his first Arab orphans, and established them in villages created expressly for them, his biographer (1) found them and their children " perfectly faithful to our faith and our customs ; around them the Mussulmans, who sought the villages because of the charities of which these were the centre, had become less fanatical, more like

Christiana, and to bring it to the level of more recent archaeological discoveries. And since his innumerable occupations prevented his undertaking the task, he entrusted it to F. Toulotte, a learned missionary of his Congregation ; and it is now very nearly completed.

(1) The Abbé Felix Klein, in his *Cardinal Lavigerie and His Labors in Africa*. Paris, 1890.

unto ourselves, and full of confidence in our priests." Let us see how these first fruits of the faith were gathered. In 1867, the year of our prelate's arrival in Africa, a frightful famine ravaged Algeria, and in a few months a fifth of the indigenous population had perished. The government tried to hide the state of affairs, although it secretly distributed some scanty relief; but the archbishop broke the cruel silence, and sent an appeal not only to the faithful of France, but to those of other countries, and abundant alms were soon available for the victims. But there were many orphans to be gathered in, and to be endowed with some substitute for the guardians whom they had lost, or by whom they had been abandoned. Very soon Mgr. Lavigerie became the father of nearly two thousand of these derelict children; he refused not one of those who voluntarily came to him, or who were brought to him by his White Fathers. Having saved their lives, he now proposed to give them such a training as would enable them to earn their living in a civilized manner, and would permit them to judge between Christianity and Islamism. This project was a flinging down of the gauntlet to the party of the "Arab kingdom," whose ideas were followed by the military administration. Immediately, the pretended Arabophilists prevailed on Marshal MacMahon to order the prelate to return the orphans to their tribes; whereupon the apostolic bishop thus protested: "You order us, Marshal, to hand over to the bestial passions of their co-religionists these defenceless children, these orphans who were abandoned by all and given over to death, but whom the charity of French Christians enabled our priests and Sisters to save at the cost of twenty of their own lives (owing to the typhus caught from their charges.) A thousand times better would it have been had they been left to perish. And this horror is represented to you as necessary! But it shall not be effected without my solemn protest to the entire world. I would have given them up to their parents, their natural tutors; but I am their father and protector, since their fathers and mothers do not exist. They belong to me, for I have preserved their lives. Force alone can take them from their refuge; and if it is employed,

my episcopal heart will emit such a cry that the authors of the crime will experience the indignation of all those who deserve the name of men and of Christians." These words of a stricken father evoked an outburst of sympathy throughout France, and the Supreme Pontiff sent him a brief of praise and encouragement. But Mgr. Lavigerie was not content with mere protests: he appealed personally to Napoleon III.; and on May 28, 1868, the *Moniteur* published a letter of the Minister of War, which announced that the Government "never had intended to restrict his episcopal rights, and that every latitude would be allowed Mgr. Lavigerie to extend and improve the refuges in which the prelate's love exercised itself in succoring the orphan, the aged, and the widow."

It often becomes the duty of the Algerian, like all other missionaries among the heathen, to baptize infants at the hour of death, and thus send them to heaven, without informing the parents, and without the permission of the civil administration. But, says the biographer of Mgr. Lavigerie, this is the sole "abuse" which can be laid to the account of the clericals in their interference with the natives, and it produces no consequences on this earth. However, very precise and severe rules define the duty of the clergy in all that concerns the baptism of heathens and Islamites. The diocesan statutes inculcate that "no Jewish or Mussulman infant shall be baptized without the express permission of the parents." The only exception is for such infants as are in evident danger of death, and for the orphans adopted by the missionaries or by the Christian colonists. And in the last case every prudential precaution is taken to prove that the child is really abandoned by its family, that it enjoys the necessary liberty, and has received the necessary instruction. Even in the case of a subject who has attained the legal age of majority, the authorization of the bishop is requisite for the baptism, and is given only when the probable durability of the conversion is assured. Mgr. Lavigerie always insisted that it would be folly—aye, a crime—to excite the fanaticism of the Mussulman population by an unwise proselytism. He opined

that "it is not necessary to be a priest, it is enough to be a man, to cause one to desire the enfranchisement of the fallen denizens of Northern Africa; and while the civil authorities deprive the indigenous peoples of their arms, of their power, and of their traditions, we priests try to calm them, to mollify their chagrin by the exercise of charity. We teach their children; we heal their wounded and nurse their sick; we succor their poor; we have for them only words of kindness. We do not obtain hasty and imprudent conversions, which are mere preludes to apostasy; but rather a certain preparation, without shocks or danger, for a transformation of the African world. The seed is sown; we who may not gather the crop will have our reward in having served the cause of humanity and of God."

The most important work of Mgr. Lavigerie in Africa was the creation of the band of Algerian missionaries popularly known as White Fathers. The astonishing progress of their apostolate was evident on the occasion of the first modern Council of Carthage. Children from their schools rendered the liturgical chants which accompanied the consecration of the primatial church; it was in their seminary, educating a hundred students, that the Council was held. Here were seen some of the missionaries who first traversed the Great Lakes and evangelized Ouganda. One White Father had for years directed the mission of Zanzibar, and had organized and accompanied apostolic caravans into East Africa. One had been military chaplain in the heart of Tunis; another came on horseback from Ghardaja in the Mزاب. There was the superior of the establishment at Malta, where negro boys are taught medicine and surgery, that they may afterward gratuitously attend on their compatriots. This same priest had previously been a professor in the Seminary of St. Anne at Jerusalem, where the White Fathers are preparing a new Greek clergy in the interests of unity. There could be seen several Fathers from the summits of the Grand Kabylia; or one who directed a novitiate in Brussels; or one who attended to the affairs of his congregation in the capital of Christendom. This admirable society was founded in 1868, when the archbishop,

having saved his orphans from famine, was cogitating how he could educate them, and maintain them in fidelity to their new religion and their new country. One day the Abbé Girard, the superior of the Seminary of Algiers, presented to the anxious prelate three students who were desirous of devoting themselves to the special service of the natives. "With the help of God," said the abbé, "this will be the beginning of the work you have desired to effect." The novitiate to which the candidates were assigned soon received many aspirants. One of these, already a priest, presented his credentials; and when the archbishop handed him his faculties, he found that, instead of the ordinary formula, the prelate had written: "*Visum pro martyrio*" (endorsed for martyrdom). "Do you accept?" asked Monseigneur. "It was for that I came here," replied the priest. In time the White Fathers were exempted from the jurisdiction of the ordinary, and subordinated directly to the apostolic-delegate for the Sahara and Soudan. The missionaries soon had their own revenues independent of the diocese of Algiers; and their own charges as well, which each one tries to lighten, "by submitting to privation, or by undergoing the humiliations necessary to procuring the means of living." In a General Chapter of all the missionaries of the new society, held in October, 1874, for the election of its first superiors, Mgr. Lavigerie was unanimously elected superior-general; but as he declined the position, Father Deguerry was chosen, with the title, however, of vicar-general during the life of the beloved founder. One special object the White Fathers have constantly in view, and without it they would lose their very reason of being. They were designed for the exclusive service of the heathen and Mussulmans of Africa. For this reason it is their characteristic to conform to the habits of the natives in all externals—in language, dress, and food. "Love these infidels," said their founder; "heal their wounds, do every good to them. Then they will give you their affection, afterward their confidence, and finally their souls." To see these sons of civilization made Africans for love of Africa must excite our admiration. As they guide their steeds

through the solitudes of the Sahara or the rocky passes of Kabylia, no one would take them for European priests. Nor would the illusion vanish, if we were to observe them as they lightly dismount, enter a tent, squat with native impassibility on the mat of palm or *alfa*; conversing in Arabic with their hosts, showing every interest in their wants, seriously explaining for them the innumerable masses of waste-paper with which the administrative and judicial authorities persist in endowing them; instructing the children in the three R's; exciting the admiration of the elders by their knowledge of the Koran; distributing little presents; sharing the repast of *couscous* and fresh water; and, when about to depart, exchanging the graceful Arabic salutation with their friends. Quite picturesque, a superficial observer would remark; but the reality is not very agreeable, the Abbé Klein will remind him, "if one has a keen sense of smell, or when one has journeyed for half a day to sup on *couscous*. Remember, too, that the White Fathers adopt the external habits of the people even in their private lives; for example, at night they stretch on the ground, wrapped in their *burnous*: although in their own houses they may rest on a plank, and if ill, on a mattress." Touched by their virtue, the Mohammedans often say to them: "The other Roumis [Romans, Christians] will, of course, be damned; but you will enter Paradise."

And now a few words on the anti-slavery agitation instituted by Mgr. Lavigerie, and its results. On May 24, 1888, Cardinal Lavigerie (he had been elevated to the purple in 1882) presented to His Holiness twelve secular priests from various dioceses of French Africa, twelve White Fathers, twelve Christian Kabyls of Algeria, and twelve negroes of Central Africa whom the missionaries had purchased from slavery and converted to Christianity. In an eloquent and touching reply to the cardinal's address, the Pontiff said: "It is upon you, Lord Cardinal, that we chiefly rely for success in the arduous missions of Africa. We know your active and intelligent zeal, we know what you have already accomplished, and we believe that you will not pause until your great enterprises have triumphed." Encouraged and

excited by these words of the Father of the Faithful, His Eminence wrote to Mgr. Brincat, procurator in Paris for the African missions : " I am about to go to Paris, to tell what I know of the crimes which desolate the interior of our Africa, and then to put forth a great cry,—one of those cries which stir the depths of the soul in all who are still worthy of the name of men and of Christians. . . . I know not where I shall speak ; but I do know that in demanding an end to such infamous excesses, in proclaiming the great principles of humanity, liberty, equality, and justice, I shall find in France and in the Christian world no intelligence or heart to refuse me its aid." Philanthropists and politicians will follow their usual course in claiming the glory of the great movement begun at the Conference of Brussels to engage the honor of Christian nations in a unanimous effort to terminate the slave-hunts of Africa ; but the fact will remain that hitherto, if we except some generous tentatives of the king of Belgium, neither philosophers, politicians, nor journalists had advocated the cause of the persecuted natives of Africa in anything like a serious manner. Cardinal Lavigerie held his first anti-slavery conference at Paris, in the Church of St. Sulpice. He then proceeded to London ; and so effective was his appeal, and so powerful the agitation resulting, that the English Government asked the Belgian monarch to take the initiative by requesting a conference of the powers at Brussels. Here was another favorable opportunity for the cardinal to preach his crusade ; and accordingly in the Church of Ste. Gudule he demanded the active co-operation of the authorities of the Congo State. After this sermon five hundred volunteers placed themselves at the cardinal's disposal for the defence of the negroes of the Upper Congo. Illness prevented the attendance of the prelate at the Catholic Congress of Fribourg-en-Brisgau, but he sent to it a lengthy and impressive appeal describing the slave-trade in Tabora and Oujiji, the two great centres of the German-African regions ; he suggested the formation of a German anti-slavery society after the style of those founded in France and Belgium. An anti-slavery committee was soon formed at Cologne, and all that was Catholic in

Germany joined in the great crusade. After an imperative, but brief rest from labor, the cardinal perfected the French Anti-Slavery Society, exclusively national, but designed to keep up relations with the similar associations in other countries, and with the various congregations of missionaries laboring in Africa (1). Other countries soon fell into the line of march indicated by the cardinal. Her Catholic Majesty of Spain became protectress of the work in her dominions, and Canovas del Castillo accepted the presidency. In Portugal, the great explorer Serpa Pinto organized a branch, the king becoming protector, and his second son head of the central committee. In Italy, a national committee was founded at Rome under the direct protection of Pope Leo XIII., and having Prince Rospigliosi for president, and Prince Altieri for vice-president. Cardinal Lavigerie was greatly aided in his endeavors in Italy by the zeal of his eminent brethren of the Sacred College, the ordinaries of Naples (2), of Capua, and of Palermo. After a final conference at Milan, the cardinal, when about to return to his diocese, wrote to M. Keller, begging the members of all the anti-slavery committees to continue his work of nourishing the zeal of Europe in the cause to which they had consecrated themselves. He had accomplished the first part of his design by publishing to the world the horrors of the slave traffic; now it remained to abolish it. His mission had not been comprehended by those who imagined that he had aspired to an immediate abolition of domestic slavery among all the Mussulman populations: what he demanded of all men of heart was to aid in abolishing the hunt for slaves in Africa, and the sale of slaves in the Turkish markets. There

(1) Its Council of Administration had M. Keller for president; and among the members of the Council were Chesnelong, General de Charette, the Count de Mun, Wallon, and Mgr. Brineat. A *conseil de haut patronage* was instituted for the defence of its cause in political assemblies and in the press; it counted among its members Jules Simon and Lefevre-Pontalis.

(2) The inhabitants of Naples were especially moved by the cardinal's eloquence. Cardinal Sanfelice, the archbishop, wishing to contribute to the collection, and being impoverished by his charities, handed in the rich pectoral cross which had been given him by the city in recognition of his noble conduct during the cholera, the jewels of which were worth more than two thousand dollars. But Cardinal Lavigerie wrote to the *Corriere di Napoli* that he would regard the acceptance of the gift as a sacrilege, and that therefore he sent it to the office of the journal to be raffled for, so that the fortunate winner might enjoy the sweet satisfaction of restoring the souvenir to its holy owner.

is not now on earth, he concluded, a work more holy or more necessary. At a conference held in the grand amphitheatre of the Sorbonne on February 10, 1889, Jules Simon, the celebrated republican philosopher and orator, while expressing his indignation at the public apathy toward African misery, thus vented his admiration for the White Fathers and their illustrious chief: "The spectacle afforded by these missionaries would console one somewhat for these miseries, if consolation were possible. . . . The more we realize the depth of these horrors, the more must we express our profound gratitude to these young men who abandon their parents, friends, and almost their ideas and feelings, leaving all that is dear behind them, to confront such evils and assuage such woes. Here, gentlemen, we are merely echoes: we come simply to repeat, and weakly, the words of a man of large heart. . . . He will persevere, and will amass treasures of pity in compassionate souls; he will teach humanity to know itself; and perhaps he will yet perform a work more magnificent than the destruction of slavery—the conversion of the European powers to the idea that they can do better than devour one another, and can actuate the possibility, for the men of our day, of serving with one heart, in the presence of God, the sacred cause of humanity and justice."

In 1868 Mgr. Lavigerie had urged on the Holy See his appointment as apostolic-delegate for the immense region extending from Morocco, Tunis, and Tripoli, to the missions of Senegal and the Guineas on the south, to the Atlantic on the west, and to the Fezzan on the east; for he realized that the French possessions of Algeria and Tunis could be connected by means of the Sahara and Soudan with those of Senegal. His design was to wrest the Sahara from barbarism, that it might cease to be a refuge for slavery, and a nursery of rebellion against France. The security of the French colonies, as well as the interests of religion, demand the sacrifices necessary for the reclamation of the Sahara: and it will not suffice to subjugate the Touaregs. A civilized training must be given to these tribes who now live only by assassination, pillage, and the sale of human beings. Who can effect this wonderful change? Our cardinal

replied that it will be worked by his White Fathers, six of whom had then already been martyred in the Sahara; and by the Brothers of the Sahara, an organization then being trained at Biskra—becoming acclimated, learning the languages of the desert, and studying its medical needs as well as its pharmaceutical possibilities. These Brothers were to give life to the waste by a revelation of the lost sources of fresh water, and by such agricultural ventures as experience would prove to be profitable in such a climate. They would instruct the children and nurse the sick; they would receive the slaves who might flee to them, or who might be delivered by the soldiers of France.

Cardinal Lavignerie was not only a man of action, but a *savant*. The importance of what he wrote, and the manner in which he wrote, caused him to be mentioned for the French Academy. We allude to this fact simply because it furnishes an opportunity of adducing an excellent illustration of his character. In 1884, having been invited by the perpetual secretary of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres to introduce his candidature in that section of the Institute, he replied by the following letter: "Owing to a serious illness, from which I have scarcely recovered, I have been able to reply only by telegraph to the flattering communication sent me in your name. I wish now to make up for the forced laconicism of that first answer, and to express at least my gratitude to those members of your Academy who have initiated my candidature. I desire above all to explain a reserve which may have surprised you. I appreciate the rule which obliges all candidates to solicit directly the votes of the Academy. It is but proper that they should show the high value they attach to these suffrages. But two personal reasons cause me to recoil from this task. The first is a total absence of justificatory reasons; the only one I could allege would be my own inclination, which, in a case where science and results are concerned, is an insufficient recommendation. The second reason is of a still more delicate nature. After all, I am a poor missionary; my other titles derive all their value from that fact. Now, while a missionary must receive everything, because he has nothing,

there are some things for which he must not ask. In order to make an inroad into barbarism, I have had to surround myself with a legion of apostles. In the struggle going on in the interior of our Africa, already eleven of these have spilled their blood, and others have succumbed to fatigue and sickness. What would be said of me, if while my sons seek only the palms of martyrdom, I should wave those of the Institute? Were I to yield to the seductive temptation, I should blush with shame. It is better to leave me in my Barbary."

However glorious it may be for France that the immense majority of missionaries in Asia and Africa is formed of Frenchmen, the zeal of Leo XIII. soon perceived that it was only proper for other Catholics to bear something like a just proportion of labor in the cause of heaven. Therefore the bishops of Belgium were told that they should encourage priests to join the missions in Belgian Congo; and since Germany had established a "protectorate" over a large portion of African territory, the Pontiff wrote to the archbishop of Cologne, asking him "to enquire diligently among the German clergy, as to whether there were not any of them who would appear to be called by God to evangelize the unfortunate peoples of Africa." The pontifical appeal was heeded; many Belgian and German priests entered on the new apostolate; and very soon both Belgian and German military officers reported, to the great scandal of the Protestant element in their jurisdictions, that the new missionaries were "excellent civilizing agents." One of our Pontiff's suggestions for the Christianization of the Dark Continent was the establishment, as soon as practicable, of monasteries of various orders; he remembered the paramount influence of the sons of St. Benedict in civilizing the barbarians of Northern Europe in the early Middle Age; and as a beginning, a colony of Trappists fixed themselves in Belgian Congo, the Pope himself giving 100,000 francs toward the defrayal of their expenses. In 1890, Leo XIII. was encouraged by the receipt of a letter which had been received by Cardinal Lavigerie from Mwanga, king of Ouganda (1). This sover-

(1) "Your Eminence and my great father. I, Mwanga, king of Ouganda, send a man

eign, who had been expelled from his dominions by the Arabs, had taken the offensive, and being aided by such of his subjects as were Catholics, had just reconquered his inheritance, and from a bitter persecutor had become a protector of the faith. Catholicism was progressing in every sense in Ouganda, when, in 1892, the Protestant missionaries induced the English East African Company to attack and disperse the neophytes. Their villages were burnt, hundreds were massacred, and their wives and children were sent adrift to wander or perish among strangers; the persecutors openly avowing that they preferred Pagans or Mohammedans to Catholics. However, in this case as in so many others, the blood of martyrs was the seed of the Church; for the thousands of Ougandan Catholics were scattered only to be the means of the conversion of many others. And in the following year, the East African Company was compelled to evacuate this region, authority therein devolving on Sir Gerald Portal, an English Imperial Commissioner, who soon showed that the Catholics might rely on his justice.

In 1890 there departed from Belgium the first of the anti-slavery expeditions which were destined to carry succor to Joubert (1), and to establish a long line of armed stations

to visit you. I write to tell you that I have returned to my kingdom. You knew that when the Arabs defeated me, I fled to Bukumbi. Mgr. Livinhac and his missionaries treated me kindly. After four months the Christians sent for me. We fought for five months. God blessed us, and we defeated the Arabs. Now I beg you to send priests to teach the religion of Jesus Christ in the whole of Ouganda. I also ask you for some physicians, like those who went to Ujiji. When they arrive, I shall give them a good place. I have heard that our Father the Pope, the great head of religion, has sent you to Europe to treat with the great ones concerning the abolition of slavery in Africa. As for me, if the white men help me, I can aid them, and I can prevent the slave-trade in all the country around the Nyanza. Deign to beg heaven to give me the strength to do good. On my part, I pray God to bless all the works that you perform for His glory. Your son
MWANGA, *King of Ouganda.*"

(1) "What a heroic poem would be formed by the mere recitation of the gigantic works performed in Africa under the inspiration of Leo XIII., and by the activity of Cardinal Lavigerie! One would need to depict the legions of missionaries attacking the Dark Continent from all sides, creating centres of enlightenment, and attracting the ardent sympathies of the natives. One would need to give a detailed narrative of the efforts of the Pope and the cardinal to protect, by a circle of steel, the still pagan regions of Africa from the raids of the infamous traders in human flesh. One would need to describe the military heroism of Joubert, that Frenchman without fear, that Christian without stain, who alone resisted the assaults of the slave-traders for many years, that other St. Louis, who is, as Captain Jacques said, *le bon sergent de Dieu* among the blacks to whom he gives also material prosperity, the love of labor which civilizes the most degraded peoples, the hope which consoles, and the faith which ennobles. All this should be shown in life, in action, in combat, in suffering, and ever sustained by the spirit of God, unceasingly

which would serve as a barrier to the march of the slave-traders. This expedition, commanded by a Belgian officer named Hinek, was recalled before it could attain its object. More fortunate than Hinek, Captain Jacques had the Pontiff bless his sword, and in 1891 he destroyed the power of the ferocious Wagagos, and after a wonderful march of fifty-eight days, he reached the German station at Tabora with a caravan of 2,000 men. Then occurred his rapid march to the Tanganika, where his presence alone entailed the dissolution of the army of Rimaliza, the most powerful Arab of Oujiji, who was preparing to assail Joubert. Then Jacques joined Joubert at St. Louis de Mrumbi, having arrived just in time to save him from the annihilation threatened by the slave-trade hordes who had surrounded him. But the Arabs were not discouraged; they constructed a fort in front of Albertville, ravaged the neighboring districts, and tried to reduce the Franco-Belgians and their black allies by famine. While Jacques and Joubert were awaiting succor from Belgium, another expedition was being organized in that country, thanks to a public subscription, and especially to a subscription from the veterans of the Franco-Belge Pontifical Zouaves, to which noble body Joubert had belonged. Leo XIII. signified his intention of associating himself with this expedition by means of a contribution of 50,000 francs. Commanded by Captain Descamps, this fourth Belgian private enterprise was a success, the stations of the Tanganika becoming a formidable barrier to the Mohammedan slavers. In the Belgian territory of the Upper Congo, many deeds of heroism were performed, notably that by Prince Henri de Croy, when he destroyed a caravan of 1,200 Arabs, and thereby delivered 307 slaves; but the civil administration of the Congo State seemed to have hitherto shared with all other civil Afro-European authorities the idea that the Arab in Africa is invincible, and that his presence, at least in Central Africa, is a necessary evil. To the intense indignation of Leo XIII. and Cardinal Lavignerie, the administrators of

manifesting itself in the ardent words of Leo XIII., and in the *furieuse* energy of the cardinal." T'SERCLAES; *Pope Leo XIII.: His Life, and His Religious, Political, and Social Action.* Paris, 1894.

Independent Congo had concluded a treaty, in 1887, with Tippo-Tip, recognizing him as *vuli* of Stanley Falls, and reconciling themselves to the idea that Nyangwe and Kassongo were inexpugnable intrenchments of slavery. However, in 1892 the Arabs of Tippo-Tip massacred the Hodister expedition, and attacked M. Tobbacq, the Belgian agent at Stanley Falls; whereupon Tobbacq, succored by Chaltin, undertook a vigorous campaign which resulted in the final annihilation of the power of Tippo-Tip. Thus finally, by means of the initiative of Leo XIII., the eloquence of Lavigerie, the good will of King Leopold II. of Belgium, and the valor of Belgian volunteers and soldiers, the domination of the Arab slaver in Central Africa was overthrown. As though he realized that he was not destined to behold the completion of the work that he had begun and impelled on its road to full development, Cardinal Lavigerie addressed the following words to the charitable in France and Belgium who had aided his projects :

“I thank them all in the name of the poor slaves whose restoration to life and liberty they have effected; I thank them, in the name of the devoted mothers, and of the dear little ones, who will not any more be separated, perhaps to be barbarously massacred, perhaps to be sold in distant regions; I thank them in the name of religion, whose progress toward peace and security they have promoted; I thank them, finally, in the name of the missionaries, whose lives they have protected, and whose regeneration and fructifying labors they have seconded.” On Nov. 27, 1892, a few months after he had written this token of the interest which devoured him to the last, the great soul of Lavigerie went to its eternal reward. From among the innumerable eulogies which this death evoked, we select the following passages from that presented by the *Moniteur de Rome*: “A hundred years from now, when the European tourist visits the white cities of the Dark Continent, he will admire in their public squares the twin-statues of Pope Leo XIII. and Cardinal Lavigerie. To follow the reciprocal actions of the grand Pontiff and of the great organizer of missionary work would be to undertake a narrative of indefinite length. Without Leo XIII.,

the primate of Africa would not have been a founder; his brow would not have been stamped with the seal of a creator; the works of his own initiation would have been developed less fully and less rapidly, and his best and most daring conceptions would not have been born; a century would not have sufficed for the wonders which have been accomplished in ten years. In the reciprocating motion between Rome and Carthage, all was grand; the inspirations and the accomplishments, the direction and the execution, the conceiving intellect and the operating arm, the enjoining and blessing Pontiff and the apostle-patriarch who drew from the Vatican the force which filled the world with admiration. History will not mention the cardinal without also speaking of the Pope; they will live together in the memory of men. . . . A great man is never so creative, his creations are never so solid and far-reaching, as when his works are sanctioned by a great Pope. From the beginning of their acquaintance, Leo XIII. had discerned in the cardinal 'a man who will deserve well of humanity.' To counsel, to encourage, and to sustain Lavignerie was the constant idea of His Holiness; to use the cardinal for his own purposes was the Pope's noblest ambition. With what enthusiasm did not the Pontiff speak of the archbishop of Carthage? How confidently Leo XIII. watched that illustrious career! Neither detractors, nor calumniators, nor reprovers could ever prevent the Pope from blessing this grand man of action."

CHAPTER XIV.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE EDUCATIONAL QUESTION IN BELGIUM.

The theory of an "independent morality," that is, of a morality derived from an absolute independence of all "religious dogmatic teaching," has been, as we have had frequent occasion to note, the pet dogmatism of the Freemasonry of our day, which thus accentuated, as though such emphasis was needed, its essential difference from the system which proclaims that all social order is based on

revealed truth—on God and His Christ—*Omnia instaurare in Christo*. On Jan. 26, 1879, at the ceremony of the consecration of the Masonic Temple of the *Amis Philanthropes* in Brussels, Brother Goblet d'Aviella, knowing full well that his words would be proclaimed immediately to the "profane" world, openly avowed that the time had come for the enforcement of the "independent morality" on Catholic Belgium. "When we laid the corner-stone of this temple (1877), I observed, my brothers, that Masoury is the philosophy of Liberalism, that is, the source from which the foes of all prejudices and superstitions must procure their superior principles of moral direction and political reconstruction. . . . What question chiefly engages the attention of the government and the people of Belgium to-day? It is that of a reform of popular education—that lever, with which, as a certain philosopher declared, mankind could be renovated. To-day we are about to deprive revealed religion of that right to teach morality which it has hitherto monopolized in the public schools. . . . If the Liberals wish to find the true principles of education, let them come to our temples. On our walls they will see those principles written; in our works they will see those principles formulated. Masonry teaches that in the moral just as in the physical world, there are laws which are absolute, primordial, permanent, universal, and independent of all time and place—independent of every sect and school, and destined to be the foundation of every society which is rationally organized. . . . When Masonry proclaims these laws, it merely conforms to the object for which it was instituted; for this object—as is known by all of you who have arrived at the third degree—although it is hidden under the *Biblical superstitions* of our Rituals, is simply the study of Nature" (1). The confidence of Brother Goblet d'Aviella was well-founded; for in the elections of the previous May, the Liberals had attained to power, and an entirely Masonic cabinet, composed of such men as Frère-Orban (for Foreign Affairs), Bara (for Justice), and Van Humbeeck (for the Interior), swayed the destinies of Belgium. The Brethren

(1) Reported in the *Courrier de Bruxelles*, March 7, 1879.

of the Dark Lantern in France, as we have seen, were firmly entrenched; the adepts in Holland, thanks to their ally, the "Society for the Public Welfare" (1), had just procured the passage of a law which laicized all teaching of youth; why should not halcyon days now arrive for Belgian Masonry? (2). On Jan 21, 1879, the Venerable Brother, Van Humbeeck, in his capacity as Minister of the Interior, introduced into the Chambers the great desideratum of his order. The following were the principal articles: Art. IV. "Religious teaching is left to the care of families and of the clergy of the different religions. A place in the schools shall be assigned to the ministers of the various denominations for the purpose of giving, after school hours, religious instruction to such children as belong to their respective communions." Art. VI. "The books used in the primary schools shall be selected by the *Conseil de Perfectionnement*, and shall be approved (or rejected) by the government." It was evident that these provisions would be obnoxious to the immense

(1) This society was founded in 1784 by Nieuwenhysen, a Dutch Mennonite pastor, "with the intention," as his programme announced, "of combatting, in children as well as in adults, all the prejudices of superstition." Its apparent inoffensiveness rendered it an admirable propaganda of Freemasonry, especially among the lower orders. See the excellent work of M. de Moussac on *The Educational League*, p. 9 and 234.

(2) Under the domination of the first Napoleon, Freemasonry, which had hitherto flourished but poorly in Belgium, developed greatly; but it attained to much larger proportions when the Machiavellian Congress of Vienna incorporated the Catholic Belgians with the Hollanders. One of the chief re-organizers of Belgian Masonry was an apostate priest named Saint-Martin, a counsellor of the Paris Court of Cassation, who had been employed by Napoleon in many confidential missions in the Low Countries. None of the Belgian Masons of those days had any sympathy for Belgian aspirations toward liberty; the union with Holland under the sceptre of a Protestant prince promised to favor their game. A distinguished member of the Belgian parliament, Woste, thus alluded to this unpatriotic attitude of the Belgian Masons: "When King William (of Holland) assumed a hostile and aggressive attitude toward Catholicism, Masonry took good care not to espouse the cause of the liberty of the Church against him. It proclaimed him 'the most enlightened monarch in Europe.' It approved his expulsion of the Brothers of the Christian Schools; his suppression of the freedom of teaching; his foundation of the 'Philosophical College'; and one of the Masonic representatives in the States-General, Reyffius, exclaimed: 'It was necessary to take measures which would insure for Belgium in the future an educated and enlightened clergy; and the government therefore created the Philosophical College. The government should not only watch over public instruction; it should direct it, seeing that the young are taught good principles, those which conform to our habits and institutions.'" See the *Anti-Catholic and Radical Evolution of the Liberal Party*, in the *Révue Générale*, Nov., 1876. It is worthy of note that while the educational master-stroke of the Masons of Belgium was being prepared, these praters or patriots were drawing closer their relations with the German Lodges, through the medium of one of Bismarck's chief confidants, Bluntsehli; and this was precisely the time when it was an open secret that the German chancellor was engineering the annexation of Holland and at least a part of Belgium to the domain of the Hohenzollern. See the *Bulletin of the Grand Orient of Belgium for 1874 and 1875*.

majority of the people, and that therefore in very many places the Municipal Councils would find some means of retaining the olden order of things. To obviate this inconvenience, a body of inspectors, to be appointed by the Minister of Public Instruction, was created, and to render the hold of the government on the schools still more firm, there was to be in each commune a School Committee, also of governmental appointment. To Catholics of the great American Republic who have come to regard the crying injustices of their Public School System as a matter of course, this Masonico-Liberal Belgian law of 1879 must naturally appear as comparatively a "consummation devoutly to be wished" in their own "freest land on earth"; but the bishops and clergy of Belgium, whose ancestors in the faith, ever since the days of Clovis, had been accustomed to the hand-in-hand march of religious and secular education, regarded the Frère-Orban law as the entering-wedge which would entail an ultimate triumph of indifference. It would be the height of rashness, therefore, to designate as excessively severe the decision emitted concerning this law by the Belgian prelates, after mature and conscientious reflection. This decision, as communicated to all the deans and pastors, declared: Firstly, absolution was to be refused to all the teachers and pupils of the secondary or Normal Schools. Secondly, since the religious instruction given in the lay schools was imparted by persons who had not received the canonical commission from their bishops, said instruction was to be regarded as schismatical; and therefore said instructors had incurred excommunication. Thirdly, absolution was to be refused to all the instructors under the new regime, even to those who gave no religious instruction in their schools; but as to the children frequenting the primary schools, their tender age excused them from culpability, and they could be admitted to the Sacraments, for the present (1). However, the prelates of Belgium had no intention of depriving their youthful subjects of the benefits of secular education. They called on their people to establish Catholic schools immediately, leaving those of the government to its subsi-

(1) Thus the decision was summarized in the *Gazette de Bruxelles*, Sept. 1, 1879.

dized and excommunicated servants. The organs of Belgian Masonry did not affect to conceal their exultation when the educational law of 1879 had been voted. On June 29, a "convent" of the Belgian and Dutch adepts was held in the Lodge *Geldersche Braderschap* of Arnhem; and among other ebullitions, the brother, Van Capelle, congratulated the order on "having accomplished a work for which humanity thanked it; it had put into the hands of a neutral State a primary instruction which it had taken from the hands of an intolerant clergy" (1).

From the day when the educational law was proposed in the Belgian Chambers, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Frère-Orban, endeavored to procure from Pope Leo XIII. an assurance that the Holy See did not share the indignation manifested by the Belgian bishops in regard to that law. When six months had elapsed, and the law had been voted, the desired assurance had not been given; therefore the disappointed Minister sought to make it appear that the Vatican had contradicted itself, blaming the Belgian prelates in the beginning, and afterward upholding them. But, as Cardinal Nina, then the papal Secretary of State, told the Belgian Minister to the Vatican, during the time when the law was being discussed in the Chambers, "the Holy See had hoped, and to the last moment, that some amendment would render the law less hateful to the Catholics"; now that the law was being executed, however, His Eminence declared that "he could not hold the opinion of the Minister for Foreign Affairs concerning the attitude of the Belgian clergy—he could not pronounce that attitude illegal or seditious." Speaking of the Pastoral in which the Belgian bishops, on June 12, 1879, had pronounced the censures of the Church on all co-operators with the wicked law, the cardinal declared that the doctrine contained in the document was thoroughly orthodox; and that the disciplinary portion, in which provision was made for dispensations in cases where the children would run no risk of spiritual injury, was couched indeed in strong language, but in terms which were perfectly justifiable. On three different occasions,

(1) The entire speech is published in the Masonic *Chaîne d'Union*, Jan., 1880.

Leo XIII. wrote personally to King Leopold II. in reference to the iniquitous enactment. In Aug., 1879, he begged His Majesty "to consider the disastrous effects of a law which has justly and deeply shocked the Belgian Catholics, as well as those who have charge of their religious interests." On Nov. 4, the Pontiff insisted that "any bishop who tried to fulfil his pastoral duties, let him be the most consummately prudent of prelates, would inevitably find himself at variance with a law which contradicts the principles of Catholic doctrine"; and His Holiness adds that it is because of the evident iniquity of the law that all the bishops of Belgium, "differing as they do in disposition, are so unanimous in arranging measures to counteract the consequences of the new legislation." The Pope also reminds the king that "no real need called for such an enactment—for a measure which was so utterly offensive to the immense majority of His Majesty's subjects." On May 10, 1880, the Pontiff tells the monarch that the Belgian bishops have been forced to adopt extreme measures, because of "the grave danger threatening the souls of their peoples," on account of a law which was designed "to undermine the Catholic faith in Belgium, rather than to vindicate rights of the State which no one had usurped." And the king must not forget, adds the Pope, that the bishops have accorded numerous dispensations, and taken other measures calculated to moderate the conflict—and all these things were done in accordance with the counsel of the Holy See." In the face of these letters of the Pontiff, the Masonic conscience of Frère-Orban allowed him to assert in the parliament that Leo XIII. had disapproved of the conduct of the Belgian prelates. This lie caused Cardinal Nina to send to Archbishop (now Cardinal) Serafino Vannutelli, the nuncio at Brussels, a despatch dated Nov. 11, 1879, in which the supposed discord between His Holiness and the Belgian episcopate was clearly denied. Frère-Orban refused to receive this despatch *officially*—an insult which was probably meant to induce the nuncio to ask for his passports. However, as Vannutelli knew the mind of the Pontiff to be averse to an open rupture of diplomatic relations with a Catholic

sovereign, when such a catastrophe could possibly be avoided, he consented to withhold the document, without, however, modifying its contents in any way. In spite of this letter, Frère-Orban made to the parliament a most impressive denunciation of the bishops, as of men who were disobedient to the Holy See. Then, in the name of the entire Belgian hierarchy, Cardinal Dechamps, archbishop of Malines, published a formal denial of the assertion, concluding with the words, "not only has the Holy Father uttered no word of blame for the bishops of Belgium, but we know positively—*nous le savons de science certaine*—that our adversaries will wait in vain for such a word." Nor did the Pontiff delay in notifying the world that Frere-Orban had lied, although of course, the papal language was polite, and restricted to the mere necessary. In a Brief to His Eminence of Malines, dated April 2, 1880, His Holiness said: "We wish to assure you, with all our heart, that your manifestations of devotion, of attachment to this Holy See, and of zeal for the preservation of faith and piety in your country, have filled us with consolation; and that they even strengthen the ties of paternal affection which have so long bound us to the bishops, clergy, and laity of Belgium." And the diplomatic correspondence of Baron d'Anethan, the Belgian Minister to the Vatican, shows that the Pope said to this envoy: "That alleged discord never existed. I am united completely with all the Belgian bishops; there is but one Fold and one Shepherd." But the Masonic audacity of the Belgian Foreign Minister was unaffected by shame. On April 7, 1880, he asked Cardinal Nina for "explanations" of what had been already explained *ad abundantiam*. In a despatch dated May 3, the cardinal-secretary again insisted that the Belgian prelates had acted properly and necessarily, when they condemned a law which violated the principles of Christian morality, and when they interdicted all formal co-operation in the observance of that law. The Holy See, again "explained" His Eminence, had indeed hoped for a moment that the Belgian bishops might find it possible to distinguish between school and school, showing in practice a kind of indulgence toward such institutions as did not really

inspire distrust in the Catholic mind; but the prelates replied that such a distinction was impossible. Therefore "the Holy See, considering the actual condition of the new schools in general, did not deem it wise to oppose the judgment of the bishops; for these prelates were on the spot, and were fully able to appreciate the circumstances as well as the needs of the faithful who were committed to their care." Nevertheless, again remarks the papal secretary, His Holiness did not cease to advise great moderation in the application of spiritual penalties; but such advice was by no means an opposition to the general condemnation of the new schools. Frère-Orban still affected to perceive a discord between the minds of the Belgian bishops and the mind of the Pontiff. On May 18, he repeated this often reiterated assertion; and then, in justification of his laicizing policy, he pointed to certain other countries, in which the Catholic clergy had been at least less opposed to "neutral" schools. To this would-be argumentation Cardinal Nina replied on June 8, proving that the Holy See had always condemned those schools, in whatever land they had been introduced. Before Frère-Orban received this despatch, he had ordered Baron d'Anethan to withdraw his legation from the Vatican. In the name of His Holiness, the cardinal-secretary protested against this outrage on June 13; and in another despatch, dated June 29, His Eminence said: "Europe will render justice to the great condescension of the Holy See, and to the striking proofs of his conciliatory spirit which Leo XIII. has given in the course of this affair. It was the duty of His Holiness, and history will honor him for it, not to debase his divine mission by compromises which would have involved the faith of the rising generation in Belgium, and perhaps the faith of the entire Belgian people." In the consistory held on Aug. 20, our Pontiff delivered a solemn Allocution, in which he condemned the Belgian educational law of 1879, and protested against the recall of the Belgian Minister to the Vatican, as well as against the dismissal of his nuncio at Brussels. He protested especially against the latter act, since it was a violation of the Apostolic dignity, and of the inalienable

right of the Roman Pontiff to send his envoys to any country on earth. He praised the zeal of the Belgian prelates, and the magnificent generosity of the Belgian laity, "who so fully recognized the danger that threatened religion when that law was voted, and who resolved to defend the faith of their ancestors at every cost" Then he referred to the grand eulogy of Pope Gregory XVI. on the Belgians, which that Pope pronounced when he was about to send the future Leo XIII. as nuncio to Brussels. "When Gregory XVI. deigned to name us for the pontifical legation in that country, he spoke to us in most flattering terms concerning the Belgian nation, styling it a strong race, whose loving fidelity toward the Apostolic See and its own sovereigns had been long maintained, despite many vicissitudes. And we ourselves were able, during our nunciature, to bear witness to those Belgic virtues which the monuments of long-vanished days have recorded. We have cherished a special affection for that people, because of the sweet recollections of persons and events which we still preserve, as we think of our residence in that land. We are certain that the Belgians will never abandon the love and the service of the Church; that on the contrary, remaining constant in the Catholic faith, and continuing in their solicitude for the Christian education of their children, they will always be worthy of their ancestors."

On Aug. 3, 1881, Leo XIII. addressed a Brief to Cardinal Dechamps, urging the necessity of concord among the Belgian Catholics, both clerical and lay; begging them to abstain from all irritating discussions, and giving them some rules for their guidance when talking or writing on politico-religious matters. Some of these remarks will interest the reader. "Filled with anxiety for the maintenance of concord among you, we notice that certain controversies on public law, which are agitated among you with great fervor, are not very favorable to peace. The theme of these controversies is the propriety of reconciling the principles of the new jurisprudence with those inculcated by Catholic doctrine. No one can desire more ardently than we desire, the organization of human society on a Christian basis, all

the institutions of the State being penetrated and impregnated by the Christian virtues. But if Catholics wish to strive for the common weal, it is necessary that they keep before their eyes, and follow faithfully, the prudent methods adopted by the Church in regard to these matters. Although the Church defends with indomitable firmness the integrity of revealed truth and of the principles of justice, and although she endeavors to secure the triumph of these principles in public and private life; nevertheless, she ever considers the circumstances of time, persons, and places, and frequently she resigns herself to a toleration of certain evils which cannot be overcome without opening a door to greater ones. In all discussions, you should beware of passing the bounds of equity and charity; you should never accuse rashly, or even suspect men who are docile to the teachings of the Church, especially when they are constituted in places of ecclesiastical dignity." On June 5, 1883, the Pontiff was able to congratulate the Belgians on their attention to his warning voice, in a letter addressed to the members of the federation of the Catholic societies of the kingdom, then assembled in convention at Audenarde. And the result of the prudent zeal of the Belgian laity was soon declared. In the general elections of June 10, 1884, the Masonic yoke was cast aside, and an enormous majority of Catholic deputies were chosen as representatives of a Catholic people. Under the successive Ministries of Malou and Bernært, the work of Frère-Orban and his brethren was undone. On July 19, the legation to the Vatican was re-established; and on Sept. 20, the Chambers voted a new School Law which restored their legitimate rights to the Catholics, while it also respected freedom of conscience in their adversaries.

CHAPTER XV.

POPE LEO XIII. AND THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. THE CONDEMNATION OF SO-CALLED "AMERICANISM."

In November, 1889, one hundred years after the institution of a regular hierarchy in these United States by Pope

Pius VI., there was opened in Washington, in the presence of a papal ablegate, Mgr. Satolli, Archbishop of Lepanto, and of Mr. Harrison, then President of the Republic, a theological school which was intended to be the beginning of an American Catholic University. There was much reason for the complacency manifested by the American Catholic community on this occasion of an anticipated completion of its Catholic educational system; but the satisfaction would have been more thorough and more justifiable, had there been perceived no necessity for remembering that at that very moment many hundreds of parishes in the Republic were destitute of Catholic elementary schools. This lamentable fact must have appeared incomprehensible to such of the participants in this festivity as did not willingly ignore the convictions of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in 1884—sentiments which were accentuated by a decree that parochial schools should be established in all parishes in which they did not already exist, unless such foundations proved impossible of actuation; that the new schools should be opened *within two years*: that deprivation of his parish would be merited by any pastor who would be derelict in this matter; and that all Catholic parents should send their children to the parochial schools, unless the bishops should decide that in particular cases the contrary course might be pursued. Certainly poverty could scarcely have been accepted as a palliation of the fault by any friend of Catholic education who was familiar with the financial prospects of the heartily welcomed University; and such an observer might have trusted that the manifested zeal for the higher education of Catholic laymen indicated a perception, on the part of the wealthier American faithful, that necessary and proper mental food is to be given to the children who are mentally starving or poisoned—that the vital needs of the educational life of the majority of American Catholics are of paramount importance. Then it might have been deemed not foolish to believe that the endowers of the University would finally equip and endow a Catholic elementary school in every poor parish in the Republic. Such fancies, however, would have been dissipated when, in little more than a year after

the celebration in Washington, dearth of pecuniary resources was alleged by one of the foremost promoters of the University in defence of a transaction which appeared to menace the most important of the causes ever championed by the American hierarchy. The archbishop of St. Paul had entered into an arrangement with the civil authorities of Faribault and Stillwater, whereby the Catholic schools of those towns were to pass under the direction of the Public School Boards for the space of one year, the agreement to be renewed according to the good pleasure of each party. It was understood that the Sisters who had hitherto taught in the Catholic schools were to retain their positions, but were to use the text-books prescribed by the Board, and were to give no religious instruction during the school-hours. The "Faribault Plan," as it came to be styled, was certainly a pecuniary relief to the Catholics who had hitherto supported the parochial schools affected by it ; but it was regarded by nearly all the bishops and clergy of the Republic as an entering-wedge which, if tolerated, would ultimately entail the ruin of the edifice of Catholic elementary education. The discussions which ensued eventuated in a submission of the question to the judgment of the Holy See ; and on April 21, 1892, the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda decided that " while the decrees of the Councils of Baltimore still preserve all their force, nevertheless, all the circumstances of the case having been considered, the agreement concluded by Archbishop Ireland *may be tolerated.*" In his explanation of this decision, Cardinal Ledochowski, Prefect of the Propaganda, recalls the decrees of his Congregation and of the Third Council of Baltimore concerning the parochial schools, and especially the Canon by which the Baltimorean synodals " decided very wisely that every church in every diocese should have a school for the education of Catholic children in religion, morality, and letters, said school to be under the authority and direction of the pastor." The cardinal-prefect recognizes that very many American ecclesiastics blame the course pursued by the archbishop of St. Paul as derogatory to the decrees of the Propaganda and of the Council of Baltimore ; but His Eminence adjures

the clergy to heed the decision of the Sacred Congregation. The letter of the cardinal-prefect did not terminate the discussion; it was asserted by many, notably by the editors of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, that the phrase "may be tolerated" implied a disapprobation of the "Faribault Plan." In these circumstances Pope Leo XIII. deemed it prudent to address, on May 24, 1892, a letter to the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of New York, in which he declared that while it was his Pontifical will that the decrees of Baltimore should be religiously observed, "nevertheless, in the case of all general laws whenever anything special and unexpected occurs, equity may lead the lawgiver to tolerate something which deviates a little from the letter of the law." And the Pontiff adds: "We have perceived that the present is such a case; and we have thought it wise to follow the counsels of moderation and of prudence, rather than to judge according to the rigor of the law." Then the Pontiff draws attention to the fact that in the United States there is not one bishop who does not condemn the schools of the State, as they are now constituted. He urges the prelates to continue their efforts to prevent the little ones of their flocks from attending schools in which religious instruction is not given, and in which their morality will be endangered. He expresses the hope that some day the fairness of the non-Catholics among the Americans will cause them to perceive the propriety of doing justice to their Catholic fellow-citizens in this matter. On Nov. 16, the question of the schools was considered by the archbishops of the United States in an apposite meeting held in New York. The archbishop of Lepanto, Mgr. Satolli, who had recently returned to the Republic as special delegate of His Holiness to its prelates, was present; and as he laid before the bishops fourteen propositions designed to regulate the matter of the schools, he declared that his act was performed "in the name of the Holy Father" (1). We give the salient features of these propositions: II. Wherever there is no Catholic school, or when the existing school does not furnish a fitting education to the pupils, according to their condition of life, then those

(1) Thus in the Official Report of the meeting, signed by the secretary, Mgr. Chapelle.

children may attend the State institutions with a safe conscience, if the judgment and conscience of the ordinaries perceive no danger of perversion in that attendance. V. The bishops strictly enjoin, in accordance with the formal prohibition emitted by the Sovereign Pontiff by the mouth of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, that no bishop or priest dare to refuse the Sacraments, or to threaten such refusal, to parents who send their children to the public schools; and with much greater reason this provision is to be applied to the children themselves. VI. *Absolutely and generally speaking*, it is not repugnant that a Catholic child should receive rudimentary and superior instruction in the schools of the State. VII. *But the Church entertains a horror for those public schools which oppose Christian truth and true morality; and once that it appears to be possible to procure the abolition of such institutions, it is the duty of both clergy and laity to aid in that abolition.* The Church, be it understood, does not reprobate secular pedagogy as such; she would rather encourage a united action of the spiritual and temporal powers, whereby there would be established everywhere public schools which would satisfy the legitimate needs of all the citizens in the matter of instruction in the arts and sciences. VIII. *The Church finds that, as a rule, the public schools in the United States are "dangerous to faith and morals,"* because they furnish a merely secular education, excluding all religious instruction; because the teachers are indiscriminately selected from among all the sects with which the Republic abounds, and because therefore *every kind of error is liable to be inculcated in the susceptible minds of the pupils.* However, this article grants that whenever there is found a public school which, thanks to the care of the school commissioners and of the parents in the community, offers no danger to the faith or morals of the children, then the parents may avail themselves of that school, *on condition that their offspring are elsewhere taught carefully all the truths and duties of the Catholic Religion.* IX. Each ordinary is to judge whether, in such and such a parish of his diocese, a good Catholic school can be maintained. XIII. The Catholic schools should be in every

respect model institutions ; and the teachers should try to obtain certificates of their capability from the civil educational authorities, both because such action will show that they do not despise the prescriptions of the State, and because they will thus augment the respect of the heterodox for our schools. Having carefully considered these articles, the American archbishops accepted them all with some unimportant modifications (1). In a letter which Leo XIII. addressed to Cardinal Gibbons on May 31, 1893, His Holiness alludes to his intention of establishing a permanent Apostolic Delegation in the United States, and then having remarked that one of his objects in sending Mgr. Satolli to the Republic was a settlement of the school question which had caused much perturbation in well-meaning minds, he says : " This venerable brother obeyed our orders exactly. . . . The wise decisions of the assembly (of the archbishops in New York) appeared to the archbishop of Lepanto to be worthy of all praise ; and we ourselves confirm that judgment." Then the Pontiff alludes to the propositions submitted by Mgr. Satolli to the archbishops, the inopportune publication of which by some indiscreet person had caused much agitation among the journalistic wiseacres of the Republic : " Our delegate laid before the assembly certain propositions which he had drawn up, and which referred to that double order which embraces the science of truth and the guidance of life. . . . (2) These propositions of our delegate having been inopportunately published, new and more vivid discussions were excited, and because of inexact interpretations or of malign insinuations by certain journals, these discussions became more general and more acrid. Because of this fact, several of the American bishops, either disliking the interpretations which had been given to certain of those propositions, or fearing that said interpretations might result in injury to souls, confidently laid the matter before us. Therefore, remember-

(1) The Report says : " *Quæ omnia lecta et perpensa fuerunt in archiepiscoporum concurrentia, resolutis difficultatibus et actis emendationibus requisitis, die 17 Novembris, 1892.*"

(2) " *Propositiones quasdam vobis exhibuit ab se concinatas, duplicem attingentes ordinem quo scientia veritatis et actio vita continentur.*"

ing that the salvation of men must ever be our supreme law, and wishing also to give you another proof of our good will, we asked each one of you to express his mind separately to us on this subject. All of you hastened to comply with our wish. These replies have shown that while some of you found no cause for fear in the propositions, others thought that they appeared to abrogate in some measure the decrees of the Councils of Baltimore on the schools; and these latter bishops feared that a consequent diversity of interpretation of the decrees of Baltimore would engender grave dissensions. We have examined this question seriously; and we have found that the above-mentioned misinterpretations (of the propositions) accord neither with the intentions of our delegate, nor with the mind of the Apostolic See. *The principal propositions presented by the archbishop of Lepanto were drawn from the decrees of the Third Council of Baltimore: they especially announce the necessity of using the greatest zeal in the foundation of Catholic schools, although they leave to the discretion and conscience of each ordinary the duty of determining the cases when a child may or may not attend a public school. If in every document the words at its end ought to be understood in the sense of those which precede them, is it not dishonest to give to the second part of a discourse an interpretation which contradicts the first part? When our delegate presented these propositions to the episcopal assembly in New York, he proclaimed his admiration for the pastoral zeal shown by the American bishops in their promulgation of the wise decrees of the Third Council of Baltimore concerning the education of Catholic youth. And he added that so far as those decrees prescribed a general rule of conduct, they were to be faithfully obeyed; and that without any absolute condemnation of all the public schools, energetic efforts were to be put forth for the numerical increase and perfect organization of Catholic schools.*" It is evident from this letter of Leo XIII., if indeed it had not been evident before the letter was received in America, that firstly, parochial schools must be maintained and extended throughout the Republic; secondly, that it is the province of each bishop to judge, in the case of each parish in his

diocese, whether parents are to be free to send their children to a public school; and thirdly, that a general permission for a use of the public schools *cannot be accorded*, since only certain cases are affected by the toleration of what is in last analysis an abuse—" *possunt enim casus incidere*" (1).

During the years 1891 and 1892 the minds of the Catholics in the United States were profoundly agitated by a question which was intimately connected with that of the "Faribault Plan," and the consequences of which promised, at one time, to be as baneful as those which would have been entailed by a general adoption of that plan. We allude to those claims which, considered collectively, a certain element in the Republic has been pleased to designate as "Cahen-slyism." In several of the countries which furnish a large number of immigrants to the United States of America, there had been organized branches of that zealous Society of St. Raphael which occupies itself with both the religious and material interests of those immigrants during the first few years of their residence in the New World. In April, 1891, the guiding spirits of this noble organization, among whom were such representatives of the most worthy among the European aristocracies as the Marquis Volpe-Landi, the Count de Mèrode, Prince Isenburg-Bierstein, and the Prince Schwartzenberg, met in Congress at Lucerne. The result of their deliberations was a report addressed to Cardinal Rampolla del Tindaro, the Papal Secretary of State, in which it was declared that an active intervention of the

(1) While the controversy concerning the "Faribault Plan" was being waged, another, and one which was closely connected with that plan, attracted much attention. This dispute, having for its object a determination of the extent of the rights of the State in the matter of popular instruction, was held by Dr. Bouquillon, a professor in the Catholic University in Washington, and the *Civiltà Cattolica*. According to Bouquillon, the State possesses, independently of all religious principles, the right to raise the children of its citizens; it can and should regulate every matter connected with schools, fixing the minimum of obligatory instruction, imposing what it will in the way of subject-matter for acquisition, punishing parents who fail to obey its prescriptions, and exercising full jurisdiction over every private educational establishment. Of course the partisans of the "Faribault Plan," as well as all the lovers of Statolatry, whose number is continually increasing in our Republic, acclaimed the theory of the Universalist. The *Civiltà Cattolica* strenuously controverted the Spartan-like assumption, defending in its turn the thesis proposed by Schifflini (*Moral Philosophy*, Vol. II., § 517) in these terms: "Excepting only that moral and religious education which ought to be given by the parental care under the direction of the ecclesiastical and not the civil authority, instruction such as is given generally in the schools cannot be enjoined as a thing necessarily to be accepted by every citizen."

Holy See could alone prevent an annihilation of the spiritual interests of a large number of the Germans, Italians, and Austro-Hungarians who had arrived in the United States during the previous few years. This report was signed by Cahensly, the secretary of the German branch of the Society of St. Raphael, and by the Marquis Volpe-Landi, the president of the Italian branch. According to these gentlemen: "The most authoritative statistics show that the Catholic immigrants into the United States, together with their children, should have given to the Republic, by this time, a Catholic population of twenty-six millions; whereas we know that there are not more than ten millions of Catholics in the country, showing that there has been a loss of sixteen millions." Undoubtedly there has been a very extensive "leakage" in the Catholic population of the United States; but in the collective letter which the American archbishops sent to His Holiness during their conference of Nov., 1892, the prelates protested that the Raphaelite calculations were a gross exaggeration. Cahensly and Volpe-Landi alleged six causes of the lamented defection: I. The absence of adequate protection for the immigrants, during their voyage, and on their arrival in America. II. An insufficiency of priests and of parishes for each nationality among the immigrants. III. Exorbitant pecuniary sacrifices frequently demanded from the faithful. IV. *The public schools.* V. The need of benevolent and national Catholic societies. VI. The absence of representatives of each foreign nationality in the American episcopate. In their illustration of the first of these causes of defection, the Raphaelites insisted on the necessity of a preservation of their mother-tongue on the part of the immigrants as well as on an ~~actuation~~ actuation of the idea of national parishes (1). "Of course," said the report, "in time the immigrants will speak the English language; but if they do not practice their religion until that time arrives, there will be a probability of their not practicing it at all. Sad experience has taught us

(1) In 1886 the German Catholics had even asked the Propaganda to order that no German, or child of a German, should be allowed to frequent any other than a German church, without an *exeat* from his bishop. It goes without saying that the request was refused.

that such is nearly always the case. And since each people has its own characteristics, it is necessary that its priests should not only speak its language, but should also be of the same nationality. Therefore it is desirable that each national group of immigrants be organized in a distinct parish, under a pastor of its own nationality." It would be absurd to deny that justice and Christian prudence formed, in the main, the animating spirit of these views; but the English-speaking Catholics of the Republic, who formed the immense majority of the faithful, discerned in their actuation a danger to the American national unity. In his admirable work on the Pontificate of Leo XIII., Mgr. T'Serclaes says: "Unfortunately, the report insisted, in a rather unhappy fashion, on the possibility of an Americanization without a final abandonment of one's original national predilections. This idea was frequently enunciated, notably in the insistence on the establishment of national Catholic societies for the workingmen, and in the Sixth Article which demanded representatives of each nationality in the American episcopate. This last point excited a veritable storm in the United States. The dominating thought in the report of Lucerne was acceptable in a certain sense. Certainly an abandonment of the immigrants, without aid among the olden inhabitants, was an exposure of them to the danger of a loss of faith and of morality. Therefore nothing could be more useful than the establishment of national societies, which would remind the newly-arrived of their mother-country; nothing could be more just than to supply their religious wants by means of priests speaking their mother-tongue who were of their own nationality. But it was undoubtedly imprudent to desire a maintenance of the separate nationalities through a long series of generations, in the very bosom of that American people which is mainly composed of persons who are 'Anglo-Saxon' or Irish by race. The experience of other countries proves that the assimilation of immigrants with the nationals is soon effected, and often in the second generation; therefore it would seem that protective societies ought to restrict themselves to a preservation of the religious interests of the immigrants

during the period of transition, thereby facilitating the fusion of the foreigners with the natives. But the report of Cahensly and Volpe-Landi regarded the question from the contrary point of view, and seemed to look to a division of the races, and not to their harmonious commingling." It was quite natural that the English-speaking Catholics of the United States should have protested against the pretensions of the Society of St. Raphael; but an immediate affectation of violated American patriotism attained the height of absurdity when Catholic pens began to write about "the conspiracy of Lucerne," and to designate as a "siege of Rome" the report which Cahensly and Volpe-Landi had presented to the Father of the Faithful. The unfortunate secretary was accused of the blackest designs; his language was travestied, and he was represented as talking in a fashion that would have frightened him; it was declared that not only all the members of the noble society, but also all the German bishops and Windthorst himself, were but tools of an insidious Austro-German policy. Several of the weaklings so common in American Catholic journalism told their readers that Cahensly insisted on the establishment of two bishops, one American, and the other German, in each diocese of the Republic; whereas the report had plainly said: "Since the dioceses contain faithful of different nationalities, it is evident that we do not desire any division of these dioceses by nationalities. What we do request from the wisdom and justice of the Holy See is that the episcopal body be made to include prelates of the various nationalities, so that the different peoples may be represented by some of their own in the episcopate, in the ecclesiastical provinces, and in the Councils." In vain Cahensly declared that he adopted as his own the saying of a journal of Cincinnati: "That immigrant is a traitor, and cannot be tolerated here, who proposes in this country to favor the interests of his native land." The irritation continued; and finally the Holy See interfered. On June 28, 1892, Cardinal Rampolla wrote to Cardinal Gibbons: "The Holy Father cannot but rejoice because of the establishment of associations among you destined to give material and especially spiritual aid to the

Catholics who now migrate to America. But we have heard that some of these associations—for instance, the German Society of St. Raphael—are endeavoring, in their zeal to attain their object, to procure the elevation of a representative of each nationality among the immigrants to the American episcopate.” His Eminence alludes to the displeasure excited even among the American bishops by this project; and he declares that the Holy See finds that the idea “is neither necessary nor opportune,” and that there is no intention, on the part of the Pontiff, of making any change in the method of episcopal nominations which has hitherto obtained in the United States. The American prelates are asked not to foster “a movement which has been occasioned by a fear which had no foundation,” but rather to promote harmony, resting assured that the Holy See will never entertain any proposition which could disturb them. And the cardinal-secretary is careful to add that His Holiness considers that the spiritual interests of the European immigrants are sufficiently protected by the appointment of pastors who are their fellow-countrymen. Certainly this letter ought to have terminated the trouble. But the German branch of the Society of St. Raphael was nettled; and it complained to Cardinal Rampolla, because he had singled it out for implicit reproof, while all the other branches of the society had cherished the same reprobated ideas. And the Germans took advantage of the opportunity, in a memorial *ad hoc*, to reiterate their desire that every lawful means should be adopted to secure the preservation of its language to each nationality in the Republic. This memorial was referred to Cardinal Ledochowski, who had recently been made prefect of the Propaganda; and on May 15, 1892, there was sent to each bishop in the United States a circular which put an end to the agitation. After a meed of praise to the zeal of the American prelates, His Eminence thus speaks of the nomination of bishops: “The discipline now in force must be preserved entire and inviolable. . . . Your Grandeur knows that in your country when there occurs an episcopal vacancy, there begin certain movements among both clergy and people, and experience teaches that these movements are becoming

insensibly more grievous and more frequent... We see the people and the clergy agitating, without regard to legitimate right, in favor of certain candidates for the episcopal throne; discussions concerning them are held in the newspapers, public and private meetings are convened, and each party lauds its own preference, while it disparages all others." Such agitations, says the cardinal, are principally caused by the intense desire of each faction to have a bishop who belongs to its nationality, as though the choice of a worthy pastor were a matter of private interest, and not of the general good of the Church. The Holy See regards the welfare of the whole Church whenever it appoints a bishop in any country; and it must have that welfare before its eyes most especially when there is a question of the United States of America, a land in which men of various European nations, seeking a new country, are forming one people and consequently one nation. The cardinal says that the bishops "must crush all attempts" to undermine the authority of the American Plenary Councils, especially that of the Third Council of Baltimore, whose decrees, "most conformable to the necessities of the time and the place," have been approved by the Holy See. It will be futile, concludes His Eminence, for any persons to devise or to entertain projects which in any way contradict the prescriptions of the Council of Baltimore, "since the Apostolic See has nothing more at heart than the integrity of Ecclesiastical Law, the guardian of order and the upholder of peace."

When it was announced that the government and people of the United States intended to celebrate, in a becoming manner, the fourth centennial anniversary of the discovery of America, Pope Leo XIII. wrote to the Committee of Arrangements, declaring his wish to be associated with so laudable a manifestation of legitimate national pride, and of gratitude to the Giver of all good things. Having praised "the vigor of the American people which enables them to effect the most difficult tasks with such audacity and success," His Holiness expressed the hope "that their noble enterprise (the World's Fair), to the success of which other nations would contribute, would have the happy result of

further inciting the genius of man to the efforts for the development of the gifts of Nature, and for the encouragement of the Fine Arts." Among the objects which the Pontiff loaned to the Centennial Exposition was the celebrated map on which Pope Alexander VI. traced what was to be the future line of demarcation between the Spanish and the Portuguese possessions in the New World (1). The American secretary of state, in a letter to Cardinal Rampolla, in which he assured His Eminence that the utmost care would be taken in order to ensure the restoration of the pontifical exhibits to their proper domicile, recognized the intimate association of the Holy See with the enterprise of Columbus; and in his turn the cardinal-secretary of state to His Holiness, after thanking the American government for its courtesy, announced that the Pontiff would be represented by a special delegate at the Columbian ceremonies; "His Holiness, who has so much reason for manifesting special regard for the government of the United States, because of the freedom enjoyed by the Catholic Church in that country, has determined to be represented at the festivities in honor of the great Genoese, and by a personage who is distinguished no less by his own merits than by his exalted position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy. This person is Mgr. Satolli, Archbishop of Lepanto, a prelate greatly esteemed for his virtue, as well as for the profound erudition which he has exhibited in so many writings." On July 16, 1892, Leo XIII. addressed to the bishops of Italy, Spain, and North and South America the Encyclical concerning the imminent Columbian festivities to which we have already alluded (p. 190).

In the beginning of 1893 Pope Leo XIII. actuated his long-entertained design of establishing a permanent Apostolic Delegation in the United States, appointing Mgr. Satolli, whom we have already seen fulfilling a temporary mission to the American bishops, as the first incumbent of the important position. In the letter by which he announced the new departure to the cardinal-archbishop of Baltimore, the Pontiff said that the mission of Mgr. Satolli during the Columbian festivities had been intended as a testimony of

(1) See our Vol. III., p. 221.

“the pontifical regard for those who are at the head of the American Republic”; and then he continued: “We have openly declared, not only that your nation is as dear to us as are those flourishing nations to whom we are accustomed to accredit representatives of our authority, but that we earnestly desire a firmer consolidation of the ties which bind you and your flocks to our person.” Shortly after the promulgation of this Apostolic Letter, His Holiness felt himself justified in writing again to Cardinal Gibbons: “We were greatly gratified when we learned that the additional mark of our regard for your nation had been followed by demonstrations of a general gratitude and respect for ourself.” Noteworthy indeed was the reception accorded to the Papal representative in each one of the great cities of the Republic which he visited officially during the first few months of his delegation; but special interest was attached to his magnificent reception in New York, since it afforded to Archbishop Corrigan an opportunity to break a noble silence, and to finally vindicate himself, without any debasement of his personal or official dignity, from the aspersions which many of the secular and even some Catholic journals had cast upon His Grace as they deliberately falsified his position on the School Question, and as they travestied his sentiments in regard to the delegate-apostolic. On Aug. 15, 1893, Mgr. Satolli pontificated in the cathedral of the metropolis, before a congregation of more than 10,000 persons. After the Gospel, His Grace of New York mounted the pulpit, and began a discourse on the duties of bishops and their flocks to the Sovereign Pontiff and to his delegates. Finally, the archbishop approached the subject which most of his auditors, who had borne with impatience his long silence in face of his detractors, were anxiously awaiting. He entered on the matter by an allusion to the happiness and advantages experienced by those who, like himself, had received their ecclesiastical education in the Eternal City. Then he declared that he who had enjoyed those privileges would feel himself humiliated if he found that he was expected to protest that never, even for an instant, had he entertained the idea of disobeying the explicit commands, or of even disre-

garding the wishes of the Holy Father. For it is certain, insisted the prelate, that excepting that sorrow which is entailed by an offence against God, no more poignant grief can afflict the heart of a conscientious bishop, than that which he feels when his faith is attacked, or when doubt is expressed concerning his fidelity to his oaths of consecration. Of course, the archbishop reflected that such a cross might be productive of great merit; and he knew that a bishop so afflicted was in duty bound to imitate his Master, and to forgive his calumniators. In conclusion, His Grace protested that he rejoiced with his brethren of the clergy, because of the honor accruing to their diocese from the presence of the representative of the Vicar of Jesus Christ; and in the name of his priests, as well as in his own, he welcomed the delegate-apostolic most cordially. Then the archbishop declared that he repudiated whatever had been said in public or in private, against the undeniable rights or against the sacred character of his venerable guest; but he cheerfully endorsed everything that had been said in exaltation of the delegate's office and prerogatives (1).

During several years previous to the period which now engages our attention, certain imaginative American clerics had devoted much of their time to a fanciedly imperative task of indoctrinating the Catholics of the Republic with lessons in patriotism, although outside their diminutive circle no one had dreamed that the American Catholics needed this

(1) Mgr. Satolli was destined to look askance at those who had asked him to distrust the Archbishop of New York. We cull the following remarks from the *Church Progress* of St. Louis (Aug. 12, 1899): "It is well to look back at times. Past history often casts a light on present events. I remember when Cardinal Satolli first came to this country as Papal Alegate. He was acclaimed with a flourish of trumpets and with huzzahs by the Faribaulters. They had prepared Mgr. Satolli in Rome; his right ear was filled with their dust. When he arrived, they hedged him round, jealously guarding him from everybody save their own clique. The Papal Alegate could not then speak English. He had been led to believe that the people of the United States were eager to embrace Catholicity, if only some slight concessions were made in matters of discipline. After a time Mgr. Satolli, who has eyes and ears of his own, and had learned to read and speak English, learned that things were not in this country as he had been led to suppose. From that time Faribaultism ceased to flourish in Rome. Its weediness became apparent. Cardinal Satolli had studied the situation and understood what it meant. Since then His Eminence at Rome has been guarding the integrity of the Church in this country. . . . As long as Mgr. Satolli was in their hands (the hands of the "Americanists"), and was ignorant of the real conditions in this country, they could not blow his praises too loud nor too long. And now that he has seen through their complot, alas! for human fickleness, His Eminence is consigned to the limbo of their wrath."

instruction. Platform and even pulpit were made to resound with declamations which implied that these clergymen alone were the models of all that was patriotic for the imitation of their Catholic compatriots ; and as such models they were persistently indicated by the heterodox press, and by a few of the weaker sort of Catholic journals and periodicals. Had the exuberances of these gentlemen been manifested by nothing more grave than their titillating verbiage ; had they and their comparatively few acclamants prudently confined the resultant theories within the regions of simple academics ; the American hierarchy, as well as the immense majority of the Catholic laity, might have continued to smile indulgently, waiting until the lessons of experience would act with their wonted vigor. But the region of pure academics was not sufficiently broad for the new "Americanists," as they had come to be styled. In a sermon devoted to a commentary on the Apostolic Letter which will soon claim our attention, Dr. McQuade, the venerable bishop of Rochester, N. Y., very aptly described a few of the vagaries of the "Americanists," after their descent from the realms of theory to those of practice : "Firstly, you will remember the sorry spectacle of the Parliament of Religions at the Chicago Fair, when the Catholic Church was put on a par with every pretense of religious denomination from Mohammedanism and Buddhism down to the lowest form of Evangelicalism and infidelity. It is not at all surprising that our simple Catholics, who knew their *Catechism* in its letter and spirit, were shocked at this degradation of the Religion of Christ. The Holy Father's reprobation of such parliaments satisfied the just sentiments of our Catholic people. Secondly, there was heard the cry from some quarters that if our Catholic people would adopt the State system of public school education—education without religion or God—the American people would be disarmed and would embrace us all as brothers. Many of the lukewarm and the indifferent were led for a time to think that schools without religion would suffice. The whole question went before the head of our Church for adjudication, and the response gratified the heart of every loyal child of the Church. It left no room for doubt or cavil.

Thus ended the second cropping out of false Americanism. Thirdly, an assault was directed against the ban placed on secret societies. Just when the evil consequences of secret organizations are making themselves felt everywhere, and non-Catholic religious denominations find their churches depleted because the Lodge has become a substitute for the Church, and a few natural virtues replace the supernatural teachings and counsels of Christ, our liberal-minded Catholics would open the doors of the Lodges to our Catholics. They were not satisfied with permitting Catholics to enter the 'Odd Fellows' and 'Knights of Pythias' Lodges, but held out the hope that soon the ban would be raised from Freemasonry. The Pope's letter condemning the 'Odd Fellows,' the 'Knights of Pythias,' and the 'Sons of Temperance,' extinguished all hope of raising the ban against Freemasonry. Thus the third form of false Americanism among Catholics was shattered. The fourth exhibition came before the public when a Catholic ecclesiastic took his stand before a non-Catholic University in his clerical robes to advertise to the community the new-born Liberalism of the Catholic Church. It was an advertisement well worth paying for, as it was an encouragement to Catholic parents to send their sons to Universities of such liberal tendencies that they were glad to rank among the alumni the veriest atheists in the land. It was an innovation that affected the whole ecclesiastical body; yet the leaders in these proceedings never condescended to take counsel except from their superior wisdom." The bishop of Rochester might have adduced many other illustrations of the necessary consequences of the new theories; but these will suffice to indicate the dangers which were threatening the Church in the United States when Pope Leo XIII. sent to Cardinal Gibbons, under date of Jan. 22, 1899, an Apostolic Letter which showed those dangers in their native hideousness to the American Catholics. The reader will remember that in 1891 there appeared in the United States a biography of one of the founders of the community of secular priests known as the Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle (1). The author of this biography must have been sur-

(1) *The Life of Father Hecker, by the Rev. Walter Elliott.*

prised when he heard the "Americanists" lauding his hero as "the Paul of the nineteenth century," and it is improbable that he believed with the innovators that Hecker was "the apostle of the reconciliation of the Church with the age." Certain peculiar views of the famous Paulist attracted the attention of the European theologians, when his biography was translated into French by the Abbé Klein; then Magnien asked: *Was Father Hecker a saint?* and Delattre examined the nature of *An American Catholicism*. Finally, on Jan. 22, 1899, in order to terminate the controversies which had been excited by "Heckerism," as the new opinions had come to be designated, His Holiness issued the letter, *Testem benevolentie nostrae*, from which we shall quote the more salient passages: "You are well aware, Beloved Son, that the *Life of Isaac Thomas Hecker*, especially through the agency of those who undertook to publish it in a foreign language or to interpret it, has excited no little controversy by reason of certain opinions that have been introduced concerning the Christian manner of living (1). . . . The principles on which the new opinions we have mentioned are based may be reduced to this, that in order the more easily

(1) There were some acrimonious debates between the "Americanists" and their opponents, concerning the proper translation of this passage. The Roman correspondent of the *Freeman's Journal* of New York (St. Killian More) thus commented on the matter: "The translation (made in the office of the *Baltimore Sun*, and then copied by the other American papers), is in the main a very satisfactory one; but it fails altogether to give the true sense of the Pontiff's thought in a part of one important paragraph: In the Latin this runs: '*Comperit tibi est, dilecte fili noster, librum de vita Isaaci Thomae Hecker, eorum praesertim opera, qui aliena lingua edendum vel interpretandum susceperunt, controversias excitasse non modicas ob invectas quasdam de ratione Christiane vivendi opiniones.*' In the Italian version (which, let me point out, is official) the passage is as follows: '*Li è ben noto, diletto figlio nostro, che il libro intorno alla vita di Isacco-Tommaso Hecker, per opera in ispecialità di coloro che lo tradussero in altra lingua o lo chiosarono, suscitò controversie non poche per talune opinioni messe fuori intorno al vivere Cristiano.*' And finally, the English translation puts it this way: 'It is known to you, beloved son, that *The Life of Isaac Thomas Hecker* especially as interpreted and translated in a foreign language, has excited not a little controversy, because therein have been voiced certain opinions concerning the way of leading a Christian life.' Now the real sense of the passage is this: 'It is well known to you, beloved son, that the book on *The Life of Isaac Thomas Hecker* has, especially through the work of those who have undertaken to publish it in a foreign tongue or to comment upon it, excited no little controversy, by reason of certain opinions advanced concerning the way of leading a Christian life.' This last version is not elegant (far from it), but in the light of the Latin and Italian texts, it is accurate, and that is the main thing to be considered now. The difference between it and the published translation is sufficiently important in itself, but it becomes more important still, owing to the coloring it has given to the entire document. The translation makes His Holiness put all the responsibility of

to bring over to the Catholic doctrine those who dissent from it, the Church ought to adapt herself somewhat to our advanced civilization, and relaxing her ancient rigor, show some indulgence to modern popular theories and methods. Many think that this is to be understood not only with regard to the rule of life, but also to the doctrines in which the *deposit of faith* is contained. . . . On that point the Vatican Council says : 'The doctrine of faith which God has revealed is not proposed like a theory of philosophy which is to be elaborated by the human understanding, but as a divine deposit delivered to the Spouse of Christ to be faithfully guarded and infallibly declared. . . . That sense of the sacred dogmas is to be faithfully kept which Holy Mother Church has once declared, and is not to be departed from under the specious pretext of a more profound understanding.' Nor is the suppression to be considered altogether free from blame, which designedly omits certain principles of Catholic doctrine and buries them, as it were, in oblivion. The same Vatican Council says : 'By the divine and Catholic faith we must receive all of those things which are contained in the word of God, either written or handed down, and are proposed by the Church whether in solemn

the controversy on the French version of *The Life of Father Hecker* and the views of the religious life contained in it ; whereas the Holy Father lays the responsibility on all those who have given countenance and publicity to those views by promoting the publication of *The Life of Father Hecker* in French and by commenting on it in various ways. Now leaving this subject of responsibility, it is a very serious mistake to suppose that only the French *Life* is referred to in the Papal document. I note that an American clergyman has in a manner excused His Holiness for the condemnation of *The Life of Father Hecker* on the ground that the Pope, being a very busy man, has not time to examine the accuracy of a translation, and just trusts to luck in dashing off a condemnation. This view of the matter is wildly grotesque, besides being grossly disrespectful. The supreme authority of the Church does not work on these off-hand lines, and in the present case I am in a position to state that the English as well as the French edition has been subjected to the most careful examination and (this is the most important point) been found to be out of harmony with Catholic teachings. Indeed, nobody who reads the English work and the Papal letter together can fail to see that a number of propositions singled out for reproof in the latter are contained explicitly in the former, while the tone of the one is simply in violent contradiction with the tone of the other. Let me observe here that I am not now discussing what Father Hecker or his followers and admirers held or hold subjectively. That is another matter, and it is highly satisfactory to see with what unanimity everybody concerned repudiates and condemns all the propositions repudiated and condemned by His Holiness. But let us look objective facts squarely in the face and bow to their inexorable logic, no matter how much hurt we may be by them. It is a fact that *The Life of Father Hecker* in English as well as in French contains objectively teachings which are not in consonance with the teachings of the Catholic Church."

decision or by the ordinary universal magisterium, to be believed as having been divinely revealed.' Far be it then from anyone to diminish or for any reason whatever to pass over anything of this divinely delivered doctrine; whosoever would do so, would wish to alienate Catholics from the Church, rather than to bring over to the Church those who dissent from her. . . . The history of all the past ages is witness that the Apostolic See, to which not only the office of teaching, but also the supreme government of the whole Church was committed, has constantly adhered *to the same doctrine, in the same sense and in the same mind*: but it has always been accustomed to so modify the rule of life, that, while keeping the divine right inviolate, it has never disregarded the manners and customs of the various nations which it embraces. If required for the salvation of souls, who will doubt that it is ready to do so at the present time?—But this is not to be determined by the will of private individuals who are mostly deceived by the appearance of right, but ought to be left to the judgment of the Church. In this all must acquiesce who wish to avoid the censure of our predecessor Pius VI., who proclaimed the 18th Proposition of the Synod of Pistoia 'to be injurious to the Church and to the Spirit of God which governs her, inasmuch as it subjects to scrutiny the discipline established and approved by the Church, as if the Church could establish a useless discipline or one which would be too onerous for Christian liberty to bear' (1). It is far indeed from our intention to repudiate all that the genius of the time begets; nay, whatever the search for truth attains, or the effort after good achieves, will always be welcome to us, for it increases the patrimony of doctrine, and enlarges the limits of public prosperity. But all this, to possess real utility, should thrive without setting aside the authority and wisdom of the Church. . . . It is hard to understand how those who are imbued with Christian principles can place the *natural* ahead of the *supernatural* virtues, and attribute to them greater power and fecundity. Is nature, then, with grace added to it, weaker than when left to its own strength? and have

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 596.

the eminently holy men, whom the Church reveres, shown themselves weak and incompetent in the natural order, because they have excelled in Christian virtue? Even if we admire the sometimes splendid acts of the natural virtues, how rare is the man who really possesses the habit of these natural virtues? . . . If we scrutinize more closely these particular acts, we shall discover that oftentimes they have more the appearance than the reality of virtue. But let us grant that they are real. If we do not wish to *run in vain*, if we do not wish to lose sight of the eternal blessedness to which God in His goodness has destined us, of what use are the natural virtues unless the gift and strength of divine grace be added? . . . With this opinion about natural virtue, another is intimately connected, according to which all Christian virtues are divided as it were into two classes, *passive*, as they say, and *active*; and they say that the former were better suited for the past times, but the latter are more in keeping with the present. There is not and can not be a virtue which is really passive. . . . From this species of contempt of the evangelical virtues which are wrongly called *passive* it follows that the mind is imbued gradually with a feeling of disdain for the religious life. And that this is common to the advocates of these new opinions, we gather from some of their utterances concerning the vows which Religious Orders pronounce. For, say they, such vows are altogether out of keeping with the spirit of our age, inasmuch as they narrow the limits of human liberty; they are better adapted to weak minds than to strong ones; they avail little for Christian perfection and the good of human society, and rather obstruct and interfere with them. That these assumptions are false is evident from the usage and doctrine of the Church, always according the most formal approval to religious life. Nor should there be any distinction of praise between those who lead an active life and those who, attracted by seclusion, give themselves up to prayer and mortification of the body. How gloriously they have merited from human society and do still merit, should be evident to all who do not ignore how *the continual prayer of a just man*, especially when joined

to affliction of the body, avails to propitiate and conciliate the majesty of God. . . . If there are any, therefore, who prefer to unite together in one society without the obligation of vows, let them do as they desire. That is not a new institution in the Church, nor is it to be disapproved. But let them beware of setting such association above Religious Orders. Since mankind is more prone now than heretofore to the enjoyment of pleasure, much greater esteem is to be accorded to those *who have left all things and have followed Christ*. . . . Lastly it is also maintained that the method which Catholics have followed thus far for recalling those who differ from us is to be abandoned, and another followed. It suffices to advert that it is not prudent, Beloved Son, to neglect what antiquity with its long experience, guided as it is by Apostolic teaching, has stamped with its approval. . . . If among the different methods of preaching the word of God, one may sometimes prefer that by which those who dissent from us are addressed, not in the Church but in any private and proper place, not in disputation but in amicable conference, such method is not to be reprehended, provided that those who are devoted to that work by the authority of the bishop be men who have given proof of science and virtue. . . . Hence from all that we have hitherto said, it is clear, Beloved Son, that we cannot approve the opinions which some comprise under the head of *Americanism*. If by that name be designated the characteristic qualities which reflect honor on the people of America, just as other nations have what is special to them; or if it implies the condition of your commonwealths, or the laws and customs which prevail in them; there is surely no reason why we should deem that it ought to be discarded. But if it is to be used not only to signify, but even to commend the above doctrines, there can be no doubt but that our Venerable Brethren the Bishops of America would be the first to repudiate and condemn it, as being especially unjust to them and to the entire nation as well. *For it raises the suspicion that there are some among you who imagine and desire a Church in America different from that which is in the rest of the world.* One in the unity of doctrine as in the unity of government—such is the

Catholic Church ; and since God has established its centre and foundation in the Chair of Peter, one which is rightly called Roman, for where Peter is, there is the Church" (1).

The reader will have noted that Pope Leo XIII. was careful to assure us that this condemnation of a false "Americanism" did not involve any reprobation of the political or patriotic predilections of the American people. It was to be expected, therefore, that "the opinions which some comprise under the head of 'Americanism'" would be repudiated by the entire American Church as soon as the Roman Pontiff drew attention to the falsity and evil tendencies of those principles ; especially since a further advocacy of such ideas would confirm "the suspicion that there were some who imagined and desired a Church in America different from that which is in the rest of the world." Nor was this expectation entirely unsatisfied. But a few of the "Americanists," while professing submission to the Pontifical decision, insisted, in a quasi-Jansenistic fashion, that none of the condemned theories had been received, if indeed they had ever been known, in the American Church ; that His Holiness had been deceived by certain intriguing spirits surrounding him, and by the mistakes or perhaps criminal

(1) Commenting on this Apostolic Letter in its issue of March 18, 1899, the *Civiltà Cattolica* says : "It is a historical fact that the word 'Americanism' was coined neither in France nor in Germany nor anywhere else in Europe by enemies of the United States. Its origin was purely American, and there it was employed at first to indicate in general the 'new idea' which was to rejuvenate the Church and, in particular, the 'new crusade' which was to be led against the uncompromising position of the Catholics of the old creed. But one capital, all-important imitation, must be borne in mind. The word 'Americanism' although it is neither void of sense nor indicative of a phantom, does not mean, neither is it employed in the apostolic letter to designate, a set of opinions common to all Americans or even one peculiar to all Catholics in the United States. . . . But if the 'Americanism' condemned by Leo XIII. cannot be called American in the sense of its being common to all Americans, or at least to those who profess the Catholic faith, it must be called and is American in the sense that America was its birthplace and that there it found its first advocates and adherents. These in truth were never numerous in the United States, but being restless and noisy, they always professed to be the only true Americans and the only genuine representatives of the Church. . . . Whoever knows anything about the causes defended by them, their speeches that have been printed, the introductions with which they have prefaced the works of others, the approval which they have given to certain books, the pamphlets and articles which they have published in various periodicals, the memoirs scattered right and left ; whoever knows, we say, all this and other things besides, needs not names or other proofs to be convinced that the 'Americanism' that has been reproved by the supreme head of the Church is not 'an inflated balloon,' is not an invention of the enemies of the United States, but a sad reality which precisely on account of the evils which it had already produced in the United States and of the greater evils threatened, if it had been allowed to progress and grow

unfaithfulness of the Frenchmen who had respectively translated and misinterpreted the *Life of Father Hecker*—in fine, the more obstinate of the “Americanists” asked the Catholic world to believe that His Holiness was simply a theological and Pontifical Don Quixote. The assertion that the “Americanistic” opinions had been unknown in the American Church before their ostentatious discovery by the Roman Pontiff, or perhaps by the Abbés Magnien and Delattre, was daring indeed; it implied that the memories of the more persistent of the “Americanists” had conveniently failed to retain the matter of their teachings, during the previous ten or fifteen years, and that those ebullitions had been forgotten by such Catholic readers as are wont to consult the columns of the press. Had such oblivion overtaken all those utterances, however, the spirit of the false “Americanism” would have manifested itself to all who perused such passages as that in the *Preface* to the original *Life of Father Hecker*, in which it was insisted that precisely because the dogma of Papal Infallibility has been defined, Catholics should now enjoy greater scope for individual action—an action free from external direction. “There have been epochs in history,” said the archbishop of St. Paul, “where the Church, sacrificing her outposts and the

strong in Europe also, deserved to be condemned without delay or hesitation. . . . We come now to its nature. If by the name of ‘Americanism’ are meant those peculiar qualities of mind with which the peoples of America are endowed as other nations are with other qualities; likewise if it means the condition of their cities or the laws and customs which are peculiar to them; that is, if it is a question of an Americanism in the political sense, ‘There is no reason,’ writes the Pontiff, ‘why it should be rejected by us.’ This must be understood to mean, as is only natural, after excluding the exaggerations of the Americanists. Such are, for example, that of proposing the Constitution of the United States as the ideal of political perfection to be imitated by all other nations, or that of persons who, arguing from the fact that in the United States the Church, unhindered by the laws of the civil Government, enjoys without obstacles the secure liberty of living and acting according to the simple common law, infer that from America the model for the best condition of the Church must be taken; or that it is allowable or expedient, speaking generally, that Church and State should be disunited and separated in other countries just as they are in the United States. Wherefore, as Leo XIII. said wisely on another occasion: “If in the United States the Church remains unharmed, if even it prospers and spreads, that in every way is the result of the fruitfulness granted by God to His Church which, when it is not opposed by others, when it finds no impediment, grows and expands through its own power; when, nevertheless, it would give far more copious fruit if, besides having liberty, it enjoyed favor from the laws and patronage from the social power. (Encyclical *Longinqua* to the bishops of the United States, 1895.). . . . Another exaggeration of the Americanists is that of exalting American democracy, representing it as the form of government most loved by the Church, indeed as the flower of its principles. To arouse the idea or suspicion that the Church is a partisan of one form of government

ranks of her skirmishers to the preservation of her central and vital fortresses, put the brakes, through necessity, from the nature of the warfare waged against her, upon individual activity, and moved her soldiers in serried masses; and then it was the part and the glory of each one to move with the column. *The need of repression has passed away. The authority of the Church and of her Supreme Head is beyond danger of being denied or obscured, and each Christian soldier may take to the field obeying the breathings of the Spirit of Truth and piety within him, feeling that what he may do he should do. . . .* The responsibility is upon each one; the indifference of others is no excuse. Said Father Hecker one day to a friend: 'There is too much waiting upon the action of others. The layman waits for the priest, the priest for the bishop, and the bishop for the Pope, while the Holy Ghost sends down to all the reproof that He is prompting each one, and no one moves for Him.' Father Hecker was original in his ideas, as well as in his methods; there was no routine in him, mental or practical." It is not improbable that it was this passage from the pen of His Grace of St. Paul that drew from the Pontiff the following commentary: "It is of importance, therefore, to note particularly an opinion, which is addressed as a sort of argument to urge

rather than another, or that it is better adapted to one form rather than to another, is a wicked artifice contrary to reason and to history. . . . There is no question in the Apostolic letter of political 'Americanism.' It is a question of that 'Americanism' which pretends not merely to rejuvenate the Church by promoting its evolution in dogma and in discipline in such a way that it may accord with the century, but also to renew Christian life and regulate it according to the aspirations and demands of new times. Every century, says 'Americanism,' must have a special type of holiness. Ours demands that the natural virtues should be more particularly cultivated, and that the first place should be given to personal initiative, or to the so-called spirit of individualism. It should, therefore, be active rather than passive, and, so far as possible, free from religious vows, independent of all external authority, and subject almost solely to the internal and personal direction of the Holy Ghost, of whose language the soul is supposed to have perfect knowledge. By this system, which is condemned in all its parts by the Apostolic Letter, religious life would be reduced to a sort of independent republican and democratic asceticism, or if you prefer, to the transformation of the Protestant idea of 'free examination' into a personal 'free sentiment,' that should be then applied to the Christian and religious life of every one. . . . If Americanism has been condemned, whose fault is it? Certainly not that of the 'enemies of the United States,' to whom till the other day even the existence of Father Hecker was unknown, and who, if they were Catholics, could not avoid being delighted at seeing glorified the first 'saint' of the American Church. The fault, if that term must be used, belongs alone to the friends and commentators of the *Life* of Hecker, who have repeatedly dignified his opinions with the name of 'Americanism' and have proposed him to the admiration and veneration of the faithful as the standard-bearer of their new school."

the granting of such liberty to Catholics. *For, they say, in speaking of the infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff, that after the solemn decision formulated in the Vatican Council, there is no need of solicitude in that regard, and, because of its now being out of dispute, a wider field of thought and action is thrown open to individuals.* Truly this is a preposterous argumentation. For if anything is suggested by the infallible teaching of the Church, it is certain that no one should wish to withdraw from it, nay, that all should strive to be thoroughly imbued with, and be guided by its Spirit, *so as to be the more easily preserved from any private error whatever.*" And His Holiness adds: "*Qui sic arguunt, a providentis Dei sapientia discedunt admodum.* For in willing that the authority and teaching office of the Apostolic See should be more solemnly asserted, God willed above all to guard more efficaciously the minds of Catholics from the dangers of the present age. A license which is often confounded with liberty, a craving to put in a word on every topic, and the freedom of thinking as one pleases and putting one's thoughts in print, have cast such dense darkness over men's minds that *never before was there greater need for the existence and exercise of ecclesiastical authority to prevent them from running counter to conscience and duty.*" In several other reprobations of "Americanistic" ideas, His Holiness paraphrases those notions with words which, just as in this case of the Preface to the *Life of Father Hecker*, are all but identical with utterances of "Americanist" publicists. But if we were to grant that it is allowable to credit Pope Leo XIII. with crass ignorance of the state of affairs which he undertook to remedy, are we to ascribe the same want of knowledge to all those American bishops who, in their replies to the Apostolic Letter, proclaimed the fact of at least a limited circulation of the stigmatized errors in the American Catholic community? Of course the "Americanists" would have us ignore as of no value the avowal of the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of Milwaukee; since, as the innovators insisted, these prelates were "merely a few Germans in obscure dioceses"—as though the most pronounced Catholic opponent of the Teutonic Idea would fail to recognize those bishops as

competent witnesses in regard to matters which are presented to their observation. Archbishop Elder of Cincinnati was not "a German bishop of an obscure diocese"; and nevertheless he and his suffragans wrote to His Holiness: "The errors you condemn were calculated to work great harm to souls. Your Apostolic Letter, with its lucid explanation of Catholic truth, will, we feel confident, end all future misunderstanding. *Roma locuta est: causa finita est.*" And certainly Archbishop Corrigan of New York and the prelates of his province were not "Germans in obscure dioceses"; but on March 10, 1899, these bishops declared to the Holy See: "If Your Holiness had not opportunely come to our aid with your admirable letter, how numerous might have been those who, through ignorance rather than malice, would have been taken in the snare! The bishops and clergy would have had a heavy task to keep the people far from error. . . . We rejoice greatly that by reason of your infallible teaching we will not have to transmit to our successors the ungrateful task of having to struggle with an enemy which perhaps would never die" (1).

Among all the luminaries of the Liberal school in Europe, probably very few had even heard of "Americanism," when the Pontifical condemnation of that vagary appeared; but

(1) This letter of the bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of New York should be read in its entirety: "Most Holy Father: We cannot express in words the feelings of admiration, of joy, and of gratitude, with which our hearts have been penetrated on reading the masterly and admirable letter which Your Holiness deigned to issue concerning what has been, for some time past, designated under the name of 'Americanism.' With what wisdom has Your Holiness known how to summarize the multitude of fallacies and errors which it has been sought to pass as good and Catholic doctrine under the specious title of 'Americanism'! And at the same time, with what prudence, discretion, and gentleness, together with force and clearness, has Your Holiness fulfilled the office of supreme and infallible teacher! Certainly this last emanation from the wisdom of Your Holiness is not inferior to any of the many which have excited the admiration of the nations during the course of your glorious Pontificate. As for us, placed by the Holy Ghost as bishops to rule the Church of God under the guidance of Your Holiness, we hasten to offer to you our sentiments of unqualified adhesion. We receive in the most absolute manner, for ourselves and for our clergy, for the religious orders and congregations working with us for the salvation of souls, and also for our flocks, the doctrinal Letter *Testem benevolentie* sent to us by Your Holiness. We accept it, and we make it wholly ours, word for word and sentence for sentence, in the very same sense according to which Your Holiness, following the tradition and wisdom of all Christian antiquity, understood and understands it, and wishes it to be understood by all. We shall never be guilty of any reservation or tergiversation, either directly or indirectly, in regard to it; nor shall we tolerate such a course on the part of those who are under our care. Your Holiness has spoken; therefore the question is terminated. This thought gives us great satisfaction, and it was this satisfaction that we wished to express in the first words of this letter. And we may now say that

immediately the Masonic and Protestant journals of Italy, France, England, and Germany, expressed their sympathy with the alleged progressists whom the retrograde Vatican was said to be persecuting. None of these effusions merits citation; but it may interest the reader to note the manner in which the Papal pronouncement was received by those nondescripts who so pathetically endeavor to vindicate for themselves a right to be considered as Liberal, even while they pose as Catholic. No sincerely Catholic periodicals or journals would loan their columns for a ventilation of the "Liberal Catholic" ideas; but fortunately for the vanity of the purveyors of those theories, the heterodox and indifferentist organs are ever ready to publish what promises to injure Catholicism, while it increases their circulation. Three of these periodicals, in England the *Nineteenth Century* and the *Contemporary Review*, and in the United States the *North American Review*, were made vehicles for the distribution of the latest concoction of "Liberal Catholic" poison under the guise of a defence of "Americanism." The *Nineteenth Century*, in its issue of May, 1899, enabled the Hon. William Gibson, a gentleman whose ravings in the matter of Lamennais we found it necessary to notice in our dis-

almost on its first appearance, death has overtaken that monstrosity which, in order to obtain a durable home among us, usurped the fair name of 'Americanism'; and it is to Your Holiness that this happy result is due, for if you had not opportunely come to our aid with your admirable letter, how numerous might have been those who, through ignorance rather than malice, would have been taken in the snare! The bishops and clergy would have had a heavy task to keep the people far from error. Error would have been able, little by little, always to take a greater hold; and we would soon be designated by the thoughtless as persons who are not Americans. Meanwhile the false 'Americanism,' understood like similar titles which have endured for ages among the nations to the great detriment of souls, would have taken tranquil possession among us, ever increasing its conquests in enormous proportions of time and place. Therefore we rejoice because of your infallible teaching which has so effected that we will not be obliged to transmit to our successors the ungrateful task of having to struggle with an enemy which perhaps would never die. Now, with heads erect we can repeat that we also are Americans; we are Americans, and we glory in the fact. We glory in this fact because our nation is great in its institutions and in its undertakings, great in its development and in its activity; but in matters of religion, doctrine, discipline, morals, and Christian perfection, we glory in entire obsequiousness to the Holy See. For these reasons we are, and shall ever be, most grateful to Your Holiness for the signal benefit which your Letter *Testem benevolentie* has conferred on us and on all the Catholics of America. By the testimony of your kindness, Your Holiness has uprooted this cockle from the field of wheat, as soon as it appeared. May God preserve, etc.! For the Right Reverend Bishops of this Ecclesiastical Province, the Most Humble Servant of Your Holiness, MICHAEL AUGUSTINE, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK."

sertation on the great unfortunate (1), to prove that the lapse of time had not augmented his store of common sense. A writer who thinks that the great Napoleon's "war of liberation" in Italy—a war which "demonstrated the utility of an organization like that of the Carbonari"—was followed by a great mistake on the part of the Pontiffs who "might at this time have succeeded in winning for themselves a great position as the representatives of a great idea"; a writer who represents Lamennais as the victim of "the cowardly and underhand operations" of men whose religion was "identified with the divine right of kings"; might well be expected to see in every teaching of Leo XIII. an attempt to crush all independent thought in man. According to this honorable gentleman, the numerous Encyclicals of Leo XIII. have produced but one effect; they have demonstrated that the Church so distrusts all progress in science, that no true devotee of science can be a faithful Catholic. And Mr. Gibson finds the most conclusive proof of this Pontifical oppression in the condemnation of that "Americanist" tenet, according to which "the manner and method hitherto adopted to effect the return of dissidents should henceforth be abandoned for another" (2). The writer in the *Contemporary Review*, also of May, 1899, is anonymous; but he claims to be a Catholic, albeit "independent." He regards the condemnation of "Americanism" as consistent with a system which gives a place in the *Index* to the work of nearly every Catholic who is sufficiently brave to write on scientific matters. He asserts that the Church is now, if not formally, at least practically, divorced from science; the two are "separated at least *a mensa et thoro*." The *Civiltà Cattolica* thus comments on this aberration: "He utters an untruth and he calumniates the Church, if he refers to real science which is the certain and evident knowledge of a thing through a true knowledge of its causes; the science which does not rest on nothing, and is not bolstered by silly theories and gratuitous hypotheses, but is derived from unshakeable principles, and

(1) See our Vol. v., p. 280, 287.

(2) Since such are the views of Mr. Gibson, the *Review of Reviews* might well express its surprise on learning that the gentleman still remains in the fold of Catholicism.

deals with facts rigorously established—the science, in short, which is taught us by those who have a right to speak for it. From this science the Church is not separated—rather does she make it her own, promote it, bless it, and desire that it be cultivated with all zeal by her children. Far from plucking from the brows of real scholars a single leaf from the bays of learning that adorn them, she would have new laurels of still more glorious conquests added thereto. If, however, we are to judge by the names of ‘our best Catholic writers,’ the giants ‘whose heads tower above the crowd, which we find cited in the pages of the *Contemporary*, it is evident that the anonymous writer does not know what real science is, and, as a consequence, who are the true scholars. We are far indeed from wishing to detract in any way from the scientific and literary attainments of a Semeria and a Genocchi; but to present these two young priests to the English public as ‘the best thinkers, the only true scholars, the giants of science among Italian Catholics,’ is certainly an exaggeration which borders on the ridiculous. It is a little remarkable that the anonymous *Contemporary* writer, while knowing, or pretending to know, a number of giants in France, Germany, Italy, and the United States, is a complete stranger to those of England. He never quotes them—and he is wise, for were he to quote English ‘giants’ of the calibre of the Loisy, Schells, Semerias, and De Wits, he would be simply laughed at by every Englishman who knows anything about the scientific history of his country.” Certainly the surviving “Americanists” must have wished that they had been spared the ignominy of such defences as those advanced by Mr. Gibson and by the anonym of the *Contemporary*; and we would fain believe that few of them were grateful for the encouragement tendered in the *North American Review* (July, 1899) by Dr. William Barry, an English priest whose pen had hitherto done excellent service in the cause of religious truth, but who then announced to the world an alleged discovery of a Spanish diplomatic complicity in the matter of the Letter *Testem benevolentie*. According to this English champion of the “Americanist”

idea, the condemnation of that idea was the work of "the party which in France has pursued Dreyfus to extermination; which in Italy is accused of coquetting with Socialists to overturn the monarchy; and which saw itself confronted with a new enemy, and that enemy America." And why did this party, these conspirers against the Savoyard of the Quirinal, regard "Americanism" as an enemy? Dr. Barry finds the reason in the fact that "The Franco-Latin world had been shaken to its foundations by the triumph of an English-speaking race over Spain; and if anything was to be undertaken by way of safeguard or revenge, American Catholics stood in the front, the first line of battle, resting on Rome. At Rome, accordingly, they have been assailed." After this malevolent identification of the French Catholic party with the Jew-baiters whose chief leaders are by no means prominent in Catholic circles, and many of whom are no more Catholic than are those foremost of Anti-Semites, the Communist Rochefort, and the German court-preacher, Stöcker; after this slur on those who would restore the Papacy to its proper independence; after this sop to the ignorant prejudices of that Celtico-Anglo-Saxonico-Dano-Norman stock which a defiance of historical truth terms the "Anglo-Saxon" race; Dr. Barry's discovery thus unfolds itself: "The Society of Jesus opened fire upon Liberalism, an ancient enemy; the Dominicans were solicitous for the credit of the Master of the Sacred Palace (Father Lepidi, who granted the *Imprimatur* to the book by Magnien). There was another place in Rome, too, that of the Spanish embassy, whose tenants were not idle. The high Roman society was led by Spaniards, and its tone was violent against America." In plain words, therefore, Dr. Barry would ask us to regard the Apostolic Letter *Testem benevolentie* as the work of supposedly retrograde, absolutistic, vindictive, and ignorant Jesuits; of presumed timorous and vain-glorious Dominicans; and of a Spanish government, most of the members of which, like nearly all their predecessors during the now closing century, were votaries of the Dark Lantern. And according to the "Anglo-Saxon" cleric with a Norman-Irish name, the Apostolic Letter has resulted

principally in an acquisition of "everlasting honor" for those "Americanist" leaders who have (so superfluously) "shown the world how they can be at once fervent Catholics and loyal Americans"—for those victims of European obscurantism who "in the name of America have undergone a *moral martyrdom*." Such might have been the chief consequence of the Leonine condemnation of "Americanism," had that vagary been, as Dr. Barry afterward asserted in the Liverpool *Catholic Times*, "a scarecrow set up under that name, and manufactured in Paris" (1).

It is well to note, however, that in an article which this "Americanist" champion published in the *Contemporary Review* simultaneously with the one in the *North American*—an article which professedly descanted on the "Troubles

(1) The *Church Progress* of Sept. 16, 1899, says: "Now that we have discovered that we are in the category of those who know nothing about Christian liberty, who detest the American Constitution as the work of Antichrist, and who hate England because of her freedom, we venture the hope that Dr. Barry is done telling Americans what 'Americanism' is, and where 'Americanism' came from. . . . Dr. Barry assures his American brethren that they have had nothing in common with the condemned opinions, and that there is nothing to be avoided or corrected. Hitherto, we were wont to suppose that a certain amount of human prudence, at least, was exercised by the Holy See before condemning or locating any set of errors, and that its practice was more conscientious and more methodical than to be driven 'by sheer force of lungs' to find error where error did not exist. It was very old-fashioned, to be sure; but we believed that were error to begin spreading, for instance, among the Catholics of Austria, the Church would hardly be satisfying her obligation as custodian of the deposit of faith, by sending her condemnation to Honolulu. Those of us who are prepared to accept Dr. Barry's explanation of the proscription of 'Americanism' will certainly be ready for just such an hypothesis as that we have mentioned. . . . We do not wonder that general readers arise from the perusal of such language as Dr. Barry's with the conviction that the Catholic Church is full of foolish and dishonest people, and that the supreme authority permits itself to be made the tool of their foolishness and their dishonesty. It must be quite painful to an up-to-date Anglo-Saxon like Dr. Barry to have to notice the ignorance of the Roman officials. What strangely uncultured intellects these Latins have, anyhow, that, when we talk error or heresy, they can't see that we are only poking fun at somebody! Most devoutly do we hope that the Apostolic See will make itself acquainted with the labyrinthal eccentricities of the American mind, before it risks another Encyclical, warning us what to beware of and to correct. A tremendous responsibility would be lifted from the shoulders of those zealous men who at present find it 'an imperative duty' to amend or to explain away the Pope's mistakes. Doubtless Dr. Barry would be prepared to say that he had spoken with some of those whose names were chiefly associated with the proscribed views, and that they emphatically denied ever having held them. Of course, they emphatically denied it. The distinction between *right* and *fact* is an ancient but very common weapon of defence. Every second man whose opinions have met with the Holy See's disapproval will tell you that Rome did not understand him. . . . If, as often as a Papal Encyclical were issued, we were prepared with an interpretation, neutralizing its point and palpably foreign to its spirit, we might, at an opportune moment, gain some cheap publicity. We might even have the honor of being classed with those progressive spirits who, on their own showing, are eternally rescuing the Church from collision with the judgments of advanced thought. But we think we can forego that dazzling distinction. We are satisfied to be taught by the Church: we don't seek to be her teacher."

of Catholic Democracy"—he presented "Americanism" as anything but a "scarecrow set up under that name." The following passages alone would suffice to show that "Americanism," as understood by the "obscurantists," is a real entity, and that Dr. Barry is saturated with its poison. "The years of Leo XIII., shining *once* with all the milder lights of reconciliation, are drawing toward sunset, and clouds come up from the north and the west. Secessions have taken place; books are denounced to the *Index*; persons fall under suspicion; the battle of the nations, never quite asleep, has broken out afresh in Rome. . . . 'Reaction' is the cry of assault and defence. The elements in conflict are many; it is a tangled situation, which we may view from the standing ground of theology, politics, or historical criticism. . . . The American demand—for there is a demand—turns not upon doctrine, but upon government; it is, in a high and important sense, political; but it has no concern with revolutions in dogma. . . . *My drift is to explain why many of us who know the Church from inside, and who see what the fortunes of religion have been since private judgment took hold of it in Northern countries, are Catholics still despite imperfections, abuses, tyrannies, and all the evil, great or petty, which has encrusted itself during ages on a venerable institution. . . . The nations are perishing. That any large number of men and women will be drawn to the Church by arguments, by decrees, which bear on minute details in the text or the history of the Bible, or which deal with RECONDITE POINTS OF DOGMA and rarefied systems of philosophy, it is impossible to imagine. The issues of life and death are elsewhere. . . . We are constrained to cry aloud and spare not; to warn those who threaten liberty in the name of Absolutism (in the name of common sense, who are these parties?) that they are darkening the door of faith, and repeating their ancient error which confounded religion with dynasties, as now they would confound it with national prejudice and local interests (of course Dr. Barry and the other "Americanists" are guiltless of this crime). It is well that they should learn that the youthful peoples who speak our tongue do not mean to be ruled by Philip II. from his tomb in the Es-*

curial; that they prefer Stephen Langton and Magna Charta to Spanish and Renaissance methods, and will ever do so." The foolish howl concerning the tomb of Philip II. of Spain may be pardoned as a mere manifestation of "Anglo-Saxon" spleen; but it is not easy to qualify, within the limits of ordinary courtesy, an ebullition of contempt for the Latin races with which Dr. Barry panders to "Anglo-Saxon" and German arrogance as he perorates for the recognition of "an English or German school" which should at least rank with "the Scotists and Thomists who once, long ago, fought their battles in the arena of the Vatican." Having reminded us that the pre-eminently freedom-loving and noble-minded English-speaking peoples "live under the Common Law," while the wretched Latins groan "under the Roman," the English "Americanist" hurls this *pronunciamiento*: "Futile indeed will be the task (who has undertaken it?) of those who attempt to persuade us that the laws we have inherited from our Catholic ancestors are not preferable to a jurisprudence derived from imperial Cæsar and heathen Rome." This deliberate concealment of the fact that the jurisprudence of the Latin nations is no more derived from that of heathen Rome than is the Common Law which is presented for our veneration; this lamentable indication that Dr. Barry wished to forget that the mediæval and modern Roman Law of the Latin peoples resulted from the transforming action of Catholicism on the ancient Roman jurisprudence; this insinuation that when compared with the Common Law of blissful Anglo-Saxondom, the fundamental codes of the Latins are heathen in nature and tendency; may flatter the prejudices of the more ignorant among those Americans who desire that Anglo-American Alliance for which Dr. Barry seems to hold a brief, but the cause of "Americanism" is not strengthened by this travesty of the truth.

What will be the effect of the Leonine condemnation of the so-called "Americanism"? Unless we are prepared to admit, with Dr. Barry, that "the plane of thought (of the American Catholics) was unexplored by the officials of the *Curia*"; and that Pope Leo XIII. was utterly deficient in

even a commonplace knowledge of religious matters in the United States—a want under which he would have labored, had he called “attention to things to be avoided and corrected,” when those things were fantasies or inventions of hallucinated or dishonest Europeans; we must believe that the consequences of the Letter *Testem benevolentie* will be many and beneficial. One great and practical consequence, a more intimate appreciation of the fact that Catholic truth is ever the same in all lands and in all times, has already been observed, and has been thus noted by the *Civiltà Cattolica*: “The practical lesson which we must all draw from Leo XIII.’s Apostolic Letter is that Catholic principles do not change, whether through the passing of years, or the changing of countries, or new discoveries, or motives of utility. They are always the principles that Christ taught, that the Church made known, that Popes and Councils defended, that the Saints loved, that the Doctors demonstrated. As they are, they must be taken or left. Whoever accepts them in all their fulness and strictness is a Catholic; whoever hesitates, staggers, adapts himself to the times, makes compromises, may call himself by what name he will, but before God and the Church he is a rebel and a traitor.”

CHAPTER XVI.

POPE LEO XIII. AND SOCIALISM.

The Encyclical *Rerum novarum*, published by Leo XIII. on May 15, 1891, and dealing with the relations between capital and labor, was a veritable programme for a reconciliation of these apparently irreconcilable factors of modern society. But before we enter on an analysis of the teachings of our Pontiff in the matter of the great social question of our day—convictions which had been presented at least in germ in several of the pastorals of the archbishop-bishop of Perugia, it may be well to consider the significance of the term “Socialism.” In its more general sense, the term indicates certain theoretical and practical efforts

to remedy, by means of social institutions, the evils now predominant in society. Such a Socialism as this the Church must necessarily favor—witness, in the practical order, the monastic system, and the Jesuit “Reductions” of Paraguay; and in the line of theory, the *Civitas Solis* of Campanella, and the *Utopia* of St. Thomas More. It is not this species of Socialism, however, that has become an object of distrust to such minds as are still properly conservative at the close of the nineteenth century, whether those minds be Catholic, heterodox, or pagan. As the term is now generally understood, Socialism is a species of philosophy which inculcates the necessity of destroying the now-existing society, with an intention of forming a new order of things on its ruins. This idea, until our day resident only in the domain of theory, has now become a real danger; and all the more easily, because, on account of the present prevalence of religious indifference, Socialism seems to have reason on its side. Remembering the words with which St. Paul characterized the pagan times in which he lived, “You were at that time without Christ... and without God in this world” (1), we may define Socialism as the philosophy of those moderns whose souls know not God, and who, being strangers to resignation, would form a society founded solely on a hope of enjoying unto satiety the things of earth. Philosophically speaking, Socialism is Pantheism reduced to practice; the doctrine of continuous progress, of the legitimacy of evil inclinations, and many other ravings, are taught also by Saint-Simonism, Fourierism, and Communism, all of which are derived from Pantheism and Naturalism, which in their turn are the progeny of Protestantism. It is not reserved for men like Bossuet to demonstrate the logical sequence between Luther’s war on the Papacy and the more modern war on social order; the arch-revolutionist, Louis Blanc, averred: “The revolution prepared by philosophy, begun by theology, and continued by statecraft, must finish in Socialism. *Protestantism was the first step toward Anarchy: Luther led straight to Munzer.*” A logical system like that of Socialism cannot be combatted successfully by

(1) *Ephesians*, ii., 12.

so illogical a system as Protestantism—a conglomeration of conceits which was born in a contempt of logic; the sole invincible foe of Socialism is the true Church of Christ, teaching and acting according to the principles of the divine revelation which was entrusted to her alone. The eminent Protestant publicist, the Count de Toqueville, admitted: “Catholicism alone, by her union of all classes of society at the foot of the same altar—a union such as they present in the eyes of God, solved the great problem of human dignity and of hierarchical dependence.” Coming now to a brief consideration of the history of Socialism, the most intellectual of its votaries whom we meet are Robert Owen in England, and Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Proudhon, in France. Owen, whom some regard as the founder of Socialism, published a manifesto in 1840, in which he stigmatized as false all the social systems which had hitherto obtained; all the history of the past, he insisted, is but a narrative of “the irrational period of humanity.” History has been, he well declares, an interminable series of wars and massacres; it shows us humanity in a constant state of opposition to all that might work for its happiness; each one is always fighting against the rest—“one against all, and all against one.” He essayed a new system as a remède for these evils, the scene of the experiment being at New Harmony, in Indiana; but financial ruin and ridicule were his sole rewards. The basis of Owen’s society was the life in community; there was to be no private property; education was to be the same for all. As for Saint-Simon, who was the first of the French Socialists, chronologically speaking, and the no less celebrated Fourier, we have already detailed their hallucinations (1). Proudhon, easily the most intellectual and best equipped of the entire school of Socialists, would have based all social economy on mutual justice—a justice, he believed, asserting itself little by little, amid a number of economic contradictions, the most important of which is the antithesis of property and also of community. According to Proudhon, “property has a just basis, namely, liberty; but it becomes unjust, when it becomes capital. On the other hand,

(1) Vol. v., p. 378, *et seqq.*

community of goods, although it is derived from the just idea of association, is in itself an injustice." When asked how he could reconcile these "antitheses," he replied that "synthesis" would effect the reconciliation; the "synthesis" was furnished by the idea of "mutuality." He ex-cogitated an ideal society, formed of "free and independent laborers," making one family, with no capital besides their tools of trade, and such like. Hours of work were to be equal, and wages the same. The State would be composed of working persons alone; there were to be no idle consumers. Central government would be unknown; but a local police and magistracy would be necessary. As for property, according to Proudhon, "that is theft." As for God, "that is evil itself." As for capital, "that is truly *the infamous one*." It is noteworthy that like the Reformers of the sixteenth century, who agreed in destruction, but could not agree in constructing, the Socialists have such divergent notions of the essential constituents of their expected millennium, that it is difficult to define their aspirations with any degree of precision. Perhaps the most satisfactory idea of their general ambition is found in the programme which is often presented as the basis of the future social edifice—"the free consent *of all*." In his admirable work on Socialism, Count Edward Soderini thus descants on the difference between French and German applications of the pestiferous theory: "French Socialism, while elaborating theoretical systems, has nevertheless sought, in order to render them acceptable to the masses, to bring them to the concrete, and to apply them immediately. On the other hand, German Socialism has assumed a shape more definitely scientific; and while in France the Socialists for a long time sought to show themselves humanitarian rather than speculative, in Germany the matter has proceeded very differently. Learned men, devoted either to politics or to the study of public economy, have unfolded the banner of discontent; but instead of repeating with Proudhon and Rousseau that all economic ills are derivable from faulty social organization, they have preferred asserting that the economic systems prevailing have been the true cause of social corruption. Hence, while the

former hastened to demand the destruction of the State, the latter, on the contrary, have declared themselves its partisans in order to get the upper hand in it, to reform it to their own liking, especially by the application of a wholly different system of political economy. Protectionists have affirmed that social salvation is to be found in a system of protective duties, and hence through intervention, more or less pronounced, on the part of the State. Somewhat nearer akin to them are the so-called *Katheder* or 'pedant' Socialists, in whose eyes the great remedy consists in the State's intervening with intent to recast the whole economic situation. Then come Free-traders, who afford lavish assurance that the problem would be happily solved were only the most ample and unlimited freedom of competition adopted, and the action of the State dwindled down to the narrowest range possible. Some even have pushed matters so far as to demand the complete abolition of the State. But while they have been thus wrangling among themselves, and their quarrels, breaking over the borders of Germany, have been embraced by the several economic schools of all Europe, German Socialism has burst forth in sudden and full maturity. It has stood forth as a body of doctrines, or rather a *creed*, which, presented previously under various guises and elaborated gradually, is found thoroughly condensed in the manifesto recently published by the directing centres of revolutionary Socialism, all of which now receive their password from Bebel and his adherents. . . . The Socialist State must begin by taking possession of the great industrial establishments; expropriating on the ground of public utility the actual owners, who are to be indemnified according to conditions to be determined, either by bonds bearing slight interest or by an annuity payable up to the death of the respective owners. This only in case of a peaceful solution of the question. But if, contrariwise, the Socialist workmen have to attain to victory by means of a violent revolution, the measures would change and might prove far more radical in regard to capitalists. The manifesto does not state in what such radical reform is to consist; but we are led to understand that they would not shrink from the revolutionary enormities of the

last century, reserving the fate that then befel the nobles, the rich, and the clergy, for such landlords and middle-class folk who should refuse to relinquish voluntarily their property to their new masters" (1).

Now for a few words concerning the connection between Socialism and Freemasonry. In his monumental work on Secret Societies (2), Deschamps demonstrates, by means of an analysis of the Masonic Rituals, and of the writings of the chief luminaries of the sect, that its doctrines are radically destructive of the rights of property, whatever may be the secret and natural proclivities of the more wealthy and therefore more "conservative" adepts. But let us listen rather to the avowals of conspicuous contemporary Masonic authorities. The Socialistic manifesto published by the *Récolté* of Geneva, on the occasion of the workingmen's Congress held in Marseilles in Sept., 1879, began with this fanfaronade: "Considering that every man, by the very fact of his being a man, has a right from his birth to the same satisfaction of his desires that any one else enjoys, etc." Here we have the doctrine of the "Rights of Man," according to which emanation of 1793, the right to property was one of the "natural rights" of every citizen, to whom the State was to assign his quota of other men's goods; "the Jacobins cried loudly for equality of right, the sole right compatible with individual property. Condorcet (the author of the above-mentioned doctrine) was more revolutionary when he said: 'Equality in fact, the ultimate end of the social art'" (3). Hearken to Ragon, the founder of the "Trinosophs" of Paris, whose work was solemnly approved by the Grand Orient of France in 1840, "as written by a profoundly-instructed brother," and was afterward sent to a second edition by the Capitular Lodge of Nancy, with orders that it should be termed "a sacred edition, for the purpose of reconstructing unity of thought, from which eventually will come unity of power and of action." This authoritative Ragon tells us: "Masonry alone is capable of realizing that

(1) *Socialism and Catholicism*. Rome, 1895.

(2) *Secret Societies and Society; or, The Philosophy of Contemporary History*, Bk. I., ch. 6. Paris, 1882, Sixth Edition.

(3) MALON; *Exposition of the Socialist Schools*. Paris, 1872.

grand and beautiful social unity which was conceived by Jaunez, Saint-Simon, Owen, and Fourier. Let the Masons only will it, and the generous conceptions of these philanthropic thinkers will cease to be vain utopias" (1). Saint-Simon is regarded by Masonic authors as one of the luminaries of their order; and the infamous Enfantin (2), quite naturally a Masonic adept, thus unites his patriarch with the Carbonari and the Jacobins: "Those who sympathize to-day with Saint-Simon, if they are thirty or forty years old, will have sympathized with Foy, Manuel, and Lafayette; and if they are sixty, they will have sympathized with Mirabeau, Saint-Just, and I might also say, with Robespierre" (3). The chief founders of Fourierism were Masons, and the Lodges were their proselytizers; this is especially true of Jaunez and Pompery (4). Eugene Sue, the first of Socialistic romancers, received special honors from the Belgian Lodges in 1845; and in his letter of thanks to the Lodge *Persévérance* of Antwerp, written on Jan. 13, 1845, he congratulated himself on the fact that "the Masonic Lodges were at the head of the Liberal Socialist Party." On Nov. 7, 1866, the United Lodges of *Parfaite Intelligence* and *L'Étoile*, both of Liège, were affiliated to the Lodge of *Philadelphes* in London; and they avowed that their object was to further the work of "Militant and Progressive Masonry," according to the following programme: "To banish from the human mind all vain thoughts of a future life, and the fetichism of a Divine Providence succoring humanity in its miseries; to crush the pride of money and of privileges; to transform charity to the poor, as a thing which humiliates them; to procure for the poor the rights which will elevate them; to equalize all intelligences by instruction, all fortunes by a proper equilibrium of salaries (*sic*), and all protections by laws which treat all alike; and finally to realize justice here on earth, instead of promising it in a future and unknown world" (5). In 1868, when there was question of revising the statutes of Belgian Masonry,

(1) *Course of Ancient and Modern Initiations*, p. 46. (2) See our Vol. v., p. 380.

(3) *Letter to General Saint-Cyr*.

(4) See the *Globe, Journal des Initiations*, 1839, p. 170; 1840, p. 144, 168, 210.

(5) Cited by *Le Monde*, Jan. 16, 1867.

Brother Jacobus, in an address to the Lodge *Amis Philanthropes* of Brussels, said: "The transformation of charity into emancipation, of beneficence into social institutions, of protection into definitive freedom—that is the doctrine which may be termed 'practical Socialism,' and which we desire to express clearly in the very first Article of the General Statutes of Belgian Freemasonry" (1). In its issues of August and November, 1879, the *Monde Maçonnique*, which disputes with the *Chaîne d'Union* the right to be considered the most reliable Masonic organ in the world, told how the Lodges of Paris were about to found a "Superior School of Positive Science," destined to propagate Socialism scientifically among the members of the "intelligent classes." And why not? Did not Brother Jules Ferry proclaim, in 1875, the identity of Masonry and Socialism? (2). The first German Socialist, Weitling, who began his propaganda in Switzerland and Germany in 1837, organized his societies on the model of the Illuminati and the Carbonari; and the "Musical Associations," founded by him, were Masonic Lodges in thin disguise (3). Finally, we would ask the reader to heed the remarks of the *Monde Maçonnique*, as it eulogizes Proudhon in its issue of Dec., 1881: "Masonry never forgets Proudhon; and when the celebrated publicist died, in 1865, Massol was charged with the task of interpreting the regrets of us all, and of showing how the life and work of Proudhon conformed to the aspirations of Masonry.... In spite of his various occupations, Proudhon never grew lukewarm in his love for Masonry. Read the following page, written by him at the close of his life, a page which was a precious encouragement to the friends of progress." And then we are treated to a morsel which is as Proudhonesque as it is Masonic. Since the accredited organs of Masonry assert that the work of the patriarch of Socialism "conformed to the aspirations of Masonry," we are not surprised when we read that on March 4, 1882, in the Lodge *Libre Pensée* of Aurillac, Brother Paul Roques,

(1) Cited by *La Patrie* of Bourges, Oct., 1868.

(2) See the *Chaîne d'Union*, 1877, p. 181.

(3) FROST; *The Secret Societies of the European Revolution*, Vol. ii., p. 268. London, 1876.

after reminding his brethren that the French Revolution was the work of their order, declared: "The past is a guarantee of what you will do in the future. The task of Freemasonry is far from finished. After having effected the Political Revolution, Freemasonry must now undertake the Social Revolution" (1).

The Encyclical *Rerum novarum* is at once a forcible arraignment of Socialism at the tribunal of religion and reason, and a guide for Catholics when they find themselves confronted by the social questions of these days. That a "redoubtable conflict" now subsists among the social classes; and that this conflict is due to a too great concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, to the increasing exigencies of the workers, to the closer union of workers among themselves, but above all, to the corruption so prevalent in modern society; Pope Leo XIII. cannot, if he would, avoid perceiving. As in the fulfilment of his Apostolic duty, His Holiness approaches the problems which are entailed by the social question, he realizes that these problems are both difficult and dangerous. Their difficulty is evident to the most superficial thinker; they are dangerous, because the revolutionary spirit now so rampant profits by their difficulty to foment disorder. But the Roman Pontiff must speak, since the working classes are in so many lands "in a situation of unmerited misfortune and misery." His Holiness discerns the causes of this situation in the disappearance of the mediæval guilds which protected the workingman; in the present non-existence of religious principle in civil jurisprudence; and in the consequent isolation of the workingman as he is oppressed by "irrepressible competition" and by "employers too often inhuman." Then there is usury, always condemned by the Church, and which appears every day in new form; and there is also "the monopoly of labor, and of the fruits of trade," possessed by a few rich ones "who impose an almost servile yoke on an infinite multitude of laborers." For these evils Socialism proposes a remedy in the shape of an abolition of private property, and a State-ownership of everything ownable—a system which would

(1) *Chaine d'Union*, July, 1882.

not only annihilate present proprietary rights, but would ultimately injure the workingman. "The right of private proprietorship is according to the Natural Law;" a brute, governed entirely by instinct, attains his end by a transient use of present things, whereas man, endowed with reason, "by virtue of this prerogative, is capable not only of using the things around him, but also of acquiring a perpetual right to them." To a certain extent, man is a law and providence unto himself, subjected, of course, to the Supreme Providence of God; nor can the Socialists reasonably appeal to a Providence of the State." The State's existence is of later date than that of man; long before the State received its being, man "had acquired the right to live, and to defend his existence." Nor can it be objected that since the Scriptures tell us that the fulness of the earth was given to the children of men, private proprietorship must be wrong. The Bible "tells us merely that God did not assign any part of the earth to this or that particular individual—that, on the contrary, God wished to leave the limitations of property to human enterprise and to the ordinances of the peoples." Even when the land is divided among various owners, it serves, directly or indirectly, to the benefit of all; in fact, we may say "in all truth, that labor is the universal means with which all provide what is needed for life, whether that labor be exercised on one's own bit of land, or in some lucrative occupation, the remuneration for which is drawn from the many products of the earth—products which are exchanged for the things produced by some other kind of labor." When a man has applied his intelligence to the cultivation of some bit of the earth, to which no other man has a better right, he acquires an inviolable right to that estate; "for those fields, under the hand of the cultivator, have changed their nature; they were wild, and now they are fertile. Would justice allow a stranger to appropriate that soil which has been improved by the sweat of another's labor?" As for the rights of property, when considered in reference to the family, we must remember that the family existed *by natural right*, before the State, and independently of the State; and in this domestic society, "a society very small

undoubtedly, but nevertheless real, there must be recognized certain rights and duties which are absolutely independent of the State." Among these rights, that of proprietorship must be counted as "possessed by man, considered as head of a family." Therefore the Pontiff concludes that "paternal authority cannot be abolished or absorbed by the State"; the children, a kind of extension of the personality of the parent, are incorporated into civil society only "by the medium of that domestic society in which they were born." Here we perceive the monstrous injustice of the Socialistic idea which would substitute a Providence of the State for that of the parent. And the consequences of such a substitution are as patent as their injustice: "Perturbation in every rank of society; a hateful servitude for all citizens; an open door to all jealousies and discontents; talents deprived of their necessary stimulants, and therefore the sources of prosperity abolished: in fine, instead of the desired equality, an equality in every kind of misery." Having shown that the Socialistic theory of collective proprietorship is untenable, Leo XIII., in the plenitude of his Pontifical right and of his Apostolic duty, proceeds to point out the remedies for the present social miseries. To secure an amelioration of the present conditions, "the intervention of governments, of the rich, of employers, and of the workingmen themselves, is certainly indispensable"; but all the efforts of these powers will be futile, without the concurrence of the Church (1). The first thing

(1) "On opposite sides, two schools or two parties are bent on representing Catholicism or Social Christianity as a sort of purely lay and earthly doctrine, stripped of all supernatural elements, entirely devoted to the solution of a painful problem by means of human activity. Those who will not accept Social Christianity, because they hate Christ's religion, and those who will not accept Christian Socialism because they hate the mere thought of an organic reform of society, agree with certain men of more pronounced zeal, but ignorant in their good will, in order to deprive this great movement of its true sense and import. To bring down religion to an earthly level; to efface, or at least put in the background, all supernatural elements of Christianity; to treat dogma as old-fashioned rubbish, which is preserved through a sort of pious weakness for the past; to make human solidarity the alpha and omega of morality, without resting it on the fatherhood of God revealed by the brotherhood of Christ; to transform the Church into an immense Friendly or Benefit Society; to wish to perform the miracle of human love in the sphere of men's interests, after having rejected the miracle of divine love on the Cross; in a word to pretend to renew humanity, to establish the reign of justice and charity on the earth without the help of those great deeds which contain all salvation, the salvation of the species as that of the individual, such is the vague, unhealthy dream of minds who think they can kill two birds with one stone, unchristianize the Church, and with it regenerate the world. They would not all define with

for the discontented to remember is that "grief and suffering are the appanage of humanity"; to attempt an entire suppression of this inheritance is purely chimerical. In the state of innocence, had it endured, labor would have been a pleasure; after the fall of man, labor became one of the inevitable expiations of sin. But coming to the very heart of the present question, His Holiness says that its capital error "is to suppose that the rich and the poor are born enemies of each other; on the contrary, they are destined by nature to help each other in a perfect equilibrium; there can be no capital without labor, and no labor without capital." As to the conflict of to-day, "Christianity amply and multifariously provides for its termination." Manual labor is honorable; "but it is shameful and inhuman to use men as though they were mere instruments of gain, and to esteem them merely in accordance with the strength of their arms." On the other hand, the workingman should remember his obligation to furnish the labor demanded by a free and just contract; he should in no way injure his employer, either by violence, or by seditious insistence on presumed rights, or by hearkening to the seducers of the people. In considering this question, the Pontiff does not omit the part which pertains by right to the State—not to this or that particular State, but to "every government which acts in accordance with the dictates of natural reason, and of the divine teachings." It is the duty of the State "to see that public and private prosperity flow without effort from the very

this pitiless precision the object of their secret desires or their unconscious aspirations. There are souls still half-religious, but tainted by the deadly contagion of modern rationalism, who think that all that lessens the share of dogma and increases that of practical activity in the Church makes her truer to her vocation, and more conformable to her Master's design. It is often the noble error of ardent and generous hearts touched profoundly by the sufferings and the injustice of society, indignant at the indifference, I had almost said the passive complicity of the Church, who long to see her fulfill her sacred mission, and who lose sight of the fact that without these dogmas, in which they say she is selfishly absorbed, she would have neither authority, nor strength, nor means of action, nor motive power. In our day, when it is so difficult to maintain resolutely our testimony in honor of Christian supernaturalism and of Jesus Christ, the miracle of miracles, nothing is so dangerous as the coalition of very practical rationalism and imprudent charity. Therefore one cannot profess enough gratitude for the inflexible champions of principles, who, while being the first to preach with incomparable ardor the social crusade of the Church, have been careful to connect this crusade closely with the profession of objective, dogmatic, orthodox Christianity. They have not only cleansed the Church from a reproach; they have offered to the world the only efficacious instrument of salvation. What particular

organization of society"; and the State being ordained for the good of all, the rich and poor, it should "take special interest in the welfare of its most numerous class of citizens, the workingmen." The State should see that "the workingmen receive a proper share of all the wealth that they procure for society; that they be enabled to live with the least possible amount of privation and suffering; that, in fine, they be not always familiar with misery." The authority of the State comes from God, and it should be exercised for all the children of God. The bodily interests of the workingmen demand that the State "protect them from those speculators who see in them so many machines, and abuse their persons to the utmost for the sake of mere cupidity." The care of female and youthful operatives is especially incumbent on the State; "no child should be allowed to labor, until it is sufficiently developed in all its physical, intellectual, and moral forces; for otherwise, like a tender plant, it will wither." Touching the question of wages, His Holiness does not agree with those economists who hold that once that an employer has paid the precise wages demanded by the contract, his obligations are satisfied; and who contend that justice is offended, only when the employer retains wages that are due, or when the employed do not fulfil their engagements. The Pontiff holds that these reasoners ignore a very serious side of the question; he insists that labor is at once *personal* and *necessary*: "it is *personal*, because it is the property of him who exerts

value would men ever attach to the purely natural, human, and terrestrial action of a great corporate body? Without a divine mandate, without the help of her Master, without the Gospel to awaken consciences, without the Sacraments to nourish souls, what could the Church be, do, even hope for, in social matters? Social Christianity will either be Christian in the full sense of the word, or it will not exist. That is what Manning set forth, with incomparable strength and clearness, not only in all he said and wrote on Social Catholicism in the last years of his life, but by his whole career. He believed he ought to become a Catholic, because he did not believe he could otherwise remain a Christian; in virtue of the same need, he was a Catholic upholding authority and centralization; finally he was the initiator of Social Christianity or Catholicism through his very fidelity to doctrinal Catholicism. All this development is alike connected and self-complete. It is one of the greatest honors to the memory of Manning to have been the first representative—at least in his country—of the benedict doctrine which the Social Encyclicals of Leo XIII. have since sanctioned and set forth, and which has the double object of reminding the Church of the performance of an essential part of her divine vocation, and of offering to our unhealthy society the remedy of supernatural Christianity." PRESSENSÉ; *Cardinal Manning*, in *Introduction*. Paris, 1896.

it, and to whom the power of exerting it was given for his own benefit; it is *necessary*, because man has need of the fruit of his labor, in order that he may live." If we consider the matter of labor as personal, the workingman is free to engage for insufficient wages; but if we consider labor from the second point of view, which really is inseparable from the first, such will not be our conclusion. "It is the duty of every man to preserve his existence, and he cannot neglect that duty without sin. From this duty comes naturally the right to procure the necessaries for life, things which the poor man must buy with his wages. Therefore let the employer and the employee come to what agreement they will, far above their free consent is the more elevated and older law of natural justice, which proclaims that wages ought to be sufficient to secure subsistence for an honest and sober workingman." The Pontiff deprecates those societies of workingmen which obey the commands of unknown leaders, and which are "equally hostile to Christianity and to the welfare of nations"; but he has words only of praise for beneficent societies, labor-unions, etc., which are conducted in the light of day, and in a Christian manner. Here we take occasion to notice the course pursued by our Pontiff in regard to a powerful association of workingmen which had recently been formed in the United States and Canada. Justin McCarthy thus comments on this subject: "Men will always find some allurements in the mysterious, and the Knights of Labor at first put on certain of the forms and fashions of the secret society, and of the Masonic Lodge. This, however, was afterward altered by the American order, in deference mainly to the objections of the Irish Catholics, who counted for much in the ranks of the Knights of Labor. . . . In Canada, however, the condition of things was not quite the same; and the archbishop of Quebec, upheld indeed by all the Canadian bishops, condemned the association because of its mystery and its secrecy and its possibly dangerous tendencies. The archbishop appealed to Rome, and obtained from Rome an expression of disapproval as regarded the form and the rules of the Canadian association, which, be it observed, had not undergone the revision applied to the association in the

United States. On the other hand, the archbishops and bishops of the United States sent to the Pope a clear and very interesting memorial, drawn up by Cardinal Gibbons, archbishop of Baltimore. The order of the Knights of Labor in the United States numbered nearly three-quarters of a million of men. Cardinal Gibbons explained that a council of archbishops and bishops had examined the rules of the association, and that only two out of twelve of the bishops were in favor of its condemnation. No oath was exacted by the society, Cardinal Gibbons pointed out; no obligation of secrecy was imposed; no blind obedience to the chiefs of the order was exacted from its members. There was no indication of hostility toward civil authority or the Church. Cardinal Gibbons went, at some length, into the subject of the grievances against which the association protested, and against which, as he explained, the association only claimed a legal remedy. . . . No one, he insisted, could deny the existence of the evil, and the necessity of a remedy. But then came the question, whether the methods employed by the Knights of Labor were lawful in themselves? On this point the cardinal was very distinct. To obtain any public object, he said, the association and organization of multitudes interested in a reform must be the most effective means to the end—a means at once natural and just. Such a method he declared to be especially in conformity with the genius of the American Republic, and of its essentially popular social state; and, indeed, almost the only means of commanding public attention, and of giving power to the most legitimate resistance, and weight to the most reasonable demand. Cardinal Gibbons submitted that the strikes, in which, undoubtedly and unhappily, acts of violence sometimes occurred, were by no means the invention of the Knights of Labor, but were the rough-and-ready methods by which, in every country, and in all times, the employed protest against injustice on the part of the employers. The rules and the leaders of the Knights of Labor endeavored, as far as possible, to discourage violence, and to keep the whole movement within the limits of good order and lawful action. Cardinal Gibbons admitted that amongst the Knights of

Labor, as in every movement where workingmen are grouped in thousands and hundreds of thousands, there must be wild, or even criminal men, who commit violence, and urge their fellows to the same course. But he protested earnestly against the tendency to attribute those evils to the organization itself. . . . A condemnation of their movement from Rome would be regarded as unjust, and would perhaps not be accepted. Cardinal Gibbons admitted that the condition of things might be different in Canada, especially in Lower Canada, where the population might be said to be altogether Catholic. He did not fail to point out, also, that the Canadian bishops had criticised the constitution of the Knights of Labor, before the recent modifications which the interest of Mr. Powderley had been able to introduce into the rules of the American order. . . . The Pope referred the whole question to one of the Sacred Congregations of Rome. The Sacred Congregation does not seem to have quite entered into the spirit of Cardinal Gibbons' recommendations. The Congregation abstained from condemning the movement of the Knights of Labor, but only extended to it a certain conditional toleration. It is not unreasonable to suppose that Leo XIII. was, for himself, much more sympathetic with the purposes of the labor organization all over the world. He had more than one opportunity of expressing his sentiments in person. Several pilgrimages of French workingmen—one of them organized and introduced by the Count de Mun—waited on him, during the time of his sacerdotal jubilee. One of these pilgrimages contained nearly two thousand members; another was much larger still. To all of these deputations the Pope spoke with sympathy, with encouragement, and with affection. He warned them against the danger of expecting too much; he told them that the solution of the whole question would be impossible, except on a basis of mutual charity, of morality, and of religion. But he recognized and accepted their movement; he welcomed them for such as they were—the delegates of a great trade-union organization. In the language of diplomacy, he 'recognized their existence,' and he made it impossible for anyone, thereafter, to say that the

Pope had pronounced against the movement for the organization of labor. That in itself made one of the great events of the time" (1). Returning now to our synopsis of the Pope's great Encyclical on labor, we observe that His Holiness especially commended the zeal manifested by his wealthier children throughout the world for a betterment of the condition of the working classes, chiefly by efforts to improve the relations between employers and the employed, and by measures calculated to make the workmen more exact in the performance of their religious duties—a course which infallibly leads to harmony. He also praises the numerous Catholic Congresses which have been held so frequently in our day, serving as means for a profitable interchange of ideas, and for the arrangement of definite programmes of united Catholic action. He praises perhaps more than anything else the endeavors to establish something like the mediæval guilds; and he would have the State protect these associations, without any attempt at interference with their action. These Corporations, which have been the object of so many dreams of a possibly happy future for the modern workingman (2), should be so organized, says the Pope, that "they may obtain for the laborer, as far as possible, an increase of all the goods of body, soul, and fortune." The first Christians, remarks His Holiness, were despised by the Pagans, because of the poverty which afflicted the majority of them; but wise and charitable conduct finally silenced sarcasm, and opened the way of triumph for Christian truth. So it ought to be with the social question of to-day, if taken in hand by Catholics throughout the world. Let all the Catholic workmen unite with a will, and let them act according to Catholic principles; then there will be no longer a Labor Question. "Let the force of prejudice and of passion be what it will, sooner or later the public good must turn toward those workmen who are seen to be active and modest, preferring justice to profit, and placing duty above everything else." The truly admirable Encyclical terminates with this call to action: "Let each one begin the task that

(1) JUSTIN MCCARTHY: *Life of Leo XIII.* New York, 1896.

(2) See our remarks on *Trades Unions*, in the Supplement to our work, this volume, in chapter on *Salient Features of the Middle Age*.

is incumbent on him, and without delay, lest the disease now so grave may prove to be incurable. Let governments use the protecting authority of laws and institutions. Let the wealthy and employers remember their duties. Let the workingmen, whose future is involved, seek their interests by legitimate means ; and since religion alone can destroy evil in its very root, let the laboring classes remember that their first ambition must be for a restoration of Christian morality, without which very little good will be produced by the means which human prudence regards as efficacious."

In the minds of non-Catholics of thinking proclivities this Encyclical produced sentiments of mingled astonishment and admiration. The London *Times* declared that it presented many observations worthy of universal attention, and breathed the spirit of Christian charity, and a good-will which, if it were imitated and shared widely, would nearly resolve all the industrial questions of the epoch. The same journal described the Encyclical as clear, logical, and written with all the knowledge of a statesman. The Tory *St. James's Gazette* thanked the Pope for the courageous words in which he had enforced the necessity of keeping the multitudes within the limits of duty. It asked the question, How many of our politicians who have votes to keep or to win, would have ventured to express such a sentiment in a form so intrepid? But the *St. James's Gazette* carefully noted that it would be a serious injustice to the Pope if his Encyclical were to be treated as a declaration in favor of the capitalists. Every paragraph, said the *Gazette*, breathed a love for the working people, and many passages of it were inflamed with an eloquent anger against the inhuman abuses which too often made their way into industries and commerce. The High Church *Guardian* spoke in the warmest terms of the tone and purpose of the Encyclical, and said that its effects could not fail to be important, since in all questions which concern labor, the Catholic Church put itself readily on the side of the working population. The Pope's Encyclical had done this in a wise and moderate spirit, and with the constant care to distinguish legitimate claims from those which are extravagant, and are set up in the pretended interest of

the working-people. The Pope, added the *Guardian*, spoke as a prudent friend, not as a blind and impassioned advocate. The effects of the Encyclical, the *Guardian* predicted, would be of immense importance in the development of the social question, and it would be so also without doubt for the future of the Catholic Church. The Anglican incumbent of Manchester declared at a public meeting that the Encyclical revealed a spirit very vast, a great depth of knowledge, and a foresight most sagacious. The Pope, according to this Protestant dignitary, had put his finger on the sore part of the social system, and his word must be heeded or otherwise the world would have to expiate its neglect by terrible calamities. The principal organ of German Socialism, the *Vorwärts*, was apparently thunderstruck; for it exclaimed: "In the plenitude of his power, the Pope has stolen a march on the princes and governments of all the civilized States, and has solved the social question. Yes, undoubtedly he has solved the social question, so far as any existing power can solve it." The ultra-liberal *Breslauer Zeitung* said: "We praise the attitude of the Pope. His Encyclical is the teaching of a wise and generous man, who has carefully studied the economic and social situation of these days." In France, the judgments emitted by Maurice Barrès, a famous Socialist deputy; by the Socialist economist, Leroy-Beaulieu, a member of the Institute; by Emile Ollivier, an ex-Minister of the Second Empire; are worthy of being noted at some length. Barrès said: "In discussing the social question, the Pope recognizes the right of the weak. Give us a few more years for the disappearance of mistrust, and democracy will no longer discern an enemy in a priest. . . . Will Leo XIII. be content with having disarmed hatred? Will he not try to restore to the Papacy the power that it had in the Middle Age? We may well suppose that such is his ambition; that he intends St. Peter to direct the social reorganization which all demand. Wonderful audacity! Unforeseen metamorphosis! To reconcile the Church and modern society by thrusting them together into the same unknown! To change with one breath the mental attitude of many millions of believers, at least in their views of the old

social forms of Europe! I admire, and I am astonished. The more I feel my inability to conceive all the possibilities of the new policy, the more do I feel a respectful curiosity in regard to that illustrious old man who, as they say, is about to undertake it." Leroy-Beaulieu was so impressed by the Papal pronouncement, that he wrote an apposite book on *The Papacy, Socialism, and Democracy*, which was entirely devoted to a respectful criticism of what he reluctantly admired. He began his work with the following reflections: "What is the Pope troubling himself about to-day? How does the social question concern the Church and the priests? Such a question might be put by an old man, and he would talk according to the French tradition of the last century. The nineteenth century was—we may now speak of it as having been—congratulating itself for having deprived the Church of all connection with the things of this world. It had thought that religion, having been made for things of heaven, should have no connection with those of earth. Liberalism, professing all respect for religious liberty, had carefully shut up the clergy in their churches, seminaries, and convents. The nineteenth century had acted like those mayors and sub-prefects who, in the name of the law, ordered Christ not to show Himself in the street. The cross was to be seen only in the solitude of the cemeteries, or on the tombs of the dead, or on the tops of church-towers, up there in the air, far from the gaze of the living. Well, all this was a mere illusion. The Church could not remain very long, without taking some interest in those who lived and acted around her. Her priests could not remain content with chanting psalms in the immobility of their choirs, with intoning the *De profundis* at the bier of the dead, with teaching the Catechism to distracted children, or with listening to the monotonous avowals of the devout of every age in the silent twilight of the confessional. . . . And now behold! That old mother, treated like a dotard by so many of her irreverent sons, has begun to talk to men about things which interest and divide them most. Just as though we were living in the days of Gregory VII. or of Sixtus V., the Pope must have his word on human affairs;

and the world shows no irritability, it does not seem to be surprised. Here is a sign of the times that are coming. It seems that we are beholding one of the great actors in history returning to the stage. On that old theatre from which some people believed it for ever banished, the Papacy beholds a new personage of its own order, indeed, but very different from those whom during a thousand years the world has seen. The Papacy shows that it has the spirit of its age, and, without lingering over useless dissertations, it goes straight to the democracy, and of what does it speak? Of that which comes closest to the heart of the people—the social question.” Emile Ollivier, whose judgments on Leo XIII. are not always accurate, has naught but praise for the *Rerum novarum*. “Here Leo XIII. surpasses himself; he has never been so much the Pope of enlightenment and of harmonious serenity. These pages are a wonder of elevation, of justice, of elegant and strong language, of delicate and firm handling of contradictory ideas and interests. . . . In all the theses of this Encyclical we meet an incomparable circumspection, an imperturbable equilibrium, because of which the fundamental question of the intervention of public authority is solved, without any injury to any other principle which is equally fundamental. Thus Leo XIII. is favorable to the poor man, but he is no foe to the rich man; he does not hurl against the latter any paraphrases of the text: ‘Woe to the rich!’ He speaks severely of the too evident hardness of heart of certain rich men; but instead of maltreating them, he implores them, and he tries to convince them. To this end, he is not satisfied with leaving them to the judgment of God; he shows them the perils that menace them, and he does not exaggerate these dangers, for every observer knows that the social conflict, excited wherever employers are ‘intelligent concerning the poor and the indigent,’ is continually growing more bitter in those centres of ferocious egotism. . . . The politicians themselves, turned temporarily from their rivalries, have been impressed by this language of a sage and an apostle, language which is beautiful with the beauty that comes from on high; and they have admired it. Truly, said these gentlemen, the venerable man has

uttered very significant words ; he understands the drift of the times, and he marches with it ; hitherto the Church has been in the tents of the rich, but now she caters to the poor ; Leo is an able tactician. Leo XIII. does not merit this species of eulogy in which irony is mingled with distrust. Had the framers of this eulogy understood the policy of the Church, they would have abstained from it. The Church, depository of many doctrinal treasures, does not exhibit them all at once, and with equal insistence (?) ; she puts forth more especially those which meet the intellectual and moral needs of the present. When Pelagius contested the divine sovereignty, the Pontiffs and the Doctors explained the doctrine of grace. When the free will of man was attacked by Luther, Calvin, Baius, and Jansenius, the Pontiffs and Doctors defended that free will. To-day the object of general preoccupation is the problem of Poverty and Wealth ; and the Pope explains the Catholic doctrine on the relations between the two. Where is the strategy of this explanation ? It is not necessary for the Church to change her domicile, in order that she may be found with the poor. When was she not with them ? At what moment were her maternal ears closed to their cries ? The poor have always been her favorite children. Have the poor ever had such servants as Francis of Assisi and Vincent de Paul ? What land does not testify to the inexhaustible fecundity of the Church's charity ? So much the worse for you, if you have not hitherto perceived this truth."

Naturally an immediate consequence of the Encyclical *Rerum novarum* was an effort, on the part of Catholics in every civilized land, to mobilize their social forces in accordance with the spirit indicated by the Pontiff. In France, always at the head of every movement involving the destinies of Catholicism, the systematic opposition of the Republican government could not prevent the development of such admirable institutions as the many Catholic Workingmen's Circles, the Confraternity of Notre-Dame de l'Usine, the model co-operative establishments of the Harmels at Val-des-Bois, etc. In Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, and the United States of America, there was manifested an instan-

taneous desire to meet the paroxysms of an anti-Christian demagoguery with Catholic organizations which would be no longer purely isolated and individual. In Spain and in most of the Spanish-American countries, the pre-eminently Catholic spirit of nearly all their inhabitants had caused labor-agitations to be unknown, because they were without any reason for being; but the sentiments of the *Rerum novarum* gave in these lands a new impetus to the already dominant Catholic idea that the workingman and his employer were but servants of the same Master, and consequently Catholic charity began to consider the possibility of ameliorating social conditions which were already far superior to those which obtained in the "Anglo-Saxon" and the other regions which are of Teutonic or of partially Teutonic origin. In Celtic and Catholic Belgium, the land so dear to Leo XIII., the several Catholic Congresses of Liège had already drawn the attention of the rest of Christendom to the schemes of the Socialistic foes of the Christian name; and the echoes from the trenchant words of the Pontiff had not died out, ere there arose everywhere in the original home of Clovis those *Maisons des Ouvriers* which were to be powerful centres for the propaganda of a Christian Socialism. Everywhere in Belgium the Catholics founded guilds similar to those associations which had been the very life of the mediæval Flemings, and which were now to contest with Pagan Socialism for the empire over the hearts of Flemish workingmen. Throughout the length and breadth of the kingdom, there were held festivals which were at once religious and civic—festivals at which tens of thousands of Catholic workingmen prayed before the renowned shrines of their motherland, or enjoyed their simple games in the parks of the first nobles of the country. But it is to the Pontiff's own city of Rome that we must turn—to the Rome that the Vatican could reach, not to the Rome of the Quirinal—if we wish to see, in a pre-eminent degree, the teachings of the *Rerum novarum* reduced to practice. Of course, when Leo XIII. mounted the pontifical throne, he found Rome as ever the model for Christian charity, very nearly such as his predecessors had made her; for not even a devastat-

ing regime such as that of the Quirinal could at once obliterate the work of centuries which had its roots in the hearts and traditions of the real Romans. But it devolved on the new Pope, even though he was not in fact a Pope-King, to protect and sustain the many Catholic Schools in the Eternal City, the hope of future Roman generations, and the many orphanages and refuges which had made the Rome of the Popes the most beneficent city in the universe. And the financial crimes of the "liberators of Italy" had entailed new duties on the Pontiff; thousands of workingmen were in abject destitution. For the succor of these victims of "free Rome," Leo XIII., through the Circle of St. Peter, established cheap kitchens throughout the city, furnishing a solid and appetizing meal for four cents. The same Circle of St. Peter established Night Refuges which were managed by the Sisters of Charity, and superintended by the members of the Circle; in these asylums, the poor man or woman found a clean and comfortable bed for two cents. Then there was the "Primary, Artistic, and Operative Association of Reciprocal Charity," which, established by Pius IX., received a splendid development under Leo XIII. This association is a society of mutual help, numbering about five thousand members, divided into several sections, all sections having their delegates in the directing council. Painters, sculptors, jewellers, printers, and workers of every kind, are admitted to membership. In 1888, Pope Leo donated to the Association a piece of ground for its home, which cost five hundred thousand francs. One of the sections, especially concerned with workingmen and the smaller employers of labor, has in its charge the making of allowances to its associates in case of sickness or want of employment. The funds of this section are obtained by subscriptions from its members, and by voluntary contributions from the public. This section also gives gratuitously the medicines necessary for its members who are out of health and are poor. It has created savings banks on a small scale, which have done much to encourage a spirit of economy and of foresight among the poorer class. In fact, the Association forms a centre of economy and of self-help, around which various similar institutions have recently

grouped themselves. Among these, the least important is not the one which grants loans without other security than the "honor" of the borrower; nor another which builds comfortable houses for workmen. As for alms-giving properly so-called, on the part of Leo XIII., it ought to be sufficient to remember that he is a Roman Pontiff; but nevertheless certain journals of the Quirinal party have dared, from time to time, to assert that he is avaricious. In 1890, the *Cittadino* of Genoa and the *Osservatore Romano* gave details which showed that in the previous year His Holiness had distributed 427,125 francs in private charity. Even the *Sera*, a Liberal organ, experienced nausea on reading these aspersions on the character of its chief priestly adversary, and said: "It is false that the charities of Leo XIII. have become unfrequent. Were we to enumerate the families who are continually aided and even supported by the Pope, we would never finish. And all of his alms are distributed to the designated beneficiary, even to the last penny; for the bureaus charged with this duty are so scrupulously careful, that it is impossible for any sums to be alienated from their proper objects."

Concerning the burning question of wages, the mind of the Holy See, although never indicated by an apposite and positive decision as to the details of that question, can be sufficiently apprehended by him who reads the Encyclical *Rerum novarum*; but in 1891, there appeared a document which was, if not inspired by the Pontiff, at least tacitly approved by him, and which served to develop the already-emitted pontifical judgments on the rights of wage-earners. When the Congress of Malines was about to be held in 1891, Cardinal Goossens, the archbishop of the honored city, anticipating a discussion on certain points of the *Rerum novarum*, submitted three questions to the Holy See. It was not deemed necessary, or perhaps advisable, to give an official answer; but Cardinal Goossens was informed that the doubts would be submitted to a reliable theologian for solution. This theologian was the erudite and judicious Cardinal Zigliara; and the reader will note that his views in the premises are to be regarded with more than ordinary

deference, since the Holy See intended them to serve as guidance for the deliberations of a very important Catholic Congress. Cardinal Goossens observed that the pontifical Encyclical contained the following passage: "Let the employer and the employee come to what agreement they will, far above their free consent is the more elevated and older law of natural justice, which proclaims that wages ought to be sufficient to secure subsistence for an honest and sober workingman." Regarding these words, His Eminence asked, firstly, whether the "natural justice" here mentioned was to be understood as "commutative justice," or rather as "natural equity" (1). The reply was: "Commutative justice." In support of his answer, Zigliara called attention to the fact that the labor of the workman, a free and wage-deserving labor, differs greatly from a piece of merchandise that is sold for a determined price; but that nevertheless said labor may be regarded as a merchandise, when it is considered from the point of view which makes merchandise an object of price. Just like a piece of merchandise, therefore, the work of the laborer is an object of *commutative* justice. "Whenever," continues Zigliara, "the workingman has fulfilled the natural duty of obtaining the immediate object of his labor, and it is found that the wage does not procure for him food, lodging, and clothing, then from the very nature of things, it follows that there has been produced an objective inequality between the labor and the wage—in plain words, *commutative* justice has been violated." Cardinal Goossens had asked, secondly, whether sin is committed by the employer who pays wages which suffice for the decent support of a workingman, but which are utterly insufficient for the sustenance of his dependent family. To this deli-

(1) For the benefit of the reader who is not conversant with the terminology of Moral Theology, we note that theologians distinguish three kinds of justice: *legal*, *distributive*, and *commutative*. The *legal* turns on the relations of an individual body-corporate, or the State; it is called *legal*, because it has for its objects things that a man owes to the community, because of positive law. *Distributive* justice turns on the distribution, according to the decrees of legitimate authority, of the honors or burdens to which the citizen may be subject. *Commutative* justice, which is the species which principally engages the attention of moralists, is exercised by one citizen toward another, by one private individual toward another; and its ordinary manifestation occurs in contracts, and in other relations of social commerce. It is also to be noted that a violation of *legal* justice is termed *illegal injustice*; a violation of *distributive* justice is an *exception of persons*; and a violation of *commutative* is styled simply an *injury*.

cate and heart-touching question, Zigliara replied that in that case there would be no sin against strict justice, but that there might be a sin against charity or natural equity; and he thus explained his answer: "His labor is the personal work of the employee, not that of his family; said labor has relation with the workingman's family only subsidiarily and accidentally, inasmuch as the workingman shares his wages with his wife and children; just as the family has not contributed to the labor, so justice does not demand that the family be paid for the labor. But there is a question of charity in this case; although one should not rashly decide as to whether charity is violated in this or that particular instance." The third difficulty propounded by Cardinal Goossens was as to whether an employer sins, when he, without any violence or deceit, gives smaller wages than the work would merit, and smaller than decent living would require for the employee, merely because there are many workingmen who would be glad to labor for starvation wages? The reply of Zigliara is: "Such an employer sins against commutative justice," and the reason is clear: "When one purchases a thing, it is not allowable, properly speaking, to give less for it than it is worth, according to common estimation, circumstances of time and place being considered; much less is it permissible to give wages which are less than the labor merits," excepting, of course, the case in which the employer is himself making no profit.

In the spring of 1893, three hundred representatives of the workingmen of Switzerland held a Congress at Bienne; more than half of the participants were either Protestants or infidels, and very many were avowed Socialists. During one of the first sessions, Dr. Gaspard Decurtins, a national counsellor, a "Democratic Ultramontane," proposed the following resolution: "The Catholic Associations of workingmen are invited to exercise an international propaganda for a realization of the principles which Leo XIII. enunciated in his Encyclical on the Labor Question." The motion was carried almost unanimously, despite the religious differences of the members—a convincing proof, remarked the very unclerical *Journal des Debats*, that the Swiss workingmen had heard of

the Encyclical, that they no longer considered the Roman Church as an instrument of oppression, and that their immediate aspirations agreed with the social doctrines of the Pontiff. Writing to Dr. Decurtins on Aug. 6, Leo XIII. expresses his gratification on having received such a testimony to the effect produced in Switzerland by his words; and amid his counsels he seems to foreshadow the future institution of an international legislation for the workingman. "It is strange and very important," says the *Journal des Débats*, "to read in this short letter an expression of this pontifical hope. In 1887 M. Decurtins asked the Swiss Federal Council to propose certain questions on labor to the various States of Europe, with the hope of arriving at an understanding concerning them; and Mgr. Jacobini congratulated him. In 1890, the appeal of M. Decurtins was heard by the German emperor, and Leo XIII. wrote to that sovereign: 'The labor question must be settled according to all the rules of justice; the combined action of the powers would contribute to the desired end.' In May, 1891, the lengthy Encyclical on this question appeared; but it was silent in regard to an international legislation on the matter. This silence was remarked; in certain circles it was thought that Leo XIII., deceived by the Congress of Berlin, had renounced the idea which he had cherished. But this recent remark to M. Decurtins shows the falsity of that conclusion: 'It is evident that the workingmen will never find efficacious protection in the laws which vary in the different States. The very moment that in one land goods from various others are offered for sale, a diversity of labor-conditions assures the success of one people, and the failure of another.' Similar phrases, which one might suppose to have been extracted from some treatise on economy, abound in the documents which Leo XIII. has consecrated to the social question." And indeed our Pontiff not only declared with precision the reasons for his desire that an international understanding concerning labor should be reached, but he applauded every step toward that end: "We have learned with great satisfaction that the Congress of Bienna has taken measures for the meeting of a still more important Congress of Working-

men, the object of which will be to draw the attention of the civil authorities to the necessity of equal laws which will protect the weak, women, and children from excessive toil." The *Journal des Débats* rightly observed that Leo XIII. is not at all frightened when a great manifestation of workingmen occurs; he is much less suspicious of these indications of vigor, than is the most liberal of modern governments. "Defender of true order and of social harmony," says the perspicacious journal, "the Pontiff wishes the workingmen to organize; for once organized, they will oppose to the civil power, not a violent revolt which triumphs by force, and whose reason is force, but a plain expression of the claims which can be discussed in the name of justice, once that they are formulated" (1).

(1) In the *North American Review* for April, 1899, there appeared an article by Prince Iturbide, which must interest the student as showing not only the institution of Mexican *peonage* in a very unexpected light (if the student is an average "Anglo-Saxon" American), but also the curious fact that, of all the countries of the New World, our neighbor alone has settled the question between labor and capital to the satisfaction of both. Probably the reader knows that Mexican *peonage* is a kind of bondage for debt; but it is not generally known that this bondage is sometimes contracted directly, sometimes by voluntary inheritance. "In the former case," says Prince Iturbide, "a peon seeking employment presents himself to the administrator (by which title the manager of a hacienda is known) and asks for an *enganche*—that is, a retainer, the amount of which varies between ten and thirty dollars. If the applicant be acceptable, the peon becomes part of the establishment. His contract obliges him to work for the hacienda until his debt is canceled. On the other hand, his prerogatives are such as no other laborer in the world enjoys. In the first place, it is understood that while the peon remains in the employ of the hacienda, his debt will not be canceled, but, on the contrary, that it will be increased, until, if ever, his children are pleased to assume it, or death or old age wipes it out. The debt may not be sold without his consent, except to a new owner of the hacienda. The peon is free, however, to change creditors at will. Only a part of his earned wages may be applied each week to his debt." Each week he receives rations, sufficient for his maintenance and for his family. Each year he and his family receive an ample supply of clothing. Medical services are furnished them free of expense, and the sums of money that they may require for baptisms, confirmations, marriages, or burials are advanced to them regardless of the balance that the peon's account may show against him. Haciendas have schools to which the peon may—and often must—send his children. He is furnished space and material for the construction of his hut, and is entitled to the use of ground, which he cultivates for his own benefit, with hacienda's stock, implements, and seed. Finally there are two days in the year on each of which the peon receives extra wages amounting to several dollars. And when, through age or accident, the peon is no longer able to work, he becomes a charge of the hacienda. Prince Iturbide mentions one establishment which in 1887 had 1,600 inhabitants whose indebtedness to the owner amounted to more than \$26,000, of which one peon alone owed \$1,500. Several of the peons, however, were free of debt, and a few of them were even the hacienda's creditors. The earnings and expenses of the women, who are very industrious, are entered on the accounts of the men of their families. Sometimes, at the end of a day, a peon is credited with several days' extra work that has been done by the women of his family. Prince Iturbide is enthusiastic in his praise of the system, contrasting it with the labor systems of other lands to the disparagement of the latter. Of the condition of the laborers, he says: "There is a numerous class of human beings who are born not only in poverty, but in debt, and heirs by natural law to all the

CHAPTER XVII.

THE "INTERNATIONAL" AND ANARCHISM.

The most successful propagator of Socialism in our day has been the society termed the International, the principal founders of which were Karl Marx, the son of a Jew who had been "converted" to Protestantism, and Frederick Engels. It is not true, as many Catholic and other conservative publicists would fain imagine, that the International is now dead—that its demise was a consequence of the Socialistic Congress held at The Hague in 1872. In another Congress of the Brethren convened in Zurich on Aug. 6, 1893, Liebknecht, one of their chief luminaries, thus avowed the still persistent vitality of the dread organization: "A general ought to change tactics according to the movements of the enemy. We should do likewise. Were we residents of Russia, we would act as the Nihilists act; but we have become convinced that we must employ against the modern State every one of the means which the State can furnish us." In confirmation of this evidence of vitality, Engels then said: "I am the first Socialist of Europe. When we taught the doctrines of 'Collectivism' in 1843, they were

miserable of the proletariat—to which they would be a prey if the peon system were not there to solve their problem of life. As it is, from his cradle to his grave the peon will never lack food, raiment, or shelter. His wife and his children will never know the pinch of hunger. If he has the capacity to rise above his class, the hacienda will afford him the opportunity to do so. If he goes through life an insolvent debtor, still at the hacienda he will have an open credit, and not only his needs, but in a measure, his limited appetite for the superfluous will be satisfied. In a word, he will be above the proletariat, and that through no charity of his employer; for all that is done in his interest is his due. "The peon system affords the farmer proportionate advantages. It is less expensive than others—so much so that in many instances peon labor competes successfully with machinery. The prerogatives and perquisites that it secures to the field hands could not be replaced by increased wages of reasonable amounts; hence the owner secures greater satisfaction among his laborers by this system than he would by others that demand larger pecuniary disbursements. Then the laborer becomes identified with the hacienda. It is his home, and he takes a natural interest in its welfare. "This solution of the labor question is due to the clergy of the early Mexican Church, who perhaps did not conceive the peon system as such, but whose humanitarian efforts in behalf of the Aztec race constitute one of the forces of which the system in question is a resultant. It perhaps presents imperfections, but improvements may be sought in keeping with its principles: for it is an excellent formula that has stood long and varied tests, with the result that Mexican haciendas collect an indigent population into communities that know no want, while they furnish the most remunerative safe investment to be found in this hemisphere."

pronounced a dangerous Utopia; but now, after a period of fifty years, those doctrines are professed by a party which is found everywhere on earth, and which holds the future in its hands. Who then will dare to say that the International is dead? You yourselves have proved that it is more alive now than it ever was" (1). Although the International was founded and is managed by men in close relations with the powers of Masonry, and although it continually breathes a spirit of impiety that is truly Masonic; nevertheless, the average Internationalist heartily curses the Revolution of 1789, the masterpiece of the Brethren of the Three Points, as having been of benefit only to the hated middle classes, and he includes the Masonic Lodges in his imprecations, since they are really so many intrenchments for the security of his capitalistic enemy (2). We must remember, however, that this antagonism does not imply any divergence of views and aims between the leaders of the two sects. "The International and the various Socialistic organizations," says Jannet, "have hitherto been in the hands of men who were more or less dependent on the supreme directors of the secret societies, who have always succeeded in turning the revolutionary ardor of the proletariat against the Church. The Jacobin element, just as it was during the Paris Commune, is now more powerful than the purely Socialistic element. But this policy of equilibrium and intrigue cannot always dominate the passions which it unchains; and the opposition between Freemasonry and the International, between Jacobinism and Socialism—if we may represent the diversity of the sects by these names—must always be real, since it derives from the very nature of things, from the different social positions of the members. United, so long as the Christian social edifice is the object of attack, the different secret societies try to throttle one another, as soon as they deem their work finished; and by this procedure they often undo their work, thus anticipating the hour of divine justice" (3). Originally the Internationalists

(1) BECHAUX: *Demands of the Workingmen in France*, p. 12. Paris, 1894.

(2) The *Monde Maçonique* of Jan., 1880, says that in 1870, the Radical Committee of Lyons insisted on a declaration, on the part of its candidates, that they were not Masons. In 1870, in fact, the International of Lyons "excommunicated" all the Masonic Lodges.

(3) *Introduction to the Secret Societies* of Deschamps, § 7.

styled themselves Communists; but even while they bore that name, their association had already become international. At the head of their manifesto, issued in 1851, was inscribed the call, "Proletaires of every land, unite!" The World's Fair held in London in 1862 gave a powerful impetus to the International; and on Sept. 28, 1864, the name was officially adopted and promulgated in a public meeting in St. Martin's Hall, at which there were present delegates from every European country (1). It would have been strange indeed if Mazzini, the champion conspirator of modern times, had allowed an international league to be formed without his intervention; hence it was that Wolff, his secretary, presented to the meeting of 1862 a number of statutes which his master had prepared in accordance with the centralizing policy which had served him so well in the management of his Young Italy and Young Europe. But Marx was unwilling to be eclipsed even by the superior talent of the Italian; his influence caused the adoption of a set of statutes which flattered the susceptibilities of the particular circles, while at the same time they strengthened his directing hand (2). The supreme authority of the International, according to the statutes as ratified in the Congress held at Geneva in 1866, was placed in Congresses, one of which was to be assembled each year. The time and place for the meeting, and the subjects to be treated, were to be prescribed either by the Congress or by the General Council, a body corresponding to the Masonic Grand Orient. The seat of this Council was originally in London; but in 1873 it was transferred to New York. Each section was to be free to appoint its correspondents with the General Council. The General Council was to have the right of granting or refusing affiliation to any new society or group, saving a right of appeal to the next Congress. The General Council was to have the right to suspend, until the meeting of the next Congress, any section of the order; and any group could exclude one of its sections from its communion, but without depriving it of its internationality. One would imagine that from the very birth of the In-

(1) FRIBOURG; *The International Association of Workmen*, p. 6. Paris, 1871.

(2) See the opposite article of Laveleye in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, March 15, 1880 and also the *Contemporary Socialism* by Winterer.

ternational, its sole ostensible reason for existence having been the good of the workingmen, none but workingmen would have been admitted to its membership; and indeed it was this proletarian characteristic that caused the essentially democratic Internationalists of the European rank and file to detest the Freemasons, among whom the European laboring man seldom or never enters. But if this had been the rule, Marx himself, a man of independent fortune, would have been excluded from the house that he had built; and the same would have been the lot of a horde of Jacobin *bourgeois*—professors, physicians, clerks, military officers, etc.—who had joined the association of manual laborers, in order to use them for their own or for the purposes of some other organization. Therefore it was that the German group of the order, entirely devoted to Marx, refused to listen to the demand of the French delegates in the Congress of Geneva, that the International should be closed to all who did not live by their own manual labor. All of those whom the German decision benefited, soft-handed Socialists of dubious sincerity, were Freemasons; and hence it was that despite the repugnance of the least impious among the impious host, the Brethren of the Three Points became the rulers of the International. Among the notable votaries of the Dark Lantern who joined this “association of workingmen” during the first years of its public life, we may mention the famous and popular historian, Henri Martin; Chaudey, the collaborator with Proudhon, who fell a victim of Rigault, during the Commune; Corbon, who had been vice-president of the Constituent in 1848; and strange to say, Jules Simon, who was certainly far from suspecting that his new comrades would soon try to burn Paris, and that he, the bitter enemy of standing armies, would help Thiers to crush those comrades to earth. Like many others of his party, this naturally well-meaning man was the victim of the first principles of a philosophy which starts from man’s absolute independence of all divine positive law; and when he finally realized the necessity for that law, he abandoned the International and Freemasonry for Christianity.

The religious and social doctrines of the International are

public property, since each one of its Congresses published expositions of those teachings. At the Peace Congress held in Geneva in 1866, the French member of the General Council, Eugene Dupont, thus perorated: "The workingman is certainly the warmest advocate of perpetual peace; but do you think that you will attain it by means such as were proposed to you yesterday—the creation of a new religion (that of the God-Reason, suggested by Garibaldi)? Well, far from creating a new religion, you ought to destroy all those that now exist. Every religion is a despotism that has its standing armies—the priests; and those armies have inflicted far worse wounds on the people than are ever received on the field of battle. Those armies have travestied right; they have atrophied reason. Do not change a barrack into a church; pull them both down." Among the toasts which were given at the banquet which followed this Congress, that of the Russian delegate, the enigmatical Bakunine, prognosticated a glorious future for humanity, when "true democracy would be attained, by means of Federalism, Socialism, and *Anti-Theologism*" (1). At the Congress of Lausanne, held in 1867, a certain Albert Richard advocated a study of the careers of "useful men, instead of *the immoral study of the Bible*"; and one Murat endorsed the plea with the assertion that "*The Bible is a code of immorality.*" At this same Congress, notice was given by Aristide Rey, one of the students who had infamously distinguished themselves at the Congress of Liège in 1865, that recently there had been formed an organization entitled an "Act as You Please Society," the members of which were sworn to insert the following clause in their last wills: "It is my final desire that I be not buried with the rites of any religion whatsoever, and I appoint N. . . to represent me at my funeral, charging him to see that my body be not profaned by such ceremonies." This Congress of Liège deserves more than a passing notice. It was a reunion of more than a thousand students of the irreligious stamp, who had come from England, France, Spain, Germany, Russia, and Holland, in order to encourage the youth of Belgium to oppose religious education. The

(1) *Annals of the Congress of Geneva*. Geneva, 1868.

sessions were appropriately held in the Casino Grétry, a dance-hall and *café chantant*. In the work of Deschamps the reader will find copious extracts from the orations with which the young men were enlightened; and if he peruses them attentively, he will find that it was quite natural that many of the auditors should have afterward become eminent in the councils of the International, of Freemasonry, of the Commune, and of the Gambettist administration in France. We submit a few of the precious morsels. Arnould, the editor of the *Précurseur*, the most important among the Liberal journals of Belgium, said that in the present condition of society, "there were not two institutions, whose reason for existence was based on justice." As for the moral order, said Arnould, "we have, in spite of ourselves, a Catholic morality, and that is all"; how, therefore, could there be "any serious and complete education in a society which is governed by ideas that have come from—goodness knows where?" A certain Fontaine, a lawyer and an editor of Brussels, took care to remind his hearers that "although he had been baptised a Belgian by the Civil Code and the Catholic clergy, nevertheless, he had no country; for him, his country was every land where there was liberty." Then he proceeded to demonstrate the object of the education which his party proposed to make obligatory in Belgium, "in the name of freedom of education." The Socialists insisted, said Fontaine, on "an annihilation of every prejudice derived from religion or Church, an annihilation which will produce a denial of a God, and entire freedom for investigation." In fine, concluded Fontaine, "we expect to procure, by means of the enfranchisement of the workingman and of every citizen, the abolition of every authoritative system." Shortly after the explosion of the cerebellum of Fontaine, a certain Georges Janson called on the youth of Europe and America "to seek for models in their political lives, among the Dantons, the Saint-Justs, the Camille Desmoulins, and the Marats." It should be noted that the Masonic organ, the *Chaîne d'Union* (1878, p. 147), said that Janson here expressed the "present view" of Freemasonry. After the ebullition of Janson, a French educationalist named Regnard

told the assembled students that "if success had attended the efforts of the man who is termed Julian the Apostate, the fifth century would have seen all the good which has been accomplished in the nineteenth." A sage named Lafargue told the boys to remember that "human affairs are regulated by no divine intelligence"; but that they ought not to forget that "Catholicism is the great weapon of the spiritualists; that during the last four centuries men have tried to destroy it, and that it is, unfortunately for us, as strong now as ever it was." A few days after the adjournment of the Congress of Liège, this same energumen, Lafargue, bidding farewell to the lads in Brussels, concluded his address with: "*War on God! Hatred for God!* In those sentiments all progress consists! *You must demolish heaven as though it were a ceiling of paper!*" One of the French boys, Germain Casse, who afterward made some noise as a deputy, called on his comrades to vote, as soon as they were able, for "the absolute withdrawal of the right of teaching from every individual who represents, in the slightest degree, the religious idea"; and he added: "When you leave this hall, you belong either to Paris or to Rome; you will be either Jesuits or Revolutionists." In the following year, another crowd of students, assembled in Brussels under the auspices of the editors of the *Liberté*, applauded the following utterances of a Citizen Sibrac: "I see before me a number of women, and I thank them for their presence. They will not be wanting in our revolutionary movement. *Eve was the first to emit the cry of revolt against God!*"

In July, 1869, the General Council of the International, sitting in London, admitted as a section the International Alliance of the Social Democracy, the programme of which had been prepared by Bakunine and Becker, and was couched in these terms: "The Alliance avows itself atheistic. It demands the abolition of all worship of God; the substitution of science for faith; and a recognition of human, in the place of divine justice" (1). In the memorial addressed to the Congress of Geneva by the French delegates, on the occasion of the ratification of the statutes of the Internation-

(1) FRIBOURG; *loc. cit.*, p. 129.

al, a memorial which the English and German delegates condemned as not sufficiently advanced, we read the following theory, which is in last analysis a perfect summary of the teaching of Cousin and of Masonry: "Labor is an act by which man manifests his worth, his strength, and his morality. By labor man dominates nature, acquires new knowledge, and *arrives at a deification of himself*, if we may use such an expression (superstitious, in the sense of the memorialists); for *the Divinity is not, and cannot be, anything else than an ideal of the perfection toward which humanity invincibly tends.*" If the English and German Internationalists found this manifesto too tame, they should have been satisfied with the concluding concession of the French brethren: "Religion is one of those manifestations of human conscience which *may be respectable*, like so many others, *so long as it remains an individual and thoroughly private matter.* We believe that all religious ideas, and all *a priori* ideas, can form the subjects of no useful discussion. Let each person think as he deems proper on such matters, *providing that he does not introduce his God into the affairs of society.*" No wonder that in the grand Masonic reunion which was held in Paris on April 26, 1871, in order to prepare for the Communistic explosion of the 29th, one of the chief Communists, Lefrançais, exclaimed: "When I was received into Lodge No. 133, my heart was with Masonry; for I was assured that the object of Masonry was identical with that of the Commune" (1). In regard to the tenets of the International on the subject of the ownership of land, it is necessary merely to state that the Congress of Bâle, held in 1869, proclaimed, firstly, that society "has the right to abolish individual ownership of land, and to give the land to the community"; and secondly, that "there is a necessity for a collective proprietorship of the soil." Carteret, a prominent member of Bakunine's International Alliance of the Social Democracy, was wont to defend this curious proposition: "When an owner wishes to rent a piece of immovable property, he shows that he does not need it; therefore it should be confiscated." There is no reason for our descanting on the differ-

(1) DESCHAMPS; *loc. cit.*, BK. II., ch. 14, 6.

ences which have divided the men of the International into Collectivists and Communists. This division was merely a result of personal rivalry ; and both parties aim at a destruction of the existing order of society, at an abolition of individual property, and at some kind of an omnipotence of the State. Again, when there was question of establishing the Paris Commune of 1871, all the Internationalists—Marxists, Anarchists, Jacobins, and Mazzinians—forgot their rivalries ; and now, after some years of another division, all seem to be reunited in a compact organization.

No account of the International would be complete, did it not contain some particulars concerning Michael Bakunine, the famous Pan-Slavist who, together with Herzen, another Russian, had a principal part in the foundation of the chief Socialistic organization. Thanks to the investigations of Rudolph Meyer, a famous German writer whom Bismarck honored with a particular hatred, and to the judicious reflections of the Abbé Winterer, whose *Contemporary Socialism* has shed so much light on a subject which courts darkness, we are able to perceive that both Bakunine and Herzen were merely Russian agents of Pan-Slavism at the time when they posed as agitators for the Socialism of the International. It is certain that Karl Marx and his immediate followers came in time to regard Bakunine as a Russian agent ; and there can be no doubt that Herzen was an apostle of Pan-Slavism from the very beginning of his connection with Western Europe. Undoubtedly, Herzen was a Socialist ; but, remarks Winterer, Pan-Slavism is also Socialistic. "The dream of Pan-Slavism is to dominate Europe, and then the world ; it expects to reign over the ruins of the present social order, having planted thereon the Russian social organization. It is not sufficiently well understood that the basis of this organization is Agrarian Communism. This constitution of the commune is the foundation of all the social dreams of Pan-Slavism ; its apostles despise the proletariat of Western Europe, and they proudly assert that the Russian communes have prevented their country from being afflicted by such a proletariat. Alas ! they forget that Russia suffers from wounds which are no less cruel."

Meyer and Winterer agree in terming Bakunine an agent of the Pan-Slavic party, although they seem to hesitate as to the direct complicity of the Russian government in his anarchistic enterprises. Before his arrival in Germany, Bakunine had been an officer of artillery in the Russian army. The year 1848 found him in Bohemia, where he published a Pan-Slavist manifesto in the name of the Slavic Congress which was then held in Prague; whereupon the *New Rhenish Gazette* denounced him as a Russian emissary, and when his friends demanded proofs of his guilt, the editor told them "to apply to George Sand, who had furnished said proofs to the journal." Soon after this *contretemps*, Bakunine was arrested at Chemnitz, and he was condemned to death by the governments of Austria and Saxony; but the Czar Nicholas I. demanded his person, and having obtained the extradition, sent him to Siberia, not as a convict, but as a simple exile under the tutelage of his cousin, Count Murawieff, who was then governor-general of Russian Asia. After a few years of merely nominal restraint, Bakunine was sent "on a mission to the Pacific coast"; of course he embarked for Japan, then proceeded to America, and in 1861 he appeared in London as "one who had dedicated his life to the freedom of the Russians, the Poles, and all the Slavs." So he declared in a manifesto in which he asserted that Nicholas I., just before his death, had conceived the idea of declaring war on Austria, and of inciting the Austrian and Turkish Slavs to rebellion. Here then we find in 1862 a war of races preached by the man who, in 1868, was to speak in the name of the International. At this time the revolutionists of Western Europe, not contented with the emancipation of the Russian serfs, tried to induce Herzen and Bakunine to pronounce against the government of St. Petersburg; but neither would yield to the pressure. On the contrary, Bakunine published a pamphlet in which he called on Alexander II. to head a Pan-Slavic revolution. To this programme Bakunine remained faithful to the end of his life; the fiery talker of the Peace League and of the International never ceased to be a Pan-Slavist, although his sentiments were sometimes veiled. He never would admit, with the Western

Socialists, that Russia was reactionary ; when those gentry would have entered into active politics, he counselled "complete abstention," although he was then calling on all the Slavs of Europe to enter the political arena. In fact, Bakunine did not wish the International to become a dominating power in the West ; he wished to use it as a means of weakening the West through the forces of revolution and anarchy, so that Pan-Slavism would find its triumphant march an easy one. Meyer finds a convincing argument for the Pan-Slavic apostolate of Bakunine in the fact that the last years of the agitator's life were passed in luxury in one of the most delicious villas in Switzerland. No pension from the International, no contributions from the workingmen of Europe and America, could have enabled him to lead this happy existence. He had no private fortune ; his money must have come from the Pan-Slavist treasury—a rich one, or from the government of the czar. Nor can it be urged that Bakunine's Pan-Slavic mission was incompatible with the Socialism that he propagated in Spain, Switzerland, and other lands ; for, as we have already said, this Socialism was in reality the Agrarian Communism on which the rural communes of Russia are based. Certainly the czar and his government were frequently objects of bitter invective on the part of Bakunine ; but such eloquence could easily have been a trick of his trade. And how are we to account for the czar's interference in order to save Bakunine from a merited Austrian scaffold ? Why did the culprit receive merely a nominal punishment from the imperial intercessor, and why was he afforded an easy method of escaping from even that penalty ? But more recent events show the cabinet of St. Petersburg in a light that would indicate that much of the guilt of Bakunine is to be laid at its door. "Did not Tcherniaieff," asks Winterer, "accomplish a Pan-Slavic mission very similar to that of Bakunine ? Did not the Revolution applaud this Russian commander of the Servian army ? Was not Servia then (and is it not now) harrassed by conspiracies of a nature at once Pan-Slavic and revolutionary ? Did not Garibaldi shout for that cause ? Did not Tcherniaieff withdraw at a convenient moment, with all the blessings, or at

least with the favor of the Czar Alexander? But if it may be doubted whether Bakunine had any positive relations with the government of St. Petersburg, it is impossible to doubt concerning the intimate relations of the agitator with the Pan-Slavic party of Russia, a party which enjoys all the favors of the government. Hideous, indeed, are the designs of this Pan-Slavism; the lethargic barbarism of the Crescent is much to be preferred. To corrupt, to lacerate, to enfeeble Europe by revolution, anarchy, and war; to hurl the innumerable Slavic hordes on a Europe in ruins; to offer to the insurgent proletariat of Western Europe the allurements of Agrarian Communism; such is Pan-Slavism, the monstrosity which, in company with the International, now menaces civilized Europe." Reichenbach, in his valuable *Socialism and the Reformation in Germany* (Paris, 1878), thus speaks of Bakunine: "This agitator played so extraordinary a part, that one is tempted to agree with the veteran Internationalists who insisted that he was a Russian agent. Certainly his exile to Siberia was a veritable joke. It is to be hoped that the phases of his career will be better comprehended, when there will appear a true history of the Communes of Paris, Marseilles, Carthage, etc. Karl Marx would be the man for this task, just as he would be the man to tell us all that he ought to know concerning Privy Councillor Hamburger, that personage of German nationality and of Jewish blood who received from Prince Gortschakoff the same confidence that Bismark felt for Bucher."

The fall of the Commune of Paris was ascribed, in great measure, to Karl Marx by many of his hitherto docile disciples; they insisted that he had been bought by Bismarck—a foolish charge, since it was the interest of the German chancellor to prolong the career of an institution that promised to annihilate the French. However, the dominating influence of Marx remained unshaken; and at its Congress of 1872, held at The Hague, the International voted compliance with his suggestion to transfer the seat of the General Council to New York. The cosmopolitan character of the American metropolis, and the all but absolute freedom accorded to nearly every conceivable species of organization

by the great republic, together with the phenomenal prevalence of Freemasonry among the Americans, seemed to form a guarantee for such a development of the International, that the destinies of the world would soon be in its hands. But the General Council had scarcely been established in its new residence, when the order was afflicted by a schism which for a while menaced its existence. A large number of the brethren, principally Belgians and Spaniards, disgusted with Marx, proclaimed themselves followers of Bakunine, and called for a Congress at Geneva. The meeting was held on Sept. 8, 1873, and besides the Belgian and Spanish sections, those of France, England, Holland, and Switzerland were well represented, while the Lasalle wing of the German brethren telegraphed that it would accept the Genevan decisions. A new international association, a federation of national sections without any central direction, was now formed; annual Congresses were to be the sole connecting link for the sections, and during the intervals between those assemblies the sections of each nationality were to be guided by the Federal Council of each country. The secessionists assumed the name of Anarchists, and their plans, as detailed by the famous Spanish revolutionist, Py y Margall, in his work entitled *Nationalities*, were based on the two fundamental dogmas of absolute atheism and the absolute autonomy of the individual. On the score of atheism, the palm of wickedness could not well be accorded to the Bakunists, rather than to the Marxists; and each faction vied with the other in proclaiming hatred of individual property and of all existing governments. But while Marx proposed to preserve an omnipotent State, under the form of a General Council composed of delegations from every country, the Anarchists desired to abolish every social tie; their reformation of society was to be founded on the autonomy, not only of every commune, but also of every corporative group. These first Anarchists, all partisans of Bakunine, were for some years almost the sole representatives of the International in Spain, Belgium, and the Italian and French Cantons of Switzerland; but before his death in 1877, the Russian agitator had lost all

his influence. The workingmen chafed under his order that they should abstain from political matters in their respective countries; that they should reserve themselves for the imminent revolutionary outbreak. And they bore with ill grace the presence of many members of the hated middle class in their groups. Bakunine had promised that no *bourgeois* should contaminate their delicacy by his presence; and nevertheless, the effective direction of the organization was entrusted to the class which they hated with a hate which they had never felt for the aristocrats. These two causes of complaint combined to lead the Anarchistic proletariat to a belief, encouraged by the Marxists, that Bakunine was employed by certain governments to foster dissension among the workingmen; and they soon manifested a desire for a reunion of the entire Internationalist family. The first step toward this reunion was taken at the Congress of Gotha in 1873, when the two factions of German Socialism united to form the Social Democratic Party, the disciples of Lasalle, hitherto allies of Bismarck, having shaken hands with the Marxists. The final step was taken in 1877, at the Congress of Ghent, when an "agreement of solidarity" was adopted by the representatives of nearly all the Socialistic organizations. This "agreement" was afterward accepted by the German Social Democratic Party, which had ostensibly kept aloof from the International, on account of the prohibitive German laws. From this time the International, as the prime association of the Anarchists, has been a solid organization, united for that preparation for its millenium, during which, as Kropotkin said, "much blood must be shed, but this blood will be only an incident in the struggle." In the Congress of Fribourg, held in 1878, it was declared that Anarchism demands the "collective appropriation of social wealth," and the abolition of the State under all forms (1). The Congress ap-

(1) The admirers of Ibsen are perhaps not all aware that in a letter written to Dr. Brandes on Jan. 17, 1871, the novelist gave vent to the following Anarchistic sentiments: "Yes, to be sure, it may be a good thing to possess liberty of suffrage, liberty of taxation, etc., but for whom is it a good thing? For the citizen; not for the individual. But there is no rational necessity why the individual should be a citizen. On the contrary, the State is the banishment of individuality. How has Prussia bought her strength as a State? By the absorption of the individual in the political and geographical conception. The

proved theoretical propaganda and insurrection as means for the actuation of its programme; but it condemned the use of universal suffrage as a frequently dangerous weapon. Immediately after this Congress, the attempts on the life of William I. of Germany were made by Nobiling and Hædel, the latter proclaiming himself an Anarchist; Moncasi tried to kill Alfonso XII. of Spain; and Passanante attacked Humbert of Savoy. In 1879, the Anarchists held their Congress of Chaux-de-Fonds, and their Kropotkine insisted on the propaganda of ideas "by means of acts"; and in the following year Ottero Gonzalez made a second attempt on the life of Alfonso XII. In the Congress of London in 1881, appeals to violence were made, and in the ensuing year, the insurrection of Monceau-les-Mines occurred; the walls of Marseilles were covered with incendiary placards; hidden stores of dynamite were discovered throughout France; explosions occurred at the Bellecour Theatre and at the Custom House of Lyons; and Louise Michel preached the gospel of Anarchy without hindrance. In 1884, a number of "comrades," as the Anarchists had begun to style each other, being out of work, held a public meeting at the Salle Lévis, and proclaimed their right to attack private property, that they might obtain all that they needed. In 1886, to say nothing of minor outrages, an Anarchist named Gallo fired into the crowd assembled at the Bourse in Paris; at Charleroi workshops and convents were sacked and burnt; and in Chicago the Anarchist feast of May 1 was signalized by the explosion of a bomb which wounded eighty persons. In 1889, the chief streets of Rome were filled, on one occasion, with men who either sincerely or hypocritically declared that they were starving, and then

waiter makes the best soldier. On the other hand look at the Jews—the nobility of humanity. How have they preserved their identity in isolation, in poetry, in spite of all vulgarity? Thereby that they have had no State to drag along with them. If they had remained in Palestine, they would long since have perished in their own construction like all other nations. Away with the State! I would like to take a hand in that revolution. Undermine the idea of the State; put in its place free-will and spiritual affinity as the one decisive reason for a union; that would be the beginning of a freedom that would be worth something. Changes in the form of government are nothing but fiddling with degrees—a little more or a little less—fooling altogether. . . . The State has its root in the age; it will have its crown, too, in the age. Greater things than it will perish. . . . Neither our moral conceptions nor our artistic forms have an eternity before them. How much are we really in duty bound to hold on to? Who can afford me a guarantee that up yonder on Jupiter two and two do not make five?"

proceeded to demolish windows, and to plunder shops. In 1890 Kropotkine published his *Anarchist Morality* and his *Indicator*, for the purpose of teaching the brethren the method of preparing high explosives. In 1891, explosions of dynamite frequently occurred in Charleville and Nantes; at Clichy the desperate Ravachol tried to destroy the Commissariat of Police, and the houses of many magistrates; an Anarchical propaganda was started in the French army. It was also in 1891 that the literary bureau of the comrades caused to be printed in London a manifesto purporting to be a "Declaration of the Anarchist Soldiers of France," in which we read: "If we remain in this hell, we remain with enraged hearts, and tortured by the wearers of filagree who threaten to shoot us. We must remain; but our hatred for authority is invincible, and we yearn for the day when we may turn our weapons against our tormentors. Remember how our predecessors, on March 18, 1871 (on the explosion of the Commune), nailed those two generals to the walls! We also, when we receive the proper order, will turn our rifles against the lace-bedizzened vultures who now feed on us." In 1892, dynamitic outrages became more frequent. Several occurred in the palaces and houses of Rome. In Paris they were effected at the residence of the Princess de Sagan; at that of the Councillor Benoit; in the Boulevard Saint-Germain; at the Lobau barracks; at the Restaurant Véry; and at the Commissariate of Police in the Rue Bons Enfants. In 1893, Vaillant threw a bomb into the Chamber of Deputies, and many disturbances occurred in the Quartier Latin; many explosions took place in Marseilles; thefts of dynamite abounded in Berlin, Lyons, Saint-Denis, and Roubaix; Austria experienced many troubles; in Madrid a bomb was hurled against Martinez Campos by Pallas, and an explosion was effected at the theatre Liceo. In 1894, Barcellona witnessed an attempt on the life of its prefect; in front of the House of Parliament in Rome a tin of dynamite was exploded; Paris had her explosions at the Cafe Terminus, at the Hotel Saint-Jacques, in the suburb of Saint-Martin, and in front of the shops of the Printemps; at Lyons the president of France, Sadi-Carnot, was slain by Caserio; in

Rome Lega fired two shots at Crispi, then President of the Council; and Vienna and London also experienced, though in a minor degree, the dread fact that the International was not dead, although it might now be more properly designated as the Universal Society of Anarchy. During the last five years, if we except the murder of Canovas y Castillo in 1897, the Anarchists have been apparently satisfied with their newspaper propaganda (1), probably regarding it as promising the greatest measure of success for the grand *coup* against society, with which many of their publicists propose to signalize the opening of the twentieth century. But just as this dissertation is about to go to the press (Aug., 1899), we read that the deluded wretches have sacked and gutted the church of St. Joseph in the Rue Saint Maur in Paris, thrown the Blessed Sacrament to the pavement

(1) Probably the most influential of the Anarchist organs is the *Internationale*; and as a specimen of its style we submit the following passage: "Side by side with theoretical propaganda, which is carried on without truce and which we are delighted to applaud, it becomes indispensable to proclaim aloud all that science has placed at our disposal. Useless to say that we understand the urgent, logical necessity of expropriating in all possible ways the middle class, the common object of our implacable hatred. Thus by the side of theft, murder, and incendiarism, which become naturally our legal means, we shall not hesitate to place chemistry, whose puissant voice may become absolutely necessary to guide the social uprising and to make by violent means fall into our hands the wealth of the enemy, without spilling the blood of our own people. It is necessary to demolish all political, military, and religious authority, it is absolutely needful to burn the churches, palaces, convents, barracks, town-halls, mayoralties, fortresses, prisons, and finally to take possession of everything that up to this day has been able to thrive on human labor without joining in it." The titles of the other principal Anarchist journals are sufficiently eloquent. We have the *Insurgé*; *L'Affamé*; *La Révolution Sociale*; *L'Émeute*; *Le Droit Anarchique*; *Der Socialist*; *Die Zukunft*; *Der Anarchist*; *The Commonwealth*; *Liberty*; *Freedom*; *El Corsario*; *Volne Listy*; *Demoliamo*; *L'Eguaglianza Sociale*. In addition to the newspapers there are manifestoes printed secretly. These are inserted within the folds of an unsuspected paper, and are thus expedited to the members. Next come the novel-writers, orators, and poets of the party. Their ejacubrations generally appear in Anarchist Reviews, such as *L'en Dehors*, *La Revue Libertaire*, *La Société Nouvelle*, etc., wherein they insert the best formulas for the manufacture of dynamite, bombs, and other explosives, where finally they glorify their great Anarchists, Ravachol, Henry, Vaillant, etc., whom they make "martyrs" and "saints." There is besides a large sale of almanacs, and of prints representing scenes fitted to awaken either wrath against the middle class or pity and admiration for some Anarchist. Thus when Ravachol was executed, many of his photographs were seen with these lithographed inscriptions: "Anarchy is the future of humanity, property is robbery."—"If you want to be happy, hang your landlord." There are, finally, Anarchic circulating-libraries, which contain mainly Anarchic writings, or works non-Anarchic, but which are thought fitted to produce confusion in the minds and hearts of the readers. Amongst these works the principal are: *Words of An Insurgent* and *The Conquest of Bread*, by Kropotkin; the works of Tolstoj Dostojewski, Tschernichewsky, Ibsen, Lethominnoff, etc. On every volume are printed, these words: "Read and Circulate." SODERINI: *loc. cit.*, p. 83.

and trampled on it, and made bonfires of the crucifixes and sacred pictures.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE VAGARIES OF FATHER CURCI, S. J.

When the future demi-god of Young Italy, the quasi-panthestic philosopher and semi-rationalistic theologian, Gioberti, gave to the world his grand but subversive *Moral and Civil Primacy of the Italians* (1), very many of the more generous among the Catholic clergy of Europe, less clairvoyant than the foes of the Pope-King, momentarily succumbed to the specious arguments of him who was then the most brilliant although the sole dishonest one of the Neo-Guelphs (2). Even the Jesuits, generally regarded as animated by phenomenal astuteness, were so far deceived as to acclaim Gioberti as their friend; and one of their Society, the Father Curci who was soon to become famous as the most pronounced of all the adversaries of the Sub-Alpine enthusiast, published an edition of the *Primacy* in the pontifical Duchy of Benevento (3). But two years had scarcely passed, when Gioberti, having found it to his interest to repel the charge that he was a "Jesuitizer," published his venomous *Prolegomeni*, a worthy forerunner of his *Modern Jesuit*. It was evident that the Society could not be silent in the face of the accusations which formed the very essence of the *Prolegomeni*—charges which were very different from those which constitute the arsenal of the ordinary Jesuit-ophagus, a creature who ought never to be honored with a reply. No less evident was it that the Society should entrust to no ordinary champion its defence against allegations proffered by the latest and worthiest apologist of

(1) Brussels, 1843. The future prime-minister of Charles Albert of Sardinia was then living in the Belgian capital, his liberal opinions having entailed his exile from Piedmont in 1833.

(2) See our remarks on Gioberti and his works, in Vol. iv., p. 442; Vol. v., p. 241, 388.

(3) It is interesting to note that Curci, having desired to publish this edition in Naples, and having applied for authorization to Santangelo, the royal Minister of the Interior, received the following reply: "You are still a young man; but I, a man of greater experience than yours, find in this *Primacy* the seeds of the Revolution and of all its consequences."

the Revolution. On the side of Gioberti there was "the prestige of science, the halo of patriotism, and the fanatical devotion of (very many of) the Italians; if Gioberti were attacked, but not vanquished, the remedy would be worse than the evil" (1). In this emergency, Father Rothaan, the general of the Society, confided the task to Carlo Curci, one of the most impassioned natures whom passionate Naples has ever produced, but whose ecclesiastical reputation had hitherto been based solely on an extraordinary success in the pulpit. At this time Curci had never manifested any talent as a writer; indeed, not a line from his pen had ever been printed. But the event proved that Father Rothaan had discerned a born polemic in his fiery Neapolitan subject. Two months after he had received the general's command, Curci sent his *Facts and Arguments* to the printers (2); and in a few weeks Gioberti perceived comprehended that no sane and candid mind, after a perusal of their refutation, would attach any value to his cherished *Prolegomeni*. But the consequences of this refutation, the work of a Jesuit, and of one who was a master in a sphere where he thought that he reigned alone, penetrated to the very soul of Gioberti; and from that moment he devoted an implacable ire and an indomitable energy to an annihilation of both Curci and the Society. The first and principal fruit of his wrath was that famous work which, with little exaggeration has been styled infernal—the *Modern Jesuit*. No production of human pen was ever so adapted to the purpose of Masonry in Catholic countries as this diatribe; and to it alone might be ascribed those "popular" effervescences which forced all the governments of the peninsula to again expel the Jesuits from their dominions, even before the days of 1848. When this natural manifestation of modern Liberalism occurred in Naples, Curci was one of the 146 Jesuits of that kingdom who took the road of exile. Malta became his first abiding place, and

(1) KANNENGIESER: *The Adversaries of the Temporal Power and the Triple Alliance*, p. 254. Paris, 1893.

(2) In order to obtain the funds for the publication of his book, Curci asked for the loan of 500 ducats from a friend. The favor was granted; but when handing the money, the Mæcenas remarked that it would be better to give a hundred to some rascal who would engage to administer a good beating to Gioberti. By some means this heedless observation reached the ears of Gioberti; and the reader may imagine the use to which he put it.

there he began a refutation of the *Modern Jesuit* which he completed in Paris after ten months of labor. The original edition of Gioberti's diatribe (Lausanne) consisted of no less than five volumes; to its refutation which he termed a *Divinazione*, because he proposed to conjecture (*divinare*) the real object of Gioberti's enterprise, Curci devoted two volumes, showing that the Piedmontese had really attacked the Catholic Church when he assailed the Society which he foolishly presented as a personification of the Church as she had been illustrated by the Council of Trent. "The thesis of Curci was incontestable," observes Kannengieser; "the duel between Curci and Gioberti was really a duel between Catholic doctrine and Rationalist philosophy, involving all that derives from the one and the other; Curci had *divinato* correctly." Gioberti and Curci never met in this world (1); and three years after the commencement of their controversy, a fatal stroke of apoplexy carried off the former in the midst of his political and literary glory, leaving us to consider whether he would have ultimately acted as the latter was fortunately destined to act, after many years of a similar estrangement from the centre of Catholic authority. When the defeat of the revolutionary forces of 1848-49 enabled the Jesuits to return to Italy, the author of the *Facts and Arguments* besought his superiors for permission to found a "Review" of the first class, the special mission of which would be the defence of the right of the Roman Pontiff to his temporal dominion in the States of the Church. Accordingly, the year 1850 saw the beginning of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, which was the first of all the Jesuit "Reviews," and which, published originally in Naples, was soon transferred to Rome, and has ever easily held the first place among the Catholic periodicals of the world.

(1) On one occasion, and shortly after the appearance of the *Divinazione*, the adversaries barely escaped a meeting which would certainly have been interesting. During the exile of Curci in Paris, he often visited Mgr. Fornari, the papal nuncio to France; and one day, as he entered the courtyard he passed the sumptuous carriage of some member of the diplomatic body who had evidently just left the salon of the prelate. The Jesuit and the diplomat exchanged a fixed but an unrecognizing glance; and when the former entered the nuncio's apartment, His Excellency asked: "Did you notice the beautiful equipage which just left the palace?" Curci replied: "Certainly; that of a colleague, probably?" And Fornari smilingly said: "It was the carriage of the Minister-Plenipotentiary of His Sardinian Majesty—the carriage of the Abbate Gioberti."

Encouraged by the success of their Italian brother, the Jesuits of France soon founded their *Études*, those of England their *Month*, and even those of Germany ventured to establish their *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*. All of these organs of the Society soon demonstrated that the older periodicals of the Catholic world could advance no stronger claims to the gratitude and support of the faithful children of Christ's Vicar on earth; but none of them ever attained to the scientific and literary consequence, with which our fiery but judicially-minded Neapolitan endowed the creature of his own prolific brain, the *Civiltà Cattolica*. During his twenty-four years of journalistic combat against the united forces of the cosmopolitan Revolution and of Masonic impiety, Curci was true to the motto which he had chosen for his periodical, "*Beatus populus, cujus dominus Deus ejus.*" And when, in 1870, the Savoyard usurper feigned to consecrate the crime of the Porta Pia by a pretended vote of the Roman people, it was Curci who initiated the immense petition which was destined to manifest the true sentiments of the veritable Quirites; it was Curci who founded a new journal for the purpose of seconding the Catholic and truly patriotic efforts of the *Civiltà Cattolica*; and it was Curci who was the animating force of the many associations of faithful Christians who endeavored to impede the dedication of the Eternal City to the powers of hell. Such was the picture presented by the great Jesuit polemic until 1874, when he suddenly changed his cry, "Restore Rome to its Pope-King," to an affectation of the pious avowal, "We must bow to the will of God."

Strange to say, for the proclamation of his change of views Curci seized the occasion of the publication of the first two volumes of his *Exegetic and Moral Lessons*, a collection of certain instructions which he had already delivered from the pulpit, and which naturally afforded few, if any, opportunities for an invocation of the blessing of God on "United Italy." It was the preface, however, which served to warn the Catholic world that it erred egregiously, when it regarded the destruction of the Temporal Power as an injury to the Church. Affecting to penetrate the secret

designs of the Most High, the recreant said: "God gave a great proof of His mercy to the Church when He deprived her of this temporal domain, and thus took from her the possibility of making a bad use of it. . . . God permitted this spoliation in order to sanctify His Church, and it is toward this sanctification that the efforts of the despoiled ought to be directed. . . . It is incomprehensible how there can be so much lamentation at the moment when we ought to be thanking God for His mercy; and least of all do I understand the efforts (put forth by the Holy See) to promote a confidence in an ultimate return to that past which has been destroyed by the permission of God. . . . We must abandon all illusion, and bow to the will of God. . . . The present situation being merely a consequence of the past, we should recognize the goodness of God in His accomplishment of these changes in the external conditions of His Church, and because of His having forced us, in spite of ourselves, to become detached from the goods of earth." In the *Modern Dissension* which he published in 1877, Curci tells us that while he was engaged in preparing the last volumes of his *Lessons* for the press, he was not so ill-informed concerning outside events, as not to see reason for affliction on account of the persistent efforts of the Pope to hide the truth from the Catholic world. Therefore it was, adds Curci, that he conceived the idea of developing the thoughts then animating him in a Preface to the third volume. He communicated his design to "an eminent prelate"; but that personage advised him, he says, to lay his developed theories at the feet of the Pontiff before he presented them to the public. In accordance with this advice, the self-appointed counsellor of the Holy See sent to His Holiness, in June, 1875, a *Memorial* which Pius IX. afterward qualified as "a piece of impertinence." We select the following passages from this document: "We must admit at once that Italy will never return to the olden conditions, least of all to the recognition of the temporal power of the Pope, as it existed until Sept. 20, 1870. This truth begins to penetrate even those minds which would prefer to hope to the contrary." As for the opinion that the temporal power is necessary for

the pontifical independence, Curci insisted that "although men have tried to make it dogmatically certain, using every kind of fallacy and irrelevancy, it is the real cause of all the present troubles of the Church." And he asks: "Why should Italy be allowed to perish morally, simply because great wickednesses have contributed to her modern restoration?" Nor does the new apologist of the Revolution hesitate to say that "*United Italy has been made partly by God, and partly by the permission of God.*" Finally the Pontiff is approached on his weak side, that of his Italian patriotism and of his hatred of a German presence on Italian soil. If the Pope does not compromise with his despoilers, renouncing the imprescriptible rights of the Holy See, sanctioning sacrilege and brigandage, closing the sole mouth on earth which can protest authoritatively against injustice, then Italy, "enervated and sapped from within, separated from her natural ally, will be in danger of falling once more a prey to the Germans. For Italy will help Germany to crush France, only to be crushed in her turn by Germany." Let the Pontiff extend the hand of friendship to the Savoyard in the Quirinal, proclaiming a policy which is "reasonable, grand, and useful, and so necessary for the preservation and prosperity of Italy." Let the pontifical ear be closed to the suggestions of "a press which calls itself Catholic, while it imposes its system on imbeciles by manœuvres the most ignoble, and while it tries to reduce the wise to silence." There is but one way of salvation for the Pontiff and for Italy—a hearty and thorough acceptance, on the part of the once Pope-King, of the "glorious" results of the "grand" Italian Revolution. If the Holy See continues in its obstinacy, then, predicts Curci, "the Almighty will use the mistakes of the good and the iniquities of the wicked to inflict on the Church a long course of suffering—suffering which will strengthen her by a recourse to the evangelical principles which now seem to have been forgotten." The world was not astonished when it learned that the author of this mixture of absurdities, sophisms, and lies, all diametrically opposed to the doctrine and policy professed by the Holy See, had been expelled from that Society of Jesus into which he had entered fifty-two years

previously. We are dispensed from any obligation of now refuting the ravings which entailed this catastrophe, since they are merely manifestations of the revolutionary principles which engaged so much of our attention when we treated of the pontificates of Pius VI., Pius VII., Gregory XVI., and Pius IX. ; but the reader may not object to a succinct notice of the other works with which the quondam champion of the triple crown illustrated his otherwise inexplicable change of front.

The Modern Dissension Between the Church and Italy appeared in December, 1877 ; and the author informed his readers that his intention had been "to write a useful, not a scandalous book." He congratulated himself on the presumed fact that all who knew him would not expect a scandalous work from his pen ; they would "not be deceived by those journals, in regard to which he was about to administer severe justice." He was entirely "confident that the present work would be more beneficial to Italy than anything he had ever written" ; for it would be seen that he had demonstrated that "all the obstacles, interposed by the Church between the Italians and a love of the motherland, were rubbish contrived by ignoramuses who posed as doctors in Israel and as paladins of Catholicism." Then he declared that the temporal dominion of the Popes was irrevocably vanished, and that probably the loss was all for the best. But who was responsible for the miseries which afflicted Italy because of that everlasting "Roman question" which no man could bury ? All these miseries, according to Curei, were due, "not to the new government, which in spite of its faults might have been made good as easily as it has been made bad ; the responsibility belonged to the weaklings and cowards who despoiled themselves of their rights in favor of the enemies of morality and religion, and nevertheless have the audacity to term themselves Catholics." These weaklings and cowards are those Italian Catholics who, following the counsels (not the orders) of the Pontiff, take part indeed in municipal affairs, but refuse to recognize the powers of the Quirinal by any participation in parliamentary elections ; and Curei feels nausea when he thinks of "their

mystical and arrogant inertness, as well as of their torpid Catholicism." The sons of these *papalini* are all "puny and almost rickety creatures, while the progeny of those who have left the pale of the Church is blooming and vigorous." As for those who devote their pens to the cause of the Pope-King, "that party without a name, they are a handful of fanatics who unceasingly croak against those who decline to obey their orders"; and they may be styled "little snakes disguised as journalists," whose weapons are "insipid epigrams and every kind of uncouthness," and who are capable of descanting fittingly "only upon triduum and noveuas." The perverted Curci has no good words for Catholic France, whatever he may think of Masonic, infidel France; the quondam decrier of the German, like his leaders at Monte Citorio and in the Quirinal, finds gratitude for services received a bitter thing, and therefore he now flatters the German, and unblushingly sneers at "that famous Eldest Daughter of the Church," a pitiful victim of her own "phantasmagorias." After the publication of the *Modern Dissension*, Curci retired to a suburb of Florence for the pursuit of exegetical study; but in 1881, he proved that he had by no means abandoned the political arena, as many of his well-wishers had fancied. The pamphlet which he now issued was attractively entitled *The New Italy and the Old Zealots*: but it was not received by the Italian revolutionary public with the acclamations which had been given to the *Dissension*. The curiosity of the reading masses had been satisfied; and what was more conducive to a neglect of the unfrocked religious, the foes of the Vatican were disgusted with his persistency in professing the Catholic faith. Nor was this discouraging indifference lessened when the year 1883 witnessed the appearance of *The Royal Vatican, the Surviving Devouring Worm of the Catholic Church* (1), although the title was indicative of a feast for the cleric-baiters, and although the author had dished up for their delectation all the alleged scandals concerning the papal court which Liberalism had either concocted or exaggerated. The *Rassegna* indicated

(1) When an experience of several months had taught the booksellers that the first edition was in danger of never being exhausted, they announced in their catalogues: "Price reduced from six to three *lire*."

to Curci the estimation in which the *Royal Vatican* was held by the Liberal party, when, commenting on the basic and pet idea of the author, it entitled its article "Illusions Regarding a Reconciliation," and placed among those illusions "the Curcian theory of a complete distinction between the royal and the spiritual Vatican." And the journal added: "Let us suppose that Leo XIII. fully resigned himself to accomplished facts, and that he dreamed no more about a restoration of the temporal power. Would that fact necessarily entail a reconciliation between the Church and the State? By no means." In fact, Curci was then made to realize the Liberal demand which we have heard Crispi expressing when he said to King Humbert: "Our work is still incomplete; we must now prevent the Vatican from ruling the consciences of men."

After the comparative failure of the *Royal Vatican*, Curci published only one incendiary pamphlet, the *Scandal of the Royal Vatican*: and then he devoted his remaining days almost entirely to the composition of his *Memoirs*. It was to the two last ebullitions of Curci that Leo XIII. alluded on Christmas Eve, 1883, when he said to the assembled cardinals: "To the troubles caused us by external enemies we may add those which we have suffered from some of our own flock; some of whom have woefully wandered, while others, by means of insidious artifices and ignoble writings, have played the part of forgetful and ungrateful sons, endeavoring to render their Mother, the Church, responsible for the evils which afflict her so cruelly, instead of ascribing the guilt to those whose sole object is to outrage and vilify her." From the day that Curci was expelled from the Society, he had lived as a secular priest, of course unbeneficed, but celebrating the Holy Sacrifice, the small and unfrequent *honoraria* for which function, together with some pitiful remuneration for hack literary work, if we are to credit his assertion, alone enabled him to exist; but it is not improbable that he received considerable assistance from those whose cause he was serving. Be this as it may, until the culmination of his self-inflicted misfortunes, his expulsion from the Society had not compromised his good standing as an ecclesiastic; and the

friendship of the archbishop of Florence was always an assurance that comfort and honor would be at his command, whenever he chose to return to the right path. But his respectable ecclesiastical status was dependent entirely upon the mercy of the Holy See which he had outraged; and although from the beginning of the pontificate of Leo XIII. the leniency of Pius IX. had been more than imitated in his regard, Curci was eventually made to feel in his own person what he had often taught to others, that pontifical mercy must be guided by pontifical duty. In the early days of 1884, he learned that all of his recent works had been condemned publicly by the Holy See, and in a few months he learned that he was not only suspended *a divinis*, but even excommunicated. In a letter which the Pontiff wrote to the archbishop of Florence, His Holiness recapitulated for the benefit of the prelate the entire history of the aberrations of his protegee—aberrations which “frightened the Pontiff, because of their fatal influence on inconsiderate youth.” Having pronounced the sentence in very energetic terms, the Pope concluded: “We reject and condemn all these ill-timed and false ideas, as well as all this author’s abominable assaults on this Apostolic See and on our Holy Congregations. . . . However, our charity impels us to trust that his repentance may atone for all that his rashness has effected; and we shall continue to beg God to enlighten his understanding, and to strengthen his will.” The archbishop immediately communicated the contents of this letter to his clergy in an apposite circular, beseeching all to implore of heaven that “the diocese of Florence, which had been made the theatre of so great a scandal, might become the theatre of a much needed reparation.” Curci received official information of his excommunication in the beginning of September; and on the 15th, he sent to the Abbate Margotti, the intrepid editor of the *Unità Cattolica* whom he had for years so ferociously assailed, a request for the publication of the following retractation: “I have read the letter which, under date of Aug. 27, the Sovereign Pontiff addressed to His Lordship, the archbishop of Florence, and which was transmitted to me on the fifth of this month. By this letter I have been fully informed that the legitimate

authority of the Church has found things worthy of censure in those three works of mine which have already been placed on the *Index*. Therefore I believe that duty calls on me to make the following declaration, and I request that it be made public. Impelled by the respect which I profess, and which I have always professed, for the Catholic Church and for her visible Head, I reject and condemn everything that my last writings present in contradiction of the faith, morals, discipline, and rights of our Holy Church. And this my retraction must be regarded as covering not only all that I myself perceive to be reprehensible in my works (for I cheerfully renounce my own judgment in the matter), but also all that has been condemned by those whom the Holy Ghost instituted for the government of the Church of God. I trust that this sincere expression of my sentiments will contribute to a reparation of the scandal which I have given; and I hope that in consideration of this my submission, our Holy Father will deign to receive me once more as the last of his sons in Jesus Christ!" So unreserved a manifestation of obedience could produce but one effect; and in a few days, His Grace of Florence had the happiness of announcing to his diocesans that the Abbate Curci, "his dearly-beloved brother, having been duly absolved and rehabilitated, again offers among us the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass." However, the edification consequent on this act of proper humility was of brief duration; the retraction had scarcely been welcomed, when the Liberal journals of Europe published a letter in which Curci protested against "a too wide interpretation of his words." He affected to believe that it was "his duty to enlighten the reader as to his meaning"; it was to be remembered that he "reprobated the *Royal Vatican*, not because of its teachings, but because it had been interdicted." Such was the spirit which animated the "converted" Curci as he wrote two or three more pamphlets, which excited no interest even among the Liberals, and as he composed the *Memoirs* which he intended to be a vindication of his inconsistencies.

The *Memoirs* of Curci, although written after his reconciliation with the Holy See, form, in too many respects, a

kind of summary of all the bitter personalities with which he had illustrated the *Dissension* and the *Royal Vatican*—outrageous attacks which an atmosphere of polemics may sometimes explain, but which are absurdly out of place in a work which is composed on the brink of the grave, and when the world has ceased to give a sign that the existence of the writer is still remembered. In these *Memoirs* there is scarcely any indication of the man of talent, of noble thoughts, and of literary power; one perceives only the worst side of Curci's character, as it naturally extorted itself when he emancipated himself from the control of the religious spirit—his too frequently vulgar vanity, his proneness to unworthy impertinences, and his continual torture of self with morbid reflections on his fancied injuries. As he looks back on the career of Pius IX., he seems to regard that Pontiff as merely an imbecile: "It was the great fault of Cavour to have thought that Pius IX. possessed the qualities of a king;" this Pope deserved no monument, and that which now marks the spot where his remains repose "was erected by his creatures, all of whom were created in the philosophical sense of the term—*ex nihilo sui et subiecti*." He loves to manifest his feigned contempt for those whom Pius IX. especially cherished—Antonelli, "with his astute *finesse*"; Simeoni, "who knew nothing about statesmanship"; even Curci's own venerable general, Father Beckx, "a man of weak will, which age rendered still weaker." But Victor Emmanuel! He was "the worthy son of the magnanimous Charles Albert." And Cavour! "In both politics and religion I was with Cavour." Then he sympathized with Minghetti, "that grand statesman." Even Bonghi, who qualified the Papacy as "the cancer of Italy," was hailed by Curci as "my friend." The Marquis Massimo d'Azeglio, who detested the Jesuits, although his brother (Taparelli) was one of their luminaries, was "that excellent Massimo" in the mind of Curci. Even the blasphemous Leopardi finds grace in his eyes. But what shall we say of his treatment of his late brethren of that Society "which he had always loved, and still loved with a most sincere affection"? He tells us that in his day "the Roman College had become, in matter

of studies, a veritable Babel, because of the confusion there reigning." He insists that among the Jesuits there then prevailed "many enormous faults which revealed their moral decadence," and that those faults subsisted "either because the superiors were ignorant of them, or did not comprehend them, or—what was worse—did not have the courage or the strength to correct them." The great astronomer, Secchi, was a fairly good man, according to Curci; but he thought more of the stars than of the saints, and he desired, above all, that his brethren should revere in him "a science which, after all, might well have been ignored." As for Armellini, if we are to credit Curci, he was a vain man, and knew not the first principles of exegesis. Another celebrated professor is said to have taught Scholasticism, "because he was at the ball, and was therefore expected to dance; but his highest ambition was to see a crowd of aristocratic women waiting at his confessional." We are even asked to believe that some of the Jesuit professors were ignorant men (1). Curci is careful, however, to remind us of his own great merits. Speaking of his exegetical work, he says that "since Dom Calmet, nothing like it has appeared"; and he laments because in the government of the Society he has been ever "left in the background." Here we have his great grievance. In the *Dissension* he says: "During my membership of more than half a century in the Society, I have always been a stranger (to its government); but since I did not enter it for the sake of exalted position, . . . I resigned myself to pass my few remaining years as the very refuse of the Society." No one can arise from a perusal of the *Memoirs* of Curci without a firm persuasion that the eloquent Jesuit would never have

(1) We are told by Curci that Father Rozanka, a Pole, was very obtuse, and knew very little of the language (Latin) in which he was expected to lecture. Curci says that during an examination in Moral Theology which he underwent during his scholasticate before this professor, the matter of matrimonial impediments was taken up, and Rozanka proposed this case of conscience: *Fil casus: Titius INORS ducit uxorem. Quid faciendum?* Of course, the young student replied that the parties should not be troubled, but should live in the fear of the Lord. Then, says Curci, the professor cried: "But don't you perceive, sir, that here there is a question of an invalidating impediment?" And when the scholastic replied that he never had heard that poverty was an invalidating impediment for matrimony, the Pole was non-plussed, until one of the laughing co-examiners came to his rescue, saying: "Your Reverence wished to state that Titius was IMPOS; but you used the word INORS." Truly the perspicacity of his readers must have appeared infinitesimal to Curci.

gone astray, had he paid, in 1874, some little attention to the severe but true judgment which he had pronounced, in 1854, in the case of "that grand immoderate spirit," the author of the *Essay on Indifference in Matters of Religion*: "Lamennais, like Tertullian, possessed many virtues; but he was wanting in the most necessary of all, humility. Alas! This priest, once so honored, rebelled against the Church and the Papacy, and ended in apostasy." By the mercy of God, Curci never apostatized; and when he died in 1891, he had been fully reconciled with the Church, and had been re-admitted into the Society of Jesus.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE APOSTASY OF DÖELLINGER.

There is a widespread and erroneous impression to the effect that the unfortunate Döellinger, the founder of the "Old Catholic" heresy, was a faithful son of the Church until the Vatican Council proclaimed the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. And nevertheless, as early as 1860, ten years before the promulgation of the dogma which the "German science" of the Bavarian professor refused to accept, he avowed the already consummated shipwreck of his faith to an intimate friend. During a visit to the Protestant historian, J. B. Böhmer, the conversation having turned on the literary projects of the provost, his friend asked: "Why do you not finish your *History of the Church* (1), before you undertake other work?" And Döellinger replied: "I cannot finish it. The latter part of it would not agree with the former; the conclusion of my *History of the Church* would be thoroughly Protestant" (2). And this was the Döellinger whose correspondence with Ræss, the future bishop of Strassbourg who had founded the *Katholik Review* in 1825, shows that then the future apostate posed

(1) Döellinger had interrupted his *History of the Church* when he began his writings on the period of the Reformation, and he never finished it, contenting himself with publishing certain fragments, of which the *Paganism and Judaism* was the most noteworthy.

(2) Böhmer narrated this fact to the publicist, Jörg. See Kannengieser's *Triple Alliance*, p. 89. Paris, 1893.

as one of the few "Ultramontanes" then in Germany. This was the Döllinger who in a letter to Ræss in 1826 found fault with the *Tubinger Quartalschrift*, a Catholic periodical which suffered from Jesuitaphobia: "These good men fear lest they may say a word in favor of the Jesuits. Is it not grotesque? If perchance something complimentary to the Society drops from their pens, they immediately neutralize it." This was the Döllinger who had bitterly condemned, in another letter to Ræss, what was to be one of the war-cries of his future "Old Catholic" brethren—the marriage of the clergy. Speaking of an attack on ecclesiastical celibacy which the Theiner brothers had published, he said: "Is it not humiliating, when we see even priests rebelling against the Church? These Theiners should be beaten with rods. See that the *Katholik* makes an example of them." This was the Döllinger who in 1832, when Lamennais asked him what course the "great immoderate spirit" should pursue in regard to the papal condemnation, replied: "Submit." But the Döllinger of those happier days was the intimate friend of such grand Christian souls as Gœrres, Ringseis, Mœhler, and Klee; and perhaps it was merely in accordance with his pre-eminent characteristic of never having a will of his own, that his works of that period were animated by a thoroughly Catholic spirit. It was this excessive susceptibility to the impressions of the moment that ultimately ruined Döllinger; as Jœrg remarked, when alluding to the famous discussions between the *Correspondant* and the *Univers*, "After he had received a letter from Rio, he was all Rio; and if a letter from Montalembert arrived on the following day, he was all Montalembert. The last correspondent was always right." This lamentable defect, however, worked no great detriment in the mind of Döllinger until he fell under the influence of John (afterward Lord) Acton, now a Professor in the University of Cambridge, who, although a mere boy of seventeen when he became the nominal pupil of the idol of Munich, soon showed that he was the idol's master and predestined evil genius (1). Breathing continually the quasi-mephytic

(1) Concerning this dominant influence of Acton over the mind and destinies of Döllinger, Kannengieser says: "In 1849 a young Englishman of noble family was entrusted to the care of Döllinger for the completion of his scientific and literary education. Lord

atmosphere which surrounded Acton no less than it surrounded the Jesuit-eating theologian, Huber, and several others *ejusdem furfuris*, Döllinger showed, even before the avowal to Böehmer which we have noted, that his faith had been weakened. Joerg, who has been styled his foremost disciple, said of him even in 1858 : " In order to become a heretic, Döllinger wants only to be assured of his rear-guard."

In the autumn of 1860 there appeared a work by Döllinger which bore the title *Christianity and the Church*, and was written in a thoroughly Catholic spirit ; not only was the temporal power of the Pontiff defended, but certain of its sentiments were intelligible only under the supposition that the author believed in the still undefined doctrine of Papal Infallibility. But in April of the following year, he delivered in the " Odeon " of Munich two discourses which were gleefully acclaimed by the Liberal press on account of their disrespectful tone toward the Holy See. As yet, however, the timidity of Döllinger was greater than his vanity ; and in order to calm the indignation of the Catholics which had been expressed in no uncertain manner, he pretended that the Liberal journals had grossly exaggerated some of his

Acton-Dalberg was seventeen years old when he arrived in Munich. He was a boy of quick intelligence and very precocious ; and his temperament attested his double origin. Through his mother he was German, she, *née* Duchess of Dalberg, having married an English nobleman. After the death of her first husband, the duchess espoused the Whig minister, Earl Granville. The mere mention of this double marriage indicates the surroundings amid which the new disciple of Döllinger had passed his boyhood. Although a Catholic because his mother was one, he lived in a Protestant and Liberal atmosphere which was necessarily an obstacle to his religious development. Full of admiration for Gladstone, Russell, etc., he had conceived an invincible repugnance for Wiseman and the English converts of the day. He was bitter against the restoration of the English hierarchy, and like all his intimates, he entertained feelings of horror for the Jesuits. It is evident therefore, that the young Acton was more of a Protestant than of a Catholic. His mother perceived this fact ; and in hopes of withdrawing her son from pernicious influences, she confided him to the care of the most illustrious scholar in Germany. She trusted that Döllinger, by means of his knowledge and his faith, would subjugate his English Telemachus. But wonder of wonders ! The contrary happened. The erudite scholar, who knew only his books, was conquered by the young politician who had a great experience of life. Lord Acton was certainly the evil genius of Döllinger ; he obtained an incredible ascendancy over his master, and drew him insensibly into schism. And this was effected because the young Englishman was endowed with what Döllinger did not possess—character. In this species of *connubium*, of intellectual marriage, if I may so speak, which was contracted between the master and the beardless pupil, the latter represented the virile element. Döllinger had no firmness in his disposition ; he continually yielded to transient influences. . . . When Acton entered the household of Döllinger, he became literally the master of the professor's soul. Hitherto the French friends of the Bavarian had exercised a happy influence over him ; their very disputes could never have drawn Döll-

observations, and he made haste to issue, after a labor of only three months, his *Church and the Churches, the Papacy and the Temporal Power*. The first part of this work was an excellent championship of the Holy See; but in the second part, which treated of the pontifical difficulties then obtaining in the temporal order, while the author modified many of the views expressed in the "Odeon," he so flattered the Liberal school, that the *Historisch-Politische Blätter* plainly charged him with having capitulated to the enemies of Rome. In 1863, the *Papal Fables of the Middle Age* appeared; and here for the first time Döllinger explicitly attacked the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, relying principally on the alleged heresy of Pope Honorius (1). In September, 1863, at the first of the Congresses of Munich which he had organized for the glorification of "German science" even at the expense of Catholic faith, Döllinger first emitted his pet idea of reconciliation of the "three great Churches, the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican," by means of a suppression of everything that separated them, and by a maintenance of whatever they all accepted—a scheme which implied the possibility of an abandonment, on the part of

linger from the right path, for in spite of their dissensions of later days, they all loved the Church with their entire souls. The fall of Lamennais had only strengthened their convictions. Montalembert had cried: 'The Church is more than a woman; she is a mother.' And the French Catholic correspondents of Döllinger cherished an inexpressible tenderness for that mother, while the Bavarian shared that feeling until the day when Lord Acton succeeded in giving another direction to his thoughts. This disciple put the professor in relation with his compatriots—not, however, with men like Wiseman, Newman, Manning, and others of the young English Catholic school—but with a group of Protestant Liberals, of whom Gladstone was more or less the soul. Döllinger became entirely Lord Acton, in anticipation of the moment when he would become entirely Gladstone. . . . When he lost his old friends, he lost, we may say, his compass; he was like a ship without a helmsman; perfidious friends directed the course of the vessel, resolved on casting her on the rocks. The ship was not wrecked until many years had elapsed. Thanks to the impetus of the direction already initiated, thanks also to one or two of his olden intimates, the moral vagaries of Döllinger were not perceived at once; he drifted a long time, ere he foundered on the shoals of heresy. . . . Perhaps all would have yet been well, if Döllinger had remained faithful to his vocation as a historian; but questions of religious politics were the order of the day. Young Italy was preparing her war for independence, and English diplomacy favored her ambition. Lord Acton took a keen interest in the political struggles which his English friends had instigated; a decided partisan of Italian unity, he condemned the temporal power of the Pope. These problems were often discussed by the master and the pupil; and Döllinger ended by harboring all the antipathies of the English Liberals, and by encouraging the designs of the Sub-Alpine plotters. The past lost its attractions for him; instead of burying himself in historical documents, he now devoured Italian pamphlets and the reports of English diplomacy. The effervescence of the peninsulars consumed him; he became an *Italianissimo*."

(1) For the defence of Pope Honorius, see our Vol. I., p. 432.

the Church, of at least some part of her dogmatic teaching. This step in the path of "religious progress" was rewarded in the following October by the provost's appointment as a member of the Royal Bavarian "Historical Commission," and so great was his glee on receiving this gratification of one of his supreme ambitions, that he wrote to Jøerg: "*Est mirabile in oculis nostris.*" Besides this token of approbation, others had been given to Döellinger by King Maximilian II., whose ideal scheme for religious pacification was practically a mere substitution of a kind of Universal Academy instead of the Church; in 1860, His Majesty had conferred on him a decoration which allowed him to appear at court—a favor which caused him, although he had said in 1859 that the court was "a mad house," to now call on Jøerg to rejoice because "the wind had changed." Ranke was delighted with the ebullition of Döellinger at the Congress of Munich; writing to Sybel on Oct. 7, the historiographer of His Prussian Majesty said: "Döellinger has defended the rights of *science* so well, that we may regard him as being, in a certain sense, one of our friends and allies." These rights of science, and let it be understood, particularly of "German science," were strenuously vindicated by Döellinger in the funeral oration for Maximilian II. which he pronounced before the Academy of Munich on March 30, 1864, insisting that "Germany is the heart of Europe, and Bavaria is the heart of Germany; Munich is the heart of Bavaria, and the Academy or the University is the heart of Munich." In January, 1865, the provost completed a study on the *Question of the Seminary of Spire and the Syllabus*, and in 1866 a pamphlet on the *Council of Trent*, both of which were redolent of a spirit of bitter hatred for the Papacy, but were retained in the writer's desk until his death enabled Reusch, an injudicious friend, to give them to the public among other effusions of minor importance (1). In 1867, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* and the *Neue Freie Presse* published a series of venomous anti-papal articles which a few of the friends of Döellinger refused, contrary to the general opinion, to regard as his productions. Jøerg said

(1) *Minor Writings of Döellinger.* Stuttgart, 1890.

at the time that the provost had placed his signature on them by means of the fulsome eulogies of himself which the articles contained; and their appearance in the posthumous collection published by Reusch is a proof that the unfortunate was really their author. In 1868, he "corrected" his *Christianity and the Church*, suppressing all the passages of the first edition which favored the Holy See; and when the "corrected" version appeared, the reader was left in ignorance concerning the "corrections." In 1869, when the Protestant and Catholic worlds were both indulging in speculations upon the imminent Council of the Vatican, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* published several anonymous articles which time has shown to have been written by Döllinger, and which were more injurious to the Papacy than anything which he had hitherto produced; and when a friend, taking for granted that the paroxysms were his, ventured to reprove him, the hypocrite replied: "Your reproaches are unjust. I am always the same; I follow the march of events attentively and tranquilly. It is true that I do not approve of everything that is being now done in the name of the Church; but can it therefore be said that I sulk? If so, then certainly St. Bernard and Fénelon were sulkers." This comparison of himself with the last of the Fathers and with the gentle dove of Cambrai deprives Döllinger of every claim to be excused on the score of good faith. Well may Kannengieser say: "When revolt is accompanied by frankness, it may have its grandeur; but we find it difficult to pardon the hypocrite who lifts his eyes toward heaven while he assassinates. Döllinger had the misfortune to play this part, and the stain is irremovable. For his honor it is a pity that he did not at least regret these articles. At a time of violent anger, one may pen pages which he may afterward deplore most sincerely; but alas! such a regret did not trouble the heart of the learned historian. When a friend conjured him to close the mouths of his accusers by publishing an avowal of submission to the Holy See, the provost took advantage of the anonymousness of the articles, and said that he had nothing to retract; 'he accuses himself who excuses himself,' he wrote, adding that

his conscience was tranquil. It was a strange conscience that prompted him to unite these articles in the volume which he entitled *The Pope and the Council, by Janus.*"

In the work which Döellinger published under the pen-name of *Janus*, he rejected not only the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, but also that of Œcumenical Councils; according to the infallible *Janus*, public opinion, guided of course by "German science," of which Döellinger at least implicitly claimed to be the incarnation, was to take the place once occupied by the Popes or by the bishops assembled in Council. Since the ninth century, there has been no Church; we must now try to re-discover her; when the bishops considered whether or not they should proclaim the Pope infallible, they were amusing themselves with child's play, for the Papacy itself is illegitimate. Such is a summary of the teachings of *Janus*; but when, a few months after the appearance of the incendiary incubration, the same *Janus* addressed his *Reflections* to the bishops who were on the point of starting for the Vatican Council, he showed that he was indeed two-faced, for he adopted a tone of evangelical sweetness, and he begged the prelates to remember the solemnity of an oath. Nothing, he said, could exceed the respect with which he regarded them; but this assurance was eloquently belied when, shortly afterward, he declared that the French episcopal partisans of the Pope-King were like "a lot of old women armed with the squirt of Molière, trying to save a palace in flames." We have already given some attention to the course pursued by Döellinger in reference to the Council of the Vatican (1); but there are other details which will interest the student. When the note of Prince Hohenlohe, praying the European powers to prevent the meeting of the Council, had failed of success, Döellinger, who had inspired that note, did not therefore regard his cause as desperate. No sooner had the prelates arrived in the Eternal City, than he began to publish in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* a series of letters on the Council which purported to come from Rome, but were written by him after he had studied information furnished to him by his friend

(1) See Vol. v., ch. 17.

Friedrich and by Count Arnim, who were then really in the capital of Christendom. One of these letters, that of Jan. 19, 1870, abandoned the affectation of anonymousness which the others presented, and the author took care to draw the attention of the public to his position as a "doctor of the Church—*Lehrer der Kirche*," averring that his conscience was troubled, because of the imminent ecclesiastical revolution. The numerous endorsements of these letters—forwarded by Protestants, Freemasons, avowed infidels, and men bearing the stamp of every school except the Catholic—caused Schulte, one of the most prominent of the Döllingerites, to hope that the conciliar minority would carry its point; but the master told him that they "could not count on the bishops," and that it would be better to convoke a Council of the anti-infallibilists, in order to show their power. We have seen the importance of this and similar reunions of the future heretics; here we would merely remind the student that the first Döllingerite assembly, convened at Nuremberg on Aug. 25, 1870, was composed of eleven priests and two laymen. The chief consequences of this convention were the pastoral of the German bishops, assembled in Fulda, warning their flocks concerning the machinations of the Neo-Protestants; and a demand of the archbishop of Munich, addressed to the Faculty of Theology in the University, calling on its members to announce their definitive position in reference to the dogma of Papal Infallibility. Seven of these professors submitted to the Vatican decrees; Döllinger refused compliance, continuing to lecture in the University, and strange to say, the seminarians of Munich were sufficiently fatuous to frequent his exhibitions (1). That His Grace of Munich should have so long allowed this scandal is a curiosity of episcopal polity. Undoubtedly the protection of the mad king, Louis II., prevented the

(1) One day toward the end of 1870, one of these seminarians happened to find a portfolio of Döllinger which the professor had mislaid. Impelled by youthful curiosity, he had examined the contents, and he found among them the proof-sheets of the *Ecclesiastical History* which Kurtz, a Protestant, had recently written. Further investigation showed that for some time Döllinger had delivered, *verbatim et literatim*, the course of Kurtz to his own auditors. When the rector of the seminary restored the portfolio to Döllinger, he requested the old gentleman to have some respect for the faith of his students; and justice demands that we record that the hint was taken, at least to some extent.

entertainment of any hope that the heretical professor of Ecclesiastical History would be deprived of his chair in a State institution; just at this time the monarch wrote to his protegee: "I am glad that I have not been deceived in you. I have often declared that you are my Bossuet. Veritable rock of the Church, I am proud of you." But the recalcitrant was certainly excommunicated *ipso facto* because of his obstinately heretical teachings; and proper ecclesiastical zeal now demanded that the toleration he still enjoyed should be abrogated immediately by a public announcement of that excommunication. Only when that course had been pursued, would the seminarians and other Catholic students of the University be compelled to avoid the lecture-room of Döellinger. Not until January 4, 1871, did His Grace of Munich demand a retraction from his rebellious diocesan, and then his letter was answered with a request for a delay of a few weeks, during which the culprit "might conscientiously study the grave question on which his future depended." The insincerity of this prayer was almost immediately demonstrated when, on January 20 and 22, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* published two letters, anonymous indeed, but which all Germany recognized as Döellingerian, and which, like all of the other anonymous productions which were universally ascribed to the professor, the collection given to the world by Reusch acknowledges as such. These letters heaped outrages on the archbishop of Munich, and denounced the Catholic Church as an institution dangerous for any State. Eight days after these ebullitions, however, their author wrote to his ordinary, not anonymously, but as Dr. Döellinger, begging for another respite, during which he might "implore light from the Most High." And again, almost immediately, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of February 10 presented to its readers an anonymous lueubration, which is also accepted by Reusch, and which branded the archbishop as a forger. Nevertheless, on February 15 the prelate signified to the hypocrite that a further delay of a month was accorded to him; and when that term was about to expire, and a respite of eight additional days was requested, for the purpose of enabling the heretic "to examine the many documents

which he was receiving from every quarter," His Grace paternally granted the favor. Meanwhile Lord Acton and other self-proclaimed good theologians, the real leaders of the movement which was fondly supposed by many good Protestants to prognosticate the final demise of that Papacy which had been so frequently killed, were prompting their scapegoat as he prepared the pronunciamiento which was to announce to the world the birth of the Bismarckian National Church of Germany. On March 25, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* published Döllinger's formal declaration that "as Christian, as a theologian, as a historian, and as a citizen, he could not accept the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff." And he exultantly proclaimed: "Thousands of priests, and hundreds of thousands of lay persons, think as I think, and regard the recent conciliar decrees as inadmissible. Down to this present moment no Catholic has ever told me that he was convinced of the truth of those doctrines; and all my friends and acquaintances declare that their experience is like mine." Even this manifesto did not induce the archbishop of Munich to declare the excommunication of Döllinger; he simply announced that thereafter the seminarians of his diocese would not be allowed to attend the lectures in Ecclesiastical History which were given in the University of Munich. But on April 17, His Grace felt that he was compelled to act; and the faithful were informed that by his own avowals the great Dr. Döllinger had segregated himself from the Catholic communion. Naturally "the champion who had endeavored to save the Church" was congratulated by all the Protestant, Masonic, Jewish, and avowedly infidel journals of the world; the University of Oxford enrolled him among its Doctors of Laws (at least a superfluous compliment to the most prominent exponent of "German science"); the ex-Carmelite apostate, Loyson, prophesied that the unfortunate would be revenged by the terrible punishments which were being prepared for "those who had corrupted the Church."

We have already shown, in our dissertation on the "Old Catholics," the miserable delusion under which Döllinger labored when he flattered himself that hundreds of thousands

of Catholics would follow him as he deserted from the Roman camp; now we would draw the attention of the reader to some features of the evolution which the heresiarch experienced, after his emancipation from the "tyranny" of the Catholic Church. One of the most salient of these features, although an apparently necessary accompaniment of every abandonment of the faith, was his treatment of the Society of Jesus. We have seen that in his Catholic days Döllinger was not hostile to the Jesuits; but after the catastrophe of his life, the *Modern Jesuit* of Gioberti would appear to have become his *Vade Mecum*. Writing to Michelis on May 1, 1874, he said: "I have found that I am obliged to revise radically all my historical and patriotic science (after forty-eight years of a professorship of that science); I must again investigate the fundamental results of my early studies. Would that I had done this twenty years ago!" He prosecuted this so much needed revision; and one of its results was a consciousness of a duty to teach the world, in nearly every one of the academical discourses with which he regaled his infidel or latitudinarian audiences in Munich, how little they knew concerning the iniquities of the sons of Loyola. In 1882, he published, with this object, his *Policy of Louis XIV.*; and in 1886 there appeared his foolish essay on the noble Mme. de Maintenon under the title of *The Most Influential Woman in the History of France* (1). Here his revised historical and theological attainments impelled him to define the Jesuit conception of moral science as "the art of changing mortal or venial sins into indifferent acts." This evolution of the famous historian, however, is less inexplicable than his *volte-face* in the matter of the Jews. In the olden times, he had been inexcusably severe toward the children of Israel; even his feelings as a Bavarian, commiserating the sufferings of the thousands of his countrymen who were the prey of Jewish usury, could scarcely justify this passage from a discourse which he once delivered in the Bavarian Chambers: "One should have seen the

(1) For a defence of Mme. de Maintenon against the aspersions with which her character and career have been visited by the majority of Protestant, and by many ignorant Catholic writers, see our Vol. iv., p. 291, *et seqq.*

cold calculation with which the Jew selects his victim, seizes him slowly but surely, and then sucks his blood without pity or mercy, and with the imperturbable calm with which a surgeon dissects a corpse. One should have seen all this on the spot; and then he would recall involuntarily the verses in which the Roman poet depicts Laocoon fighting the serpent whose folds entwine him and are about to strangle him. And besides these diabolical manœuvres, we behold the vampire of the Jewish press spreading its wings. It waves them in the journals of the morning, of mid-day, and of the evening; in its issues on Sundays and on holy-days; in order that those whom it deceives may not have a moment for reflection, and in order that, reduced to semi-paralysis, they may not feel that the proboscis of the Jewish demon is drawing from their frames the last drops of their life-blood." But after Döllinger had separated from the Papacy, he had no hatred to spare from that with which he pursued Rome and the Jesuits. He forgot the manner in which his then dearly-beloved Luther had treated the Israelites when descanting on *The Jews and Their Lies*. He ignored the assertion of his colleague, the Protestant Lagarde, that "The Jewish Alliance is, in the field of Semitism, what the Society of Jesus is in the field of Catholicism"; and he cared not to hear Böckel, another Protestant associate, declaiming that "The Jew-Jesuits are a thousand times worse than the others." It was in accordance, therefore, with the anti-Christian predilections of his later years, and not because of any universal humanitarian proclivities, that in the discourse which Döllinger pronounced in 1881 on *The Jews in Europe*, he declared that "he was there to love, and not to hate"; and that "Israel *remains* the chosen people of God; for God does not forget His promises. The Jews are our brothers, who will be one with us as soon as we learn how, by our faith and our lives, to excite in them a holy emulation." But the most interesting phrase of the Döllingerian evolution was the apostate's virtual acceptance of Rationalism. He showed his unbelief in the historical truth and in the inspiration of essential parts of the *New Testament* when, in 1887, he insisted that the story of Simon the Magician, narrated in the

Acts of the Apostles, is a fable ; and that "belief in demonism is an illusion," being nothing more than "a gift from Paganism to Christianity." He had already implicitly denied the historical value of the Pentateuch in 1883, when, speaking of the *Founders of Religions*, he said : "The first commencements of religious development are a mystery for us, just as the primitive history of humanity is a mystery. . . . The history of *all* religions proves that it is a very dangerous temptation to believe one's self divinely inspired, and to imagine that God has chosen one's self, among many millions, to be the instrument of His designs." In 1887, when treating of the influence of Greek literature and civilization on the Western world, he adopted the assertion of Ranke : "The Christian religion was born from the antagonism subsisting between the religious opinions of other peoples," and then, concluded that Christianity is simply a mixture of Greek philosophy, Judaism, and a few poetical fictions. "It was from this atmosphere," said Döellinger, "that Christianity emanated." It is true that in many of the discourses which the apostate pronounced in the days of his terrible desolation—when he was "isolated," as he wrote to the papal nuncio, Mgr. Ruffo-Scilla, in 1887—the most palpably Rationalistic sentiments were often so clothed in a thin disguise of ostensibly orthodox verbiage, that persons of merely ordinary powers of penetration might have been led to believe in a survival of Christian convictions in the mind of the orator. But from the day of his formal segregation from the Fold of Christ, Rationalistic asseverations fell from the lips of Döellinger so frequently, that one is led to believe in the accuracy of the judgment which impelled Gladstone, some years after the great catastrophe, to term his unfrocked friend a freethinker. This freethinking propensity, however, may have resulted merely from a habit which the unfortunate had consecrated by very many years of indulgence—the habit of yielding to circumstances, to the dictates of policy, and to the tyrannous exigencies of human respect.

In the year 1857, three years before he avowed to Bœhmer the shipwreck of his own faith, Döellinger took occasion, in an article published in the *Historisch-Politische Blätter*,

to account for the religious aberrations of Baader, one of his comrades of the School of Munich. The vagary of this septuagenarian was short-lived, and he died in the communion of the Church; but after his demise certain foolish friends thought to procure for him a posthumous reputation by publishing certain love-letters which the old man had written to a little soubrette of nineteen. Commenting on this intrigue, Döllinger said: "This correspondence shows very clearly that the motives for Baader's animosity against the Church were purely external and accidental, and that they were foreign to his philosophy. . . . We need no more than these letters in order to understand how Baader crossed the line which separates the serene convictions of one who has arrived at the zenith of his intellectual development, from the passionate but almost childish desires of an impotent old man." If Döllinger ever perused these lines during the long years of his segregation from the Fold of Christ, he must have recognized in them his own self-condemnation. Baader had once said that when an old man descends to illegitimate amours, he is "a soul that has fallen from heaven into a scullery." So far as we know, the old age of Döllinger succumbed to no onslaught of carnal passion; but certainly, like those of Baader, "the motives for his animosity against the Church were purely external and accidental," and Satanic pride is at least as ignoble as sensuality. No Catholic will pretend to judge as to the sentiments of Döllinger's innermost heart at any moment of the long years which he spent as an exile from his Father's house; still less will any Catholic abandon the hope that when, on Jan. 9, 1890, a fatal stroke of apoplexy reduced the more than nonagenarian to an unconsciousness which ended only in death, a moment of lucidity and of sincerity might possibly have enabled him to conceive an Act of Contrition, as he remembered the words which he penned in 1861 in his *Church and Churches*: "One thing is certain. Amid the ruins of everything earthly, one institution alone will ever survive, emerging intact from the mass of debris, because it is indestructible, immortal. That institution is the Chair of St. Peter."

CHAPTER XX.

LOUIS VEUILLOT. *

“Place my pen at my side ; put the crucifix, my pride, on my breast ; lay this volume at my feet ; then close my coffin in peace. . . I trust in Jesus. Here on earth, I have not been ashamed of His faith ; and on the last day, when I stand before His Father, He will not be ashamed of me.”

Such were the words of his funeral sermon, preached by Veuillot himself in his beautiful book, *Here and There* ; and one of his biographers would add no more by way of epitaph than the involuntary homage which was rendered to the great journalist by the adversary who said that Veuillot never had other objects in view than the Pope and good grammar. The life of such an editor must necessarily furnish material for the edification of a Catholic layman ; and that of Louis Veuillot will refresh his memory with the remembrance of some of the most stirring events of our century. Veuillot was born at Boynes in the Gatinais, October 11, 1813. “Once upon a time,” he tells us in *Rome and Loreto*, “there lived, not a king and queen, but a journeyman-cooper, who had nothing in the world but his tools ; and who, carrying these on his back, in winter through the mud, and in summer in the heat of the sun, trudged from town to town, making and repairing barrels, tubs, and pails ; pausing awhile wherever he found work, and departing when there was no more ; happy if he took along enough to sustain him during his new journey, but certain of leaving behind him a good name, and of receiving a welcome when he returned. He was called Francis Veuillot ; he was a native of Burgundy ; he could not read, and knew nothing but his trade, which he had learned by prodigious efforts of intelligence and courage, since he was the seventh or eighth child of a farm laborer. One day while passing through a village of the Gatinais, he saw at the honeysuckle-framed window of a humble dwelling a robust young girl,

* This chapter appeared in *THE AVE MARIA*, Vol. XXXIV.

who was singing at her work. He walked more slowly, then he turned toward her, and he tramped no further. The maiden was as good as she was pleasing; she liked to work; honor shone on her brow amid the flowers of health and youth; good sense ruled her conversation; her fortune was equal to his; their hearts were soon paired; they were married." Louis Veillot was the first fruit of this happy union. While yet a child, his parents moved to Paris, and he was brought up almost without religion; going, of course, to Mass on Sunday, but dependent for his early training on one of the government schools. The Catechism was taught in a kind of a way in these establishments, and finally he made his First Communion. "Happy they," he afterward wrote, "who can go through life under the protection of the souvenirs and graces of that beautiful day! Such felicity was not for me. Led to the Holy Table by hands which were ignorant or altogether impious, I approached it without knowing the holiness of the Banquet; I left it with all my stains still upon me, and I returned to it no more." When manhood had come upon Veillot, the realization of all he had lost in his youth by having been trained in the irreligious schools of the State contributed chiefly to the zeal of his advocacy of freedom of education.

When thirteen years of age, Louis entered a lawyer's office, receiving as stipend twenty francs a month, and a crust of bread every day for breakfast. The revolution of 1830, which dethroned the elder branch of the Bourbons, excited the sympathy of the boy. "I was seventeen years old," he tells us, "when I heard the best youth of the *bourgeoisie* congratulating themselves on having demolished the throne and the altar; I was eighteen when I saw ferocious beasts pull down the cross. . . . Already my companions were less sympathetic, but I still applauded. All that fell excited their fears; all that fell excited my joy." Very soon the trembling *bourgeois* began to found journals in order to defend themselves from the baleful consequences of their own work, and young Veillot was offered a position on the *Echo de Rouen*, a moderate paper founded by M. Herbert, afterward a Minister of State. Without any special preparation

he became a journalist ; his first duties were in connection with the theatres, but he soon launched into politics. His brother Eugene, the most reliable of his biographers, warns us not to credit readily all the stories narrated about the early commencements of the journalistic life of Louis. Much has been said concerning his innumerable duels ; but the fact is that he engaged in only two, and in each case he was the challenged party. In 1832 Louis Veullot became editor of the *Mémorial de la Dordogne*, at Périgord. Hitherto he had made no classical studies ; he now repaired this defect. And it was while he was editing the *Mémorial* that he began to experience a change in his religious sentiments, although his full conversion did not take place until his visit to Rome in 1838. In 1837 he was called to Paris to collaborate on the *Charte de 1830*, a journal founded by Guizot ; but the fall of that statesman precipitated the end of his paper, and Veullot passed over to the *Paix*. At this time Louis Veullot, as we gather from his fraternal biographer, had lost all sense of the just and unjust, and he was little better than one of those *condottieri* of the pen who sell their labors in any field with equal pleasure. While in the lamentable condition produced by such a life in the case of one destined by nature and grace for better things, his friend Fulgence Ollivier asked him to accompany him on a voyage ; he needed the diversion, and accepted the offer. “ He thought to go to Constantinople, but he went farther ; he went to Rome ; he went to baptism.” We would refer the reader to the charming pages of *Rome and Loreto* for Veullot’s own account of his arrival in the Eternal City on March 15, 1838 ; of his visits to the monuments of antiquity, and then to the churches ; of his hesitations and struggles ; and finally, of his paternal reception by Pope Gregory XVI., who perhaps perceived in his prodigal son the future champion of the Church.

Now that he was a practical Christian, Veullot could scarcely resume his place in the officious press of the government of July ; but he accepted a position in the Ministry of the Interior, and while thus occupied he produced his *Pilgrimages in Switzerland, Rome and Loreto, The Holy Rosary, An Honest*

Woman, and other works. But agreeable as was the sinecure which he enjoyed, Veuillot was impelled by both his temperament and his new faith to abandon it. Combat was his life, and again he entered the journalistic arena; but now it was Catholic journalism that he undertook to sustain. There was then in Paris but one purely Catholic journal, the *Univers Religieux* established in 1834 by M. Bailly, the founder of the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul. Since 1839 Veuillot had written for this paper; in 1843 he became its editor, renouncing for that end a sure place which furnished him double the revenue he was about to receive. It was his design to abstain from all systematic opposition to the government of Louis Philippe, but despite himself Veuillot soon found himself involved in a struggle concerning the vital question of the freedom of education. Immediately after the revolution of 1830 certain Catholics, disgusted with the sceptical, if not impious, education given by the University, and relying upon the guarantees professedly offered by the Constitution, had opened a school. Summoned before the House of Peers, one of their number, the Count de Montalembert, being a Peer of France, they were condemned. The recollections of his own experience in the government's godless schools gave great force to the zeal with which Veuillot entered into the controversy which now ensued. He wrote an introduction to an account of the trial of the Abbé Combalot, who had written a memorial to the bishops on the dangers of University education (as then given at Paris), and had been condemned to fifteen days' imprisonment and a fine of four thousand francs. For this introduction Veuillot was condemned to a month's imprisonment and a fine of three thousand francs. The governmental and freethinking press was dumbfounded at the audacity of Catholics who dared to defend themselves. The absurdity of these despised ignoramuses presuming to pretend to a possibility of reason against such adversaries! And then, said some of the bigwigs of the University, and others of the political world—men like the Duke de Broglie and the Count Portalis, who called themselves Catholics, and had nevertheless violated the rights of the Church and of Catholic parents,—how lament-

ably deficient was the editor of the *Univers* in evangelical meekness! In fine, the violent course of the recent convert, who, to make matters worse, was a thorough Ultramontane at a time when there were still many Gallicans among the French clergy, was presented as the cause of all the trouble between the Church and the government of July. An evident error; for the question of the freedom of education had originated in 1831, before the *Univers* existed (1).

The revolution of 1848 was favorably received by the *Univers*. Catholics could have few regrets for the Orleans branch of the Bourbons; and certain members of the provisional government, such as Lamartine, Arago, and Marie, were capable of inspiring confidence. On February 24, Montalembert being present, Veillot traced the following manifesto for his journal: "The dynasty of July has succumbed. The struggle was at an end on the third day. The revolution is accomplished, and it is one of the most surprising in history. The tempest has carried everything away; new men appear on the scene; God will effect His designs by means which the world now ignores. To-day, as yesterday, nothing is possible unless through liberty; to-day, as yesterday, religion is the only possible base of society. Religion is the aroma which keeps liberty from corruption. It is in Jesus Christ that men are brothers; it is in Him that they are free. Real liberty can save everything. The new government has great duties toward France and toward the entire world. We trust that it may be able to fulfil them. All governments have the faculty of being able to consolidate themselves; they need only love justice and frankly promote liberty." Two days afterward Veillot reminded the provisional government that the Catholics had done their duty by the government of July, and that the new *régime* might expect the same fidelity. The *Univers*, added the writer, did not believe, "with Gallican theology, in the inamissible right of crowns; but, with Catholic theology, in the right of peoples." But the *Univers* did not long remain a partisan of that republic which it had so warmly welcomed. Alongside of Lamartine were Ledru Rollin and Louis Blanc;

(1) See our dissertation on Montalembert, in Vol. v.

the former distributed his fiery circulars, demanding an assembly "capable of understanding and accomplishing the work of the people"; he wanted deputies who would be "all men of the past, and not of the future"; that is, Robespierres, and not common-sense patriots. But having little confidence in most of his allies, whose principles he regarded as little better than those of the revolutionists, Veillot reserved complete liberty of action for his journal. When the Catholics were divided as to the candidature of General Cavaignac and Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte for the presidency of the republic, the *Univers* called for the intentions of the aspirants in regard to the Roman question. The capital of Christendom was then in the hands of the Revolution, Pius IX. having fled to Gaeta after the assassination of his Minister, Rossi. "It is not the Pope," wrote Veillot, "but the Papacy that we must now defend; it is the keystone of European civilization, the work of God, that must be preserved from a horde of wretches, whose strength is the ruin and opprobrium of the world. He who will manifest sufficient intelligence and heart to pronounce himself the enemy of these scoundrels, in order to break with them entirely, to trample on their bloody standards, to prefer their poisoned daggers to the ignominy of their praise; he who, before these atheists, will proclaim himself a man of God, and will reply to their clamors with the Sign of the Cross,—that man will deserve our suffrages." To this direct appeal Cavaignac, though sufficiently courageous, made no answer; he had to account to his political friends. Louis Napoleon seemed more disposed to satisfy the Catholics. At this juncture Veillot was asked to meet Louis Napoleon; but he declined, alleging that Montalembert was the head of the Catholic party. Then appeared the letter of the prince to the papal nuncio, in which that candidate disavowed the conduct of his cousin, the Prince of Canino, at Rome. He "regretted with his whole soul that the Prince of Canino had not realized that the temporal power of the venerable head of the Church was intimately connected with the *éclat* of Catholicism, and with the liberty and independence of Italy." Although the *Univers* did not plainly avow itself in

favor of the presidency of Louis Napoleon, it was now clear that it might be ranked among his partisans; and consequently numbers of Catholic votes went to secure the majority which effected his election.

In less than two years the Second French Republic had convinced the world that its tendencies were socialistic, even though the legislative majority was monarchical. For this majority was divided into Legitimists, who themselves were split into the pure and fusionist; Orleanists, or the non-descript devotees of the younger and usurping branch of the royal house; and finally, Bonapartists. Veillot was personally inclined to a submission of the Orleans princes to the Count of Chambord, the grandson of Charles X., and, as Henry V., legitimate king of France. But when all hopes of a submission, or even of a fusion, had vanished, thanks to the influence of Thiers on the Duchess d'Orleans, what were the Catholics to expect, now that 1852, which would conclude the term of the prince-president, was at hand? During his journeys in the provinces, Louis Napoleon had arranged that he should be invited to restore the Empire; Veillot saw that the prince was the sole obstacle to the triumph of the socialists. So far in accord with Montalembert, who had not yet abandoned the prince-president, Veillot acquiesced in the *Coup d'État*. He was "neither conquered, nor conqueror, nor malcontent"; France now possessed "a government and an army, a head and an arm"; the new ruler was to be supported, "that they might afterward have the right to counsel him." "Property need not now anticipate pillage; families need not fear dishonor; religion will not mean martyrdom. The head of the Church is no longer on the road to a new exile, a new Calvary. The foundations of society are no longer threatened by sophism, armed with poniards. Public blasphemy has ceased." Undoubtedly Veillot was no prophet when he saw in the new Empire an anti-revolutionary government, and in Louis Napoleon the material for another Charlemagne; but we must not forget that the *Coup d'État* was followed by many reparative measures. And according to M. de Mongeot, a judicious biographer of Veillot, the prince-president would have suppressed the University,

that receptacle of every evil doctrine, had it not been for the objections of certain bishops, who feared that they could not yet supply its place. Again, as Montalembert expressed the idea, our editor was a witness, not a guarantee, for Louis Napoleon. And he reserved the right to combat the new government, if it deviated from the right path; refusing, in order to do this with more freedom, every offer of preferment and every favor.

It was about the time of the *Coup d'État* that the famous controversy on the classics began; and this contest was, for a while, one of the most painful in which Veillot ever engaged. In 1851 the Abbé Gaume, a distinguished theological writer, had denounced the disastrous influence of the pagan classics, and had advocated the substitution of works by Christian authors. He was sustained by several prelates, among whom was Cardinal Gousset. Veillot defended the thesis advanced by Gaume; and Mgr. Dupanloup, in a letter to the professors of his preparatory seminary, justified the olden methods, and attacked rather vividly the partisans of the new idea. Veillot responded with equal energy, and then the prelate of Orleans interdicted the reading of the *Univers* in his seminary. Such judges as Cardinal Gousset thought that Mgr. Dupanloup had gone too far; they held that a journal had the right to discuss an opinion emitted in an episcopal act, provided it did not blame the act in itself. Mgr. Dupanloup tried to procure a collective warning from all the French bishops to the *Univers*, but he could obtain the signatures of only a small minority. Finally, Veillot requested his friends to terminate the dispute: "We need not defend ourselves; in fact, we have said only what we have said. Malevolent or unintelligent interpretations will fall of themselves, and useful truth will alone remain. If on our part, any exaggerations have been committed, we trust that they may be forgotten." In her own good time Rome spoke on the matter; the Christian classics obtained more attention in the French seminaries, while the good faith and learning of the Abbé Gaume were attested by his promotion to the Roman prelate.

An incident of more gravity succeeded the controversy

on the classics. In 1850 Veillot had begun the publication of a collection of new works which would constitute a complete "apology" of Christianity. Among his colaborers were the Benedictines Dom Pitra and Dom Guéranger, the Abbé Martinet, and Bishop Rendu. The great Spanish orator, Donoso Cortes, wrote for this collection his solid essay on *Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism*, in which he contended that the second system was necessarily the precursor of the third. Against this idea the Abbé Gaduel, vicar-general of Orleans, arose, discerning in the work of the great Spaniard a tissue of errors, and taking occasion to involve in his censures the entire religious press whenever it undertook to treat of theological matters. At this time Donoso Cortes occupied in Spain an unchallenged position as chief apostle of the truth in the world of letters; and, unknown to Gaduel, he had taken the course generally followed, *pace* Gaduel, by all prudent Catholic laymen in similar contingencies; that is, he had submitted his ideas to the judgment of authorized theologians. In reply to Gaduel, Donoso Cortes submitted his book to Rome, and he was fully justified. But Veillot had less equanimity than his Spanish friend, and in his defense of the religious press he wielded his ready weapon of raillery very freely against his adversary. Unable to reply, the latter complained to the archbishop of Paris, Mgr. Sibour. This prelate then prohibited the *Univers* to all the priests and religious communities of his diocese. The archiepiscopal act was applauded by the entire revolutionary press; but many prelates, in public letters, manifested sympathy for the condemned journal.

Louis Veillot was then in Rome, and he appealed to the Pontiff, writing to his staff on the same day: "Judged by the Father of all the faithful, by the highest authority on earth, we shall know with certainty what we must do, and we will do it at once. We will continue our work or we will abandon it with equal security; asking pardon of God and of men for having been unable to do good, or for having done evil." Six days afterward he received from Mgr. Fioramonti, Secretary for Latin Letters to His Holiness, a consoling letter, which, while inviting him to moder-

ation, augured well for the success of his appeal. And very soon the supreme authority took up the defense of the religious press. In an Apostolic Letter to the bishops of France, dated March 21, 1853, Pope Pius IX. said: "We must here remind you of the ardent advice which we gave four years ago, to all the bishops of the Catholic world: that they should exert every effort to induce talented and healthily educated men to devote themselves to writings calculated to enlighten the mind and to dissipate the darkness of error now so prevalent. Again, therefore, while urging you to remove from your flocks the poison of bad books and journals, we insist that you extend every protection to the men who consecrate their energies to the production of works whereby Catholic teachings may be propagated, whereby the venerable rights of the Holy See may be fully recognized, and whereby the obscurity of error be dissipated. Your episcopal charity should excite the ardor of these Catholic writers who are animated by so good a spirit; and if, perchance, they sometimes commit some mistakes, advise them paternally and prudently."

This letter of the Pontiff was generally regarded as a justification of Veuillot, and Archbishop Sibour hastened to lift the sentence which he had so rashly pronounced. But the adversaries of Veuillot were not reduced to silence: in less than two years from the appearance of the above papal letter there was issued an anonymous pamphlet, which, entitled "The *Univers* Judged by Itself," endeavored to show by means of citations, that the said journal was "revolutionary, turbulent, without respect for authority, without charity, full of injuries and insults, which constantly involved itself in contradictions, in the name of the Church." Another Catholic journal, *L'Ami de la Religion*, upheld the pamphlet; but the incriminated editor found many distinguished defenders, among whom were Mgr. Parisis, archbishop of Arras, and the ablest journal in Italy, the *Armonia*. It was proved that most of the pamphleteer's citations were made in bad faith; that they were presented without regard to the context; that in many cases they were truncated, and even falsified. And the *Armonia* well in-

sisted that if the *Univers* were a revolutionary journal, it would not be the object of revolutionary hatred in every land, and the Roman Pontiff would not have extended his protection to it. While the discussion was at its height, and while Veillot was taking the first steps to vindicate himself before the tribunals, the assassination of Mgr. Sibour saddened the hearts of all Catholics, and Veillot generously let the matter drop.

When after the Crimean War, the Count Walewski, representative of France at the Congress of Paris, allowed the Count di Cavour, agent for Piedmont, to menace the pontifical government, Veillot protested against this open attack on the rights of the Church. When the Italian war of 1859 opened, he asked whether Napoleon III., allying himself with the revolutionists, was not about to undo his work of '49. When the preliminaries of Villafranca were signed, he rejoiced at the end of a war "which had caused a fear lest the Revolution, rather than liberty, would be the gainer." But he found in these preliminaries "no recognition of the right of revolt; Lombardy did not give herself, but was rather ceded by Francis Joseph, and given by Napoleon"; he was sufficiently optimistic to trust that Piedmont would prove "one Catholic nation the more." Alas! Napoleon III. allowed Victor Emmanuel to contend for the whole of Italy, not even excepting the Papal States. Then Veillot entered upon the combat which he had vainly tried to avoid. When the *brochure*, "The Pope and the Congress," written by La Gueronnière, but inspired by Napoleon, appeared, advocating the spoliation of the Pontiff as a political necessity, Pius IX. characterized it, in reply to an address from the Count de Goyon, commander of the French army of occupation in Rome, as "a signal monument of hypocrisy and an ignoble tissue of contradictions." The imperial authorities would have prevented the *Univers* from publishing the papal rebuke, but Veillot knew his duty. His brother Eugene says that just as he had resolved to ignore the imperial wishes, a friend asked him if he realized what he was doing. "We are dying," was the reply. The discourse of the Pontiff was published on January 11, 1860; but the government

hesitated. On the 28th, however, Veillot received the Encyclical *Nullis certe*, condemning the last aggressions against the Papal States. The document was at once translated; and as he sent it to the printers, the brave editor said: "Our paper will be suppressed to-morrow." So it happened, but Veillot had triumphed; for when the government realized that the news of the pontifical action had already transpired, it authorized the other journals to publish the Encyclical. Thus it was, as Veillot wrote to the Pope, that an Encyclical of Pius IX., that of 1853, had given life to the *Univers*, and another one had taken that life. Twice Veillot asked for authorization to resume his journal, but in vain; however, in 1867, while Napoleon was effecting his tentative evolution toward liberalism, and which was to involve freedom of the press, the permission was accorded. Pius IX. sent a sum of money to further the good work; but as it did not prove necessary, Veillot turned it over to the Peter's Pence. The attitude of the *Univers* did not change toward the liberalized Empire. When, just previous to the plebiscite of May 7, 1870, Emile Ollivier, the new Minister, solicited its support, he was told that the imperial government would have to promise the preservation of the territories still remaining to the Pope. As this assurance was not given, our journal remained neutral, being unwilling to vote with the revolutionists against the plebiscite, and unable to support an administration which refused satisfaction to the Catholics. Meanwhile the General Council of the Vatican was celebrated, and the favorite thesis of Veillot was solemnly promulgated. Well has it been said that in the Constitution which promulgated the dogma of Papal Infallibility, "*Tout Veillot est là, et tout Veillot n'est qu'une victoire.*"

The revolution of September 4, 1870, did not surprise Veillot; Sedan was a consequence of Castelfidardo. Remaining in Paris during the siege, he sustained the Government of the National Defense, and continued to hope against hope. He was a constant adversary of the Commune, and the articles which he wrote against its insane leaders form his interesting book entitled *Paris During the Two Sieges*. When peace had returned, he seized every occasion to protest

against the brutal seizure of Rome on September 20, 1870. One day the members of the right had almost interdicted the right of speech to M. de Belcastel, who wished to interpolate the government on this subject; and Veuillot severely attacked this Catholic majority for thus appearing to abandon the cause of the Head of the Church. For this action he was blamed by many persons of his own party; and even Pius IX., so partial to the *Univers*, complained of his too zealous defenders. Veuillot bowed to the rebuke, declaring himself ready to break his pen if it was deemed a danger or useless. But a few days afterward Mgr. Mermillod, then vicar-apostolic of Geneva, and supposed to be, in this matter, an authorized interpreter of the sentiments of the Pontiff, informed the entire staff of the journal that Pius IX. blessed their work. When Marshal MacMahon was called to the presidency, May 24, 1873, Veuillot welcomed the loyal soldier who seemed disposed to favor a monarchical restoration. We need not detail how such efforts failed, and how MacMahon showed himself pliant to the dictates of the secret societies—probably because he belonged to them. Enough here to note that this administration disliked the *Univers*. Twice the journal was suspended: once at the request of Bismarck, it was thought, for having published a letter of the bishop of Perigueux on the religious persecutions in Germany; and again for an article which displeased the Spanish Cabinet of the day.

In this short sketch we have confined our remarks to the public life of a great soldier of the Church; his private life "*est de l'intime*," as Eugénie de Guérin would say. Even his brother hesitated to trench upon this privacy: "To speak of his habits would be a puerility; and as for his joys and griefs, I have shared them too entirely to display them before the indifferent." But a trace of his joys and griefs is to be found in his works. It is believed that one chapter of *Here and There* gives the history of his marriage; and in his masterpiece, *The Nuptial Chamber*, are depicted many of his chagrins. After the death of his beloved wife, Louis Veuillot found a faithful companion in an adored sister, Mlle. Elise Veuillot, whose portrait he outlines in *Here and There*:

“Your sweet and noble countenance is beautiful in our eyes as in those of the angels, by the cares which have prematurely impressed their mark. For the love of God you refused yourself to the service of God, and for charity’s sake you deprived yourself of the joys of charity. You do not fully enjoy the peace of the cloister, nor the care of the poor, nor an apostolate in the world; and your great heart has known how to forego all that is grand and perfect like itself. A servant to your brother, a mother to his orphans, you have sunk your life in little duties. You have given away your youth, liberty, and future; you are no longer yourself, but one who is no more, a dead wife and a buried mother. You are a virgin-widow, a religious without a veil, a spouse without her rights, a mother without the name. You sacrifice your days and your vigils to children who do not call you mother, and you have shed a mother’s tears upon the graves of those who were not your children. And amid all this labor, this abnegation and trial, you seek and you find for repose other infirmities to succor, other weaknesses to strengthen, other wounds to heal. May you be blessed by God as you are by our hearts!” Louis Veuillot went to his reward on the 7th of April, 1883.

A profound and judicious critic, the Abbé Le Noir, comparing Veuillot, the journalist of the sovereign and infallible Papacy, with Emile de Girardin, the journalist of liberty, says: “Girardin had no governmental system, and he was defeated by all our governments, not one of which either understood or desired liberty. Veuillot had a fixed, clear, and simple system, which the French clergy adopted; the Papacy upheld him even against the bishops, and he ended by obtaining a complete triumph in the Catholic Church. Veuillot created a style which was adapted to the clergy of his time; he found the tone which was to touch their heart-strings; he gave them in his journal the aliment they craved, and he became omnipotent with his readers. Certain prelates tried to crush him: they merely rendered his vitality greater. In the eyes of Rome and his public he was right, and afterward the Council of the Vatican solemnly proclaimed his thesis” (1).

(1) *The Dictionary of Bergier, Adapted to the Intellectual Movement of the Latter Half of the Nineteenth Century*, Art. Veuillot. Paris, 1876.

CHAPTER XXI.

CESARE CANTÙ, PRINCE OF MODERN HISTORIANS. *

Modern Italy has reason to be proud of her knights of the pen. To say nothing of her ecclesiastics who have distinguished themselves in current literature, and whose name is legion, no other country has produced, in this century, a literary galaxy which merits comparison with that formed by Pellico, Manzoni, Monti, Brofferio, Foscolo, Romagnosi, Grossi, Troya, D'Azeglio, and Cantù. Our century has produced more celebrated mediocrities than any of its predecessors; and, since the inception of her sham-encouraging unitarian revolution, Italy has brought forth her share. But literary mediocrities are soon forgotten in Italy. There, few mistake voluminousness for exhaustiveness; obscurity is not lauded as profundity; petulance is not taken for vivacity; specious smartness does not pass for wit. As a rule, literary pre-eminence is attained in Italy by the deserving alone; and among those contemporary writers who have won the respectful admiration of the Italian historical and literary world, the first place, both for the number and the variety of his works, must be accorded to Cesare Cantù, who went to his eternal reward in 1894, in the ninetieth year of his age. The chief title of Cantù to the gratitude of scholars throughout the world is his *Universal History*, a work which excels all similarly styled lucubrations as a persevering research for historical truth, and as a frank expression of that truth. It is a voluminous work; but the scholar never meets with anything that might be omitted without diminution of its utility, or even with little passages which have no necessary bearing on the subject-matter. As all the peoples of the earth pass in chronological order before the student, he feels as though he were contemporary with each of them; so clearly does his Mentor philosophize, as the procession moves on, concerning the social, political, and religious development of all. Characteristic details abound. The events are so grouped,

* This chapter appeared in *THE AVE MARIA*, Vol. XL.

that the scholar can consider them from a general as well as from a particular point of view ; and during the entire unfolding of the panorama, he inspects humanity as it accords with or transgresses the law of justice and progress. In the perusal of this admirable *History*, we often discern the hand of him who has touched the most delicate fibres of the heart in his poems and romances ; on the other hand, the historian is ever calm on his judicial bench as he descants on past and present, and penetrates into the future. No historian has so well understood the science which is termed the philosophy of history ; that science which deduces from the events of the past the laws obeyed by human passions, the aspirations of men and of nations, and which aids us in anticipating the future. The work of Cantù is pre-eminently a living work ; it is not a mere corpse of the past which he presents to our contemplation. The men whom he evokes are living characters, not the mere shades and names of men. And he is no mere shade of a historian, when he judges these personages : he is sagacious, trenchant, and precise, utterly void of that eclecticism and that scepticism which are the dominating features of nearly all modern would-be historians.

One cannot but think that the poetical genius of Cantù helped him to attain to historical eminence. Of course few poets make good historians. Not one true poet in ten is properly equipped to court the Muse of History ; and the chances are ten to one that the properly equipped poet will sacrifice historical truth to the exigencies of dramatic effect. But poetic fire is of great advantage to the competent historical delineator, as the works of Cantù well evince. Our author shows that a man can be both poet and historian, although such success is exceptional. Schiller, for instance, a good poet, and an admirable one when he speaks the truth, is but a poor historian. He essayed a history of that brigandage and butchery, that chaos of contrary elements, which is termed the Thirty Years' War ; which he would never have approached had he not hoped to make capital out of its tremendously dramatic personages. Well, Schiller found the material for a thrilling work ; but, as we have remarked elsewhere, he brought forth an incoherent

mass of platitudinous declamations. In fine, Schiller ceased to be a poet without becoming a historian. Such was not the destiny of Cantù.

Our author's *Universal History* was, so to speak, the tree which put forth those fruitful branches, the *History of the Italians*, the *History of a Hundred Years*, and *The Last Thirty Years*. After the revolution of '48, during that time of repose which preceded the unitarian movement of '60 which was to "regenerate" Italy, Cantù deemed it well to draw the attention of the world to the lessons furnished by the events which were consequent on the great French Revolution of 1789, and which were calculated to serve as warnings for the revolutionists of the future. This intention was realized in the *History of a Hundred Years*, dealing with the period from 1750 to 1850, of the latter part of which Cantù could well say: "*Quorum pars magna fui.*" He had already experienced the bitter fate which is reserved for one who declines to be the slave of any faction, and who, recognizing the merits and faults of all, becomes a target for the venomous shafts of diametrically opposite parties (1). Nevertheless, he had undertaken the task of describing that magnificent but doleful period, with the sole desire to manifest the truth, without fear of either despots or popular passions. He felt that he was a re-creator, and for such a one truth is necessary. In this work Cantù read severe lessons to Austria; but he told just as severe truths to the leaders of '48. Intensely patriotic, he never deviated from the principles of sound morality; and when, in concluding his exhortations, he questioned himself as to the prospects of Italy's gaining her independence, he made Italy reply to Austria in the words used by Matteo Visconti to Guido Torriano when the latter asked him when he would return to power: "When thy sins shall have become greater than mine." The volumes created a great sensation throughout continental Europe; but the French version was a sad mutilation of the original; and when the author complained to M. Renée, the Napoleonically-inclined translator, he received the reply: "Do you think that there is as much free-

(1) For an account of Cantù's experience with the Congregation of the Index, see our Vol. iii., p. 189, in Note.

dom of speech in France as there is in Italy?" And this question was put before the Italians had tried their unitarian experiment. In his *Last Thirty Years*, describing events in which his own part was so great, Cantù never loses the serene tranquillity which is one of his characteristics; and, ever loyal in his own sentiments, he is indignant when he beholds crime figuring as a chosen instrument of statesmen. He says of Cavour: "He despised men sufficiently to avail himself of their wickednesses, and he introduced a corruption which contaminated Italian regeneration." He paints in gloomy colors the condition of his country since she succumbed to the domination of the Brethren of the Three Points; but the facts which he presents are so patent, that the book has found few censors.

In the *Heretics of Italy*, our author depicts the vicissitudes of the Church in Italy with broad and masterly lines. The constant theme of this work is the often forgotten fact that civilization has always developed under the influence of the Church, and has always retrograded when that influence has been impeded. The conclusion of the three large volumes is in these words: "After a study of Christianity in the light of reason, of history, and of conscience, our respect for Catholic tradition has been confirmed. Our studies have furnished us new reasons for the conviction that the Christian organization, infusing a spirit of subordination into the masses, confers on men the greatest amount of happiness. Of course we speak of that felicity which subjects the will not to violence, but to the sweet empire of a persuasive morality. We remain convinced that the most ancient of powers, the sacerdotal principality, is also the most venerable and the most generous; that it is the keystone of the social edifice and the guarantee of the liberty of our nation, because it can oppose to social convulsions the sole force which can curb them—conscience."

With Manzoni and Grossi, Cantù completes the triumvirate of modern Italian poetry. As for his power as a novelist, we may say that no romance, not even *The Betrothed* of Manzoni, has furnished such exquisite pleasure to refined and sympathetic souls as his *Margherita Pusterla*. And

Cantù could write for "the people." His honesty was equal to his intelligence, and he always loved what it is the fashion to style "the lower orders." For the benefit of the working class he wrote many books, small in volume, but of immense value,—books which speak to the heart of the toiler, although dictated by solid reason and filled with extraordinary erudition. One of these works, *Good Sense and Good Heart*, published in 1870, has been pronounced, by competent critics of every school of thought, to be the best educational work given to workmen in modern times. In this book Cantù speaks to the people in their own language, displaying no party feeling; and urging his readers to economy, benevolence, sobriety, and above all to activity, which he regards as the vocation of man on earth, an instrument of that progress which is the characteristic of true civilization. The stupendous amount of historical knowledge possessed by Cesare Cantù, the immense amount of reading, writing, and other labor in which his nearly ninety years of life were spent, enabled him to adorn and fructify this volume with a profusion of examples illustrating every precept which he inculcates. And he ever remembers that the mind of his reader, a "man of the people," must not be fatigued; so he drops at times into a bit of poetry, which is both recreative and edifying. In fact, he so *miscuit utile dulci* that, as a certain critic observes, his useful appears to delight in swimming and splashing in sweetness.

Another beautiful work for the improvement of the toiler, called *The Workingman's Portfolio*, is admirably practical. It is an autobiography of a young Neapolitan orphan who goes to Lombardy to learn a trade. Naturally restless and fond of novelty, he continually changes masters and trades; picks up a little knowledge of everything; learns much about the vicissitudes of Italy, and participates in some of the recent ones; studies considerably; and through all his adventures ever thinks of the injunction of his deceased mother: "Remember that God sees you!" Around this simple framework Cantù entwines much practical philosophy, moral counsels, refutations of the socialistic theories of the day, and advice concerning the oft-recurring conflict between the

interests of the employee and those of the employer. Certain chapters on "A Father's Experience Narrated to His Children," "One for All and All for One," "Rich and Poor," and on "Strikes," are a perfect quintessence of all the possible arguments against communistic and socialistic dreams. Throughout the entire book Cantù evinces such sincere devotion to the moral and intellectual progress of the toiling classes, and exhales so pronounced an odor of honesty, that even those of his compatriots who do not sympathize with his "clerical" aspirations, have fain avowed that every workingman should have a copy of the book, and that the government should introduce it into every public educational institution. In a letter to the author, the illustrious French publicist Laboulaye says: "You have written more extensive and graver works, but none have attested so well as this one your great love for the 'people' and your real patriotism." However, the Italian governmental authorities have stigmatized the book as "anti-national" in its sentiments; and they discourage its circulation among those whom it would undoubtedly prevent from becoming a peril to the State.

"Perseverance" was ever the motto of the long life which Cantù devoted to the glory of the God who gave great talents to him. In 1873 he thus replied to greetings sent by the printers of Milan: "For a long time your eyes have been directed toward a workingman who wills strongly. Like yourselves, that workman was born in humble circumstances. When twenty years of age, he became the father of nine orphans; and, without fortune or any kind of protection, he resolved to preserve the independence of his opinions, without any adulation of either the great or the lowly. Asking for no other Mæcenæ than the public, he produced books which are more conscientious than scientific. Deprived of his liberty and of his country, defrauded of the fruit of his youthful labors, attacked in his most sincere aspirations and in his dearest affections, made a target by all who thought or wrote differently from himself, he adopted for his motto the word, *Perseverando*. When you accompany him to the cemetery, say: 'A good workman has passed away. Let us imitate his perseverance.'"

The charity of Cantù well deserved to be so termed, for it was reasonable; and it did not prevent his manifestation of a noble indignation, when he found himself face to face with the enemies of the Church, and of Christian truth. He never cared to hide his disgust when he was compelled to listen to pretentious chatter like that of one of his scientific compatriots who smartly declared: "At length we know how much phosphorus is required to make a Dante." To men of that ignoble stamp, Cantù would address but one serious observation: "The studious man will not ignore the researches and the conjectures of the grand seekers who, perseveringly although sadly, pursue that Infinite which they cannot reach; but he will not attempt to raise an edifice on systems which are not only discordant, but which contradict each other. Yesterday we were told to listen to Renan, who insisted that Monotheism was instinctive in the Semitic race; to-day we are directed to Soury, who affects to show that the Hebrews were Polytheists." To those who are willing to derive their descent immediately from monkeys although possibly mediately from the hand of God, Cantù adduces language as a decisive proof of the immediately divine origin of man: "Language is a treasure of wisdom which is superior to all our meditations; its origin cannot be ascribed to reflection or to conscience, since in its very beginnings it was the vehicle of metaphysical conception so fertile and so logical that the would-be scientist is at a loss for an explanation." To the so-called reformers who to-day foster one of the most pregnant evils which now afflict civilized society—to all who exalt popular instruction to the detriment of popular education, Cantù proclaimed: "Attention should be paid to the hearts of men much more than to the alphabet and to gymnastics." To those whose adoration of the nineteenth century does not hide the fact that Anarchism is now a power, Cantù prescribes: "We must lift up those who are on their knees; we must not prostrate those who stand erect. . . . The laborer may need to gain his daily bread by the sweat of his brow; but it should not be necessary for him to live with tears always in his eyes." To the France of his day Cantù spoke the language of confidence in

the destinies of the land which had shown to the world the *Gesta Dei per Francos*; he did not hide from himself the melancholy fact that modern France is "a clinic of all the social diseases," but he bade Frenchmen remember: "The literature of France is the literature of all Europe; her language is the universal vehicle of all ideas; her tribune seems to be the tribune of the peoples who have none; and with more truth than ever the saying of Jefferson may now be quoted: 'Every man has two countries—his own and France.'" To the misguided zealots who in 1848 were confounding the cause of the Pope-King with that of the Austrian campers on Italian soil, Cantù, who had just brought his *Universal History* down to his own time, complained that they knew not the significance of "Pius IX., who in his doubts threw himself at the feet of the crucifix"; and he called on the Italians to learn from the political attitude of the Pontiff, and from all history, "how reason is on the side of those who expect a regeneration of their country, not from revolutionary despotism, but from a healthy moderation."

CHAPTER XXII.

THE PLACE OF THE MIRACULOUS IN HISTORY. THE MIRACLES OF LOURDES.*

I.

THE MIRACULOUS NOT UNHISTORICAL *PER SE*.

Few incredulists cherish any kind feeling for mere authority; but nevertheless, the entire school expects men to submit their intelligences to the ukase of its own *ipse dixit*, and to do so with as much simplicity as was ever evinced by devout royalists when they doffed their caps before an edict issued, "*De par le Roi*." We can fancy that we see, in every part of the habitable globe, placards warning God that the school of "pure science," of "pure reason," of "rational criticism," denies His right to transcend the laws of His own creation. However, a very respectable number of persons contend that

* The first part of this dissertation appeared in the *Arc Maria*, Vol. xl.

even at the close of this progressive nineteenth century miracles do occur in Christendom. The incredulist, inflated by the spirit of modern "criticism," may sneer as he reads of the faith displayed at the venerated shrines of Lourdes, of La Salette, or of Ste. Anne de Beaupré by so many thousands of every age, condition, and mental calibre; but perforce he acknowledges that the ancient theories of the miraculous are not yet efficaciously exploded. In our day the sincere student of history thanks Providence—or mayhap the stars which take the place of Providence in his imagination—that he lives in this much-vaunted period of "scientific criticism." If he has already acquired a certain amount of solid information as to the nature and history of the critical faculty, he realizes that a critical school is not a peculiar appanage of the nineteenth century: that the best modern scholars admit that the so-called Dark Ages witnessed the agitation of nearly all the questions that have been mooted and disputed in our days of presumed intellectual pre-eminence. However, this real student perceives that modern days have beheld some advance in the apparatus wherewith man exercises his perceptive faculties; and he is grateful for his share in the improvement. But does the modern school of "scientific criticism" always deserve its name? Do all its professed devotees follow out in practice the principles inculcated by its canons, and which they really venerate so long as there is merely question of abstract theory? The Rationalistic school can not close its eyes to the fact that Catholic scholars and—alas! it must be admitted—*monks* founded the most solid and severe school of historical criticism which the world has yet admired; but, despite this fact, the arrogant tribe proclaims that a Catholic has no place in historical science, since he is necessarily subservient to prejudices which are foreign to science. This proclamation is made whenever it is asserted that a narrative of a miracle is a mere legend, and that legends have no rights in history. In other words, Dom Mabillon, Dom Bouquet, and other founders of that school of historical erudition to which the Benedictines have given their name, are to be dismissed as incorrigible dunces.

We are asked to believe that miracles have no place in

history : and therefore, since we do believe in miracles, to write ourselves down as outlaws in the historico-critical domain. But we would ask our Rationalistic friends what method of historical criticism one should follow when, in the course of his inquiries, he finds himself face to face with a presumed occurrence which is certainly strange, and which Catholics insist upon regarding as a miracle. Is he to summarily dismiss the alleged fact as an impossibility? Prof. Huxley would reply in the negative. He frankly admits that the impossibility of miracles can not be sustained, although he knows of nothing which calls upon him to qualify the grave verdict of Hume : "There is not to be found in all history any miracle attested by a sufficient number of men of such unquestioned goodness, education, and learning as to secure us against all delusion in themselves ; of such undoubted integrity as to place them beyond all suspicion of any design to deceive others ; of such credit and reputation in the eyes of mankind as to have a great deal to lose in case of their being detected in any falsehood ; and, at the same time, attesting facts performed in such a public manner and in so celebrated a part of the world as to render the detection unavoidable ; all of which circumstances are requisite to give us full assurance in the testimony of men." We do not propose to question the necessity of adopting these stringent canons ; but, admitting the postulate of Hume, Huxley, and others of that ilk, we ask our Rationalistic friends how they proceed in the contingency just mentioned. If they are honest, they will candidly reply that when they meet a passage recording some strikingly strange event, their first and immediate proceeding is to note whether the narrative accords with their own preconceived ideas concerning the subject matter. They will avow that if, at this early stage of the so-called investigation, they discover that their notions have sustained no unpleasant shock, then, and only then, will they bring the canons of criticism to bear upon the point at issue. It is only when they have assured themselves that there is no likelihood of contagion from the new applicant for admittance into their self-arrogated domain, that they deign to lift the quarantine, and allow the detained to be-

come amenable to those canons which are at once invoked in every other class of cases. Then indeed will be heard the usual challenges: Where and how did this narrative originate? Who was its author? Does he merit credit? What means of verifying his story did he enjoy? and so on. We suppose, of course, that our Rationalistic friends are true students and well-equipped critics; for these interrogatories imply that an intricate investigation is imminent, and the audacious individual who would omit it in a matter of any moment would not deserve the name of scholar, let him be Catholic or Rationalist. Now we imagine that most of our readers have opined that the ordinary canons of criticism should be put into practice before any use of, or at least independently of the quarantine regimen which the advocates of "pure reason" so zealously enforce. We shall illustrate our position and that of these gentry by two examples.

In the year 484 Humeric, King of the Vandals, an obstinate Arian who was then master of the Mediterranean coast of Africa, and had begun a cruel persecution of all Catholics who would not deny the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, one day ordered that several of the recalcitrants should have their tongues plucked out at the roots. Six contemporary authors record that after their mutilation, the victims continued to proclaim the divinity of our Saviour in as audible and distinct tones as had hitherto been natural to them. These six writers are: Victor, bishop of Vite (1); the Emperor Justinian, the third successor of Zeno (2); Æneas of Gaza (3); Procopius (4); the Count Marcellinus (5); and Victor, bishop of Tuonon (6). Furthermore, these six authors tell us that the martyrs proceeded to Constantinople, where the Emperor Zeno attested the prodigy. Four of these authors say that they examined the mouths of the victims, and that they heard them talk. It is useless to object that perhaps the entire tongues were not cut out (7); and that

(1) *History of the Vandalic Persecution*, Bk. v.

(2) *Code*, Bk. i., tit. 27.

(3) *Dialogue "Theophrastes."*

(4) *War Against the Vandals*, Bk. i., ch. 3

(5) *Chronicle*.

(6) *Ibid.*

(7) Thus urges the English translator of Mosheim.

the "Memoirs of the Academy of Sciences" of Paris make mention of two persons who had no tongues, but nevertheless could talk. In these latter cases there were remaining small portions of the original tongues; and even with those portions, as the examining surgeons reported, the unfortunates could talk only with very great effort, and their utterances were unintelligible articulations rather than comprehensible words. On the other hand, an inspection of the mouths of the martyrs of Typasis revealed not a vestige of tongue, and the emitted tones were precisely such as would have been produced by organs in normal condition. Now, if four eye-witnesses, men respectable by their worldly rank and by their learning and probity of life, do not form good historical testimony, we know not where to find any. Let the reader apply the criterions insisted upon by Hume and Huxley to the testimony in favor of this miracle. He will find that it will stand the test. Our witnesses could not have conspired to palm off an impudent fraud upon a credulous world; for some of them wrote in Africa, and others in Constantinople. And mark that they all agree in the substance of their narratives, while their simplicity and positiveness are indicative of sincerity.

The narrative for which we now ask attention concerns St. Martin of Tours. It is related by Sulpicius Severus, a writer with whom the learned among our opponents are well acquainted, and whom they esteem as a reliable authority, whenever their preconceptions do not interfere with their sanity of judgment. One day it happened that while St. Martin was walking in the neighborhood of Chartres, a weeping father besought him to give speech to his daughter, who had been mute from her birth. By the power of God the saint complied with the request; and one Evagrius, a priest who witnessed the event, related it to Severus, who recorded it in his book. Here is an author who is not only contemporary with the subject of his story, but who knew him well, who lived long among the disciples of the saint, and heard their testimony concerning the prodigies performed by him, and whom, therefore, we must suppose to have been well equipped for the work of preparing an accurate account of

the life and deeds of the great prelate. His book, multiplied into thousands of copies while he yet lived, has come down to us intact, and with as sure guarantees of authenticity as is possessed by any ancient manuscript. There is still preserved in Verona a copy which was contemporary with Sulpicius, an exceptional case in the matter of a work of the fourth century. Now, according to all the rules of ordinarily sound criticism, the narrative of Sulpicius Severus concerning the adduced miracle by St. Martin of Tours ought to inspire confidence in the credibility of that prodigy. But our Rationalistic friends will not view the matter in this light. With a contemptuous shrug they dismiss both the well-attested miracle of St. Martin and the equally well-proved prodigy which occurred among the Vandals. And why? Merely because they are presented as miracles. We are told that rules of criticism do not exist for such narratives. In fine, the results of an investigation which has been conducted in scrupulous accordance with canons adopted and consecrated by these same devotees of "pure reason" and of "scientific criticism" must go for nothing whenever those results contradict the Rationalistic manner of thought on the Deity, on the soul's immortality, or, for that matter, on anything else. And this is the same as saying that incredulist criticism diametrically reverses the position which criticism ought to occupy. Criticism should lead us to a knowledge of the truth. That which one may happen to regard as truth before any preliminary examination has been held, should not impose its limitations upon criticism. Why will not our Rationalistic critics be content with treating an alleged miracle as they would any other alleged fact? Why not subject it to the same verifying process? When the alleged miraculous appears on the pages of history, let all sincere critics pronounce judgment on it, with eyes directed simply on the question of fact, without any preliminary reflections, direct or indirect, upon even the existence of the supernatural. There will be sufficient time afterward to decide whether the event must be regarded in a natural or supernatural light. We ask for no more than this; and this is mere justice, plain common-sense.

We can scarcely believe that atheistical and Protestant critics will ever adopt this course. It is much more easy to settle every question as to the truth of an alleged miracle with a smart sally of words,—with a feeble attempt at a joke. Mayhap such conduct is prudent; for the frivolous travesties of ratiocination generally presented by the giants of agnostic criticism can not withstand the shock of the evidence which leads the Roman Congregation of Rites to proclaim the miraculous nature of a given occurrence. When Joseph II., the philosophistic German emperor and “sacristy-sweep,” visited the Eternal City during the Conclave of 1769 which resulted in the election of Pope Clement XIV., he had resolved, like a true philosopher, to ridicule everything papal; and among other enterprises, he sought to belittle the precautions taken by the Sacred Congregation in cases of canonization. Having requested to be allowed to examine some evidence regarding an alleged miracle then being considered by the tribunal, he obtained it, and taking it home, he subjected it to a hypercritically thorough investigation. The result was not what the pupil of Kaunitz had fondly anticipated; and he was constrained to remark, when returning the documents, that if all the testimony favoring the truth of “Roman miracles” were as conclusive as that which he had just weighed in his Rationalistic balance, no sane jurist would reject it. Judge of the emperor’s consternation when he learned that the Congregation of Rites had rejected as insufficient the evidence which he had deemed satisfactory. We do not know whether Joseph II. again feigned to contemn Roman views of the miraculous; but we do know that if our contemporaries of the pretendedly scientific school of historical criticism were to peruse the documents just mentioned, they would simply resort to ridicule. With the rank and file of men, ridicule succeeds where reason would fail. Few men are capable of sustaining the painful march of argumentation; and still smaller is the number of those who are above being influenced by a display of some verbal scintillations which pass for wit. Even educated and thinking persons not infrequently succumb to raillery, and prefer a specious vivacity to unadulterated truth.

II.

THE MIRACLES OF LOURDES.

Commenting on the assertion, so often made by heterodox polemics, that if mathematical certainty could be predicated of even one of the many miracles which the Church indicates as forming one of her constant and necessary treasures, the entire world would probably be converted, Léon Gautier thus speaks of the entrancing but calmly critical book (1) which Henri Lasserre presented to Our Lady of Lourdes as an *ex-voto* in grateful recognition of a cure which he himself had received at her hands: "Henri Lasserre has furnished us with the proof of this one miracle, chosen from among thousands. He has obstinately confined himself to one fact, closing his eyes to thousands of other splendors, in order to contemplate one alone. He has had sufficient patience to study only one star in a heaven studded with so many constellations; but who knows that star so well as he knows it, and who has revealed it so well to men? In *Our Lady of Lourdes* you will not discern any of those honeyed phrases which are so characteristic of the false mysticism of our day; this work cannot be styled 'a good little book'; it is nervous and virile, and it will make men; every thing in it is strong, and above all, everything is demonstrated. Lasserre is a judge, and not a narrator; he is a magistrate pronouncing from his tribunal a decision which is based on good reasons which have been duly weighed. His book is a scientific production; it is a series of theorems which are endowed with splendid form" (2). This one miracle which claimed the attention of Lasserre as though he had determined to satisfy the affectedly modest demand of heterodoxy—the one fact which, if proved to have been the effect of a real miracle, was supposedly to be pronounced a sufficient reason for the conversion of the sceptical world, was "the incessant procession of pilgrims—men, women, entire populations—

(1) *Our Lady of Lourdes*. Paris, 1869.(2) *Portraits of the Nineteenth Century*, Vol iii., p. 216. Paris, 1894.

coming from all sides to kneel before a grotto in the desert which had been unknown ten years previously, but which the word of a child had suddenly caused to be regarded as a divine sanctuary." Before the inception of his investigation, Lasserre had felt that the word "superstition" was rather unsatisfactory as an accompaniment to the scoff of the incredulists at the most wonderful phenomenon of the grand nineteenth century; the mouthing of that word, albeit an expeditious proceeding, was not to his taste: "Whether the miracle (of the apparitions to little Bernadette) was true or false; whether the cause of this vast concourse of persons was due to the divine action or to human error; a study of the matter was no less of consummate interest. This study did not at all suit the worshippers of 'free investigation'; they preferred a summary dismissal, a course at once more prudent and more easy, but which I could not regard as consistent with a zealous search for the truth, although I felt that it was risky to affirm with a haste equal to that of their denial. . . . The witnesses of what I have narrated are living; I have given their names and their residences, so that they may be questioned, and so that my own conclusions may be confirmed." The Church has as yet accorded no formal admission of the miraculous nature of the prodigies of Lourdes; just as in the cases of those which have rendered celebrated, although to a minor degree, the shrines of Genazzano, La Salette, St. Anne de Beaupré, and several others, we are not obliged to predicate anything worse than rashness and absence of common sense concerning the infinitesimally small number of Catholics who, after a study of the events which have recently conferred a halo of glory on the little Pyrenean town, persist in regarding it as a monument to human credulity. To those who have carefully reflected on the arguments adduced by Lasserre there can occur no good reason for hesitation in agreeing with Pope Pius IX., when, in an apposite Brief to the zealous but judicious Frenchman, His Holiness congratulated him on "having demonstrated the truth of the recent apparition of the Most Clement Mother of God," and on having so adduced his proofs, that "the luminous evidence of the event is strengthened by the

very objections advanced by human malice as it attempts to combat the divine mercy."

On Feb. 11, 1858, a girl of fourteen years named Bernadette Soubirous, accompanied by a younger sister and a little friend, left her home in Lourdes in order to search for drift-wood on the banks of the Gave. When a mere infant, Bernadette had been consigned to the care of a relative of her father, the poverty of the family rendering such a course necessary, and the health of the child demanding a life in the fields. She had returned to her parents' humble domicile only two weeks before the day when their persistent poverty forced her to seek for fuel with which the simple food of the family might be prepared. During the years of absence, her guardians had given no care to her religious instruction; she had, however, picked up that quantum of knowledge which is necessarily breathed in every Catholic atmosphere, and she was able to recite her Rosary with simple faith in the existence of a God who was her Creator and Protector, and of a Dear Lady in heaven who was the Mother of God, and wished to be the adopted Mother of every child of man. It was in order to procure for their daughter all necessary catechetical instruction, so that she might receive her First Communion, that the Soubirous had taken her home; she had already joined a class under the care of the pastor, but had not as yet attracted the attention of that clergyman. The Rosary had been continually in the hands of Bernadette, since the day when she had learned to regard it as a dear companion while she tended the sheep of her foster-parents; and when, on the occasion of which we speak, the trio of girls had arrived at the Massabielle Rocks, where they expected to find many branches and twigs which had drifted with the current, her companions were not astonished when they noticed that instead of bending to her task, she had fallen to her knees, seemingly forgetful of the purpose that had brought them to the river. The drama of Lourdes had begun. The sister and the friend of Bernadette had formed their little bundles, when they were approached by the apparently negligent child, who seemed to be strangely agitated as she demanded: "Did you see

anything?" Learning that the others had heard or seen nothing worthy of mention, she replied to the query as to her own experience with the words: "If you saw nothing I have nothing to say." Then the children started on their return; but the strange demeanor of the eldest excited the curiosity of the others to such a pitch that at length, with many injunctions of secrecy, she narrated what had befallen her. Standing above the grotto before which her sister, Marie, and their little friend, Jeanne, were gathering fuel, a beautiful lady had appeared to Bernadette. The personage, declared the child, was surrounded by an ineffable light—a light which was brighter than that of the sun, but which in no manner wounded the eyes. The apparition was that of a person about twenty years old, of medium height, and with a countenance of inexpressible sweetness; the figure was clothed in white, with a blue girdle, and the feet were bare, each one supporting a rose which seemed to be of gold; the hands of the lady were joined, as though she were praying, and from them a Rosary showed beads of a milk-white color. Bernadette said that when she first saw the lady, she instinctively raised the cross of her chaplet, trying to make with it the Sign of our Redemption; that, however, her trembling prevented the action; and that it was only when her visitor made the salutary sign, that she received sufficient strength to make it. Then, added Bernadette, she felt no more fear; she recited the five decades of her Rosary, and as she pronounced the final "Glory to the Father," the luminous figure vanished. Marie and Jeanne afterward declared that they had passed about fifteen minutes at their task while Bernadette was apparently wrapped in devotion; and this fact, together with the assertion of the favored child that she had recited five decades of the chaplet during her vision, would indicate that about fifteen minutes was the duration of the apparition. It is needless to state that Marie and Jeanne forgot their promise of secrecy; that they informed Mother Soubirous of the event, real or imaginary; and that the story was ridiculed, while they were forbidden to revisit the grotto. Two days passed, and Bernadette, whose recollection of "the beautiful lady" continually filled

her heart, begged her mother to withdraw the prohibition. The other girls supported the request; the mother yielded; and after the early Mass the little ones again repaired to the Massabielle Rocks, taking the precaution, however, to carry with them a bottle of Holy Water, for, as Mary and Jeanne declared with their relatively superior theological knowledge: ‘If the lady is the devil, she will flee if we throw the Holy Water on her; we need only say: ‘If you come from God, approach; if you are from the demon, depart!’” When they arrived at the grotto, Bernadette began the recitation of the Rosary, the others responding. Suddenly the countenance of Bernadette seemed to be transfigured; her eyes gave forth a preternatural light, as she cried: “Look! She is there!” Marie and Jeanne saw nothing but the usual rocks and verdure; but the bearer of the salutary water handed it to Bernadette, who quickly threw some drops on the figure, saying: “If you come from God, approach!” She cared not, she afterward said, to add the alternative words of the objurgatory formula; for her heart told her that the implied suspicion would have been an outrage on the “beautiful lady.” And indeed, declared Bernadette, she had no sooner spoken to the apparition than it moved a few steps toward her, smiling, as it were, at the precaution of the child. Then the children concluded their Rosary, the “lady,” insisted Bernadette, appearing to join with them, for, as the girl said, she saw the beads gliding through the fingers of the apparition, just as they passed through her own. When the devotion was completed, the “lady” disappeared. As on the previous occasion, Marie and Jeanne had seen nothing of the vision. It was quite natural that this strange story should have soon become known in the town; and while nearly all agreed with the Soubiraus that their child was the victim of an hallucination, all were struck by the evident sincerity of the visionary, and by the wonderful change in her appearance and demeanor. Two of the townswomen, a “Child of Mary” named Antoinette Peyret, and a matron named Millet, believed that the apparition might be that of some suffering soul of Purgatory who was desirous of prayers for deliverance; and accordingly they told Bernadette that

when she next saw the "lady," she should ask her what it was that was wanted, and that, lest Bernadette might make some mistake in reporting the answer, the "lady" should be requested to write her reply on a paper which the child would hand her. Bernadette, therefore, accompanied by Mlle. Antoinette and Mme. Millet, went to the grotto on February 18; the "lady" again appeared, the child's visage being transfigured as before, but her companions seeing or hearing nothing else which was preternatural. "She signs to me that I should go to her," cried Bernadette. Then Antoinette said to the girl: "Ask the lady whether she is displeased because we are with you; tell her that if she so desires, we shall retire." And Bernadette replied: "She says that you may remain;" whereupon the Child of Mary and the matron knelt on the sward at the side of Bernadette, and lighting a blessed candle which they had deemed it wise to bring, they told her to obey the sign to approach which the apparition had given. "Ask her who she is," they suggested; "ask her why she has come, and whether she is not some soul desiring that Masses be said for her deliverance from Purgatory. We are ready to do all that she may desire, if that be the case." Receiving from Antoinette the paper, pen, and ink, with which the "lady" was to make known her identity and her wishes, the child advanced toward the mysterious figure, a maternal smile seeming to encourage her steps. But the apparition receded as Bernadette progressed; it did not stop until it reached the entrance to the grotto, and then the little one stood on her toes, as though she were trying to place the writing materials in the hands of the "lady." The matron and the maiden now stepped forward, wishing to hear a possible conversation; but the child, without turning toward them, and as though she was obeying a command of her visitor, signed with her hand that they should move no further. Then the favored girl was heard to say: "My lady, if you have something to tell me, please write it down, and tell me also who you are." Bernadette afterward said that the "lady" smiled at this request, and replied: "It is not necessary that I should write what I intend to tell you; and I simply ask that you

do me the favor of coming here each day during the next fortnight." And the reply was cheerfully given : " I promise, my lady ; " whereupon, as Bernadette afterward said, she received the assurance : " And in my turn I promise to render you happy, not in this world, but in the other." Evidently the " lady " now told Bernadette that she might withdraw ; for the child backed toward her companions, and as she reached them she exclaimed to Antoinette, the Child of Mary : " Now she is smiling on you " ; and Lasserre is careful to note that from that moment Antoinette lived on that smile. " Ask her," cried the maiden, " whether it would displease her if we were to accompany you in your daily visits during the coming fortnight." A pause ; and then Bernadette announced that the " lady " had replied : " They, and others also, may come ; I wish to see everybody." Another moment ; and the child declared that the " lady " had gone, and with her the light that had always announced her coming. Thousands of persons, some merely curious, but many filled with the spirit of faith, came from the neighboring districts and attended the little Bernadette as she made her visits to the grotto during the two following weeks. None saw anything but a child in ecstasy ; a few were disposed to regard the matter as a comedy arranged by priestcraft ; others saw, or affected to see in Bernadette an illustration of the power of hallucination. The hypothesis of trickery was not long sustained ; good judges, who had seen the best efforts of the most eminent actresses of the world, declared that human art could not produce such manifestations as those presented by this ignorant and stolid peasant girl. But the supposition of hallucination, of catalepsy, was a simple method of explanation adopted by the philosophists who soon came from all parts of France to pronounce their dictum concerning the " visionary " of Lourdes. Meanwhile the clergy of the locality, realizing full well that while God has His miracles, nevertheless the devil has his prodigies, and man has his impostures, followed the course which is traditional with their order in similar circumstances. An appreciation of their attitude must result from reflection on the instruction given to his assist-

ants by the Abbé Peyramale, the senior *curé* of the town and Canton of Lourdes: "Let the impatient have their talk. If on the one hand we are strictly obliged to examine thoroughly the affair which is now progressing, on the other hand we are enjoined by the simplest kind of prudence not to mingle with the crowd now singing its canticles at the grotto. By holding aloof from these assemblages we will run no danger of sanctioning an illusion or a trick by our presence; but neither should we manifest a hostile attitude, or condemn by a premature decision a thing which may be the work of God. As for attending these demonstrations as simple spectators, such a proceeding would be impossible to persons wearing the *soutane*. If the people saw a priest at the grotto, they would place him at their head, and insist on his intoning their chants; and if he were to yield to the general pressure or to his own unreflecting enthusiasm, and were afterward to discover that the alleged apparitions were illusions or impostures, who does not see that religion would be compromised in the persons of its clergy? And if a priest were to frequent the grotto, and nevertheless resist the popular clamor, would not the same lamentable consequences follow, if perchance the hand of God were found to have been in the apparitions?" And when many pious persons insisted on his change of front, the *curé* replied: "We clergymen can interfere only if there should result from this excitement some heresy, some superstition, or some disturbance; then our duty would be marked out by the facts themselves, for by bad fruit we would recognize a bad tree, and we would perforce attend to the first symptom of disease in order to save our flocks. Up to the present moment no danger has presented itself; on the contrary, the people have shown a spirit of recollection, and are content with prayers to the Holy Virgin, thus increasing in piety. We may well wait for the decision which episcopal wisdom will soon pronounce on this matter. If these events are the work of God, they need not our interference; and the Omnipotent, without our help, will know how to arrange affairs in accordance with His designs. But if these events are not from God, the moment when we

should interfere, in order to denounce them, will be designated by Him. In a word, let us trust in Providence." Mgr. Laurence, the bishop of Tarbes, and therefore ordinary of Lourdes, approved the instruction given by the *curé-doyen* : and without a single exception the clergy checked their own possibly legitimate desire to share in the pious demonstrations of their flocks before competent ecclesiastical authority had spoken the permissive word. The attitude of the civil authorities, however, was less sensible than that of the clergy. The Second Empire, almost as entirely a child of the Revolution as the Third Republic which succeeded it, was far more Masonic than Christian in the choice of its governmental servants ; and these gentry, since they were loud praters concerning liberty of conscience, declared that civilization was outraged by a claim that a miracle had occurred in the nineteenth century, and that in any case the Catholic people of France had no right to pray without governmental permission. On Feb. 21, the third day of the fortnight of interviews described by her "lady," when the apparition had particularly enjoined upon Bernadette to "pray for sinners," the child was arrested "in the name of the law" as she was leaving the church where she had assisted at Vespers. A thrill of indignation coursed through the veins of nearly all those who had that morning seen the visage of the little one illumined by what they deemed to be rays of heavenly origin ; and they would have resisted the officers, had not a priest ordered them to "submit to the authorities." The multitude accompanied the child to the office of the Commissioner of Police ; but the first great ordeal of the innocent was undergone behind closed doors. The official report of the interrogatory, sent by the Commissioner, Jacomet, to his superiors in Paris, was refused to Lasserre, so anxious were the Masonic agents of the government for a triumph of truth ; but from M. Estrade, the local Receiver of the Indirect Taxes, whom Jacomet had allowed to assist at the examination, and who shared the views of the Commissioner, our author afterward obtained all the particulars. All the cunning of an experienced and more than usually brilliant detective, all the malice of an

adept of the Lodges, had not succeeded in confounding the simplicity of Bernadette ; even when the officer, affecting furious anger, termed her a liar, and menaced her with imprisonment, the child had calmly answered : " Monsieur, you may order the police to lock me up, but I can say only what I have said ; it is the truth " (1). On receiving a command to abstain from future visits to the grotto, she had replied that she had promised the " lady " to repair thither every day for a fortnight, and that even though she might wish to obey the Commissioner, an interior force would induce her to prefer obedience to the apparition. The result of the examination had been an order to François Soubirous to prevent his daughter from re-visiting the grotto. " She is a cunning child," Jacomet had remarked when Bernadette had departed. " She is sincere," Estrade had replied. Out of obedience to her father, who believed in the truth of the apparition, but who greatly feared the more tangible power of the government, Bernadette now endeavored " to resist the attraction toward the grotto which possessed her " ; and on the morning of Feb. 23, she proceeded to school, sore at heart, feeling that she would displease God, whether she disobeyed her " lady " or disobeyed her parents. She received, of course, no consolation from the Sisters of the school, who believed, or affected to believe, that she was a victim of hallucination. But when the mid-day *Angelus* had been recited, and the pupils started for their dinners, the quandary of the little one was dissipated by a force, irresistible although maternally sweet, which impelled her to an interview with her whom she regarded as her Protectress. Hastening to the grotto, where some of the crowd of the morning still awaited her appearance, hoping that she would defy the Commissioner's prohibition, Bernadette as usual knelt and began her Rosary ; but alas ! her " lady " did not appear. The tears ran

(1) Estrade informed Lasserre that personally Bernadette was timidity itself, as might have been expected in the case of an ignorant peasant girl confronted by the dread powers of the police. Indeed, at this period of her life the child was always more or less confused in the presence of any stranger. But whenever there was a question of the reality of her vision, the girl manifested a strength of mind seldom found in persons wise with the wisdom of the world ; and on such occasions she always replied without any indication of timidity, and with invincible firmness, although, even then, she showed the virginal modesty which leads its possessor to avoid the notice of the curious.

down her cheeks as she exclaimed: "Have I done something wrong, and thus prevented her coming?" She waited in painful anxiety for some moments, and then turned toward her home, many of the spectators declaring that the Commissioner had gained his point—that the foolish child would have no more visions. But one joy was hers when she appeared before her father; when he heard that she had disregarded his command because she was impelled by an interior and unconquerable force, he declared that his daughter had never told a lie, and that it was not for him or her mother to contradict the will of God. Bernadette might go to the grotto whenever she desired to go. In vain Jacomet now threatened to imprison the entire Soubirous family, if his orders were again violated; Bernadette innocently declared that she could not disobey her "lady," and both the parents upheld her determination. In this emergency the Commissioner sent a report of his predicament to the imperial Procurator of the Department; and that wise official replied that there was no pretext for police interference unless the crowds became "disorderly"—a view which encouraged an officer of a body which knew well how to manufacture disorder for its own purposes. On the morning after her bitter disappointment, Bernadette prostrated herself again before the grotto, holding a blessed candle in the hand which was not occupied with the Rosary; and scarcely had her knees pressed the ground, when the ineffable expression of her countenance showed the bystanders that she was again in communion with her mysterious visitant. As the girl afterward swore in her declarations, the "lady" sweetly called her by name, and then said: "My child, I have something to tell you, and to you alone; do you promise me that you will repeat it to no one?" (1). When the promise had been given, the

(1) Concerning this secret, Lasserre asks: "What secret could there be between the Mother of the Sovereign Creator of heaven and earth and the daughter of the miller Soubirous; between that lowly child and the resplendent Majesty of her who ranks after God alone; between a little shepherdess and the Supreme Queen of the realms of the Infinite? Certainly we dare not divine it, we would consider it a sacrilege to listen at the doors of heaven. Nevertheless, we may note the profound and delicate knowledge of the human heart and the maternal wisdom which induced the august speaker to communicate some secret to Bernadette, before she conferred the public mission that the girl was to fulfil. Favored with wonderful visions, charged with a message from the other world to the priests of the True God, this childish heart, hitherto so peaceful and so solitary, found itself

“lady” communicated to her protegee that secret which Bernadette would never divulge ; and then she said : “ Go now and tell the priests that I desire that a chapel be built here in my honor.” The vision disappeared, and paying no heed to the questions of the crowd, the most favored of all the Children of Mary of our day hurried to the residence of the Abbé Peyramale, with whom as yet she had not exchanged a word. “ *M. le Curé*, I have a message for you from the lady who appears to me at the grotto of Massabielle.” When the worthy pastor heard this announcement, delivered with calm assurance, he deemed it wise to feign some roughness of manner, and said : “ Ah ! you are the one that pretends to have visions, and who runs around the country with foolish tales. Well ; tell me all about these extraordinary adventures, the truth of which nothing seems to prove.” The heart of the child sank a little as she heard the harsh tones of one who was celebrated for his kindness to the lowliest of his parishioners ; but in all simplicity she repeated the story of the grotto. The accents of sincerity impressed the priest, and as he afterward said, had there been merely a question of the opinion of Monsieur Peyramale, he would have yielded full credence to Bernadette ; but the girl was addressing the

suddenly in the midst of dense crowds, and subjected to great agitations. She was about to be contradicted by many, to be threatened by some, to be ridiculed by others ; and what was to be most dangerous for her, to be venerated by a large number. The day was approaching when multitudes would acclaim her, and dispute among themselves for bits of her clothes as though they were relics of a saint ; when illustrious persons would kneel before her, and ask for her blessing ; when on the faith of her simple word a magnificent temple was to be erected, imposing pilgrimages to be undertaken, and grand processions to be held. Thus this poor child of the people was about to suffer the most terrible trial which could assail her humility, a trial in which she might lose forever her simplicity and all the sweet and modest virtues which had grown in the days of her solitude. The very graces which she had received were about to be for her a redoubtable danger, a danger which more than once has conquered souls favored by the honors of heaven. Even St. Paul was tempted by pride after his visions, and had need of the afflictions which came from the evil spirit of the flesh in order that his heart might not be exalted. The Holy Virgin wished to secure the child of her predilection without any approach, on the part of the wicked angel, toward the lily of purity which was warmed by the rays of her favor. What does a mother do, when danger menaces her child ? She presses her more tenderly to the maternal bosom, and softly whispers in the little ear that there is no need for fear, since the mother is near. And when the mother is forced to leave the child alone for a moment, she murmurs : ‘ I shall not be far away ; only extend your hand, and it will meet mine.’ So did the Mother of us all for Bernadette. All this did the Queen of Heaven to the little child of Lourdes when she told her that secret. . . . The secret became for Bernadette the surest of safeguards. Theology does not teach us this ; we learn it from a study of the human heart.”

Abbé Peyramale, the pastor of a large flock which he was obliged to guard from snares. He persevered with his rough demeanor, and asked: "And yet you do not know the name of this lady?" And when the child replied that she had not yet learned the name, the priest said: "Those who believe you imagine that she is the Blessed Virgin Mary. But do you not know that if you tell untruths in this matter you are in the path which leads far from heaven?" After a few moments of reflection, the abbé continued: "Nothing compels me to believe that this lady is the Queen of Heaven. Tell her that before I can undertake to procure the fulfilment of her request, she must give me some proof of her power." Again he mused awhile, and then he said: "You tell me that the apparition has at her feet a wild rose-bush, an eg-lantine which grows from between the rocks. Well; we are now in the month of February, and you may say to the lady that if she wants that chapel, she will cause that bush to flower." When Jacomet and the other incredulists of Lourdes heard of this interview, they said that the abbé had asked the mysterious lady for her "passport." Estrade, the incredulist collector of taxes whom we have heard avowing that Bernadette impressed him as being at least sincere in her belief in the vision, was one of the curious who joined the throng of devotees on the morning after the child's delivery of the message to the *curé*; and it may be well to let him give his own account of what he saw, and of the effect that the spectacle produced on his deeply rooted infidelity. His remarks were first published by Louis Veuillot in the *Univers* of July 28, 1858, and afterward he himself amplified the narrative for the benefit of Lasserre: "I arrived on the scene, bent on having a good laugh at a farce or at some grotesque incidents. . . . Thanks to my elbows, I easily obtained a place in the foremost rank. As the sun arose, Bernadette appeared. I was next to her; and I noticed in her childish features that character of sweetness, of innocence, and of deep tranquillity, which had impressed me when I saw her at the office of the Commissioner. She knelt without any ostentation or embarrassment, without any attention to the crowd, absolutely as though she were alone in a church

or in an unfrequented forest. She began to pray on her Rosary, and suddenly her features seemed to receive and to reflect a mysterious light; her looks became fixed on the opening of the grotto, and she became radiant with happiness. I looked at that spot, but I discerned absolutely nothing but some leafless branches of eglantine; but nevertheless, all my previous prejudices, all my philosophical objections, all my preconceived negations, were immediately destroyed as I looked on the transfiguration of that child, and I felt that in spite of myself some extraordinary sentiment had mastered me. I had an irresistible intuition, a certainty, that some mysterious Being was there; my eyes did not see it, but my soul, as well as the souls of innumerable others there present, saw it with the light of evidence. Yes, I avow it; a Divine Being was there. Suddenly and completely transfigured, Bernadette was no longer Bernadette; she was an angel from heaven. . . . Her attitude, her slightest gestures, the manner, for instance, in which she made the Sign of the Cross; all these had a dignity and a grandeur more than human. . . . She seemed to fear, lest she might lose, for a single instant, the ravishing spectacle that she was contemplating. . . . I held my breath, as though I might thus hear the conversation between the apparition and the girl. Bernadette was listening with an expression of the most profound respect, or rather of absolute adoration, mingled with a limitless love and the sweetest of ravishments, although at times a tinge of sadness was observed. . . . If the denizens of heaven make the Sign of the Cross, assuredly they make it as Bernadette did during her ecstasy; she seemed, in some sort, to embrace the Infinite. At one moment, she moved on her knees from where she had been praying to some distance within the grotto—about ten yards of a rather steep ascent; and those near her distinctly heard her murmur: ‘Penance, penance!’ A few moments afterward she arose, and took the road to the town. Then again she was but a poor little child in rags who appeared to have had no part in this wonderful drama.” Bernadette immediately visited the *curé*, telling him that she had given his message to the “lady,” and that the reply had been a smile. “Then,” added the child, “she told me to

pray for sinners, and asked me to enter the grotto. Three times she cried: 'Penance, penance!'; and I repeated the words as I moved on my knees toward her. In the grotto she revealed to me a second secret which is personal to myself. Then she vanished." When Bernadette prostrated herself at the grotto on the following day, the "lady" raised her and embraced her, saying: "My daughter, I wish to confide to you a third secret which, like the others, you will keep to yourself." Then the apparition told the child to go to the spring and drink, and to eat some of the grass there growing. No one had ever seen a spring in the neighborhood, and it seemed to Bernadette that her visitor meant the little brook which coursed before the grotto on its way to the Gave. But the mysterious one cried: "I told you to drink from the spring. It is not there, but here"; and the "lady" pointed toward the dry spot at the right side of the grotto, toward which the child had gone on her knees on the previous day. Wondering but promptly the girl went to the place, but found no indication of a spring; whereupon the "lady" made a sign that the clay should be scraped. The hundreds of spectators were truly puzzled when they witnessed this operation, and many began to suspect that the child's brain had become affected by the strain of her experiences. Their wonder grew when they saw her apparently drinking from the palm of her hand, for they knew that water had never been seen in that place. Afterward Bernadette said that when she had scraped the earth, she noticed that the spot appeared to be damp; that in a moment some drops of water oozed forth; that then she formed a little cavity, and that soon it was filled with the fluid; that although the water naturally was muddy, after three trials she conquered her repugnance out of love for her "lady," and swallowed some of it; that while she was eating some of the grass, the minute reservoir which she had dug was overflowed, and a little stream began its flow toward the Gave; that finally the apparition beamed on her with a smile of satisfaction, and disappeared. When the girl had come out of her ecstasy, the crowd rushed to the new fountain, and found that it was continually growing more abundant; regarding it as mirac-

ulous, they drank of it, and many carried some of it to their homes. The news travelled quickly; and as that day, Feb. 25, a Thursday, was market-day in Tarbes, the city was well filled with strangers. Hundreds of persons therefore left Tarbes during the night, in order to be present at the events which the next morning would probably bring forth at the grotto of Lourdes; and at the first dawn of Feb. 26, more than five thousand acclamants greeted Bernadette with cries such as "See the saint!" while the nearest to her reverently touched her garments as she passed to her accustomed station. But the more devout, and especially the more perspicacious of the Catholic spectators, were not surprised when, after the popular attempt at canonization, the innocent subject of the honor seemed to have lost her connection with the world of heaven. On that morning the child appeared to be no more than any ordinary denizen of earth; no ecstatic radiance was visible on her countenance; and after the usual recitation of her Rosary, she announced that her "lady" had not manifested herself. Undoubtedly, remarked those who were versed in the science of God's dealings with the children of grace, the sweet Mother of the humble had deigned to remove a temptation to vain-glory from the daughter of her predilection. But when the multitude returned to Lourdes, they learned that strange rumors were current concerning some wonderful cures which had been operated by the use of the recently revealed water; and the ensuing days beheld a multiplication of these apparent instances of divine approbation of the claims of *la voyante*. People talked of how the hand of Jeanne Crassus, paralyzed for ten years, had immediately recovered its vitality when bathed with the water of the new spring. Cures had also been effected, it was said, in the cases of Marie Daube, Bernarde Soubie, and Fabien Baron, whom various maladies had rendered bedridden for several years. The most remarkable of the cures, because its subject had been deeply pitied in all that part of France for twenty years, was Louis Bourriette, a poor man who, while working in a quarry in 1838, had been a victim of an explosion which almost entirely destroyed the sight of his right eye, and so undermined

his constitution that he could never afterward work more than sufficiently to barely sustain his life, and that of a daughter. At the time of which we are speaking, when Bourriette closed his left eye, he could not distinguish a man from a bush; and it was greatly feared that the sound organ would soon be affected in a similar manner. The poor man heard of the supposedly miraculous virtues of the new spring, and he asked his daughter to bring him some of the water. "If the Holy Virgin is the author of that spring," said he, "she will restore my sight." The water was brought; raising his heart to God, and imploring the intercession of Mary, the suppliant bathed his eye, and immediately he could distinguish objects with considerable clearness; he continued the application at intervals until the following morning, when he announced to his physician, Dr. Dozous, who had attended him from the day of the accident, that his sight was perfect. The medical man, who had hitherto believed in little save human science, shrugged his shoulders, and told his patient that the diseased eye could never regain its powers; that all of the doctor's care had been extended merely in order to assuage Bourriette's pain. "But I do not say that you have cured me," cried the exultant one; "it is the Holy Virgin of the Grotto that has cured me." Dozous having persisted in his incredulity, and Bourriette having reiterated his declaration that he saw well with his right eye, the physician quietly tore a leaf from his pocket-diary, and having written a few words thereon, he handed the paper to the obstinate man, telling him to close his left eye, and to repeat what had been written. "If you do," proclaimed Dozous, "I shall believe what you have said." Bourriette looked with his right eye alone at the paper, and immediately read aloud: "Bourriette has an incurable amaurosis; he will never be cured." Then the physician announced that however he himself and his brethren of the Faculty might be displeased with the denouement, he was forced to admit that the cure was not ascribable to natural influences; and both he and Dr. Verges, a professor in the Faculty of Montpellier, so testified before the episcopal commission which afterward examined the manifestations at the grotto.

“Bourriette was not cured,” cried some of the “philosophers of the day. “Bourriette’s eye was never diseased,” exclaimed others. “Bourriette imagines that he sees with the right eye,” insisted many. “There is no such a person as Bourriette,” proclaimed a few.

During the next few interviews between the “lady” and Bernadette, there occurred nothing which the child thought proper to reveal; but on March 2, she again waited on the *curé*, and insisted that he should see to the construction of the chapel demanded by her celestial visitor. The time had come when the Abbé Peyramale could yield to his natural expansiveness of heart when talking with the maiden; but he was still governed by prudence when he replied: “I believe you now, my daughter; but it is not my province to grant your request. That concession depends on the decision of our bishop, to whom I have submitted a report of all that has happened at the grotto.” But Mgr. Laurence, the bishop of Tarbes, one of the most prudent and judicious members of the French episcopate of that day, thought, as he declared in a Pastoral published at the time, that “the hour had not arrived, when the episcopal authority should intervene in the matter”; he contented himself with the receipt of daily reports, made by witnesses of undoubted probity and of approved capability, concerning all that happened at the Massabielle Rocks, and concerning every rumored cure that took place. Bernadette bore this delay with her habitual patience and serene confidence that her “lady” would work all things well. But the civil authorities of Lourdes and its neighborhood were less calm than the prelate, and less serene than Bernadette; even the Baron Massy, Prefect of the Hautes-Pyrenees, an excellent Catholic, but whose administrative zeal seemed to lead him to a belief that, as Lasserre expresses the idea, “the part of God (in the affairs of France) was regulated by both the Orthodox Creed and the Concordat,” conceived it to be his duty to order the police and garrison of Lourdes to hold themselves prepared for any event, and to watch, by day and by night, the grotto and all its approaches. The government entered on a course of insulting suspicion, but the people continued to manifest

their interest and devotion, merely smiling at the regiment of cavalry which "preserved order"; fortunately the immense majority of the soldiers and the police were good Catholics, and the chagrin of the people was neutralized by the air of sincere respect which both police and soldiers manifested toward the grotto, and especially toward Bernadette. On March 4, at least twenty thousand persons knelt with the *voyante* as she began her customary recitation of the Rosary; and in the afternoon, five or six hundred of these were still praying, when there burst on the scene a distracted mother, carrying a dying child two years of age. Croisine Bouhohorts, to the great fright of her husband and sympathizing neighbors, had snatched the little consumptive from its dying couch, crying that she would place its emaciated frame in the hands of the Lady of the Grotto. Praying aloud to the Mother of the Afflicted, the wretched parent ascended on her knees to the miraculous spring; she stripped the babe, apparently in its last agony, of every bit of clothing; and then having made the Sign of the Cross over herself and the little body, she plunged the babe, all save its head, into the glacial water. Turning indignantly to those who cried that she was killing her infant, and who tried to lift it from the spring, she exclaimed: "Leave me! I must do what I can; the good God and the Holy Virgin will do the rest." The crowd retired a few steps, saying that the babe was already dead, and that the crazy mother should be humored. During fifteen minutes the immobile, corpse-like frame remained in its icy bed; then the mother carried it to her cottage. "You have killed him"; cried the father. "No," replied Croisine; "the Holy Virgin has cured him." So it had happened; the babe slept well that night, and in the morning he who had never walked a step was running around the cottage. Dr. Peyrus, the physician who had attended the child, and Drs. Verges and Dozous, testified to the supernatural nature of this cure, drawing attention to the length of the immersion, to the immediate effect, and to the acquisition of the power of walking, which the babe had never evinced, and which he continued to enjoy. Several other miracles occurred at this time, but we shall adduce only

that of Blaise Maumus, who was cured of an enormous wen by plunging his hand into the spring, the wen disappearing immediately; that of a widow named Crozat, who was cured of an all but absolute deafness by an application of the water; and that of a cripple named Anguste Bordes, whose crooked leg was restored to its natural form and pristine strength by the same means. In the face of all these at least presumed facts, what course was pursued by the incredulist servants of the imperial government? Lasserre replies: "The Administration, the Parquet (the prosecuting officers), the Police, did nothing; but turning aside, they deemed it prudent to not risk a public examination of facts which were notorious throughout the land. In the presence of such striking prodigies, what does this abstention signify? It shows that incredulism is prudent. Even amid its extravagancies and its passions, the spirit of party has a certain instinct of self-preservation which warns it of danger when it is on the point of falling into that danger. . . . A change of front then takes place, and a petty warfare is undertaken on a less perilous field. In the military order, such a course is proper; but in the order of ideas, similar prudence is scarcely compatible with good faith. It implies a doubt and even disquietude as to the truth of its own thesis. Nay, I must say that it indicates a suspicion that what it combats is true. . . . In spite of the many invitations extended, incredulism turned a deaf ear to everything which would procure a public debate concerning these wonderful cures. It affected a complete indifference in regard to striking phenomena which were objects of the senses, and which were notorious and easy of study; it preferred to advance theories on hallucinations—to occupy a very indistinct field, where one could declaim at his ease without being troubled by the brutality of visible, palpable, and irrefutable facts. In fine, the Supernatural offered debate; Free Investigation declined that debate, sounded a retreat, and thus proclaimed its defeat." Of course the incredulists used ridicule as an argument against the "besotted" Catholics who proclaimed their belief in miracles by their belief in the prodigies of Lourdes; and the same devotees of Free

Thought did not forget, on this occasion, their favorite weapon, brazen mendacity. Thus, the governmental journal *L'Ère Imperiale*, in its issue of March 6, asked its readers to believe that the partisans of Bernadette proclaimed that during her ecstasies a dove continually fluttered over her head; that those partisans declared that their idol had given sight to a blind child, by blowing into his eyes; that they insisted that when a certain peasant of the vale of Campan had refused to credit the assertions of the *voyante*, she changed his sins into snakes, and that the reptiles so efficaciously devoured the irreverent wretch, that not an atom of his body remained.

Since the last day of the fortnight designated by her "lady" for the visits to the Massabielle Rocks, Bernadette had gone thither several times before she again beheld the apparition. It was on March 25, the Feast of the Annunciation, that she was once more raised almost to the height of heavenly bliss, and it was then that she obtained the answer to the question which the Abbé Peyramale had told her to propound to her mysterious visitor. As soon as the "lady" had appeared, the child expressed the great desire of her heart: "Please, my Lady, do tell me your name, and who you are!" Thrice the demand was repeated, but saving an indulgent smile, no answer was vouchsafed; however, the fourth repetition was followed by a declaration which transcended the very untheological capacity of the still ill-informed mind of Bernadette. Separating her hands, which had remained joined in the attitude of prayer as they had been during all the apparitions, the "lady" allowed them to fall to her side; then raising them toward heaven, while an ineffable expression of gratitude shone on her countenance, she exclaimed: "*I am the Immaculate Conception*," and immediately disappeared. Bernadette, as we have observed, was still very imperfectly informed concerning even the essential truths of religion; she had never heard of an "Immaculate Conception"; and as she wended her way toward the house of the *cuvé*, she continually repeated the words, so that being well-fixed in her memory, they might be correctly reported to the priest. Undoubtedly the reader has

wondered why the Blessed Virgin used that peculiar phraseology, instead of one of the apparently more correct expressions: "I am the Immaculate Mary," or "I am she who was conceived without sin." The reader may possibly have suspected that the phrase ascribed to Mary might have indicated that it had originated in the still comparatively rude mind of Bernadette. If such an objection has been conceived, it must be remembered that not only such an idea as that of an Immaculate Conception was utterly foreign to the imagination of the *voyante*, but that the words of Mary admirably, and more forcibly than those ordinarily used, expressed her wonderful and unique prerogative. As Lasserre remarks: "These words sound as though Mary, if she wished to say that she is pure, would not say: 'I am pure,' but rather: 'I am purity'; as though she would not say: 'I am a virgin,' but rather, 'I am Living and Incarnate Virginity.'" On April 7, the Wednesday after Easter, when Bernadette knelt at the grotto in the presence of nearly ten thousand persons (1), she held in her hand a very long lighted candle which she rested on the ground. When the visitor appeared, and the ecstasy began, the child, in order to join her hands in suppliant adoration, slipped them up to the lighted end of the candle, holding it between her wrists, while the fingers were interlaced in the flame which was plainly seen curling around them and waving with the gentle motion of the air. She remained for fifteen minutes, according to Dr. Dozous, who took care to time this feature of her ecstasy, insensible to any pain. When the ecstasy terminated, the nearest persons seized her hand, and examined it; there was no sign of its having been burnt. Then one of the spectators, having taken the candle from her, held the flame quite near to her hand; whereupon she retreated a step, crying: "Monsieur, you are burning me," and then calmly joined the companions of her everyday life. And here we must note that although the name of "Bernadette the *voyante*" was already on many thousands

(1) In Letter No. 86, written by the Mayor of Lourdes to the Prefect, it is stated that on this occasion governmental agents had been appointed to count the number in attendance; and that it was found that there were 9,060 persons, of whom 4,238 were strangers to Lourdes.

of lips ; although she was continually visited by many of the most illustrious persons in society ; her simplicity was ever as marked as it had been when she was tending the sheep of her foster-parents. None of the children in her school enjoyed play more than Bernadette ; in fine, until the day when she donned the robe of a Sister of Charity, and was freed from the admiring persecutions of the world, that world saw nothing in her that was not child-like. Some of her remarks, however, were quaint and very much to the point. Thus, when M. de Rességnier, a counsellor-general and former deputy for the Basses-Pyrénées, brought several ladies of the *élite* to see her, and then told her that she uttered an untruth when she asserted that her " lady " addressed her in the dialect of the Pyrenees, since " the good God and the Holy Virgin do not know that miserable language." She asked : " If they do not know it, how comes it that we know it ? " When the lawyer asked her whether the Blessed Virgin was as beautiful as the ladies there present, she made a little pout of something like disdain, saying : " Ah ! the beauty of Our Lady is very different from *tout cela*." When she was asked what she would do, if the *curé* were to forbid her to go any more to the grotto, she replied that she would obey ; and when she was asked what she would do, if, after that prohibition, her " lady " should command her to go, she answered : " I would beg for permission from the *curé*."

On April 28, there occurred at Nay, in the Basses-Pyrénées, one of the most striking of the events which were then corroborating the truth of the asseverations of Bernadette. Two years previously, a boy named Henri Busquet, then thirteen years of age, had been afflicted with a violent typhoid fever. The malady left him with an abscess, as large as an ordinary fist, which covered the right side of his neck ; and the pain was at times so terrific, that he would roll on the floor in his agony. Dr. Subervielle, one of the most renowned practitioners in Southern France, had tried every known remedy in vain, when the boy insisted on being taken to the Grotto of Lourdes. It was deemed impossible for the lad to live after such a journey, and therefore he besought his father to procure for him some of the water

from the holy spring ; and when it had been brought, Henri removed his bandages, bathed the ulcer with the water, although the physicians had warned him never to use cold fluids for that purpose, and then tried to compose himself to sleep. His rest during that night was perfect ; and in the morning, he found that his pains had vanished entirely, and that a scar, which appeared like one that had been formed years before, was all that reminded him of his terrible ulcer. Occurrences such as this, and there were many of them, enraged the philosophists of the day ; and they racked their brains in order to devise some means of checking what they termed the unbridled audacity of the fanatics. Mesmerizers undertook to subject Bernadette to their influences, trusting that they might procure from her avowals of fraudulent practices ; but she proved to be insusceptible to the magnetic fluid. Traps were laid in the hope that it might be shown that the Soubirous were exploiting certain powers of their daughter for purposes of gain ; but it was notorious that the family remained as poor as they had ever been, and that they had refused to accept all donations which their many visitors had pressed upon them. Then a grand idea was conceived ; Bernadette was to be pronounced a victim of hallucination, and for that reason was to be confined in a madhouse. The imperial Prefect was induced to order an examination of the child by two physicians, each of them a determined foe of the supernatural ; but the result of the investigation was a declaration that while the girl was asthmatic, her brain had no lesions, her nerves were normal, and all her faculties were in perfect equilibrium. However, added the wise men, she *might be subject to hallucinations*. Armed with this *might*, the imperial Prefect inaugurated the Month of May in one of the most Catholic portions of France by an address to all the mayors of the Canton of Lourdes, in which, according to the official journal, *L'Ère Impériale* of May 8, "he showed how the scenes at the grotto had *compromised the good name of religion* ; and how the establishment of an oratory at the grotto had constituted an *illegality*, since the law forbids the erection of a public chapel or oratory without the previous consent of the government."

And then this zealous official announced that he had ordered the arrest of Bernadette as a "disseminator of false news," the said Bernadette to be confined for the present in the asylum in Tarbes ; and he also informed the mayors that he had ordered the removal of every object of devotion from the grotto. Afraid of the effect of this ukase on his fellow-citizens, the Mayor of Lourdes besought the imperial procurator, Dutour, to accompany him on a visit to the Abbé Peyramale, in order to enlist that influential clergyman in the cause of "legality"; but as he must have anticipated, the priest interrupted the explanations of the procurator with this indignant protest: "That child is innocent, sir; and the proof of her innocence is found in the fact that you, in spite of interrogatories of every kind, have discovered no pretext for prosecuting her." The procurator vainly adduced a number of sophisms in favor of the "legality" of the prefect's action; the *curé* protested: "This prosecution is inexcusable. As priest and as *curé-doyen* of the Canton of Lourdes, I belong to all, more especially to the weak; and if I see an armed man attacking a child, I shall defend that child, even at the risk of my life, and even though that man were the prefect, armed with an iniquitous passage of an iniquitous law. Go, sir, to Baron Massy, and tell him that his police will find me at the door of this poor family, and that his agents will trample me under their feet, before they succeed in touching a hair on the head of Bernadette! As for the dismantling of the grotto, let the prefect, if he wishes, in the name of the law and of his own piety, appropriate the objects which innumerable Catholics have dedicated to the honor of the Holy Virgin. The faithful will grieve, and will be indignant; but the prefect may rest assured that the inhabitants of these districts respect the civil authority, even when it is delirious. They say that already at Tarbes cavalry are in the saddle, awaiting the prefect's signal to charge on Lourdes. Well, let the troopers dismount; for hotheaded though my people may be, lacerated though their hearts may be, they obey my words. If the troops do not come, I answer for the tranquillity of my flock; if the soldiers show themselves, I shall not be responsible for the consequences." The mayor

reported these words to Massy, and declared that he would not act in the matter of the proposed arrest of Bernadette; that if the prefect refused to reconsider his determination, the outrage would necessarily be committed by some other person than the mayor. The prefect did reconsider his resolution, and Bernadette was not disturbed; but Jacomet, the Commissioner of Police, was ordered to despoil the grotto. Lasserre gives many interesting details of this sacrilegious operation which horrified the thousands of weeping spectators. We merely note that the woman who mercenarily loaned her cart to Jacomet for the transportation of the sacred furniture, after every other owner of carts and horses had refused to be his accomplices even for gain, fell from her hay-loft on the following day, and broke several of her ribs; that at the same time a joist crushed both feet of the man who had loaned to Jacomet a hatchet with which to demolish the railing which had been placed around the grotto. These occurrences were, of course, mere coincidences in the eyes of the philosophists; and the contrary opinion of the devout served only to impel the foes of the supernatural to adopt more subtle means for the annihilation of "superstition." On June 8, the prefect issued a decree whereby, after a declaration that he was acting only *in the interests of religion* by obviating a repetition of the *regrettable* scenes lately witnessed at the Massabielle Rocks; that it was the duty of the civil authority to safeguard the public health by a careful examination of *mineral waters*: and that finally it was well known that no person could exploit mineral waters without the previous consent of the government; he prohibited all persons from taking water from the spring at the grotto, and for the more efficacious observance of his decree he ordered that the local authorities should not allow any person to approach the grotto. But in spite of this decree; in spite of the barriers which were erected around the grotto; and in spite of the guards (very frequently, it must be admitted, devoted sons of Mary): the salutary waters continued to be drawn from the spring, and the local magistrate, one Duprat, vainly tried to put an end to the "evil" by rendering each culprit responsible not only for his or her particular fine of

five francs, but also for the fines—*en solidarité*—of all the other criminals. Not every recalcitrant, however, was dragged before this magisterial genius; if Massy, Jacomet, and their brethren knew nothing about theological *epikeia*, they realized the propriety of admitting an “exception of persons.” When the wife of Admiral Bruat, the governess of the Prince Imperial, made known her identity after her arrest, she was dismissed with profuse apologies.

By this time the philosophists had come to the conclusion that the supposition of hallucination could no longer be presented as accounting for the wonderful cures effected at Lourdes; they now suddenly opined that those cures were real indeed, but that they were purely natural effects of wondrously powerful medicinal waters. On April 28, Dr. Lary, a worthy physician of the Canton who disbelieved in the miraculous, had written to a colleague as follows concerning one of the prodigies: “This woman, Mme. Galop, had been so afflicted by rheumatism in her left hand, that she could grasp nothing with it. . . . For eight months she had neither made her bed, nor sewed a stitch; but after one trip to Lourdes, where she used the water internally and externally, she sewed with great ease, she made her bed, she drew water from the well, she washed and carried her china to the table—in fine, she used her left hand nearly as well as the right. . . . She intends to return to the grotto, and I shall see that she calls on you, so that you may be convinced of the truth of what I have said. On examination you will perceive that she has an incomplete ankylosis of the metacarpophalangeal articulation of the index-finger—the sole remnant of the olden trouble. If a reiterated use of the water of the grotto banishes this morbid condition, the disappearance will be a proof of the alkalinity of that water.” In fact, after the second visit to the grotto, Mme. Galop was entirely cured; and the letter of Dr. Lary was immediately quoted by the incredulists as having furnished the explanation of all the wonders of Lourdes. These gentry were determined to recognize nothing supernatural; anything *extra-natural* was welcome, but on no account was any credit to be given to God. They feigned to regard as of no value the reflections of the

“ fanatics ” on the fact that this presumed “ medicinal ” water had been discovered by Bernadette while she was in a state of ecstasy superinduced by her celestial visions (real or false), and that the discovery seemed to prove the heavenly origin of the apparition. They laughed at the assertion that Bernadette discovered the spring while she obeyed the supernatural injunction (real or imaginary) to go and drink at that spot where water had never flowed. Great was their glee when the chemist of the Administration, Latour de Trie, after an analysis of the water, declared that “ its constituent substances showed that *perhaps* medical science would in time perceive that the spring possessed special curative power ” (1); but it was rather unfortunate for the *éclat* of the fancied triumph of the prefect, that he had forgotten to warn his official journal of the imminent triumph of chemistry over superstition, and that because of that neglect, on the very day when Latour de Trie submitted his report, May 6, the zeal of *L'Ere Imperiale* led it to qualify as mere “ dirty water ” that which the governmental chemist was lauding as probably beneficent : “ It goes without saying that the famous grotto floods our Department with miracles ; at every turn in the fields you hear people talking about the thousands of cures which have followed the use of this *eau malpropre*. Very soon physicians will have lost their occupation ; all rheumatics and consumptives will have disappeared from the Department.” The governmental chemist could have afforded a pitying smile to the unscientific journalist ; but his own report appeared unsatisfactory to many who considered the variety and suddenness of so many of the operated cures. And a chemist of some repute, Thomas Pujo, soon followed by many others, even insisted that the analysis effected by himself had demonstrated that the water in

(1) We submit the result of the official chemical examination : “ The water of the grotto of Lourdes is very limpid, inodorous, and with no pronounced taste. Its specific gravity is very near that of distilled water ; its temperature at the spring is 15° centigrade. Its constituents : I. Chlorides of soda, calx, and magnesia ; abundant. II. Carbonates of calx and magnesia. III. Silicates of calx and alumina. IV. Oxide of iron. V. Sulphate of soda and carbonate of soda. VI. Traces of Phosphate. VII. Organic matter : ulmine. In the composition of this water there is a complete absence of sulphate of calx or selenite ; and this quality, very remarkable, is to its advantage, forcing us to conclude that it aids digestion and gives to the animal economy a disposition which benefits the equilibrium of the vital action. We run no risk in saying that,” etc., as above.

question was the ordinary article, utterly destitute of any special therapeutic value. Much was written on both sides of the dispute; and finally, without consulting the prefect, the Municipal Council of Lourdes requested one of the most illustrious chemists of the century, Prof. Filhol, of the Faculty of Toulouse, to analyze the water. This task was imposed on M. Filhol on June 3, the day on which Bernadette received her Sacramental Lord for the first time; and on Aug. 7, the professor submitted the result of his investigations to the mayor of Lourdes—an analysis which completely nullified the conclusions of M. Latour de Trie. “This analysis shows that the water from the grotto of Lourdes has the constituents of all the drinkable waters which are found in mountains where the soil is richly calcareous. As for the extraordinary effects which are said to have followed the use of this water, said effects cannot be explained, at least in the present condition of science, by the nature of the salts which analysis has found in the water. The said water contains no active substance which would be capable of endowing it with the indicated therapeutic properties” (1). It is evident, therefore, that the naturalistic theorizers had at least not proved their hypothesis to the satisfaction of all truly scientific men; that is, the incredulist foes of the supernatural had not demonstrated the presumed hallucination of the *voyante* of Lourdes by any proof of the natural therapeutic value of the water which testified, in the opinion of thousands of Catholics, to the reality of Bernadette’s visions.

On July 28, Mgr. Laurence, the bishop of Tarbes, appointed an episcopal commission for the purpose of determining the answers to four questions of consummate importance: Whether the alleged cures, operated by the drinking of

(1) Lasserre gives this report in its entirety; we shall quote merely the results of the analysis: “The water of the grotto holds in solution: I., Oxygen. II., Azote. III., Carbonic acid. IV., Carbonates of calx, magnesia, and a trace of Carbonate of iron. V., A Carbonate or an alkaline silicate of the chlorides of potassium and sodium. VI., Traces of sulphate of potassium and of soda. VII., Traces of Ammonia. VIII., Traces of Iodium. The quantitative analysis of the water, effected by the ordinary method, gave the following results in one kilogramme: Carbonic acid, 8 centigrammes; Oxygen, 5 centigr.; Azote, 12 centigr.; Ammonia, traces; Carbonate of calx, .096 milligr.; Carbonate of magnesia, .017 milligr.; Carbonate of iron, traces; Carbonate of soda, traces; Chloride of sodium, .008 milligr.; Chloride of potassium, traces; Silicate of soda and traces of Silicate of potassium, .018 milligr.; Sulphate of potassium and of soda, traces; Iodium, traces. Total, 434 milligrammes.

water from the grotto of Lourdes, or by means of bathing with said water, could be explained naturally, or whether they should be attributed to a supernatural cause; whether the presumed visions of Bernadette Soubirous were real, and whether in that case, they could be explained naturally, or should rather be regarded as impressed with a supernatural and divine character; whether the personage seen by Bernadette (if really seen) had made demands on the child, or manifested certain intentions to her; and whether the spring, now flowing in the grotto of Lourdes, existed before the presumed visions of Bernadette occurred. The commission was composed of nine canons of the Cathedral of Tarbes, the superiors of the Grand and Preparatory Seminaries, the superior of the diocesan missionaries, the *curé* of Lourdes, and the professors of dogmatic theology, moral theology, and physics, in the Grand Seminary. Scarcely had the commission been appointed, when the bishop received from M. Rouland, the imperial Minister of Worship, a letter which, coupled with the episcopal reply, will dispense us from detailing some episodes which had recently occurred at the grotto and in the neighborhood of Lourdes. The imperial director of the religious affairs of France informed the prelate that he had heard how "the affair of Lourdes was of a nature which necessarily afflicted all persons who were truly religious." He sternly condemned "the blessing of Rosaries by children, and all manifestations in which, in the front ranks, women of equivocal morals were prominent." He reprobated the "grotesque ceremonies which parodied those of true religion," because he feared, in his apostolic zeal, that "Protestant journals would take advantage of them." And he besought the bishop "to publicly condemn all similar profanations." The reply of the bishop was as follows: "Monsieur le Ministre; your communication has astonished me. I am well informed concerning everything that happens at Lourdes, and as a bishop I am deeply interested in a reprobation of whatever might injure religion or the faithful. I can assure you that the scenes mentioned by you have not been of the nature which you describe; and I can also assure you that if certain regrettable things have occurred, they have been so

transient as to leave no trace behind them. Your Excellency alludes to things which happened after the grotto was closed to the public, and in the early part of July. Then two or three children of Lourdes played the part of visionaries, and emitted certain extravagancies in public. The grotto having been closed, as I have remarked, these boys contrived to pass the barriers, and approaching the visitors who were praying on the other side, offered to take Rosaries from those visitors in order to touch the beads to the interior of the grotto, and also to deposit offerings which they appropriated to themselves. One of these children, the most remarkable for conduct which was far from edifying, was one of the choir-boys of the church of Lourdes; and the *curé* reprimanded him severely, expelled him from the catechism class, and banished him from the service of the altar. The disorder was a passing one, and the people regarded it as a boyish frolic which would cease under threats of punishment. Such are the facts which have been reported by superfluously zealous parties as permanent scandals. I would be pleased, Monsieur le Ministre, if you would derive your information concerning Lourdes from its regular inhabitants and from the child who declares that she saw the apparition, as well as from the many respectable personages who have visited the grotto—persons like the bishops of Montpellier and Soissons, the archbishop of Auch, the wife of Admiral Braut, Louis Veuillot, etc. The prudence of the clergy of the district has been admirable; they have refrained from visiting the grotto, and have even favored the measures adopted by the authorities. And nevertheless, these priests have been denounced as favorers of superstition. . . . On June 8, the Mayor of Lourdes prohibited all access to the grotto (by order of the Prefect); and the alleged reasons were based on a presumed care for the interests of religion and of the public welfare. Religion was made an excuse for this action, although the bishop had not been consulted; and nevertheless, the prelate formulated no protest. . . . Now, however, yielding to pressure from all sides, I have determined to give my attention to this matter; and accordingly I have appointed a Commission which will gather the

data necessary to enable me to come to a decision on a subject which seems to interest the whole of France." This letter produced no change in the philosophistic and tyrannous policy of Rouland; Massy and Jacomet continued to arrest those who dared to pray before the grotto, otherwise than from the opposite side of the Gave, and Duprat continued to impose his fines. But during a visit of Napoleon III. to Biarritz in September, the archbishop of Auch, Mgr. de Salinis, waited on His Majesty; and besought him, in the name of the rights of conscience, to withdraw the matter of Lourdes from the cognizance of Minister, Prefect, and Police Commissioner, and to act in accordance with his own sense of justice and of humanity. The emperor immediately wrote a dispatch to the Prefect of Tarbes, ordering him to cancel his prohibitory decree, and to permit the people to have free access to the grotto. On Oct. 5, the barriers were removed.

It would certainly interest the reader if we were to quote at some length from the lucubrations of the Liberal journalistic quidnuncs of that time, as they prognosticated concerning the probable outcome of the investigation ordered by Mgr. Laurence. Such journals as the *Siècle*, the *Journal des Débats*, the *Presse*, the *Indépendance Belge*, as well as nearly all the secular journals of England, the United States, and Germany, teemed with effusions no more honest or reasonable than an ebullition of the *Amsterdamsche Courant* in its issue of Sept. 9, with which our limits compel us to be satisfied: "A new manifestation, designed to rekindle and nourish the ardor of the faithful in the worship of the Virgin, was imminent. The deliberations of the bishops on this point resulted in the preparation of the famous miracle of Lourdes. Recently the bishop of Tarbes appointed a Commission instructed to enquire into this miracle; but the so-called conclusions of the report of this Commission were prepared long previous to its first session. Bernadette, the pretended shepherdess, is no innocent little peasant-girl; she is a very well educated and very cunning young woman of the *bourgeoisie*, who resided for many months in a cloistered nunnery where she was taught the part that she was to play. Long before

the drama was presented in public, it was rehearsed in this convent before a small number of select spirits. If ever there is a dearth of sorry dramatists in Paris, it can easily be supplied by the upper clergy. However, the Liberal press has so ridiculed this farce from beginning to end, that it is not impossible that the priests will be prudent, out of regard for their own interests." All the philosophists of the day did not confide in the "prudence" of the clergy of Lourdes; many called on the emperor to prevent the Commission from rendering any decision in the matter of the apparition. Prévoist-Paradol, who was soon to commit suicide while representing his country in Washington (1870), even dared to argue that it would be an injustice to the other religions tolerated by the State, if God were supposed to manifest a particular interest in any special religion: "It is evident," said this coryphee of Masonic enlightenment, "that by any striking manifestation in favor of one religion, the Deity openly attests its truth, its superiority over all others, and its incontestable right to govern souls. This decision, therefore, will naturally be followed by many desertions from the ranks both of dissidents and incredulists; it will be, in a word, an instrument of proselytism. . . . It will tend, to some extent, to destroy in France the proper equilibrium between the religious and the civil power. The ministers of the favored religion, the one which the prodigies will have favored, are not those whom the Concordat foresaw, organized, and regulated; they exercise another influence over the people, and in case of conflict, they will guide the people independently of Prefects and Councils of State. . . . Nothing can be done legally in France without a previous authorization of the Administration. If, as M. de Morny once well said, a stone cannot be moved or a ditch dug without the consent of the Administration, much less, without that consent, can a miracle be approved or a pilgrimage be instituted. Whoever has any acquaintance with religious affairs knows perfectly well that the administrative authority has on its side not one means, but ten; not one law, but twenty or thirty which accord to it supreme power in such matters. The sessions of the Commission of Tarbes can be prevented or

dissolved in a hundred ways by an invocation of the Concordat, of the Penal Code, of the law of 1824, of the decree of Feb., 1852, or of municipal and every other kind of authority" (1). However, the imperial government did not allow itself to be tempted to this ridiculous pretension to a legitimate competency in the premises; the emperor may have been influenced by his pious consort, or he may have appreciated these remarks of Louis Veuillot: "We do not doubt the existence of ordinances permitting the government to interfere with the sessions of the episcopal Commission; but the wisdom of the ruling powers ought to convince them that their interference would favor superstition. Governmental intervention would give free rein to popular credulity, since then the bishop would be unable to decide the matter in question" (2). When the Commission entered on its task, it found that hundreds of alleged miraculous cures awaited its consideration. It decided that an investigation of only thirty would suffice for its purposes; and it selected those whose instantaneousness rendered them especially remarkable, carefully ignoring those which were alleged to have occurred while the subject was under medical treatment, since, as the secretary said in his report: "Although in these cases the inefficaciousness of the remedies had been sufficiently demonstrated, nevertheless, the cures could not be rigorously and exclusively ascribed to a supernatural virtue of the water of the grotto, since it had been used simultaneously with those remedies." The report of the Commission divided the investigated prodigies into three classes: In the first class were six cures which, striking though they indubitably were, could possibly be explained by the laws of nature; in the second class were nine prodigies which were deemed by the testifying physicians to present supernatural conditions, but in which those supernatural conditions were not necessarily to be acknowledged; in the third class were fifteen cases which the Commission declared to be undeniably of a supernatural character. All of these cases in the third class were of widely different maladies; nevertheless, all had yielded to

(1) Thus wrote Prévost-Paradol in the *Journal des Débats*, Sept. 3, 1858.

(2) *L'Univers*, Sept. 10, 1858.

the application of one and the same thing—a fact which is not in accordance with the natural and scientific order, since according to that order each remedy is beneficial in certain classes of maladies, but injurious in others. It cannot be said, therefore, declared the report, that it was some inherent natural property of the water of the Massabielle Rocks that produced effects not only so extraordinary, numerous, and sudden, but also diverse in their nature. In the medical report we read: “When we first examined these cases (of the third class) we were surprised by the ease, promptness, nay, instantaneousness, with which the effects had been produced; by the complete violation of all therapeutic laws in each case; by the contradictions of all the precepts and provisions of science which each case displayed; by a sort of disdain manifested in regard to the duration and deep-seatedness of disease; by a kind of hidden but real care in so arranging and combining the circumstances, as to show that in the cure it would be evident that all had been effected outside of the habitual order of nature. These phenomena are beyond the comprehension of the human mind. How indeed can we understand an opposition between the means and the grandeur of the result; between the oneness of the remedy and the diversity of the maladies; between the brief application of the curative agent and the length of the treatment prescribed by science; between the sudden efficaciousness of the first and the long futility of the second; between the chronicity of disease and the instantaneousness of the cure? Certainly there must be here a contingent force which is superior to those derived from nature, and which is consequently foreign to the water which it uses for a manifestation of its power.” To a mind ill-informed concerning the habitual attitude of the authorities of the Church in regard to matters of a reputed miraculous nature, this report might seem capable of producing in the mind of the episcopal judge a conviction that the visions of Bernadette were real, and that the prodigies effected by the water of Lourdes were true miracles. But Mgr. Laurence demanded further proof; he wished to be assured as to the permanency of the reputed cures; and not until Jan. 18, 1862, more than three

years after he had received the favorable report of the Commission, did he issue the much-desired approbation in an apposite Pastoral to his flock. In this document the prelate begins by reminding his people how, at intervals during the entire history of humanity, there have been marvellous communications between heaven and earth; how in the very first days of that history, God appeared to our first parents in order to rebuke them for their disobedience; how in the succeeding centuries God conversed familiarly with the Patriarchs; and how, as we read in the Old Testament, the children of Israel were often favored with celestial apparitions. And the bishop carefully notes that these divine favors could scarcely be expected to terminate with the Old Law; nay, he insists, such manifestations were naturally to be more numerous and more striking under the Law of Grace, and history attests that they were not restricted to the first days of Christianity—that ever since that period they have frequently occurred for the glory of religion and the edification of the faithful. Then the bishop narrates briefly the wonderful experiences of Bernadette, but he also reminds his flock that “the Church is wisely slow in forming a judgment concerning reputed supernatural occurrences; that she demands certain proofs of their supernaturalness, since from the date of the original fall of man, and especially in matters of this kind, humanity has ever been subject to error, yielding now to the deceptions of its own weak reason, and then to the wiles of the demon who often transforms himself into an angel of light.” We are told how the bishop had studied the manifestations at the Massabielle Rocks for nearly four years; and that his convictions had been formed not only because of the testimony of Bernadette, but because of the events which followed the apparitions, and which could have been effected only by divine interposition. And as for the testimony of the little girl herself, the prelate regards it as indubitably trustworthy. “In the first place,” he insists, “her sincerity is unquestionable. Who does not admire, if he approaches this child, her simplicity, candor, and modesty? While everybody talks about the wonders that she has seen and

heard, she remains silent ; she speaks only when she is interrogated, and then she narrates without affectation, her answers to the numerous questions being always to the point, and evidently proceeding from firm conviction. She was never influenced by threats ; she always rejected the most generous offers of assistance (whether for herself or for her family). Always consistent, she never varied in the slightest degree in her narrative, during the many interrogatories to which she was subjected. But it has been asked whether, if not herself a deceiver, Bernadette may not be a victim of hallucination ? We cannot harbor this suspicion. The wisdom of her replies reveals a rectitude, a calmness of imagination, and a good sense, which are superior to those possessed usually by children of her age. In her, religious sentiment has never been exaltedness ; she has never manifested any weakness of intellect or any mutability of views, any extravagancies of character, or any morbidness which might dispose her to freaks of imagination... But the testimony of Bernadette, so important in itself, is corroborated by the wonderful events which occurred after the first apparition ; if we may judge of a tree by its fruit, that apparition was supernatural and divine, since it produces supernatural and divine effects." In conclusion, the bishop declares : " Having invoked the Holy Name of God, and following the rule established by Pope Benedict XIV. for the discernment of true and false apparitions (1) ; having read the favorable report presented by the Commission appointed by us to consider the apparition at the Grotto of Lourdes and its consequences ; having read the testimony of the physicians whom we consulted concerning the numerous cures which have followed applications of the water from the grotto ; and considering firstly, that the fact of the apparition, whether it be regarded in reference to the child who narrated the event, or whether it be regarded in reference to the extraordinary effects which it has produced, can be explained only by a recognition of the intervention of a supernatural cause ; considering secondly, that this cause could be no other than divine, since its effects were such

(1) *Canonization of Saints*, Bk. iii., ch. 56.

perceptible results of grace as the conversion of sinners, or such derogations from the law of nature as miraculous cures—effects which could be produced only by the Author of grace and the Master of nature ; considering, finally, that our conviction is strengthened by the immense and spontaneous attendance of the faithful at the grotto—an attendance which has been continual since the first apparitions, and the purpose of which has been the receipt of favors or thanksgiving for benefits already obtained ; therefore, in order to satisfy the legitimate impatience of our clergy and people, and that of so many pious persons who have long asked us to pronounce a decision which motives of prudence compelled us to defer, and wishing also to yield to the desires of many of our colleagues in the episcopate ; and having invoked the light of the Holy Ghost and the aid of the Most Holy Virgin ; we have declared and do declare as follows : *Art. I.* We judge that the Immaculate Mary, Mother of God, on Feb. 11, 1858, and on eighteen following occasions, did really appear to Bernadette Soubirous ; that this apparition presents every characteristic of truth, and that the faithful may safely credit it. However, we humbly submit this our judgment to that of the Sovereign Pontiff, who is entrusted with the government of the Universal Church. *Art. II.* We authorize the cult of Our Lady of the Grotto of Lourdes in our diocese : but we forbid the publication of any particular formula of prayer, or of any canticle or book of devotion, referring to the apparition, without our approbation in writing. *Art. III.* In order to conform to the desire which the Holy Virgin expressed during several of her appearances—a desire that a sanctuary should be erected near the grotto, that is, on land which has recently become the property of the bishops of Tarbes : and since the steepness and other difficulties of the site will entail a need of long labor and relatively large sums of money for the construction of the edifice ; we appeal for the requisite means to the clergy and faithful of our diocese, to those of all France, and to those of all lands who are zealous for the honor of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary.”

APPENDIX.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Of the Roman Pontiffs, Rulers of Principal Nations, Principal Councils, Ecclesiastical Writers, and Sectarians.

NINETEENTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes. Date of Election.</i>	<i>Holy Roman Emperor.</i>	<i>Kings, Emperors, etc., Of France.</i>
Pius VII,	1800 Francis II, at the com-	Napoleon, abdicated in
Leo XII,	1823 mand of Napoleon in	1815, d. in 1821
Pius VIII,	1829 1806, ceased to be Ger-	Louis XVIII, d. 1824
Gregory XVI,	1831 man emp'r, and as-	Charles X, dep. 1830
Pius IX,	1846 sumed the title of emp'r	Louis Philippe, abd. in
Leo XIII,	1878 of Austria as Francis I.	1848, making way for
		Second Republic, which
		was followed by the
		Second Empire in 1852
		Napoleon III, emperor, ab-
		dicated in 1870, and was
		succeeded by the
		Third Republic.
<i>Kings of England. Date of Death.</i>	<i>Emperors of Austria. Date of Death.</i>	<i>Kings of Spain. Date of Death.</i>
George III, supplanted by	Francis I, 1835	Charles IV, abdicated in
a regency in 1800, and	Ferdinand I, abdicated in	1808, d. in 1819
d. in 1820	1848, in favor of	Ferdinand VII, 1833
George IV, 1830	Francis Joseph, now	Regency of Christina un-
William IV, 1837	reigning	til 1841, followed by
Victoria, now reigning		that of Espartero until
		1843 when Queen Isa-
		bella II. was declared of
		age.
		Isabella II. abdicated in 1870
		Alfonso XII, 1885
		Regency of Maria Chris-
		tina, in the name of
		Alfonso XIII, who may
		reign in 1903
<i>Czars of Russia. Date of Death.</i>	<i>Kings of Prussia. Date of Death.</i>	<i>German Emperors. Date of Death.</i>
Paul I, 1801	Fred. Wm. III, 1840	William I, 1888
Alexander I, 1825	Fred. Wm. IV, 1861	Frederick III, 1888
Nicholas I, 1855	William I, became Ger-	William II, now reigning
Alexander II, 1881	man emp'r in 1870	
Alexander III, 1894		
Nicholas II, now reigning		

Ecclesiastical Writers: Picot, Joseph de Maistre, Cardinal Maury, Barmel, Frayssinous, Bausset, Lamennais, Boyer, Carrière, Gosselin, Gousset, Parisis, Guéranger, Lacordaire, Cardinal Pie, Ségur, Pitra, Perrone, Patrizzi, Tosti, Audisio, Curei, Ventura, Rosmini, Passaglia, Balmes, Lingard, Milner, Cardinal Wiseman, Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Moran, Gasquet, Moehler, Theiner, Hefele, Cardinal Herzenroether, Hurter.

Councils: The Council of the Vatican (Nineteenth General). About 200 others.

Sectarians: Anti-Concordatarians, Ronge, Vintras, Traditionalists, Socialists, Naturalists, Satanists, Freemasons, Spiritualists, Mormons, "Old Catholics."

SUPPLEMENT.

CHAPTER I.

THE IDENTITY OF THE THREE MAGI OR WISE MEN OF THE EAST. *

Such of our readers as are of Italian or German origin, or who have resided for any length of time in Italy or in the Catholic portions of Germany, must have been impressed by the devotion exhibited in those regions toward the Wise Men of the East,—those favored persons who came from among the Gentiles to adore the Expected of Nations, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, having been notified of His advent by the appearance of a new star, which their wisdom had taught them to regard as a sign that God was about to work some prodigy in favor of fallen man. The devotion to the Three Kings, or Magi, is more prevalent in Italy and Germany than in other regions of the Western Patriarchate; but every Catholic student will welcome a few reflections on the condition of life, nationality, etc., of those Gentiles who were the first of their kind to adore the God-Man, and who, therefore, were our first ancestors in the Christian faith. We sometimes speak of these holy men as the Three Kings; but we generally denote them by the term “Magi” or “Wise Men.” Now, the question arises whether these persons were really magicians, as the term “Magi” would seem to indicate. That up to the time of their extraordinary vocation (for as such we may designate it) they had been veritable sorcerers, was believed by St. Justin Martyr, Origen, St. Basil, and St. Jerome. But that they were merely astronomers—or, as more modern men would say, scientists,—was held by such excellent judges as St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and Pope St. Leo I. We know that the word *magus* was commonly used in the East when men spoke of any very learned man or philosopher; and hence Baronio, Maldonado, Calmet, Gotti, and nearly all modern Catholic biblicists reject the idea that the Three Kings had ever been guilty of the crime of sorcery or incantation (1).

* This chapter appeared in THE AVE MARIA, Vol. XLII.

(1) That the word *magus* was used by the ancients to signify a philosopher is clear from Cicero, in his treatise *On Divination*, Bk. i., ch. 23.

It may be asked, secondly, whether the Magi were really kings in our sense of the term. Calvin and Beza denied the royalty of the Wise Men; and several Catholic critics—*e. g.*, Tillemont, Baillet, and Serry—have held the same opinion. It is difficult, however, to resist the arguments of the generality of Catholic critics, led by such authorities as Baronio, Sponde, Maldonado, Sandini, Onorato di Santa Maria, and Gotti. It is not necessary to suppose that the Wise Men were great monarchs, or even kings in the ordinary sense of the latter designation. Every Scriptural scholar knows that Holy Writ frequently applies the term “king” to the ruler even of an insignificant village; and the classical student is aware that the Latin word *rex* is merely the correlative of *regere*—“to rule.” We need cite only a few Scriptural passages in defence of the position held by most Catholic polemics in the premises. In *Isaiah*, ch. 49, we read: “Kings shall see, and princes shall rise up and adore for the Lord’s sake.” The entire context of this chapter indicates that the prophet is treating of God’s summons to the Gentiles to adore His Incarnate Son; and therefore exegetists unhesitatingly apply it to the adoration of the Magi. The same must be said of ch. 60, v. 3: “And the Gentiles shall walk in Thy light, and kings in the brightness of Thy rising”; as well as of Psalm 71, verse 10: “The kings of the Arabians and of Saba shall bring gifts.” Many of the Fathers of the Church testify to the royalty of the Wise Men. Thus Tertullian tells us: “Nearly all the East and Damascus had kings for their magi” (1). St. Ambrose says: “The Magi are said to have been kings” (2). About A. D. 310 the poet Juvenecus wrote: “These lords were called Magi; and they were accustomed to note carefully the rising and the course of the stars. The said lords made a long journey to Jerusalem, and went before their King” (3). And Claudius Mamertus says: “The Chaldean kings brought their gifts to

(1) *Against the Jews*, ch. 9.

(2) In *Homily on the Epiphany*.

(3) “*Astrorum solers ortusque obitusque notare,
Hujus primores nomen tenere Magorum.
Hinc lecti proceres Solymas per longa viarum
Deveniunt, Regemque adeunt.*”

Thee : myrrh to Thee as man, gold to Thee as king, and incense to Thee as God " (1).

Those who contend that the Wise Men were not kings rely upon the silence of St. Matthew as to their royal condition ; and this objection seems to gather force when we notice that St. John is careful to note that one of the beneficiaries of Our Lord was the son of a certain ruler—*regulus* (petty king). But if St. Matthew does not mention the regal dignity of the Wise Men, he says nothing which would contradict it ; and we may hold with Melchior Canus that it was eminently proper for the Evangelist, wishing to obtain credit among the Gentiles for his narrative, to lay stress upon the intellectual calibre of the Magi, rather than upon their more adventitious splendor (2). Again, it is certain that the condoling friends of Job were kings or rulers ; but the sacred text in *Tobias* does not so term them. It is urged, secondly, that Herod treated the Wise Men not as equals, but as inferiors. In the supposition that they were kings, how are we to account for the monarch's brusqueness in telling them to go after accurate information as to the whereabouts of the Divine Babe ? To this objection it is not necessary to reply with Canus that Herod simply displayed an innate ruffianliness on this occasion. The more natural answer is implied in the belief that the Magi were really petty kings or rulers, and therefore of dignity inferior to that of Herod. And we must not necessarily discern an arrogant command in the words of the monarch. They are easily interpreted as : " Do you find this Messiah. That accomplished, I also will go and adore him." A third objection is made by heterodox writers, alleging that it was only in the eleventh century that Theophylactus, the first to style the Magi kings, flourished. The futility of this difficulty is shown by the testimonies of Tertullian, St. Ambrose, Claudius Mamertus, and Juvenius, which we have already given ; and the reader will find additional evidence in the writings of St. Cæsarius and many other Fathers of the Church.

(1) " *Dant Tibi Chaldæi prænuntia munera reges ;
Myrrham homo, rex aurum, suscipe thura Deus.*"

(2) *Theological Sources*, Bk. ii., ch. 5.

Ecclesiastical writers are not accordant in their views as to the nationality of the Magi. Some think that they were Chaldeans ; others describe them as coming from Arabia Felix ; while many assign either Ethiopia, Mesopotamia or India as their country. The most common opinion is that they journeyed from Arabia Felix ; and certainly, if we reflect that Saba is a part of Arabia, we shall find a basis for that view in the words of the royal psalmist : "The kings of the Arabians and of Saba shall bring gifts." Again, this opinion is strengthened by Tertullian (1) and by St. Justin Martyr (2) ; for both expressly pronounce it. Finally, the gifts tendered by the Magi, especially the myrrh and incense, were such as an Arab would deem most appropriate. But it is urged that the Magi, or Wise Men, were a monopoly of the Chaldeans. This is not correct ; for we read that Job and his friends were good philosophers. And St. Cyril of Alexandria informs us that Pythagoras and Porphyrius went for their studies to Chaldea and to Arabia (3). There is no strength in the allegation that the olden pictures and medals represent the Magi as of different complexions, and therefore as of diverse nationalities. In the first place, the adduced fact is not universal. In the picture given by Papebroch, copied from very ancient rituals, all three kings are shown as white men. Secondly, we know that artists often, and sometimes righteously, insist on great latitude in regard to the observance of historical exactness in their compositions. Now, a diversity of costume in the component figures of a picture adds greatly to its attractiveness ; and how much more impressiveness is obtained by the introduction of various facial characteristics ! Finally, why should we conclude from the black visage of one of the Magi, even though it occupied a legitimate place in the picture, that all three of the adorers did not come from Arabia ? Were there no negro tribes in Arabia ?

A very interesting question is raised concerning the time when the Magi appeared before the Infant Jesus. Eusebius says that the event occurred two years after the divine

(1) *Loc. cit.*(2) *Against Trypho.*(3) *Against Julian*, Bk. x.

birth (1); and St. Epiphanius contends for the same view (2). Then the celebrated authors of the Bollandist *Lives of the Saints* placed the advent of the Wise Men precisely on the first anniversary of the birth. They hold also that the guiding Star of the Magi had appeared twenty-one months before what they regarded as the first Epiphany,—*i. e.*, it is said to have been created on the day when Our Lady gave her consent to the Incarnation of the Word in her own bosom (3). And there is still another theory as to the date of this event. Tillemont, Calmet, Dupin, and Baillet regard it as having occurred a little before or a little after the Purification of the Blessed Mother. However, there are excellent arguments which seem to evince clearly that the correct date of the first Epiphany was the 6th of January, the thirteenth day after the Nativity of Christ. Firstly, St. Matthew narrates that the Magi found Our Lady and the Blessed Child in Bethlehem; but if they had arrived in Bethlehem one or two years after the birth of Jesus, they would not have found the Holy Family in that village. When the days of her Purification were completed, Mary, accompanied by St. Joseph, took her Divine Babe to Jerusalem, and thence to Nazareth (4). Secondly, the authority of St. Justin Martyr and St. Jerome is of great weight, especially in this case. The former says: “Mary bore Christ, and placed him in the Manger, where the Magi, having come from Arabia, found Him” (5). And St. Jerome writes: “Behold the great Lord of the earth born in this little nook of the earth! Here He was seen by the Shepherds; here he was adored by the Magi” (6). Are we to suppose that the Holy Family inhabited that stable for a year or two? Thirdly, St. Matthew seems to indicate that the adoration of the Magi occurred immediately after our Saviour’s birth; for he says: “When Jesus was born . . . behold, there came Wise Men,” etc. This use of the word “behold” in the circumstances shows that the Magi arrived very soon after the glorious

(1) *Chronicle*.(2) *Heresies*, Nos. 30 and 31.

(3) Zaccaria observes that Papebroch, after having assigned the day of the Annunciation as the date of the first appearance of the Star, anticipates that date by making it concordant with the day of the conception of St. John the Baptist.

(4) *St. Luke*, ch. 2.(5) *To Marcella*.(6) *Loc. cit.*

event; for such is its meaning in most Biblical passages where we find it. Fourthly, in the Bollandist supposition, the Star ought to be styled the Star of the Baptist rather than "His Star," as the Magi termed it. Fifthly, it seems certain that Herod died three months after the nativity of Christ, and therefore the Bollandist theory is untenable.

CHAPTER II.

THE LEGEND OF THE WANDERING JEW.*

Few legends are so pathetic, none more weird, than that which we now present for the consideration of the student. Poems of merit and entrancing novels have been based upon it; but the genius who will do it justice has yet to appear. If it should ever be taken in hand by a thoroughly Christian writer, one who also possesses an accurate knowledge of ecclesiastical as well as of profane history, who is capable of constructing dramatic scenes in both telling and simple form, and who is endowed with Heaven's choicest gift to a knight of the pen—true poetic fire, then men will enjoy a production which will be worthy of its subject, and which will not be ephemeral. The apposite poems of Schubert and A. W. Schlegel are fairly interesting; but no higher praise can be accorded to them. They lose sight of the main point of the legend, when they represent the accursed of God as receiving the boon of death. Goethe had designed to compose an epic in which he would trace the travels of Ahasuerus, and would make of him an experienced guide through the regions of profane history and into the mazes of the history of religion. But the world has lost little by Goethe's abandonment of his project; for little could have been effected in the premises by one who believed, or, what is worse, affected to believe, that "beautiful and healthy nature needs no morals nor natural law nor political metaphysics; and one may add that she needs to take no account of a Deity or of an immortality of the soul" (1).

* This dissertation appeared in the *Ave Maria*, Vol. xxxix.

(1) In a letter to Goethe, his friend Schiller, once a Protestant but then an atheist, said of these views of the master: "You are right."

The first European author to speak of the legend of the Wandering Jew was the very unreliable English chronicler Matthew Paris (often incorrectly designated as Matthew of Paris), who, writing in the thirteenth century, tells us that there arrived in England in 1229 an Armenian archbishop, who gave to the islanders much interesting information concerning the Orient. When asked as to whether he knew anything about a certain "Joseph" of whom many strange reports had reached Britain—for instance, that said Joseph had been among the living at the time of the Saviour, and had talked with Him,—the prelate replied that he had conversed with Joseph, and that what was narrated concerning the mysterious man was indubitably true. Then, continues Matthew Paris, the dragoman of the archbishop entered into some details about Joseph. This strange being had dined with the prelate, and during the repast had given a minute account of his life. According to his own words, he had been a janitor at the time of the Passion, and was called Calphurnius. He was standing at the door of his house when Jesus, after His condemnation, was led along the street. As Our Lord paused a little, Calphurnius struck the Divine Victim on the back, crying: "Walk on, Jesus; walk on!" The Saviour gazed mournfully at the miserable man, and said: "I shall walk on, but thou shalt remain until I return." In time Calphurnius was baptized by Ananias, taking the name of Joseph, and thenceforth he was a homeless wanderer over the earth. Once in every century, said the dragoman, Joseph falls into sickness, and becomes rejuvenated, always appearing at the time of recuperation to be thirty years old, his age when he insulted Our Lord. The next mention of the Wandering Jew is in the chronicles of the sixteenth century. According to Dudukeus (1), the records of that period represent the unfortunate as appearing in Hamburg in 1547. He was very tall and emaciated, and in the rags of a beggar. He told several persons that when Jesus, wishing to rest at his doorway when on the road to Calvary, paused for a moment, he struck his Lord,

(1) *History of a Jew Who, by a Strange Fatality, Has Wandered Since the Time of Our Lord Jesus Christ!*. Hamburg, 1634.

and then heard those fearful words: "I would have rested here; but thou shalt walk until I return." The involuntary pilgrim was once accosted by Paul Eizen, afterward bishop of Schleswig, while he was praying in a church at Hamburg in 1564; and then he called himself Ahasuerus, and seemed to be about fifty years old (1). Boulenger says that Ahasuerus was also known as Gregory and as Buttadeus (2). Duduleus states that he was seen in Naumburg shortly after his appearance in Hamburg; and that he never sat down, being forced to a continuous walk. The same writer naïvely remarks that Ahasuerus made considerable money by the recital of his experiences. In 1616 his history and portrait could be bought in Tournay. He is said to have appeared in England in the early part of the eighteenth century. Colerus, a lawyer of Lubeck, says that the wanderer displayed, so far as men could judge, an intimate knowledge of every circumstance of the careers of the various Apostles; and that the most learned professors, with whom he frequently discoursed, were astounded at his apparently thorough acquaintance with the events, trivial as well as great, of the past centuries of the Christian era. In vain did they devise cunning traps in order that he might be compelled to admit that he was an impostor (3). He next appeared on the Matterhorn and in France and Hungary. The narrative of the interview between Eizen and Ahasuerus is so interesting, that the reader will be pleased with a brief synopsis (4). The alleged wanderer said that he belonged to the Tribe of Nephthali; that his father was a carpenter, and his mother a seamstress, employed at the Temple of Jerusalem in embroidering the vestments of the Levites. He was born in the year of the world 3962. His father trained him in a knowledge of the Mosaic Law, and taught him many wonderful historical facts, which were all narrated in an immense parchment volume which he had inherited from his

(1) HEDECK; *Story of a Pilgrim Called Ahasuerus, a Jew Who Lived at the Time of the Crucifixion of Christ, and Who is Said to Still Wander.* Hamburg, 1681.

(2) *History of His Times.* Paris, 1628.

(3) See CALMET; *Biblical Dictionary*, Vol. viii. Paris, 1721.

(4) THULO; *History of the Wandering Jew.* Wittenberg, 1668.—SCHULTZ; *Dissertation on the Immortal Jew.* Kottsborg, 1668.—ANTON; *Dissertation in Which the Flimsy Fable of the Immortal Jew Is Investigated.* Helmstadt, 1756.

ancestors. One of these not generally known facts concerned the death of Adam. When our first parent felt that he was about to die, he sent Seth to the entrance of the Garden of Eden, where the Angel Gabriel stood on guard with a flaming sword. Seth was to beg the Angel to allow Adam to look once more upon Eden. The boy made the request in vain; but when he was about to depart Gabriel handed him three seeds of the Tree of Life, telling him that when his father was dead he should place them upon his tongue, and then bury the body. So it was done; and over the grave of Adam soon appeared three beautiful trees, from one of which Moses took the rod with which he worked such prodigies. In time these trees were transplanted to Jerusalem, and as a boy Ahasuerus had often played in their shade. It was from their wood that the cross of Christ was made. The reader should know that among the many beautifully ingenious fancies invented by the vivacious faith of the Middle Age was that of our Saviour dying on a cross made from the seed of that tree which was so fatal to the human race,—from a seed which had matured out of the dust of the mortal frames of our first progenitors. The idea was carried even further, our ancestors imagining that the cross was erected over the grave of Adam and Eve, so that the Sacred Blood drenched it, and, as it were, vivified the ashes therein contained. As Ahasuerus continued his tale, his hearers were made acquainted with many details of the mortal life of the Son of God; details which in great part he probably took from the apocryphal Gospels—documents which, though not inspired, are by no means to be utterly despised by the historian. According to his story, when Ahasuerus was nine years old his father told him that he had just heard of the arrival of three kings from the Orient, who were seeking for some royal Babe just born, whom they wished to adore. The boy went to see the kings, followed them to the Manger, and witnessed their adoration of Jesus. The flight of the Holy Family into Egypt is graphically described. While on their journey they were once captured by robbers and led to a cave. They were on the point of being despoiled of what little property they had, when the Divine Babe smiled

so sweetly on the evil men that their hearts were touched, and the leader told the travellers to go in peace. But before they departed the leader's wife took the little Jesus and bathed His sacred limbs ; then when she had performed the same office for her own child, who had dropsy, she found the little one suddenly cured. The captain spoke to the Infant Jesus, saying that he felt that He was more than man, and he begged Him to pity his miserable life. That robber, said Ahasuerus, was afterward the Penitent Thief of Calvary. Many other interesting incidents of the sojourn in Egypt were narrated ; and if the reader has opportunity to consult one of the cited works, his curiosity will be well repaid.

When Ahasuerus came to speak of the Passion of Christ, his hearers trembled with excitement. He gave quite a minute account of Judas, saying that the wretch had been a thief and a murderer before he followed our Saviour. "I was standing at my door," said Ahasuerus, "when the crowd which accompanied Jesus to Calvary approached. I lifted up my child, that he might have a good look at the Victim. When Jesus, staggering under the great weight of the cross, had arrived in front of us, he stopped as though He would like to rest. 'Away with you from my door!' cried I. 'No ribald shall rest here.' Then Jesus directed a sorrowful glance upon me and said : 'I go, and shall find repose ; but thou shalt travel and find no rest. Thou shalt walk while the world is the world ; and then thou shalt behold Me on My throne at the right hand of My Father, when I judge the twelve tribes of Israel who are now about to crucify Me.' I put away my boy and followed Jesus. The first person whom I met was Veronica, who was just approaching to wipe the perspiration from Christ's holy face. As you know, the imprint of His features was fixed upon the towel. Then I saw Mary and other weeping women. A workman was carrying a hammer and some nails very near to us, and I seized one of the nails, and thrusting it directly under the eyes of the Mother of Jesus, I gloatingly cried : 'Look, woman ! This is one of the nails which will fasten thy Son to the cross.' Then came the crucifixion." Ahasuerus narrated its details, and described the convulsions of nature sympathizing with its outraged

God. When Christ had expired "Longinus pierced His side with a lance, and the Sacred Blood flowed to the ground, was soaked in, and bathed the ashes of Adam and Eve, who were there buried." Ahasuerus now cast a mournful look on Jerusalem and began his travels. "I knew not whither I was going; I crossed high mountains, and could not pause. Even now, gentlemen, while I am talking to you, I feel as though I were standing on hot coals. If, by chance, I sit down for a moment, my legs seem to be moving." He tells how he journeyed for an entire century before he saw Jerusalem again; how he yearned for death, for all relatives, friends, and even acquaintances were gone. He soon started again on his mournful journey, and ere long he began a series of attempts to lose his life. He fought in many battles, receiving thousands of apparently deadly strokes; but he could not even be wounded, for "his body was hard as a rock and impenetrable by mortal weapon." Many a time he suffered shipwreck, but he could not drown: "he walked on the waves or floated like a feather." He sometimes ate, but he needed no food. He never had serious illness. When Ahasuerus arose to depart, Eizen offered him money, but he refused it as something to him entirely superfluous. He needed no food, he insisted; and as for shoes and clothes, they never wore out. That many persons, during the course of the Christian era, have claimed to be this mysterious individual is as certain as any fact of history; but few of the claimants seem to have so favorably impressed men with an idea of their veracity as did this Ahasuerus of Wittenberg. One account says that the bishop of Schleswig was preaching, by invitation of Eizen, afterward his successor in the cathedral of Wittenberg, when he observed beneath the pulpit an old white-bearded man, who struck his breast and groaned painfully whenever the name of our Saviour was mentioned. The good prelate, thinking that the poor man might be in sore need of spiritual succor, sent a servant to invite him into the episcopal residence after the service. For a long time the stranger refused to give any account of himself, but finally he was influenced by the cordiality of the host: and joining the company at dinner, he manifested his identity.

In 1602 there was issued at Leipsic a popular history of the Wandering Jew (1), in which it was declared that this Ahasuerus led the Magi to Bethlehem, that he was well acquainted with St. John the Baptist, that he had talked with Judas, and that he had helped to make the cross on which Our Lord was nailed. Quite naturally, among the writers who speak of this Ahasuerus or Calphurnius there is a great diversity of opinion as to the genuineness of his claims. Matthew Paris entertains no doubt of his veracity. Duduleus, Hedeck, and others of the seventeenth century, show some hesitancy. Bartholin thinks that the presumed Jew may have been an emissary of Satan. Boulenger dismisses the legend with: "*Credat Judæus Apella: non ego!*" It is noteworthy that most of the consideration accorded to this legend has been given by very incredulous parties—namely, German Protestants; and that the wanderer is said to have manifested himself in Teutonic lands in every instance but two. But long before European imaginations began to be affected by this weird and improbable tale, it had circulated widely in the East. According to Herbelot, the Arabs of the seventh century were wont to narrate how, in the sixteenth year of the Hegira, one of their princes, Fadhil by name, having penetrated into a lonely valley to perform his devotions, heard each one of his prayers repeated by some invisible personage. He exclaimed: "If thou who repeatest my prayers art an angel, may the favor of Allah remain with thee! But if thou art from the Evil One, I want nothing to do with thee! And if thou art a man, show thyself." Then there came forth a venerable, bald-headed man, who appeared to be a dervish, and who leaned heavily upon a staff. Addressing Fadhil, this personage said: "I am Zerib, son of the Prophet Elias. Jesus Christ ordered me to remain in this life until His second coming. Even since that day I have been waiting for the Lord, the Source of every good." We must here note that this phrase would indicate that the legend was not of Mohammedan manufacture; for no good Islamite could give to Jesus a title which belongs only to God, since, according to

(1) *Wonderful Story of a Jew Born in Jerusalem, and Called Ahasuerus, Who Pretended to Have Been Present at the Crucifixion of Christ. First Printed in Leyden.*

his faith, Jesus and His Apostles, like Abraham, were good Moslems,—that is, children of Islam—the religion of trust in God. Jesus, according to Mohammed, was the first among the prophets, and he (Mohammed) continued His work. Jesus is to come again upon earth, says the Koran; and therein the apparition talks like an Islamite, but none save a Christian would term Jesus the Source of all good. Probably the Arabs derived the legend from Eastern Christians. Prince Fadhil is said to have asked when Jesus would come again upon earth, and Zerib replied: “When men and women shall live promiscuously, without distinction of sex; when abundance of food does not prevent famine; when the blood of innocents shall be shed; when the poor beg and receive no alms; when mercy shall have vanished from the earth; when the Sacred Scriptures shall be set to music; when the temples of the One and True God shall be filled with idols.” If any of our readers credit this legend, they will probably find in the prophecy of Zerib an indication that the days of Antichrist are already upon us. At any rate, the Arabs found in the prediction a description of the time when the Last Judgment would be imminent. It is strange, however, that gross as Mohammedan ignorance was then, and has ever been, it was not perceived that the story of Zerib asserted an anachronism in its assignment of a son of Elias to the time of Christ. But such was the legend of the Wandering Jew as it was credited in the East twelve centuries ago. That the story was accepted by many Christians as well founded in its essential features, is not at all surprising; for probably it was regarded, when it first originated, as a mere allegory, illustrative of the condition of the Jewish people since their final dispersion—scattered over the earth, deprived of their national existence, and immovably obstinate in their rejection of Christianity. In Joseph, Alasuerus and Zerib was recognized the Jewish race, bearing the consequences of their self-imprecation: “His Blood be upon us and upon our children!” Destined to subsist, as testimonies to Christ and His Church, until time is no more, the Jews, according to some Fathers, are to be reconciled with God at the end of the world. Alasuerus, therefore, was represented as ex-

pecting the end of his punishment to arrive when Jesus would ascend His judgment throne. To us, and probably to most Christians, the most interesting point to be debated in this legend is the implication that the Jewish people, as the end of the world approaches, will recognize Jesus as their Messiah and their God.

CHAPTER III.

THE ALLEGED IDOLATRY OF POPE ST. MARCELLINUS.

Writing to the Emperor Michael in the year 865, Pope Nicholas I. said : " In the reign of the sovereigns Diocletian and Maximian, Marcellinus, Bishop of the city of Rome, who afterward became an illustrious martyr, was so persecuted by the Pagans that he entered one of their temples, and there offered incense. Because of this act, an inquiry was held by a number of bishops in Council, and the Pontiff confessed his fall." Platina amplifies the reputed fact with these details : " When Pope Marcellinus was threatened by the executioners, he yielded to fear, offered incense to the idols, and adored them. But when, soon afterward, a Council of 180 bishops met in Sinuessa, a city of Terra di Lavoro, Marcellinus appeared in the assembly clothed in sackcloth, and begged the synodals to impose upon him a penance, because of his infidelity. But no member of the Council dared to condemn him, all declaring that St. Peter had sinned similarly, and had merited pardon by his tears " (1). Belarmine admits the sin of St. Marcellinus, and the demand for pardon at Sinuessa, contenting himself with a refutation of the conclusions drawn by heretics from the presumed fact (2). And also Baronio, although he had been the first to question the genuineness of the *Acts of Sinuessa*, and consequently the truth of the charge against St. Marcellinus, thought that he served the cause of historical truth when, in his second edition, he said of the arguments which militated for the innocence of the Pontiff : " Although they

(1) *Lives of the Pontiffs*. Venice, 1674.

(2) *Roman Pontiff*, Bk. II., ch. 36 ; iv., 6 and 8.

appear to be weighty, we do not find them sufficiently strong to demonstrate the entire falsity of the *Acts*." And strange to say, even the Bollandists, although they afterward changed their opinion (1), at one time averred the weakness of the Pontiff (2). When such Catholic authorities as these encouraged them, it is not strange that the rank and file of Protestant polemics, beginning with the Centuriators of Magdeburg, exultantly proclaimed the idolatry of St. Marcellinus, especially as they regarded the alleged fall as an argument against Papal Infallibility; being unaware, or perhaps feigning not to know, that this special prerogative of the Roman See does not imply any personal impeccability on the part of the Pontiff. However, one of the most eminent of these Protestant polemics, Samuel Basnage, having perceived that the guilt of St. Marcellinus could be evinced only by an acceptance of the *Acts of Sinuessa* as genuine, was constrained by a fear of the teachings of those *Acts* to denounce the incriminating story as a mere fable. The presumed *Acts* had declared that "The first See can be judged by no one"—a doctrine which the zealous Protestant recognized as much more to be feared by the children of the Reformation than an unwilling admission of the innocence of the accused Pontiff; therefore he reluctantly avowed: "The story is a fable; the *Acts of Sinuessa* are also fabulous" (3).

Among Catholic authors who have combatted the genuineness of the *Acts of Sinuessa*, and who therefore have denied the idolatry of St. Marcellinus, the first place must be accorded to the illustrious Gallican historian, Noel Alexandre, whose natural predilections could not prevent him from discerning the contradictions and absurdities presented in the *Acts of Sinuessa*. That other eminent coryphæe of Gallicanism, Claude Fleury, is silent in the matter; therefore as it was the interest of his school to make known every instance of Pontifical weakness, we may conclude that this historian also discredited the melancholy story. Amat de Graveson deems the tale "a badly constructed fable" (4).

(1) When treating of the month of May.

(2) At April 26.

(3) *Politico-Ecclesiastical Annals*. Amsterdam, 1692.

(4) *Ecclesiastical History*, Dialogue ii. on Cent. V. Venice, 1761.

Cardinal Noris (1), Francis Anthony Zaccaria (2), Cardinal Orsi (3), and Audisio (4), find that it does not stand the test of historical criticism. Why the more recent Catholic historians, Palma and Alzog, should have ignored the question is incomprehensible; but a still later Catholic scholar of eminence, the late Cardinal Galimberti, while he was filling the chair of Ecclesiastical History in the Urban College of the Propaganda, published an exhaustive monogram in which he may be said to have pronounced the last word in defence of Pope Marcellinus (5), clearly evincing that throughout the whole of his career the Pontiff was *integer vite, scelerisque purus*. Certainly none of the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries have any words of condemnation for this saint; whereas, on the contrary, Theodoret (386-457) expressly qualifies him as "one who was illustrious under persecution—*eum qui persecutionis tempore inclaruit*" (6). Are we to suppose that Theodoret would have assigned fidelity under persecution as a characteristic of a pontificate which had unfaithfulness for its most striking feature? And how is it that no contemporary or quasi-contemporary of our Pontiff even alludes to an event which, from its very nature, was of transcendent interest to Christendom, if it had really happened? Not a word of this accusation was heard until the Donatists, like all heretics, wishing to debase the authority which had stricken them with anathema, declared that Pope Melchiades was not to be obeyed, because he had received Orders from the Pope Marcellinus "who had fallen into idolatry." To this calumny St. Augustine replied: "What necessity is there for refuting the incredible calumnies which he (Petilianus) urges against the bishops of the Roman See? He charges that Marcellinus and his priests, Melchiades, Marcellus, and Sylvester, were wicked and sacrilegious men, who had delivered the holy books (to the persecutors), and

(1) *History of the Donatists*. Venice, 1690.

(2) *Collection of Dissertations on Ecclesiastical History*. Rome, 1790. *Anti-Febronio*. Pesaro, 1767.

(3) *Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. ii., ch. 41. Rome, 1746.

(4) *Religious and Civil History of the Popes*. Rome, 1880.

(5) *Apology for Pope Marcellinus*. Rome, 1876.

(6) "Sylvester was the successor of that Melchades who ruled the Church after that Marcellinus who was illustrious under persecution." *Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. i., ch. 3.

had offered incense (to the idols). *I reply that these men were innocent*; and why should I work to prove the truth of my assertion, when he has not tried in the least to support his accusation?" (1). Again, the most ancient documents adduced in proof of the idolatry of St. Marcellinus seem to bear upon their face evidence of their unreliability in this matter—evidence, that is, of interpolation. These documents are the *Pontifical Book* and its probable parent, the *Second Catalogue of the Popes*, in both of which we read: "Marcellinus was led to a temple, and ordered to offer incense; and he complied. But after a few days, he repented, and was beheaded for the faith of Christ by the same Diocletian." Now, as Bencini observes in his commentary on Anastasius the Librarian, whom some mediæval writers credited with the authorship of the *Pontifical Book*, Diocletian could not have been in Rome at the time of the martyrdom of St. Marcellinus. Relying on the testimony of Lactantius, who was "probably at that time in Rome," Bencini finds that Diocletian came to Rome for the *vicennalia* which were to be celebrated on the Twelfth of the Kalends of December, 303; and that "when the *vicennalia* had been celebrated, Diocletian, unable to bear the arrogance of the Roman people, suddenly rushed from the city just before the Kalends of January, when the consulate was to be re-tendered to him. This circumstance not having been remembered by the inventor of the guilt of Marcellinus, he ruined the value of his *Acts of Sinuessa*"—that is, since it is certain that St. Marcellinus received his palm on April 26, 304, he could not have been condemned by an emperor who was not in Rome. However, it is not improbable that the arrest and execution of the Pontiff might have been effected by the orders of even an absent emperor; therefore we abandon this line of argument, and turn our attention to the question of the genuineness of the *Acts of Sinuessa*, upon the solution of which depends absolutely and entirely that of the guilt or innocence of St. Marcellinus.

(1) " *Ego innocentes fuisse respondeo. Quid laborem probare defensionem meam, cum ille nec temerè probare conatus sit accusationem suam?*" In book on *One Baptism*, ch. 16.

Who can believe, if he is conversant with the circumstances of Christendom during the reign of Diocletian, that a Council of 180 bishops, as Platina alleges, or of 300, as *The Acts of Sinuessa* pretend, could have met in any city of the empire? Even at the Council of Nice, when peace had been given to the Church, when her prelates and priests were protected and aided by the imperial authority, only 308 synodals answered to their names. Elsewhere we have descanted on the horrors and the universality of the persecution under Diocletian (1); here let it suffice to say with Lactantius: "The entire world was tormented; from East to West three ferocious beasts hunted for prey... the emperor (Diocletian) raged not only against his own household, but against all... Priests and assistants were seized, and without trial were led to execution... Persons of every age and sex were thrust into the flames, not merely one at a time, for so great was the multitude that they were collected into a heap, and fire built around them" (2). It has been said that bishops from Africa might easily have crossed for a Council into Italy; but we know from Optatus of Milevi that "the tempest raged through the whole of Africa, making martyrs of some, confessors of others" (3). And if African bishops went, in any number, how comes it that no memory of such a Council subsisted in Africa in the days of St. Augustine, when there certainly lived many, whose fathers had been contemporary with the great assembly? Many historians, among whom it seems strange to perceive Baronio, Pagi, and Basnage, find an argument against the genuineness of the *Acts of Sinuessa* in a supposition that such a city as Sinuessa never existed; but unfortunately for one who would expect to solve the present question in summary style, the existence of Sinuessa is known by every careful student of Livy and of Martial (4), and Ughelli demonstrates that it was an episcopal city, two of its bishops, whom he identifies, having been crowned with

(1) In our Vol. I., p. 56, *et seqq.*

(2) *Deaths of the Persecutors*, ch. 19, *et seqq.*

(3) *Against Parmenian*, Bk. I.

(4) Livy tells us (*Bk. X.*, ch. 21) that the city of Sinope, a Greek foundation, *Falerum contingente agrum*, was termed Sinuessa by the Romans; and Strabo (*Bk. V.*) says that the latter name was given to it because it was in the heart, *in sinu*, of the *Vesicino*. Martial praises the wine of Sinuessa in his *Bk. XIII.*, *Epiogram 2*.

martyrdom (1). However, as Galimberti remarks, if geography does not condemn the *Acts of Sinuessa*, chronology will effect the purpose. The presumed *Acts* assert: "While Diocletian was engaged in the Persian War, he heard that 300 bishops, thirty priests, and three deacons, had united in the one condemnation; and that Marcellinus himself, first of all, agreed in his own anathematization by his own subscription to the decree. Then Diocletian became furious, and sent (officers) to that city. . . and Marcellinus was condemned *suo judicio* on the Tenth of the Kalends of September." Now it is certain, firstly, that Maximian, not Diocletian, then ruled at Rome and in the contiguous regions; secondly, that all the ancient *Martyrologies* contradict the assertion that Marcellinus was condemned in September; and thirdly, which at once subverts the authority of the *Acts*, that the Persian War had been terminated either in 301 or in 302, two years or thereabout before the alleged idolatry, the alleged anathematization, and the martyrdom of St. Marcellinus. How could Diocletian have "raged against Marcellinus," arrested, and condemned him, while the emperor "was engaged in the Persian War," since, according to Eusebius, it was only after that war that the sovereigns, having met in Nicomedia, issued the decree of persecution which overwhelmed our Pontiff? This anachronism alone must suffice to prove that the *Acts of Sinuessa* are forgeries; but it will be interesting and profitable to examine the absurdities, of which they are redolent—absurdities which caused Le Nain de Tillemont to say: "The way in which Marcellinus talks in these *Acts*; the lie that he utters when he denies his crime, and the terms that he uses when he confesses that crime; are all less like the lamentations of a sincere penitent, than they are like the foolish excuses of a schoolboy who is about to be whipped."

The following are the words with which the presumed *Acts* describe the alleged crime of our Pontiff: "Then Diocletian deemed it prudent to shower blandishments on Marcellinus; and his caressing language succeeded so well, that he was able to lead the Pontiff to the Temple of Vesta.

(1) These bishops were Sts. Castus and Secundinus. *Sacred Italy*. Venice, 1717.

He was accompanied by two deacons, Caius and Innocentius; and by three priests, Urbanus, Castorinus, and Juvenalis. When these had seen Marcellinus enter the temple, but before he had offered incense, they went away, and proceeding to the Vatican, they informed their priestly colleagues as to what they had seen. In the meantime, many Christians who had entered the temple, in order to see what was being done, beheld Marcellinus offering incense." And this pontifical renegade, succumbing to an oily tongue, is the "Marcellinus who was illustrious under persecution"; the same who "confirmed the faith of the soldiers of the Theban Legion, so that they might rather die under the sword, than deny the holy faith of Christ which they had embraced!" (1). But can we believe that in the height of the persecution of Diocletian, many Christians left their hiding-places, and visited a pagan temple, the home of "those false gods who were demons," in order to witness a denial of the faith by one of themselves? All of those Christians, whom the inventor of the *Acts of Simuess*a represents as yielding to a curiosity "to see what was being done" in one of the sanctuaries of the foul deities whom they both contemned and hated, proclaimed with Tertullian: "If we keep our throats and stomachs clean, how much more should we keep far from our eyes and ears all idolatrous pleasures—things that are not merely taken into our intestines, but are digested in our very souls, the cleanliness of which God desires more than that of our bodies?" (2). But listen to the *Acts* as they present what purports to be a Chapter on "The Synod, and the Denial of His Idolatry by Marcellinus": "The synod met, but all the clergy had not assembled, because of the persecution then in vigor. Marcellinus having entered, he denied that he had offered incense." We are not told the authority by which this synod was called. And why is a stress laid on the absence of many because of the persecution? Certainly, if there were 300 bishops present, it was a very respectable convention. But how did those 300 prelates, from so many interdistant dioceses, manage to travel safely in that direful time? Then we hear:

(1) BOLLANDISTS; *Acts of the Saints*, at Sept. 22.(2) *On Spectacles*, ch. 13.

“Fourteen witnesses entered, and said: “We saw thee (Marcellinus) offering incense to Hercules, Jupiter, and Saturn.” The forger showed in this passage that he knew nothing about the pagan liturgy; for the temple in question was dedicated to Vesta, and no worship of other deities would have been tolerated in it. “When was it,” the Pontiff is represented as asking the witnesses, “that you saw me offering incense?” The reply is given as: “On the day when you discarded your purple garments, and donned scarlet ones, Diocletian thereupon rejoicing.” If the reader believes that in that day, and even in a time of persecution, a Roman Pontiff wore distinctive robes of purple, he will not smile at this passage. We are told that when conjured to reply truly to his accusers, Marcellinus protested: “I did not sacrifice to the gods; I simply placed some grains of incense on the fire.” Can it be supposed that a Roman Pontiff, a priest necessarily acquainted with the story of Ezechiel and the prohibited food, would proffer such a puerile explanation to an assembly of three hundred Christian prelates? Finally, say the *Acts*, when the Pontiff was exhorted to judge in his own cause—“thou shalt be condemned by your own judgment, not by ours,” he threw himself on the ground, and: “As he remained there prostrate and hesitating, they condemned him.” Then it is said that soon afterward “Marcellinus, Bishop of the city of Rome, exclaimed in a loud voice: ‘I have sinned in your sight, and I ought not to remain in the priestly order (?), for I have been corrupted by gold’; whereupon they signed his condemnation, and expelled him from the city. Bishop Melchiades was the first to sign this condemnation; and he said in a clear voice: ‘He has been condemned justly by his own mouth. . . for *the first See will never be judged by any one.*’” And nevertheless, according to the *Acts*, the bishop of bishops was judged by his inferiors, and was “expelled from the city.” No wonder that Tillemont could not understand how it is that these pretended *Acts of Sinuessa* have been allowed to retain a position among the received *Acts of the Councils*. Concluding our examination of the absurdities of the composer of these supposititious

Acts, we must note that the phrase "the First See is judged by no one," as purporting to be uttered by one of the members of the alleged Sinuessan Synod, would indicate that the synodals were very bad theologians, since they tacitly, at least, approved a doctrine which, according to their hypothesis, would be false and absurd. That the decisions of the Holy See in matters of doctrine are *per se irreformabiles*, and therefore "to be judged by no one" in other than a spirit of obedience, is a matter of faith; but it is false that in an hypothesis like that asserted to have been verified in a synod at Sinuessa, a Roman Pontiff "could be judged by no one." Of course we hold with Bellarmine and the majority of theologians that "it is probable, and may piously be believed, that *even as a private person* the Roman Pontiff cannot be a heretic, obstinately teaching anything contrary to faith" (1). But if we were able to suppose, as the presumed Sinuessan Synod was said to have supposed, that a Pontiff *could* fall into apostasy, then certainly we would be obliged to admit that such a Pontiff could be subjected to an inquiry *as to the fact*. That three hundred bishops could advance the contrary theory, and at the very moment when they "condemned Marcellinus, and expelled him from the city," we must refuse to believe.

But we are asked to remember that the *Roman Breviary* explicitly records the idolatry of St. Marcellinus. This objection can be seriously adduced only by one who is unacquainted with the nature of the *Breviary*. As Pope Gelasius observed, the Church does not present the lives of the saints, which are sketched in the *Breviary*, "as a Gospel." The same Pontiff tells us to "examine all (the presumed facts), and to hold to what is correct"; and his advice was reasonable, for, as all ought to know, the historical features of the *Breviary*, being based on human, not on divine faith, can properly be made subjects of historical criticism. Several Pontiffs, notably St. Pius V., Clement VIII., Urban VIII., and Benedict XIV., reformed the text of this monumental work; they all understood, as all future Pontiffs will understand, that historical assertions in the *Breviary* have no

(1) *The Roman Pontiff*, Bk. iv., ch. 6.

more value than that possessed by the sources from which they are derived. That pre-eminently learned and judicious Pope, Benedict XIV., speaking of the authority of the *Breviary*, says : “ It is thought that Pope Nicholas III. (1277-1280) finally decreed that in all the churches in the city of Rome those *Offices* should be recited, and those books read, which the Franciscans were accustomed to use ; and that all the more ancient *Offices* and *Books of Chant* should be thereafter proscribed. . . . Gavanti (1), speaking of the *Roman Breviary* as we now have it, gives us in his already-mentioned work (*The Lessons*) an account of the corrections of the Lessons in the Second Nocturn which were made by Cardinals Baronio and Bellarmine in the time of Clement VIII. ; and he testifies to the difficulty experienced in reforming those Lessons concerning the saints according to the demands of historical truth, and with the least possible change. He even admits that certain legends of the saints, which good historians pronounce inexact and perhaps without good foundation, were generally retained, because of the possibility that they might be true. . . . Although it may safely be asserted that an insertion in the *Roman Breviary* gives no little weight to historical narratives, nevertheless, it must not be thought that there is any prohibition against laying before the Apostolic See any historical difficulties (in reference to those narratives), in order that said difficulties may be considered, whenever another correction of the *Breviary* is undertaken” (2). It is evident, therefore, that when we consider the positive arguments which militate for the innocence of St. Marcellinus, the contrary testimony of the *Roman Breviary* is not necessarily to be received. We must say of the credulity of the compilers of the *Breviary* what Papebroch remarked concerning that which Pope Nicholas I. displayed in his letter to Emperor Michael : “ He alleged in good faith a report which was regarded as true in his time.” It may be noted, however, that this is not the sole historical error committed by Nicholas I. in the same letter. He speaks of a Roman Council having been convened by

(1) See our Vol. iv., p. 49.

(2) *Canonization of Saints*, Pt. ii., Bk. iv., ch. 13. Rome, 1747.

Pope Xystus III. for the purpose of judging Polychronius, bishop of Jerusalem; and both Baronio and Papebroch demonstrate that no such bishop of Jerusalem ever existed. The same remark as to inculpable credulity might be made in regard to the author of the *Second Catalogue* or *Pontifical Book*, a work which is ascribed to the sixth century—to a period two centuries later than the questioned event—by nearly all erudite chronologists, notably by Papebroch, Pearson, and Dodwell; but the innocence of this author becomes problematical, when we reflect on the absurdities which he utters, and on the silence of the *First Catalogue*—a more ancient work which he must have read—concerning any guilt of St. Marcellinus.

CHAPTER IV.

CONSECRATED VIRGINS AMONG THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.

In the very first days of the infant Church we find followers of that state of perfection which Our Lord had chosen for Himself and for His Mother. Virginité was the portion of some of the apostles, absolute continency of all. The ancient records show us SS. Peter and Paul receiving the vow of chastity from St. Petronilla; St. Matthew from St. Iphigene, and St. Clement from Flavia Domitilla. Not a Father of the Church fails to show his admiration of those who are “to follow the Lamb wherever He goeth.” St. Ignatius, fresh from the instructions of the virgin St. John, tells the people of Tarsus to “honor the virgins who are consecrated to Christ.” St. Justin sings the praises of those who have grown old in voluntary celibacy. St. Cyprian declares “that the greater the number of virgins, the greater the joy of the Church.” And so tenderly did the early Church cherish these imitators of Mary, that, as a rule, they were supported by ecclesiastical funds. Some writers, following St. Athanasius, ascribe the first cloister to a sister of St. Anthony, about the year 313; and they insist that before Constantine gave peace to the Church, all the sacred

virgins lived in the world, although, of course, not "of it." But there is good reason for the assertion that, at least in Syria and Mesopotamia, cloisters were known before the fourth century. Tertullian (160-245) and St. Cyprian (d. 258) are cited by Balto, in his *Preface to the Acts of St. Febronia*, as alluding to such establishments (1). And St. Ephrem (d. 379) speaks of them as having existed in his country long before his day. But the *Acts of St. Febronia*, as transcribed in the *Martyrology* of the Western Church, in the Greek *Menology*, in the *Calendars* of the Copts and of the Muscovites, would remove all doubt in the matter. These authentic *Acts* tell us that when Silenus, Lisymachus, and Primus, fulfilling the command of Diocletian, in 304, to punish all Christians with death, had arrived at Sibapolis in Assyria, they there found "a monastery of fifty women under the government of Bryene, who had hitherto followed the rule assigned them by one Plato, a deacon." However, it seems certain that cloisters were unknown in the West during the days of pagan persecution; then our religious resided at home, carefully avoiding all worldly amusements, and subject, so far as circumstances permitted, to what we call a "rule." Writing to the virgin Eustochia, St. Jerome says: "May the intimate privacy of thy chamber protect thee! May thy Spouse ever rejoice in thy heart! When thou prayest, thou speakest to thy Spouse; when thou readest, He talks to thee. All of you know well the Hours—Prime, Tierce, Sext, None, and Vespers. Twice or thrice a night thou must arise and recall to thy mind the lessons of Scripture. Leaving home, let prayer arm thee; returning, at once prayer must meet thee." As to the obligation of perseverance on the part of these consecrated virgins, the Council of Elvira (2) decreed, in its thirteenth canon, that a violation of their vow should entail a denial of Communion even at the hour of death.

With the triumph of Constantine came that of Christianity; and just as magnificent basilicas took the place of hidden and often subterranean churches, so the system of the clois-

(1) TERTULLIAN; *On the Veiling of Virgins*.—ST. CYPRIAN; *Discipline of Virgins*.

(2) This Council was probably held in 324, but some writers assign it to the year 252.

ter replaced the independent religious life. Palladius, writing at the end of the fourth century, says that Pacomius built a convent for his sister on the bank of the Nile opposite his own monastery; that while the latter counted fourteen hundred monks, the former sheltered four hundred nuns (1). St. Basil built many convents, and drew up a rule for their inmates. In the Thebaid the Abbot Elias directed three hundred virgins; and in the city of Ossirintum, says Rufinus, there were twenty thousand (2). The delicate ladies of Rome seem to have shown, at first, but little inclination for the severe life of the cloister. Most of its votaries were for a time from the lower classes; indeed, we learn from St. Jerome that St. Paula so far yielded to the prejudices of her noble subjects as to locate the others, unless when at prayer, in separate buildings (3). But very soon the example of Marcella and her daughter affected ladies of even the highest rank, and the aristocracy gave more than a reasonable quota of its daughters to the holy level of convent discipline. At the time of Pope St. Gregory the Great (590-604) the number of cloistered women in Rome was so large, that during a period of scarcity of food, the Pontiff himself fed and clothed more than three thousand (4). Just as in our day, parents were accustomed to confide the education of their daughters to the care of religious. Writing from Bethlehem, St. Jerome earnestly advises Leta, a widow, to send even an infant to the care of Paula, over whose convent the holy doctor exercised supervision: "Try not to bear a burden which is too great for you, but so soon as you have weaned her, let her be consigned to the monastery; let her live in a virginal choir, knowing not the world. . . . If you send her to Paula, I promise to be her teacher and her guardian. I will carry her on my shoulders, and my age will direct her hesitating words." Many of these girls were destined by their parents (if they afterward should deem them-

(1) *Lausiac History*.(2) *Lives of the Fathers*, Bk. I., ch. 5.(3) *Plures virgines, quas e diversis provinciis congregarat, tam nobile, quam mediis et infimi generis, in tres turmas monasteriaque divisit, dumtaxat ita ut in opere et in cibo separate, psalmodiis et orationibus jungerentur. . . unumquodque agmen matrem propriam sequeretur.*" Thus in his letter to Eustochia on the epitaph of Paula.

(4) Bk. vi., letter 23.

selves so called) to the conventual life, and their training was accordingly directed with that view.

Religious profession was allowed at sixteen (1); but St. Jerome says that his friend Asella made her profession at ten (2). Consecration, which corresponded to the solemn or definitive *profession* of our day, was given only at twenty-five, as we learn from the 26th canon of the Third Council of Carthage, held in 397. The age at which a nun might be made an abbess was put at sixty by St. Basil; but the Councils of Chalcedon and Trullo deemed forty a sufficient guarantee of prudence. St. Gregory the Great, writing to the bishop of Syracuse, said: "We absolutely prohibit the appointment of young abbesses; Your Fraternity will appoint only such as are sixty years old." This requirement of very advanced age was extended at one time even to a consecration. St. Leo I., having learned that certain cruel parents forced their daughters to take the veil, decreed in 458 that no religious should be invested before the age of forty; but in the course of time the age of twenty-five was re-established, to remain until the twelfth century, when twenty became customary. It was quite natural that all these women, whether members of the cloister or consecrated to a particular service of God at home, should adopt some distinctive dress, while, of course, they abandoned all garments which might savor of vanity, however harmless. The latter generally wore clothing of wool and of a dark color; the former, owing to the variety of institutes, in time came to present as many different uniforms as they formed families. But there was one distinctive mark for all religious women, which dated at least from the fourth century, and, with the exception of a very few modern Congregations (3), they have always worn it—the veil. Even Tertullian seems to allude to this vesture when he says: "True and entire virginity fears nothing more than itself; it cannot bear the eyes even of women, and retires under its veil as behind a shield which protects its treasure" (4). St. Jerome speaks of those who,

(1) BASIL; *To Amphiloctius*, epist. 2. (2) *To Marcella*.

(3) Thus, the Sisters of Charity have no veil. When their founder, St. Vincent de Paul, was interrogated on this point, he replied: "Their virtues will be their veils."

(4) *Loc. cit.*—Among the Orientals, unmarried females never went out unveiled. We

“when they swear to preserve their virginity, hide their features under a dark mantle.”

Although the veil was often assumed without ceremony, it was frequently blessed and solemnly imposed by the bishop; thus, St. Jerome exhorts Demetrias to perseverance in her obligations, assumed when “the prayer of the Pontiff laid the virginal insignia on her head.” This solemn profession at the hands of a bishop was, in the first centuries, always made on a principal feast; thus, St. Ambrose, in his elegant exhortation to virgins, says: “The Paschal day has arrived, and all over the world the Sacrament of Baptism is conferred, and virgins receive the veil.” And Pope Gelasius (492), writing to the bishops of what is now Portugal, mentions Christmas, the Epiphany, and Low Sunday as days when “especially the veil is to be given by bishops.” In the course of time this ceremony was performed also on Sundays and on anniversaries of Our Lady and of the martyrs. Catalani shows that the bishop usually pronounced an appropriate discourse on the occasion (1). Sometimes, but only in very extraordinary circumstances, the Supreme Pontiff enhanced the solemnity of the function by himself officiating; thus, as St. Ambrose informs us, on a Christmas Day, Pope Liberius gave the veil to his sister Marcellina in the Vatican Basilica (2). In the days of St. Jerome, and in Rome, the religious veil was of purple, and the saint explains the mystic sense of the color: “The sacred virgins invest their hair with sobriety, modesty, and continence, as well as with the entire company of the virtues; and, covered by the veil purpled with the blood of Our Lord, they show His mortifica-

read of Rebecca (*Genesis*, xxiv. 65) that when she saw Isaac, her future husband, from a distance, she covered herself with her veil. On the contrary, the ancient Roman girls showed their faces in public, while the married women were veiled; in fact, the primitive meaning of *nubere* (to marry) was to veil one's self. The privilege, of course, pleased the young women; but the severe Tertullian condemned them for availing themselves of it in church, and it was with this object that he composed his treatise, *The Veiling of Virgins*. He was told that the privilege was appropriate to the candor of innocence, and that, when the virgins were seen to be thus unique in church, they invited others to imitate them. But he answered that where there was complacency there came vanity, interest, constraint, weakness; and a constrained virginity was a source of crime.

(1) *Commentary on the Pontifical Book*, title 19.

(2) Benedict XIV. (1740-58) gave the veil to one of the Colonna princesses, and delivered on the occasion one of his most erudite and majestic sermons. We have met with no more modern instance of such pontifical action.

tions in their own frames" (1). St. Optatus of Milevi says that there was no precept as to the material of the purple veil (2). Generally, however, the veil was black. In some places, as is shown in the learned dissertation by the Benedictine (St. Maur) Anthony Mege, published in 1689, there were eight different veils : 1. The veil of probation, given to any one who asked for it ; 2. That of reception, for novices, and this was white ; 3. That of profession, which was red ; 4. That of consecration, blessed by the bishop, and given only to virgins ; 5. That of "ordination," so termed, given to deaconesses on their appointment ; 6. That of "prelacy" or authority, for abbesses ; 7. That of continence, for widows ; 8. That of penance, for any religious who had been guilty of grave scandal. As to cutting the hair of a novice, it was not in vogue in some places, but in others it was customary from time immemorial ; the operation was performed by the superior-ess. From the *Acts of St. Saturninus and His Companions*, and from many other testimonies adduced by Martene (3), we learn that the first religious did not cut their tresses, but wore them hidden.

And now a few remarks as to the order of "deaconesses"—women consecrated to the service of the Church, who, although known even in Apostolic days (4), have not been seen in the West since the twelfth century, nor in the East since the thirteenth. But in very modern times the Ambrosian rite provides for a similiar organization of matrons—*vetulones*,—who furnish the bread and wine for the Sacrifice (5). It was the duty of the deaconesses to perform toward females those offices at baptism, then conferred by immersion, which the deacons fulfilled toward men ; to act as vergers or beadles in that part of the church assigned to women ; to visit the poor and sick of their own sex ; and, when circumstances would not allow a deacon to do so, to strengthen by exhortation the courage of the women during persecution (6).

(1) *The Institute of Virgins.*

(2) *Against the Donatists.*

(3) *Ancient Rites of the Church.*

(4) St. Paul speaks of them in the *Epistle to the Romans* ; and Pliny the Younger, writing to Trajan, says that he has put two *ministrae* to the torture.

(5) MACER ; *Hierolexicon*, art. *Deaconesses*.

(6) BALSAMON ; canon 2 of the Council of Laodicea.—ASSEMANI ; *Oriental Library*, Vol. vi., ch. 13.

The Council of Trullo, in the year 692, uses the word *cheirotonein* (to impose hands) in speaking of the consecration of deaconesses; however, it is certain that such "imposition" was not Sacramental, but merely ceremonial, for the Nineteenth Canon of the Nicene Council expressly places these women among laics. At first the deaconesses were widows who had been married but once, and their reception as deaconesses was an impediment to a second marriage; in time, as is shown by Zonaras and Balsamon, virgins also were enrolled. The modern Greeks, both the United and the Schismatic, give the name of deaconesses to the wives of their deacons, but these have no office in the Church. The same is to be noted of those women who are sometimes mentioned during the early Christian centuries as priestesses, bishopesses, etc. (1); they were separated wives of men who had become priests, etc., and they are specially denominated laics by Pope Soter (175). These were bound to a life of continual prayer and mortification, and were excommunicated if they broke their vows.

In the olden time, female religious were often styled "canonesses," because their lives were arranged by the ecclesiastical Canons (2). But they were very different from the aristocratic "canonesses" of the Middle Ages, and from those who are to be found to-day in the Empire of Austria. These women are not, properly speaking, religious; for, the abbess alone excepted, they are bound by no vows. All necessarily being of noble, and often of imperial blood, their retirement is frequently only temporary; but so long as they remain in the convent, they are bound to the Divine Office and many exercises of piety, and in the choir they wear the robes of "canonesses." In 816 the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle prescribed for them a somewhat severe rule, founded on the prescriptions of SS. Cyprian, Jerome, and Athanasius; thus, it obliged them to chastity, and, while it allowed them servants, it compelled them to make their own clothes. But in the thirteenth century the canonesses ceased to observe these rules,

(1) Thus the second Council of Tours, can. 20, says: "*Si inventus fuerit presbyter cum sua presbyteria, aut diaconus cum diaconissa, aut subdiaconus cum subdiaconissa.*" etc.

(2) SOCRATES; b. I., c. 17.

although Cardinal James de Vitriaco, writing about the year 1240, remarked: "I have observed that many of these women are very earnest in their struggle toward perfection; and probably they are acceptable to God precisely because they have been in the fire, and nevertheless have not been burnt" (1).

(1) During the course of our disquisitions we have frequently had occasion to refer to the mute but eloquent testimony of the Roman Catacombs in favor of many points of Catholic dogma and discipline; and here we would observe that the researches of the eminent archaeologist, the late Commendatore De Rossi, show that the Catacombs are redolent of testimony concerning the consecration of virgins among the primitive Christians. On Feb. 14, 1900, the Roman archaeologists listened to a discourse in which the Rev. William Campbell, formerly rector of the Scotch College in the Eternal City, recalled to mind many of De Rossi's observations on this subject. Shortly afterward the *Baltimore Sun* published a synopsis of this lecture, and we submit to the reader a few of its more salient points. In the Catacomb of St. Priscilla, on the Salarian Way, a pictorial representation in one of the oldest chambers shows the reception of the veil. There are three figures in the group—a bishop, a deacon, and the maiden who is about to receive the veil. The bishop, an aged man with a white beard, is seated on a chair or throne. With his right hand he points before him, probably to the figure at the other extremity of the picture, which represents the Blessed Virgin, seated on a throne, holding the Divine Infant in her arms. The action of the bishop has been interpreted as calling the attention of the virgin about to be professed and to receive the veil to the model she is to aim at imitating—the Virgin Mother. The maiden stands at the side of the bishop, holding the veil with both her hands. She is dressed in a long yellow tunic, with two red bands falling from the shoulders to the feet. Behind her stands the deacon. In the centre of the picture there is a large figure of a virgin, with a veil and long dark red flowing gown or tunic. The veil, which is white, hangs down on each side of her head, and near the ends it is crossed by bars of red color; it terminates in a fringe. The figure is that known as an *Orante*, or praying figure, and represents the virgin vowed to God, who was, in all probability, buried here and is thus represented as having passed into the enjoyment of heavenly bliss. The eyes are looking upward, and you may read the desire of the artist to convey the idea that this *Orante* beholds the face of the Lord. This notion is strengthened by the doves with olive branches and the peacocks—symbols of immortality—depicted in the curving ceiling of the arcosolium, where these groups are painted. There are several other frescoes in different catacombs in which virgins are represented, such as that in the catacomb of St. Cyriacus, where Christ is seen with five virgins on His right hand, and five others on His left. Those on His right hold up lighted torches, while those on His left bear extinguished torches. The picture is easily read as a symbolical representation of the five wise and the five foolish virgins—the former with their lamps trimmed and burning, the latter with their lamps extinguished for want of oil. That it has a special reference to this place, the catacomb of St. Cyriacus, is evident from the fact that here in the vicinity of the Church of St. Lawrence, which stands close to the catacomb, was in early centuries a convent for nuns. When this church was restored and newly adorned by Pope Pius IX. in 1862, many inscriptions to the memory of virgins were found. The fresco in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, representing the investiture of a virgin with the veil, belongs undoubtedly to the second century, but the interpretation of the subject of this fresco has been questioned, though the burden of evidence favors the original interpretation. In the latter half of the fourth century, that the life of the cloister was established and recognized is evident from the writings of St. Jerome, especially from the letters he wrote to those who led such lives, on the duties and observances of their state. It has been supposed that Marcella, a noble widow of Rome, was the first who gave the example of such a mode of life in the metropolis of the Roman world. She studied the discipline which the widows and virgins placed under the direction of Pachomius practiced in the monasteries of the Thebaid; "and she did not blush," says St. Jerome, "to adopt a rule of life which she recognized as pleasing to Christ." The interpretation, says De Rossi, which would represent St. Jerome as having said that Marcella was the first among noble Roman ladies to give the example of living

as virgins or as chaste widows, is a wrong interpretation. Well, indeed, are the names of illustrious virgins and widows dedicated to God known and celebrated who flourished in Rome in the very ages of the persecutions. What St. Jerome says is only that Marcella first among Roman matrons undertook the monastic life in Rome, *propositum monachorum*; that is, that mode of solitary and severe living together with other companions of the same intention. On the slabs found at St. Lawrence's church, the epitaphs bear dates of the years 431, 464, and 486. These are much later than the dates of other sacred virgins mentioned in the writings of the Fathers, and very much later than the picture in the catacomb of St. Priscilla. In fact, more than a century before the last of these dates, the Latin poet of Christian Rome, Prudentius, mentions the conventual house of St. Lawrence. He mentions in a special manner a Vestal virgin named Claudia who, having left the worship of Vesta and embraced the Christian life, went to St. Lawrence's—in every probability a convent of nuns in the vicinity of this church, the epitaphs of some of whom were brought to light in 1862. It is in the proximate catacomb—that of St. Cyriacus—that the fresco representing the wise and the foolish virgins was painted, and according to the general opinion, over the tomb of one of these nuns. Other incidents depicted here seem to point to the fact that the tomb was that of a person converted to the faith. The question has been asked, could it have been the tomb of the Vestal Claudia who, as Prudentius tells, became a Christian nun? In the Atrium of Vesta—the courtyard of that pagan cloister—there stands a pedestal bearing a most laudatory inscription to a high priestess of Vesta, to whom a statue was erected on this pedestal by the college of the high priests, under the vice-presidency of Macrinus Sossinus, as a testimony to her chastity and to her profound knowledge in religious matters. The name of this highly lauded lady has been carefully erased from the pedestal, no other erasure but the name having been made. On the discovery of this pedestal in 1883, the minds of scholars and students went at once back to the events of the time—for the pedestal is dated A. D. 364—and considered what was likely to have happened in Rome at that date. It is contemporary, or almost so, with the words of Prudentius in his hymn to St. Lawrence—"Claudia the Vestal virgin enters thy shrine." It is not improbable that the virgin buried at St. Lawrence's, over whose grave the fresco of the wise and foolish virgins was painted, was indeed that Claudia who had forsaken the cloister of Vesta. It is not improbable that it was the name of Claudia that was erased from the laudatory inscription in the Atrium of Vesta. However strange these conjectures may seem at first sight, there is probability in them; and thus if they be true, one of the noblest of the women of pagan Rome, for such were the Vestals, became one of the noblest of the Christians, living out her pure and holy life at the shrine of the martyr Lawrence, while the priests of paganism decreed that her memory should be condemned to oblivion and her name erased from their records of honor. It would again be one of the ironies of history to find that the name of the Vestal condemned to forgetfulness should under newer and better auspices be recorded in the writings of the great Christian poet and held in high honor for centuries as that of Claudia, the converted Vestal Virgin.

Gregorovius, the most pretentious and one of the most deliberately mendacious among the exponents of so-called "German science" in historical matters, audaciously asserts that before the fourth century Rome knew little or nothing concerning any special veneration of the Blessed Virgin; that said devotion began only in 432, when Sixtus III. restored the Liberian Basilica, dedicating it to the *Virgo Deipara*. Thus the German "historian" in his *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Age*, Vol. i., p. 121. In an opposite monograph entitled *Historical Notes Concerning the Antiquity of the Veneration of the Virgin Mary* (Rome, 1887), the learned Jesuit, Mariano Armellini, demonstrates the absurdity of the antipathy ever displayed toward an even ordinary respect for the Most Blessed among Women, on the part of the heterodox North—that North "which once gave to the Latin races a lesson in regard to respect for women"; and he shows how Gregorovius, problematically well equipped for a study of the Rome of the Caesars, was absolutely ignorant of all that concerns Subterranean Rome, the Rome of the Martyrs. The monuments of the Catacombs demonstrate that long before Pope Liberius erected St. Mary Major's on the Esquiline, the disciples of the Apostles, children of those who had known and conversed with Our Lady, "had depicted her dear features on the sepulchres of their dead, thus proving that the devotion of the nineteenth century for Mary is the same as that of the primitive Church."

CHAPTER V.

SOME SALIENT FEATURES OF THE MIDDLE AGE.*

(*Complement of Chap. I., Vol. II.*)

I. ASTROLOGY, ALCHEMY, AND SORCERY.

Désiré Nisard, the late venerable Dean of the French Academy, once rebuked a presumptuous, self-acclaimed wise man with these words: "It is not your knowledge, sir, but your ignorance that we fear." The Catholic apologist for the Ages of Faith indulges in the same reflection whenever he is obliged to note the arrogant ignorance of some decrier of a period which the poor man has not studied. We have no desire to ignore any of the salient features of the Middle Age; although we are ready to admit that Christendom was then as now composed of human beings, and that then as well as now individual men and general society suffered from many failings. Among these failings—or, as the worshippers of everything modern would term them, the crying evils—of the most misunderstood of periods, we are sometimes asked to note the existence of a blind faith in astrology, alchemy, and sorcery. But was such a belief a creation of the Middle Age? He must be indeed a tyro in historical study who does not know that astrology was a legacy from paganism; that it originated among the ancient Chaldeans; that from Chaldea it passed into Egypt, thence into Greece; and that from the decadent Lower Empire the Arabs transplanted it into Spain, whence it was diffused throughout Europe. Very little patience in investigation is required in order that one may learn that all that was *magical* in astrology—that is, the so-called *judiciary* astrology—was always condemned by the Church. Even a casual student of the Middle Age knows that *natural* astrology was only what we now term astronomy, and that this science was always cultivated pre-eminently by the mediæval ecclesiastics. Judiciary astrology, which Kep-

* Most of the contents of this dissertation appeared in *THE AVE MARIA*, 1893-'99, *passim*.

ler rightly styled a "crazy daughter of a sane mother," pretended to predict the future of men and states by means of examination of the stars; and we read that Charlemagne issued many edicts against its practice, while many Pontiffs condemned it in apposite Bulls. And long after the Middle Age had vanished, judiciary astrology continued to be in vogue. To say nothing of the then still comparatively crude English and Germans, the more enlightened Italians and French were not guiltless in this matter, even in the sixteenth century. And even in our own day, astrology is practised to a great extent among people who are far from mediæval in their tendencies; and if it is not more in favor than it is, especially among those who are outside of the Catholic Church, the reason is to be found not in any superiority of intellect, but in a spirit of materialism which prevents so many non-Catholics from looking above the roofs of their houses for an explanation of the things of earth.

The word "alchemy"—merely the Arab term for our "chemistry" (*al chemia*)—does not occur in any writings of an earlier date than the ninth century; but the science itself is of ante-mediæval origin. We know that the Greeks and Arabs derived it from the Egyptians; and that the latter, with every appearance of reason, assigned its beginnings to the early generations of humanity. As an illustration of the antiquity of alchemical experiments and inventions, we may adduce the fact that the art of enamelling, rediscovered by the Frenchman, Bernard Palissy, in the sixteenth century, was known not only by the ancient Etruscans whose pottery we so admire, but also by the Egyptians of thirty centuries ago. In the Khedival Museum of the Boulak, in Cairo, there are specimens of *oua-chaptis*, in a state of perfect preservation, taken from the Pharaonic tombs, and evidently at least three thousand years old. However, it is not this legitimate alchemy or chemistry that the contemnners of the Middle Age indicate, when they ridicule that period as addicted to charlatany. They point to exceptional abuse, or rather travesties, of the science; and they never use the term "alchemy" in other than contemptuous fashion, reserving the synonym "chemistry" for the nobler operations and

investigations of the same science. But is it true that alchemy, understood in the ignoble sense of the term, flourished peculiarly in the Middle Age? Is it not rather an indisputable fact that every age has furnished its charlatans and innumerable victims, of whom it could always be said: "What fools these mortals be"? Long after the Middle Age had disappeared, even in that Golden Age of the semi-pagan and semi-Christian Renaissance, if we take a peep at Sedan, we shall see Henry I. de Bouillon negotiating with an itinerant alchemist who has promised to communicate to the needy prince the "great secret" of the method of manufacturing gold. And the man of the world, the circumspect politician, having witnessed "with his own eyes," as he afterward assured his friends, the fact of the transmutation of metals, gave to his deceiver what would be a quarter of a million of our money, that he might advance the cause of science in the imminent Congress of the adepts at Venice. During this same illuminated period of the Renaissance, Charles IX. of France, intent on the same method of acquiring wealth, was swindled by Jacob Gautier to the amount of twenty thousand louis d'or. We may note, however, that Pope Leo X. was more prudent than either Bouillon or Charles IX. When Giovanni Augurello read to His Holiness his poem, *Chrysopea*, or "The Art of Making Gold," the greedy promoter received from the grand Mæcenas in tiara, not a plethoric purse, but an empty one, which, observed Leo, would serve to hold the fortune which would soon be manufactured. If we approach nearer to our own days, we behold the entire school of Voltaire, to a man, dupes of charlatans like Cagliostro, the Count de Saint-Germain, and J. J. Casanova (1). Again, we must not forget that the chemical, or alchemical (if we must use the term), investigations of the Middle Age were the immediate causes of all the advances made by modern chemistry. In fact, the study of the occult, the prostitution of science in the interest of knavery, occupied much less of the attention of our mediæval ancestors than is commonly supposed. Speaking of the aberrations of certain mediæval alchemists, Cantù says:

(1) See our remarks on Cagliostro in Vol. iv., p. 420.

“These vagaries of human reason were an inheritance of antiquity, and they ceased during the most glorious centuries of Christianity (the early Middle Age). Undoubtedly, it is to be regretted that human intelligence ever abandoned itself to such a delirium; but the occult sciences were to have their moment of reign in the age of imagination, and to impel, by means of the imagination, the minds of men to an activity of which reason alone was not capable. How many vigils were consecrated to study by those men who thought that thereby they would surely discover the universal remedy and the philosopher’s stone! It was out of their labors that chemistry was born.” It was only after the time of Raimondo Lullo that rascals turned alchemy into an instrument for swindling, and that it was abandoned by men of merit. From the time of Lullo to that of Palissy it made no progress. While engaged in alchemy, Arnaldo di Villanova (b. 1238), the preceptor of Lullo, discovered the sulphuric, muriatic, and nitric acids. He it was who made the first attempts at the distillation which afterward produced alcohol. Paracelsus introduced antimonial, saline, and ferruginous preparations. Glauber discovered the sulphate of soda. Basil Valentino (or whatever Benedictine monk wrote under that name in the fifteenth century) gave to us vitriolized tartar.

Judiciary astrology and the abuses of alchemy certainly produced many baneful effects during the Middle Age; but they were harmless when compared with the evils which attended the practice of sorcery—that lengthy hallucination, says Littré, “which afflicted humanity during many long centuries. The prodigious multitude of sorcerers who were victims of a senseless justice, show how persistently and effectively intellectual maladies are communicated. The executioner did not deter the sorcerers; and they all died, avowing their relations with the demon.” But, like the corruptions of astrology and alchemy, sorcery was not peculiar to the Middle Age. It existed among the ancient Egyptians, and even among the Jews long before the time of Moses, as we learn from *Deuteronomy*; and in *Kings* we read how the Pythoness of Endor caused the ghost of Samuel to appear to Saul. The works of ancient Greece are more redolent of the

paraphernalia of sorcery than of the glories of Hellas ; you can open scarcely one of the Greek narratives, plays, poems, or philosophical treatises, without meeting divinations, philtres, charms, invocations of the dead, metamorphoses of men into animals, etc. Every student remembers the scene described by Homer, where Tiresias prepares the ditch filled with blood for a summoning of the shades ; and that scene where Circe changes the companions of Ulysses into pigs. We know that in pagan Rome sorcery was an acknowledged profession ; and in the time of Tacitus its adepts, under the name of “mathematicians,” were addicted to abominations which caused the great historian to number them among the worst scourges of the empire. These were the “mathematicians” against whom Pope St. Gregory the Great so forcibly inveighed, with the result that many Protestant writers exhibit him as an illustration of papal hostility to learning (1). From Roman paganism, by means of Neo-Platonism (a philosophico-poetical mixture of Indian, Egyptian, and Greek doctrines, which the School of Alexandria tried to substitute for pure Christianity) sorcery and other theosophistic inventions found their way into early mediæval society ; but during the halcyon days of this Age of Faith—that is, from the eighth to the fourteenth century—the number of adepts of occultism was always incomparably less than that which flourished during the Renaissance. Nor could it have happened otherwise. In pagan times, when, to use the words of Bossuet, “everything was God, excepting God Himself,” association with demons, either real or imaginary, was not repugnant to the tastes of men, especially since it was endowed with the charms of terror. But the worship of demons could not subsist in hearts which were occupied by faith in the one, all-powerful, and loving God. In vain did the powers of darkness join the remnants of the Latin with the Germanic superstitions in order to oppose a last resistance to the conquests of the God-Man : the mind of the Church, like that of her grandest poet, Dante, assigned to the sorcerer the lowest place in hell. But when the Renaissance tried to effect an alliance between the ideas of paganism and those

(1) See our Vol. i., p. 389.

of Christianity, there was a great revival of the ancient tendency to superstition; and then arrived the Golden Age of sorcery,—a fact which seems not to be recognized by the admirers of the Renaissance and the decriers of the Middle Age. And this Golden Age of sorcery reached its culmination in the sixteenth century, the period of Protestantism and of scepticism, when the characteristics of the Middle Age had become mere traditions. When writers on sorcery adduce instances of capital punishment for this crime, they seldom go further back than the sixteenth century. They do, indeed, point to the signal case of Joan of Arc in the fifteenth century; but what modern historian, possessed of critical acumen, and not enrolled in the service of the father of lies, ventures to assert that the English murderers of the sweet Maid of Orleans really believed that she was a sorceress?

The many treatises encouraging sorcery and demonology which were published and scattered broadcast throughout Europe, especially in Germany and England, at the time when the so-called Reformers were claiming that human reason had broken its fetters, were the cause of a spread of superstition such as the Middle Age never knew. Martin Luther and his companion preachers contributed their share in furthering the contagion. If we except Luther himself, Melancthon, and a few others of the first innovators, who had been trained by that Church whose seamless garment they were rending, the early preachers of Lutheranism were men of no education; and naturally, instead of combating the belief and practice of sorcery, they helped to propagate the evils. Luther himself said that he held theological conferences with the devil (1), and that he often saw the *Killkropft*—a child born of Satanic parents—sitting among his own offspring; and for many years after the heresiarch's death, credulous visitors to his room in Wartburg were shown the inkspot on the wall which recalled his interview with the prince of darkness. M. Alfred Rambaud—a dis-

(1) *Works of Luther*, Vol. III.—*Claude's Defence of the Reformation*, pt. 2.—*Nicole's Legitimate Prejudices*, ch. 2.—*Basnage's History of the Reformed Churches*, Vol. III., ch. 5.—*Bayle's Dictionary*, Art. *Luther*.

tinguished professor of the French Institute of our day, and of course a freethinker,—is astonished when he reflects on the fact that, in so many places in the days of the Reformation, superstition should have taken the place of religion: “It is very strange, and very humiliating for human reason, that when the Middle Age had vanished; when Charron and Montaigne had just written those books so impregnated with the spirit of scepticism; precisely then, in the full light of the sixteenth century, persecutions of sorcerers entered on their most violent phase” (1). One of the most sincere writers on sorcery, albeit probably the most tiresome and pedantic, was the royal head of the English Church Establishment, that “wisest fool in Europe,” as Sully termed him, James I. “It is not a century,” writes Voltaire, “since King James himself, that great enemy of the Roman communion and of the Pope, caused his *Demonology* to be printed. Master James, as Henry IV. styled him, admitted the fact of enchantments, etc.; he granted the power of the devil, and that of the Pope, who, according to him, has the power of expelling Satan from the bodies of the possessed, just as all priests have it. And even we—we unfortunate Frenchmen, who think to-day that we have re-acquired a little common sense,—even we were then immersed in—oh, what a sewer of stupid barbarism it was! At that time there was not one parliament, not one tribunal, which was not engaged in trying sorcerers.”

Yes, M. Aronet, it was a shame for France that her parliaments and other courts of judicature, like the tribunals in Protestant lands, and notably like the disciples of Cotton Mather in the English colonies of America, were so foolishly cruel toward men and women who may have been guilty of devil-worshipping, but who may have been the victims of hallucination, and may have been more innocent than their judges. But, Sage of Ferney, you who were so sympathetic toward the real or alleged sorcerers and witches who cursed the Pope, at the very time when you wrote of Pombal's burning of the Jesuits at Lisbon (2) that “it is a good

(1) *History of Civilization*, Vol. I., p. 511. Paris, 1885.

(2) It had been rumored in France that Pombal had sent twenty Jesuits to the stake; and it was of this reported hecatomb to Freemasonry and Protestantism that Voltaire said

beginning," could not have been ignorant of the fact that those cruelties would not have been possible in the early Middle Age, when the merciful spirit of the Church permeated the civil jurisprudence. You must have known that at least in that France which you so persistently besmirched, the jurisprudence which you rightly decry was a revival of the old *Jus Penale Romanum*, which had been replaced by the Canon Law of the Church until Philip the Fair broke with all the traditions of the Middle Age, and put secular tribunals in the place of the "Courts of Christianity" which had never prescribed the pain of death for sorcery.

Witchcraft (that form of sorcery which is the most familiar to the American student of history), was a legacy of paganism, and was scarcely known until toward the close of the Middle Age, when the hitherto all-pervading spirit of the Church was beginning to lose its hold on European institutions. The student of the classics will remember Lamia, beloved by Jupiter, and the victim of Juno's jealousy; the murderess of children and the foe of imminent motherhood (1). From this idea of Lamia the pagan Romans drew that of beautiful but lubricious women whom the gods had transformed into witches—*striges*,—and who sucked the blood of infants, or weakened them by feeding them from their own breasts. Garlic was supposed to be a remedy for these enchantments (2). Lucian and Apeleius give many notions concerning the witches of Thessaly, and their powers of transformation. The Jewish *Talmud*, that strange mixture of traditional ancient wisdom and puerile errors, speaks of a certain Lilith, who may have been a version of the pagan Lamia. This Lilith, says the *Talmud*, was the first wife of Adam, a mother of demons, and most baneful to the newly-born children of men; and in order to obviate all danger to the infant, it was deemed necessary to place in the room of

it would do for a beginning. We can imagine the chagrin of the Sage when he learned that only one Jesuit had been burnt—Father Malagrida. (See our Vol. iv., p. 452.)

(1) "*Neu prænse Lamiæ rixum puerum extrahat abro.*" (HORACE, in "*Ars Poetica*," 310.)

(2) "*Præterea si forte premit strix atra puellas,
Virosa immulgens exertis ubera labris,
Alia præcepit Tiliæ sententia necti.*"

—SERENUS SAMONICUS, ch. 59.

the mother a triangle bearing the names of God, Eve, and Adam, together with the warning, "Away, O Lilith!" Another instance of the belief in witchcraft in the early days of Christianity is furnished by the legend that when Herodias received the head of the Baptist, she attempted to kiss it; and that the mouth of the victim opened, emitting a breath which sent the murderess floating in the air, where she is still seen in the quiet of night, waiting for opportunity to injure Christians.

However, during the greater part of the Middle Age there was but little belief in witchcraft. Friar Bernard Rategno, a most zealous Inquisitor of the sixteenth century, whose *Guide for Inquisitors* is praised by that light of the Holy Office, Francis Pegna, says that there were no witches in Christendom "before the time when the *Decree of Gratian* was compiled"—that is, about the year 1151; and he adds that "the *Strigiarum secta* first appeared only about a hundred and fifty years ago, as is evident from the archives of the Inquisition" (1). We are justified, therefore, in believing that it was only after the crime of Anagni had entailed the vital end of the Middle Age, that witchcraft and its attendant horrors became a scourge to humanity.

II.—TRADES-UNIONS.

Among the many proofs that the lot of the mediæval workingman was superior to that of his modern brother, not the least convincing is found in those trades-unions of the Middle Age, which formed an essential constituent of not only the social organism, but also of the political life of that too frequently misunderstood period. A trade-union an institution of the Middle Age? Is it possible that in that "dark period" there existed associations for the protection of the laborer? Such is the fact, surprising though it may be to those who have been led to think that all the social good in the world is a thing of yesterday. In the *History of the Hermit Ampelius* (2), which dates from the fifth

(1) *Guide for the Inquisitors Into Heretical Perverseness, in Which They May Find All That They Need to Know for the Exercise of Their Office*; by Friar Bernard of Como, Friar-Precacher and Illustrious Inquisitor. Milan, 1566.

(2) In the *Golden Legend* by Jacobus de Voragine.

century, we read of the "consuls" or presidents of the locksmiths. In many of the *Chronicles* of the Carolingian period we find mention of the corporation of the goldsmiths. We discover that the bakers had formed an association even in the time of King Dagobert; for an ordinance of that monarch, dated in 630, speaks of them in their collective capacity. Several of the *Capitulars* of Charlemagne prescribed the number of journeymen whom the bakers' association may receive, to the end that the trade may not be overcrowded. In the days of this first Holy Roman Emperor there were in Lombardy many *collegia* of artisans, probably relics of the ancient pagan Roman associations, or rather imitations of those bodies, transformed and sanctified by the Church. In many of the *Annals* of Ravenna, we perceive that about the year 943 there was in that gem of the Adriatic a *collegium* of fishermen; the same annals, at the year 953, make mention of a corporation of traders; and in 1001 they introduce us to a president of the butchers. In 1061 King Philip I., of France, grants privileges to the "masters" of the tallow-chandlers. The records of the reign of Louis VII., at the year 1162, allude to time-honored customs of the butchers' union. In 1182 Philip Augustus confirmed the statutes of the butchers, as well as those of the furriers and the drapers (1). It is true that in Germany, during the early Middle Age, artisans were generally mere serfs; but in the twelfth century even there the laborers had formed their *eimungen*, or unions, although the princes placed every obstacle in the way of these associations, and the emperors (notably Frederick II.) decreed their abolition. In France, on the contrary, just as in Italy and in Spain, there was never any antagonism between the trades-unions and the monarch; and from the time of St. Louis IX. to the Revolution, royal confirmations of the privileges of these associations were multiplied. In 1261 St. Louis appointed Etienne Boileau, a wealthy *bourgeois*, to the provostship of Paris, charging him with the task of collating in form all the customs and usages of each trade-union; for as yet those

(1) *Customs and Usages of the Middle Age, and at the Time of the Renaissance; by Paul Laeroix* (Bibliophile Jacob). Vol. I., p. 301, 6th edit. Paris, 1878.

customs, etc., had been merely traditional. Boileau conferred with the "masters" of all the associations, and the result of his labor was the *Livre des Métiers*, or "Book of the Trades," which Depping edited in 1837; and which, as the editor observed, "has the advantage of being, in great part the unaffected work of the unions themselves, and not a series of regulations established and formulated by municipal or judicial authority." This work of Boileau contains the statutes of a hundred different organizations of artisans; but during the reigns of the Valois and that of Henry IV. the number of trades-unions in France was increased to an immeasurable extent, there having been, in the time of the first Bourbon monarch, one thousand five hundred and fifty-one in Paris alone. The fourteenth century was the golden age for all the trades-unions in Europe. At that time they paraded their own armorial insignia in every religious or other public solemnity. They enjoyed the right of discussing their own general interests and of modifying their statutes. In order to unite its members more closely, each trade inhabited a special quarter of a city, and preferably one street, as is shown to-day by the names of innumerable streets in every European city of any antiquity.

The trades-unions of the early Middle Age exercised a civil and, to some extent, a criminal jurisdiction over their respective members; but since they constantly tended to extend the limits of this jurisdiction, the municipalities and sovereigns finally restricted it to a simple affair of police, to be exercised only in matters concerning the business of the unions. The relations of a union with its members were held by means of officers, who were variously styled as kings, masters, deans, wardens, or syndics. These officers decided all disputes between employers and employees; and at any moment a shop or factory was liable to be entered by one of these representatives of the sovereign corporation, in order to discover whether any infraction of the rules was being committed. These syndics, etc., were generally elected by the members of the unions; in some cases they were appointed by the king himself or the feudal lord. It is by no means a rarity for the reader to discover

in mediæval annals instances of women filling these positions. An eminent publicist of our day has well said that the corporations (so were termed these unions) formed the beloved country of the laborer, the artisan, the mechanic, and the artist of the Middle Age (1); and it is certain that in those days, far from hating the middle class, the workingman could afford to regard the *bourgeois* as his equal, since no member of the *bourgeoisie* occupied so eminent a position socially, or exercised so much civil authority, as did the syndic of a corporation; and every workingman knew that the syndicship was the reward of probity and of skill in his trade (2).

The corporation of the Middle Age (let not the word alarm the reader who may be suspicious of modern corporations) was a "moral personality," which guaranteed to the workingman many social, material, and moral advantages which are unknown to the modern laborer, whether, as is the rule in most countries, he be in that state of isolation to which the individualizing tendencies of the day condemn him, or whether he belong to that unsatisfactory substitute for the corporation of the Ages of Faith, the modern trade-union. In the Middle Age the workingman "was a *body* in the state; now he is merely an *individual*" (3). The mediæval corporation protected each one of its members; the modern omnipotent state confronts individuals who are powerless in their vaunted independence. In the mediæval corporation the laborer, artisan, or artist found the means to satisfy his most ordinary and pressing needs—primary and industrial instruction for his children, his own support when sick or incapacitated by age, and even dowries for his marriageable daughters. The mediæval guild (another name for this admirable institution) was surrounded by an atmosphere of religion the most life-giving, as it is the most encouraging atmosphere which the workingman can breathe. Each guild was placed under the patronage of some special

(1) LEVASSEUR; *History of the Working Classes in France*. Paris, 1859.

(2) FOUQUE; *Historical Researches Concerning the Communal Revolution in the Middle Age*. Paris, 1840.

(3) ROMAIN; *Was the Middle Age a Period of Darkness and of Servitude?* Paris, 1895.

saint; the feast of the patron was the great holiday of each member and of his family; the saint's portrait was the prominent feature of the guild's banner; in the church dedicated to the saint (or in the absence of such, before his image) the apprentice assumed the obligations of his "mastership"; in fine, in every action of the corporation, as such, every member was made to feel that the end of labor should not be the mere accumulation of money, but rather the sanctification of one's soul.

In nearly all the pictures and medals of the thirteenth and fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, illustrating the careers of the mediæval guilds, which may be seen to-day in the Vatican Museum, the religious spirit of these associations is attested as having been of their very essence (1). Here we see the workingmen marching in solemn religious procession, surrounded by the emblems of their corporation, bearing lighted candles and revealing an expression of devotion which real acolytes do not always present. There we see a guild kneeling in prayer, probably in its own special church; and the artist has endowed the figures of the suppliants with a spirit which leads us to believe that those laborers, mechanics, or artists did conscientious work. Conscientious? Certainly; for when the apprentice was received as journeyman, one of the solemn promises which he made to God and to his corporation was to the effect that he would do "loyal" (that is, sound and honest) work. It was the duty of the syndic to see that this promise was kept, and to destroy or undo every piece of work which would bring discredit on the association. The instinctive and disciplinary "loyalty" of these mediæval workmen is evidenced in every production of their hands which has come down to us. Every mediæval corporation consisted of apprentices (for one, two, or three years, according to the nature of the labor or art), of journeymen, of aspirants to a mastership, and of wardens. The modern trade-union is an association of employees, the employer having no other connection with the organization than that which is entailed by his nearly constant antagonism to its measures,—an antagonism which is

(1) Many of these representations are reproduced in the monumental work of Lacroix.

sometimes justifiable, frequently inexcusable, and always lamentable. In the mediæval guild the employer was a member, and he was as subject to its laws as was the humblest apprentice. The mediæval employer, just like the newest apprentice in the guild, regarded as the ægis of his happiness, as the symbol of his real glory, that silken banner on which was admired, in gold or in silver, the saw of the carpenter, or the knife of the shoemaker, or the scissors of the tailor, or the crown and golden cross of the goldsmith; and like the apprentice, the employer was ever guided by the motto of his corporation, which could never lead him astray, since the device of every guild was assigned by the spirit of Christ (1). In order to become a member of a corporation, a person was obliged to prove that he was of good reputation, and it was necessary that the commune or municipality should certify his moral character. The candidate was also obliged to show that he was capable of performing, or of learning how to perform, the labors of his chosen craft; and when he had passed the examination, he was presented to the mayor of the municipality, and then led to a banquet of initiation, accompanied by two "god-fathers." When the apprentice had become a journeyman, his great ambition was the mastership in his trade or art, and that grade could not be attained until he had produced a "masterpiece" which won the approval of the best judges in the corporation. Once a master in his trade, the workman of the Middle Age could travel in any country of Europe, and he would always be sure to receive assistance from his brethren of the same trade. In those days, says Levasseur, the corporation was the safeguard and the teacher of industry. "It taught the people how to govern themselves. It did more: it gave to the artisan dignity, a taste for his business, pecuniary aid, the joys of fraternity in the most extensive sense of the word. It was the great affair of the working classes—the source of their pleasures, and the interest of their entire life." As George Sand expressed the idea, the corporation "conferred on the

(1) The corporations of Paris all had for device: *Vincit Concordia Fratrum*—"The concord of brothers conquers."

initiated a patent of nobility, of which he was proud and zealous even unto excess."

A very productive source of revenue, for both the corporation and the municipality, was formed by the system of fines for every delinquency on the part of a member. But gross offences against the reputation of the association in matter of "loyalty" were not condoned by a merely pecuniary sacrifice. At as late a date as the fifteenth century, we find that *adulteration of material, and culpable deficiency of care in building, were punished by death*, just as other kinds of robbery were then punished. The good traditions of each trade or profession, as well as the public interest, were guaranteed by the care which was taken for the morals of all the members. If any of them associated with, labored with, or took food with an excommunicated person, a reprimand ensued; a repetition of the offence entailed more severe punishment, perhaps expulsion from the guild. Immorality, in the case of a master, meant the loss of his mastership; in the case of an apprentice, it prevented his entrance on the examination for advancement. In many corporations the most trivial indecent expression was followed by a fine. Injudicious rivalry was obviated by prohibiting a new master from opening an establishment within a certain distance from the quarters of his old superior. Among the merchants and traders there was no "pulling in" in those days; the street was as free to the wayfarer as the castle to the baron.

That in time abuses arose in the mediæval corporations cannot be denied; but most of those abuses originated at the decline of the Middle Age, not in its prime. And even though those abuses—natural concomitants of everything human—had been tenfold more numerous and more condemnable than they were, they were more than neutralized by the eloquent fact that the laborer and artisan were then free men, and that their liberty was defended by municipal institutions and by the confraternities to which these workingmen belonged. It cannot be denied that the modern workingman is sometimes reasonably proud of his *individual liberty*; but it may be questioned whether his condition be not rather one of *individual abandonment*, in the face of that

capital which has become, to a very great extent, his antagonist,—that capital which in the Middle Age was his partner in the strict sense of the term. Indeed, absolute social equality is purely utopian; but its semi-insane advocates ought to acclaim the corporations of the Middle Age as having done more than any modern institution has effected in the way of harmonizing the social classes. It is of the essence of fallen human nature to be subject to the attacks of the passion of envy; therefore there was, in the Middle Age, a certain amount of ill-feeling for the rich and the lords of feudality, on the part of those whose bread was gained by the sweat of their brows. But how trivial was that envy if it be compared with that hatred of “the capitalist” which is now but too rampant in the breasts of very many workingmen! Speaking of France, where the mediæval corporations did not disappear entirely until the Revolution of 1789, the very unclerical Prondhon pronounces their abolition a “great iniquity”:—“It was the new system of law, inaugurated in 1789, which created the entirely new distinction between the middle class [*la bourgeoisie*] and that of the working people [*les prolétaires*],—a distinction which was unknown in feudal times. Before '89 the workingman lived in the corporation and in the mastership, just as a wife, a child, or a servant lives in the family. Then it would have been simply absurd to recognize one class of employers and another of employees; for then the employers included the employed. But since '89—the tie of the corporations having been severed without any equalization of wealth and condition between masters and workingmen, without any provision for a repartition of capital, and for a new organization of labor and of the rights of laborers,—a distinction has arisen between the class of capitalists and great proprietors who were the manipulators of the instruments of labor, and the class of laborers who were mere wage-earners. The deep-seated antagonism between the two classes—a thing unknown in the Middle Age—cannot be denied; and *that which caused it was a great iniquity.*”

This judgment of the giant among the many pygmies of modern Socialism should be well considered by all proletarian

sympathizers. Class hatred is styled by M. Levasnier, the editor of the Parisian journal *La Corporation*, "the barbarism of the civilized world, the dynamite of progress which threatens to destroy the edifice of society." When the Revolution of 1789 abolished the corporations in France, the government realized that the workingmen would suffer, and it promised to frame "a law on associations which would restore to the laborer the guarantees which had disappeared with his corporative organization." But unto this day that law has not been passed; and there is too much truth in the words of the extremely radical journal, the *Cri du Peuple*, when, after declaring that in the Middle Age the laborer was a free man, it complains that in our day "the condition of the workingman is very similar to that of a serf who enjoys a relative liberty, while because of that liberty his master has no duties in his regard." The trade-union of the Middle Age was certainly a close corporation, and probably its consequent condition of a privileged monopoly was its chief defect. M. Levasseur contends that this monopoly was justifiable at a time when "labor was extremely conscientious," the market very difficult, and local life very limited. Be this as it may, the monopolistic feature, the closeness of the corporation, might have been abolished without a destruction of the union itself; and there is no reason why our day should not see a revival of the mediæval institution, divested of its spirit of exclusiveness, but being, as of yore, a veritable representative of the interests of the workingmen. In France the enterprises of the noble Count Albert de Mun bid fair to bring about some such consummation.

III.—BUSINESS FEATURES.

Should some enterprising archæologist of the twenty-fifth century undertake to investigate the social life of the nineteenth, would he derive any information from a perusal of one of the ledgers of any of the monstrous "department-stores" now so common in both Europe and America? Some of the account-books of these establishments may possibly survive the vicissitudes of the next five or six

centuries; and possibly, though very improbably, the ink of the nineteenth century may prove to have been, in some rare instances, nearly as durable as that of the Middle Age. But a twenty-fifth century investigator will scarcely find any eloquence in the interminable columns of dry and heartless figures which are now more distressingly monotonous to many poor book-keepers than are, to any seamstress, the stitches produced to the tune of the "Song of the Shirt." Will any idea be derived concerning the private lives of those individuals whose shopping proclivities are now the cause of the ledger's existence? The average merchant of our day will tell you, of course, that his account-book must necessarily deal with nothing but dollars and cents; that in his business minds and hearts have no place; and that only a madman would expect the records of his office to furnish material for a treatise on social or religious economy. Very different from this theory was that entertained by the average business man in the Ages of Faith. Then hardness of heart did not cause a mercantile register to present a record merely of monetary transactions—of things which are of no use to the philosophy of history. Of course in mediæval days, as in our own, the merchant noted accurately each expenditure and each sale; but then time was found, or made, for such an explanation of each transaction as renders it, when examined by the modern investigator, an interesting and reliable source of history.

Under the auspices of the Historical Society of Gascony there was published, in 1890, a ledger of a mercantile establishment which flourished in the fourteenth century at Montauban (1). The book had been unearthed in the archives of Montauban by M. Edouard Forestié; and when read with the aid of the Introduction furnished by its discoverer, it sheds much light upon the social and economic conditions of the Middle Age. We learn from this book of accounts that the Bonis Brothers were general merchants in Montauban. They were bankers, both of deposit and of issue; money-lenders; collectors of taxes and of ecclesiasti-

(1) *Ledgers of the Bonis Brothers, Merchants in Montauban in the Fourteenth Century.* Paris, 1890.

cal revenues; executors of wills; dealers in all kinds of dry-goods, made clothing, and shoes; jewellers, armorers, and mechanics; manufacturers and loaners of all things requisite for baptisms, weddings, and funerals; manufacturers of gunpowder and of all kinds of chemicals; wholesale and retail apothecaries, confectioners, etc. We are told that the two members of the firm lived in apartments over the immense halls in which the goods were retailed; that the younger brother, Gerard, was married, and had several children, who were educated at home by a Master of Arts; that during "the year of mortality"—that is, 1349, the year of the Great Plague—two of these children died; and that in the following year, Pope Clement VI. having proclaimed a Jubilee, the bereaved parent journeyed to the Eternal City, that he might obtain, as the book-keeper piously notes, rest for the departed and grace for himself. The clerk describes carefully the itinerary of his master: "He who wishes to visit SS. Peter and Paul, St. John of the Lateran, and the other saints in ancient Rome, should proceed from here [Montauban] to Avignon. He will dine at Avignon. At night he will sleep at Carpentras. On the next day he will dine at Sault, and then he will sleep at Sederon. . . . On the twenty-third day he will dine most joyously in ancient Rome. During this year 1350 our lord the Pope grants pardon from guilt and punishment to all repentant persons who have confessed their sins. This present Pope is a native of Avignon." Since the clerk informs us how careful M. Gerard Bonis was in complying with the conditions of the "Pardon," we are not surprised on hearing that in the house of the great merchants there was a resident chaplain, whose chief duty it was to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass for the living and dead of the house of Bonis.

One of the striking features of this mediæval ledger is its presentation of evidence that the Bonis Brothers never charged interest to their debtors. It is undoubtedly true that many merchants in the Middle Age were less disinterested; but a very small minority—and that minority composed almost entirely of Jews—were guilty of what was then regarded as a nefarious practice, since the ecclesiastical

canons of that period prohibited it. Another important fact evinced by this book is the not merely comfortable but the luxurious conditions enjoyed by most of the customers of the Bonis. The list of purchases shows that during the fourteenth century not only were garments of very fine texture worn by the lower middle class of the French, but that even the peasants were not unaffected by the tyranny of fashion. Much of the time and energy of the Bonis was consumed in the manufacture of medicines; and the ledger gives valuable information concerning the ingredients of many of the popular nostrums of the day. We learn that in the little city of Montauban—then of about ten thousand souls—there were eighteen regular physicians; in the Suburban parish of Montricoux the pastor was the acting Æsculapius; and in some places one individual was both lawyer and physician. One of the curious items is a charge for a quantity of powder for cannon—*polveras per lo cano*—entered against the monastery of St.-Theodard (1).

Luxury at the table, if we are to credit the revelations of the Bonis ledger, which speaks of sales of the finest condiments and confections to families of the middle class, was well known to the French of the fourteenth century, whatever may have been the gastronomic taste of the English and Germans of that time. There is scarcely a spice or a sweet known to us that is not charged to some *bourgeois* of Montauban. As to the peasants, their condition, as evinced by this quaint but reliable authority, is very different from that described as theirs by most modern historians. We find many of these presumed unfortunates stamping their documents with their own seals—things which are generally supposed to be prerogatives of aristocracy; we learn that

(1) Commenting on this entry, M. Forestié makes this interesting remark: "Hugues de Cardailiac, lord of Bioule, nephew of the Bishop of Montauban, was one of the most vallant knights in the French army. Friend and comrade of Gallois de la Beaume, grand-master of the cross-bowmen, he had a brilliant share in the campaign of Gascony, under the standard of Armagnac. We find him in 1339 making the cannons which are to defend Cambrai against the English, and it is his squire who makes the powder. At Bioule we see him with twenty-two *breech-loading* cannons. It was he who furnished the artillery to the walls of Montauban, Lauzerte, and Cahors; and thus we find that there were sixty cannons on the ramparts of four little towns of Quercy, just at the time when Villani (and after him many modern writers) states that at Crecy three little cannons demoralized the French chivalry."

their garments were lined with fur, and that they lived in brick houses rather than in the loathsome huts in which we are accustomed to picture them. Every farm laborer had his wages and other recompenses assured by written contract. As a specimen of these contracts, we give the following: "He is to be in our service, with his own ox and one belonging to us, from January until the Feast of St. John the Baptist (June 24), to act as ox-driver and general farm-servant; and we are to give him a barrel of wheat, a barrel of mixed grain, and two barrels of wine." Many of the laborers mentioned in this ledger had quite comfortable properties. Thus the swineherd, Jean Chausse-Noire, owned a fine vineyard. Salona, an ox-driver for the Bonis, owned two houses in Montauban; and his wealth must have been considerable, since the ledger notes that on the occasion of the baptism of one of his children he bought two hundred and twenty livres' worth of wine for the feast. Another peasant, owner of an extensive vineyard, must have dwelt in a fairly large house; for we read that he bought twenty thousand bricks from the Bonis for the facing of its walls. One of the servants of Gerard Bonis was a rival of that steward whom Chaucer represents as so thrifty that he could lend to his master "out of his owen gude"; for we find that this domestic loaned three golden scudi to Gerard during his Roman pilgrimage. Those who believe that the peasants of the Middle Age were generally illiterate, should observe that in the register of the Bonis many of the laborers signed receipts with their names; and the same book tells us that each village of the neighborhood had a school, in which the parish priest was pedagogue. Commenting on the discovery of M. Forestié, that sage and impartial critic, Lecoy de la Marche, makes these reflections: "The general prosperity of which we have seen the proof, and which the people of France owed to the wise and firm government of St. Louis, was soon to disappear amid the incalculable disasters of the Hundred Years' War; and the second half of the fourteenth century was not at all like the first. But the Hundred Years' War was the end of the Middle Age, the tearing up of the pacific charter which united the nations

and constituted Christian society. The Middle Age, properly so called, was a flourishing period for commerce and agriculture, and for both public and private fortune. Let it be loudly proclaimed that down to the end of that period—down to the day when the peace of Jesus Christ ceased to cover Europe like a protecting mantle—the world knew much more of happiness than it has known since, and incomparably more than it will know under the sway of atheism and socialism. God treats faithful nations as he treats faithful individuals: ‘All these things shall be added unto you’” (1).

In the National Archives of France there is preserved a register of the accounts of the mines of Jacques Cœur in the Lyonnais and the Beaujolais, dated 1455. This document, given to the light in 1890 (2), shows the condition of the miners at a time when, according to most modern publicists, there was no ordinary comfort for the workingman. According to this register, the mines were in the charge of a “governor”; but the decisions of that official were subject, on the appeal of the miners, to the judgment of a representative of the king, who was specially charged with the preservation of their privileges. The rules of the mines were most stringent in regard to blasphemy and all matters of immorality. The workmen were paid, for little more than half a year’s labor, from two hundred to two thousand francs, according to their skill and consequent position; and when we reflect on the cheapness of living at that time, and on the fact that the miners were fed, clothed, lodged, and doctored by the establishment, we shall realize that they must have saved sufficient to ensure for themselves a comfortable old age. This conclusion is well founded; for they were never allowed, unless in cases of real necessity, to draw their wages in advance. The food of these workmen was abundant and of the best quality—consisting of beef, mutton, pork, fish, eggs, bread, cheese, spices, nuts, and all kinds of fruit. They had as much white and red

(1) *Recent Progress of History*. Paris, 1893.

(2) In the *France During the Hundred Years’ War, Historical Episodes and Private Life in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, by Simeon Luce, Member of the Institute. Paris, 1890.

wine as they desired. They slept in dormitories near to the kitchens of the establishments, so that in cold weather the immense sleeping rooms might be heated by hot air carried by pipes from the kitchen fires. A modern miner, especially an English one, would wonder at a description of the resting-place of these laborers. Each one had his own couch; and on it was a mattress, a feather-bed, linen sheets, two blankets, a coverlet, and a pillow (1). The subterranean tasks of these mediæval miners did not last from January 1 to December 31: many of them were owners of farms, and at sowing time and harvest-tide they left the bowels of the earth to attend to their crops. Certainly the picture conjured by these two registers cannot be acceptable to those who would fain believe that our mediæval and Catholic ancestors enjoyed neither comfort nor common-sense; that the lot of the modern workingman is immeasurably superior to the apology for an existence which a Catholic society is presumed to have decreed for the mediæval laborer. But it conveys some valuable lessons for us who live in a time of charlatanical political and social economy.

IV.—THE LOT OF THE PEASANT.

When Chateaubriand declared that "the peasant serf of the Middle Age, partly soldier and partly laborer, was probably less oppressed, less ignorant, and less rude than the free peasant" of later days (2), the decriers of the Age of Faith hailed the remark as one of the many proofs that in the author of *The Genius of Christianity* historical acumen was less evident than poetical imagination. Nevertheless, a universally acknowledged prince of historians in that day, Augustin Thierry, at a time when his investigations had not yet led him from rationalistic darkness to Catholic light, had pronounced the feudal system—which was said to have

(1) It is a pity that Michelet, who thought that the sanitary features of the toilette were habitually neglected by the mediæval peoples ("not a bath in a thousand years"), could not have read this passage concerning the bed for each miner. But what must have been the surprise of M. Stupuy, that member of the Municipal Council of Paris who, just before the publication of this register, had informed his colleagues that in the public institutions of the Middle Age the beneficiaries were always consigned to rest at the rate of "eight to ten in each bed."

(2) *An Analysis of the History of France*, Vol. iii., p. 354. Paris, 1838.

been a source of misery for the workers of mediæval Europe—"a necessary revolution, a natural bond of defence between the lords and the peasants,—a bond which originated on the one hand in the thing conferred, and on the other hand in recognition of the gift (*donum*) and in the oath of fidelity" (1). Undoubtedly the mediæval lord exercised many rights; but he had also many duties, especially that of protection to his vassals. Certainly the serf, in return for the land which he had received from his lord, was obliged to pay the "tithes" which are so universally misunderstood by the worshippers of all that is modern; but this burden was far less grievous than those which crush the modern peasant and workingman, especially in the Europe of our day. It is not improbable that a fairly accurate idea of the feudal *régime* may be formed by a contemplation of the little Pyrenean republic of Andorra, a vassal of France, but a survival of the many independent and happy republics of the Middle Age (2). Happy in their vassalage to their lords, the bishop of Urgel and the government of France, to whom they pay what is almost a nominal "title," the Andorrans might appropriate to themselves the saying of Tacitus, "*Plus ibi boni mores valent quam alibi bonæ leges.*" Of course the unique conditions of Andorra exempt her from the miseries of a society which was too prone to shed human blood in intestine and foreign war; but an unprejudiced eye will discern that the little state has much in common with those of the Middle Age. "The erndite," remarks Le Play, "who have investigated the condition of the European peasantry of the olden time, without being blinded by the passions of our day, have all arrived at the same conclusion. Faithful

(1) *Considerations on the History of France*. Paris, 1837.

(2) Charlemagne permitted the Andorrans to continue to govern themselves according to their own customs, in recompense for their aid in his war against the Moors of Spain. Afterward Louis le Debonnaire transferred part of his right of suzerainty over the Andorrans to the bishop of Urgel, thus making that prelate a co-suzerain with France,—a form which still subsists. As suzerains of Andorra, the bishop of Urgel and the French government appoint two *riguiers*, who conjointly with the syndic of the Valley of Andorra decide in all important cases. Ordinary matters are submitted to the twelve consuls whom the people elect annually to represent the six parishes of the republic; and these magistrates consult with the consuls of the previous year. Each *commune* imposes its own taxes, every citizen paying according to the revenue from his land or flocks. Primary instruction is more extensive in Andorra than in the contiguous districts belonging to France and Spain.

pictures of the past show us peasants judging in their own civil and criminal cases, paying very light taxes, and fixing these in accordance with local necessities; in fine, those peasants yielded to an independent attraction toward their lords, which could not be excited by any modern European bureaucracy" (1). "In those days," observes Duruy, "no tax could be levied without the consent of the parties affected; no law was valid unless it had been accepted by those who were to obey it; no sentence was legitimate unless it had been pronounced by the peers of the accused. Behold the rights of the feudal society,—rights which the States-General of 1789 found under the ruins of absolute monarchy. The sentiment of the dignity of man, which despotism had destroyed, was rediscovered. Mediæval society, which shed blood with so deplorable a facility, often exhibited a moral elevation which can be found in no other age. The low vices, the degradation of the Romans in their decadence, were unknown in the Middle Age; and that age bequeathed the sentiment of honor to modern times" (2).

About forty years ago the Abbé Defourny, *curé* of Beaumont in Argonne, France, while delving among the musty archives of his municipality, brought to light a document which illustrates the relations which subsisted in the twelfth century among the lords, citizens, and serfs of France. It proved to be the famous *Charter of Beaumont*, given to his people in 1182 by Guillaume de Champagne, cardinal-archbishop of Reims and lord of Beaumont; and since the eminent author declares that he simply ratifies *existing customs*, we may be assured that his charter presents a faithful picture of at least a large portion of French society in his day. Guizot termed this charter "one of the most liberal" of the Middle Age; but we know that in every country of Europe there were then in vigor customs analogous to those which His Eminence of Reims confirms; and it is certain that the same charter, in all its details, was promulgated throughout Lorraine by Duke Fery III. in 1270 (3). The cardinal shows

(1) *Social Reform*. Paris, 1880.

(2) *History of the Middle Age*. Paris, 1875.

(3) ROMAIN: *Was the Middle Age a Period of Darkness and of Servitude?* Paris, 1890.

that the political power in his jurisdiction of Beaumont resided in himself as lord of the fief; but we find no indication that he ever exercised such power, except to defend his vassals from outside attack or to grant pardon when it could be granted. He does not claim the right to appoint magistrates or judges or fiscal agents; in fact, he gives no sign that he ever interfered in the administration of justice. He declares that he will never revoke any of the clauses in his charter; and although one of his successors in the see of Reims, Richard Pique, transferred his rights to King Charles V., care was taken that the new suzerain should promise to "respect all the stipulations of the charter of Guillaume de Champagne"; and the said privileges were respected until the Revolution of 1789. We adduce this *Charter of Beaumont* in order that the reader may determine whether the lot of the mediæval peasant was, as is so frequently asserted, one of unmitigated misery and despair. In the first place, we observe that every peasant's "hut" (if the reader prefers that term) was heated without any expense to himself: the communal forest furnished him all the wood that he required for comfort and for cooking. His lamp was supplied with oil made from the beech-nuts which the lord of the soil allowed him to gather in the manorial woods, and he could sell to the denizens of the nearest city all the superfluous oil that he could manufacture. The communal forest and the woods of the lord also furnished the peasant with the timber which he needed for building purposes; and from the same sources he obtained wild apple and pear trees, which by cultivation (since arboriculture was then an art far better and more universally understood than it is in these days) became ornaments to the peasant's acres and beneficent purveyors for his table. Generous wine was at the easy command of this needlessly-pitied man; for all around him grapes were common property. And we may note in passing that his modern successor would be much more happy if he used such wine in abundance, instead of the foul spirits which were unknown to the average peasant of the Middle Age. Much has been written concerning the discomforts of the peasant domiciles in this olden time; but we note that the *Charter of Beaumont*

informs us that each commune, at least in that jurisdiction, operated a tile-factory which furnished coverings for every peasant's roof. This item alone would justify the opinion that the mediæval "hut" was more sanitary than at least half of its modern successors in the most progressive countries of the world. Did our space permit, we could dilate on this matter of the domestic economy of the mediæval dwellers in the fields; and the result would not flatter the intelligence of many "educators" of our modern youth. We must dismiss this feature, however, with one reflection. Famine was nearly an impossibility in mediæval Europe. Each commune had a common pasture ground—*la vaine pâture*,—on which any individual, domiciled or houseless, comfortably situated or destitute, could find sustenance for one cow and for one goat or sheep. It is not strange, therefore, that pauperism, that plague which modern society vainly endeavors to neutralize through mercenary agents, was impossible in the rural districts of that time. And it would seem that free-trade, if not as to the word, certainly as to the thing, was familiar to the mediæval peasant; for the *Charter of Beaumont* declares: "It shall be lawful for you to buy and sell whatever you may desire, without paying us any tax whatsoever." No wonder that the Protestant De Tocqueville was constrained to avow that in spite of the many advantages of modern civilization, "the condition of the peasant was better in the thirteenth than in the eighteenth century" (1). If the economists are right when they assert that a density of population is an indication of prosperity, at least rural France of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries must have been remarkably happy; for although the science of statistics is of modern birth, such investigators as Dureau de la Malle and Simèon Luce have furnished indications which seem to evince that the rural population of the France of to-day is less numerous than the same population in that early period.

But was not serfdom a running sore among the populations of the Middle Age? No; a thousand times no! Serfdom, a vestige of ancient pagan slavery, was gradually disappearing throughout the Middle Age, being continually pressed

(1) *The Old Regime and the Revolution*, Bk. ii., ch. 12. Paris, 1856.

by the triumphant advance of the Christian civilization which the Catholic Church had created. "How many persons," exclaims Lecoy de La Marche, "even to-day imagine that the Middle Age was the halcyon time of serfdom, and that the existence of a caste of slaves was one of the essential foundations of its social constitution! But the truth is diametrically contrary to this assertion. The Middle Age waged incessant war against serfdom as a principle; it substituted for crying abuses alleviations which became more and more efficacious, and finally it abolished the evil *de facto*. When it bequeathed the rule of the European populations to the modern states, serfdom had long been a mere memory or a name. Already in the thirteenth century it had become rare; in Normandy and in many other parts of France it had disappeared entirely" (1). France is generally supposed by the poor dupes of certain English and German historiasters to have been, until the "glorious" days of 1789, a veritable holocaust to the mediæval Catholic love of slavery; and it has suited the purpose of French Voltaireans and atheists to swell the chorus which must necessarily try to besmirch the fame of the Spouse of Christ. But it is certain that in the beginning of the fourteenth century serfdom was legally abolished in France; and that before the end of the fifteenth century—before the dawn of the Renaissance—there were no longer any of those who, despite the royal decrees, had persisted in regarding themselves as serfs (2). We hear certain readers demanding whether it can be possible that any sane human beings could have insisted upon their right to remain in serfdom. Such was the case when Louis X. declared that "in the land of the Franks no man should be a serf"; force was required ere thousands of the serfs could be brought to recognize the new order of things. Such was the case in our day when the Russian Czar, Alexander II., incited by

(1) *History of St. Louis*. Paris, 1891.

(2) The *corryphées* of the Revolution and the generality of the Masonic tribe continually laud, *usque ad nauseam*, the decree of August 4, 1789, by which the French National Assembly pretended to abolish serfdom in France. They wish us to ignore the fact that Louis XVI. himself had issued a similar decree in 1778; and that even this *ordonnance* affected only a few light burdens which had survived the march of centuries rather as archaeological curiosities than as objects of serious attention.

Napoleon III., emancipated the serfs of his empire. Nor was this fact worthy of enumeration among phenomenal aberrations of human perversity. The serf was by no means a slave; no mediæval serf could have even dreamt of being visited by such horrors as were the almost constant concomitants of American slavery, or by such as were solemnly sanctioned by the pagan Roman jurisprudence. The serf, to use the words of Eginhard, the secretary of Charlemagne, was a vassal of an inferior degree; and his own immediate superior—his “lord”—was merely a vassal of a higher degree. The serf had no master, but a patron; he was master of his own person, but he had certain obligations and duties toward his lord, who recompensed his fidelity by efficacious protection. The serf drew his sustenance from a piece of land, the high domain of which was reserved by the lord to himself, but of which the serf was a kind of half-proprietor. Of course the serf was “attached to the glebe”; and this phrase is offensive to certain modern ears. But is not the modern mechanic bound to the means which gain his livelihood? the merchant to his business? The serf could not abandon his glebe; but neither could he ruin himself by mortgaging it. If he fell ill, his lord took care of him; if his cattle died, his lord replaced them; if he or his family were attacked, his lord defended him. “While the lord was owner of the soil,” says Guérard, “he could not dispossess its inhabitants. The residents on his territory had become, through custom, real proprietors; whereas in olden days they had been tenants. If the lord wished to sell his domain, he did so without ousting the serfs: he acted as a monarch acts when he cedes a province.” Does the reader perceive much practical difference, so far as this matter of attachment to the glebe is concerned, between the lot of the mediæval serf and that of the English or Irish tenant who leases a piece of ground for a hundred years? Such difference as we perceive is in favor of the serf, especially when we note this sentiment uttered by the Abbé Defourny in his commentary on the *Charter of Beaumont*: “In the twelfth century, after the serf had improved his land, the lord gave to that serf a right of property in

that improved land, together with full liberty to transmit it to his descendants, without payment of any right of succession or any other tax. Then the serf could say to himself while he was improving his farm: 'This soil, watered with my sweat, belongs to me and my children; at each stroke of the spade I take possession. The lord asks for only one-seventh of the crop; therefore my labor is well rewarded, and from generation to generation my posterity will possess the land which I have fertilized.' But the tenant-farmer of the nineteenth century must say: 'I have improved this land, but it belongs to the landlord. After a few years, when I am old, when the lease has expired, I shall be ordered to move with my children to some other farm, which, in its turn, after being improved by me, will still belong to the landlord.'"

Now a few words in explanation of certain burdens suffered by the mediæval peasant, which at first sight may perhaps appear to blur the pleasing picture which we have drawn. In the Middle Age the peasant was subjected to the payment of tithes, ecclesiastical and temporal; to the law of pursuit, to the law of *mainmorte*, and to the right of *forismaritagium*. As to the payment of tithes, we may observe that it was not peculiarly a mediæval institution: it was instituted by Moses, and we find it in force among the Christians of the fifth century; it exists to-day in England (1). We find no records of complaints of the excessiveness of ecclesiastical tithes during the Middle Age; indeed, such complaints would have been absurd, since, although the term "tithes" indicates a tenth, the tax was seldom so large, and was frequently only one-twentieth of the crop. When Vauban submitted his work on *The Royal Tithe* to Louis XIV., he urged the monarch to take the ancient ecclesiastical tithe as the model for the tax which he advised Louis to decree; for, said he, "the ecclesiastical tithe has excited no complaints since it was established, and we have never found that it has been the occasion of corrupt prac-

(1) At present tithes *in kind* are not collected in England for the benefit of the clergy of the Royal Establishment. In 1835 it was ordered that they should be paid in money, the value being determined by the average receipts from the crops during the preceding seven years. They amount to about forty millions of dollars.

tices. Of all taxes, it requires the fewest collectors, it entails the smallest expenses, and it is the most easily and gently raised." And let us not forget that the ecclesiastical tithe was always payable *in kind*, or in the products of the soil; so that in times of failure of crops the peasant paid nothing. On the contrary, the greater number of secular taxes, being payable in money, were often grievous burdens to the taxed. The decriers of the mediæval tithe should study the economic conditions of the rural populations of France, as they now subsist under the Third Republic, the foremost European representative of all that is peculiarly *modern* in our civilization. On January 21, 1884, M. Pouyer-Quertier showed the French Senate that agriculture paid thirty per cent. of its revenue in taxes, and industrial property paid twenty per cent.

We do not hear much concerning the presumed burden of the "law of pursuit," since it was fairly reasonable, and was seldom executed to the letter. By virtue of this right, the lord of the soil could pursue and capture a serf who abandoned his tenure. It is certain, however, that in practice the serf could, by means of the payment of a small sum, and by the fulfilment of his other obligations, generally obtain the right to reside where he desired. A different judgment must be emitted in regard to the "law of *mainmorte*." According to this law, the serf could leave to his natural heirs only a small portion of his movable property, the greater part accruing to his lord; and against this prohibition the Church continually thundered. The curious student of the Middle Age, one who delights in reading the quaint but frequently sublime sermons of that time, knows how often the preachers compared the nobles to vultures pouncing on a corpse. It was this fact, this difference between their spiritual guides and their temporal lords—the latter too often worthy precursors of our modern liberals,—that caused the peasants of the Age of Faith to declare that "it is well to live under the crosier." However, this tremendous evil, like many other loudly-published abuses of the Middle Age, was frequently attenuated. Lecoy de La Marche observes that it generally affected only

the isolated serf: "If the serf had established a kind of community with his natural heirs, residing with them on the land which he cultivated, his goods passed to them. Very often this course was adopted in order to overcome the legal obstacle: the community subsisted after his death, and therefore naturally succeeded to him. It succeeded, in the same manner, to all of its successively deceased members, successively replacing them. These associations of farm-laborers, entitled 'tacit societies,' eventually constituted, in certain localities, veritable little agricultural republics."

The right of *forismaritagium* was, for a time, undoubtedly the most obnoxious, as it is still the most famous, of all the burdens which the mediæval peasant was called to bear. As is partly indicated by the etymology of the word, it was an exemption from a feudal proscription which forbade the marriage of a serf with a woman of superior condition who resided in another lordship; and the reason or pretext for the prohibition had been based on the supposition that such a union might "diminish the fief" by depriving it of the services of persons who ought to have been born within its limits. That this theory was a relic of pagan slavery was evident; and the Church, ever zealous for the freedom and the honor of Christian matrimony, resisted its actuation as a tyranny which could have no invalidating effect on a Sacrament pertaining to her sole custody. The nobles ultimately abandoned their claim so far as to permit the undesirable unions, on condition that they received from the bridegrooms a sum of money (varying from three cents to sixty cents), as an acknowledgment of their presumed jurisdiction in the premises. Such was the meaning of the *forismaritagium* at the beginning of the twelfth century; but very frequently the fine, or tribute, was solved by the presentation of a fancy cake, or even by a gymnastic exhibition before the lord and his retainers (1).

V.—HOSPITALS.

So vivid was the spirit of religion in the Middle Age, that music, architecture, and all the arts were brought into

(1) See the *Glossary* of Ducange, art. *Forismaritagium*.

requisition to *externate* this noblest sentiment that can fill the heart of man ; and the choicest flowers of language were culled, and made to join in the general homage to the Creator. Most of the beautiful expressions which so impress us in our devotional and ascetic works were then coined. Nowhere more than in the service of charity were the tender capabilities of language, the poetry of which it is capable, adapted to Christian use. Thus when speaking of those who were in dire want, our ancestors in the faith styled them *pauperes nostri*—our poor ; and the establishments in which their necessities were supplied were called Houses of God, a term perpetuated by Catholic France in every *Hotel Dieu*. The necessitous were theirs, because these were especially dear to God ; they were theirs to love and succor ; and when our ancestors went on errands of mercy into the refuges of the needy, they felt that only when before the Tabernacle were they nearer to God. Animated by such a spirit, it is no wonder that scarcely had they emerged from the Catacombs, when the early Christians founded on every side asylums destined to every category of misery : *brephotrophia*, *gerontocomia*, *xenodochia*, *ptocheia*, *orphanotrophia*,—for children, the aged, the stranger, the hungry, the orphan. St. Jerome tells us that in the time of Fabiola, one of the founders of such institutions—that noble woman, whose fame Cardinal Wiseman has so beautifully perpetuated,—the healthy poor used to envy the “ lot of the sick.” From the eighth century the most famous hospitals were those devoted to lepers ; and in the thirteenth century, says Matthew Paris, these amounted to nineteen hundred ; but by the fifteenth this scourge had almost entirely yielded to Catholic heroism.

The Catholics of the Middle Age really loved the poor ; for they saw in them the members of the suffering Jesus Christ. Our love is more platonic ; for too often it has its source in a vague “ philanthropy ” rather than in the ardor of faith. Hence it is that we erect immense, grandiose establishments, uniform monuments to the vanity, probably, of their founders, and fill them with as many sufferers as we can—the more, the better for the reputation of the

managers, etc. But it is certain that until very lately—and not even now in most cases—the comfort of every individual patient has been less studied in hospitals of modern foundation than have deceitful and unprofitable appearances. Modern philanthropists, in their zeal to claim for the nineteenth century every advance in the realms not only of science and of physical comfort for the masses, but in that of consideration for the afflicted, confidently point to the introduction of the pavilion system (and in how many institutions has that been adopted?); ignoring the fact that said system was used in the Middle Age, and on a vastly greater scale, as well as with more comforting adjuncts than moderns have yet attempted. Where the pavilion system was not in use, something very nearly approaching it was in vogue. The sick were encouraged in the illusion that they were not in a public asylum—an object of horror to so many,—but still at their own hearth-stones. Each one had a room to himself, or at least the appearance of one. A judicious author—one, by the way, not suspected of clericalism—speaking of the prejudice of the common people against hospital treatment, says (1): “In the few hospitals of the Middle Age which are still extant, we find a spirit of charity well understood and delicate. Without being richly ornate, the buildings present a monumental aspect. The sick have air, space, and light. They are separated one from the other; their individuality is respected; and certainly if there is one thing which is abominated by the unfortunate who take refuge in these establishments, in spite of the intelligent care now accorded them, it is their dwelling together in vast wards. . . . The separate system has a great advantage from a moral point of view, and it has emanated from a noble sentiment of charity on the part of the numerous founders of the ancient *Maisons-Dieu*.” One of the most interesting illustrations of this olden respect for the individuality of the patient is furnished us by M. Lecoy de La Marche in an excellent article on this subject. It is the grand Hospital of Tounerre, founded by a sister-in-law of St. Louis IX. The great hall, or ward, was divided by suffi-

(1) VIOLETT LE DUC; *Dictionary of Architecture*, art. *Hôtel Dieu*.

ciently high partitions, and a little above these a gallery ran around the entire enclosure. Attendants could always observe the inmates without disturbing their equanimity. The circulation of good air was perfect.

A very interesting book was published in 1887 by M. Leo Legrand, of the *École des Chartes* at Paris, descriptive of the hospital or asylum founded by St. Louis, under the name of the *Quinze-Vingts*—the “Twenty Times Fifteen,”—from the fact that it accommodated three hundred patients (1). It was situated just outside of the capital, and was destined for the poor who were blind. It is specially worthy of attention as being an example of that system of separation—and even of family life, though in the confines of a hospital,—which we have indicated as so advantageous. No great, massive structure frightened the visitor as he approached: he saw a collection of residences, apparently inhabited by people of the middle class. Some of these were occupied by a family, others by one individual. The blind formed a confraternity—albeit not restricted to a religious rule,—and as an independent body, they governed the establishment. Marriages were celebrated in the community, but never between two blind persons: one of the spouses should be capable of managing the little household. Those who were not blind were relatives or friends of the afflicted; they formed part of the society, and served as a kind of lay-brethren to the wants of the blind. Both parties wore a uniform of substantial material, with a lily on the left breast. Each household did its own cooking, ate by itself, and “the mother,” as the community was called, supplied the food. All the members met at stated times for pious exercises. The children were apprenticed to trades, or were sent to school; while the blind themselves were generally taught music, that being, in the Middle Age, a profession specially followed by the so afflicted. The governing body of this miniature republic was a Chapter, composed of women as well as men; the sovereign being represented by his grand almoner as presiding officer. One must not suppose that the Hospital

(1) *The Quinze-Vingts From Their Foundation*, in the Collection of the Society of History of Paris, 1887.

of *Quinze-Vingts* was unique in its care for the blind : from the first days of Christian freedom, there were similar institutions, although not on the same plan, in Syria and in many parts of Europe.

But it was not in well-organized hospitals alone that the poor of the Middle Age found relief from their physical woes. A multitude of local congregations were dedicated to their consolation ; St. Vincent de Paul and his heroic Sisters of Charity had their forerunners in those Ages of Faith. There were thousands of Brothers and Sisters aggregated to the service of the sick outside the precincts of organized establishments. These did not form a united congregation, depending from one head ; but, considering the circumstances of the time, the general spirit of decentralization then prevalent in every order, political and ecclesiastical, the system worked very well (1). Perhaps, however, this separatist tendency was the cause of the disappearance of these "fraternities" in the sixteenth century ; and certainly St. Vincent de Paul was divinely inspired when he resuscitated them, giving them all the prestige and influence which result from unity. In the Middle Age these societies, just like the Conferences of St. Vincent nowadays, carried aid and consolation into the homes of the afflicted ; governed, remarks M. de La Marche, "by the idea that the unfortunate should continue to enjoy the family life, the associations of the domestic hearth." This practice of extending domiciliary relief was common even during the persecutions of the first Christian centuries ; to do so was one of the chief duties of the deacons ; and owing to this touching office the members of the modern Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul are often

(1) "When we reflect," remarks M. de La Marche, "on the extreme divisions of the society of that day, on the differences in customs and language subsisting between the different provinces, and on the difficulties of travelling, we may ask ourselves whether distinct organizations—the separatist system, in fine—was not a hundred times preferable in the circumstances. Just in proportion as distances are lessened, as kingdoms agglomerate, as the larger countries absorb the smaller, centralization becomes a political and social necessity. But in the olden time the contrary system insinuated itself [into national and social polity], and it worked as much good then as it would now effect harm. And remember that an identity of spirit and of sentiment united these charitable communities in very close bonds : all these Brothers and Sisters were equally animated by a love for suffering humanity, and all met in that Divine Heart where this supernatural love originates."

styled "lay-deacons." When the great abbeys came into existence, each one very soon established an infirmary for the poor; and to these was joined a subsidiary service extended by men and women living in the world, who made regular domiciliary visits to the sick.

The latest biographer of St. Margaret of Cortona (1) believes that the *Poverelle*, founded by her in her native city, are the earliest examples of Sisters of Charity known in the Middle Age. Indisputable documents show that such devoted women were at their beneficent work centuries before the time of St. Margaret; nevertheless, the *Poverelle* were a most interesting community. Led by a spirit of penance and reparation for a scandalous early life (2), Margaret joined the Third Order of St. Francis, placing before herself two great objects—the maintenance of peace among the feudal nobles and between the city factions, and the alleviation of human misery. She became, in fine, an angel of peace and an apostle of mercy. She founded at Cortona a refuge for pilgrims and other travellers, and a hospital for the sick poor. This latter establishment she herself served, assisted by a number of zealous women whom her fervor had drawn around her. A local Sisterhood was soon formed, and the people denominated it the Congregation of the *Poverelle*, or Little Poor Ones. St. Margaret soon joined to these Tertiaries a number of independent confraternities, who should spread the benefits of her work among the Cortonese in their own homes. This latter association extended a special care to the bashful but really needy, of whom there are so many in every large city. The director was a prior elected for six months from among the secular clergy, and he was assisted by six counsellors, a treasurer, a secretary, and a standard-bearer. Besides its directly beneficent visits to the poor, this forerunner of the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul exercised a social and political rôle. Let not any hypercritical worshipper of the State, like his friends the advocates of the "separation" of the Church and State in

(1) LEOPOLD DE CHERANCE: *Life of St. Margaret of Cortona*. Paris, 1887.

(2) This saint, who is well styled the Mary Magdalen of Italy, had passed nine years of her youth in a sinful alliance.

Europe, affect to be scandalized at this presumedly clerical interference in political matters. A momentary reflection on the nature of this interference will show that it was for the good of society; and that, far from retarding, it advanced progress and civilization. When civil war was imminent, or when any disorder threatened the peace of the community, the *gonfaloniere* or standard-bearer seized the banner of the Confraternity, rushed to the principal Square, and, summoning his brethren around him, explained the state of affairs, and dispatched them in every direction to preach union, concord, and patriotism.

VI.—THE LOT OF THE LEPERS.

Much has been written concerning the *lazaretti* of the olden time; but a mere modicum of truth has been imparted by either the false humanitarians, the sentimental romancers, or the irreligious historians who have handled the theme with the object of decrying the Catholic Church. "Michelet and his school have seized on the phantom of leprosy, shaking it, just as the leper himself used to shake his rattle to frighten the passer-by. According to these writers, leprosy was a consequence of the filthiness of our ancestors. People never washed in the Middle Age; therefore leprosy was the result of a spontaneous generation in the dung-hill on which society was rotting. And since the Catholic Church had formed mediæval society to her own image, she alone was responsible for the ravages of the terrible malady. And the Church not only originated leprosy, but she persecuted its victims. She thrust the unfortunates into loathsome huts, banishing them forever from human society; she cruelly condemned them to be devoured by the fire in their frames, augmenting their physical sufferings by the tortures of perpetual solitude. The theme has become hackneyed (1)." Nor are there wanting some Catholic writers who have assisted in propagating false notions as to the lot of the lepers in the Middle Age. Even the tender Xavier de Maistre forgot, or perhaps was unaware, that the strict isolation of the leprous was not enforced before the dying

(1) LECOY DE LA MARCHÉ; *Lepers and Leper-Houses*. Paris, 1892.

agonies of the Middle Age had begun,—in that fourteenth century when men's hearts had commenced to lose some of the charity which had characterized the Middle Age in its Catholic fulness ; and hence it was that the sympathetic were invited to pity the woes of the *Leper of Aosta* in pages where pathos strives with exaggeration for prominence. Xavier de Maistre should have known that in the Middle Age the lot of the leper was diametrically the opposite of that which he depicted. When treating of the hospitals of the Middle Age, we showed that the constant aim of our Catholic ancestors was to furnish the sick with all the benefits accruing from a union of independence with a community life ; and this beneficent idea was actuated in the case of the leprous, just as with the sick from other causes. No sooner had Catholic Europe realized the fell nature of the evil which the returning Crusaders brought from the pagan East, than the generosity of the faithful erected and endowed thousands of institutions for an amelioration of the lot of the afflicted. If the reader would like to know the characteristics of these *lazaretti* (also styled *maladreries* and *léproseries*), we shall not regale him with the product of a feverish imagination, but present to his consideration the regulations of one of these establishments which was founded in the thirteenth century.

Probably the reader is familiar with at least the names of the chief Societies of France, developments of that principle of association which our century has borrowed from the Middle Age, and which have merited so well of the science of history. Great is the fame of the Société Bibliographique, whose name indicates its programme very imperfectly ; of the Société de l'École des Chartes, which has really founded a school of serious historical criticism in France ; and of the Société de l'Histoire de France, which has proved worthy of its founders (1833)—Guizot, Thiers, Pasquier, Barante, Count Molé, Champollion-Figeac, etc. But throughout France there are many minor Societies working on lines more or less similar to those occupied by these more famous organizations ; and every now and then the records of their sittings show how some indefatigable member has unearthed a

precious monument of the past, a study of which sheds much light upon some important matter of history which has hitherto been beclouded or travestied. Among these societies the least distinguished is not the Société Académique de Saint-Quentin; and in 1891 one of its impartial and disinterested members drew forth from the musty archives of Noyon a document which demolishes completely the theories of the school of Michelet regarding the lepers of the Middle Age. M. Abel Lefranc read to his fellow-academicians, and illustrated with apposite and erudite commentaries, a collection of rules for the leper-house of Noyon, which had been composed by Mgr. Vermond de la Boissière, who occupied the See of Noyon in 1250-1272. The reader shall judge whether the generally accepted opinion in regard to the olden leper-houses is well founded,—whether these establishments were hideously loathsome habitations; whether the regulations governing their inmates were pitilessly severe; whether no one approached the abodes of misery without terror; whether the unfortunates were really obliged to ring a bell, or sound a rattle, as warning to the wayfarer to flee their presence; whether they were strangers to even those joys and distractions which were permitted to the galley-slaves; whether, in fine, the lepers were truly “living-dead,” painfully awaiting a final dissolution which would free them from the implacable anathema which a Catholic society had launched against them. In the first place, the code of rules promulgated by the good bishop of Noyon proves that the lepers in his establishment occupied a more than tolerable position, since the prelate was obliged to obviate an abuse of the privileges of the *lazaretto*, on the part of healthy and well-to-do persons who frequently wished to join the community. We have already had occasion to notice how, even in the fourth century, many of the poor envied the comparatively happy lot of the sick, the crippled, the blind, whom the Catholic asylums supported and protected. A similar envy was often expressed in the Middle Age in regard to the lot of the lepers. So numerous and striking were the advantages of residence in the *lazaretto* that the managers could not satisfy all who begged as a favor to be admitted.

even at the risk of contracting the horrible disease. "This strange yearning for a life in the leper-house," observed M. Lefranc, "is easily explained. We must remember that most of these institutions were richly endowed, having extensive territorial possessions, and therefore receiving revenues far more than sufficient for their support. In those days no person made a will without leaving large legacies to charitable establishments, and especially to the leper-houses. In time the property of these abodes of misery became enormous. Then life in them was easy, and even lavishly sustained. There was nothing onerous in the labors which most of the lepers performed: they merely cultivated the lands near to the asylum, the rest being leased to farmers. We can easily perceive how many persons, in spite of certain inconveniences, sought to find refuge in these tranquil homes."

But, above all, we must remember that the spirit of the Middle Age was pre-eminently one of charity and self-sacrifice, actuated in the hope of pleasing God by succoring the creatures for whom He died. Therefore many were attracted to the leper-house, not merely in the hope of finding tranquillity, but by the more commendable intention of assuaging the sufferings of God's children. Damians were common in the Middle Age. He who has read even in a cursory manner the lives of the saints who lived in that period of exuberant faith, knows that there is no exaggeration in this assertion. Who were the attendants, the nurses, of the lepers? Ignorant and heartless mercenaries of the State? Praters about philanthropy—blatant friends of abstract humanity, with no real affection for the concrete man? No! Such persons cannot furnish the material out of which the Church fashions an Elizabeth of Hungary or a John of God—saints whom she has duplicated thousands of times, and will continue to duplicate when the laicizers of her institutions of charity shall have sunk into oblivion, or be remembered only to be condemned by men of common-sense. The reader knows that in many monasteries and convents there are two kinds of religious: those of the choir (a species of religious aristocracy) and the lay-Brothers or lay-Sisters. The menial offices

of the establishments—a means to gain heaven equal to the more intellectual offices performed by the choir religious—are the province of the *conversi*, or lay-brethren. Now, in the leper-houses, who were the aristocrats of the institutions, and who the servants? The loathsome lepers were the honored patients and masters; the nurses, guardians, and servants of these unfortunates were healthy, even wealthy persons, who had given themselves to the service of Christ in the guise of His afflicted members. These heroic souls formed a religious confraternity, under the immediate and exclusive authority of the bishop; but the immediate superintendence of the community, lepers and all, was confided to a “master” and to a “council,” all elected by the lepers. The sexes were separated; the male volunteers attending to the men, and the female volunteers to the women. All the inmates were required, one year after their entrance, whether lepers or nurses, to take simple vows of chastity and obedience; the vow of poverty was optional. All dispensations from the rule, all punishments, were pronounced by the “master.” The punishments varied according to the gravity of the fault. A very flagrant offence was followed by perpetual exclusion; then there were temporary banishment, a deprivation of some choice but unnecessary article of food, a deprivation of wine, etc. All who were able, took their meals in the refectory. The inmates wore a uniform; but, as M. Lefranc gathered from the Noyon rule, “this dress presented nothing of that sombre and repulsive aspect of which we often hear.” The men wore a plain skirt and a wide-sleeved mantle. The mantle of a woman was of lamb’s wool, and she wore a rather coquettish head-dress. Each leper had an excellent bed and plenty of clean linen. No leper was allowed to enter the kitchen or the bakery, but all the rest of the establishment was open to them. Every possible provision was made for the most minute and scrupulous cleanliness of person, as well as of every nook and corner of the institution. There were numerous fountains; but, quite properly, certain of these were restricted to the use of the uninfected inmates—a necessary provision. The utmost care was devoted to the spiritual interests of the lepers.

They had a beautiful church, and a chaplain always at hand. Games of chance were prohibited, but all other means of recreation were provided.

Certainly this picture of the leper-house of Noyon is very different from that presented by those who can discern no good in mediæval times, and whose denunciation is always in strict proportion to their ignorance of even the salient characteristics of those days. But it may be retorted that this rule of Bishop Vermond de la Boissière shows the good treatment of lepers in only one isolated instance. We are fully justified in supposing that the *lazaretto* of Noyon may be regarded as a specimen of all the leper-houses of the time ; because, firstly, no mediæval documents can be adduced to evince the contrary ; and secondly, because we know that more than a century before the birth of La Boissière there were in Europe over 19,000 well-organized leper-houses, most of which were served by the members of the Order of St. Lazarus, which had been instituted for that purpose.

VII.—A TYPICAL BISHOP OF THE MIDDLE AGE.

When that great Scholastic, Peter the Lombard, he who was termed the “ Master of Sentences,” went to his heavenly reward in 1160, the Chapter of Paris deemed it proper to consult King Louis VII. as to their choice of a new bishop for the capital of France. His Majesty asked the canons for the names of such clergymen of the diocese as seemed most worthy of the mitre. Only two candidates—Master Maurice and Peter Le Mangeur—were selected ; and when the monarch asked for information as to their comparative merits, he was told that Maurice was very zealous in leading souls to heaven, but that Peter was better versed in the Scriptures. Then the king pronounced his decision : “ Let Maurice govern the diocese, and let Peter manage its schools.” And the chroniclers tell us that “ so it was arranged, and everybody was well pleased.” Thus the mitre was placed on the head of Maurice de Sully, the enlightened prelate who was to bequeath to Parisian piety that grand and perhaps imperishable monument which every French revolution has respected—the Cathedral of Notre-Dame. This bishop of

Paris was not, as his name would seem to indicate, a member of a noble family; still less was he of the stock which produced the celebrated minister of Henry IV. The family of Master Maurice was so lowly in social station that the chroniclers of the day have not transmitted its name to us, and probably because they knew nothing concerning it. In his case the particle *de* is not significant of nobility. His family name having been unknown, the distinguished cleric came to be styled Maurice de Sully, because he was born in the village of Sully, in the department of Loiret. Maurice had left this village in quest of an education, and in the guise of a "poor scholar," literally begging from door to door for his daily bread. It was to no "little red school-house" that the ambitious lad had recourse for instruction; but to the gratuitous courses which were about to give birth to the grand University of Paris, and which had recently been rendered illustrious by the lectures of Peter the Lombard, William of Champeaux, and Abélard. There was, of course, in the twelfth century no dearth of such establishments for primary education as the "little red school-house" is sometimes supposed to represent. As the not too clerical J. J. Ampère avowed to the French Institute in 1837, "*Even in the days of Charlemagne there were probably more primary schools than there are to-day*" (1).

In the Middle Age, observed Duruy, a minister of the Second Empire who was not always favorable to the rights of parents in the matter of education, "the Church, then the depositary of all knowledge, distributed *gratuitously* the bread of the mind, just as she gave to all the bread of the soul. Nor do I speak merely of monasteries—institutions into which the poorest man was admitted, and out of which he often came a bishop or perhaps a Pope, like Gregory VII. or Sixtus V.; I allude to other schools. The decrees of the Popes and of Councils attest the desire of the clergy to multiply free schools for the poor" (2). In fact, when the little Maurice proposed to himself a search for an education,

(1) *History of Literature under Charlemagne*. Paris, 1841.

(2) "*Report of 1863 on the Freedom of Primary Instruction.*" By M. Victor Duruy, Minister of Public Instruction.

he saw no arduous task before him. The number of students then in Paris, the majority of whom were "poor scholars," nearly equalled that of all the other inhabitants. In a few years Philip Augustus was obliged to extend the limits of the city, in order to accommodate the votaries of science; for their number had increased to 20,000—an attendance of which no modern University can boast, even though the populations of Christendom have multiplied tenfold since the twelfth century. Therefore it was that as Maurice entered the capital of France, where the great Benedictine statesman, Suger, was guiding the helm of state with a zeal and success such as have never been displayed by any minister of modern times, he had no reason to complain that the Church of his day or the Christian royalty of France—the creation of that Church—had become hostile or indifferent to popular education. Maurice felt a justifiable pride, pauper though he was, when he reflected that he was about to become a resident of the great "city of philosophers," as Paris was then termed, just as Bologna was termed "the city of jurists." His pride assumed a holy tinge when he remembered that whatever course of study he should elect to follow, Holy Mother the Church would regard him as under her special protection, and would proclaim through her Canons that, as a student, his person was inviolable (1).

A prolific but not always reliable chronicler of the thirteenth century asserts that when the canons of the Cathedral Chapter of Paris were debating as to a successor to Peter the Lombard, it occurred to them that the election might be effected more easily if it were entrusted to three of their number; that the three were delegated; and that one of these, Maurice de Sully, prevailed on his associates to place the mitre of Paris on his brow. This story is contradicted by the well-evidenced humility of Master Maurice, by the direct testimony of the contemporary and otherwise trustworthy Etienne de Bourbon (2), and by the incontestable fact that the alleged manner of election was as foreign

(1) DU BOULAY; *History of the University of Paris*, III., 33.

(2) LECOY DE LA MARCHE; *The French Pulpit in the Middle Age*. Paris, 1890.—*Edition Etienne de Bourbon*. Paris, 1891.

to the mind of the Church of the twelfth century as it is to the will of the Church of our day. One illustration of the humility of Master Maurice deserves mention, although the reader may remember that he has read of similar incidents in the lives of several bishops and in the case of at least one pope. The mother of the new bishop had continued, during her son's scholastic and professorial career in Paris, to lead the humble life of a peasant widow of that day; but her neighbors deemed such retirement unbecoming to the mother of the bishop of Paris. Accordingly, by their own exertions and with the aid of certain noble ladies, they procured for her a magnificent outfit, and sent her, all bedecked and bedizened, to congratulate her mitred Maurice. But, says the chronicler, when the poor woman entered the episcopal presence, she found, to her dismay, that the son of her bosom did not recognize her. "My mother," he exclaimed, "is an humble peasant, and she wears the commonest clothes!" And not until his mother had retired, and had donned the habiliments of her station, did Maurice de Sully embrace her affectionately. A similar episode is related in the various "Lives" of Mgr. Dupanloup, the celebrated bishop of Orleans. As bishop of Paris, Maurice de Sully held, of course, a high rank among the temporal lords of the kingdom; but, like all the French prelates of his time—prelates whose appointment was not due to the crown,—he remembered that he was, above all else, a shepherd of Christ's flock. From the very beginning of his episcopal career he seemed to think that he was living in one of those early centuries when preaching was the chief duty of a bishop, and his exclusive prerogative (1). He realized how-

(1) In the early days of Christianity, who had the right to preach? Origen (185-253) says that "the bishops, priests, and deacons teach us, and rebuke our vices with severe words." (*Hom. 1 in Ps. xxxvii.*) This remark, however, must be understood as applying, in its absoluteness, only to the Eastern churches, which all, from the earliest days, observed discipline inculcated in the (authentic or not) "Apostolic Canon, decreeing that any bishop or priest who neglects his clergy or people, and does not teach them, is to be deposed." (*No. 57.*) Eusebius tells us that Origen preached in Jerusalem and in Casarea of Palestine, and Socrates says that priests preached in Cyprus and in Cappadocia. Many of St. Chrysostom's finest homilies were delivered before his elevation to the episcopacy. Certainly the priests of Alexandria were forbidden to preach in the fourth century; but this decree was issued, as we are told by Socrates, Sozomenus, and Nicephorus, because of the audacity of Arius. In the West, however, during the first centuries of Christianity, in most dio-

ever, that his was an age when it was not sufficient for the parochial clergy to instruct their congregations by means of homilies taken from the ancient Fathers. The need of real preachers was great in the twelfth century; that need had not yet been supplied by the Orders which were soon to be founded by Saints Dominic and Francis. Bishop Maurice resolved to transform his priests, whenever possible, into so many sacred orators. With this intention, he composed for their use a collection of plans for sermons. And for the benefit of such persons as believe, or feign to believe, that in the Middle Age all spiritual works were couched in Latin, we note that these models of discourses were written in French, and—considering that the Age of Louis XIV. had not yet arrived—in very elegant French. The reader of these skeleton sermons perceives at once that they are destined to become, after amplification, short but substantial instructions for those who have just attended at the celebration of the parochial Mass. They are, in fact, excellent models for those familiar but solid “short sermons” which the French call *prônes*. In them there is no display of zeal

ceses priests were not allowed to preach, at least in the presence of the bishop; and in Africa this rule was so strictly observed that it was not left to the discretion of the bishop to relax it. Valerius, Bishop of Bona, seems to have been the first African bishop to allow a priest to preach before him, and the privilege was granted to St. Augustine. So indignant did the other African prelates show themselves because of this action of Valerius, that St. Jerome was moved to write: “The custom of some churches imposing silence on priests in the presence of their bishop, is abominable. One would think that the bishops are jealous or that they cannot condescend to listen.” (*Epist. ad Nepot.*) In Gaul the discipline varied. Gennadius, writing about the year 470, speaks of Museus, a priest of Marseilles, as preaching in 461; but it is certain that in many Gallic dioceses preaching was the special office of the bishops, until the Council of Vaison decreed, in 529, that every parish should frequently enjoy such ministrations. In the Iberian Peninsula, as late as the year 619, we find a Council of Seville establishing that no priest shall presume to preach in the presence of his bishop. However, we must not suppose that in those Western dioceses where preaching was reserved to the bishop, the laity heard the word of God only on the rare occasions of an episcopal visitation; for at nearly every meeting of the faithful the pastor read a homily of some Father. That deacons preached, even in the first days of the Church, is evident from Holy Writ; this office of preacher caused Philip, one of the seven deacons, to be styled an evangelist (*Acts xxi.*) St. Ignatius, who was martyred in the year 107, praises the sermons of a deacon named Philo, and encourages the eloquence of Hero, a deacon of Antioch. During the fearful persecutions of the first three centuries of our era, the principal attention of the pagan tribunals was directed against the deacons, not only because of the Church treasures of which they were the custodians, but on account of their preaching office. It is interesting to observe here that in many dioceses of the East it would have been impossible to adopt the Latin custom of restricting the obligation of preaching to the bishop; for the Orientals had become so fond of sermons that frequently one was followed by a second, and then by a third—generally, however, delivered by different clergymen. (CHRYSOSTOM; *Hom. 26 in Epist. 1 ad Tim.*)

for science; not even any leaning toward those scholastic subtleties which are popularly supposed to have formed the soul of every mediæval intellectual effort. Each sermon is a simple explanation of the Gospel of the day, interspersed with practical advice for the auditors. In the introduction to his manual, the bishop insists on the preaching of the divine word in season and out of season; and he warns his clergy that success will attend their efforts only when solid attainments in sacred learning are joined to their holiness of life. He advises each one to possess and to study continually the *Sacramentary*, the *Lectionary*, the *Collection of Penitential Canons*, the *Psalter*, and the *Calendar*: although it is certain that in those days, when books were as rare and costly as they were solid, a priest's annual income would scarcely have purchased any one of the works recommended. The zeal of Maurice de Sully for the sanctification of his people led him to request the celebrated Foulques de Neuilly, the enthusiastic but prudent preacher of the Second Crusade, to devote many of his later years to missions in every part of the diocese of Paris; and the chroniclers of that time grow eloquent when they describe the consequent improvement of morals in the French capital (1).

Although not the chief city of France in ecclesiastical dignity (2), Paris, as capital of the kingdom, naturally surrounded the mitre of Maurice de Sully with much of its own splendor. During eight centuries the piety of monarchs and nobles had so added to the estates possessed by the bishop of Paris, that much of the time of Maurice was devoted to the cares of their administration. The zeal of the prelate in this regard has been well illustrated by instructive details in a work published in 1890 by M. Mortet in the sixteenth volume of

(1) Otho de S. Blasio, a Benedictine of Constance, tells us that, as a consequence of the preaching of Foulques, many usurers and dishonest merchants and tradesmen frequently threw themselves at his feet, avowed their guilt, and made restitution on the spot. Wherever he preached, abandoned women would rush toward the pulpit, cut off their tresses, and bewail their sins. Foulques procured husbands for some of these penitents; but so many desired to lead penitential lives in cloistered retirement, that he obtained from the king, in their favor, the foundation of the Cistercian Abbey of St. Anthony.

(2) The archbishop of Lyons was primate of France until the Revolution of 1789 erased nearly every ancient landmark in the kingdom. Although the see of Paris was established in the third century by St. Denis (not by the Areopagite, as was once believed), it did not become an archbishopric until 1622.

the *Memoirs of the Society for the History of Paris*. But why such a state of affairs? Why, the hypercritical and the anti-clerical may ask, should the Church countenance a system which consumed time that ought to have been given to the service of the altar? And was so much wealth a benefit to the Church? These specious insinuations are refuted when one remembers that the funds of which Maurice was trustee were, like those of all the other bishops and abbots of that time, devoted to the erection and care of churches, to the modest support of the parish clergy, to the relief of the poor, to the care of the sick, to the education of youth; and, far more frequently than our modern historians record, to the needs of the State. As for the revenue which might remain after the liquidation of these obligations, a visit to the grand cathedral of Notre-Dame de Paris will convince the reader that the money was put to good use by Maurice de Sully. Like the author of *The Imitation of Christ*, like nearly all the architects of the cathedrals of the Middle Age, the original architect of Notre-Dame de Paris labored for the glory of God, and not for the praise of men; and therefore he took care that his name should not be transmitted to posterity (1). But no veil of modesty could possibly cover the name of the episcopal projector, to whose generosity the grand monument owes its existence. The original cathedral had seen six centuries of existence when, in 1163, the cornerstone of the new edifice was laid by Pope Alexander III., who had sought refuge in France from the persecutions of the German emperor Barbarossa, and his creature, the anti-pope, "Victor IV." The year 1177 witnessed the completion of the choir of the vast edifice; in 1182 the high altar was consecrated by the papal legate; and in 1196 the roof was about to be constructed, when Maurice de Sully went to his reward. The immediate successor of Maurice erected the façade and the towers, and many other bishops of Paris labored for the non-essential but beautiful features of the cathedral; still, the credit of the principal part of the work

(1) Several architects labored on Notre-Dame before, with its wealth of ornamentation, it was completed; and of these, we only have the name of one—Jean de Chelles, who constructed the southern transept in the thirteenth century.

will always be given to the prelate who began his ecclesiastical career as a "poor scholar" of Sully.

When St. Thomas a Becket sought a French refuge from the persecutions of Henry II.—persecutions at which, alas! some English bishops connived,—Maurice de Sully was foremost among the French prelates in encouraging King Louis VII. to persevere in his truly royal refusal to banish his guest from French soil. Just as he had refused to deliver Pope Alexander III. into the hands of his German enemy, so Louis VII. assured the archbishop of Canterbury of a continuance of his hospitality. The letters which were sent to the Pontiff on this occasion, by Maurice, and by the bishops of Sens and Nevers, are redolent of the sentiments which actuated their monarch when he thus replied to Henry's demand to repel "the late primate": "You are king of England, and I also am a king; but I would not depose the least one of the clerics of my kingdom. The defence of exiles from persecution, especially ecclesiastics, has ever been one of the glories of the French crown." When the light of seven hundred years of history had come to his aid, Michelet, who is not regarded with suspicion by the foes of Papal Rome, found himself constrained to admit that the interests of the human race were defended by the holy Becket; but without that light which was to be furnished by the centuries which were yet to come, Maurice de Sully was able to perceive the consequences of the struggle which had been initiated by the "Constitutions of Clarendon." We have three of the letters which Maurice wrote to Pope Alexander III., criticising respectfully but candidly the hesitancy of the Pontiff in the matter of adopting extreme measures against the king of England, and against the episcopal sycophants who were ready to ruin the cause of religion that they might bask in the smile of royalty. In the first letter we read: "Let the bishop of London, and the other enemies of the Church whom Thomas has justly though tardily anathematized, be crushed entirely by that Rock of Peter which has so often crushed men like them (1). If this criminal audacity goes

(1) For an account of the dastardly conduct of these prelates, see our Vol. II., p. 293, *et seq.*

unpunished, we may expect the speedy ruin of the Church in England." In his second letter Maurice says: "Our Most Christian King shares the sufferings of the archbishop of Canterbury; the entire kingdom pities him, and everyone asks himself whether the Apostolic See can be deceived in so evident a matter. What criminal will ever be condemned, if this king of England is not brought to account for so manifest an outrage, for so patent a contempt of the Church? How shall innocence henceforth escape the wiles of the calumniator, if you do not come to the aid of this archbishop and of his companions in exile?... It is our heartfelt prayer, and that of the entire Church in France, that Your Holiness now put an end to this great scandal; that you teach this king of England to conduct himself in a Christian manner; and that you exercise in its plenitude the prerogative of the king of kings." Letters like these of Maurice de Sully determined Pope Alexander III. to send a warning letter to the royal criminal, announcing: "We have not thought it proper to close our eyes to your obstinacy any longer, nor shall we again close the mouth of the aforesaid bishop. We now allow him to do his duty freely: to punish you with the weapons of ecclesiastical severity for the injuries which you have heaped on him and his diocese" (1). The threatened excommunication only deferred the catastrophe. Thomas à Becket gave his life for his flock; and it is edifying to read that not the least of his consolations, during his exile in the Land of the Lillies, came from the "poor scholar" of Sully.

VIII.—"LEGENDS" OF THE SAINTS.

During the latter part of the Middle Age, and indeed as late as the sixteenth century, no book, after the Bible, was so much studied as the *Golden Legend*, or "Lives of the Saints," by James de Voragine. In the Age of Faith no book could appeal so strongly to the affections, aspirations, and even interests of men, as did one which laid bare the foundations of that faith which was their very life, and another which taught them how thousands of their fellows

(1) ROGER OF HOVEDEN: *Annals*.

had built upon those foundations the edifice of their own salvation. The name of James de Voragine was a household word in Christendom for many centuries; and nevertheless the very name of his family is ignored, for the term "De Voragine" is variously derived from the village of Vorago, near Savona in Italy, from our author's reputation as a devourer of literature, and from his extraordinary facility in Scriptural citation, as though he ever had at hand an inexhaustible mine of apt quotations. He informs us that he joined the Order of Preachers at Genoa in 1244, when he was fifteen years of age (1). According to the conscientious and critical work of Echard (2), he was an able theologian, a zealous and pathetic orator, an accurate interpreter of Scripture, and an edifying religious. It was James de Voragine who, realizing that the then fully developed Italian language had finally supplanted the mother Latin in general use among his countrymen, first translated the entire Bible into the new idiom, half a century before Dante, through his immortal poem, gave precision to that idiom (3). Sixtus of Siena (d. 1569), regarded as the founder of the historico-critical method of Biblical study, greatly praises this translation for exactness—a fact worthy of note when we remember that the Dominican Passavanti, one of the best prose writers of the fourteenth century, found the opposite fault, and worse ones, in every translation that had yet appeared, whether Italian, French, Provençal, English, German, or Hungarian (4). Spondanus says that no author was more imbued with the principles of St. Augustine, and that he had learned this doctor's works almost by heart (5). In 1267, although only twenty-three years of age, James de Voragine was chosen provincial of his Order in Lombardy, and as he filled this office during twenty years, his brethren must have been persuaded of his talents, piety, and wisdom,

(1) *Genoese Chronicle*, in Muratori's *Italian Writers*, Vol. ix.

(2) *Writers of the Order of Preachers*, Vol. i., p. 454. Paris, 1719.

(3) "That Dante created the Italian language off-handed can be asserted only by one who, through convenience or ignorance, repeats the sayings of others. To say nothing of other persons, his friend Guido Cavalcanti spoke Italian like a modern. Dante directed Italian to sublime flights; he did not arrange, but determined it." CANTU; *Universal History*, b. xiii., ch. 28.

(4) *Mirror of Penance*.

(5) At year 1292, No. 8.

for we must remember that the sons of St. Dominic were still glowing with their primitive fervor. In 1292 the Cathedral Chapter of Genoa elected him as their archbishop. For more than fifty years Genoa had suffered intensely from the wars of the Guelphs and Ghibellines, and one of the prelate's first tasks was to put an end to the civil strife, and to efface its cruel traces from his diocese. His four immediate predecessors had struggled in vain to this end, and Pope Innocent IV. had personally endeavored, during a visit to Genoa, to restore tranquillity. But nothing discouraged James de Voragine, and in 1295 success crowned his efforts (1). It has been said that our author was a Ghibelline, and that on an Ash-Wednesday, when Pope Boniface VIII. perceived him kneeling to receive the ashes, the Pontiff dashed a quantity into the prelate's eyes, saying: "Remember, man, that thou art a Ghibelline, and that with thy fellow-Ghibellines thou shalt return to dust!" But there is no foundation for a story so unworthy of the grand character of Boniface and of that of the archbishop, though Sismondi adduces a passage of Stella's *Genoese Annals*, and under the presumed authority of a greater name, Muratori, to show that Pope Boniface committed the violence in question toward Porchetto Spinola, the Ghibelline successor of De Voragine (2). But Muratori does not sanction even this latter tale, as Sismondi would have us believe that he does. He declares that "it snacks of the fabulous—*fabulam sapit*." Touron, an excellent annalist of the Dominican Order (3), well describes the life of De Voragine as devoted entirely to study and religion; but the Jansenist Baillet, one of the most bitter contemners of the *Golden Legend*, shows superfluous grief because of a fancied beatification of the archbishop on the part of the Genoese and the Dominican Order (4). "We do not know," replies Touron, "whether the people or the church of Genoa have ever given the title of Blessed to this bishop, but we know that M. Baillet attributes to the Dominicans pretensions which they do not entertain."

(1) UGHELLI; *Sacred Italy*, Vol. iv., col. 888. Venice, 1717-22.

(2) *Loc. cit.*

(3) *History of the Illustrious Members of the Order of St. Dominic*. Paris, 1743.

(4) *Discourse on the Lives of the Saints*, § 33.

The principal work of De Voragine is undoubtedly that to which he gave the name of "*Legenda Sanctorum*—Stories of the Saints," but which came to be called, in time, the *Legenda Aurea*—"Golden Legend," and also *Historia Longobardica*—"History of Lombardy," because it finished with an abridged history of that country. There now exist more than a hundred editions of the work, and in every civilized language. Here we must remark at once that the title of the book is apt to mislead a modern reader. When moderns use the word "Legend," it is in the sense of something uncertain, perhaps fanciful in the main, and often fabulous; but in the days of James de Voragine, the word signified "something to be read," without any implication of doubt as to its foundation in the world of fact. Therefore we must beware of supposing that our author presented his *Lives* as mere legends; such a theory would be too favorable to the school which, as Catholics, we must combat. The entire work is an explanation of the *Office* as it is recited, day by day, during the ecclesiastical year. Naturally, therefore, the *Lives of the Saints* received prominent attention, for the feast of some canonized servant of God occurs every day. "The principal object of the author," remarks an erudite writer, "is to teach the faithful the meaning of every solemnity recognized by the official calendar of the Catholic world. Since each ceremony has its own significance, he explains that meaning by means of certain traditions—sometimes very extraordinary ones, and as in his time it was not so easy as it is to-day to lay one's hand on the life of a saint as the feast comes around, James de Voragine conceived the idea of gathering in one great work, in a form more diffuse than that furnished by the Lessons of the *Breviary*, all the particular *Lives* of the blessed ones proposed by the Church for the veneration and imitation of her children" (1). He reproduces, as nearly as possible, the style of every author whom he cites; and the dialectic form of his moralizations, which so greatly charmed his contemporaries, shows that the people of the Middle Age were much better informed than our age generally supposes.

(1) The Abbé Rose, in the *Revue de l'Art Chrétien*, 1867, p. 39.

The value of the *Golden Legend* was first impugned by James Lacopius, an unfrocked friar who apostatized in 1566. He not only rejected all that sound criticism justly blames in the *Legend*, but denied the credibility of many of its histories which are incontestably true. However, having returned to the fold of the Church, he sealed his devotion to the faith with his blood, being martyred by the Calvinists at Gorcum in the Netherlands, on July 9th, 1572, together with eighteen other ecclesiastics, secular and regular (1). At the last moment of his terrible agonies he threw his famous book, the *Refutation of the Golden Legend*, into the flames. Launoy, the "un-nicher of the saints," as his extravagant scepticism in all hagiographical matters caused him to be styled (2), narrates that Despence, a celebrated doctor of Paris in the College of Navarre, fiercely declaimed, one day while preaching (y. 1543) against the *Golden Legend* as being a tissue of lies; but the critic adds that the doctor afterward publicly retracted, on the demand of the Faculty of Paris (3). This proves that as yet, in the sixteenth century, the famous collection found champions among the learned. Melchior Canus, a great light of the Dominican Order, and one of the first among Catholic theologians, is adduced by Elias Dupin, a most erudite scholar of the seventeenth century, as denunciatory of the *Legend* (4). Dupin says that De Voragine amassed, "without any critical discernment, a quantity of narratives mostly fabulous. This is the opinion of Melchior Canus on this writer: 'The *Legend* was compiled by a man who had an iron tongue and a leaden heart, and whose judgment was neither correct nor prudent; he give us monstrosities rather than miracles.' But if this archbishop is not to be admired for his writings, he is to be esteemed for his piety. He was very devout, and very charitable to the poor, to whom he gave nearly all his revenue." Now the great Dominican never pronounced this

(1) ECHARD; *loc. cit.*, p. 456.—*Roman Breviary*, in *Suppl.*, July 9.

(2) Whenever the parish priest of St. Roch at Paris met this hypercritic, he invariably made an extraordinary deferential salutation, "for fear," he would say, "lest some day M. Launoy may rob me of my dear St. Roch."

(3) *History of the Royal School of Navarre in Paris*, Vol. i., p. 297.

(4) *History of the Controversies of the Thirteenth Century*. Paris, 1701.

opinion on De Voragine. The words cited by Dupin are those of Louis Vives, a famous Spanish Humanist. Canus does not even mention the *Legend* or its author, in his vigorous onslaught against false *Lives of the Saints*. The Jansenist Baillet finds fault with Bollandus for trying to mollify the extravagantly strong censure of Vives. Bollandus says: "I have always esteemed Louis Vives most highly. . . . but I wonder when so grave and moderate a man styles so wise and holy a person one of iron tongue and leaden heart. . . . James de Voragine, like all his contemporaries, did not possess a cultivated style, but he was learned and pious, and was a man of singular prudence and judgment; so much so, that he was more capable than Vives or Erasmus of judging as to the probability of his narratives" (1). Bollandus insists against Wicellius (2), that James de Voragine consulted ancient authorities of reliability: "I cannot doubt it; I even find that the majority of his narratives agree with the original documents" (3).

Undoubtedly the *Golden Legend* has many grave faults. In the first place, grievous and even absurd errors are frequently committed in the etymological and other derivations of names. Thus, for example, we read that the name of St. Denis, "Dionysius," is derived "from *Diana*, i. e., Venus, the goddess of beauty, and 'syos,' i. e., God, as though the bearer were beautiful before God." Again, the compiler is too prone to credit every story of heavenly visions, ecstasies, diabolical possessions, etc. But it is to be noted, remarks Fleury, that De Voragine never invented any of the stories which a more advanced critical science has relegated to the realms of the fabulous; they, and similar ones, are found in Vincent of Beauvais and other preceding writers; our author "merely added some embellishments, discourses, and probable circumstances, which he deemed an edification to the reader, and he did so with good judgment."

(1) The text has: "*Erat non modo doctus et pius, sed prudentia judicioque singulari, ut quam probabilia essent que scriberet, Vire Erasmoque melius potuerit judicare.*" Vol. i., p. 20.

(2) Speaking of that critic's *History of the Saints*. Metz, 1541.

(3) If the reader desires to know how far James de Voragine carried his investigations, he may consult the Abbé Roze, *loc. cit.*, who arranged all these authorities in chronological order.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CONVERSION OF THE FRANKS. THE ALLEGED CRUELTIES OF CLOVIS AND OF ST. CLOTILDA.*

It has been said that when God erases, He is about to write again. In the fifth century of our era God made use of the barbarians to destroy the Roman Empire in the West ; and on the resulting *tabula rasa* He traced the future annals of a new civilization, in which the instruments of His justice and of His loving wisdom, transformed by His Church, were to play a prominent part. These barbarians—these “conscripts of God,” as Chateaubriand happily styled them—were the blind accomplishers of an eternal design. The new religion, recently issued from the Catacombs, had need of new peoples, and the need was well satisfied ; for twenty years after Odoacer the Herulan had reduced the Eternal City and had put an end to the Western Empire, there occurred in Gaul an event which initiated that marvellous series of events which mediæval writers gratefully described as the *Gesta Dei per Francos*—the wondrous deeds which God performed through the arms of the French, and which are discerned in even more modern times by such historians as grasp the truth that there can be no true philosophy of history for him who ignores the directing power of the Most High in the affairs of nations. There are two theories concerning the origin of the Franks. One holds that they were a Germanic people, and that Tacitus mentions them when he speaks of the Istevoni—a league of the Cherusci, Sicambri, Cauci, Catti and Brutteri. According to this idea, the Cherusci became weak after the days of Arminius, and were for some time protected by the Catti ; then recovering some of their olden strength, and acquiring a preponderance in the league, they assumed the names of Salic or River (*Ripuarii*) Franks, according as they dwelled near to the Saal or to the Rhine. However, some historians contend that the Franks were dis-

* Most of this chapter appeared as an article in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, Vol. XXI.

inct from the Germans, and that originally they inhabited what are now Denmark and the duchies of Holstein and Lauenburg. During the reign of Gallienus, the Franks crossed the Rhine and advanced even into Spain, and at Tarragona they embarked for Mauritania ; then loading themselves with booty, they returned to their own land. In the middle of the fourth century they became nominal subjects of Rome, and defended the Rhenish frontier against the other barbarians. Many poets, and some historians, speak of a Frankish king, Pharamond, whose reign they ascribe to the neighborhood of the year A. D. 420 ; and authentic history tells of King Clodion, under whom the Salic Franks, about the year 440, advanced to the Somme. Meroveus, the founder of the Merovingian dynasty, was one of the victors at the battle of Chalons, in 451. Childeric, son of Meroveus, ascended the throne in 458 ; but his immoralities disgusted the nation, and he was forced to flee to Thuringia, whereupon the Franks chose as chief, probably not as king, the Roman Count of Soissons, general of the Roman forces in that part of Gaul. This nobleman, Egidius, was faithful to the Emperor Majorian, and therefore hostile to Ricimer, the Warwick of that day ; consequently, he found himself deposed in favor of Gundioc, king of the Burgundians, and he saw the Visigoth, Theodoric II., with the connivance of Ricimer, occupy the Narbonnaise, his line of communication with Italy. Then Egidius invited the banished Childeric, whom the Franks now yearned for, to return to his throne. Childeric bade farewell to his host, the Thuringian monarch, but took with him the queen, Basina, who had become infatuated with him. Childeric expelled from Gaul the Alani, whom Theodoric II. had pushed as far as the Loire ; and he consolidated his power over the Salic Franks. He died in 481 ; and the Franks lifted on their bucklers, in token of their submission to his rule, the young Clodoveus (Chlodowig or Clovis), the issue of the late king's adulterous union with Basina.

At this time five different peoples occupied Gaul. In the centre were the Romans ; but we must remember that this term was then applied to such of the olden Gauls as had not imitated the Armoricians (Bretons) in proclaiming their in-

dependence, or had not recognized the sway of some barbarian monarch. Although the Western Empire had been dead for five years, the Roman authority was still represented by Syagrius, a son of the famous Egidius, who ruled over the cities of Beauvais, Soissons, Amiens, Troyes, Rheims, and their dependent territories. The Armoricans were in the west, the Alemanni in the northeast, the Burgundians in the east, and the Visigoths in the south. The Romans, Gallo-Romans, and Armoricans were Catholics; the Burgundians and Visigoths were Arians; while the Franks and Alemanni were Pagans. The power exercised by Count Syagrius was regarded as the sole legitimate authority in Gaul, having a duration of five centuries for its sanction, whereas the barbarian and Armorican governments relied only on the sword. Hence it was understood that if the Gauls were ever to resolve on a conquest of their national independence, they certainly would fight in the name of the Roman Empire. Therefore the destruction of that remnant of Roman domination, to which the Gauls still avowed an honorable fidelity, would naturally be the aim of any enterprising individual who would essay the formation of one state out of all the discordant elements which confronted his ambition. Clovis perceived this truth, and when the eastern emperor, bent on a restoration of the Western Empire, appointed the Frankish king general of the Roman armies in Gaul, the young monarch felt that the time for action had arrived. In virtue of his new title, he demanded obedience from Syagrius, and when the proud Roman refused to abdicate his rank, 5,000 Franks advanced on Soissons. The count led his few soldiers to the open field; and having been defeated, he fled to Toulouse, the capital of Alaric II., king of the Visigoths. Soissons opened its gates to the conqueror; and in less than a year he was master of all the territories which the Romans had possessed between the Loire and the Rhine. Then, fearing that Syagrius would incite the neighboring princes to combine against the Franks, Clovis menaced Alaric with war unless the Roman general were delivered to him. The Visigoth dared not refuse, and the unfortunate was put to death. Clovis now sought for a bride, and his choice of Clo-

tilda, a Burgundian princess and a Catholic, although she had been raised in an Arian court, gained for him the hearts of the Gallo-Romans. From the day of her marriage every Catholic eye in Gaul was turned toward Clotilda as to one who was to be the divine instrument for the conversion of the great Clovis to the true religion and a humane policy. In 496 the Alemanni, burning to emulate the Franks, advanced as far as Cologne and attacked Sigebert, king of the Ripuarii; whereupon Clovis, being a nephew of Sigebert, led his Salic Franks to the rescue. The hostile forces met at Tolbiac; the Alemanni were routed, and Clovis annexed to his dominions all the Alemannic conquests between the Moselle and the Rhine, together with a large district on the right of the latter river. All of these Frankish conquests now received the name of *Francia Rhenana*—Rhenish France. The remaining Alemannic territories, Vindelicia alone excepted, were accorded to a duke of Alemania, who swore to be a vassal of the Frank monarch. Vindelicia was given to the Ostrogothic sovereign, Theodoric, who had acted as a mediator in effecting peace. This victory of Tolbiac was the occasion of the conversion of Clovis. In the beginning of the action the Franks, greatly outnumbered, were on the point of retreating, when their king thought of the God of Clotilda. He vowed that if he conquered the adorers of Odin, he would become a Christian; and on the ensuing Christmas Day he was baptized by St. Remy in that baptistery at Rheims which still remains as a monument of one of the most important revolutions which the world has seen. The entire Frankish nation soon followed their monarch into the Fold of Christ; and from that date they became the most efficient constituent, after the Catholic Church, the informing spirit, of the new civilization. Pope Anastasius II. granted to the Frankish kings the title of "Most Christian," and styled them the "Eldest Sons of the Church" (1)—qualifications which were historically correct, since at that time the eastern emperor was a Eutychian heretic, and all the western Christian princes of any importance were Arians (2).

(1) For the antiquity of this title, see our Vol. iii., p. 369.

(2) About the year 377 the Goths asked the Emperor Valens, an Arian, for permission to

The consequences of the conversion of Clovis were immediate and supremely important. All the cities of Brittany submitted to the Frankish sceptre; all the Gallo-Romans regarded Clovis as their liberator from the yoke, either actual or threatened, of the Arian Visigoths and Burgundians; all the Roman legions which were still stationed between the Seine and the Loire entered the service of him whom the Vicar of Christ had blessed; and the Roman eagles and *Labarum* shed some of their ancient splendor over the warriors of the new Christian nation. Gallo-Romans and Franks were soon amalgamated by the force of their common Christianity; the foundations of France were laid.

In his last will and testament, St. Remy thus speaks of the family of Clovis: "I raised it to the supreme rank of royal majesty; I baptized them all in the waters of salvation; I gave to them the Seven Gifts of the Holy Ghost, and I consecrated their head as king with the Holy Chrism." But on that Christmas Day of 496 it was not only the family of Clovis, not only those 3,000 of his warriors who were baptized with him, whom Christendom acclaimed as they issued from the baptistery of Rheims; then all France was assigned by the hand of God to a pre-eminent place in the destinies of the world. "Nearly two hundred years after Constantine," says Lacordaire, "there was, as yet, no Christian nation in the world (1). The empire was formed of twenty different races, united indeed in administration, but separated by

settle in Roman territory, and the request was granted on condition that they embraced Arianism. One of their deputies, a bishop named Ulphilas—a man of talent, who had shown much orthodox zeal at the Council of Nice—yielded sufficiently to the imperial wiles to permit his nation to obey the sovereign's behest, although he himself continued to preach the Catholic doctrine, at least in its substantial integrity. Very soon the pest was communicated to all the allies of the Goths, such as the Gepidi, the Ostrogoths, the Vandals, the Alani, etc. Genseric led his Vandals into Arianism in 428. Gondebald did the same for his Burgundians in 430. The Anglo-Saxons in Britain were still idolators.—TILLEMONT, *Hist. Eccles.*, at y. 377; OELLER, art. *Ulphilas*.

(1) This sentence is misleading, if one does not remember that the illustrious Dominican uses the word "nation" in its strict sense; that is, applying it only to a politically-organized, united, and independent people. At the time of the baptism of Clovis, there were very many peoples in Western Europe who were entirely Catholic; and in the East, very far from all had succumbed to heresy. In Europe, the Italians were not the only ones who rejected Arianism: the Gauls and the Britons (the latter then relegated to Cambria) were Catholics. And for half a century the Scots, afterward known as the "Irish," had been Catholics, and they were then propagating the faith in Caledonia. The term "barbarian" was then applied pre-eminently to the various hordes of Teutonic origin; and therefore it was said that the Franks were the first "barbaric" nation to receive the faith.

their traditions and customs ; and a new germ of division had been planted by Arianism, a most active and fruitful heresy. Then the empire was beset by barbarous populations whose greed was ever increasing, and who were either given to idolatry or subjugated by Arianism. But now behold the work of God ! Not far from the banks of the Rhine, a barbarian chieftain was engaged in battle with other barbarians. His followers were giving way ; and in his peril he bethought him of the God whom his wife adored, and whose power she had often lauded. He invokes that God ; and victory having declared for him, he prostrates himself at the feet of the God of Clotilda. That God was Christ ; that king, that queen, that bishop, that victory, were the French nation ; and the French nation was the *first Catholic nation* which God gave to His Church " (1). If it had been given to St. Remy to see through the veil of the future, he would have known that a national birth was effected by the regenerating waters which he poured on the head of Clovis. "Forth from the Baptistery of Rheims issued France and all her destinies ; the age of Charlemagne, the freedom of the communes, the genius of scholasticism, the glories of the Crusades, the days of St. Louis, the heroism of Joan of Arc, the valor of Henry IV., the splendor of Louis XIV., the eloquence of Bossuet, the great modern movement, and we ourselves. Yes, from that Baptistery we also came ; we who are Catholics, despite the scandals of the Great Schism, despite the seductions of the Reformation, despite the diabolical reign of Voltaire, despite the bloody persecutions of the Revolution. Despite all these terrible trials, we are Catholics. Long and magnificent is that history which has been termed the *Gesta Dei per Francos* : for on its every page the grandeur of God and our national greatness stand forth in indissoluble unity " (2).

Fourteen centuries have passed since the Frankish king, Clovis, led the Burgundian princess, Clotilda, to the hymeneal altar, thus opening the way to an event which was

(1) *Discourse on the Vocation of the French Nation*, delivered in Notre Dame, Paris, February 14, 1841.

(2) PÉRREYVE ; *Panegyric on St. Clotilda*.

to be one of the chief directive agents in the formation of modern history—the baptism of France. With few strokes of his pen Féval has described this wonderful conversion: “A man praying amid the ruins of the past, and a seed developing in the dense shade of the oaks—that was sufficient; it was thus that God made France.” The man praying amid the ruins of Gallo-Roman splendor and power was St. Remy, archbishop of Rheims; the seed developing its great potentialities in the silence of oppression was St. Clotilda, a delicate flower which had survived the storm that had devastated everything around her, and still retained its native freshness and beauty. We must devote a few words to the career of this princess, for too many historians have sadly travestied it. Through her father, Clotilda descended from Gondicarius, who, while defending his subjects from the invading Huns, perished at the hands of Attila. The Burgundian dominions were then divided by his sons: Gondemar, Godeghesil, Gondebald, and Chilperic. The last-named prince was the father of Clotilda. On the death of Godeghesil, Gondebald made war on his two other brothers; Gondemar fell amid the flames of his last fortress; while Chilperic, taken on the field of battle, was conveyed to Geneva, then the capital of the Burgundians, and massacred, together with his wife and all his children, excepting Clotilda and one sister. At this time the Burgundians were Christians, but had succumbed to the Arian heresy. Gondebald, although a fervent Arian, allowed full liberty to his nieces to practise the Catholic religion, in which they had been trained by their mother. Frequently Clotilda heard the voice of nature crying for vengeance on the murderer of her family; but she ever hearkened to the promptings of divine grace to forgive him. Before many years the young princess became the idol of Geneva, so completely did she unite angelic beauty with the best gifts of a large heart and a grand soul. Clotilda had not reached her twentieth year, when, in 492, her fame was sounded in the ears of the great Clovis. He was seized with desire to make her his queen, and accordingly negotiated with Gondebald for her hand. The Burgundian sovereign willingly assented; but at first the princess hesitat-

ed. The Franks were brave and glorious indeed, and the world already prognosticated their early arrival at the height of power ; but they were still pagans, and Clovis especially was attached to the worship of the false deities with all the ardor of an impetuous and naturally religious heart. Clotilda reflected, however, that Clovis was held in great esteem by the bishops of Northern Gaul, and that the holy Remy, with whom she regularly corresponded on the affairs of her soul, had told her that he cherished great hopes that the brave Frank would yet become a Christian. What if she were to be the instrument of Providence in effecting so wonderful and happy a transformation ? In fine, Clotilda consented to become Queen of the Franks, and in due time set out for the court of Clovis. Only a few days had been spent on the journey when an event occurred which very nearly changed the current of Clotilda's career, and which helped to give rise to a calumny which is gleefully repeated by philosophic historians. Shortly after the departure of the bridal *cortège*, there had returned to Geneva, from an embassy to Constantinople, a virulent enemy of our princess ; and on learning of the matrimonial treaty with Clovis, he sought to prevent its consummation. Aridius was a Roman, and the intimate confidant of Gondebald. He had been a Catholic, but had sacrificed his religion to political ambition, and had embraced Arianism. There was not a more ardent sectary among the Burgundians than this renegade, and he had often endeavored to draw Clotilda into apostasy ; but failing, and perceiving no favorable opportunity of injuring her, he had dissembled his rage, and bided his time. He now tried to procure a disavowal of the agreement with Clovis, and an order for the pursuit and interception of the princess. He represented to Gondebald that he risked great danger by placing Clotilda in the camp of the Franks. Even as a captive she had been formidable ; he had often suggested to his lord the propriety of ridding himself of the last of the serpent's brood. What would she not become, if raised to the Frankish throne ? Even when in the power of Gondebald, she had defied him by persisting in her Catholicism. If now she were supported by the Frankish army, what would she not effect ? The

king should remember that Clotilda was of a race that forgot no injuries ; and that she had seen her father and brothers murdered before her eyes, and her mother, torn from her embraces, thrown into a well with a stone at her neck. Aridius prevailed ; an armed force was immediately dispatched to arrest the princess. But secretly as these measures had been taken, they came to the knowledge of a Catholic officer who was devoted to Clotilda ; and by means of a shorter road, impracticable to the heavily accoutred troops, he managed to warn her. The resolution of the princess was soon taken. Leaving her litter, she was soon in the saddle ; and surrounded by a few chosen cavaliers, she pushed ahead at full speed for the Frankish frontier, while the main body of her late escort continued their march. No sooner had their mistress disappeared over the horizon, than the Franks, for her protection and their own, fired and otherwise devastated all the villages and forests in their rear, as they advanced, so that the pursuers found their progress so impeded that they were unable to prevent the little band and its precious charge from reaching the border in safety.

This ravaging of the Burgundian territory, presumably by order of Clotilda, on the first occasion furnished her of satisfying a natural desire for vengeance, has given to authors of the freethinking school a specious advantage, when they adduce in favor of their theory of our saint's vindictiveness a passage of St. Gregory of Tours (545-595), in which the holy chronicler, rightly styled the "father of French history," seems to say that Clotilda, in her advanced age and widowhood, armed her sons against Burgundy, in order to further slake her thirst for revenge for the crime of Gondobald, committed thirty or forty years previously. This testimony of St. Gregory, say the philosophistic historians, is rendered more credible by the vengeance taken by the expectant bride ; and then they feign to show, from the words of the archbishop that her implacability, not military necessity and a desire to preserve their own lives, prompted the Frankish devastation. And in this vicious circle they pretend to find their proof that the Catholic Church has presented to the veneration of her children a virulent fury, or at best a person who quite

readily succumbed to the ordinary frailties of the descendants of Adam. Even Catholic authors of merit have accepted the story of Clotilda's two strokes of vengeance as authentic and indubitable, contenting themselves with a more or less successful minimization of the force of the argument deduced from the alleged facts by the freethinkers. Thus Cesare Cantù, as Catholic and truly philosophical a historian as ever wielded a pen, gives the generally credited version, unaccompanied by the slightest manifestation of doubt (1). Henrion evinces the same innocence of suspicion concerning the authenticity of the Gregorian text, though he extenuates the alleged guilt of the saint by the assertion of the rights of her sons over Burgundy. Fleury says nothing on the subject; but from the fact that whenever he alludes to the Franks, he constantly cites St. Gregory as his source of information, we may conclude that he places no reliance on the passage in question. We may imagine how welcome to Henri Martin, who saw in St. Clotilda a spirit of blind and implacable vengeance, was the spectacle of one canonized saint incriminating another. But had this historical champion of the modern anti-clerical school read the excellent disquisition of H. del'Epinois on the value of the writings of St. Gregory of Tours (2), or the still more convincing work of the Abbé de Barral (3), he would have felt less reason for complacency. The alleged inculcating text of St. Gregory of Tours runs as follows: "Queen Clotilda, addressing Clodomir and her other sons, said to them: 'Let me never have to regret, my dear sons, having raised you to maturity. May my injuries excite your indignation, and enkindle an ardent zeal in your hearts to avenge the slaughter of my father and mother.' Having heard these words, they turned toward Burgundy, and marched against Sigismund and his brother Godomar." Now, this delivery of her native Burgundy to rapine and pillage, this deluging of then peaceful homes with blood, this loosening of a flood which might engulf all Europe, is very unlike an act of that ven-

(1) *Universal History*, bk. viii., ch. 9.

(2) In the *Annals of Christian Philosophy* for February, 1862.

(3) *Examination of the Celebrated Text of St. Gregory of Tours on the War Against Sigismund*. *Ibi*, December, 1862.

erable widow of Clovis, whom St. Gregory describes elsewhere as "passing her days near the tomb of St. Martin of Tours in all *benignity* and chastity." Of course, Henri Martin accounts for this unchristian conduct by the purely gratuitous averment that among the barbarians Christianity existed only on the surface. Here is another vicious circle : to evince contested facts the character of the barbarians is adduced, and then this character is painted by the aid of these same contested facts. But though that barbarian blood boiled ever so fiercely, age should have somewhat cooled it, and about forty years had elapsed since the murder of Clotilda's relatives. Again, the alleged passage of St. Gregory confronts us with many absurdities which nothing compels us to admit. If it is to be accepted in evidence, how did Clotilda succeed so well in dominating her thirst for vengeance during the entire life of the guilty Gondebald ? Occasions for the satisfaction of her supposed lust for blood had not been wanting ; and nevertheless, she had not induced her husband to gratify it. Once, when Gondebald was shut up in Avignon by the victorious Franks, she had but to insinuate the wish, and Clovis would not have accorded peace to the royal murderer, but would have exacted his wretched life. On another occasion Gondebald had violated his troth to the Franks, and had refused his tribute of vassalage to their king. The queen certainly so far forgave as not to influence Clovis toward severity ; for he overlooked the crime and made a new alliance with the culprit against Alaric. Again, she displayed anything but a vindictive spirit in not opposing the hearty welcome into the Frankish camp of that Aridius who had very nearly prevented her marriage, and had pursued her with Burgundian troops. And, finally, it is incredible that Clotilda should have kept peace for thirty or more years with the murderer of her family, only to take her revenge at last on the innocent and holy Sigismund. These and other absurdities force us to conclude that the unique motive of the sons in warring on Sigismund was their own ambition.

But how are we to account for the incriminating words of St. Gregory of Tours ? We cannot charge the holy chron-

icler with deliberate lying ; but we must remember that he wrote nearly a hundred years after the marriage of St. Clotilda. And as Henri Martin, unconsciously refuting his own theory, admits : " That union and its important consequences struck the popular imagination so vividly that they became the text for romantic recitals, which every succeeding generation enlarged and embellished." In this embellishment, then, and consequent alteration of the Gregorian manuscript, and not in the writings of the saintly chronicler, is to be found the source of the charge that Clotilda was a vindictive woman. These " highly embellished recitals " had impressed the imagination, perhaps even affected the critical faculties, of some copyist, monastic or secular, who was occupied in a reproduction of the saintly author's chronicle. Either in good or bad faith, he wrote his ornamenting ideas on the margin of his copy ; and in time some other copyist, perhaps in good faith, inserted the annotations in the text as originally the production of the recognized author of the work in hand (1). No fact is more familiar to historical investigators than such interpolations in olden manuscripts ; and to detect the fraud is one of the chief tasks, as it is the most laborious, of the patient critic. In fine, we hold that St. Gregory of Tours was not the author of the passage which incriminates St. Clotilda. No other hypothesis can account for the eulogy which the same historian pronounces on the humility of the queen : " Queen Clotilda so conducted herself that she was honored by all. Neither the royalty of her sons, nor worldly ambition, nor wealth, could entice her to perdition ; but humility raised her to grace " (2). That the chronicle of St. Gregory has been grievously interpolated in many places, is satisfactorily proved by Le Cointe (3) and by Kries (4). That the passage in question must be rejected,

(1) St. Gregory of Tours was well aware of the danger of alteration which all MSS. underwent in his day, from indiscreet or malevolent interpolation. At the end of his work he placed this warning : " Although this volume is written in uncultivated style, I conjure all the priests of the Lord who hereafter govern the Church of Tours, and I do so by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the judgment-day, if they do not wish to see themselves then covered with confusion and condemned with the devil, that they never destroy this book ; also that they never, in copying it, add any things or omit others."

(2) *Loc. cit.*

(3) *Ecclesiastical Annals of the Franks.*

(4) *Life and Writings of Gregory of Tours.* Breslau, 1839.

has been well demonstrated by the eminent Italian historian, Carlo Troya (1), and by Alphonse de Boissieu (2). And now a word concerning the testimony of Fredegarius, which is also adduced by freethinkers in corroboration of their charge against St. Clotilda. This chronicler, speaking of the future queen's journey to the court of Clovis, says that before crossing the frontier and joining the king, who awaited her at Troyes, the princess asked her escort to pillage and burn two leagues of the Burgundian territory, on both sides of the road. They obtained permission of Clovis, and the Franks set themselves to the task. Then Clotilda is said to have prayed: "Almighty God, I thank Thee! Now I see the beginning of my vengeance against the murderers of my family." Now, is it probable that Clovis, at such a time, and merely for the satisfaction of a woman's caprice, would have thus created a cause of war? And how did the Frankish escort of Clotilda, pursued by the Burgundians, find leisure for the message to their sovereign and for the arrival of the reply? And remember that the expectant bride was just then running great risk of being captured and restored to the custody of her enemies; for she was guarded, not by a powerful army, but by a mere escort of honor. These considerations impel us to pass the same judgment on the testimony of Fredegarius that we have recorded concerning that of the Turenian chronicler. As to the prayer of thanksgiving which Clotilda is said to have offered on the consummation of her first vengeance for the slaughter of her relatives, we need not let it cause us much surprise. It is not very easy to draw the line where a just punishment of a terrible crime ends, and the principle of Gospel forgiveness begins to have force; especially in the case where the sufferer is judge and punisher. And Clotilda was then a girl of scarcely nineteen, who had been trained amid many of the traditions of barbarism. Even when she knelt at the altar of God, thanking Him for her escape, she was breathing the atmosphere that surrounded her. She was a Christian; but her lately converted nation had not yet forgotten the maxim of retaliation, "An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." The law of her

(1) *History of Italy*, Vol. xi.(2) *Ancient Inscriptions of Lyons*.

people assigned "to the nearest relative of the victim, the goods, the arms, and revenge." Hard indeed was the task of the Church to extirpate from the customs and laws of our ancestors that barbarity which, born of egotism, could be eradicated only by the spirit of self-sacrifice, cultivated by sympathy with the woes of Calvary. In fine, we may admit that at the time of her union with Clovis, Clotilda had not yet arrived at that Christian perfection to which, under the guidance of St. Remy, she was destined to attain.

Returning now to the conversion of Clovis, we would remark that the spirit of the world affects to regard as insincere nearly every conversion to the Catholic faith, although it finds no difficulty in awarding the praise of sincerity to any perversion from that faith. It is quite natural, therefore, that heterodox and rationalistic historians should represent Clovis as being influenced by ambition when he threw himself at the feet of St. Remy; but one would suppose that a writer of the calibre of Augustin Thierry, even though he was not a professing Christian when he penned the observation, would not have fallen into this error (1). Thierry wrote: "Among the French kings of the first race, Clovis was the politician. With the view of founding an empire, he trampled on the worship of the gods of the North, and he associated himself with the orthodox bishops for the destruction of the two Arian kingdoms. But he was the tool, rather than the director of this league. . . . He continued to be influenced by the customs and ideas of his people. . . . The torch and rapine did not spare the churches when he made his incursions toward the Saone and to the south of the Loire. . . . The ceremony (his baptism) was performed at Rheims, and the most splendid arts of the Romans were adopted with profusion to celebrate the triumph of the bishops" (2). Gorini well remarks that if

(1) Gorini, in his admirable *Defense of the Church* (1853), took occasion to refute a number of Thierry's assertions made in the *Conquest of England by the Normans*, and in the *Letters on the History of France*. It is a pleasure to note that Thierry most handsomely admitted the justice of Gorini's animadversions, and in all posterior editions (while he lived) the criminated passages were either corrected or omitted. But the great historian had then become a devout and uncompromising Catholic. M. Henri Martin, the head of the Druidical school, imitated Thierry's example to some extent. Guizot granted the accuracy of Gorini's judgments, but he allowed the errors to appear in his later editions.

(2) In later editions, also published before his conversion, Thierry modified the last sen-

Clovis received baptism in order to found an empire, it was *his* policy that triumphed, and not that of the bishops or their faith; especially if, as Thierry says, the Christian Clovis was no more reverent toward the churches than the pagan Clovis had been. But how is it that the policy of Clovis had never shown itself during his fifteen years of reign on both banks of the Somme in the midst of Christian populations; during his ten years of intimacy with St. Remy, and of acquaintance with other clergymen; and during the three years of entreaty on the part of Clotilda that he would abandon paganism? It was not until he found that the God of the Christians had heard his prayer at Tolbiac that he abandoned his false deities. And if conversion to Christianity was to strengthen his power, is it not strange that other barbarian princes of the day, equally ambitious, never made such a discovery? But, humanly speaking, Clovis did not need to embrace Christianity in order to attain the objects of his royal ambition. As a pagan he had subjugated Central Gaul; and all the other Gallo-Roman populations, still subject to other barbarians, were calling on him to deliver them. And what had he to hope, if fortune abandoned him, from the power of the orthodox clergy? They had been unable to save the orthodox Syagrius, put to death by him at Soissons; or the orthodox Childeric, murdered by the Burgundian Gondebald. Let us, therefore, say with Nicetus, bishop of Treves, addressing Chlodosinda, a granddaughter of the Frankish king: "Being a man of extreme prudence, Clovis did not embrace our faith until he found that it was the true one" (1). As for the remark of Thierry that Clovis and his Franks retained, after their conversion, an affection for their olden habits, it is certain that no people, newly converted, are at once metamorphosed; Clovis could scarcely become a St. Louis. Among the heterodox there are some fortunate souls who are able to appreciate to some extent the intervention of God, the Creator and Sustainer, in the affairs of human life; but the arrogant Rationalist, of the earth earthy, would fain

tence so as to read: "To celebrate the triumph of the Catholic faith," thus presenting the prelates in a less odious fashion.

(1) SIRMOND; *Ancient Councils of Gaul*, Vol. i., p. 324.

perceive the workings of priestcraft in this intervention. Hence we are told that the marriage of Clovis to St. Clotilda was an affair of episcopal policy ; that the bishops, who are said to have then held the destinies of Gaul in their hands, projected this union as a means for the conversion of the Franks, to whom they intended to subject the whole of Gaul, having realized that the Arian barbarians would be less easily converted than the idolatrous ones. But St. Gregory of Tours (b. 539), the father of French history, upon whom we must chiefly rely for all knowledge concerning the Franks of this period, assigns the charms and virtue of Clotilda as the cause of the demand of Clovis for her hand ; the historian utters not one word which would indicate that the clergy had any part in the affair. " Clovis often sent ambassadors to the Burgundians ; and these messengers, having seen the young Clotilda, were impressed by her beauty and graciousness. Having learned that she was of royal blood, they told Clovis about her. He immediately sent a special embassy to demand her hand, and Gondobald, not daring to refuse, delivered the maiden to the messengers. When Clovis received her, he was so enraptured that he made her his wife " (1).

As for the assertion that the Gallo-Roman bishops had devised the plan of subjecting all Gaul to the Franks, because of the greater probability of the future conversion of those idolaters, it is certain that the orthodox clergy had no reason to despair of the conversion of the Arian Burgundians and Visigoths. They had already attained great success ; and very little perspicacity was needed to foresee that soon their apostolic labors would be fully rewarded. In Burgundy the Catholic faith had been openly professed by King Chilperic, and Gondobald had proposed to profess it in secret. The daughter and grandchildren of the latter prince abjured their heresy ; and Sigismund, the king of Geneva, made St. Avitus, bishop of Vienne, his intimate friend and adviser. As to the Visigoths, in the previous century, before they had entered into any relations with the Arians of Constantinople, they had been Catholics ; and even in Gaul it is very probable that Frederick, the brother of Theodorie II., was orthodox,

(1) *Ecclesiastical History of the Franks*, bk. II., ch. 28.—*Epitomata*, ch. 18.

for we find him informing Pope Hilarius of the intrusion of Hermes at Narbonne, and we hear the Pontiff styling him "my son" (1). Certainly these and many similar facts must have encouraged the Gallo-Roman clergy in the belief that the conversion of the Burgundians and the Visigoths was not improbable; and in the face of such a belief they would scarcely have devised the expedient of fettering themselves and their entire nation under the domination of those idolatrous Franks who, if we are to credit Guizot, were "more German, more barbarous," than the other barbarians. But, by the way, were the Franks more barbarous than the Burgundians and Visigoths? Guizot says: "There were notable differences between these peoples. The Franks were more foreign, more German, more barbarous than the Burgundians and the Goths. Before entering Gaul, the last had long held relations with the Romans, had lived in Italy and in the Eastern Empire, had become familiar with Roman manners; and very nearly the same may be said of the Burgundians. And what is more, these two peoples had been Christians for a long time, whereas the Franks came from Germany, as yet pagans and enemies" (2). In the first place, we must observe that Clovis did *not* bring his Franks from Germany; but from Tournai, in the ancient Roman province of Belgium. When Clovis became King of the Franks, they had resided on the Roman side of the Rhine for more than a hundred and fifty years, having established themselves there in 337; and we may well say with Michelet that during this long residence in Celtic Belgium, they must have necessarily become, through intermarriage, Celtic to a great extent (3). But the relations between the Franks and the Romans were of a date more ancient than that of the Frankish occupation of Belgium. From the year 288, when the Emperor Maximian hurled the Franks and other Germanic invaders across the Rhine, great numbers of the former entered the military service of Rome, and thus came in contact, at least, with Roman refinement. St. Sidonius, a contemporary of

(1) *Epistles of Hilary to Leontius*, in Sirmond, Vol. 1.

(2) *History of Civilization in France*, Vol. 1., lesson 8.

(3) *History of France*, Vol. 1., p. 195.

Clovis, gives pictures of luxurious display on the part of Frankish warriors, which are incompatible with utter barbarism. According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus the Emperor Constantine the Great considered the blood of the Franks so noble that he issued a decree permitting imperial princes to marry Frankish women (1). Before the time of Clovis, the Franks had given to Rome nine commanders-in-chief for her armies, five tribunes, a prefect of the city, a prime minister (Arbogastes), and an empress (Eudoxia). Ammianus Marcellinus, writing in 370, tells us that for a long time past young Franks had frequented the schools of Rome, Ravenna, Milan, Narbonne and Autun; that so fine were the dwellings and so careful the cultivation on the right or Frankish side of the Rhine, that a stranger had to inquire as to which bank was the Roman (2). If the reader now reflects that the Visigothic chief, Ataulphus, said that the sole reason why he abandoned his design of founding a Gothic empire on the ruins of the Roman was, that "long experience had taught him the absolute impossibility of subjecting the unrestrained barbarism of the Goths to any kind of law" (3), he will not agree with Guizot in the assertion that the Visigoths were more cultured than the Franks. There is no need of dilating on the barbarism of the Burgundians, since all historians agree that they were inferior to the Visigoths in every respect. Gorini assigns a very probable reason for the frequently accepted notion that the Visigoths were more cultured than the Franks. "As narrator of his life, the Frank monarch had only St. Gregory of Tours, the barbarian historian of barbarism; whereas, at the court of the Visigoths, there was, both as courtier and as suppliant, that personage whom M. Augustin Thierry terms 'the grandest poet of the fifth century,' St. Sidonius Apollinaris. This writer, a sensible man, and one of imagination, addicted to a highly-colored style, was led by many circumstances to describe the habits of Theodoric; his efforts to raise to the empire the father-in-law of Sidonius; the solemn receptions of his successor, Euric; the pleasures of his Gallo-Roman subjects, who lived

(1) CHATEAUBRIAND; *Analysis of the History of France*.

(2) *Deeds*, bk. xv.

(3) OROSIUS; *History*, bk. vii., ch. 43.

in the retirement of their villas exchanging verses with each other, or carelessly promenading along the banks of the Garonne, or preparing magnificent presents for their sovereigns. The brilliant periods of the poet form a setting amid which the Visigothic kings lose their barbarism, and such a setting did not fall to the lot of Clovis. But the description of the prayers, labors, games, and public audiences of Theodoric are no more interesting than would have been, if executed by an able pen, a picture of Clovis, surrounded by Clotilda, the lords of his court, and the leaders of his army; the artists who had been brought from Italy; the Gallo-Romans of the East and South begging him to enroll them among his subjects; ambassadors imploring the freedom of the prisoners of Tolbiac; other ambassadors handing to him the insignia of the Consulate which they have brought from Constantinople; and St. Remy discoursing on the duties of a Christian ruler or recalling the pomp and splendor of the baptism at Rheims. There was no such painter for Clovis; only St. Gregory of Tours was to illustrate his career. Would Theodoric affect our imagination more strongly than Clovis, if no one had spoken of him but Jornandes or St. Isidore? . . . That superior refinement which Thierry discerns in the Visigoths must be ascribed less to any merit of the conquerors than to the Gallo-Roman nobles of the court, and to the descriptions of Sidonius. As Thierry himself says, 'the German appeared in the Visigoths as soon as they took the field,' and they took the field very frequently" (1).

"Hail! O Christ, who lovest the Franks! Preserve their kingdom; enlighten their leaders with Thy grace; protect their army; strengthen their faith! May Jesus Christ, the Sovereign Master of the masters of the earth, give to the Franks all the joys of peace! Hail! O Christ, who lovest the Franks! By means of its courage and its strength the Frankish race threw off the heavy yoke of the Romans; and having received the grace of baptism, covered with gold and precious stones the bodies of the holy martyrs which the pagans had burnt with fire, lacerated with the sword, and given as prey to wild beasts!"

(1) *Ubi supra*, Edit. 1864, Vol. i., p. 319.

These quaint and sublime words form the prelude to the new Salic Law, which Clovis, immediately after his baptism, assigned to his Franks as the basis of their future jurisprudence. Does the reader discern in them the spirit of a murderer—of a murderer of his own kindred? And yet we are told by certain historians that Clovis the Christian was a foul assassin of his own flesh and blood. In the year 1873 the educational superintendents (“Conseil de l’Instruction Publique”) of the Third French Republic authorized and “crowned” a text-book on the history of France, written by one Mad. de Saint-Ouen, in which we read: “Clovis I. would occupy a distinguished place in history, if he had not soiled his reign by his cruelties toward the chiefs of the various Frankish tribes, most of whom were related to him. Some of them he caused to be massacred, others he killed with his own hand.” Then the poor woman, undoubtedly sincere, since she follows, at a distance, in the footsteps of such pioneers as Guizot and Henry Martin, devotes twenty-five modest pages to the presumedly easy task of trying and condemning, for the instruction and edification of French youth, the entire series of Merovingian monarchs: “It is necessary to give only a rapid glance at these barbarous times.” Can it be possible that the charge of murder is deserved by a prince whom Pope Anastasius lauded as a just man, and as the Eldest Son of the Church; by a prince whose most intimate counsellor was the grand St. Remy? But what evidence sustains the hideous accusation? Merely an alleged passage of St. Gregory of Tours, who wrote toward the end of the sixth century; that is, nearly a century after the death of Clovis. And it is to be noted that St. Gregory, in this short passage, if indeed he was its author, used the word “*fertur*—it is said” no less than four times. Again, if this passage is authentic, how are we to account for the following language of the saint, uttered immediately after it? “Every day God caused the augmentation of the kingdom of Clovis, *because he walked before Him with a pure heart, and did what was pleasing in His eyes*” (1). And in the pro-

* (1) “*Deus augebat regnum ejus, eo quod ambularet recto corde coram eo, et faceret que placita erant in oculis ejus.*”

logue to his fifth book, St. Gregory offers the example of Clovis to the sovereigns of the sixth century: "Remember the deeds of the first author of your victories; of him who put to death so many hostile kings, who crushed so many wicked peoples, who subjugated those who now are our countrymen (*patrias gentes*), and who left to you an authority which is stainless and uncontested." In the Council held at Orleans in 511, immediately after the alleged crimes of Clovis, the synodals placed at the head of their *Acts* a letter to Clovis in which they lauded his pious zeal and his *humanity*. Were these bishops hypocrites? Finally, we would draw attention to the characters and deeds of the petty princes who are supposed to have been the victims of the rage and greed of Clovis. In the *Life of St. Maximin* (Mesmin, abbot of Mici, near Orleans), written in the early part of the sixth century; in the *Chronicle of Aimoin*, written in the tenth century; in the *Chronicle of Balderic*, written in the eleventh; and above all, in the *Life of St. Remy* which Hincmar (b. 806) reproduced from a biography composed by a contemporary of Clovis, we find some pertinent particulars regarding these personages, all of which indicate that the Frank monarch was an inflexible punisher of revolt (1), like Dagobert, if you will, or Charlemagne, or Louis XI., or Richelieu; but not an assassin. Much stress is laid upon the killing of Ragnacarius, a relative of Clovis. But Balderic, who tells us that he drew his narrative from the text of St. Gregory of Tours, plainly evinces that he did not read, in his copy of the alleged criminating *History*, the passages which are adduced to show the wickedness of Clovis and the culpable subservience of the saint to royal power. Balderic says: "Clovis had assigned the custody of Cambrai to Ragnacarius, his cousin or nephew. . . . When the king returned, this Ragnacarius, inflated by criminal pride, violated his pledges, and refused entrance into the city to his sovereign. The insolence and obscenities of Ragnacarius had already procured for him the hatred of the Franks, and now they resolved to bring about his death, and they informed the king of their

(1) And, nevertheless, yielding to the intercession of St. Euspicius, he granted full pardon to the rebels of Verdun.

intention." The rebel was delivered to his sovereign, and his execution was an act of justice. As to the murder of Sigebert by his son Chloderic, and the killing of the latter by order of Clovis, there is nothing in the adduced passage of St. Gregory which would indicate that the parricide was instigated by the Frank king, and certainly this sovereign was justified in punishing so revolting a crime. Augustin Thierry (1), Ozanam (2), and Kries (3) assign a German legendary source to the belief in the cruelty and injustice of the Christian Clovis ; but one of the best of the critics of our day, A. Lecoy de la Marche, discerns its origin in the hatred which the Gallo-Roman race resumed during the reigns of the immediate successors of Clovis (4). We believe that the adduced testimony of St. Gregory of Tours is at least an interpolation, and probably a malicious forgery.

The marvellous action of Christianity in the work of civilization has been recognized by all conscientious historians and polemics ; not only by those who were guided by Catholic principles, but even by those who were the victims of Protestant prejudice, or who allowed their intellects to be obscured by the vagaries of rationalism. The Protestant Guizot says : " Among the causes of our civilization the Christian Church presents itself to every mind. Society has never made such efforts to influence its surroundings and to assimilate to itself the external world as the Church put forth between the fifth and the tenth centuries. The Church attacked barbarism, as it were, on every side, and, conquering it, she civilized it." Probably the reader has noted the frequently passionate invectives of Michelet against the Church ; but the otherwise grand historian found himself compelled to admit : " By the side of the civil order another order is established, and it will take up and preserve the civil during the tempest of the barbarian invasion. Everywhere, alongside the Roman magistracy which is about to be eclipsed and to leave society in peril, religion has established another magistracy which will never prove deficient. Imperial universality is

(1) In the Preface to his *Merovingian Times*.

(2) *The Germans*, Vol. i., p. 133.

(3) *Loc. cit.*

(4) *Political Murders of Clovis*, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, Vol. i., p. 450.

on the verge of ruin ; but Catholic universality has appeared, and the world will be maintained and arranged by the Church." Balmes observes : " Amid this social dissolution, this monstrous upheaval of laws and customs, Christianity stands erect like a solitary column in a ruined city, like a glowing beacon in the midst of darkness. Christianity is the sole element which can render life to the germs of regeneration which are covered by ruins and gore." Laurentie says : " When civil wars had desolated the empire, and the provinces were at the mercy of the barbarians, only one authority in Gaul was popular, and that authority took care of the nation, a prey to various conquerors, one after another. This authority was that of the bishops, who were ever ready to throw themselves between the combatants." And the eloquent Montalembert remarks : " With invincible perseverance religion performed the arduous work of kneading and moulding the various elements of those Teutonic and northern races which had overrun Europe, in order to civilize and sanctify them through the patient and vivifying action of faith. Even Littré, the great materialist and philologist, who persevered in his atheism almost unto the hour of his death, avowed, in the midst of his hallucinations, that " in the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries the Church was the grand agent of social salvation." And Gibbon himself declared : " The bishops made the kingdom of France." This admission received the equally celebrated commentary of Joseph de Maistre : " The bishops made France, as bees construct a hive." As Cantù well observed, it is only by agriculture that men become really fixed in a country, " and become attached to it by sentiments which make sacred the name of fatherland," and Guizot never spoke more solidly than when he said that the Benedictines were *les défricheurs* of Europe. This influence of the Church was felt wherever there were barbarians to be tamed ; but, above all others, and from the very day of their conversion, the Frank barbarians seem to have been the most amenable to the lessons of their spiritual mother, and to have been the most zealous and enthusiastic in their demonstrations of gratitude to God for their rescue from the darkness of paganism. Probably much of their amenability and much of the

simplicity of their Catholic spirit was due to their speedy amalgamation with the Gallo-Romans; for centuries were to elapse (in the case of the Prussians more than seven) before all the other Teutons abandoned idolatry. But their own nature also seems to have been in their favor. We can discern a heart yearning to love God and to fight for His honor in the Clovis who cries out when he first hears of the Passion of Christ: "Oh! why was I not there with my Franks?" From the day when Clovis and his three thousand companions issued regenerated from the Baptistery of Rheims, giving an example which was to be soon followed by their entire nation, France seems to have been—if we may reverently so express our idea—the special pet of heaven. In its entirety, although not in all its particulars, her history warrants the supposition, and many a time and oft her foes have proclaimed the idea as truth. Probably there never lived a less enthusiastic man than that profound observer, the Austro-Spaniard, Charles V.; but he declared, after many years of experience of French propensity to recover from even merited misfortune: "No people ever did so much to bring about their own ruin as the French have done; but they always recover, for they are specially protected by God."

Gesta Dei per Francos! Certainly the French Catholic has reason for holy pride as he peruses the annals of his country, and discerns so many instances of God's use of the arms of France to effect His designs in the world, especially in the sole really important matter of the preservation of His Church. And now that a culmination seems to have been nearly attained by the efforts of the enemies "of all that is called God," which have been exerted for a full century and more to effect the unchristianization of his country, the French Catholic may well meditate upon these *Gesta Dei*; for in them he will find a justification of his confidence that God has not deserted France, even in the matter of her temporal prosperity. Of course, while individuals attain the end of their creation only in the next world, nations must accomplish their end here below, and therefore it may easily be that the end for which God established French nationality has already been reached. It may be that all Europe is soon

to be made a *tabula rasa* by a Russian or a Mongolian invasion, and that once again the Catholic Church, the sole surviving institution of what was once the European *populus Christianus*, will pursue her God-given work of taming and converting a new set of barbarians, who will be the most prominent members of her flock during a coming decade of centuries. But the remembrance of what France has done, as an instrument of God, for Catholicism and civilization will endure in the world when the annals of many a now proud nation shall have become myths; for that remembrance will be guarded as a precious souvenir by that Church which will endure until the end of time. Perhaps it will be chiefly by a study of these *Gesta Dei per Francos*—both the original series, which were so named a thousand and more years ago, and the later ones, equally glorious—that the student of the thirtieth century of the Christian era will be able to learn something definite concerning that Arianism which is even now almost a myth to most people, although it was, in its day, more powerful than Protestantism has ever hoped to be. The student will learn how a mortal blow was given to Arianism by the victories of Clovis—against the Burgundians on the plains of Dijon, and against the Visigoths on the plains of Vouillé. In the thirtieth century the investigator will learn how, when Arianism was in its death-throes, Mohammed appeared, and, as Lacordaire observes, “renewed the idea of Arius at the point of the scimitar”; how, after its subjugation of Spain, Islamism tried to subject France to the laws of the Koran, and the nation that was baptized at Rheims furnished Christendom with its champion in the person of Charles Martel, whose victory at Poitiers hurled the Mussulman hordes back into the Iberian peninsula, and deprived them of future possibility of subjugating the whole of Europe. Then our thirtieth century indagator into the past will continue his searches among the *Gesta* of that wonderful people of whose glories the traditions circulating in his day will be so redolent; and he will read how Frankish monarchs *restored* (not *gave*) to the head of God’s Church that temporal sovereignty which the Founder of the Church had designed as its guarantee of indepen-

dence amid the poor fluctuations of the politics of human intelligence. The Baronio of the thirtieth century will read how, when the Roman people, in 754, had proclaimed the secular sovereignty of their Pope-King, Stephen II.; and the Lombard still quasi-barbarian monarchs, Astolphus and Desiderius, had appropriated much of what was rightly styled the Patrimony of the Church; the French sovereigns, Pepin and Charlemagne, restored, by force of French valor, the temporal power of the Pope, declaring that they reserved to themselves and their successors "No power within the same limits, unless that we may gain prayers for the repose of our souls, and that by you and your people we be styled PATRICIANS OF THE ROMANS" (1). And when the searcher for historical truth shall have read such annals of the nineteenth century as may have come down to him, he will wonder why so many of the Italians of that time were so basely ungrateful to that pontifical monarchy which France had assured to them, and which had procured for them an almost uninterrupted primacy in letters, science, and art during eleven centuries. Pursuing his studies, the thirtieth century publicist will find in the *Gesta* how, in the eleventh century, the great heart of France recognized the voice of God issuing from the sepulchre of the Saviour, and calling on the children of Clovis, Martel and Charlemagne, to deliver the Holy Places from infidel persecution; how in that and all the following Crusades these descendants of heroes, and heroes themselves, shed far more of their blood in the holy cause than all other peoples combined, and how French monarchs ever afterward regarded that blood, and the tears and sympathy of those who could not fight, as the most precious jewels in their diadems. Then our investigator will read how, in the fifteenth century, God raised up that sweet Maid of Orleans who was canonized in the beginning of the twentieth century; how her valor, her purity, and her faith triumphed over the arrogant nation which was soon to

(1) In the olden time the title of "Roman Patrician" was given by the Pope-Kings to very few, and only for very great services to the Holy See. Clovis had received the honor, and Pepin was anxious to bear a title which then signified "Defender of the Church," and would therefore increase his consequence in the eyes of all Christian nations. He received it from Pope Stephen on the day that the Pontiff crowned him as King of the Franks.

become heretical, and by that triumph preserved the Land of the Lilies from the imminent pestilence. Then the student will perceive, a little further on in the *Gesta*, how gallantly the French prevented their own land from succumbing to the dire conflagration which had seared the regions watered by the Thames and the Elbe. "Luther came into the world," says Lacordaire, "and at his call Germany and England separated themselves from the Church. Had France accepted their fearful invitation, what would have been the result for Christianity? Her national enthusiasm saved France. Confederated in a holy league, Frenchmen placed their faith above everything else—even above their allegiance to their monarch—and they refused to recognize as legitimate heir to the crown any prince who would not swear fidelity to the God of Clovis, of Charlemagne, and of St. Louis. For the defence of the Church we Frenchmen have fought combats of blood and of mind. Arianism crushed, Islamism vanquished, the temporal dominion of the Popes consolidated, Protestantism repelled,—behold the four crowns of France which will not fade for all eternity." These four crowns represent, indeed, the chief episodes among the *Gesta Dei per Francos*; but they are not the sole instances of God's use of the arm of France for the good of His mystic spouse, or of His loving protection of France. Much could be said about God's work in saving France from the philosophists and *sans-culottes* of the last century, and much about France's defence of the Holy See almost to the present day. Are there to be any more chronicles of *Gesta Dei per Francos*? An affirmative reply will be given by those who perceive pre-eminent vitality in the Catholicism of the great majority of Frenchmen: by those who contend that the French Church of our day has an inestimable advantage over that of the eighteenth century, inasmuch as now the warfare between good and evil in France is open, a contest between affirmation and negation, and not a question between religion and religiosity—because, in fine, the day of half-measures has passed, and now a Frenchman must be either a Christian or an atheist. Such students of their epoch find that the religious movement encouraged by Lacordaire, Montalembert, and Dupanloup, has

been much advanced, of late, among the enlightened classes ; and while they are invincibly opposed to the sect which now administers the affairs of the Republic, they see no reason why Catholics, as such, should regard the Republic itself with suspicion. "The Church follows all the natural movements of reason and of history, with the intelligent tenderness of a mother for her child ; she is ever ready to satisfy the legitimate desires of her child. To the man of ancient times, crushed under the despotism of the Roman Empire, the Church offered refuge in one of her solitudes, where he could renounce the corrupting goods of earth. In the Middle Age, when man had acknowledged her maternal authority, the Church showed him that he could live according to the law of God, even in the world. At the time of the Renaissance, the Church associated herself with the literary and artistic movement of civilization ; and she furnished the world with inspirations and subjects which helped to immortalize so many men and works of the sixteenth century. To-day, democracy, the equality of all men in civil and social rights and duties, is a general aspiration of civilized people ; and it does not entail upon the Church any necessity of changing her doctrines, since she was the first to inculcate, under the superior law of charity—the love of God and of men—the principle of equality among men" (1). We hope, therefore, that Mgr. Freppel, one of the noblest Frenchmen who ever donned the mitre, was justified in pronouncing these encouraging words : "Lift up thy head, noble land ! Have confidence in thy divine vocation ! Thou hast not yet fulfilled thy divine mission ; for shouldst thou disappear, thou wouldst leave a void which Divine Omnipotence alone could fill. If some days of forgetfulness have called down punishment upon thee, many centuries of devotion to Christ and His Church demand pardon for thee. Thou wilt resume thy glorious destiny ; remaining in the world the soldier of Providence, the armed apostle of faith and of Christian civilization. Just as in the past, the weak and the oppressed of the universe will owe their deliverance to thy valor. Thou wilt repeat those grand days of thy history, when all that

(1) PELLISSIER ; *Christian France in the Nineteenth Century*. Paris, 1895.

was most venerable on earth was protected by the sword of Clovis, of Charlemagne, of Godefroy de Bouillon, of St. Louis, of Joan of Arc " (1).

As we write this dissertation, Christian France is celebrating the fourteenth centennial of that sacred function which was performed by St. Remy in the baptistery of Rheims on the Christmas Day of A. D. 496. From all parts of Christendom the great heart of the real and Catholic France has received proof that its emotions are shared by all the children of that Church whom it has served so well. The following ode, written by our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., on this joyful occasion, deserves remembrance by future generations :

VIVAT CHRISTUS QUI DILIGIT FRANCOs.

OB MEMORIAM AVSPICATISSIMI EVENTVS QVVM FRANCORVM NATIO
PRÆVNTË CLODOVEO REGE SE CHRISTO ADDIXIT.

Gentium custos Deus est. Repente
Sternit insignes humilesque promit :
Exitus rerum tenet atque nutu
Temperat æquo.

Teutonum pressus Clodoveus armis,
Ut suos vidit trepidos pericli,
Fertur has voces iterasse, ad astra
Lumina tendens :

Dive, quem supplex mea sæpe conlux
Nuncupat Iesum, mihi dexter adsis :
Si juves promptus validusque, totum
Me tibi dedam.

Illico excussus pavor : acriores
Excitat virtus animos ; resurgit
Francus in pugnam ; ruit, et cruentos
Disiicit hostes.

Victor i, voti Clodovee compos,
Sub iugo Christi caput obligatum
Pone ; te Remis manet infulata
Fronte sacerdos.

Ludor ? en signis positis ad aram
Ipse rex sacris renovatur undis,
Et cohors omnis populisque dño
Tingitur amne.

Roma ter felix, caput o renatæ
Stirpis humanæ, tua pande regna :
Namque victrices tibi sponte lauros
FRANCIA defert.

Te colet matrem ; tua maior esse
Gestiet natu ; potiore vita
Crescet, ac summo benefida Petro
Clara feretur.

Ut mihi longum libet intueri
Agmen heroum ! Domitor ferocis
Fulget Astoldi, pius ille sacri
Iuris amator.

Remque Romanam populantis ultor:
Bis per abruptas metuendus Alpes
Irruit, summoque Petro volentes
Asserit urbes.

Lætus admiror Solyinis potitas
Vindices Sancti Tumuli phalanges
Me Palæstinis renovata campis
Prælia tangunt.

O novum robur celebris puellæ
Castrâ perrumpens inimica ! turpem
Galliæ cladem repulit Ioanna
Numine freta.

O quot illustres animæ nefanda
Monstra Calvinî domuere, gentem
Labe tam dira prohibere fortes.
Sceptraque regni !

Quo feror ? tempus redit auspiciatum
Prisca quo virtus animis calescat.
Ecce, Remensis ciet atque adurget
Corda triumphus.

(1) *Discourse for the Benefit of Wounded Soldiers.* Feb., 1889.

Gallicæ gentes, iubaris vetusti
 Ne quid obscuret radios, cavete ;
 Neve suffundat malesuadus error
 Mentibus umbras.

Vos regat Christus, sibi quos revinxit :
 Obsequi sectis pudeat probrosis ;
 Occidat livor, sociasque in unum
 Cogite vires.

Sæcla bis septem calor actuosæ
 Perstitit vitæ, renuens perire :
 Currite ad Veslam : novus æstuabit
 Pectore fervor.

Dissitis floret magis usque terris
 Gallicum nomen : populi vel ipsi
 Adsit eois, Fideique sanctæ
 Vota secundet.

Nil Fide Christi prius : hac adempta
 Nil diu felix. Stetit unde priscae
 Summa laus genti, manet inde iugis
 Gloria Gallos.

CHAPTER VII.

THE REIGN AND CHARACTER OF ST. LOUIS IX.*

The reign of the holy grandson of Philip Augustus has been rightly styled the keystone of the arch of French history. Certainly much had been effected for the consolidation of the French monarchy when Philip Augustus defeated, at Bouvines (July 27, 1214), the trebly larger forces of the German Otho IV. and the English John Lackland. By that victory the standard of the Lilies, which for some years had waved only over the space which is covered by five of the modern departments of France (1), again threw its protecting folds over all the ancient provinces excepting Aquitaine. But it was in the reign of St. Louis that the lineaments of the later French society were drawn ; and it was in the person of that everlasting glory of the French monarchy that the world beheld an incarnation of all that was most honorable, most redolent of justice—in fine, most Christian, in the royalty of the Middle Age. This reign demonstrated that the great theologians of the Church had not formulated the vagaries of a dream when they conceived the idea of a Christian royalty legitimized, not only by sacerdotal consecration, but by justice in its exercise, and by a proper participation, on the part of the governed, in public affairs. The salient features of the career of St. Louis, the grandest of the nearly innumerable Christian heroes of France, are at the

* This chapter appeared as an article in the *Amer. Cath. Quarterly Review*, Vol. xii.
 (1) Seine, Seine et Loire, Seine et Marne, Oise, and Loiret ; 120 by 90 miles in extent.

command of the student (1) ; in these few pages we propose to treat of some points which, although essential to a proper appreciation of the character of the royal confessor, and to even a moderate understanding of the period in which he lived, are ignored by the authors whose works are consulted by the average reader. We shall touch upon the sanctity of Louis IX. only by implication ; for nothing in the domain of history is more certain than the belief in that sanctity, held by the contemporaries of the monarch, whether Frenchmen or foreigners, Christians or pagans. Neither shall we attempt to detail even the principal events of this charming and edifying life ; but we may be permitted to preface the fulfilment of our main purpose by a brief summary of the results of a policy which, although less theatrically impressive than that followed by certain of the crowned disposers of national destinies, was probably unique in an utter absence of reasons for blame. From the very beginning of his reign, Louis IX. resolved to restrain the abusive domination of the great vassals of the crown ; but law and justice formed the invariable basis of his conduct. The same scrupulousness led him to doubt as to the entire legitimacy of certain conquests of some of his predecessors to the detriment of the kings of England, and he resolved to yield something for the sake of peace. By the treaty of Abbeville, in 1259, he voluntarily ceded to Henry III. of England part of the territories which that monarch reclaimed from the conquests of Philip Augustus ; but in return he obtained the recognition of Anjou, Normandy, Maine, Touraine, Berri, and Poitou, as inalienable from the French monarchy. The English sovereign also engaged to do homage to the king of France, as to his liege and suzerain lord, for all his possessions in the kingdom of France. When the dissensions between Henry III. and his barons threatened to become interminable, the reputation of Louis for probity caused the contestants to appeal to him as arbitrator. In 1264 both parties argued

(1) MICHELET ; *History of France*, ch. 8. Paris, 1830.—VILLENEUVE ; *History of St. Louis*. Paris, 1840.—MIGNET ; *Feudality and the Institutions of St. Louis*. Paris, 1850.—CANTU ; *St. Louis of France*, in the Collection of Biographies attached to that author's *Universal History*, 9th Turin edition, 1862.—LECOY DE LA MARCHE ; *St. Louis, His Government, and His Policy*. Paris, 1891.

their claims before the saint at Amiens, submitting to his judgment, although only for a time. In his conduct toward Frederick II., the most virulent of all those German emperors who were, with few exceptions, so many running sores in the visible body of the Church, the saintly monarch demonstrated that if the Holy Roman Emperors of the German line had ignored the fact that their sole reason for existence was their obligation to be Defenders of the Holy See, that sublime privilege had devolved on the Eldest Sons of the Church. In his relations with the Orient, the crowned hero showed himself a missionary, as well as an armed defender of the Christian faith; he spared no exertion, no expense, in aiding the missions which the sons of Sts. Dominic and Francis had established among the Photian and Nestorian schismatics, and among the Saracens and Tartars. In the administration of the internal affairs of his kingdom, St. Louis was an energetic and prudent reformer; there was not, in all France, a bailiff, a seneschal, or a provost who was not made to feel that his office was a solemn charge for the benefit of the people. The reign of St. Louis was pre-eminently one of justice. The royal tribunals became sure refuges for oppressed innocence; and the king himself heard whatever case a subject desired to be considered by him. From one end of the kingdom to the other, the proudest lord hastened to undo a wrong, when he heard the peasant murmur: "If the king only knew of that!" Students of public economics know that anything like a well-regulated system of governmental finance is of very modern origin; but St. Louis so regulated the reception of revenue, so accurately verified all the accountings, that never, during his reign, was there ordered an extraordinary tax. And let the statesmen of our day note that to our times must not be credited the invention of that famous panacea: "No taxation without representation." In 1256 this "crowned king" decreed in favor of the *bonnes villes* of his dominions that no tax should be levied on them without their consent. If the reader is curious to know how much St. Louis effected for the amelioration of the lot of the serfs, and how he emancipated those of his own royal domain; if it would interest the social economist

to learn all that this crowned saint of the Middle Age effected for the encouragement of art, for the improvement of agriculture, etc., we refer him to the eloquent but judicial narrative of Lecoy de la Marche. When the beautiful picture has been examined, it may occur to the observer that it is strange that one is not oppressed by the sight of some disagreeable shadows, behind which some possible miseries may lurk. Nearly every other biography furnishes some occasion for adverse criticism of its subject; but that of St. Louis refuses to a critic the exercise of his choicest prerogative, and for the simple reason that Louis IX. was more than a worthy husband and father, a consummate statesman, a successful general, and an excellent sovereign. He was also a saint. Such a phenomenal combination has been witnessed in only three or four instances in the history of the world; for while it is true that, at least in the Middle Age, there were many royal saints—considering the comparative fewness of royal personages, more than from any other condition of life—very seldom have other saintly royalties filled all the positions which St. Louis occupied (1).

I.

It is impossible to attain to a correct conception of the character and influence of St. Louis, or to any accurate knowledge of the period in which he lived, if one does not appreciate properly the theory concerning the nature and origin of the royal power which was then in vogue. And among moderns, especially among those whose ideas of history have been derived from Protestant and rationalistic sources, how many are there who understand the meaning of that phrase, the "divine right of kings," which, with some show of reason, they regard as indicative of that *toto cælo* difference which

(1) Speaking of the Venerable Mary Christina of Savoy, mother of King Francis II. of the Two Sicilies, a writer in the *Civiltà Cattolica* (1859) says: "In the Ages of Faith sanctity shone on the thrones of kings, and in royal halls; and perhaps more than in the homes of the lowly and in the cells of religious. Then Italy, France, Spain, Germany, England, Scotland, Hungary, and Denmark gave to the Church so many saints who were either kings or queens, or royal princes or princesses, that, considering the comparatively small number of those persons who occupy so elevated a position, it may be seen that reigning families furnished more saints than were produced by any other condition of life."

subsists between mediæval days and our own? Very few; and, nevertheless, there are some who have read, to say nothing about many minor struggles between royal autocracy and the protectress of the peoples, much concerning that perennial and soul-sickening struggle between the Papacy and the Holy Roman Emperors of the German line—a contest the sole object of which was, on the part of the Pontiffs, to force the emperors to avow that between them and God there was a divinely-appointed power. If these pages come to the notice of any persons who believe, with the immense majority of Protestants, that the “divine right of kings,” as they understand the formula, was the theory held by jurists in the Middle Age, and then taught by the Church, they must learn that the Church has never made any definition concerning either a mediate or an immediate communication of ruling power. The Church has simply presented the dogma revealed in the Pauline declaration that all power comes from God. But the most reliable and most authoritative doctors and theologians of the Church have taught that power has its source in the nation; that power comes from the nation; and that the nation gives, in some manner and in unison with God, that power to princes or other rulers of the peoples. Hear St. Chrysostom, as he comments on the Pauline text: “Is every ruler established by God? I do not say that he is; for I am not speaking of any particular rulers, but of the thing in itself. I say that it is an institution of Divine Wisdom that some command, and others obey; and thus human affairs do not go on in haphazard fashion, the peoples being agitated like the waves of the sea. The Apostle does not say that there is no prince who does not come from God; but speaking of the thing itself, he says that there is no power, unless from God” (1). But hearken to the Angel of the Schools, who, to put the matter very mildly, is the best accredited of all the Catholic theologians, and upon whose judgments all other theologians rely, when they approach this matter *et professo*. St. Thomas, who was a contemporary of St. Louis, tells us that the legislative power resides in the nation, in the people, or in him who has received it from the peo-

(1) *Homily XXIII. on the Epistle to the Romans.*

ple (1). He says the same in regard to the coercive power (2). He insists that in certain conditions of society, the ruler has power to make laws, only because he represents the nation—in *quantum gerit personam multitudinis* (3). A little further on he says that in a well-ordered state the governing power belongs to all—*principatus ad omnes pertinet*, inasmuch as all can vote and be elected (4). After St. Thomas of Aquino, probably Suarez would dispute with Bellarmine the honor of leading the schools. The opinion of Suarez concerning the divine right of kings can be gathered from his "Treatise on Laws," and from an apposite work written in reply to King James I. of England, who, an earnest champion of that doctrine which is falsely supposed to be Catholic teaching, had taken up the pen in an attempted refutation of Bellarmine's defense of the really Catholic position. Listen to Suarez: "It must be admitted that the power to rule is not given by nature to any one person in particular; being, rather, resident in the community. This is the *common opinion*, and it is *certain*. It is the teaching of St. Thomas" (5). And can anything be clearer than the following? "Whenever the civil power resides in any man, in any prince, it has emanated, by legitimate and ordinary right, from the people and the community, either immediately or mediately; and in no other way can it be legitimate" (6). Again: "When the civil power is found in this man, it is the result of a gift of the nation, as I have proved; and in that respect, the power is of human right. And if the government of this or that nation or province is monarchical, it is such because of human institution, and therefore the power also is of human origin. And what proves the matter more strongly, the power of the ruler is more or less great, according to the agreement between him and the nation" (7). Now listen to the reply of Suarez to His Protestant Majesty: "Here the most serene king not only upholds a *new and singular opinion* (that of the *immediate and direct divine right of kings*), but he violently attacks Cardinal Bellarmine because His Eminence affirmed

(1) *Summa Theol.*, 1 a., 2 ae., q. 90, a. 3.(2) *Ibid.*, q. 90, a. 3, ad 2 um.(3) *Ibid.*, q. 97, ad 3. ad 3 um.(4) *Ibid.*, q. 105, a. 1.(5) *Laws*, lib. iii., cap. 2.(6) *Ibid.*, lib. iii., cap. 3.(7) *Ibid.*, cap. 4.

that monarchs, unlike the Sovereign Pontiffs, do not receive their authority immediately from God. His Majesty holds that a prince does not receive his power from the people, but immediately from God ; and he tries to support his assertion with arguments and facts which I shall examine in the following chapter. Now, although this controversy does not turn directly on matters of faith, since neither Scripture nor patristic tradition determines anything concerning the subject, nevertheless the matter ought to be treated carefully, firstly, because it may furnish an occasion of error in others ; secondly, because the king's opinion, such as he establishes it, and because of its object, is *new and singular*, and seems to have been expressly invented in order to enhance the temporal, and to diminish the spiritual power ; and, thirdly, because we contend that the opinion of the illustrious cardinal is *ancient, received, true, and necessarily to be admitted*" (1). When such was the opinion of theologians like the Angelic Doctor, Bellarmine, and Suarez, we are not surprised on hearing Beaumanoir, in the thirteenth century, and Marsilio of Padua, in the early fourteenth, asserting that the people were the first sovereign, and that from the people the king derived his right to make laws.

Nevertheless, the sovereigns of the Middle Age, especially in France, were popularly regarded as, in some sort, images of the Deity ; in those days men respected authority. In France, the holy unction which the monarch received at Rheims gave to him, in the popular imagination, an almost sacerdotal character ; hence in the *Chanson de Roland* we see Charlemagne giving a solemn blessing to his army. It is very probable, remarks a judicious critic of our day (2), that this idea of the quasi-divinity of royalty came from the principle of Aristotle—a philosopher then almost worshipped in the schools—that the monarchical form of government is the most conformable to the order of nature, since all nature is ruled by one God. So thought Gerson, repeating the words of Homer, “*Ουχ αγαθὸν πολυκοιρανία’ εἰς χοίρανος ἔστω*—It is not good to have many leaders ; let us have but one.” As to

(1) *Defense of the Faith Against the Errors of the Anglican Sect.*

(2) JOURDAIN ; *The French Royalty and Popular Right.*

hereditary monarchy, the principle was by no means absolute in mediæval France. Louis VIII. was the first monarch whose father had not procured his coronation during his own life; all the Capetians, down to Philip Augustus, had found it necessary to take this measure in order to secure the succession to their eldest sons. At that time, not only in France, but also in Italy, Hungary, and Germany, there was always a menace in the ears of a reigning prince; he knew that misconduct or tyranny might cause the royal dignity to be transferred to some other family. However, with the advent of St. Louis, the hereditary principle was definitely accepted by the French; the Christian prestige of this prince was so communicated to his race that to be the heir of St. Louis was equivalent to being the future wearer of his crown. And now a word as to the measure of the royal authority during the Middle Age. Elinand, a Cistercian monk of the diocese of Beauvais, in the time of St. Louis, whose knowledge and prudence is lauded by all his literary contemporaries, and whose political ideas are regarded as having helped to form the policy of the holy monarch, thus speaks of the power of a Christian sovereign in his day: "The ancient code (the pagan Roman) utters a tremendous lie, when it pronounces that the mere will of the prince has the force of law. . . . It is not at all strange that, among us, the king is not allowed to have a private treasury; for the king does not belong to himself, but to his subjects" (1). And lest the reader may think that this theory of Elinand is a mere isolated opinion, we subjoin a remark of the most celebrated publicist of that day, Cardinal James de Vitry, bishop of Tusculum and dean of the Sacred College: "There is no security for a monarch, from the very moment when men find that they are not secure from him" (2). Then we hear St. Thomas proclaiming that the good of the community is the sole end of a government; that a monarch is not enthroned for his own satisfaction, but for the public weal; that a king must be the good shepherd of his people; that, in fine, no law should be considered as

(1) In a sermon by Elinand, recorded in the edition of the works of Vincent of Beauvais, published by the Dominicans of Douai, in 1624.

(2) Latin MS. No. 17,509, folio 103, in the National Library of France, cited by Lecoy de la Marche, *loc. cit.*

such, unless it be "a reasonable regulation, promulgated by him who has the care of the community, and directed to the public good—*quedam rationis ordinatio ad bonum commune, ab eo qui curam communitatis habet promulgata*" (1). One of the most ardent partisans of hereditary monarchy was the great Gerson; but he wrote: "He errs who thinks that a king can use the persons and goods of his subjects as his pleasure dictates; or that he can load his people with taxes, when the public weal does not call for such burdens. Such conduct is that of a tyrant, not that of a king" (2). It is true that in the time of Philip the Fair, the hero of the sad and disgraceful episode of Anagni, certain jurists tried to flatter their royal master with the notion that his authority was unbounded; that it was even independent of the tiara (3). But we must remember that between the reigns of St. Louis and Philip the Fair there had intervened the reign of Philip III. (the Rash); that then had really begun the end of the Middle Age, and the disintegration of its vital and most characteristic elements. During the reign of St. Louis, and during many previous centuries, no Christian publicist would have dared to utter such sentiments as began to be current when *the populus Christianus* was giving place to the divided Christian peoples, and when other elements than the Christian faith began to sway the nations. In the palmy days of the Middle Age the governmental ideal was an absence of both despotism and demagogy.

St. Louis was not twelve years of age when, by the premature death of his father, Louis VIII, he was called to the throne of France in 1226. The political condition of France was very different from that which the kingdom had presented in the time of Charlemagne. That king of the Franks, placed by Pope St. Leo III. at the head of a new empire which had nothing but the name in common with that of pagan Rome, had fulfilled his mission by combining the heterogeneous elements entrusted to his care, so that he left behind him neither Romans nor Franks, neither Gauls nor barbarians; but a *populus Christianus*, in a unity which

(1) JOURDAIN: *Philosophy of St. Thomas*, I., 407.

(2) JOURDAIN: *Ibid.*

(3) GOLDAST: *Monarchy of the Holy Roman Empire*, II., 96.

required for its maintenance merely the moral leadership of the Roman Pontiff, and in that unity the political and social organization of the Middle Age was established (1). In the year 962 Pope John XII. transferred the Holy Roman Empire from the French to the Germans; but thereafter the emperors were merely kings of the Germans and of whatever other peoples happened to be subject to the titular of the nonce, he enjoying over other sovereigns only the primacy of dignity. When the crown of France passed from the Carolingians to the Capetians, a radical change had been effected in the royal condition. Under both the Merovingians and the early Carolingians, the dukes and counts, in various parts of the kingdom, had been merely administrators for the king; but toward the end of the ninth century they bought up or appropriated the proprietorship of their territories. Thus arose feudalism in France, the new proprietors soon confounding, in good or in bad faith, the right of the land-owner with that of sovereignty. In this new state of affairs, in which the sovereignty was attached to the land instead of to the individual, the king was a person of small consideration; for even his residence, the Ile de France, belonged to the Count of Paris. Even when the will of the nation raised Hugh Capet, Count of Paris and Duke of France, to the royal throne in 986, his own services and those of his father, Hugh the Great, could not obtain for him better conditions than that he should be full sovereign in his own county of Paris, and have the commandment of all forces in war. Of course all the other princes swore homage to the new king as their "suzerain." From the date of Hugh Capet's accession down to the time of Louis XI., the main object of every king was to enlarge his own peculiar domain by purchase or alliance, and to augment the attributes of his suzerainty. The first successors of Hugh Capet, namely, Robert, Henry I., and Philip I., effected much in this really praiseworthy struggle; that great minister, the Benedictine abbot Suger, did still more in favor of Louis VI. and Louis VII.; but Philip Augustus struck two mortal blows against feudalism. The first was when he caused the king of Eng-

(1) LECOY DE LA MARCHE; *loc. cit.*, p. 27

land, his most redoubtable vassal, to answer, before the peers of France, for the crime of murdering his own nephew ; confiscating thereafter to the benefit of the French crown, nearly all the fiefs which the English monarch had held in France, namely, Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Touraine, and Poitou. The second blow was when, by the victory of Bouvines, he destroyed forever the arrogant pretensions of the German emperors in regard to France. It is true that Philip Augustus feared for the permanency of his work ; but God had decreed that his daughter-in-law, the saintly Blanche of Castile, should carry it on during her regency, and should so train her son, St. Louis, that he would perfect it by the exercise of an ability and an honesty which exceeded those of his grandfather. In the fulfilment of his task, St. Louis relied little on the lasting effects of conquest ; nay, he was so unworldly that he would not regard as legitimate any gain accruing to his kingdom, which had not been sealed by a perfect concord between the parties concerned. The work of consolidating the Capetian monarchy on the ruins of feudalism was indeed consummated only by Louis XI., the very antipode of St. Louis ; but the latter monarch had contributed more to that end than all of his predecessors united. And how different was the policy of St. Louis from that of his foxy successor ! Certainly Louis XI. was not the character which most modern historians describe for the worshippers of the nineteenth century ; nor was he at all the incarnation of royal cruelty and deceit whom modern play-goers know so well. But where Louis XI. was astute, St. Louis was frank ; where Louis XI. was unjust, St. Louis observed an equity which would have excited the derisive laughter of a Cavour or a Palmerston, if the Middle Age could have tolerated those who are grandmasters of "diplomacy" in our day. Finally, the policy of St. Louis was less expensive than that of Louis XI. ; and since it was incomparably less expensive than the policies now in vogue, our utilitarians should accord to it their heartfelt admiration.

II.

In the palmy days of Gallicanism, and of its sister-school,

German courtier-theologism, one often heard the name of St. Louis cited as that of an opponent of the "encroachments of Rome." Even in our own time, when both of these schools were dead, and waiting for the Vatican Council to bury them, theists of celebrity *et id omne genus* were wont to utter the same absurdity with complacent solemnity. Poor Renan said: "The Church had commanded kings to obey; Philip Augustus *and St. Louis protested*, and Philip the Fair dared to resist" (1). That Philip Augustus protested against the order, issued by Pope Innocent III., to put away his concubine, and to restore Queen Ingelburga to her rights, is true; but he repented in time, and obeyed. That Philip the Fair resisted the just demands of Pope Boniface VIII. is also true; but he was obliged to acquiesce in the vindication of that Pontiff's conduct by the Fifteenth General Council. That St. Louis protested, in the sense in which Renan, Michelet, etc., use the term, is false. The principal, if not the sole, reason for supposing that St. Louis would have been a Gallican, if there had been such a thing in his day, is founded on an unauthentic document—that celebrated forgery which bears the pseudo-title of "Pragmatic Sanction" (2). Elsewhere we have done justice to this pretended edict of St. Louis (3), and here we need only say that no true erudite of our day defends its authenticity. But there are some, for instance, Viollet and Wallon, who insist that even though St. Louis did not issue the supposed Sanction, he *might* have done so in all consistency; for, they contend, his principles were those defended in it. This curious theory was that of Bossuet, who did not fully credit the document. The great bishop of Meaux exclaimed to those who, even among his partisans, decried the authenticity of the Sanction: "Even though this Pragmatic were apocryphal, its doctrine ought not to be rejected" (4). Let us see, therefore, what was the attitude of the grandest Christian of the thirteenth century toward the Holy See. This

(1) *Literary History of France*, xxiv., 146.

(2) The title is absurd in the premises. The word "Pragmatic" is derived from the Greek *πράγμα* and the Latin *sanctio*; and it would be appropriate if the edict sanctioned some previous ordinance. But this document sanctions nothing.

(3) See Vol. iii., ch. 9.

(4) *Defense of the Declaration*, pt. ii., bk. 2, ch. 9.

attitude will appear without distortion if we consult, not the prejudices of Henri Martin, Beugnot, Faure, or the rank and file of English authors, but those original sources, the neglect of which constitutes the capital sin of a historian. In this matter those sources are the official documents preserved in the *Tresor des Chartes* (1), and cited by Lecoy de la Marche; the pontifical letters collected by Rinaldi; many documents published by the Bollandists; and last, but by no means least, the *Registers of Pope Innocent IV.*, comprising many hitherto unknown illustrations of the reign of that Pontiff, especially in the matter of his relations with St. Louis, which M. Elie Berger recently unearthed from the archives of the Vatican and of the National Library of France (2). In the year 1235 St. Louis attained his majority, and from that time he governed his kingdom by his own sole authority, although he took frequent counsel from his wise and holy mother until the end of her life, in 1252. One of the first communications held with him by the then reigning Pontiff, Gregory IX., was of a nature to indicate that His Majesty of France was a personage not merely ordinarily *grata* to the Holy See; we find the Pontiff conceding the extraordinary privilege of exemption from any possible interdict to the private chapels of the royal family, and what was still more wonderful in that age, the king and his family were allowed to communicate with the excommunicated without consequence of censure (3). At the renewal of the struggle between the Holy See and Frederick II., that German emperor who proclaimed that "the world had suffered from three impostors, Moses, Christ, and Mahomet," we hear Pope Gregory IX. asking for aid and counsel from His Most Christian Majesty, invoking the ancient friendship between the tiara and the lilies, and concluding: "Just as the tribe of Juda was called to a special blessing from among

(1) In the National Archives of France.

(2) *Registers of Innocent IV.*, Paris, 1884-1887. This monumental work merited the "prix Gobert," from the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. M. Berger's two introductions, one historical and the other diplomatical, form a mine for the polemic whose duties bring him to a study of this important period of European history; and the entire work is another proof of the sagacity which dictated the establishment of the *École Française in Rome*.

(3) *Tresor des Chartes*, Nat. Archives of France, J. 684, 686.

the other tribes, so the kingdom of France is illustrious above all others through a divine prerogative of honor and grace. Just as the tribe of Juda, a figure of France, defeated and subjugated all its enemies, so the kingdom of France, fighting the battles of the Lord, and combating for the liberty of the Church in both the East and the West, delivered the Holy Land from the pagans under the leadership of your predecessors, reduced the empire of Constantinople to the Roman obedience, saved Rome herself from a multitude of perils, and conquered the pest of Albigenian heresy. Just as the tribe of Juda never abandoned the worship of the true God, so in the kingdom of France the Christian faith has never vacillated, devotion to the Church has never weakened, ecclesiastical liberty has never been imperilled" (1). Certainly the recipient of this praise had not yet shown any tendency to interfere with the prerogatives of the Holy See. And in the subsequent years his conduct during the struggle between the Church and the Empire proved his intense devotion to the Papacy. Undoubtedly he tried to mediate between the contending parties, for a love of peace was the dominant feature of his character; but his active sympathies were with the Supreme Pontiff of Christendom. Immediately on the arrival of the special legate of Pope Gregory IX. in France, the holy monarch ordered the publication of the anathema against Frederick which the prelate had brought; and he facilitated the levy of the tax on ecclesiastical benefices which was to furnish the means of combating the imperial enemy of the Church. The English chronicler, Matthew Paris (sometimes styled Matthew of Paris), tells us that the Pope wished St. Louis to do more; that he desired France to declare war against Frederick; and that when St. Louis refused, he annulled the election of one of the king's uncles, Pierre Charlot, to the bishopric of Noyon. But the truth is, as we gather from Baronio, that the Pontiff did not desire immediate war on the emperor, for he was about to try the effect of a council on the recalcitrant. As to the affair of Charlot, the election to the See of Noyon was annulled for reasons unconnected with the matter of Frederick II. This

(1) *Ibi*, J. 352; *Invent.*, Num. 2,835.

Charlot was a bastard son of Philip Augustus, and the Holy See had dispensed with the impediment *publice honestatis*, in order that the royal wish for his admittance to the priesthood might be gratified; but it was not the intention of the Pontiff that the higher dignities of the Church should be open to one who was tainted by infamous origin. When the Thirteenth General Council (First of Lyons) was convoked, and Frederick opposed its meeting by every means in his power, St. Louis adopted every means to further it. In the height of his insanity, the German seized the Papal legate and some French bishops who were accompanying him to Italy, maltreated them, and imprisoned them. Immediate preparations for war, however, on the part of France, induced him to give full satisfaction for the insult. Before the Council of Lyons could meet, Pope Gregory IX. died; and when his successor, Celestine IV., also died, after a reign of a few days, the intrigues of Frederick, more than probable infidel though he was, to raise himself to the Chair of Peter, led to an "*interpontificium*" of nearly two years. Then St. Louis voiced the sentiments of Christendom, when he wrote to the Sacred College this very un-Gallican message: "Since there is a question of defending the independence of the Church, you can rely on the aid of France. Be firm; throw off the yoke which has pressed your necks so long!" (1). And here we would take advantage of an opportunity to show the utter unreliability of Matthew Paris, whenever that ultra-English chronicler undertakes to write of French affairs. He asserts that St. Louis threatened, in his letter to the cardinals, to choose a Pope by his own authority, *by virtue of a privilege to that effect conferred on St. Denis by Pope St. Clement*. A Pontiff was soon chosen in the person of Innocent IV., and one of his first acts was to assure the king of France of his affectionate respect: "God has already made your name great among the greatest." The Pope also besought the aid of his Eldest Son against the perjured emperor, who was then conspiring against the personal freedom of the head of the Church.

(1) HULLIARD-BREHOLLES: *Diplomatic History of Frederick II.*, in introduction, page ccciii. Paris, 1860.

The Thirteenth General Council met at Lyons in 1245, and by a unanimous vote of the synodals the Emperor Frederick II. was deposed. But one resource was open to the disconcerted prince; he might induce the temporal rulers of Christendom to unite against the "usurpations" of the arrogant churchman who presumed to dictate to the salt of the earth. To gain the king of France to his views would be equivalent to a conquest of all the other sovereigns of Europe; therefore, besides the circular which he sent to every monarch, he sent to St. Louis his chancellor, who was empowered to make the most brilliant promises. Frederick knew well the spirit which actuated many of the vassals of the French crown; therefore he cunningly suggested that Louis should arbitrate in his cause, "together with his peers and barons, as became so grand a monarch and so powerful a state." He promised to give to the Church whatever satisfaction this tribunal should deem proper; he would accompany the French king in his projected Crusade, and he would not lay down his arms until the entire kingdom of Jerusalem was conquered. In return, besides the revocation of his deposition, he would ask for only one little concession; he was to be allowed to glut his imperial vengeance on the Lombards (1). Naturally such terms were unacceptable to both Innocent IV. and St. Louis. The latter could not sit as an equal with those vassals whose pretensions he was combating; but for the love of peace, and in the interest of the Crusade, he consented to intercede with the Pontiff. Innocent granted the requested interview; and in November, 1245, the Most Christian King prostrated himself before the Sovereign Pontiff in the cloisters of the abbey of Cluny. The conferences lasted for fifteen days, Queen Blanche alone assisting. The Pontiff finally announced that he could not accept the conditions formulated by the culprit; but in order to show that he was not averse to an ultimate reconciliation, he agreed to allow Frederick to wait upon him at Lyons, there to try to clear himself of the charges, especially of heresy and heinous violence, which the Christian world had made against him. It is not probable that either the Pope or the king believed that Frederick

(1) HUCILLARD-BREHOLLES; *loc. cit.*, p. cccvi.

would dare to attempt a formal justification of his notorious crimes ; at any rate the perverse man affected to regard the pontifical offer as a refusal of justice, and ere long St. Louis learned that he had resolved to march on Lyons, not for the purpose of conferring with the Pontiff, but in order to seize his sacred person. Then the disgusted monarch broke off all negotiations ; he announced to the Pope his resolve to attack the excommunicated traitor, and would have led his intending crusaders across the Alps, had he not learned that Frederick had decided to remain in Italy, and had not the Pontiff ordered him to sheathe his sword. Probably we have adduced a sufficiency of proofs in the matter of the attachment of St. Louis to the See of Rome ; but it will not be amiss to present a few more instances of an utter absence of any " Gallican " ideas of a false independence on the part of this Catholic hero. Firstly, then, it has been asserted that Innocent IV. condemned a league which certain French barons formed for the purpose of upholding their own judicial decisions when they differed from those of the episcopal tribunals. But we reply with Wallon (1), that St. Louis was foreign to this league, as is fully proved by the absence of his seal in the original Act. Again, when the monarch returned from the Seventh Crusade he received a letter from Innocent IV., in which the Pontiff lauded the zeal which he had ever displayed in defending the rights of French ecclesiastical establishments against the exactions of some of the royal bailiffs and certain barons. "The king," says the Pope, "does not know of these crimes (when they are committed), and he grieves when they are brought to his knowledge." The many favors which Alexander IV. showered on St. Louis also show that the king was a prince according to his pontifical heart. And that these concessions were granted simply because of the virtue of the applicant, and because Rome realized that he would never abuse them, is evinced by the fact that when the king begged that some of the favors might be extended to his heir, the request was refused. Rome is never blind. The relations of St. Louis with Pope Clement IV., the last of the potentates who were contemporary with him,

(1) *St. Louis and His Times*. Paris, 1865.

indicate a perfect harmony of thought between the two powers—a thorough true respect for the rights of each. As the Bollandists expressed the idea: “Negabat alter alteri quod justis rationibus concedendum non putabat, nec inde amicitia lœdebatur.” During the vacancy of the episcopal see of Rheims, Pope Clement conferred several benefices which were of episcopal right; but he soon revoked the collation, lest he might appear indifferent to the “right of regalia” enjoyed by the French kings (1). St. Louis showed an equal appreciation of the difference between pontifical and royal prerogatives when the Greek emperor, Michael Paleologus, having asked him to arbitrate between the Pontiff and himself, he replied that such a rôle was above the powers of even a king of France, since the Roman Pontiff was the supreme judge in Christendom. He would promise the emperor merely the exercise of his “good offices” at the pontifical court. When many of his courtiers advised St. Louis to claim as a royal fief the county of Melgueil, near Montpellier, then in the possession of the bishop of Maguelonne, he followed the advice of Pope Clement, and respected the claims of the bishop. When St. Louis thought of taxing the merchandise which passed through the port of Aigues-Mortes, which had been constructed in the interests of pilgrims to the Holy Land, and wishing only to use the revenue for the maintenance of the port in good condition, he consulted with Pope Clement; and received permission to levy the desired imposts, “after consultation with the bishops of the province, the barons of the neighborhood, and the consuls of Montpellier, and on condition that the duties would be moderate and never afterward increased” (2). Here, then, we see St. Louis asking for the intervention of the Pope in a purely temporal matter; the Pontiff admits that the king can decide as he thinks best, and the monarch deems it advisable to follow the counsel of His Holiness. Certainly a more perfect harmony could not have been desired. Did our limits permit, we could multiply instances of this concord; but the reader will probably conclude that the course of St. Louis toward the Holy See was always such as one would have expected, *a priori*, so pious a monarch to follow.

(1) See our Vol. IV., p. 211, *et seqq.*

(2) BOLLANDISTS, at Aug. v. 485.

III.

The best efforts of Pope Gregory IX. had been devoted to the preparation of a new crusade; and in the next pontificate the urgency for such an expedition became extreme. Jerusalem, which for some years had been in Christian hands, was captured in 1244 by the Mussulmans of Egypt, who had become masters of Syria. Aid from the West was tearfully sought by the few Christians of the Holy Land whom the scimitar had spared. But the king of England and the German emperor ignored every appeal; the other princes, St. Louis excepted, were too feeble to do else than pray to heaven for the success of a holy cause. To France, therefore, then, as always, the reliance of Christendom in every dread emergency, the entreaties of Pope Innocent IV. were directed; and St. Louis arose from a bed of sickness, donned the cross, and having proceeded to Notre-Dame in the dress of a humble pilgrim, went to Lyons for the blessing of Christ's vicar upon his enterprise. It is not our purpose to describe this expedition. In 1248 St. Louis led his army out of France, not in royal array, but in a pilgrim's guise, and with bare feet, to impress his followers with the truth that they were about to engage in a holy task, and one which needed a special blessing for its success. In the same penitential dress he entered Damietta, chanting the *Te Deum*. When the final reverse overtook him, he was able to say with the Apostle, "*Quum infirmor, tunc potens sum.*" How much of the responsibility for the failure of the Seventh Crusade must be cast upon the German emperor, Frederick II.? When St. Louis was about to depart, Frederick feared that a new French principality would soon be founded in the Orient, and he asked of the king a promise that all of his conquests should be annexed to the kingdom of Jerusalem. The saint replied that he would effect nothing to the prejudice of the emperor, but that he could only promise that all his actions would be for the good of the Church. Frederick appeared to be satisfied; he ordered his officers in Sicily not to overcharge the French for the provisions they would buy in that island. But the Arab historian, Makrizi, declares that Frederick sent a spec-

ial messenger, disguised as a merchant, to warn the sultan, then sick at Damascus, of the French intention to attack Egypt (1). Such a course was perfectly consistent with the entire career of Frederick II. He had already shown how little spirit he had for the Holy Wars, when, in 1227, after years of incitement by Rome, Italy, Germany, and Hungary, he had finally set sail from Brindisi, only to return three days afterward, alleging that he was sick—conduct which entailed upon him his first excommunication by Gregory IX. (2). And when finally he did appear in Palestine, it was only for the annoyance of the Christians, he having hastened to make an alliance with the persecuting sultan of Egypt. We are justified, therefore, in believing the Arab historian, when he says that this false Christian (and probably renegade) betrayed the plans of St. Louis. Joinville, the companion of the holy monarch during the best years of his life, and his most reliable biographer, narrates that when Frederick heard of the captivity of the hero, he burst into a frenzy of joy, and gave a grand feast to his court. Then he sent, says the seneschal, a messenger to the sultan, ostensibly for the purpose of negotiating for the release of the king, but really in order to insure the prolongation of his duration. In order to rid ourselves of so unsavory a subject, we hasten to add, that the later conduct of the German emperor was such as to confirm the recital of Makrizi. Not satisfied with allying himself with the Saracens in their own land, he invited to the Italian peninsula those of them who resided in Sicily, and gave them lands around Lucera, in a state which was a fief of the Holy See. He adopted the manners of the infidels, composed his bodyguard of them, and chose their prettiest women for his hours of lasciviousness. Shame like this well

(1) The work of Makrizi is translated in the *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, Vol. iv.

(2) The Bull of excommunication recites that Frederick was thus punished because he had, five different times, violated his solemn vows, emitted with the clause that he would incur excommunication if he broke them; because he had not furnished the troops and money which he had promised to the eastern Christians; because he had despoiled their king of his title and his revenues; because he had prevented the Archbishop of Tarento from visiting his diocese; because he had robbed the Templars and Hospitalers of their Sicilian revenues; because he had not observed treaties for the keeping of which the Holy See had become his security; because he had robbed of his property Count Roger, a Crusader, and under the protection of the Pope; because he had imprisoned unjustly the son of that Count Roger, etc.—In LABBE, Vol. xi.

befitted the closing years of the Hohenstaufen, a dynasty the most salient characteristic of which was a perennial attempt to destroy the Papacy, an institution which buried it, as it has buried, and ever will bury, others of the same stamp. The first use which the Saracens made of their royal captive was to endeavor to obtain from him an order on the Templars and the Hospitalers for the surrender of their fortresses in Palestine. When he refused, and the sultan threatened to put him to the most frightful tortures, the king replied that the infidel might work his pleasure. At length, liberty was offered to him in exchange for the surrender of Damietta, then held by the noble Margaret, the queen of St. Louis, with a small garrison of Frenchmen; and in addition, for the sum of a million golden bezants—about two and a half millions of dollars. “If the queen consents,” said the monarch, “I shall pay that amount for my soldiers, and shall deliver Damietta as my own ransom; you must know that such as I am are not exchanged for money.” One incident that occurred before the departure of St. Louis from Egypt deserves mention as indicative of the true spirit of Christian knighthood. The sultan had been murdered by his emirs, and the chief assassin rushed into the presence of the king, sword in hand, and demanded that Louis should dub him knight there and then. The wish was not preposterous in the mind of the Mussulman; for had not Frederick, the head of the Holy Roman Empire, knighted the emir Fakr-Eddin? But the French monarch could not prostitute an essentially Christian dignity, and calmly he awaited death from the horde of indignant miscreants. The majesty of his mien awed the Saracens; they drew back, and the disappointed candidate swore to observe the treaty (1). If this incident does not give the reader some idea of the ascendancy which St. Louis exercised over the minds even of infidels, we would remind him that the emirs debated among themselves whether or not they should offer him the sceptre of the late sultan. Then Joinville, being asked by the monarch in an apparently serious tone whether he ought to accept, replied “that none but an insane man would receive a diadem from those who

(1) *Memoirs of Joinville*. Edition of Wally, p. 185.

had murdered the previous wearer." "And nevertheless," said St. Louis, "I would accept it" (1). Voltaire did not credit this episode; but we can understand how St. Louis may have conceived the sublime idea of availing himself of the infidel sceptre, or rather of its attendant influence, in order to convert his new subjects to the faith of Christ. History furnished him with many precedents for such a hope.

In 1270 St. Louis entered upon his second Holy War, that which is known as the Eighth Crusade. The commercial rivalry of the Venetians and Genoese, joined to the scandalous dissensions between the Templars and the Hospitalers, had encouraged the Mussulmans to greater progress than they had ever dared to anticipate; and the condition of the Oriental Christians appealed again to the great heart of France. Tunis was chosen by the king for his base of operations; he was persuaded that the Tunisian prince was disposed to become a Christian, and he therefore relied on that portion of the African coast as his main source of supplies. But the usually circumspect monarch had been deceived, perhaps unwittingly, by his brother, Charles of Anjou, who had an ulterior motive for landing in Tunis, he being desirous of preventing any Tunisian attack on his kingdom of Sicily—a worthy intention, but which hampered the main object of the Crusade. The reduction of the castle of Carthage and successive defeats of the Tunisians and other Mussulmans appeared to augur well for the expedition; but the delay of Charles of Anjou to join the Crusaders had already filled the army with dismay, when a malignant dysentery incapacitated all for action. Among the many leaders and nobles who succumbed was the Count de Nevers, the youngest son of the king; and soon the holy monarch himself was stricken. To prepare himself for death was an easy task for one who had ever lived the life of a saint; but mindful to the last of the welfare of the nation committed by God to his care, the hero gave to his heir a written copy of those instructions which we read as "The Teachings of St. Louis." Since this document is not only a monument of the purest faith of the

(1) *Ibid.*, p. 201.

Middle Age, but an epitome of as wise a policy as statesman ever devised, as well as a faithful mirror of the testator's entire career, we subjoin some of its passages: "My dear son, the first thing I recommend to you is that you direct your whole heart to the love of God. Beware of anything displeasing to God; above all, beware of mortal sin (1). If God sends adversity to you, receive it patiently, knowing that you have deserved it, and that it will be profitable to you; if He sends you prosperity, thank him humbly, so that pride may not injure you (2). Go frequently to confession. Attend all the services of the Church with great recollection (3). Be gentle and charitable to the poor and the suffering. Maintain the good customs of your kingdom, and abolish the bad ones (4). Do not burthen your people with taxes. Always have around you worthy men, seculars as well as religious. Hear sermons willingly; and eagerly seek for prayers and indulgences. Let no man be so audacious as to utter a word in your presence which might lead another into sin; let no man speak ill of another behind his back; and if any one blasphemes God or His saints, revenge the insult at once (5). Be rigid and loyal in the administration of justice. If you know that you

(1) Through all the years of his manhood St. Louis had been accustomed, from time to time, to tell his familiars how his mother, the saintly Blanche of Castile, had often said that she would rather see him dead at her feet than know that he had committed one mortal sin.

(2) On the glorious field of Massourah he had prostrated himself, and cried: "I thank God for all, good or evil, when He sends to me."

(3) He had always heard two Masses every day; and when he was reprov'd, he would say: "These gentlemen would find no fault, were I to spend as much time in the chase or in other pleasures."

(4) He had abolished private wars, judicial duels, etc.

(5) From very ancient times it had been customary in France for any man to slap the face of one who had uttered a blasphemy, or even such a phrase as "Go to the devil!" In the days of Justinian, and through out the empire, death was inflicted on him who swore by the head or hair of God (*Norella* 67). Philip Augustus decreed against blasphemers a penalty of four golden livres (about \$80,000), and if the culprit was too poor to pay it, he was thrown into the nearest river, and pulled out only when he was nearly drowned. At the accession of St. Louis, men often took the law into their own hands, and great cruelties were sometimes practised. Pope Clement IV. remonstrated with St. Louis for allowing such treatment, and insisted that there should be no danger to "life or member" in the punishment. Consequently, in 1269 a royal ordinance mulcted blasphemers in amounts varying from five to forty livres; those who could not pay, and were under forty years of age, were whipped; the other impecunious culprits were pilloried and imprisoned. Jacques de Vitry and Etienne de Bourbon narrate how a certain knight, before the issue of this edict, gave a very heavy blow to a citizen who had blasphemed egregiously; and when he was called to account by the king, he replied; "He outraged my heavenly Master, and I struck him even as I would have done had he insulted my earthly king." St. Louis told him to act similarly when occasion warranted him.

possess what belongs to another, restore it immediately ; if the ownership is doubtful, let prudent and just men investigate the matter (1). Let your best endeavors be exerted for the furtherance of peace within and outside your kingdom. Maintain the franchises of your good cities and communes ; for by the strength and wealth of these cities and communes the peers and barons will be compelled to respect you. Honor and love most especially all religious and all ecclesiastical persons. It is narrated of my grandfather, King Philip (Augustus), that when one of his councillors remarked that it was strange that he should allow certain clerics to interfere with his rights, he replied that he knew very well that certain clerics so acted, but that when he reflected how very good the Lord had been to him, he preferred to relinquish some of his rights rather than raise difficulties with the Church (2). Love and revere your father and mother, and obey all their commands (3). As to ecclesiastical benefices, confer them on worthy persons, and after having consulted with prudent men. My son,

(1) His subjects often upbraided St. Louis with excessive zeal in the matter of restitution ; for instance, they said that he had restored to the king of England far more than justice demanded.

(2) This passage should be considered by those who think that St. Louis was the author of the *Pragmatic Sanction* ; for this monarch was much more scrupulous in ecclesiastical matters than his grandfather dreamed of being.

(3) People of our day who read the life of St. Louis must think that he carried this filial deference to an extreme. Joinville, in all simplicity, gives some curious instances of the subjection of the king to his saintly, but rather imperious mother, even in matters of his married life. And he insisted on his devoted spouse, the noble Margaret of Provence, being in all things an obedient daughter-in-law. The following passage is interesting : " So severe was Queen Blanche toward Queen Margaret, that she would not permit, so far as she could have her way, her son to enjoy the company of his wife except at night, when they retired together. Their favorite palace was at Pontoise, and they preferred it because the king's apartment was immediately above the queen's, a winding stairway connecting them. On this stairway they used to converse, having arranged with the chamberlains on duty that when the queen-mother would appear in the corridor leading to the apartment of her son, they would strike their wands on the door of that apartment ; and then the king would hurry at once to his quarters. In the same way, if the queen-mother was approaching the rooms of Queen Margaret, the officers would give the signal on her door ; and then she would hasten to her domicile. On one occasion the king had gone to his wife's chamber, where she was lying at death's door, because of a recent difficult *accouchement*. Suddenly Queen Blanche appeared, and taking the king by the hand, she exclaimed : ' Come away ' ; you have no business here ! ' When Queen Margaret saw her mother-in-law leading the king away, she cried : ' Alas ! you will not allow me to have my lord, either in life or death. ' Then she fainted, and they thought her dying. The king returned to her, and they had much difficulty in reviving her." Old chroniclers say that Margaret followed her husband in his first Crusade, principally that at last she might have him to herself. But it seems that the gentle queen really venerated Blanche, and loved her. When the news of the queen-mother's death reached Palestine, Margaret showed every token of deep sorrow ; but we note that Joinville thought that she grieved because of her sympathy with the king.

I instruct you to be ever reverent toward the Church, and toward the Supreme Pontiff, our father. Honor the Pope, for he is your spiritual father. Destroy heresy as far as your power will permit you" (1). When the dying saint had handed this document to his heir, the future Philip III., he had himself raised from his bed, and kneeling, he received his Sacramental Lord. Then he lay on the ground, which he had ordered to be strewn with ashes. Having received Extreme Unction, he calmly awaited his summons to be dissolved, and to be with Christ. At midnight of August 25, 1270, the everlasting glory of the French monarchy cried: "Now we go to Jerusalem," and he had gone indeed to the heavenly Jerusalem.

He who discerns in St. Louis, as he undertakes his crusades, merely the French warrior who is ambitious of conquest, will not realize the true significance of the monarch's efforts. Nor will that significance be grasped by him who regards St. Louis as possessed by the sole idea of restoring to Christendom the holy places which were sanctified by the tears and blood of the God-Man. With St. Louis, under the cuirass of the Christian warrior throbbed the heart of an apostle of the Christian faith. He had not designed merely to subjugate the Holy Land to European or probably French domination. He had intended to convert the heretical and Mussulman inhabitants of the Orient; and to effect that work his serried battalions were accompanied by a little army of Dominican and Franciscan friars. According to the chronicle of Primat, these missionaries converted five hundred Arabs during the saint's short sojourn in Saint-Jean-d'Acre; and hence we may judge of what they effected during the

(1) The sole ordinance issued by St. Louis in reference to heresy is dated in 1250. Previously he had been unable to follow the dictates of his heart by modifying the rigor of his mother's ordinance of 1229, which was, however, strictly in accord with the common law of the time. The revolts excited by the remnants of the Albigenses in the south of France had forced St. Louis to apply the laws against heresy with rigor. But the submission of the count of Toulouse caused the barons of Languedoc to cease their struggles against the royal authority, and then the king was free to pursue his policy of reconciling the North with the South. The chief articles of the decree of 1250 are these: "The properties taken from heretics in virtue of the ordinance of 1229 shall be restored to them, unless they have fled from the kingdom, or unless they continue in their obstinacy. Wives shall not lose their properties on account of the crime of their husbands. The goods of heretics who die in the faith shall be restored to their heirs.

Seventh and Eighth Crusades. Godfrey de Beaulieu and Etienne de Bourbon, who saw the converts in France, speak of many Saracens who were baptized during the king's first expedition, and accompanied him on his return, afterward marrying French women, and raising families which for many years remained under the direct protection of the crown. About the time that Pope Innocent IV. sent the Franciscan, Piano Carpini, into Tartary, our saint sent many other friars on the same apostolic mission. The results of his enterprise were only partial and isolated ; but they show what was the policy of St. Louis in that Eastern Question which was then far more vital than it is in our day. In a word, his design was to arrest the advance of pagan barbarism, by force when that was necessary, but constantly and principally by the Christianization of the orientals. And if we look for his successors in this order of ideas, where shall we find them ? " In the camps, or on a throne ? " asks Lecoy de la Marche ; " among the partisans of Russia, or among the defenders of the Ottoman Empire ? No ; they will be found in the humble tunic of those heroic friars whose glorious path St. Louis opened. They will be found in the persons of those persevering missionaries who are preaching the Gospel in the heart of the old oriental world, and who, like certain ambassadors of St. Louis, incur thousands of dangers in order to probably save a few souls. These men may truly be termed the heirs of the spirit of St. Louis. When they cross burning plains and arid mountains, they can sustain their courage by the thought that they are realizing the dream of the wisest and most perspicacious of French kings (for three-fourths of them are Frenchmen). And when they fall under the strokes of executioners, when they shed their blood in the cause which St. Louis championed so vigorously, they may well be saluted with that exclamation which once greeted the departure of another martyr : ' Son of St. Louis, ascend to heaven ! ' "

IV.

That the thirteenth century, the century of St. Louis, was the zenith of the Middle Age ; that, together with the twelfth century, it " formed the most important, complete, and re-

splendent period in the history of Catholic society" (1); is admitted by not only Catholic polemics, but by most of our modern adversaries, from Voltaire to Guizot. It remained, however, for the picturesque theist, Michelet, to pretend that modern skepticism dates from the thirteenth century, and that the chief personification of the Christian idea in that period, St. Louis, was a victim of religious doubt. "Such was the aspect of the world in the thirteenth century. At the summit, the 'great dumb ox of Sicily' (2), ruminating his questions. Here, man and liberty; there, God, grace, the divine foresight, fatality; at the right, observation proclaiming human liberty; at the left, logic impelling invincibly toward fatalism. . . . The ecclesiastical legislator drew back at the brink, fighting for good sense against his own logic, which would have precipitated him. This steadfast genius paused on the edge of a sword between two abysses, the depth of which he realized. A solemn figure of the Church, he kept his balance, tried for an equilibrium, and perished in the attempt" (3). The eloquent historian flattered himself that he understood the philosophy of the Angelic Doctor; but he thought that none of the scholars of the thirteenth century appreciated the delicacy of that position "between two abysses." He continues: "From below, the world looked up to the elevated region in which he calculated and understood nothing of the combats which were fought in the depths of that abstract existence." Having invented this tremendous struggle, of course Michelet comprehended it. "Beneath that sublime region raged the winds and the tempest. Beneath the Angel was man, morality beneath metaphysics, St. Louis beneath St. Thomas. In St. Louis the thirteenth century had its Passion—an exquisite, intimate, profound Passion, of which previous ages had scarcely any presentiment. I speak of the first laceration which doubt effected in souls; when the entire harmony of the

(1) MONTALEMBERT; in the Introduction to his beautiful *History of St. Elizabeth of Hungary*.

(2) So the early fellow-students of St. Thomas termed him. He was born in Aquino, a town of Terra di Lavoro, in the kingdom of Naples; but that kingdom was then one of the Two Sicilies.

(3) MICHELET; *History of France*, Vol. II., bk. 4, ch. 9.

Middle Age was disturbed ; when the grand edifice on which society had been built began to totter ; when saints cried against saints, right waged war on right, and the most docile souls saw themselves obliged to examine and to judge. The pious king of France, who wanted merely to submit and to believe, was very soon forced to struggle, to doubt, and to choose. Humble though he was, and diffident of himself he had to resist his mother ; to act as arbitrator between the Pope and the emperor ; to judge the spiritual judge of Christendom ; and to recall to moderation him whom he would have preferred to regard as a model of sanctity. Afterward the Mendicant Orders attracted him by their mysticism ; he entered the Third Order of St. Francis ; and he took part against the University. But nevertheless, the book of John of Parma, received by very many Franciscans, filled him with strange doubts." Michelet wastes many pretty phrases in an attempt to convince his readers that St. Louis was a skeptic because he once resisted the will of his mother ; but he did so in order to don the cross, she having feared, like many others and even himself, that the expedition might be futile. Michelet presents the saint as a skeptic because he combated the University and the pamphlet of William de Saint-Amour ; but he did so in order to protect the Dominicans and Franciscans (1). Michelet discerns skepticism in the relations which St. Louis had with Pope Gregory IX. ; but it is absolutely false that the French king was called upon " to judge the supreme judge of Christendom." As to the book entitled *The Eternal Gospel*, it is by no means certain that it was written by the Franciscan general, John of Parma ; but when Michelet tells us that the faith of St. Louis must have vacillated when he saw some of his Franciscan friends defending a condemned book, we are asked to believe, not that the pious king was a skeptic, but that he was a ninny.

Michelet asserts that "the thirteenth century had its Passion" ; he perceives in its sombre tableau the creakings of a social edifice which is about to tumble into chaos, and he judges that this social disorder *must have affected the faith of men*, especially of him who was the foremost layman

(1) FLEURY ; *Eccles. Hist.*, bk. lxxxiv., ch. 32.

in Christendom. But the interesting historical writer (a *great historian* he is not) ignores the notorious fact that the eleventh century was far nearer to chaos than the thirteenth. Let the reader remember the state of Italy and Germany before and after the German emperor, Henry IV., "went to Canossa"; a state of affairs that wrung from the heart of St. Gregory VII. the exclamation, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile." Certainly the eleventh century was not a period of skepticism. But Michelet thinks that "the man, St. Louis," must have plunged into the abyss of doubt, because, as he affects to believe, "the Angel, St. Thomas," knew not how to withdraw his faith from the clutches of his logic. It is true that St. Thomas was frequently the adviser of St. Louis in religious matters, as he probably was in things political (1); but the logic of Michelet could not have "clutched" his mind very firmly when he arrived at this conclusion. But what authority is there for the supposition that the Angelic Doctor "fought for good sense against his own logic," and that fearful "combats were fought in the depths of that abstract existence"? Certainly neither St. Thomas nor his contemporaries even hint at such struggles; and who has found any indications of skepticism in the works of the Angel of the Schools? Take up the treatises on the liberty of man, grace, and predestination, which seem to have served as a foundation for the ravings of Michelet. Of course, we meet the usual *videtur quod*; but with what triumphant serenity the master always pronounces his *patet*, or his *manifestum est!* Very different from the judgment of Michelet and his school is the appreciation of St. Thomas by one who had studied all the scholastics with a profundity to which Michelet was always a stranger. In his admirable work on Abelard, M. Charles de Rémusat says: "St. Thomas of Aquino includes the whole of theology in his wonderful work. He lays down the *pro* and the *contra* of every question, and of every proposition in each question; and presenting every possible objection and the answer to it, he opposes authority to authority, reasoning to reasoning, giving, without ever weakening, *without ever doubting*, a work

(1) BOLLANDISTS; at March, in the *Life of St. Thomas*.

which is as dogmatic in its conclusions as it is skeptical in its examinations. The *Summa Theologica* presents the whole of religion as an immense dialectical controversy, in which dogma always ends by being in the right. It is the frankest and most developed negation of dogmatic absolutism." Now Michelet seems to hold that as the master is, so is the pupil. Therefore, since "St. Louis realized on earth and in practical life that which preoccupied the genius of St. Thomas in the world of abstractions" (1), we may conclude, with all due admiration for the most poetic pamphleteer (not historian) of modern times, that the faith of St. Louis was as unshakable as that of the Angelic Doctor. We have not thought it proper to waste any of our limited space in quoting any of the instances of fact which Michelet adduces as pretended supports of his amusing theory. They are too puerile for serious attention; but the reader may be better satisfied, if we furnish one specimen which is a worthy exemplification of all. Michelet discerns skepticism in the mind of St. Louis, when that monarch asks Joinville: "What is God?" The seneschal thus naively records the incident: "He called me, one day, and said: 'On account of your subtle mind I do not like to ask you concerning the things of God; but since these friars are present, I shall put one question to you. It is this: What is God?'" That here the king was only playing the catechist, half jocularly and half seriously with his familiar companion, appears from the fact that he complimented Joinville because the seneschal's reply was identical with that contained in the book which he then held in his hand (2). The fact is, and it serves as another indication of his character, that St. Louis was very fond of catechizing his friends, and even his private soldiers. He also, on occasion, preached sermons. During his voyage to Africa, the sailors wanted to go to confession; whereupon he preached to them a discourse on the nature and benefits of the Sacrament of Penance (3). In his library at Paris, which was *open to the public*, he was wont to explain to the nearest

(1) GORINI: *Defense of the Church*, pt. 1., ch. 20. Paris, 1853.

(2) JOINVILLE: *loc. cit.*, p. 194.

(3) BELLOLOCO: *Life of St. Louis*, in the *Collection of Historians of the Gauls*, Vol. xx.

student some passage of the works of the Fathers which generally formed his literary pabulum (1). Once he reminded a lady of the court that she had arrived at an age when a woman could not occupy her mind with other beauties than those of her soul, unless she was willing to incur ridicule (2). Once he asked Joinville what was his father's name; and when the seneschal replied that it was Simon, he asked the poor man how he knew that such was the case. Then, says Joinville, "I told him that I knew it, because my mother had so informed me. Then he said that we ought to believe most firmly all the articles of our faith, to which the Apostles had testified" (3).

Michelet says that St. Louis must have been affected by the spirit of skepticism which began to invade the Christian world in his time. "In St. Louis the thirteenth century had its Passion. . . . I speak of the first laceration which doubt effected in souls." He would be indeed an enterprising indagator into the recondite who could determine the date of the entrance of incredulism into the world; but when Michelet discovered that date in the thirteenth century, would he not have been more worthy of admiration if he had found his champion skeptic, not in St. Louis, but in the German Frederick II., who regarded Christ as one of the three impostors who had deceived the world? (4). Skepticism had infected humanity long before the thirteenth century. There are three kinds of skeptics; those who do not believe in the Catholic Church, those who do not believe in any of the forms of emasculated Christianity, and the gross materialists who deny God and the immortality of the soul. The last form did not appear in Christendom until about the time of the full development of the Renaissance, toward the end of the fifteenth century. But the other forms of skepticism appeared in their full audacity, simultaneously with the intellectual movement of the eleventh century, when the Manichæans reappeared in France and in Northern Italy; when Leuthard destroyed so many

(1) *Ibid.*

(2) WILLIAM OF CHARTRES; *Life and Miracles of St. Louis*, in the *Collection*, *ubi supra*.

(3) *Loc. cit.*, p. 197.

(4) The authority for this accusation is Pope Gregory IX., in his *Epist.* 12 to the Archbishop of Canterbury. See Labbe's *Councils*, Cent. XIII.

religious images ; when Gondulphus preached the absurdity of Baptism, Penance, and the Eucharist ; when Turin and Milan heard many proclaiming that the Son of God is each soul illuminated by the Lord. And then the twelfth century beheld Tanchelm posing as the Son of God ; Peter de Bruis abolishing churches ; and the Cathari, Patarines, etc., attributing creation to the devil, and proclaiming fate as master of men. But the reader may ask, could Michelet have expected men to credit his presentation of St. Louis as an incredulist ? Well, the attempt was not extraordinarily audacious at the hands of him who had not only declared that Pope St. Gregory VII. was a skeptic, but had so far blasphemed as to cast the same foul aspersion on the Divine Saviour of men : “ There is a moment of fear and of doubt. Here is the tragic and the terrible of the drama ; it is this which rends the veil of the temple, and covers the earth with darkness ; it is this which troubles me when I read the Gospel, and causes my tears to flow. That God should have doubted of God ! That the Holy Victim should have cried : ‘ My God, My God, why hast Thou abandoned me ? ’ This trial has been experienced by all heroic souls who have dared great things for the human race ; all of these have felt more or less of this ideal of grief. It was in such a moment that Brutus exclaimed : ‘ Virtue, thou art only a name. ’ It was in such a moment that Gregory VII. cried : ‘ I have followed justice and hated iniquity : therefore I die in exile ’ ” (1). The veriest tyro in ascetical or even moderately spiritual matters knows that the expression of the holy victim of Henry IV. did not issue from a heart submerged in the despair of doubt ; that the words of the dying Pontiff were rather a sublime indication of his invincible trust in God, of his confidence that a reward in heaven would be the recompense for an earthly suffering which had been entailed by his worthy fulfilment of his duties as vicar of Christ. As to the calumny against Christ, which Michelet dared to pronounce at the foot of the cross, let us say, with Gorini, that he only joined the crowd who passed in front of the sacred tree, blaspheming : “ *prætereuntes autem blasphemabant.* ” The sublime lessons of the cross were foolishness to Michelet, as

(1) *Loc. cit.*, Vol. II., bk. 4, ch. 9.

they ever will be to all of his school; and therefore such as they cannot understand St. Louis of France. We who have spent much time in the study of the prince who, even according to Voltaire, was as pious as an anchorite and possessed of every royal virtue, must agree with the judgment of St. Francis de Sales, that "St. Louis was the beloved of God and of men, and one of the grandest sovereigns upon whom the sun has shone." We must say, with Chateaubriand: "Each epoch has a man who represents it. Louis IX. is the model man of the Middle Age; he is legislator, hero, and saint. Marcus Aurelius showed power, united with philosophy; Louis IX. power, united with sanctity; the advantage remains with the Christian."

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SIEGES OF RHODES; EPISODES IN THE HISTORY OF THE SOLDIER-MONKS.*

On June 8, 1476, a solemn silence reigned in the island of Rhodes. The thirty-eighth grand-master of the glorious Military-Religious Order of St. John (1) had yielded his valiant soul to the God whose Church and people it had intrepidly served; and now dissemination—perhaps the chief bane of even those human institutions which are directly intended for the honor of the Most High—was at its fell work among the knights. Four centuries had elapsed since Gerard Tunc and Raymond Dupuy had founded their celebrated order in the Holy Land, and a summarization of its utility and glory during all its vicissitudes would have been made by saying, *crescit eundo*. As a bulwark of Christendom against the hordes of Islam, it had rivalled the brilliant order of the Temple—that most dazzling of Catholic organizations—whose rule was one of the masterpieces of St. Bernard; but it had succeeded better than the Templars in at least so far

* This chapter appeared in the *Catholic World*, July, 1894.

(1) Such was the proper title of this celebrated order. A Bull of Pope Paschal II., dated in 1118, confirms Brother Gerard Tunc as "president of the hospital founded near the church of St. John the Baptist, in Jerusalem." Hence the members were also styled "Hospitalers." After the knights had fixed their headquarters in Rhodes, in 1310, they came to be popularly known as Knights of Rhodes; and in 1530, when they moved to Malta, their designation was assumed from that island.

resisting corruption as not to be engulfed in it (1). Like that of all the other monastico-military orders, the universal and indomitable bravery of the Hospitalers is admitted by historians of every class. In his Bull confirming their statutes, Pope Innocent II. (y. 1130) ordered the following monition to be read to the novice at his solemn profession: "If, which we deem impossible, you should ever turn your back to the enemies of Christ, or if you should abandon the banner of the cross, you will be deprived of this holy sign (the insignia, an eight-pointed cross, embroidered on the left breast) and cut off from our body as a putrid member." It is noteworthy that in all the acts of the order there is but one instance of this penalty having been incurred. Rashness, however, was not encouraged; although it is true that these monastic knights had views concerning the constituents of rashness which were, perhaps, somewhat extravagant. Thus, the initiatory oath of a Templar required him "never to ask for quarter, and never to decline battle unless the odds were at least four to one." On the summer-day of which we are now writing, sadness might well have been dominant in every heart which throbbed in the mother-house of the Knights of St. John. Now that the Templars were no more, having been suppressed by the Holy See in 1311; and now that the followers of the false prophet had but lately raised their emblematic half-moon over the proud dome of St. Sophia's patriarchal cathedral (y. 1453); the Christians of the West realized that their hopes were to be centred, under God, chiefly on the Knights-Hospitalers. Rhodes was the advanced sentinel of European religion and civilization. Placed between Egypt, where the Mamelukes held full sway, and Asia Minor, where the redoubtable conqueror of Constantinople was encamped, it had refused to pay tribute to this prince, and it knew that he had sworn on the Koran to take the life of every chevalier of the Hospital who might fall into his hands. Every hope of success for the Cross in the coming struggle depended on the wisdom displayed in the imminent election of a grand-master. That this prudence would be manifested was uncertain, for precise-

(1) See our apposite dissertation on the Suppression of the Templars, Vol. II.

ly at that time national jealousies were rife in nearly every preceptory of the order. But heaven had decreed to use the services of the Hospitalers for many years to come. As the hour for the election drew near, the chief dignitaries resolved, in the interest of harmony, to introduce an innovation in the electoral procedure. They appointed as president of the Electoral College a knight who had been a candidate in the last election, and whose zeal and piety were pre-eminent—Raymond Ricard. Then all the knights voted for three assistants to the president, who were to be styled the chaplain, the knight, and the servant of the ceremony. These four officers swore to seek only the good of Christendom, and then they chose a fifth; the five then chose a sixth; and so on, until fifteen had been selected—two from each nationality or “language” (I), excepting in the case of the Germans, who received but one representative, there being very few of them in the order. Each member of this Electoral College then took the customary oath, but on a portion of the True Cross, which he was obliged to touch with his hand. After three hours of deliberation, the electors announced that their choice was effected; and, when all the knights of every grade and class had assembled in the chapel, an oath was exacted from each that he would recognize and obey the chosen grand-master. This precaution might have been omitted, for when the name of the grand-prior of Auvergne, Peter d’Aubusson, was proclaimed, the enthusiasm of all was indescribable.

Peter d’Aubusson, a scion of one of the noblest families of France, had made his first campaigns against the Turks, and in the train of the Dauphin, afterward King Louis XI.; and he had shared with that prince in the glory of the battle of Bale, in 1444, where the Swiss were defeated. But the destined fame of the young noble was not to be attained by combats against Christians. From his childhood the woes of the Holy Land had affected his heart; especially impressed in the memories of his boyhood was the flaying

(1) In the early days of the order there were seven “languages”; viz., Italy, France, properly so called; Provence, Auvergne, Aragon, England, and Germany. This division subsisted at the time of which we write; but when England became heretical, her “language” was abolished, and those of Castile and Portugal were added.

of a papal nuncio by the Mussulmans, while still alive. Then had come the capture of Constantinople; and, although his Catholic mind regarded that event as Heaven's punishment of the schismatic arrogance of the Greeks, it showed him that the West needed to be on the alert if it hoped not to become the prey of Mohammedan fanaticism. The most eminent of the European nobility, especially those of his own fair France, were then wearing their armor over the cassock, so why should not he also enlist in that holy militia which warred under the blessing of the Vicar of Christ, and which was regarded by every Christian youth as the very apogee of human glory? Therefore, after his return from the Swiss campaign, D'Aubusson informed King Charles VII. of his ambition; and as that monarch saw no prospect of any need of the young noble's services in France, a truce with the English having lately been arranged, he granted his permission, remarking to his courtiers: "I have never seen so much fire and wisdom united in one man." Having taken farewell of his friend the Dauphin, who was afterward, as Louis XI., to render great assistance to the Hospitalers in the time of their direst extremity, D'Aubusson proceeded to the nearest preceptory of the admired order, and donned the monastic tunic. His first military service as a chevalier of St. John was in the Grecian Archipelago; and after winning the commendations of the successive grand-masters, John de Lastic and James de Milly, the year 1460 found him castellan of Rhodes and prefect of its finances. John des Ursins, whom he was to succeed in the superiorship, made him superintendent of the Rhodian fortifications and captain-general of the city, and from that moment he was the soul of all the preparations which were being made for the struggle with Mahomet II. When he entered upon the grand-mastership, naturally the zeal of D'Aubusson redoubled; but a description of all his improvements in the defences of the island would interest only the military reader, nor are we competent for the task, although we do not imply that the priest or religious is always incompetent to understand the mysteries of Mars, especially when these partake of, or are derived from, the scientific.

We know that among the priests of the military-religious orders there were many accomplished generals and engineers, although they were non-combatants. And in the last century the Jesuit, F. Carlo Borgo of Vicenza, wrote a work on fortifications which so pleased the "great" Frederick of Prussia, that he forwarded to the author a commission as lieutenant-colonel in his army—an "honor" that was not accepted. (1).

Among the preparations which demanded the prompt attention of D'Aubusson, was an increase of the garrison; his letter to all the houses of the Hospitalers throughout Europe is pathetic in its religious patriotism and earnestness, and it resulted in an almost complete renunciation, on the part of every establishment, of all their possessions, that means might be obtained for the relief of the mother-house. Indeed, when we remember that just then the Knights of St. John were bearing the brunt of a shock directed against all Europe, we must admit that besides offering up their lives—which they valued lightly in so tremendous a contingency—these heroes did far more than their share in procuring the sinews of war. But the grand-master soon experienced the joy of seeing his religious reinforced by many of the best soldiers of Europe, especially of France and Italy. As was his duty and his pride, to say nothing of the traditions of the Roman See, ever foremost in advancing or upholding the standard of civilization, Pope Sixtus IV. contributed large sums from the papal treasury, and ordered a Jubilee in aid of the Knights. D'Aubusson also wrote to King Louis XI., reminding him of their ancient comradeship, and sending to the royal zoölogical collection some curious beasts and birds. Louis showed his own good memory by a large gift to the treasury of Rhodes. By means such as these the grand-master was enabled to purchase much-needed war material and provisions, not only for the garrison of religious and for his volunteer auxiliaries, but also for the sustenance of the Rhodians, whose means of subsistence would be destroyed by the Moslem

(1) For the distinction between the combatants and the non-combatants in the Military-Religious Orders, see this Volume, p. 136.

invasion, whichever way the struggle ended. One of the last measures taken by D'Aubusson before the conflict indicates the scrupulous devotion of these soldier-monks to their semi-monastic obligations. It will be readily understood, by any of our readers who belong to a religious community, that the fulfilment of the ordinary conventual duties was an impossibility to our Knights in the circumstances then surrounding them. The grand-master, therefore, besought the Pontiff to grant the brethren of the Hospital, then under arms in Rhodes, such dispensations as His Holiness might deem appropriate. Accordingly, the Knights were freed from every obligation excepting, of course, those entailed by the three vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity.

Meanwhile, the sultan prepared for what he regarded as the chief enterprise of his wonderful career, not excepting even his Constantinopolitan campaign. Besides the last remnant of the olden Byzantine Empire, he had subjugated Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, Servia, Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bosnia. Nearly all the islands of the Archipelago had also succumbed to the son of Amurath, and from the *campanile* of St. Mark's the dismayed Venetians had seen the flames devouring the rich possessions of the Queen of the Adriatic, only a few miles from their own lagoons; hence The Most Serene was fain to buy exemption from the same fate by a promise of an annual tribute to the Sublime Porte of the—for that time—exorbitant sum of eighty thousand golden scudi. Circassia, Georgia, and even the Crimea, had become Musulman. In the midst of this ruin of so many nationalities, indomitable Rhodes, defended by a mere handful of religious, strong in their faith and their own self-abnegation, rather than in their incontestable valor, awaited imperturbably the onslaught of the "Alexander of Islam." From the Rhodian Greeks, generally termed Rhodiotés, the Knights could not hope for much assistance. Most of these islanders were indeed Catholics; but there were many who were descended from persons who had joined the Photian Schism when the island was a Byzantine dependency. These were Schismatics, and naturally they hated

the Knights, who were a source of strength to what they called "Latinism." To this party probably belonged the one of the Rhodian traitors who gave much trouble to the Hospitalers. This man, Meligalo by name, was of noble birth; and had dissipated his patrimony in debauchery. He thought to restore his fortunes by revealing the military secrets of the island to Mahomet. Having drawn exact plans of the fortifications, he proceeded to Constantinople and sold his information.

Mahomet began his Rhodian campaign by an attack on the islands of Piscopia, Nizzaro, Calamo, and Cefalo, which were ravaged, and saw all their able-bodied men and boys carried off into slavery (1), the women being destined for Eastern harems. On May 23, 1480, the Turkish expedition, commanded by Mesis Vizir, appeared before Rhodes. In the siege which followed, all of the Catholic Rhodiotés, inspired by the devotion and bravery of D'Aubusson, rivalled the Hospitalers and their auxiliaries in zeal and patience. The aged, the women and children, and even the nuns, helped indefatigably to repair the damages caused by the enormous balls of granite—two feet in diameter—which the Turkish balistas discharged night and day, against the ramparts and into the town. Several assaults were made against Fort St. Nicholas, perhaps the key of the place; but the heroism of the knights of the Italian "language," led by the commander, Fabrizio Carretto, rendered the desperate courage of the Moslems a mere waste of blood. In his blindness concerning the spirit animating the defenders, Mesis Vizir thought that if he could procure the death of the grand-master, the city would yield. Accordingly, the few traitors within the Christian lines were instructed to poison D'Aubusson. But the design was discovered, and the enraged populace tore the miscreants limb from limb. This attempt having failed, the pasha essayed another assault, and this one was made at night. The combat lasted for hours, and an immense number of the Islamites perished. D'Aubusson seemed to be omnipresent; and if any of the knights would fain have sunk in their sanguin-

(1) In accordance with the Turkish custom of that day, the healthy boys were made cadets in the famous Janissaries, and of course were trained as Mohammedans.

ary fatigue, his cheery cry of "Mountjoy and St. Denis!" and the example of his good right arm, gave them confidence that numbers would not avail against the soldiers of Christ and the sons of Mary. With the dawn of morning the pasha found that, while the flower of his army had perished, he was no nearer to the attainment of his object than he had been when still in the Dardanelles. The futility of another assault, made simultaneously on every part of the works, led him to adopt a curious stratagem. His archers affixed to their bolts pieces of parchment, on which were described the alleged tyranny of the Hospitalers, men foreign to Rhodes and to the fallen Lower Empire; and then were described the glories and sweet disposition of Mahomet II., the favored by Allah, the tolerant prince who was so well-disposed to Christianity, so desirous of satisfying the aspirations of all his subjects, that he would accord full religious liberty in their lovely isle (1). When Mesis Virzir learned that the Rhodiotes treated his missives with scorn, he turned his overtures to D'Aubusson. A flag of truce obtained for an envoy an interview with the hero; and after an exalted estimate of the sultan's power had been unfolded, the unconquerable valor of the Moslem soldiery was extolled. Then an appeal was made to the grand-master as prince and as general. As prince, observed the turbaned pleader, D'Aubusson ought not to expose his subjects, the devoted Rhodiotes, to the horrors of war; as general, he should have regard for his soldiers. Let him, therefore, concluded the envoy, surrender Rhodes; and the possessions of the Order of St. John would be ever respected by the sublime Porte. The reply of the Christian leader was simple and to the point. By one path alone could the followers of the Crescent enter into Rhodes; it might be the duty of the pasha to try to open that path, but it certainly would be that of the Hospi-

(1) It would be interesting to know whether, in this mendacious document, the pasha made use of that story which has been credited by many European writers, to the effect that Mahomet II. was born of a Christian mother, Irene, daughter of Prince George Bulcovich, despot of Servia. This presumed Christian origin is an absurdity; firstly, because Mahomet was born in 1430, and Amurath married Irene in 1435. Secondly, because a son of Irene could have been only fifteen years old when Amurath died in 1451; and all the Turkish chroniclers describe Mahomet as inheriting the Ottoman sceptre when he was in his twenty-second year.

talers to oppose him to the death. Another assault, therefore, was now made on the stronghold; and this time the Islamites succeeded in penetrating through a breach. But suddenly D'Aubusson, accompanied by his brother, the Viscount de Monteil, showed himself at the head of a picked body of knights, and, though the enemy outnumbered his followers, together with those originally defending the breach, by twenty to one, the further advance of the half-moon was stopped. Blood flowed as it had not flowed since the siege began. Many times the standard of St. John fell out of sight, as its bearer was cut down; but just so often it was again waved on high as another intrepid hand grasped its staff, and with cries of "To us, Jesus and Mary!" and "To us, St. John!" revived the strength—not the courage, for that never failed—of the devoted band. Finally, with an exhibition of valor which the Turks afterward described as superhuman, the soldier-monks drove the infidels out of the city, pursuing them into their intrenched camp, and from the very tent of the pasha carrying off in triumph the great Standard of Islam. If, in this last attempt to capture Rhodes which that century witnessed, the lieutenant of Mahomet II. felt a shame proportioned to the extent of his defeat, he found some consolation in an explanation of that defeat given by his fatalistically inclined followers. They insisted that during the most intense part of the struggle within the walls they had plainly seen, "high up in the air, a shining cross of gold, and a virgin clothed in white, carrying a lance, and followed by a troop of richly-armed warriors." None of the knights mentioned any such vision; and probably it was either an hallucination of the highly-wrought imaginations of the Moslems, or a cleverly devised excuse for their failure. Be this as it may—and, of course, we do not deny the possibility of the appearance—the presumed miracle had the effect of soothing their pain: for, they reflected, since Allah had thus protected the Christians rather than the true believers, mortal Mussulman could do no more. It may have been owing to his real or affected belief in this prodigy that Mahomet II. did not consign his discomfited general to the bowstring, but contented himself with sending the un-

fortunate into exile. We do not know the exact number of the troops with which Mesis Vizir attacked Rhodes ; but he admitted that on the day after the final failure he found that his dead and seriously wounded were more than twenty-five thousand. When we consider that the Knights Hospitalers engaged in the defence numbered only 450, and their auxiliaries 2,000, we do not wonder that D'Aubusson regarded his victory as miraculous, and that the hostile fleet had no sooner set sail than he summoned his little band to the cathedral for a solemn thanksgiving to God and Our Blessed Lady. When the news of this event, so important to the welfare of Christendom, reached the Holy See, the Pontiff determined to signify his appreciation of the chivalrous devotion and sublime piety of the Order of St. John by an act which would reflect glory upon the entire organization, as well as upon its immediate beneficiary. He forwarded a cardinal's hat to the grand-master.

After the hopelessness of capturing Rhodes had been impressed upon his unwilling mind, Mahomet II. confined his ambitions to objects of easier attainment ; but when his successor, Bajazet, manifested an inclination to emulate the enterprises of his father's earlier years, D'Aubusson's activity seemed to indicate a renewal of youth. Incessant hostilities in the Adriatic, in the Archipelago, and on the coast of Greece, gave abundant employment to the dashing navy of the Hospitalers ; but the astute grand-master thought that all these minor skirmishes were a mere waste of time, blood, and money. He told the Pope that if Christendom was seriously bent on at least checking the advance of the Crescent, a great blow must be struck ; let a Christian fleet force its way into the Dardanelles, burn Gallipoli, and making a dash on Constantinople, burn it also, if it could not be permanently retained. The moment was favorable, urged the veteran ; for the attention of Bajazet was then drawn by the advance of a new enemy and Mussulman rival, the Shah of Persia, into Armenia. At first the powers agreed to form a league to carry out the bold design ; but alas ! the latter part of the fifteenth century was true to itself—it was the vital end of the Middle Age ; and already men might antici-

pate the remark afterward made to Leibnitz by Pomponne, Minister of Louis XIV., that Crusades were no longer the fashion. Sorrow rankled in the heart of the old soldier-monk ; perhaps he foresaw that twenty years after this culpable negligence on the part of the Christian governments, the same neglect would be manifested by an ambitious and egoistic emperor (Charles V.), who could not for an instant compromise his petty schemes in the Milanais for the sake of Christendom ; and that Rhodes, the most important outpost of Christianity, and therefore the beacon light of civilization, would capitulate to the Crescent. The chagrin of the hero entailed an illness which terminated fatally on July 3, 1503 ; and throughout the Catholic world there ensued deep and long-lasting mourning for him who had for many years been styled the "Liberator," and the "Shield of the Church." The chronicles of the time show that, as was quite natural and appropriate, the obsequies of Cardinal Grand-Master d'Aubusson were far more ornate and ceremonious than the Hospitalers, in their monastic simplicity, were wont to accord to their deceased brethren. The body was carried to the council hall, and placed on a catafalque covered with cloth of gold. Around stood knights in habits of mourning and bearing the cardinalatial hat, the cross, the standard of St. John, and the escutcheon of the deceased. On his breast was a golden crucifix, his hands were encased in silk gloves, and his feet wore slippers of cloth of gold. Beside the remains were the robes of a prelate, his well-worn armor, and the glorious sword yet tinged with Moslem blood, which he had wielded at the siege in 1480. Not only all the religious, his comrades at the altar and on the field of battle, kissed his pure though valiant hands ; the common people and peasantry, groaning and beating their breasts, also tendered him that homage, for D'Aubusson had been known as the father of the Rhodiote poor. When the body was brought out of the palace of the grand-master, an immense cry of lamentation went up to heaven, and women tore their hair in their extreme grief. After the burial in the vaults of the church of St. John, the hero's *maggiordanno* broke his marshal's baton over his tomb, and his squire did the

same with the spurs (1). Thus was laid to rest the body of one of the greatest and most valiant captains that ever drew sword in the cause of Holy Church. The glorious Order of St. John produced many real heroes and true religious ; but of its grand-master, the Cardinal D'Aubusson, it might well say :

“ . . . *Si fractus illabatur orbis,
Impavidum ferient ruinae.*”

After the death of the heroic D'Aubusson, the two succeeding grand-masters entertained little anxiety concerning the safety of Rhodes. The memory of the signal defeat of 1480 was too fresh in the mind of Bajazet, the son of Mahomet II., to allow him to do more than threaten to undertake an enterprise which had proved too mighty for his more warlike father. But in 1513, the Grand-Master Fabrizio Carretto, of the “ language ” of Italy, began to anticipate an attack from Selim. This sultan had already subjugated Egypt and Syria, and Persia seemed about to succumb to his arms. He was known to be anxious for fame, and hence Carretto bent all his energies to render the island fit to sustain another siege. He engaged the services of two eminent Italian engineers for the erection of new and powerful fortifications, and he augmented the navy of the order ; but his exertions were terminated by death. When the knights assembled for the election of a new master, it was found that three competitors divided their sympathies. These were Villiers de l'Île-Adam, grand-prior of France ; the Commander d'Amaral, a Portuguese, chancellor of the order, and grand-prior of Castile ; and Thomas Ocray, grand-prior of England. The Englishman had no great merits beyond the possession of powerful relatives who might be of some service to the order ; hence his name was dropped when the importance of a wise selection became manifest. Apparently the Portuguese had more valid claims for the suffrages. He was a skilful commander, both on sea and on land ; but he was overbearing and conceited, and on reflection the electors

(1) For the facts concerning Cardinal D'Aubusson we have relied on the *Lives of the Grand-Masters of the Holy Order of St. John of Jerusalem*, Written by the Commander, Brother Girolamo Marulli. Naples, 1636. Also, on Daru's *Republic of Venice*. Paris, 1821 ; and on Flandrin's *History of the Knights of Rhodes*. Paris, 1876.

deemed it dangerous to confide the magistral staff to such hands. There remained, therefore, Villiers de l'Ile-Adam a knight of great nobility of character, a man prudent in counsel, a veteran of a hundred battles, a fine strategist, and a true religious. With but one exception all the votes were cast for the grand-prior of France; the exception being the vote of the disappointed Portuguese, who so far forgot himself as to cry: "May ruin fall on Rhodes and the order!" Unfortunately, no attention was then paid to his chagrin; and only when it was too late did the knights discover that the miserable man had already become a renegade in his heart. At the very time that l'Ile-Adam received the staff of grand-master of the Hospitalers, the throne of the Ottoman empire was inherited by Soliman II., a prince of greater audacity than his father, Selim, and who was fresh from that victorious campaign against the Hungarians which had resulted in the reduction of Belgrade. It was said that he regretted the conquests of his ancestors, since now he had a smaller number of victories before him. In his exalted imagination he saw the Order of St. John constantly taunting him with the injuries which it had heaped upon the Crescent: with the defeat of Osman (y. 1310), and the abortive attempt of Orcan to avenge his father (y. 1323); with the innumerable naval disasters of the Ottoman fleets, which never dared to meet the galleys of the Hospital on equal terms; with the successful assistance given to the rebellious Mussulmans of Egypt; and with that most disgraceful catastrophe that ever befell the Islamites, the failure of Mahomet II. to crush the indomitable spirit of D'Aubusson. And never could Soliman expect again so favorable an opportunity to sweep the hated order from the face of the earth. The knights could rely just then upon no aid from the western powers. The struggle for supremacy in Italy was of more importance to Charles V. than any interest of the Church or of the Christian body-politic. His chivalrous adversary, Francis I., would have strained every nerve to aid a cause which appealed to his soldierly instincts, and to the Catholic traditions of his crown; but the fortunes of war had been adverse to him, and he was reduced to unwilling inactivity. The Pontiff was of

no value in a military sense. The Venetians who, by means of their powerful fleet, could have extended more valuable aid than either France, Spain, or the Empire, were envious of the maritime power of the Hospitalers; the rest of Italy was too deeply involved in the combat between France and Austria-Spain. Hungary was prostrate before the half-moon. And still another encouragement to attack Rhodes was furnished to Soliman from within the very council-chamber of the Hospitalers. The Portuguese chevalier, D'Amaral, had, as he afterward expressed the idea, "sold his soul to the demon"; and immediately after his failure to obtain the grand-master's staff he had sent to the sultan a plan of the Rhodian fortifications, and all other information valuable to an intending aggressor. And the Turk was still further aided from within the Christian lines by the cunning of a Jewish physician, who had feigned conversion to Christianity in order to play the spy more efficiently.

The intentions of Soliman soon became apparent to the grand-master; and he held a review of the garrison, that he might judge of its fitness for the coming trial. There were less than 300 Hospitalers, of whom the "language" of France contributed 140; those of Spain and Portugal, 88; that of Italy, 47; England and Germany together, only 17. But these soldier-monks were truly a *corps-d'élite*; right worthy to uphold the standards of Jesus and Mary; men who realized thoroughly the sublimity of their vocation to the evangelical counsels, and soldiers who felt that they combatted under the prayerful eyes of the Supreme Pontiff of Christendom. To these veterans of a hundred holy fights were joined many gentlemen of various lands, each followed by some soldiers who were equipped and maintained at his expense. Then there were the auxiliary troops in the service of the knights, men who wore the insignia of the order, and fought under its banners; but who took no religious vows, and did not reside in the convent. Their officers were always Hospitalers, and as a rule these auxiliaries imbibed much of the spirit of their patrons. Many of them in time joined the brotherhood; but not as knights. To become a knight, four quarterings of nobility, on the side of both father and

mother, were requisite. The inferior brethren were styled "serving brothers," and they were obliged to recite the Lord's Prayer one hundred and fifty times each day. These auxiliaries increased the total force to about 5,000 men. One Italian knight who had only lately entered the order must be especially mentioned: namely, the engineer-in-chief, Martinenghi. A native of Brescia, and regarded as the first engineer of his time, he had been employed by Venice to fortify Candia, and he had rendered it almost impregnable. Entering the service of the Hospitalers, he was so impressed by their piety, courage, and self-denial, that he begged for admittance into the holy militia. Very soon he had so distinguished himself that he was raised to the grade of grand-cross (1) and was made superintendent of the fortifications. Perhaps the heroic prolongation of the resistance to the arms of Soliman was chiefly due to the inventive genius of this Italian engineer. When l'Île-Adam had made all the military preparations possible, he began—if indeed this was not always being made—the preparation of the souls of his brethren. The Great Standard of St. John was entrusted to the care of a French knight named Grolè-Pacim; and the honor of bearing at the side of the grand-master during the battle the banner of the Crucifixion, a present from the Holy See to the Cardinal Grand-Master d'Aubusson, was accorded to the Chevalier de Tintenille, a nephew of l'Île-Adam. Then the entire garrison, or rather community, began a series of prayers, fastings, and scourgings; and these devotional exercises did not cease until the hostile sails were descried in the offing. Then the heroes were ready to draw their swords in the holiest of causes; and they smilingly committed its issue into the hands of God.

It was on the 26th of June, 1522, that Mustapha, a brother-in-law of Soliman, anchored a fleet of about 400 vessels in front of Zimboli, five miles from Rhodes. Here he disembarked 100,000 men and 300 cannon. These were to be followed in a few days by Soliman in person, at the head of another army of equal strength. The grand-master im-

(1) There were three grades of Knights-Hospitalers: the chevaliers or simple knights, the knights-commanders, and the knights-grand-cross.

mediately left his palace, which he was never again to inhabit, and established his headquarters at the advanced post of Our Lady of Victories, a position which the last siege had proved to be the most exposed of all in the *enceinte* to assault. As in the narrative of the siege of 1480, we shall avoid details and present only the most important points of this memorable event. The first balls of the Turks were received and returned by the bastions confided to the languages of Provence, Spain, and England; and no less than twenty times were the Moslems driven from their trenches by the impetuous sorties of these knights. This unexpected result of the first operations demoralized even the Janissaries, then, as ever, the choicest troops in the Ottoman service; and when the account reached Soliman, he hastened to the scene with his reinforcements. While the siege was being pressed with greater vigor, a conspiracy was formed among the Mohammedan slaves—prisoners of war as yet unransomed. The design was to fire the town in many places simultaneously; but the discovery of the plot, and the public execution of the leaders, prevented any more attempts of that nature. But there was another source of serious mischief which, originating in only one person, was less easily discovered. Mention has been made of a Jewish physician, a feigned convert, who acted as a spy for the Moslems (1). To him the knights owed the foiling of some of their most promising schemes. One effect of his machinations was especially injurious to the besieged. From the top of the cathedral tower one could easily observe every movement of the Osmanlis; and here the grand-master was wont to watch for hours at a time. By advice of the Jew, the Ottoman fire was directed against this tower until it tumbled to the ground. From the moment that Soliman appeared on the scene, every means known to the science of engineering at that time, every strategy of good generalship, and the most prodigal sacrifice of life, were adopted to crush the defiant and persistently confident knights of St.

(1) The Hospitalers also employed spies. The most successful of these was a serving brother named Raymond, who, speaking Turkish and Arabic perfectly, and having sojourned in Mohammedan lands many years, was able to pass as one of the faithful. He was wont to employ certain signals, and then shoot his message over the walls.

John. Having perceived, as had Mesis Vizir in the last siege, that Fort St. Nicholas was the key of the town, the sultan directed, during ten successive days and nights, a constant fire from twenty-two of his heaviest guns against it; but in vain. The guns of the Hospitalers were better served than his own, and Soliman beheld his soldiers surely and quickly disappearing. At last, after many murderous assaults upon various and separate portions of the works, a simultaneous attack was made on every point. Beaten back everywhere else, the Turks effected a lodgment in the bastion entrusted to the language of Spain, and the *aga* of the Janissaries there planted his standard. Then ensued a struggle of several hours, at the end of which the Mussulmans retreated to their entrenchments, leaving behind many of their banners and 15,000 dead. But the Ottoman superiority in numbers began to speak eloquently of the probable doom of Rhodes; every day the breaches yawned wider and wider. To add to the general distress, it was found that the supply of powder was nearly exhausted. Before the siege, and while there was yet time to augment the stock, the Portuguese traitor, D'Amaral, whose duty it was to inspect the magazines, had reported a sufficiency of the indispensable requisite. But the Hospitalers did not lose courage; they merely studied the aiming of their guns more carefully, and began to manufacture powder in mills improvised in the vaults underneath the palace of the grand-master. Fortunately they possessed a large quantity of carbon and nitre. The treachery of D'Amaral had failed precisely where he had thought it would be most efficacious; and just as during the first weeks of the siege, so now, every assault of the Osmanlis, though made with their natural bravery intensified by religious zeal and desperation, failed ignominiously before the heroic patience of the Knights of St. John. So furious did Soliman become, that he would have ordered his general, Mustapha, brother-in-law and favorite though the unlucky man was, to be flogged to death, had not all the pashas united in prevailing upon him to banish the unfortunate. Having realized that his choicest troops were no more, and that the Hospitalers were as

resolved as ever, the sultan now began to think seriously of abandoning his bloody enterprise. Suddenly a message from the wretched D'Amaral filled him with new hope. The recreant chevalier informed Soliman that the defenders could not possibly resist many days longer ; let the monarch press a few more assaults—he could afford the loss of a few more thousands—and the place must be his, were that end to be due only to the sheer exhaustion of the few remaining knights. The sultan withheld the order to raise the siege ; but he who had induced this change of mind had already received the punishment of a traitor. His disloyalty had been discovered ; his habit had been torn from him, his knightly spurs had been knocked off by the hangman, and the caitiff who might have been an earthly St. Michael was decapitated (1). Meanwhile the Osmanlis pushed forward their trenches, and opened fresh mines. Several more assaults were made ; but Soliman found himself no nearer to the object of his desires. He now began to reflect on the necessity of offering to the Hospitalers honorable terms of capitulation. The ramparts of Rhodes were nearly ruined, and the town might almost be termed an open place ; but he knew that even his Janissaries hesitated to confront the indomitable defenders in another attack. Six months of siege had cost him the lives of 114,000 men, He ordered a white flag to be displayed before the trenches, and two soldiers advanced to the walls, bearing a letter to the grand-master. This first offer of Soliman was rejected, for the knights were constantly scanning the horizon in hope of desecring approaching aid from the European powers. But at length l'Île-Adam presented the matter to the Chapter. Each member declared that a capitulation was proper, nay, necessary. To save Rhodes was now beyond the bounds of human possibilities. If the place were taken by assault, the inhabitants would either be massacred or carried into slavery ; all the objects so venerated by the Order of St. John, the churches, the relics of the saints, the tombs of their brethren, would be defiled by the infidels. They were all willing to die with their grand-master, if he gave the word ; but they did not think that duty called upon the order to sacrifice the

(1) The Jewish physician had been detected and hung several days previously.

lives of women and children for a point of mere military pride. And for that matter, the honor of the knights was in no jeopardy. At this juncture the grand-master learned that heavy reinforcements of men and material had reached the enemy, and that Soliman requested him to visit the imperial quarters, there to consult as to the terms of capitulation.

With a heart bursting with anguish the veteran complied with the invitation. When the two dignitaries met—what a subject for a soulful painter!—the grand-master immediately produced the document wherein Sultan Bajazet had covenanted for himself and his successors to respect the independence of Rhodes. For answer Soliman tore the parchment into shreds, and trampled them into the dust. But in a moment, as though deeply impressed by the calm dignity of l'Île-Adam, and probably ashamed of his ebullition of disrespect for his father's sign-manual, he expressed regret at being compelled to eject so old a man from his home, and after complimenting his foe upon his knightly worth, he promised him great rewards if he would abjure Christianity and enter the service of the Porte. The interview terminated by the signing of the terms of capitulation, and if we consider the violent nature of Soliman, and the weakened situation of the knights, the conditions were highly honorable to the Hospitalers. Of course all the possessions of the Order of St. John in Asia passed into the hands of the Turks; but the knights were allowed to embark with all their movable property, the sacred vessels, their archives, money, plate, and books. They could also take as much artillery and ammunition as was necessary for the equipment of the ships which bore them away. The sultan agreed to respect the churches of the island, and to allow full religious liberty to the inhabitants; but it is almost needless to note that this promise was shamefully violated. The churches were all defiled, and some destroyed. The altars were profaned, and the tombs of the grand-masters were opened, the ashes being scattered to the winds. Every dwelling was sacked, and the inhabitants were subjected to the wonted licentiousness of a Mohammedan army. Thus terminated a siege in which 5,000 Christians withstood for six months the efforts of 200,000 Mohammedans.

On January 1, 1523, the little remnant of the glorious Order of St. John embarked on galleys painted in black, as a sign of its grief. Only one flag was visible in the fleet, the one floating from the mainmast of the grand-master's vessel, and it was the standard of Our Lady with the motto: "*Afflictis Spes Mea Rebus*—Thou art my reliance in my misfortune." Villiers de l'Île-Adam led his gallant brethren to the Eternal City, and at its gates he was received formally by the entire pontifical household in robes of ceremony, by all the cardinals then in Rome, and by the ambassador of France. The reception of the grand-master by the Sovereign Pontiff was naturally most touching (1), and the veteran soldier of the Cross felt that the thanks of the Vicar of Christ were an earnest of the reward which God held in store for his faithful champions. Viterbo was assigned as a residence for the knights, and during several years they led a purely conventual life, though ever on the search for a new centre where they might resume their military activity, and thus continue the noble traditions of the Hospital. And ere long Providence hearkened to their prayer. The Turkish corsairs were then terrorizing the Italian coasts at their pleasure, and Charles V., master of Sicily and the neighboring islands, well realized how much benefit would accrue to that portion of his dominions if the Order of St. John undertook to dispute the supremacy of the Mediterranean with the Osmanlis. Accordingly, he offered to it the island of Malta and its dependencies, as well as the principality of Tripoli, with full sovereign and proprietary right. Villiers de l'Île-Adam cheerfully accepted the new responsibility; and on October 26, 1530, the knights made their solemn entry into Malta, thus inaugurating the third period of the glorious history of the Military Order of St. John,—a period which endured, in spite of many attacks on the part of the Turks, until 1798, when Bonaparte, while on his way to Egypt, planted the tricolor on the fortifications of Malta, almost without resistance. The French conquest

(1) Some olden chronicles narrate that while Pope Adrian VI. was celebrating Mass in St. Peter's on the Christmas of 1522 the day when the Turks took possession of Rhodes—a stone in the cornice became detached and fell at his feet. Since all Rome was then trembling for the fate of the island, this incident was regarded as a presage of its capture.

of their mother-house and last stronghold was virtually the death of the Knights-Hospitalers, although the order still subsists—void of any military significance—as an aristocratic organization, with its headquarters in Rome, devoted to the furtherance of Catholic interests, and to the sanctification of its members. We need make no more than an allusion to the insolent claim of the Russian czars to a still persistent grand-mastership of an “Order of Malta,” a claim based on the *per se* invalid renunciation of the last grand-master, the German Ferdinand Von Hompesch, in favor of the Schismatic autocrat, Paul I.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FABLE OF THE TWO-WIVED COUNT OF GLEICHEN.

When men began to perceive, during the first days of the so-called Reformation, that the new dispensation was much easier to live up to than the old, and that it knew very little of sacrifice or mortification for the sake of God or for the good of man, one of the first to appreciate this laxity was the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse; and we can imagine his gratitude toward the burly Doctor Martin, when that innovator, agreeing with the gentle Melancthon, manifested no reluctance to pander to the brutal passions of the powerful and wealthy. This prince was anxious to repudiate his lawful spouse, and to marry a more attractive woman. Not a shadow of a reason could be alleged for the divorce, save the ordinary one of disgust for the wife and an inclination toward her rival. In this emergency Philip applied for aid to Luther, who was already, in many respects, the Protestant Pontiff. One of the chief objects of the Wittenberg revolutionist, and one without the attainment of which his cause would have collapsed, was to secure, not only the toleration of the civil power for his sectarians, but the active co-operation of that power in his heretical propaganda. Here was an opportunity not to be ignored; and accordingly a formal authorization,

signed by Luther and Melancthon, was issued to the Landgrave of Hesse, allowing him the delectable favor. And in order to silence the tongues of any possibly *scandalizable* persons, the story was put forth that once upon a time the Holy See had sanctioned a case of bigamy in favor of a German noble. In the *factum* which Philip drew up for his justification, we read that the Pope "once allowed a Count of Gleichen to have two wives at once; he having married the second in the Holy Land, being of belief that the first was dead."

This presumed fact, adduced by the Reforming Popes of Germany to justify their flagrant and utterly shameless violation of divine and civil law, was not without effect upon the common people. The popular version of the story, however, indicated a more revolting state of affairs in the Gleichen household than was narrated in the manifesto of the Landgrave; for, according to the vulgar acceptation, the Count of Gleichen had married lady No. 2, knowing perfectly well that No. 1 was living at that very time; and the Pontiff not only tolerated, but positively sanctioned, the simultaneous bigamy. What a delicious morsel for the admiring and credulous victims of Doctor Martin; and how acceptable to the historically brilliant yokels of our day, had not an almost total oblivion been its lot! Certainly it is wonderful that no Protestant historical painter, no ambitious playwright of the spectacular school (of course he should be of the class which holds that theatric exigencies are superior to historical truth), has ever used this subject for his own profit, or for the transient gratification of heresy, or, which would be the more likely event, for the further mystification of ignor-amuses. Strange! They have placed the Roman prelacy upon the stage, to bless with melodious (operatic) chant the daggers which are to inaugurate the Barthélemy; and there are scores of other instances of the dramatization of subjects far less characterized by picturesque lies than is the Gleichen romance. And yet how effective would be the careful representation of the scene where the Sovereign Pontiff unites the Count to lady No. 2! The Pope is seated upon his throne; such a ceremony as this must be conducted with

all possible dignity. The Head of the Church is about to give the lie to the Church past, present, and future. Such an act is not to be consummated perfunctorily, or by the intervention of ordinary bureaucracy. Those who by right surround the Papal throne and a number of cardinals add splendor to the scene. Now appears the fortunate perhaps unfortunate—Gleichen, leading by either hand his wife *in re* and the wife *in spe*. Much care must be given to the expression of countenance worn by all these personages. The Pope must look like an incarnation of despair on the brink of hell. The artist or stage manager can allow much latitude of judgment as to the looks of Gleichen, according as to whether he deems the Count's position a reward of virtue or a punishment of sin. The dusky bride No. 2 must appear as simplicity itself, if not as the essence of idiocy. As to the original Countess of Gleichen, no actress should attempt to portray her, no painter to depict her, if they cannot make her countenance convey the idea that her soul is ever dominated, at one and the same time, by sisterly love and gratitude toward No. 2, and by the most poignant jealousy and hatred.

In a little church of Erfurt, in Thuringia, the officious guide draws the attention of the tourist to a sepulchral slab, bearing very rude carvings, but which at once challenges interest by the nature of the artist's subject. A knight of tall stature is represented as reposing between two women; and the guide—he is generally the sacristan—tells the significance of the sculpture in something like the following words: While warring under the Cross near Jerusalem, the Count of Gleichen was taken prisoner. Falling to the lot of the sultan, he was assigned to labor in the royal gardens, and here he soon attracted the favorable notice of the sultan's daughter. Their acquaintance ripened into love on the part of the princess; and she offered to become a Christian, to consummate the captive's liberation, and to accompany him to Europe, provided he would marry her. This truly Christian knight and pink of chivalry consented; the escape was effected, the pair betook themselves to Rome, and laid their case before the Pope. A Protestant may imagine the quandary in which

the Pontiff found himself ; a Catholic will fancy the impudent fool politely escorted out of the papal presence. But the story goes that the Pope decided that the Saracen girl, who had risked so much on the faith of a Christian knight, especially since she demanded baptism as well as marriage, should not be disappointed. It has been suggested that this complacent Pope was the very one who had been miraculously reprov'd for having refused a chance of repentance to the supplicant Tanhauser, thus causing him, in his desperation, to return to the feet of Venus, and thereby ensure his eternal damnation. At any rate, Gleichen was permitted to have two simultaneously legitimate wives, and started rejoicing for Thuringia to introduce the ladies to each other. There was not much anxiety in the breast of the Saracen claimant to wifely honors, concerning her reception at Castle Gleichen ; born and raised amidst polygamy, she perceived nothing unnatural in her matrimonial aspirations. But the mind of her lord was terribly harassed as they neared the fastness, where he knew his lawful lady was praying for his safe return to his loving family. Strange to say, however, when the transports of joy for the reunion were over, and the husband had informed the wife of all his obligations to his dusky companion, and had showed the papal dispensation, there was no sign of rage, not even of displeasure, on the part of the half-dethroned one. She took the newcomer to her arms in all sisterly affection, assuring her that she regarded their uxorious rights as equal. From that day the trio lived in unity and peace.

Such is the popular Protestant tradition concerning the two-wived Gleichen, and it requires but little perspicacity to discern that it has originated from the necessity of explaining, in some plausible way, the sculptured effigies on the tomb at Erfurt. In 1887, in a session of the "Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres"—a more appropriate name for which would be "Académie des Sciences Historiques,"—one of the members, by no means a clerical, M. Gaston Paris, read a paper on this subject ; and in it he said that he found in the tombstone of Erfurt one of the numerous examples of what is called iconographic mythology.

Antiquarians universally admit that a vast number of legends owe either their origin or their localization to a popular desire to explain works of art, the meaning of which has been lost. Now, the tombstone at Erfurt bears no name; popular imagination (only that, and simply because the Gleichens had a feudal establishment in the neighborhood, in the olden time) assigned the sepulchre to some of that family. And, of course, concluded the essentially accurate popular mind, some Gleichen had two wives at the same time. But how can we explain, most appositely demands M. Gaston Paris, the erection of a monument in favor of bigamy in a Catholic church? "Certainly the Pope must have authorized it; and to call forth such permission most extraordinary circumstances must have happened. The second wife must have given life and liberty to the already married Gleichen." Then M. Paris shows how, by this same popular logic and facility of producing indefinite sequences, the actuating scene of the drama was naturally laid in the Orient; the Crusades were to the Middle Age very much what the Trojan war was to the Greeks, above all others the Heroic Age. "The troubles which these distant expeditions excited in family life were especially adapted to upset every imagination. The various risks undergone by the returning warrior of the Sepulchre gave rise to as many tales as did the deeds of the conquerors of Ilium. Hence it is that we find, under forms the most varied, this same pathetic theme of the return of the husband at the very moment when the despondent wife is about to yield to one of her suitors,—a theme which forms the essential idea of the *Odyssey*, and which probably is of far more ancient origin than the poem. Here the theme is inverted." Quite naturally, then, a Saracen lady becomes, in the legend, the second wife of the Count of Gleichen; and, of course, as is always the case in mediæval romances, where a Christian knight is delivered by an Oriental lady, she is a king's daughter. Many used to imagine that they could discern traces of a crown over the head of one of the feminine figures on the Erfurt slab; and in 1836, when the tomb was displaced and the adjacent vault cleaned out, a physician examined the skulls of the supposed Gleichen trio, with the

result that he reported that the anatomical characteristics of one of them proved it to have been that of an Eastern female. But it was afterward shown that this enthusiast's own report did not really evince the sex of the subject. In contradiction to the credulous physician's absolute faith in the legend consecrated by Luther and the Landgrave of Hesse, there now came forth a scientist who, with an apparent show of erudition, essayed to demonstrate that the Erfurt monument was of no more ancient date than the fifteenth century, instead of being of the thirteenth, the epoch of the much-married knight's supposed career; in fact, it seemed to be proved that the disputed tomb was the last resting-place of Count Sigismund Gleichen, who, toward the end of the fifteenth century, brought from the East a Turkish woman, introduced her into the castle indeed, but with whom he never dreamed of entering into matrimony. However, it has been finally demonstrated, as M. Gaston Paris proved to the satisfaction of the French Academy in solemn session, that the Erfurt sculpture represented Count Lambert II., who died in 1227, who never went into the East, and who indeed had possessed two wives, but not simultaneously.

Such, then, was the chief of the flimsy pretexts by which the leader of the Reformers justified the permission given to Philip of Hesse to repudiate Christina of Saxony, to whom he had been united sixteen years, and who had borne him eight children; and to espouse Margaret von Saal, a maid of honor to his sister Elizabeth.

CHAPTER X.

THE CONTROVERSY ON THE CHINESE RITES.

In the year 1645 the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda was requested to settle a controversy which had disturbed the missionaries in China during several years, and which, afterward agitated with a bitterness on both sides which would have better befitted a less sacred cause, was of great detriment to the propagation of the faith in the Celestial

Empire, and productive of great scandal throughout Christendom. From the day when the Jesuits resumed in China that propagation of the Gospel which the sons of Sts. Dominic and Francis had intermittently undertaken during the two previous centuries, they had wisely and determinedly endeavored to conciliate the apparently ineradicable prejudices of those whose confidence was to be gained, ere the Christian Faith could make conquest of their intelligences. It was in accordance with this design that the Jesuits in China soon discarded the simple costume and ostentatiously humble manners of the native Bonzes—dress and demeanor which at first they had adopted. They soon donned silken robes, used litters when travelling, and did many other things which were appropriate for lettered persons, such as they undoubtedly were, and such as, for the sake of their mission, they wished to be considered. With the same object in view, the Jesuit missionaries allowed their neophytes to continue the practice of certain ceremonies which they would have preferably abolished, but which they regarded as capable of other than an anti-Christian interpretation, and to which the denizens of the Middle Kingdom were invincibly attached. Thus, the Jesuit superior, Ricci of Macerata, had convinced himself that there was not necessarily anything idolatrous or even superstitious in the prostrations and sacrifices which the Chinese offered to the shades of their ancestors; that, in fine, these ceremonies were not those of worship, properly speaking, but rather demonstrations of filial devotion. Nor can it be said that in forming this conclusion, the wish of Ricci was the father of the thought; for he believed that the doctrine of Confucius on the nature of God—a doctrine on which depended the permissibility of the rites in question—was not different from that which Christianity presented. Ricci contended that the Chinese sage had not asked his disciples to adore merely the visible heavens; the Jesuit fancied that the Confucian utterances indicated the Lord of Heaven, the True God, as the supreme object of human homage. Most of the Jesuits in China adopted the views of their superior; but in the course of time the Dominicans insisted that no Christian evangelist could hold such opin-

ions. The Preaching Friars discerned atheism in the teachings of Confucius ; they declared that the sage recognized only a material heaven, and not a pure spirit who is the Creator of the Universe.

The Dominicans having formulated their complaints at the Propaganda in 1645, the Sacred Congregation prohibited the Chinese ceremonies in question, until the Holy See should pronounce a definitive sentence ; but in 1656, the Jesuits having presented evidence which apparently favored their opinion of the crimated practices, the Congregation issued another decree tolerating said ceremonies as purely civil and political. The dispute waxed warmer ; and in 1669 and 1674 the question was again debated at Rome. The opponents of the Chinese Rites were now reinforced by the suffrages of all the missionaries whom the Seminary for Foreign Missions, that celebrated monument of French zeal for religion which had been recently established in Paris, had sent into China. In 1693, Maigrot, bishop of Conon and vicar-apostolic of Fo-Kien, issued a pastoral in which he ordered his clergy, firstly, to use the words *Tien-chu*, "Lord of Heaven," when they wished to convey the idea of God to the Chinese ; in the same circumstances the words *Tien* and *Xanti*, "Heaven" and "Emperor," were never to be used. The prelate ordered, secondly, that there should be allowed in the churches no tablet bearing the inscription, *King-Tien*, "Adore Heaven." Thirdly, enjoined the bishop, the Chinese Christians could not be permitted to assist at the semi-annual oblations made to Confucius and to the dead. Maigrot also stigmatized as false in many points the explanation given by the Jesuits to Pope Alexander VII., and which had procured the tolerating decree of 1656. The bishop praised those missionaries who had already prohibited the tablets just mentioned ; and he condemned several propositions, bearing on the matter in agitation, which had been advanced by certain Jesuit writers. This pastoral of the vicar-apostolic of Fo-Kien caused great excitement ; and the Jesuits upbraided the bishop "for having presumed to decide, by his sole authority," a question which the Holy See, as they contended, regarded as debatable. Of the six bishops then

forming the Chinese hierarchy, only two upheld the Jesuit position ; against it were ranged, besides four bishops, all the Dominicans and Franciscans, and all the secular priests from the Seminary for Foreign Missions. A new element now entered into the controversy. Most of the missionaries being then, just as they are in our day, from the Land of the Lilies, it was quite natural that the Sorbonne, as yet a powerful factor in all things Catholic, should participate in the dispute. On Oct. 18, 1700, the still justly revered Faculty condemned several propositions which a Jesuit author in Europe had advanced in favor of the views held by his brethren in China. Such was the condition of things when Pope Innocent XII. appointed a special Congregation to consider the nature of the Chinese Rites ; and perhaps superficiality would not have been predicated of him who would have then declared that apparently charity had become a stranger in the hearts of all who were debating the matter. In the words of one of the most judicially-minded polemics who have commented on this melancholy subject, " In these discussions there were most regrettable animosities. Some bitter foes of the Jesuits painted their conduct in the darkest colors, exaggerating their faults, and accusing them of idolatry ; whereas at most, they might have been charged with excessive tenderness, human prudence, or laxity. But the Jesuits, on their side, imagined that they were right in reality, because their adversaries were apparently wrong ; and they clung the more to their opinion, because they saw that many combatted it through passion, and without understanding it. An effect of extreme injustice is to embitter, and to disgust ; and this fact seems to explain the long resistance of the Jesuits. Undoubtedly we do not yearn to discover culpability in a body of men whom we esteem ; but facts do depose against many of the Society. We have already recorded the results of our researches in this matter ; and we have received many protests, urging us to read the apologies written by certain members of the Society. However, those apologies do not seem to us as excusing entirely the faults of the missionaries, of whom we have spoken. The *Memoirs* of Father d'Avrigny and the collection of

Edifying Letters, rather furnish testimony against them" (1).

On April 18, 1705, Mgr. de Tournon, titular patriarch of Antioch, who had been papal legate in India, arrived in China with the usual legatine faculties. This envoy of the Holy See had already experienced trouble with the Jesuit missionaries in India, because of the Rites of Malabar (2); therefore he was well fitted to cope with the difficulties of his Chinese legation. In September he was received in solemn audience by the emperor; but having notified His Majesty that the Holy See had condemned the practices which the Jesuits tolerated, he was ordered to leave the empire. Speaking of this episode, Picot says: "In his narrative of this embassy, Father d'Avrigny gives no exalted idea of the moderation or intelligence of Mgr. de Tournon, nor any similar appreciation of the qualifications of Mgr. Maigrot, the bishop of Conon and vicar-apostolic. However, this writer appears to aim only at a justification of such of his brethren as favored the Chinese Rites. One would imagine that he counted as nothing the sentiments of other missionaries, the authority of the papal legate, and the express decisions of the Holy See. These last decisions alone ought to have restrained a religious who, on all other occasions, professes a legitimate respect and a laudable zeal for the apostolic judgments. . . . In two letters written at this time by the legate to Mgr. Maigrot and to the Jesuits of Peking, he upbraids those religious most strongly for having abused the favor of the emperor in order to nullify the pur-

(1) PICOT; *Memoirs to Serve for the Ecclesiastical History of the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. i., p. 213. Paris, 1853.

(2) When the patriarch arrived in Pondicherry in 1703, he found that the Capuchins, Dominicans, and seculars complained that the Jesuits tolerated several idolatrous practices on the part of their converts. The charges were based on the fact that the neophytes were allowed to retain images which resembled idols, and that such of them as were musicians were permitted to play at the feasts of the idolaters. The Jesuits were also charged with neglecting the despised Pariahs; with omitting some of the ceremonies of baptism; with deferring the baptism of infants; with performing the marriage ceremony for children who were only six years of age; with allowing baths which were taken merely for luxury; with practicing superstitions and even immodest rites at nuptials; and with several other things of lesser moment. After an examination which lasted six months, the legate issued a pastoral, condemning these usages. The Jesuits sent deputies to Rome, asking to be allowed to follow such usages of the Indians as were in themselves indifferent, and such as the missionaries had rendered innocuous by elimination of everything baneful; alleging the invincible attachment of the Indians to their customs. Nevertheless, on Jan. 7, 1706, the Holy Inquisition commanded that the pastoral of the legate should be observed. Pope

pose of the Pope's representative" (1). Having received his dismissal at the imperial hands, the patriarch proceeded to Nankin, where he issued a decree condemnatory of the Chinese Rites, and announced that on Nov. 20, 1704, the Supreme Pontiff had ordered the missionaries to observe the rules given by Mgr. Maigrot in 1693. The Jesuits ignored the legatine prescriptions; most of them, and a few of the other missionaries, had already promised the emperor to continue the honors to Confucius, and never to return to Europe, thus entitling themselves to an imperial rescript which accorded them the freedom of the empire. All who obeyed the legate, that is, all of the secular clergy, and the greater part of the Dominicans and Franciscans, were banished; but many of these confessors succeeded in eluding the imperial police, and continued to perform their apostolic work in the manner prescribed by the Head of the Church. Twenty-two Jesuits signed an appeal to the Pope, dated May 28, 1707, in which they sought to justify their compliance with the imperial wishes by the dangers which a refusal would have entailed on the missions. In the meantime Mgr. de Tournon had been arrested at Nankin, conducted to Macao (a Portuguese possession), and placed in the hands of the Portuguese authorities, who were requested to allow him to have no communication with the Chinese empire. The Portuguese officials were hostile to the patriarch; for while he was in Lisbon, on his way to the Orient, he had memorialized His Most Faithful Majesty concerning the rapacity and generally un-Christian conduct of the royal representatives in the East. Quite naturally, therefore, the legate was thrown into prison, and was furthermore treated

Clement XI. was obliged to renew this order several times, so determined were the Jesuits, especially as they were sustained by two of the Indo-Portuguese bishops, to continue the obnoxious practices. However, one of the Jesuits, Visdelou, whom Tournon had appointed bishop of Claudiopolis, differed radically from his brethren in this matter; and he obeyed the pontifical injunction to use every means to secure obedience to the legate's orders. The practices were still continued; again they were condemned by Benedict XIII. in 1727; by Clement XII. in 1739; by Benedict XIV. in 1744. It is well to note that Benedict XIV. solved the tremendous difficulty concerning ministrations to the despised Pariahs—a difficulty derived from the system of caste which allowed no Hindoo of another class to communicate in any way with one who had communicated with those outcasts—by ordering that certain priests should be designated for their special and exclusive service.

(1) *Ubi supra*.

with the utmost cruelty. Pope Clement XI. replied to the appeal of the Jesuits by enrolling his legate in the Sacred College; but when the *biretta* reached the prelate, he was dying, and Father Carre, the bearer of the insignia, enjoyed the greater honor of administering the last Sacraments to him (1). The apologists of the recalcitrant missionaries are fond of dilating on the alleged "imprudences" of Cardinal de Tournon; indiscretions or worse, according to these apologists, which entailed all his suffering and his premature death. Thus, Francesco Pellico, the Jesuit brother of the renowned Silvio, tells us that the legate "did not conduct himself with that prudence" which befitted the circumstances, and that therefore "he experienced many tribulations" (2). The sole "imprudence" of the patriarch was his obedience to the pontifical commands—a deference which should have extorted the admiration of Father Pellico, who could be very eloquent when he undertook to extol the obedience of his brethren to their general. Crétineau-Joly, the most ultra among the apologists of the Society, insinuates that when the patriarch refused to obey the imperial command to tolerate the Chinese Rites, he "outraged" the proper independence and dignity of the monarch; and the same Crétineau-Joly, defending the Jesuits against the Jansenistic calumny which asserted that they "were the real murderers of the cardinal" (3), complacently adduces the "neutrality" observed by the Jesuits in the contest between the papal representative and the Chinese sovereign (4). Such desperate attempts at extenuation will

(1) Not the least amusing among the innumerable audacities of Voltaire, since all France knew the history of Mgr. de Tournon well, was his representation of the prelate as an adventurer, "a Savoyard priest named Maillard, who assumed the name of Tournon." The patriarch was born in Turin, and was the second son of Victor Amadeus Maillard, Count of Tournon and Marquis of Alby. His ecclesiastical studies were made in the College of the Propaganda in Rome; and his body, brought by the vicar-apostolic, Mezzabarba, was interred in the sepulchral vaults of that institution.

(2) Thus in the open letter entitled *Francesco Pellico, of the Society of Jesus, to Vincenzo Gioberti*, p. 183. Genoa, 1845. This work, written in reply to the *Prologomeni* of Gioberti, and especially as a refutation of that philosopher's charges against the Society (accusations which were mild, if compared with the venom contained in the posterior *Modern Jesuit*), bears this epigraph at the beginning of the volume: "*Insimulari quivis innocens potest; revinci nisi nocens non potest.*"

(3) This absurd charge was formulated by Condrette, in his *General History of the Birth of the Society of Jesus*, Vol. ii., p. 285. Paris, 1760.

(4) "*Kang-Hi n'étoit pas habitué à voir douter de sa parole et de son autorité. Il ne tolérait la contradiction que par passe-temps; elle venait là sous la forme d'un outrage; il bannit de son empire Maigrot, vicare apostolique, et il ordonna de liv-*

scarcely be endorsed by the Jesuits of our day. But we would draw the attention of the reader to the judgment which Pope Clement XI. delivered when he announced the death of his legate to the Sacred College: "We have lost a most zealous friend of true religion; *an intrepid defender of the pontifical authority; a valiant vindicator of ecclesiastical discipline; a great luminary and ornament of your College.* We ourselves have lost a son, your brother, *who was exhausted by the many labors which he performed for the cause of Christ; who was crushed by the daily sufferings which afflicted him; who, like gold, was purified in a crucible—a crucible of innumerable insults which he endured with great strength of soul.* . . . We are bidden to hope by that unconquerable constancy, because of which this truly apostolic man, although fed by the bread of tribulation and the water of anguish, never failed in his duty; and because of which he withstood imprisonment and other grievous injuries bravely until the last moment of his life. *He fought a good fight; he kept the faith*" (1). Pope Clement XI. would scarcely have pronounced, in full Consistory, such a eulogy on a prelate whose character was familiar to all the cardinals, had the subject been of that calibre which has been assigned to him by the defenders of the Chinese Rites. Before we bid farewell to Cardinal de Tournon, we would note that one of the best sources of information concerning him is the Capuchin, Pierre Parisot, known in religion as Father Norbert, whose *Historical Memoirs on the Missions in the East Indies, Presented to the Supreme Pontiff, Benedict XIV.*, were praised by that perspicacious Pope, and were

rer aur Portuguais le Legat du Saint-Siege. . . . Les Jésuites resterent neutres dans cette circonstance. . . . Ils n'osèrent pas se porter médiateurs entre le monarque et le Legat." CRETINEAU-JOLY: *Religious, Political, and Literary History of the Society of Jesus*, Vol. v., ch. 1. Paris, 1846.

(1) "*Amisimus orthodoxe religionis zelatorem maximam; pontificie auctoritatis intrepidum defensorem; ecclesiastice discipline assertorem fortissimum; magnum Ordinis vestri lumen et ornamentum. Amisimus filium nostrum fratrem vestrum, plurimis quos pro Christi causa suscepit, laboribus attritum; diuturnis, quos pertulit æramnis confectum; contumeliis, quas forti magnoque animo sustinuit innumeris, velut aurum, in fornace probatum. . . . Sperare nos demum jubet invicta illa sacerdotalis roboris constantia, qua vir vere apostolicus, tametsi sustentaretur pane tribulationis et aqua angustie, officium tamen suum nunquam dimisit; ac non minus diuturne custodie injuriis, quam aliis gravissimis verationibus ad supremum usque vite spiritum fortiter toleratis, bonum certamen certavit, cursum consummarvit, fidem servavit.*" NORBERT; *Memoirs*, Vol. II., p. 6. Paris, 1742.

formally approved by Fra Carlo Maria da Perugia, Qualificator of the Holy Office, and Consultor of the Congregation of the Index. The defenders of the Chinese Rites endeavored to nullify the effect of this work by decrying the character of its author; but with small success. Another authority for the learning, zeal, and prudence of Cardinal de Tournon is one that cannot be decried. The celebrated Cardinal Passionei, than whom no man was better versed in the diplomatic, theological, and literary history of the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries; and to whose judgment the critical Pope Benedict XIV. habitually deferred; gives full evidence that the legate possessed in an eminent degree the virtues and talents which his opponents refused to discern in him (1).

Pope Clement XI. now gave to the world the decree which he had signed in 1704, and in virtue of which his legate had acted. Accompanying the pontifical mandate which was sent to all the superiors-general of the various institutes represented among the missionaries in China, were strict orders to each of those superiors to enforce obedience to the Papal prescriptions. Among the generals who promised to respect the commands of the Vicar of Christ, was Tamburini of the Jesuits; and on Nov. 20, 1710, in the presence of his assistants and of the deputies of the various provinces then assembled in the Eternal City, this head of the Society declared that he would not recognize as a Jesuit any one who would thereafter defend the permissibility of the criminated Chinese Rites. Why was this declaration of their general ignored by the immense majority of the Jesuits who were laboring in China? We must reply with Picot, that this matter is one of the things which we cannot undertake to explain. Father d'Avrigny vainly endeavors to excuse his recalcitrant brethren by a use of the same arguments which were adduced by those Jansenists whom his Society so zealously and brilliantly refuted. "These traits, and many others," remarks Picot, "are too similar to those manifested by mere partisans (and by all heresiarchs); and they are not redolent of that

(1) PASSIONEI; *Historical Memoirs Concerning the Legation and Death of Cardinal de Tournon*. Rome, 1762.

frank submission which Father d'Avrigny demands from others when different matters are involved—a submission, an example of which he should have given" (1). On March 19, 1715, Clement XI., issued his Bull *Ex illa die*, in which he stated that the decree of the pontifical legate ought to have put an end to all the dissensions concerning the Chinese Rites; but that the defenders of the ceremonies had refused to abandon them, under various pretexts, and chiefly relying on a misinterpretation of the decree of Pope Alexander VII. The Pontiff reminded the Christian world how Pope Innocent XII. had instituted a commission of theologians, among whom was the vicar-apostolic of Hon-Quang, then just returned to Europe, for an examination of the questions which the Jesuits had presented in regard to the pastoral of Mgr. Maigrot. This examination, observes the Pontiff, lasted during several years; and finally, in 1704, the condemnation of the ceremonies was issued by himself (Clement XI.), the legate in China being ordered to see that the decree was observed. On Sept. 25, 1710, continued the Pope, the Holy See confirmed the decree which, in accordance with the pontifical desire, Mgr. de Tournon, had promulgated on Jan. 25, 1707; and nevertheless, laments the Head of the Church, very many of the missionaries were still disobedient. In conclusion, therefore, in order to obviate every possible subterfuge in the future, the Pope ordered that each missionary in China should subscribe, under oath, to a formula which he would receive; and from the moment that he received that formula until the same should have been signed, no missionary should presume to exercise his priestly functions. Most of the recalcitrants yielded to this pressure; and in 1720, the Holy See despatched another legate to China who was to relieve the unfortunates from the censures which they had incurred. The chosen prelate was Charles Ambrose Mezzabarba, a referendary of the *Segnatura*, who was now raised to the dignity of patriarch of Alexandria (2). On his arrival in China, many of the Jesuits applied for

(1) *Loc. cit.*, p. 279.

(2) Pletot speaks of Mezzabarba as patriarch of Antioch; but all the contemporary documents ascribe Alexandria as the source of his titular dignity.

absolution from their censures; so also did the bishop of Macao, who had incurred excommunication by his complicity in the iniquitous treatment of the late legate.

After some difficulty, Mezzabarba obtained an audience with the Chinese sovereign; but he found that Kang-Hi had determined to meet the papal resolution with a decree banishing all Christians from his dominions. Under the very eyes of the legate, many were arrested; and the persecution was suspended only when Mezzabarba had promised to return to Europe without exercising any more acts of jurisdiction. The details of this embassy are given in the narrative published in Milan in 1739 by Viano, a Servite who had accompanied Mezzabarba. Much of Viano's account is incredible; we therefore decline to receive his assertion that the Jesuits had poisoned the mind of Kang-Hi against the legate, filling it with apprehensions lest the upholders of the pontifical decrees should prove to be rebels to the civil authority of the emperor. Mezzabarba returned to Macao; and on Nov. 4, 1721, a few days before his departure for Europe, he issued an address to the missionaries, exhorting them to persevere in fidelity to the commands of the Holy See. He declared that although it was not his intention to derogate, in any way, from the force of the Bull *Ex illa die*, nevertheless, love of peace persuaded him to yield temporarily so far as to grant certain "permissions" in the matter of the Chinese Rites. However, added the legate, these "permissions" were not to be made known to the neophytes, nor even to be translated into the Chinese or Tartar language, under pain of excommunication, *lata sententia*: these "permissions" could be used at the discretion of each missionary, according as contingencies might demand. In fine, Mezzabarba insisted that the general tenor of the pontifical prohibitions was to be held as inviolable. We note the "permissions" as they were afterward recorded in the Constitution *Ex quo singulari*, issued by Benedict XIV. on Aug. 9, 1742. I. It was allowed to the Chinese Christians to have in their domiciles the customary "tablets of the dead," inscribed merely with the name of the deceased; but on condition that all superstition and every danger of scandal were

avoided. II. Permission was given for ceremonies referring to the dead, when those ceremonies were purely civil, and therefore free from any suspicion of superstition. III. A purely civil respect was tolerated for the memory of Confucius; candles, eatables, etc., could be placed in front of his tablets. IV. Candles, incense, etc., could be used at funerals, and offered for the funeral expenses, if no superstition was intended. V. Prostrations of respect were allowed before the tablets, biers, and corpses. VI. It was permitted to place food at the side of a bier, if respect for the dead was the sole object of the act. VII. The prostration *Ko teu* before a tablet, especially on the Chinese feast of the New Year, was allowed. VIII. As in the case of biers and graves, so candles and incense could be used before tablets which were not redolent of superstition. These "permissions," as we have observed, were not to be made known indiscriminately to the neophytes, lest in their simplicity those converts might form an idea that all the Chinese ceremonies were laudable; nay, the "permissions" could not be communicated to others than missionaries—*aut cuiquam qui missionarius non esset eam palam faceret.*" But in defiance of this explicit prohibition, the bishop of Peking, a Jesuit, availed himself of the concessions to convey the impression that they manifested the mind of the Holy See in regard to the entire matter of the Chinese Rites; that, in fine, they equivalently proclaimed that the rebellious course of the Jesuits had been approved by the representative of the Roman Pontiff. The prelate of Peking even dared to emit two pastorals, dated July 6, and Dec. 23, 1723, in which he enjoined on his clergy, under pain of suspension *ipso facto*, to interpret the Bull *Ex illa die* as fully explained by the "permissions." These pastorals were condemned by Clement XII. in 1735.

According to the Continuator of Alexandre's *Ecclesiastical History*, in their day there were preserved in the Archives of the Propaganda documents which showed that on Aug. 29, 1723, Pope Innocent XIII. sent for Tamburini, the general of the Jesuits, and after expressing his indignation because of the persistent disobedience of the members of the Society who were laboring in China, told the general that the Sec-

retary of State would inform him as to what His Holiness required of him. Pursuing their narrative, the Continuator says that when Tamburini waited on the Secretary, he learned that if he wished the Society to exist any longer, he should promise as follows: I. All the Jesuits would reverently observe the provisions of the Clementine Constitution *Ex illa die*. II. If any of the Jesuits should refuse this submission, he would immediately summon them to Rome. III. Within three years the Holy See was to receive authentic proof of the persevering obedience of the Jesuit missionaries to the papal commands. IV. From that day no new members were to be received into the Society. V. No more Jesuits, and no more seculars who would join the Society upon their arrival in China, could be sent to the Chinese missions. VI. The Jesuits then in China were to be ordered to remain at their posts; but they were to perform no missionary work until further orders from the Holy See reached them. VII. The general was to revoke the faculties possessed by certain inferior officers of the Society, whereby they were empowered to send members to the Orient. VIII. Since it was well known that the Jesuits of Pekin had procured the imprisonment of certain missionaries, the general would try to effect the liberation of those missionaries. IX. The general would warn all his subjects never again to dare to disregard the Constitutions emitted by the Apostolic See. X. Father Nicholas Giampriano would never leave Rome without the permission of the Pope. The Continuator says that Tamburini signed a promise to observe these injunctions, and that the document was countersigned by his assistants, on Sept. 13, 1723 (1). But whether or not this testimony of the Continuator of Alexandre be true, it is certain that Popes Benedict XIII. and Clement XII. found no less obstinacy in the recalcitrant Jesuits than their predecessors had experienced since the beginning of the controversy. When Clement XII. condemned the pastoral of the bishop of Pekin, he announced that he reserved to the Apostolic See the right to determine the true significance of the "permissions" accord-

(1) *Supplement to the Ecclesiastical History of Noel Alexandre*, pt. 2, Diss. 4. Bingen, 1791.

ed by the papal legate, Mezzabarba—"permissions" which the rebellious missionaries still adduced in justification of their audacity. Death prevented Clement XII. from accomplishing his design; but on July 11, 1742, Benedict XIV. promulgated his Constitution *Ex quo singulari*, in which, after a detailed narrative of all that his immediate predecessors had effected, and all else that they had attempted, in the matter of the Chinese Rites, he declared that when the patriarch of Alexandria granted the "permissions" which had been so impudently abused, the said legate of the Apostolic See merely used "a sort of economy which was necessary in the circumstances, and which he would have abandoned, had he been able to discuss the matter with learned men who were zealous for the purity of Christian worship, and who were faithful to the Apostolic decisions." Then referring to the bishop of Pekin, the Pontiff solemnly reprobated that prelate's interpretation of the "permissions"—an interpretation which indicated that the position assumed by the recalitrants was justifiable (1). Finally, His Holiness pronounced the "permissions" superstitious; and declared

(1) We give the text of this passage: "*Quum autem patriarcha Alexandrinus in præcællata pastorali mentem suam satis prudenter explicuisset, nimirum pastoralis sue epistolæ nōtia opus non esse ad promovendum in neophytis erga pontificia decreta venerationem et observantiam, quum satis esset ut juxta Constitutionis Pontificiæ mandata in viâ salutis dirigerentur; præterea quum omnibus interdictum voluisset, sub pœna quoque excommunicationis late sententiâ, ut quis illam in Sinensium aut Tartaricam sermonem verteret, aut cuiquam qui missionarius non esset eam palam faceret; de permissionibus autem quum statuisset non nisi caute, et ubi tantum utilitas vel necessitas id postularet, esse evulgandas; profecto omnis, ad quem pastoralis illa epistola dirigeretur, ex tali procedendi modo haud obscure inferre debebat quantis ille animi angustiis obsessus, et quam anceps et perperus in permissionibus hujusmodi proponendis extitisset; adeo ut æconomia quædam usus fuisset ad loci et temporis circumstantias prorsus necessaria; a qua putandum est cum recessurum fuisse, si libertas sibi data esset rem discutendi cum episcopis aliisque doctis viris qui nihil aliud quam Christiani cultus puritatem, et Apostolicæ Constitutionis observantiam ante oculos haberent. At permissiones illæ contra expressam adeo patriarchæ ipsius voluntatem evulgate, et quod mirum, Pekini episcopus per binas suas pastorales mandavit, sub pœna suspensionis ipso facto incurrendæ, universis diocesis sue missionariis ut observarent et observari præciperent. Constitutionem *Ex illa Dei* juxta permissiones quas ipse contendeat ad ea potissimum referri quæ in præcællata Constitutione fuerat solemniter interdicta; præcepit insuper ut Christi fideles quater singulis annis in diebus omnium celeberrimis distincte instruerentur quum in his quæ a patriarchæ Alexandrini pastoralis permittantur. Clemens Papa XII., prædecessor noster, tam auctor episcopi Pekinensis factum æquo animo ferre haud potens, muneri suo maxime interesse binas illas epistolas damnare, ac penitus reprobare, Apostolico Brevi quod anno 1735 promulgavit."*

that they "should be as though they never had been" (1). The intimation of punishment for the refractory is as follows: "If any of the regular missionaries of the Society of Jesus, or of any other order, congregation, or institute, refuse—which God forbid!—exact, full, absolute, inviolable, and strict obedience to all that which is prescribed in this Constitution, we command their superiors, both provincial and general, and in virtue of holy obedience, to remove such contumacious and reprobate men from the missions without delay, to call them to Europe, and to inform us of the fact, so that we may punish them according to the degree of their crime. If any of the aforesaid provincial or general superiors do not obey this our command, or are slow in obeying it, we shall not hesitate in proceeding also against them, even, among other punishments, depriving them forever of the privilege or faculty of sending any members of their order to the missions" (2). We

(1) "*Nolentes itaque quemquam ad Constitutionem ipsam summo Christiane religionis damno malitiose evterendam permissionibus ejusmodi uti, declinamus ac declaramus præfatas permissiones ita esse habendas ac si nunquam extitissent, earumque prærim tanquam superstitiosas omnino damnamus et execramur.*"

(2) "*Ex prædictorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ cardinalium consilio, motu quoque proprio, ac certa scientia, maturaque deliberatione, tum etiam de plenitudine Apostolicæ potestatis, Constitutionis presentis tenore, in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ præcipimus et expresse mandamus omnibus et singulis archiepiscopis et episcopis in Sinarum imperio aliisque regnis sive finitimis sive adjacentibus nunc existentibus, aut olim pro tempore futuris, sub penis suspensionis a pontificatum exercitio, et ab ecclesiæ ingressu interdicti, eorum vero officialibus et vicariis in spiritalibus generalibus, aliisque eorumdem locorum ordinariis vicariis, tum etiam eorum provinciarum, et insuper missionariis universis tam secularibus quam regularibus, ejuscumque ordinis, congregationis, instituti, etiam Societatis Jesu, sub penis privationis quarumcumque quibus gaudent facultatum, et suspensionis ab exercitio eorum animarum, tum etiam suspensionis a divinis ipso facto incurrerendæ absque alia declaratione, demum excommunicationis lætæ sententiæ, a qua non possint nisi a nobis et a Romano Pontifice pro tempore existente absolvi, præter quam in articulo mortis constituti, addita quoad regulares etiam vocis activæ et passivæ privationis pena, præcipimus et districte mandamus ut omnia et singula que in hæc nostra Constitutione continentur, exacte, integre, absolute, inviolabiliter, atque immobiliter, non modo ipsi observent, sed etiam omni conatu ac studio ea ipsa observari curent a singulis et universis qui quoquomodo ad eorum curam et regimen spectant; nec colore, causa, occasione, seu prætextu aliquo huic nostræ Constitutioni ulla in parte contraire aut adversari audeant vel præsumant. Præterea quoad missionarios regulares ejuscumque ordinis congregationis, instituti, ac Societatis quoque Jesu, si quis eorum (quod Deus avertat!) exactam integram, absolutam, inviolabilem, strictamque obedientiam denegaverit iis que a nobis presentis hujus Constitutionis tenore statuuntur ac præcipiuntur, eorum superioribus tam provincialibus quam generalibus in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ expresse mandamus, ut homines hujusmodi contumaces, perditos, ac refractarios a missionibus absque ulla more dimoveant, eosque in Europam statim revocent, ac de illis notitiam nobis exhibeant, ut eos pro gravitate criminis punire valeamus. Quod si prædicti superiores provinciales aut generales huic nostro præcepto minus obtemper-*

subjoin the form of the oath which, in accordance with this Constitution of Pope Benedict XIV., each missionary in China was ordered to take, ere he could exercise his functions: "I, N., a missionary sent to China by the Apostolic See or by my superiors in accordance with the faculties given to them by the same Apostolic See, have clearly understood and shall fully and faithfully obey the mandate of the Holy See concerning the Chinese Rites, which is contained in the Constitution of Pope Clement XI. which treats of that matter, and which is prescribed in the formula of this present oath. I shall observe it exactly, absolutely, and inviolably; fulfilling its injunctions without any tergiversation; and I shall strive with all my power to induce the same obedience on the part of all the Chinese Christians whose spiritual direction may be committed to my care. Furthermore, if I can prevent them, I shall never allow the Chinese Christians to avail themselves of the 'permissions' which were accorded at Macao on Nov. 4, 1721, in the pastoral letter of the patriarch of Alexandria, and which have been condemned by our Most Holy Pontiff, Pope Benedict XIV. And if I should ever fail in this promise (which God forbid!), I shall proclaim myself, on each occasion of such failure, as subject to all the penalties imposed in the aforesaid Constitutions. Thus I promise, vow, and swear on the Gospels of God" (1). The majority of the hitherto refractory Jesuits now yielded to the exhortations and menaces of the Vicar of Christ; and in a few years the

averint, aut in eo desides fuerint, nos contra ipsos quoque procedere non recusabimus, atque inter cetera mittendi aliquem ex ipsorum ordine in earum regionum missiones privilegio seu facultate eos perpetuo privabimus."

(1) "Ego, N., missionarius ad Sinus (vel ad regnum N.), a Sede Apostolica vel a superioribus meis juxta facultates eis a Sede Apostolica concessas missus vel destinatus precepto ac mandato Apostolico super ritibus ac ceremoniis Sinensibus in Constitutione Clementis Papæ XI. hæc de re edita, qua presentis juramenti formula præscripta est contenta, ac mihi per integram ejusdem Constitutionis lecturam apprime noto plene ac fideliter pareo; illudque exacte, absolute, ac inviolabiliter observabo, et absque ulla tergiversatione adimplebo; atque pro virili enitar ut a Christianis Sinensibus, quorum spirituales directionem quoquomodo me habere contigerit, similis obedientia præstetur. Ac insuper, quantum in me est, nunquam patiar ut ritus et ceremonie Sinenses in literis pastoralibus Patriarchæ Alexandrini Macæi datis die IV. Novembris, 1721, permissæ, ac a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Benedicto Papa XIV. damnatæ, ab eisdem Christianis ad præxim deducantur. Si autem quod Deus avertat! quoquomodo contraxerim, toties quoties id venerit, parvis per prædictas Constitutiones impositis me subiectum agnosco et declaro. Ita tactis Evangelistiis promitto, voveo, et juro. Sic me Deus adjuvet, et hæc sanctissima Dei Evangelia. Ego, N., manu propria."

Controversy on the Chinese Rites was happily relegated to the domain of Ecclesiastical History.

CHAPTER XI.

HETERODOXIES OF RUSSIAN "ORTHODOXY."

Many misconceptions concerning the Greek Schism and its offshoots have found lodgment in the minds of Western people, especially in the minds of the people of the United States of North America. Until recently very few Russian or other Oriental Schismatics came to our shores, and very few even of our more educated Americans have cared to know anything about their spiritual condition and religious history. Then we have been accustomed to hear that the Russian Church "is almost Catholic;" or that "it is Catholic in everything, save the Pope;" or the real truth that "it has a true episcopate and a true priesthood, the Holy Mass and all the Seven Sacraments;" and the more simple-minded among American Catholics have come to believe implicitly, certainly not explicitly, that perhaps after all the poor Schismatics are about as well off spiritually as is the obedient flock of him to whom Our Lord and Saviour said: "Feed my sheep!" Again, comparatively few among us have had anything like an accurate notion of the meaning of the word "Schism," unless in its philological sense; and hence it seemed quite natural to think of a Russian as only or *merely* a Schismatic, one who might not be on the straight road which Christ indicated as leading to heaven, but who, at any rate, skirted the road, and who, with a little care, might avoid the ditches at its sides. We heard, now and then, of some unfortunate priest who disobeyed his bishop, and who, followed by some poor ignoramuses or perhaps by some problematical Catholics, set up a little "Catholic Church" of his own. We pitied the poor schismatics, and in time we saw them all returning to the obedience of him who was commissioned by the Vicar of Christ; but in all such instances we failed to apprehend the deep significance of the term "Schismatic" in the sense

in which it is applied to, and deserved by, the "separated churches of the East." The great misery of all the Oriental Schismatic churches, including the Russian, the principal one, is found in the stubborn fact that each of them is historically and theologically *heretical*. The poor man, or set of men, who simply refuse to obey the authority divinely established in the Church, may be merely *schismatical*; but they who absolutely deny the supremacy of the successors of Peter are heretics purely and simply, since they deny an article of Catholic faith. Again, the "Orthodox" Russian Church is heretical because it denies the Catholic dogmas of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and from the Son*; of the existence of Purgatory; of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady; and of the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff. The time was when there was no great need for an accurate perception of this truth by the Catholics of this republic; but now that large numbers of Russian and Greek Schismatics are dwelling among us, too frequently mixing with our Catholic congregations, and not seldom causing dissension among them (whether as emissaries of the Holy Synod or not, we are unaware); now, we insist, our people should be taught the wicked absurdity of which they would be guilty, were they to palliate the heinousness of rending the seamless garment of Christ by the cherishing of such a thought as that expressed in the asseveration: "The Russian Church is *merely schismatical*." Reflections such as these have prompted us to dilate to some extent on the heterodoxies of which Russian "Orthodoxy" is culpable, and upon some of the flagrant inconsistencies into which its heretical blindness and obstinacy have led it.

One of the principal grievances of Russian "Orthodoxy" against the Roman Church is found in the fact that the Mother Church administers the Sacrament of Baptism by "infusion" instead of by "immersion." For the Russian, as well as the Constantinopolitan Schismatic theology, holds that immersion is *probably* of the very essence of valid baptism; and therefore, say all the separatist Eastern Christians, the efficacy of the Roman rite of baptism is at the best problematical. Thus, in the reply to Gagarin's *Will*

Russia Æccome Catholic? written by Karatheodori, physician to the Sultan of Turkey, under the title of *Orthodoxy and Popery*, we are told that "the baptism of the Latins is not a true baptism," although, according to the medical theologian, "it may be adopted in case of urgent necessity." Gagarin, one of the most learned and judicious of the modern converts from the Russian Establishment, informs us that this same doctrine is inculcated in many works which have received the approbation of the Russian Holy Synod; and we know that after the rupture of the reunion of the Eastern Schismatics with the Catholic Church which the Council of Florence had effected in 1436, and after the deposition of Isidore, the Muscovite patriarch who had signed the Act of Reunion, his successor decreed: "The Russians must rebaptize all Roman converts to their faith, since the Westerns baptize only by infusion, a condemnable practice which renders the rite null and void." But, strange to say, in the face of this opinion of the Holy "Orthodox" Church, and despite the tremendous importance of Baptism in the minds of Russian theologians, it is not the custom of the "Orthodox" clergy to insist on a rebaptism, even on a conditional one, of such Catholics and Protestants as embrace the Photian Schism. None of the German Protestant princesses who enter the imperial Russian family, not even the one who becomes Czarina, is asked to submit to what "Orthodoxy" pronounces essential to her status as a Christian; she is simply required to declare her adhesion to the Holy "Orthodox" Church of Russia, even though there is very great probability that, owing to the not uncommon carelessness of Protestants in the essentials of the baptismal rite, the "converted" lady is a mere Pagan. The clergy of Holy Russia are not shaken out of their supineness by the fact that some day the possibly Pagan Czarina, like that Princess of Anhalt-Zerbst who became the infamous Catharine II., may become in time the Russian Pope as supreme mistress of their Holy Synod. They know that the lecherous "Semiramis of the North" was not rebaptized when she married Peter III.; and the fairly well-read among them know that Catharine avowed to the sycophantic philo-

sophist, Voltaire, that the Russian Church does not rebaptize its converts from Catholicism or from Protestantism (1). In our own day there have been instances of wholesale so-called "conversions" to the Russian Establishment on the part of Polish Catholics, thanks to the knout, the bayonet, starvation, fear of Siberia, and, above all, to treachery and chicanery (2); and in no instance were these "converts" rebaptized, thanks to Peter the Great, the institutor of the Holy Synod, who by virtue of his autocratic power abrogated the decree of the Patriarch Jonas, thus opening to many a perhaps unbaptized Protestant the way to the priesthood and even the episcopate in the Russian Church. It is worthy of remark that the more intellectual among the "Orthodox" clergy have frequently appreciated the significance of this inconsistency, especially when they reflected on the more consistent practice of the clergy of the Constantinopolitan Schismatic Patriarchate, from which they pretend to derive their origin, and with which they communicate; they have endeavored to explain away the contradiction in a very curious fashion. Thus, in the *Causérie Ecclesiastique*, a periodical published by the Ecclesiastical Academy of St. Petersburg under the very eyes of the Holy Synod, we read in the issue of September 17, 1866: "The Greek Church (Schismatic) admits willingly the *validity* of baptism given by infusion; but it demands from converted Latins a new baptism in order that it may draw a well-defined line of demarcation between the Greeks and the Latins—in fact, the Greek Church so dreads a possible reconciliation with Rome that it has thought it wise to make the Greeks believe that the Latins are in no sense Christians." It is amusing to note that the famous William Palmer (3), while still involved

(1) On December 27, 1773, O. S. (January 7, 1774), Catharine wrote to Voltaire, who had alluded to his impression that the "Orthodox" rebaptized their converts from other Christian denominations: "As head of the Russian Church I cannot allow you to persist in this mistake. We do not rebaptize."

(2) See our Vol. v., ch. 3.

(3) William Palmer, one of the luminaries of the Oxford Movement, characterized by Dean Church as "a man of exact and scholastic mind, well equipped at all points in controversial theology," was perhaps most famous for his attempt to effect a union between the Russian and the Anglican Establishments. His efforts resulted only in his being told by the Greco-Slavonic heretics that he should be reconciled with his own patriarch, ere he extended the olive-branch to the separatist patriarchates of the Orient. He became a Catholic in 1856.

in the mazes of the English Royal Establishment, discovered that if he wished to become a Constantinopolitan Schismatic, a trip to St. Petersburg would dispense him from a rebaptism. "There is a way out of the difficulty," he opined, "a trip to St. Petersburg will settle the matter. I can join the Russian Church without being rebaptized; then I can go to Constantinople, and since the 'Orthodox' and the Greek (Schismatic) Churches communicate, I can be admitted to the sacraments and even to the priesthood at the hands of His Greek Œcumenicity" (1).

No less striking than that in reference to baptism is the inconsistency of the Russian "Orthodox" Church in regard to the dissolubility of matrimony. According to the olden doctrine of that Church, just as according to that of its pretended source, the Schismatic Greek Church, a consummated Christian marriage can be dissolved only because of adultery; but in practice there are now one hundred and ninety-five cases in which the tie of marriage may be nullified. One of the most interesting modern instances of this flagrant inconsistency was that of the divorce of the Grand Duke Constantine, brother of Alexander I., from his wife, Anna Feodorowna. Not a soul breathed a word against the matrimonial fidelity of the princess; the state of her health compelled her to live apart from her husband; and he had fallen in love with the Countess Grudzinska. On March 20 (April 2), 1820, Alexander I. made known to all his subjects that the Holy Synod, "relying on the precise text of the thirty-fifth Canon of St. Basil the Great, declared that the marriage of the Grand Duke and Czarwitsch, Constantine Paulowitch, with the Grand Duchess, Anna Feodorowna, was dissolved, and that he was free to contract a new marriage." It would be interesting to know how many members of this Holy Synod, this servile creature of the autocrat, were acquainted with the life of one of the glories of the Greek Church—St. Theodore Studita, who flourished at a period when the Eastern Churches were still devotedly attached to the communion of the Apostolic See. When the Greek emperor, Constantine VI. (Porphyrogeni-

(1) See Palmer's *Eastern Question*, p. 10.

tus), having discarded his wife and contracted a "marriage" with his concubine, Theodota, was upheld by a conciliabulum of courtier prelates like those who are the slaves of the Protasoffs, etc., of our day, Theodore protested against the legalized adultery; and from his dungeon he wrote to the Father of the Faithful, Pope St. Leo III.: "Since Our Lord Jesus Christ confided the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven to Peter, and afterward conferred on him the dignity of Prince of the Apostles, it is our duty to make known to the successor of Peter such innovations as are introduced into the Church of God. . . . Oh divine superior of all superiors! There has been formed here, according to the expression of Jeremiah, an assembly of prevaricators and a meeting of adulterers." But the members of the Holy Synod were then, as they have ever been and still are, of calibre diametrically contrary to that of the Studita; as for the support which they pretended to find in a Canon of St. Basil, it is evident that just as in the case of the Grand Duke there was no question of adultery, so in the adduced canon there was no question of divorce, but simply one of a more or less grave ecclesiastical censure to be visited on spouses who separated "from bed and board" (1). But instances like this of Constantine Paulowitch are insignificant when compared with the consequences of a ukase of Nicholas I. permitting new marriages to all Catholic wives whose husbands had been sent or would be sent to Siberia, to prison, or to forced labor in the mines—providing, of course, that they would promise to raise their children, future and already-born, in the Church of the State. The reader who has accompanied us in our investigations into the martyrdom

(1) Cardinal Pitra gives the text of this Canon in his *History and Monuments of the Ecclesiastical Law of the Greeks*, Vol. 1. p. 592 :

Ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ καταλειφθέντος ἀνδρὸς ὑπὸ τῆς γυναίκος, τὴν αἰτίαν χρὴ σκοπεῖν τῆς ἐγκαταλείψεως· κὰν φανῆ ἀλόγως ἀναχωρήσασα, ὃ μὲν συγγνώμης ἐστὶν ἄξιος, ἢ δὲ ἐπιτιμίου· ἢ δὲ συγγνώμῃ τοῦτῳ πρὸς τὸ κοινωνεῖν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ δοθήσεται.

The following is a free but accurate translation : " If a man has been abandoned by his wife, the reason for the abandonment must be investigated ; and if there seems to have been no just reason, the husband will deserve indulgence, while the wife will merit punishment, the indulgence toward the husband consisting in his not being segregated from the communion of the Church." The judicious Oratorian, Lescœur, in his valuable work entitled *The Church in Poland* (Paris, 1876), tells us that he compared the Greek text with the Slavonic of the *Kniga Pravil*, or Book of Canons of the Russian Church, and with the *Korvutehaia Kniga*, used by the Holy Synod in 1820, and that he found the three versions agreed.

of Poland from the days of Voltaire's "St. Catharine" to the advent of the present Czar, and who is therefore able to appreciate the iniquities of the great majority of the "criminals" who have languished in Russian penal establishments, will understand how widespread would have been the desolation if most of the Polish women had not been worthy of their Catholic ancestors (1). We would merely note that by the provisions of his matrimonial ukase Nicholas I. simply enforced the principles of modern Liberalism regarding the competency of the State, and the incompetency of the Church, in matrimonial causes—principles which an American proconsul has recently actuated in Cuba, in illustration of the beauties of a new "civilization," and which were interpreted for the benefit of Pope Gregory XVI. by Count Gourieff, Russian Ambassador at the Vatican, when in a memorial *ad hoc* presented to the Pontiff in May, 1833, he impudently asserted that "the pretensions of the Catholic Church in regard to matrimony constitute an attack on the prerogatives of the State, and that the efforts of the Roman Court in behalf of those pretensions are mere attempts to actuate certain enactments of ancient Councils *which have now fallen into desuetude.*" Such inanities as these of the little diplomat call for no attention. Let us rather use some of our limited space for a few observations on the manner in which the Canon Law of "Orthodoxy" came to recognize the one hundred and ninety-five causes for dissolution of matrimony which are unknown to the Divine and to the original Russian Ecclesiastical Law. In every age of the Christian era, just as in the days of the Old Law and of Gentile Paganism, the conflict between the ecclesiastical and the civil power has been perennial; and such it will be until the end of time, since the average human ruler will ever refuse to act as though he recognized that between him and his subjects there is always extended the ordaining and guiding hand of God. Rulers like Charlemagne, St. Edward, St. Louis IX. and Garcia Moreno are seldom granted, even to Christian peoples. Thus the Eastern Emperors, even while the Eastern Patriarchates were still devotedly

(1) See our Vol. v., ch. 3.

bound to the Chair of Peter in ecclesiastical and filial communion, frequently pretended to a right to arrange matrimonial causes according to their momentary whims. Justinian, by his *Novella 117*, admitted six reasons for divorce in favor of a husband and five in favor of a wife, in spite of the fact that even the Eastern Church, when it mistakenly relied on a false interpretation of certain verses of St. Matthew, allowed divorce only in the case of adultery. Then, just as in later days in the case of the United Greeks, the Holy See could only protest, and exclaim: "*Ipsi viderint.*" But the condemnation was launched against this violation of the law of God, and the obstinate and puerile Orientals could enjoy such satisfaction as may be derived from continuing a practice which is reprobated by the Vicar of Christ. In time the sins of the Lower Empire merited for it the usurpation of Photius, the imperial sword-bearer; and when governmental brute force had detached the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate from the communion of the Catholic Church, the intruder compiled a new code of Canon Law which he designated as a *Nomocanon*, and in which he incorporated all the *Novellae* of Justinian. From that day the canonists of the Constantinopolitan Schism, and those of all the derivatives of that Schism, have accorded a place, aye, even the first place, to the matrimonial ordinances of a civil government. Nor should we forget that Photius augmented the matrimonial consequences of the Justinian *Novella* by the addition of three new causes for divorce; for that matter, the Canon Law of the Walachian Greek Schismatics admits three others. And we must note that the most recent Collection of Canon Law received by the Schismatic Greeks, the one compiled by Rhalli, the president of the Athenian Arcopagus, under the auspices of the Holy Synod of the governmental Hellenic Church (1856), opens with the *Nomocanon* of the disreputable Photius, and eulogizes the reprobate in most extravagant terms. From these observations the reader will understand the readiness with which the Holy Synod recognized the Nicholaite one hundred and ninety-five causes for the dissolution of the matrimonial tie, when it failed to breathe a word of disapproval of them,

and allowed the "Orthodox" clergy to bless the unions which were contracted in accordance with the imperial dispensations. It is true that these privileges of Satan were ostensibly granted to the Poles alone; but we fail to comprehend how an autocrat can possess religious jurisdiction over one portion of his "thrice blessed subjects," and not over all of them. Nor can it be said that the case of the hundred and ninety-five dissolving causes was a matter of the civil law. In Russia the civil and ecclesiastical law emanate from the same source; the civil and ecclesiastical autocrat cannot be supposed to regard his civil and his ecclesiastical enactments as mutually destructive; and when the "Orthodox" priests perform a religious rite with the consent of the Holy Synod, that tribunal must be supposed to approve the act (1). However, we cannot drop this subject of Russian Cæsarian usurpation in matters of matrimony without an admission that in our day there have been many abuses by Polish Catholics in the matter of divorce; there have been adduced nullifying reasons which had been deliberately ignored by the contracting parties at the time of the marriages. But we must remember that in the premises there is one great difference between the conduct of the "Orthodox" Schismatics and that of the Catholic Church, namely, the protestation which the latter, when suffering because of human passions, never fails to emit. The Catholic Church is never derelict in this matter, even though the blood of her bishops and priests must necessarily flow in consequence of her steadfastness. In 1830, when Poland still had a semblance of a National Diet, that assembly heard the courageous protests of the Polish bishops against the frequent violations of the Ecclesiastical Canons in matrimonial causes, and it was in spite of those protests that supposedly nullifying reasons were relegated to the consideration of the civil tribunals, and that the apostolic zeal of Gutkowski, Bishop of Podlachia, and of Skorkowski, Bishop of Cracow, entailed upon them dismissal from the capital before the dissolution of the Diet.

(1) For details concerning the matter of imperial interference in matrimonial causes in the days of the Eastern Empire, the reader may profitably consult Perrone's *Christian Matrimony*, Vol. iii., p. 397, et seqq. Rome, 1858.

The great "reformer" of the Muscovite Church, and also its greatest robber, was the Czar, Ivan the Terrible; and according to him the foulest error of the "Western heretics" was the shaving of the beard. In an edict which this Head of the "Orthodox" Church issued in 1551, being unaware that another Russian Supreme Pontiff, the "great" Peter, would one day enact the contrary, he proclaimed that "the effusion of a martyr's blood would not atone for this crime." However, with all due respect to the memory of the terrible Ivan, the modern clergy of Holy Russia agree with their cousins of the Schismatic Constantinopolitan Patriarchate and with the derivative Churches of that separatist organization, in the declaration that the prime justification of the Photian rebellion must be found in the fact that the Roman Pontiffs had confirmed the "heretical" teaching according to which the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* from the Son. In fact, the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *alone* is the cardinal dogma of the "Orthodox" belief. And nevertheless, in the most important official act which the Russian Establishment has performed in modern times, namely, the declaration of the Holy Synod dated March 25, 1839, whereby certain apostates from Catholicism, a few United Greek bishops of Lithuania, were received into the communion of the Russian Establishment, no recantation of "the most damnable Latin heresy" was demanded from the "converts." The sole requisite for an admission to the yearning embrace of Holy Russia was a renunciation of obedience to the Pope of Rome. Listen to the text of the Synodal declaration: "Their solemn profession that Our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, is alone the veritable Head of the One and True Church, and their promise to persevere in unity with the holy orthodox patriarchs of the East and with this Holy Synod, leave nothing for us to demand from these members of the United Greek Church in order to effect their true and essential union in the faith; and therefore nothing prohibits their hierarchical reunion with us. Therefore the Holy Synod, by virtue of the grace and power given to it by God the Father, by Our Saviour Jesus Christ, and by the Holy Ghost, has resolved

and decreed," etc. And then the Holy Synod warns the "converted" prelates not to trouble their flocks, whom they hoped to drag with themselves into the vortex of the schism, with questions of merely "local significance," things which "involve neither dogma nor sacraments." Can it be that the Holy Synod would have asked the innocent and ignorant to believe that an exterior and public manifestation of the nature of the belief in the Procession of the Holy Ghost was a mere matter of "local significance, which involved no dogma?" Truly this act of the Holy Synod was both cowardly and (according to its faith, if it had any) sacrilegious; and when the brigandage of Chelm, which we have elsewhere described, almost destroyed the remnants of the United Greek Church in Russia, there was observed what the powers of darkness must have regarded as the same "prudent silence." How different this course from that pursued by the Holy, Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church, which receives no convert into its pale, let the person be ever so humble or ever so exalted, until he or she has abjured not only every dogmatic error in general, but also the specific errors of the forsaken creed!

Plato, metropolitan of Moscow, probably the most illustrious churchman whom Russian "Orthodoxy" has produced during the nineteenth century, was once asked by a Western concerning the teaching of his Church on Purgatory; and the prelate replied: "We reject the doctrine of Purgatory as a modern invention, excogitated probably for the sake of money" (1). And this assertion, a delectable morsel for the average Protestant, is dinned into the ears of every "Orthodox" student, despite the notorious fact that almost the principal revenue of the Russian priests is derived from prayers for the dead, and although the Russian *Particular Cathchism*, the work of Philarete, metropolitan of Moscow, inculcates the propriety and even the necessity of that practice.

Not the least strange among the inconsistencies of Russian "Orthodoxy" is the hostility which it manifested toward the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

(1) LESCEUR: *The Church in Poland*, Vol. II., p. 504.

of Our Lady; it is strange indeed, since the principal monuments of the Eastern Church are so redolent of testimonies in favor of the doctrine, that it may well be said that if Pius IX. had proclaimed its contrary, the Holy Synod would have denounced him as a heretic *ex alio capite*. However, the author of "Orthodoxy and Popery" avers that in the dogmatic definition of Mary's great prerogative, the Roman Church "manifested its unbridled love of change, of movement, and of innovations in the domain of a faith which is eternally unchangeable by its very nature." And, nevertheless, this author tells us that according to the Eastern Church the Blessed Virgin "was exempt from the effects of original sin"—an avowal which is so true, that any reader of the Bull *Incffabilis Deus* will perceive that His Holiness relies chiefly on the testimony of the Eastern Fathers for the establishment of his thesis. This same "Orthodox" author knew very well that one of the chief complaints of the Russian Starovere heretics against the Holy Synod is to the effect that this would-be authoritative tribunal renounced, in 1655, the ancient belief of the Christian East in the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God. The same author must have remembered that in the seventeenth century the ecclesiastical Academy of Kiev, speaking through Lazarus Baranowitch, Bishop of Tchernigow, regarded that doctrine as indubitably true (1); and we can scarcely imagine that the Academy could have deemed otherwise when it was accustomed to hear, among other and innumerable evidences furnished by the Russian Liturgy, that passage of the Office for the Nativity of the Virgin: "We proclaim and celebrate thy birth, and we honor thy Immaculate Conception."

We shall merely touch the manner with which the "Orthodox" Church treats the secret of the confessional. The awfulness of the subject, and the notoriousness of the sins of "Orthodoxy" in this regard, excuse us from dilation on the matter. In 1854 Snagoano, a Greek archimandrite, who gloried in his communion with "the holy patriarchs of the Orient," published in Paris a work on *The Religious Ques-*

(1) GAGARIN; *The Russian Church and the Immaculate Conception*. Paris, 1876.

tion in the East, from which we cull the following passages: "The Russian Church is simply a schism, because it has separated from the great Eastern Church; because it does not recognize the Patriarch of Constantinople as its head; because it does not receive the Holy Unction from Byzantium; because it is ruled by a Synod, over which the Czar is a despot. . . . and because Confession, instituted for the betterment and the salvation of penitents, has become, through the servility of the Muscovite clergy, a mere instrument of espionage in the interest of Czarism." That this accusation is well founded has been demonstrated for the enlightenment of those who have had no extensive experience in Russia, by Tondini (1), and by the "Orthodox" author of *The Raskol* (2). The latter writer tells us that "there is an ordinance which compels each priest to reveal to the government every plot against it which may come to his knowledge in the confessional." And this ordinance is in accordance with a ukase issued by Peter "the Great" on February 17, 1722, enjoining the taking of the following oath upon every priest of the "Orthodox" Church: "I will denounce and reveal (all conspiracies) with entire truthfulness and without any disguise or palliation, having in my mind the fear of losing my honor and my life." Certainly the term "inconsistency" is too mild to serve as a qualification of such sacrilege on the part of the priests of a Church which holds, at least theoretically, the same views concerning Sacramental Confession that are taught by the Church of Rome. However, this abject cowardice and diabolical treachery is but natural in an organization in which the civil power takes no pains to disguise its tyranny over the ecclesiastical, and in which the clergy manifest no shame because of their grovelling, but rather consider it a matter of course that they should give to the autocrat the blind obedience of a soldier.

The "Orthodox" Church claims to be a divinely instituted organization, empowered to labor for the eternal salvation of men, and resolved to accomplish its task in spite of the

(1) In his commentary on *The Ecclesiastical Regulation of Peter the Great*, p. 248.

(2) *The Raskol; An Essay on the Religious Sects in Russia*, p. 236. Paris, 1859.

influence of earthly power, when that power is hostile to its objects. Did it not claim such origin, endowment, and intention, it could not present itself as the Church of God. We pass, for the present, the matter of the origin of the Russian Ecclesiastical Establishment; now we would briefly consider its course when it finds itself confronted by the civil power. "It would be easy," remarks Lescœur, "and it has been done a thousand times, to multiply proofs of the absolute degradation of the Russian sacerdotal order in its relations with the government. Were we to examine all the grades of the hierarchy, from the pretended Holy Synod which is servile when it is silent, and more servile when it speaks, down to the humblest village pope; from the Universities and the privileged convents where are trained the few distinguished governmental candidates for bishoprics, or for diplomatic posts, or for the general run of the public offices, down to the miserable convents of men or of women, in which there languish wretched beings without piety or charity, and which are inevitably homes of ignorance and vice; everywhere we would find the same conditions produced by the same cause—the subordination, or rather the absolute effacement of the religious element, absorbed by the civil power" (1). Even in purely theological matters, the "Orthodox" episcopate and priesthood have seldom or never been able, if willing in rare instances, to withstand the governmental pressure. When Peter "the Great," following the counsels of the Genevan, Lefort, to whom he owed the invention of the Holy Synod, tried to demi-Protestantize his Church, he found his clergy, his seminarians, and even his bishops, so subservient, that when the Lutheran, Frederick Lütjens, dedicated his curious book (2) to the Grand Duke Peter Feodorowitch (afterward Peter III.) he felt justified in congratulating the Prince and his bride (the future Catharine II.) on the fact that "the glorious Peter had so restored and modified the modern religion of the Russians in accordance with the Scriptures and with the rules of the primitive Church, that he had made it as similar as possible

(1) *Loc. cit.*, Vol. II., p. 468.

(2) *Historico-Ecclesiastical Essay on the Present Religious Condition of the Ruthenians*, 1745.

to that of the Evangelico-Lutherans" (1). And the Lutheran was able to support his assertion by quoting the text of the Catechism which had been compiled by the "Orthodox" bishop, Theopanes Procopowitch, the prelate whom Peter "the Great" had employed to formulate his *Ecclesiastical Regulation*. In this Catechism, declared Lütjens, "we find the purest Evangelical doctrine on the forgiveness of sin, on justification, and on the eternal salvation which is attained by faith in Jesus Christ alone" (2). And when, in 1807, the court of St. Petersburg had tired of its playing with Protestantism, and felt the necessity of resuming its comparatively closer connection with the primitive Church, did it turn to its bishops for the accomplishment of the restoration? By no means. The imperial "supreme judge of the Holy Synod" appointed a mixed commission of ecclesiastics and laymen, according to it absolute control over the curriculum of each seminary; and in this commission there were numbered merely a few bishops, and they were all favorites of the court. But the Holy Synod perceived no insult to itself, no usurpation of the things of the sanctuary, in this imperial pretension; it was as ready then to abrogate every ecclesiastical prerogative as it was in 1830, when, in order to aid in the final destruction of agonizing Catholic Poland, it took from the seminaries 20,000 seminarians, declared them forever debarred from the priesthood, incorporated them into the army, and sent them to evangelize the Poles in the fashion which we have seen recommended and adopted by Siemaszko (3). There is one instance of abjection, however, on the part of the "Orthodox" clergy, which perhaps speaks more eloquently than those which we have indicated. In every Russian liturgical service at which the litanies are recited, not only the name of the

(1) For more information on this subject, see the already cited work of Tondini, as well as Gagarin's *Studies in Theology and History*, Vol. i., p. 56, and De Maistre's *Four Unedited Chapters on Russia*, ch. 3. Paris, 1859.

(2) See Gagarin's *Russian Clergy*, p. 135.

(3) The reader need not be surprised at this treatment of the seminarians by the Holy Synod; for during many centuries the Russian Church has not known the meaning of the phrase "ecclesiastical vocation." In Russia the priesthood has been until very recently as much a hereditary caste as it is in Hindustan; but with this difference, observes Lescœur, that in the latter country the priesthood is honored, whereas in the former, to be called a son of a pope is to receive a mortal affront. See Gagarin's *Russian Clergy*, p. 20.

Czar, but that of the last little baby of the imperial family, is mentioned before the existence of the Holy Synod is recognized. But hearken to a few of the abject phrases used by the Holy Synod; we cull them at random from some acts of the tribunal: "Conformably to the most exalted will of His Majesty, the Holy Synod has undertaken to better the condition of the provincial clergy—By order from above, many monasteries have been deprived of their rights of fishing—The bishop of Kursk is allowed to print his sermons—His Majesty has found it wise to dissolve the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools, and to confide their direction to the Holy Synod, charging the supreme procurator (always a layman, and generally a soldier) with the execution of its orders—By a decision of the Imperial Council, confirmed by His Majesty, the marriage of ——, a Pagan, with ——, a Mussulman, is pronounced valid, provided that the latter receives Baptism—We humbly beg Your Majesty to assure the salvation of the United Greeks by allowing them to join the Orthodox Church of All the Russias." It is not surprising that Voltaire, after feasting on such fulsomeness as exhales from these and similar phrases, should write to his "saint," the Messalina of St. Petersburg: "As for me, Madame, I am faithful to the Greek Church (Voltaire was very weak in historical knowledge), and so much the more since in a certain sense your beautiful hands swing its thrible, and since you may be regarded as the Patriarch of All the Russias" (1). Nor can we wonder that among the many millions of Russian dissidents who to-day despise the authority of the official Church, who await an opportunity to combat it *à l'outrance*, and who hate the Catholic Church with a venom almost equal to that expressed by the Holy Synod, by far the greater number find the sole justification of their revolt in the really unchristian dependence of "Orthodoxy" on an earthly power. "For a long time," remarks Gagarin, "the bosom of the Russian Church has been lacerated by dissident sects, but the development of these to-day is immense; between fifteen and eighteen millions are enrolled under their standard" (2). The

(1) Letter of July 6, 1771.

(2) *Studies in History and Theology*, Vol. III., p. 483.

"Orthodox" author of *The Raskol* says that the obstinate Raskolniks "confound the temporal sovereign with the head of the Church (and why not?), and therefore they are in a state of perpetual, although latent, war with the laws of the land. They excommunicate the Czar; they style him Antichrist."

Now for a few reflections concerning the Holy Synod, the presumed authoritative voice of Russian "Orthodoxy;" we shall see that the very existence of this tribunal is both an inconsistency and a heterodoxy. We have noted that the author of *Orthodoxy and Popery* reprobates the Roman See for an alleged "insatiable yearning for religious innovations;" and it is notorious that the "Orthodox" have always prided themselves on the immobility of their Church, even when they were obliged to ignore the fact that with them immutability and lethargy are generally synonymous. But can the "Orthodox" show us, we will not say any Scriptural foundation, but rather any Eastern tradition—any Eastern conciliar or patristic warrant for the existence of this Holy Synod? Is it not a matter of cold history that this body is much less than two centuries old? And can any student deny that from its very creation it has been the docile instrument of innovations at once anti-canonical and scandalous? Has the Roman Pontiff, whose alleged "omnipotence" is denounced as strenuously by the "Orthodox" as by the Anglicans and other Protestant sectarians, ever attempted to change the essential form of ecclesiastical government; has he ever dared to suppress anything in this line that the Apostles prescribed; has he ever presumed to substitute a cardinalitial, episcopal, presbyteral, or civil governmental régime for that monarchical primacy of Peter alone which all his predecessors declared to be of divine institution? But this most fundamental of all innovations the Russian Czarate effected, without any efficacious or even serious protest on the part of the "Orthodox" hierarchy, when it instituted the Holy Synod. In the *Particular Catechism* of the Russian Church, the sublimity of impudence is reached when, on page 68, to the question as to "what ecclesiastical authority rules the principal divisions

of the Universal Church," the following answer is given: "The orthodox patriarchs of the East and the Synod of Russia, the order of hierarchical precedence being, 1st, Constantinople; 2d, Alexandria; 3rd, Antioch; 4th, Jerusalem; 5th, the Patriarchate or Synod of Russia." And then to the question as to the rank of the Holy Synod, the reply is: "The Synod has the rank of a patriarch, since it takes the place of the Patriarchate of Russia which was abolished with the consent of the other patriarchs." The more than implication that there is no such thing as the Patriarchate of Rome; that the Church of God is peculiarly an Oriental Church; was probably very acceptable to the simple "Orthodox" who received as Gospel truth the lessons in history which Nicholas I. gave to his subjects when he decreed that in all the educational institutions of his empire the qualification of "tyrant" should never be given to Nero, Caligula, or Ivan the Terrible; that no teacher should dare inform his pupils that the House of Romanoff became extinct in 1761 in the person of the Empress Elizabeth, and that it was the foreign family of Holstein-Gottorp which then (as now) held the czarate; that every pedagogue should insist that the reigning autocrat descended in direct line from Rurick of Moscow; and that the reason for the preference of the ancient Romans for a republic is to be found in the fact that *they had not the good fortune of being acquainted with the blessings which are entailed by the rule of an autocrat*" (1). As for the implied falsehood that the consent of the Oriental patriarchs to the establishment of the Holy Synod was both seriously asked and freely accorded, we reply that granted this seriousness and this freedom, the prelates in question had no power to change the patriarchal constitution of their churches; and, furthermore, that there is good reason to believe that at least the patriarchate of Constantinople afterward withdrew its consent. This we are led to believe from the words of the well-informed Greek archimandrite, Snagoano, who added to the already cited anathema against "Orthodoxy" the following indictment: "Since the impieties of this Synod are so signal,

(1) *The Truth Concerning Russia*, by Prince Dolgoroukoff, p. 317. Paris, 1860.

who will dare to assert that the Russian Church is not schismatical? It is rejected by the Councils; the Canons forbid its recognition; the Church spurns it, and all who hold the faith of the Church, and whom the Church acknowledges as her children, must respect her decisions and regard the Russian Rite as schismatical." However, even if we hold that the Oriental patriarchs could and did abolish the Russian patriarchate, we cannot forget that the constitution of the Holy Synod destroyed the episcopal authority, a thing of divine institution, as to its very essence; that it left the Russian bishops that episcopal character which is God-given, and which no Synod could efface, but that it left them no more authority than that exercised by the unconsecrated Methodists, Episcopalians, Moravians and such like, who merely parade an empty episcopal title. But what would the Greek Fathers have thought of this assembly, composed of nominees of an emperor, men who were movable at his caprice? (1). Listen, for instance, to that St. John Damascene whom the "Orthodox" are so fond of quoting in fancied support of their theory concerning the Procession: "The emperors have no right to give laws to the Church. Hearken to the words of the Apostle: The Lord has established Apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers. He says nothing about emperors" (2). And what would St. Athanasius say? "If the bishops so decree, why do you speak of the emperor? When did an episcopal decree derive any authority from an emperor; when was such a decree regarded as an imperial decree? Long before our day many Synods have been assembled and many decrees have been published by the Church; but the Fathers never consulted the emperors, the emperors never examined into ecclesiastical matters. St. Paul had friends among the familiars of Cæsar; but he never admitted them into his councils" (3). Bishops of the calibre of Sts. John Damascene and Athanasius would scarcely have submitted the results

(1) Only three bishops sit in the Synod *ex officio*—those of Moskow, Kiev and St. Petersburg, and of course these can be removed from their sees at the imperial pleasure. Vol. xxv., Sig. 5.

(2) *On Images*, Art. II., no. 12, cited by Pope Gregory XVI. in his Brief to Mgr. Lewicki, Archbishop of Leopolds, Ruthenian Rite, July 17, 1841.

(3) *History of the Arians*, no. 52.

of their deliberations to the judgment of a colonel of hussars, himself the creature of a temporal ruler. But this temporal ruler must fain talk in pontifical fashion when he institutes his new secretariate. In 1720, announcing to his subjects the great blessings about to accrue to them, Peter "the Great" thus perorated: "Amid the innumerable cares which are entailed upon us by the supreme power which has been given to us by God, we have cast our regards on ecclesiastical affairs in order to reform our people and the kingdoms subject to our empire; and we have discovered grave disorders, as well as many faults of administration. This fact filled our conscience with legitimate fear lest we might prove ungrateful to the Most High, if, after having effected, through His aid, such happy reforms in the military and civil orders, we neglected (mark the logical sequence of ideas) to exert ourselves to the utmost in order to restore sacred affairs to their highest perfection and their greatest glory. Therefore, following the example of those monarchs of both the Old and the New Testament whose piety was so illustrious (1), we have determined to improve the present condition of sacred things." And observe the eloquent significance of the oath which each member of the Holy Synod takes on his installation: "*I avow and affirm under oath that the supreme judge of this Synod is our monarch the Most Clement* (listen, spirits of Polish martyrs!) *Emperor of All the Russias*" (3). It is a remarkable fact, observes Tondini, that this avowal of dependence on the Czar—a dependence so utterly incompatible with the Gospel and so repugnant to the honest student of ecclesiastical history—is not demanded from the members of

(1) What one of these pious monarchs had three "wives" at the same time? Peter had discarded Eudoxia Lapoukine as well as her successor, and was at this time, while both of these women were still living, "married" to Catherine (afterward Empress as Catharine I.), the wife of a Swedish soldier who had been made prisoner of war. Catherine had been the mistress of two Russian nobles before Peter "married" her.

(2) The journals of Russia seem to consider the enslavement of both the Holy Synod and its subjects as a matter of course. On February 2, 1860, just after the death of Colonej Protasoff, the late procurator of the Synod, the *Nord* of St. Petersburg said: "He was in reality, if not in name, the head of the Orthodox Church in Russia. With his firm and energetic will he knew how to conquer the retrograde tendencies of the older clergy. By means of the Synod of which he was the veritable head, he distributed mitres among the the young and civilized ecclesiastics." In our dissertation on *The Struggle of Russian "Orthodoxy" with Polish Catholicity* (Vol. v.), we have shown how Dimitri Tolstoy, although a mere civilian, was a fit successor of this Colonel in the matter of *civilizing* the Russian clergy.

other Russian tribunals. "The framer of the oath knew what he wanted," says Tondini; "he wanted docile prelates, and he gained his point, thus proving, as he himself boasted, that he was greater than Louis XIV."

Before we treat of the prime inconsistency of Russian "Orthodoxy," its rejection of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, it may be well to notice another inconsistency which it manifests in regard to the instigator of the Greek Schism. Prince Augustine Galitzin, in his valuable work on the "Orthodox" Church (1), remarks that "the origin of the Schism was so disgraceful that it dares not venerate its founder, whereas, among its thousand other contradictions, it joins the Universal Church on October 23 in celebrating the Feast of St. Ignatius (patriarch of Constantinople), the first victim of Photius" (2). It is true that individual writers of the Russian Church and of the Schismatic Constantinopolitan Patriarchate have been sufficiently audacious to describe Photius as of "happy memory;" and some have ventured to quote his letters to Pope Nicholas I. as models of piety, brazenly ignoring his deposition of his legitimate patriarch and his violent occupation of the patriarchal throne after a reception of Orders *per saltum*—of all, from tonsure to the episcopacy, in the space of six days. Sincerity could not have been characteristic of a prelate who, when prepared to forswear his allegiance to the Holy See, nevertheless wrote to the Pontiff in the following strain so long as he conceived it possible that Rome might countenance sacrilege and ecclesiastical intrusion: "My predecessor having *resigned* his dignity, the assembled metropolitans, the clergy, and, above all, the emperor, who is so kind to others, but so cruel to me, impelled by I know not what idea, turned to me, and paying no attention to my prayers, insisted that I should assume the episcopate; in fact, in spite of the tears of my despair, they seized me and executed their will upon me."

As is well observed by Lescœur, if the "Orthodox" theo-

(1) *The Græco-Russian Church*. Paris, 1851. This Galitzin should not be confounded with another Galitzin, also a convert, and the author of *Is Russia Schismatic?* Paris, 1859. The name of the latter was Nicholas Borissowitch.

(2) For a concise but detailed account of the beginning of the Greek Schism, and therefore of the sufferings of Ignatius, see our Vol. ii.

logians have frequently fluctuated between the Church and Protestantism, according to the spirit of the times, and especially according as the imperial will has inclined for the nonce, there is one doctrine concerning which they are frankly Protestant. "When one hears the theologians of the Holy Synod declaiming against Popery, he might believe himself in London or in Geneva; but when he beholds the measures, sometimes petty and often barbarous, with which all recourse to Rome is either prevented or punished, he recognizes that he is in Russia. The Poles know full well that it is more dangerous to be a Papist frankly in Warsaw than it is to be a Raskolnik in Moscow." And nevertheless—and here we approach the chief, the most radical inconsistency, and the *raison d'être* of every heresy which afflicts "Orthodoxy"—a Russian cannot consult the Liturgy of his own Church, or celebrate the feasts which that Liturgy prescribes, or peruse the most authoritative books of devotion recommended by his spiritual advisers, without being confronted in bold relief, as it were, by St. Peter proclaiming his prerogatives, and by the entire body of doctrine which the Roman See teaches to the world. The cultivated Russian cannot escape the knowledge that the Church of Constantinople, from which, as he believes, his ancestors received Christianity, was at that time subject to the See of Rome, or was, as moderns are fond of saying, *Roman Catholic*. He knows that originally his "Orthodox" Church was far more Roman than Greek; that his Church was not Schismatic Greek in its origin, and that it is not Greek in its language, its polity, or its government. History tells him that his ancestors were converted by the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church; for whether, as we learn from Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the first missionaries to Russia were sent by the Catholic patriarch of Constantinople, Ignatius, in 867, or, as Nestor asserts, by the Schismatic intruder, Photius, in 866, it is certain that no real impression was made upon the Russian masses before the close of the tenth century (1), when the Grand Duke Vladi-

(1) About the year 945 Olga or Elga, widow of a grand duke of Russia, journeyed to Constantinople, and was there baptized. Returning to Russia, she tried in vain to convert her countrymen. But her grandson, Vladimir, having married Anna, a sister of the Greek Emperor, Basil II., was baptized in 968, and in a few years nearly all the Russians received

mar, called "the Apostolic," embraced Christianity—an epoch at which the Greeks were in communion with Rome, for the properly so-called Photian Schism had ended with the second and final deposition of the intruder in 889, and the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate remained subject thenceforward to the Holy See until the definitive actuation of the Greek Schism by Cerularius in 1054. Our cultivated Russian knows also that the definitive defection of the Greeks did not much affect the relations of his countrymen with the Papacy until the twelfth century; that only then they were seduced entirely from the Roman obedience; that a reaction having taken place, by the time that the Council of Florence was held (1439) there were as many Catholics as Schismatics in Russia (1); and that it was a second Photius, Archbishop of Kiev, who extended the Schism throughout the land about the middle of the fifteenth century (2). Nor will our well-informed Russian fail to realize that his Church is not Greek in its liturgical language; that this language is the Slavonic, and not the vernacular, but the Old Slavonic, with which the people are not familiar (3). Again, this unbiased Russian will learn from the monuments of his own "Orthodox" Church that the Papal supremacy over the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate, or, as

(1) See the Bollandists, at month of September, No. 41.

(2) Some authors hold that the Schism of Cerularius did not affect the entire Greek Empire in the eleventh century. It is certain that Pope Alexander II. had an agent, an *apocrisiarius* (not a legate) at the court of the Emperor Michael Ducas, in the person of Peter, Bishop of Anagni; and it is equally certain that this representative of the Papacy remained as such in Constantinople for a year. Pope Pascal II. sent Chrysolanus as legate to Alexis Comnenus. It is to be noted that Euthymius Zagabenus, who obeyed the order of Alexis Comnenus to collect all patristic testimonies against each and every heresy, never speaks of the Latins as heretics. Even in the twelfth century there were many Greeks in the communion of Rome, as we learn from many narratives of the Crusades, from the *Alexias* of Anna Comnena, from the *Life of Manuel*, by Niceas Choniates, and from the letters of the Venerable Peter of Cluny to the Emperor, John Comnenus, and to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

(3) Protestants should note this fact as evidence of their mistake when they adduce the example of the Russian Church as an encouragement for their own use of the vernacular in their Liturgy—when they have one. Not one of the ancient Churches, neither the Greek nor the Syrian, nor the Coptic, nor the Chaldean, nor the Armenian, nor the Nestorian, nor the Jacobite, has the vernacular of the people for the medium of its Liturgy. The reason is evident: they all have preserved the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and they realize the necessity of having an unchangeable medium for the expression of their sentiments and doctrines—medium which is furnished by the now unspoken languages in which their ancestors learned the truths of Christianity. For information on this point consult Assemani's *Oriental Library*, Vol. iv., ch. 7, 22. Rome, 1719.

it was at that time not improperly termed, the Greek Church, dates from the first day of that patriarchate's existence. He must feel that if obedience to the See of Peter had not been part of the faith of all the Oriental Patriarchates when Photius started the Greek Schism on its first stage, that desperate intruder would not have troubled himself so exceedingly to obtain the Pontifical confirmation of his sacrilegious and all but murderous seizure of the Constantinopolitan crozier. Quite naturally he must reason in the same manner when he thinks of Cerularius, who separated definitively the greater number of the Eastern Christians from the communion of Rome. He must ask himself how it is, in the supposition that his own "Orthodox" Church was not Roman in its origin, that his Church celebrates so many feasts, which Rome prescribes, but which the Schismatic Greeks reject? And finally he must wonder how it happens that if the Russian Church did not in its early days proclaim the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, nevertheless the ancient "Orthodox" Liturgy avows that supremacy in terms which admit of no exception on the part of a Catholic theologian. For instance, St. Peter is termed "the sovereign pastor of all the Apostles—*pastyr vladychnyi vsich Apostolov.*" Pope St. Sylvester is called "the divine head of the holy bishops" (1). We read of Pope St. Celestine I. that "firm in his speech and in his works, and following in the traces of the Apostles, he showed himself worthy of occupying the Holy Chair by the decree with which he deposed the impious Nestorius (patriarch of Constantinople)." It is said of Pope St. Agapetus that "he deposed the heretical Anthimius (another patriarch of Constantinople), anathematized him, and consecrating Mennas, whose doctrine was irreproachable, placed him in the See of Constantinople." Similarly we hear of Pope St. Martin I. that he "adorned the divine throne of Peter, and holding the Church upright on this rock which cannot be shaken, he honored his name;" and this praise is given to St. Martin

(1) Gagarin cites the quotations which we give, and many similar ones, in the Old Slavonic text in his *Studies in Theology*, Vol. ii., and Tondini comments on them most judiciously in his *Primacy of St. Peter Proved by Titles Given to Him in the Liturgy of the Russian Church*. Paris, 1867.

because "he segregated Cyrus (patriarch of Alexandria), Sergius (another patriarch of Constantinople), Pyrrhus, and all their adherents, from the Church." Pope St. Leo I. is styled "the successor of St. Peter on the highest throne, the heir of the impregnable rock." Pope St. Leo III. is thus addressed: "Chief pastor of the Church, fill the place of Jesus Christ." What must be the feelings of any sacerdotally sensitive member of the enslaved "Orthodox" clergy, when he hears his Liturgy teaching how a Pope ought to speak to a wicked or heretical sovereign! We hear Pope Gregory II. warning Leo the Isaurian, the imperial champion of the Iconoclasts: "Endowed as we are with the power and sovereignty of St. Peter, we have determined to prohibit you," etc. Nor does this same Liturgy of the Russian Church hesitate to admit that a Roman Pontiff can excommunicate emperors as well as patriarchs; and not only emperors who belong to the Roman Patriarchate, but also those of the Eastern. In a fragment of a *Life* of St. John Chrysostom this Liturgy tells its admirers that "Pope Innocent wrote more than once to Arcadius, separating him and his wife, Eudoxia, from the communion of the Church, and pronouncing anathema on all who had helped in driving St. John Chrysostom from his See. He not only deprived Theophilus (patriarch of Alexandria), but he segregated him from the Church. Then Arcadius wrote to Pope Innocent, begging pardon most humbly, and assuring the Pope of his repentance. The emperor wrote also to his brother Honorius, asking him to implore the Pontiff to lift the excommunication, and he obtained the favor." It certainly appears strange that during so many centuries the leaders of the "Orthodox" Russian Church have not found some means of disembarassing themselves of these and many similar testimonies of their own Liturgy to the supremacy of the Chair of Peter; but at least they have endeavored to neutralize the force of these arguments by a free use of that favorite weapon of all heretics—calumny. Prince Nicholas Galitzin, writing while he was still an "Orthodox" professor, averred that "in Russian seminaries it is taught that in the eyes of Catholics the Pope is an irresponsible autocrat, claiming

to be *impeccable*" (1). And that medical theologian, Karatheodori, whose work, by the way, was translated into French by a Russian priest formally commissioned to the task by the Russian government, dared to emit the following: "Popery asks us to recognize in this mortal (the Pope) all the rights and all the authority of the Universal Church . . . and what is more, it asks us to believe that by ordinance of God this mortal is superior to all the Divine Commandments themselves, and that he enjoys the right to change them, adding to them or subtracting from them according to his own will." Having read this barefaced illustration of "Orthodox" mendacity, we are prepared for the Greek physician's assertion that men of the stamp of "the Jesuit Prince" (Gagarin, whose writings Karatheodori affected to refute) are "ever ready to reject the clearest truths," and that they prosecute their ends by means of lies and the falsification of documents, following the example of the "Council of Florence, in which Cardinal Julian (Cesarini) adduced forged *Acts* of the Seventh General Council." Here the Sultan's physician simply imitated the time-serving Mark of Ephesus in his too successful efforts to undo the good work of the Florentine synodals, carefully refraining, however, from any mention of the refutation of the Ephesine prelate's charges which Bessarion, the most eminent Greek Schismatic of any day, and who was converted by his experience at this same Council of Florence, adduced in his apposite letter to Alexis Lascaris. The reader will scarcely be displeased, if we here repeat the words of Bessarion, which we quoted when treating of the Council of Florence; for those words illustrate the position assumed by Karatheodori and others of that ilk. Mark of Ephesus had accused the Latins of having adduced falsified testimonies of the Fathers as corroboratory of the Catholic doctrine on the Procession of the Holy Ghost; and to this calumny Bessarion, who was still the Schismatic Archbishop of Nicea, thus replied: "Finally they (the Latins) showed us testimonies of the Fathers which evinced most clearly the truth of their teaching; and they adduced pas-

(1) *In Russia Schismatical* ? p. 38.

sages not only of Western Fathers, against which we could only contend that they had been corrupted by the Latins, but also sayings of our Epiphanius which declared plainly that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and* the Son, and to this evidence we also retorted that it had been corrupted. Then they introduced Cyprian and others, and we gave the same answer; finally we repeated this reply when they adduced the authority of Western saints. And when we (the Schismatics) had debated among ourselves for many days as to what we ought to say, we could devise no other reply, even though it seemed too trivial for our purpose. And firstly, the doctrine (of the Roman Church) appeared to be concordant with the mind of the saints; secondly, so many and so ancient were the volumes containing it, that they could not have been falsified easily, and we could show neither Latin nor Greek copies which gave the quoted passages differently from the version of the Latins; and thirdly, we were unable to cite any doctors who contradicted the Roman doctrine. Therefore it was that being unable to find an apposite reply, we remained silent for many days, holding no sessions with the Latins" (1).

So much for the "Orthodox" allegation of dishonesty on the part of that Œcumenical Council which put a temporary end to the Greek Schism. Such charges form the stock in trade for such of the "Orthodox" clergy as enjoy some smattering of theological education; but unfortunately for the prospects of conversion of the majority of the teachers of "Orthodoxy," few of them are at all versed in the essential elements of ecclesiastical lore. Were the "Orthodox" clergy well indoctrinated even with profane science, of course not

(1) But Bessarion was not satisfied with repelling the Schismatical charge that the Roman theologians were falsifiers; he retorted the charge against the Greeks. Speaking of a passage from St. Basil in which that Father says that "the Holy Ghost is from the Son, having His being from Him, receiving from Him, and depending entirely from that Cause," the Archbishop of Nicea declared that out of six codices of St. Basil's works brought by his fellow-schismatics to Florence, five gave the passage in question in its entirety, while the sixth codex "was defective in some parts, and presented many additions which had been made according to the whims of the transcriber." When he returned to Constantinople the Archbishop searched the libraries, and he discovered indeed some codices in which the questioned passage was absent; but those codices were perfectly new, having evidently been written after the termination of the Council of Florence. At the same time the prelate found in the libraries many ancient manuscripts of St. Basil's works in which the passage occurred.

with the German materialism which alone has affected some of them, they would come to realize the truth of those words which Lamoricière addressed to the Pontifical army on the eve of the unsuccessful but glorious campaign of Castelfidardo: "Christianity is not only the religion of the civilized world. It is the moving principle and the very life of civilization, and the Papacy is the key-stone in the arch of Christianity. To-day all Christian nations seem to have some consciousness of these truths." Gagarin would discern Russia among the nations whose perspicacity appealed to Lamoricière. "Russia does not yet believe," reflected the zealous ex-Orthodox polemic, "that the Papacy is the key-stone of Christianity; she does not comprehend the phrase, but already she seems to have a sort of consciousness of its truth, and in her pale there is an increasing number of souls who are penetrated by that truth, and who place their chief hopes in it."

DEO OMNIPOTENTI,
 BEATÆ MARIE IMMACULATÆ,
 BEATO JOSEPHO, ECCLESIAE PATRONO,
 AC SANCTIS APOSTOLIS PETRO ET PAULO,
 ROMANÆ SEDIS FUNDATORIBUS,
 HOC QUAEcumQUE OPUS
 AUCTOR HUMILLIMUS
 DICAVIT.

GENERAL TOPICAL INDEX.

GENERAL TOPICAL INDEX.

- ABÉLARD. Early life, II., 227. Marries Heloise, 230. The catastrophe, 230. Finds the "Paraclete", 232. False sentimentality in regard to the famous couple, 234. The "Letters of Heloise" not genuine, 235. The tomb at Père-Lachaise, 236, in Note. St. Bernard attacks certain doctrines of Abélard, and they are condemned by the Synod of Sens, 237. Pope Innocent II. enjoins perpetual silence on Abélard, 240. Reconciliation with St. Bernard, and retirement to Cluny, 241. Abélard was never a heretic, 244.
- ABGAR, King of Edessa. His alleged correspondence with Our Lord, I., 67.
- ACACIUS. Schism of, I., 344.
- ACTON, LORD JOHN. His comments on the Massacre of St. Bartholemew's Day, III., 414. He was the evil genius of Døllinger, VI., 414.
- ADAMNAN. His "Life of St. Columbkille", I., 310.
- ADRIAN, Rom. Emp. Persecutes the Christians, I., 47.
- ADRIAN VI., POPE. Early career, III., 287.
- ÆGIDIUS OF VITERBO. III., 287.
- ÆLFRIC OF CANTERBURY. His belief in the Real Presence. I., 401.
- ÆONS. The Thirty Intelligences, male and female, according to the Valentinians, I., 34.
- AETIUS, Leader of the Anomœan Arians, I., 230, in Note.
- AFFRE, Archbishop of Paris. Death at the barricades, V., 317, in Note.
- AGNES SOREL. Not the rival of Joan of Arc, III., 83.
- AILLY (DE ALLIACO) CARD. D'. One of the judges of John Huss, III. 3. His opinion of the Council of Pisa, 23.
- ALBANI, JOHN FRANCIS, CARD. His rebuke to Cardinal de Bernis, V., 3, in Note.
- ALBIGENSES. History and doctrines, II., 350. Their disgusting immoralities, 352, in Note.
- ALBRET, QUEEN JEANNE D'. Her violent persecutions of Catholics, III., 372. Not poisoned by Catharine dei Medici, 394.
- ALCUIN. On the Holy Eucharist, I., 404.
- ALEMAN, CARD. His conduct at the Council of Basel, III., 108.
- ALEXANDER SEVERUS, Rom. Emp. Kind to Christians, but not a Christian, I., 51.
- ALEXANDER III, POPE. See LOMBARD LEAGUE.
- ALEXANDER VI., POPE. Authorities on whom the decriers of this Pontiff necessarily rely. The "Diary" of Burkhard is of no value in the premises, III., 203. Guicciardini is unreliable because of his intense enmity to the Borgias, 206. Jovius was venal, and a self-confessed liar in historical matters, 207. Tomasi was interested in defaming Alexander, 207. The often-adduced manuscript narratives are either anonymous or mere diatribes, 208. The election of Alexander was not simoniacal, 211. His conduct toward Prince Zizim, 215. It is not certain that Roderick Borgia was the father of Cæsar, Lucretia, etc., 222. Course of the Pontiff in the matter of Savonarola, 237, 239, 243, 247.
- ALEXANDER I., Czar. Probably died a Catholic, V., 93.
- ALEXANDER II., Czar. Persecutes the Catholics, V., 102.
- ALEXANDER III., Czar. Persecutes the Catholics, V., 139.
- ALTARS. Removed from all English sanctuaries, III., 469.

- AMEDEO VIII., of Savoy. Made an Anti-Pope by the synodals of Basel, III., 116. Submits to Pope Eugenius IV., 119.
- AMERICANISM, So-called. Condemned by Pope Leo XIII., VI., 334. Not a mere figment of the pontifical imagination, 342.
- ANACLETUS II., Anti-Pope. See PETER "LEONIS".
- ANARCHISM. A progeny of the "International", VI., 383. Bakunine and Herzen apostles of Pan-Slavism, 391.
- ANDORRA. A survival of the many happy republics of the Middle Age, VI., 552.
- ANGLICAN "ORDERS". Invalid from a historical point of view, III., 492. Their invalidity reaffirmed by Pope Leo XIII., VI., 230.
- ANGLO-SAXONS. Their conversion, I., 395. Their faith thoroughly Papal, 398.
- ANSELM, ST., of Canterbury. Successfully resists Henry I. in the matter of Investitures, II., 174.
- ANTIOCH, COUNCIL OF. Did not reject the term *homoousios*, I., 149.
- ANTIPODES. Dispute concerning them between St. Boniface and St. Virgil, the Irish apostle of Carinthia, I., 527.
- ANTI-POPE, The first, I., 127.
- ANTONINUS PIUS, Rom. Emp. Persecutes the Christians, I., 49.
- APIARIUS. Excommunicated by his bishop in Africa, appeals to Pope Zosimus, I., 264.
- APPEALS TO THE ROMAN PONTIFF. The Council of Sardica did not initiate the right of appeal to the Holy See, said right being one of the papal prerogatives, and history evincing its exercise at as early a date as 142, I., 212.
- APPELLANTS. See UNIGENITUS.
- ARANDA, Minister of Charles III. of Spain. His character, IV., 468.
- ARCHETTI. His nunciature to Russia, V., 84.
- ARIUS. His heresy, I., 196. Divisions of the sect, 200. Its course in Gaul, 95.
- ARMENIANS. Vicissitudes of their Church, II., 343. The "New Schism", VI., 175.
- ARNAULD, ANTHONY. The "Pope of the Jansenists", IV., 115. Characteristics of the entire Arnauld family, 141. See JANSENISM.
- ARNOLD (of Rugby). His plan for the salvation of English Protestantism, V., 435.
- ASKEW, ANN. Burnt by order of Cranmer, III., 471.
- ASTROLOGY. In the Middle Age, VI., 529.
- AUBUSSON, CARD. D', Grand-Master of the Knights-Hospitalers, VI., 664.
- AUGSBURG, CONFESSION OF. III., 317.
- AUGUSTINE, ST. (of Canterbury). Sent by Pope St. Gregory I. to convert the Anglo-Saxons, I., 397. Was he the first "papistical" bishop in England, or rather a thorough Protestant? 398. Did he massacre the monks of Bangor? 417.
- AUSTRIA-HUNGARY. Religious conditions in our day, VI., 239.
- AVIGNON, The Popes at, II., 487.
- BABYLON. Rome thus designated by many ancient writers, I., 4.
- BACON OF VERULAM. Not "the restorer of science", IV., 82.
- BAIUS, MICHAEL. IV., 110.
- BAPHOMET, The Gnostic and Templar mystery, II., 459.
- BAPTISM. Controversy concerning its repetition, I., 132.
- BARBAROSSA (Frederick I., Holy Rom. Emp.). Captures Rome, burns St. Peter's, and is crowned by his anti-pope, II., 278. Defeated by the Lombard League at Legnano, 280. Submits to Pope Alexander III., 281.
- BASEL, COUNCIL OF. Origin, III., 96. Attacks the pontifical prerogatives, 107. Its pretended deposition of Pope Eugenius IV., 115. Not œcumenical, 120.
- BASILIAN. Their origin, V., 145, in Note.

- BASILIDES.** His heresy, I., 29.
- BAUTAIN.** His doctrines condemned by Pope Gregory XVI., V., 255.
- BAZARD,** The supreme father of Saint-Simonism, V., 380.
- BEATIFIC VISION.** The private opinion of Pope John XXII., II., 499.
- BECKET, ST. THOMAS À.** Contest with Henry II. and final martyrdom, II., 291.
- BELGIUM.** Her experience with Masonic legislation, VI., 310.
- BELLARMINO.** Congregation of the Index condemns his theory of a merely *indirect* divine right of the Pontiff to depose monarchs, II., 204. His treatise against the "Test" prescribed by James I. of England, IV., 18. Certifies that Galileo made no abjuration at the first trial, 61.
- BENEDICT XIV., POPE.** Praises the Jesuits, IV., 444. Condemns the Jesuit defenders of the Chinese Rites, VI., 684. His judgment on the historical value of the Lessons in the Roman Breviary, 519.
- BENEDICTINES.** Their monasteries both workshops and houses of prayer. II., 13, in Note.
- BERENGARIUS.** Nature of his error, II., 220. His chief opponents, 222. His retractions, relapses, and probable final repentance, 223. Not a disciple of Abélard, 220, in Note.
- BERTRAM OF CORBIE.** See RATRAMN.
- BESSARION.** Appeals to his fellow-schismatics to submit to the Holy See, III., 129. Nearly elected Pope, 150.
- BEZIER.** Fable concerning barbarities of a papal legate during the storming of, II., 355.
- BIBLE.** Early vernacular versions, III., 310.
- BISMARCK,** German Chancellor. His pretended "War for Civilization", VI., 1. Not a German patriot, 8, in Note. Prevents the restoration of French royalty in 1873, 112. Conspires to dominate the Conclave of 1878, 139.
- BLASPHEMERS.** Their treatment in mediæval France, VI., 636, in Note.
- BOBBIO.** Its celebrated monastery, I., 324.
- BOCHER, JOAN.** Burnt by order of Cranmer, III., 471.
- BODY OF CHRIST.** Basilides teaches that Our Lord changed bodies with the Cyrenian, I., 29.
- BOLINGBROKE (Henry St. John).** Career and opinions, IV., 509, in Note.
- BOLIVAR,** Liberator of Peru, Columbia, etc., a victim of Freemasonry, VI., 59.
- BOLOGNA, UNIVERSITY OF.** II., 14, in Note.
- BONAPARTE, NAPOLEON.** See NAPOLEON.
- BONAPARTE, JEROME.** His pretended divorce, V., 65.
- BONAPARTE, LUCIEN.** Refuses to discard his wife at the command of his imperial brother, V., 70.
- BONIFACE, ST.** Apostle of the Germanic tribes. His dispute with St. Virgilius (Ferghil) concerning the "form" of Baptism, I., 306. He was probably an Irishman, 520. He used neither force nor fraud for the conversion of the German barbarians, 526. His dispute with St. Virgilius in the question of the Antipodes, 527. He was not an ignorant man, 527. Eulogized by Cantù, 529, in Note.
- BONIFACE VIII., POPE.** His election, II., 412. Contest with Philip the Fair, 414. The crime of Anagni, 421. His calumniators refuted, 424.
- BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.** Its origin, III., 465. Not approved by Pope Paul IV., 476.
- BORRI,** "The Phoenix of Nature". IV., 161.
- BORRUSSIANISM.** Foe of German patriotism, VI., 7.
- POSSUET.** Controversy with Fénélon, IV., 310. With Leibnitz, 373. The authorship of the "Defense of the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy", I., 480; IV., 269.
- BOURBON, CHARLES DE (The Constable).** Traitor to his country, III., 341, in Note. Killed at the walls of Rome, 344.

- BRAZIL. Ravages of Freemasonry, VI., 50.
- BREVIARY, ROMAN. Its latest revision by Pope Urban VIII., IV., 49. Its Lessons in the Second Nocturn open to historical criticism, VI., 519.
- BRITISH CHURCH (EARLY). Its foundation, I., 395. The Easter Controversy no argument against the admission of Roman Supremacy by the early British Christians, 114. Proofs of this admission, 418. See ENGLAND.
- BROTHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS. Their foundation and career, IV., 180.
- BRUCKER. Praised cautiously by Tiraboschi, I., 389, in Note.
- BRUNO, GIORDANO. The Roman monument, III., 579. Judgments of his biographers, 582. His early career, 584. Doffs his Dominican habit, 586. His wanderings and his "New Philosophy", 587. The Venetian trial, 598. The Roman trial and the catastrophe, 600.
- BRUTÉ, Bishop of Vincennes. His correspondence with Lamennais, V., 278, 300.
- BUONAVENTURA, ST. He presides at the private discussions of the Fourteenth General Council, II., 381, in Note.
- BURKE, EDMUND. His speech at Bristol on the Catholic Question, V., 162, 176. Opposes state-patronage of the Catholic clergy, 188.
- BURKHARD. Worthlessness of his "Diary", III., 203.
- BYRON, LORD. Votes for Catholic Emancipation, V., 194.
- CADALAO. Anti-Pope under name of Honorius II., II., 168.
- CAGLIOSTRO (Joseph Balsamo). Finds the Egyptian Rite of Freemasonry, IV., 419. His complicity in the affair of the Diamond Necklace, 570.
- CAHENSLEYISM, So-called. The question concerning the religious progress or defection of the Catholic Latin, Teutonic, and other immigrants in the United States, VI., 326.
- CAJETAN, CARD. Early career, III., 288. Meets Luther, 306. Too partial to the League, 424.
- CALIXTINES. A branch of the Hussites, III., 11.
- CALIXTUS III., POPE. His alleged excommunication of a comet, III., 151. His efforts against the Turks, 154.
- CALVIN. Early career, III., 358. Affair of Servetus, 361. His spirit, 364. His doctrines, 366.
- CAMISARDS. Their rebellion and atrocities, IV., 286.
- CAMPANELLA. Not a "martyr to science", and not a victim of the Inquisition, III., 562. He was an exceedingly intolerant Catholic, 565.
- CAMPEGGI, CARD. At the Diet of Nuremberg, III., 314. Course in England in the matter of Henry VIII. and the Boleyn, 355. Calumniated by Burnet, 356, in Note.
- CANNING, GEORGE. Espouses the cause of Catholic Emancipation in the British Dominions, V., 193.
- CANONESSES. Meaning of this term, VI., 526.
- CANTÙ. Prince of modern historians, VI., 441. His judgment on Giberti, V., 388. His experience with the Congregation of the Index, III., 189, in Note.
- CAPISTRANO, ST. JOHN. Relieves Belgrade, III., 154.
- CAPTIER, FATHER FCS. Murdered by the Communists of 1871, VI., 98.
- CARBONARI. Origin and meaning, V., 481. Their connection with Freemasonry, 486. Scheme for the election of a Carbonaro Pope, 493. Mazzini dominates the Alta Vendita, 500.
- CARDUCCI. Poet of Atheism, VI., 156, in Note.
- CARLISM. In Spain. Its origin and significance, V., 259.
- CAROLINIAN BOOKS. Not written by an Iconoclast, I., 484.
- CASTELAR, EMILIO. His religious sentiments, VI., 195.
- CASUISTRY. Its meaning, IV., 162, in Note.
- CATAPHRYGIANS. Their heresy, I., 36.

- CATHARI.** A sect of the Waldenses, II., 312.
- CATHARINE OF SIENA, ST.** Her influence on Pope Gregory XI. for the termination of the "Captivity of Babylon", II., 493. Her conversation with Pope Urban VI. on the then imminent Schism, 527, in Note.
- CATHARINE DEI MEDICI.** Her character, III., 398. Her connection with the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 409.
- CATHARINE II., Czarina.** Her persecuting career, V., 80. Her friendship with Voltaire, IV., 536, 552, 554.
- CAVOUR, CAMILLO BENSO DI.** Calumniates the Papal government at the Congress of Paris, V., 525. His methods of annexation, 533, in Note. Declares in parliament that it was only by favor of Napoleon III. that Piedmont annexed the Romagna, 534. His ostensibly Christian death, 543, in Note. He adopts from Montalembert the formula "A Free Church in A Free State", and travesties it, 552.
- CELESTIUS.** Chief disciple of Pelagius, I., 254.
- CELIBACY, CLERICAL.** Its antiquity, II., 190. Custom of the Christians of the Oriental Rites, both United and Schismatic, 192. Objections deduced from Apostolic usage, 194. Opinion of Bacon of Verulam, 198, in Note. Many dispensations granted in this matter to both the secular and regular clergy, 199. Laxity of the Russian "Orthodox" Church in regard to its own canons concerning this subject, 192, in Note.
- CENCI, BEATRICE.** The tragedy, III., 568. Justification of the course pursued by Pope Clement VIII., 576.
- CEREMONIES, SACRED.** Not copied from the Pagans, I., 170. Mistakes of Gerson, Petau, and some other Catholic writers in this matter, there not being one Catholic rite of Pagan origin, 174.
- CERULARIUS.** Revives the Photian Schism, II., 123.
- CHALCEDON, GEN. COUNCIL OF.** Not convoked by the emperor, Marcion, I., 332. The synodals did not examine judicially the Dogmatic Epistle of Pope St. Leo I. to Flavian, I., 337. The superiority of a General Council over the Pope not evinced by the Acts of this Council, 340.
- CHAPTERS, THE THREE.** The controversy on, I., 359.
- CHARLEMAGNE.** Significance of his imperial title, II., 26. Meaning of his office as "Patrician of the Romans", 36. Falsity of the assertion that he could not write, 17.
- CHARLES IX., King of France.** His connection with the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, III., 409. Circumstances of his death, 418.
- CHARLES ALBERT, King of Sardinia.** His Carbonarism, V., 490.
- CHARLES V., King of Spain and Holy Rom. Emp.** His character, III., 293. Sacks the Eternal City, 344.
- CHINA.** German plot against the French protectorate over Chinese Catholics, VI., 173. Controversy on the Chinese Rites, 671.
- CHRISTIANITY.** Its rapid propagation a proof of its divine origin, I., 59.
- CHRISTIANS OF ST. THOMAS, So-called.** I., 288.
- CHRISTINA, Queen of Sweden.** Her character and conversion, IV., 194, in Note.
- CHRYSOSTOM, JOHN, ST.** Appeals to Pope St. Innocent I., I., 246.
- CHRONICLERS, MIDDLEVAL.** Their zeal, II., 112.
- CIVILTA, CATTOLICA, Roman Review.** Its foundation and character, VI., 402.
- CLARENDON, CONSTITUTIONS OF.** Occasion of the dissension between St. Thomas à Becket and Henry II., II., 294.
- CLAUDE OF TURIN.** Not the founder of the Waldenses, II., 317.
- CLEMANGIS.** Value of his anti-clerical declamations, II., 531.
- CLEMENT I., POPE, ST.** Shows that St. Peter came to Rome, I., 8. His writings, 72.
- CLEMENT V., POPE.** His election not the result of a bargain with Philip the Fair, II., 436. Justification of his suppression of the Templars, 461.

- CLEMENT VII., POPE. Made prisoner by the emperor, Charles V., III., 344. Efforts for a Crusade, 352. His course in the matter of Henry VIII. and the Boleyn, 353.
- CLEMENT VIII., POPE. Protests against the expulsion of the Jesuits from France because of the attempt of Chatel, III., 553. Allows all Religious Orders to labor in Japan, 557. Makes Tasso poet-laureate, 559. Justification of his course toward the Cenci, 568.
- CLEMENT XIV., POPE. His election not simoniacal, IV., 477. Suppresses the Jesuits, 481. Calumniated by Crétineau-Joly, 443, 477. Did not die insane, 497.
- CLOTILDA, ST., Queen of the Franks. Circumstances of her marriage, and her alleged cruelties, VI., 590.
- CLOVESHOE, SYNOD OF. Shows that the early Anglo-Saxon Church acknowledged the Papal supremacy, I., 410.
- CLOVIS. His conversion, VI., 588. His alleged post-baptismal barbarities, 604.
- COLUMBANUS, ST. Work of his monks at Bobbio, I., 324.
- COMET OF 1456. Its alleged excommunication, III., 151.
- COMMUNE OF PARIS (1871). The massacre of the "hostages", VI., 88. Freemasonry responsible for these horrors, 107. Culpability of Thiers, 94.
- COMTE. Styled by his disciples the Father of Positivism. His doctrines, V., 384. Positivism destructive of all human grandeur, 385.
- CONCLAVE. The "right of exclusion", VI., 140.
- CONFESSION, AURICULAR. Not condemned by the fact of Nectarius, I., 166.
- CONSALVI, CARD. His early career, V., 10. Arranges the Concordat with Napoleon, 16. His reply to Napoleon's demand for a Papal alliance with France, 30. His negotiations for Catholic Emancipation in the British dominions, 208, 212.
- CONSTANCE, COUNCIL OF. Its history, III., 26. Value of the decrees issued in its fourth and fifth sessions, 42.
- CONSTANTINOPLE, FIRST GEN. COUNCIL OF. Œcumenical merely because of its confirmation by the Roman Pontiff, I., 240.
- CONSTANTINE, First Christian Roman Emperor. Historical truth of his vision of the Cross, I., 150. His baptism near Nicomedia, 151. He did not become an Arian, 158.
- CONSTITUTIONAL CHURCH OF FRANCE. Origin and shameful career, IV., 605.
- CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT. It is of mediæval origin, II., 4, in Note.
- CONSTITUTIONAL OR PUBLIC LAW. Its meaning, II., 212, in Note.
- COPERNICUS. Not the author of the heliocentric system, IV., 83. His teachings condemned by Luther and Melancthon as crazy and heretical, 84. Derided by Montaigne and Bacon, and doubted by Pascal, 86, in Note. His treatment by the Congregation of the Index, 89, in Note.
- COPRONYMUS, CONSTANTINE. Eastern Emp. Sustains the Iconoclasts, I., 469. His bribes spurned by King Pepin, 471.
- COTTERELS, Bands of Albigenian cutthroats, II., 287.
- COUNCILS, ŒCUMENICAL. First; at Nice, I., 196. Second; First of Constantinople, 240. Third; at Ephesus, 276. Fourth; at Chalcedon, 329. Fifth; Second of Constantinople, 359. Sixth; Third of Constantinople, 419. Seventh; Second of Nice, 466. Eighth; Fourth of Constantinople, II., 55. Ninth; First of the Lateran, 265. Tenth; Second of the Lateran, 268. Eleventh; Third of the Lateran, 284. Twelfth; Fourth of the Lateran, 360. Thirteenth; First of Lyons, 370. Fourteenth; Second of Lyons, 379. Fifteenth; at Vienne in France (Isère), 446. Sixteenth; at Florence, III., 123. Seventeenth; Fifth of the Lateran, 265. Eighteenth; at Trent, 511. Nineteenth; at the Vatican, V., 571.
- COURTS ECCLESIASTICAL, In England, II., 202, in Note.

- COUSIN, VICTOR. His philosophy, V., 376.
- CREED. Addition of the *Filioque*, II., 81.
- CRESCENS, ST. Preaches in Gaul in the first century, I., 87.
- CRITICISM, SCIENCE OF. Not unknown in the Middle Age, II., 9, in Note.
- CROSS, VENERATION OF THE. Its antiquity, I., 464. Absurd objection adduced by Claude of Turin, 465. Dutch Protestants trample on the Cross in Japan, III., 558; V., 402.
- CROZIER. Why the Roman Pontiff has none, I., 88, in Note.
- CRUSADES. Origin, II., 246. Authors worthy of consultation on this subject, 252. Value of the Holy Wars, 253. Their alleged folly and injustice, 254. Their effects on art, science, and literature, 257.
- CUMMIAN, ST., THE HERMIT. Proclaims the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, I., 501.
- CURCI, CARLO. His vagaries, condemnation, and retraction, VI., 400.
- CYPRIAN, ST. Asserts the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter, I., 24. Appeals to the Holy See in the matter of the "Fallen", 123. Was not excommunicated by Pope St. Stephen, 135. He regarded the re-baptismal question as one of mere discipline, 138. He reverently acknowledged the Papal prerogatives, 142.
- DAMASCENE, ST. JOHN. His doctrine on the Real Presence, I., 478.
- DAMIAN, ST. PETER. His "Dialogue" in defence of the Papal prerogatives, II., 168.
- DANTE, ALLEGED HERESIES OF. His accusers, II., 508. Judgment of his contemporaries, 510. His Ghibellinism implied no hatred of the tiara, 511. His invectives against certain Pontiffs were caused by devotion to the Chair of Peter, 512. He insists on the Papal prerogatives, 513. He proclaims his belief in Good Works and in Free Will, 515. He insists on prayer for the souls in Purgatory, 516. Absurdity of the theory of Rossetti and Aroux, according to which the "Divine Comedy" was a praise of the Vaudois, but disguised in order to outwit the Inquisition, 519.
- DARBOY, Archbishop of Paris. Rebuked by Pius IX. for participation in the quasi-Masonic funeral of Marshal Magnan, V., 565, in Note. His arrest, imprisonment, and murder by the Commune of Paris, VI., 88. Responsibility of Thiers for this crime, 94.
- DEACONESSES. An institution of the primitive Church, VI., 525.
- DECLARATION OF THE FRENCH CLERGY IN 1662. Its history, IV., 229. Its famous "Defense" was probably not written by Bossuet, I., 480, in Note.
- DECRETALS OF ISIDORE MERCATOR. Their origin, II., 90. Not approved by Rome, 97. Who was their author?, 99. Their object, 103.
- DENIS THE AREOPAGITE. His works, I., 75. He was not Bishop of Paris, 85.
- DEPOSING POWER OF THE POPE. Various Catholic systems regarding this right, II., 203. Indisputable existence of a belief in it until very modern times, 207. Leibnitz wished for its recognition, 208. The Holy Roman Empire was, in a sense, a fief of the Holy See, 209. Oath of fidelity to the Pontiff taken by the emperor, 211. The deposing power was recognized by the public law of Spain, 213. By that of England, 214. By that of the Two Sicilies, 214. By that of France, as early as the sixth century, 216. By that of the Holy Roman Empire, 217. Advantages of the power admitted by such Protestant luminaries as Coquerel and Ancillon, and even by Voltaire, 219.
- DESCARTES. His system on certitude apparently favored by the Council of the Vatican, V., 583.
- DIOCLETIAN. His persecution of the Christians, I., 56. His presumed connection with the alleged idolatry of Pope St. Marcellinus, VI., 513.

- DIOSCORUS.** Why his cause was treated by the Chalcedonian synodals, even after they had read the Dogmatic Epistle of Pope St. Leo I., I., 340.
- DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS.** Not a Catholic, but a Protestant theory, VI., 617.
- DIVORCE FOR ADULTERY.** Practice of the Greeks, both Catholic and Schismatic, III., 137; V., 65.
- DODWELL, HENRY.** Tries to minimize the sufferings of the persecuted early Christians, I., 41, 61.
- DÖELLINGER.** His apostasy, V., 607. His faith shipwrecked ten years before the Vatican Council, VI., 413. His evil genius was Lord John Acton, 414. His tergiversations, 418. His *rolle-face* in regard to the Jews, 423. His Rationalism, 424.
- DOGOMATIC EPISTLES OF THE ROMAN PONTIFFS.** Never submitted to juridical examination in a General Council, I., 284, 337, 480.
- DOMINICK, ST.** His mission to the Albigenses, II., 354. Not the founder of the Inquisition, 390.
- DOMINION (PAPAL) IN THE ROMAN STATES.** Its origin antedates the "donations" of the French monarchs, I., 502. The "donation" of Pepin, 506. Territorial modifications of the Papal States, 512. Their consolidation, 517. Absolutism in their government a very modern system, 517, in Note. Their armed defence against invasion or rebellion a right and duty of the Pope-King, II., 140; III., 262. It is the unanimous opinion of the episcopate that this dominion is, in the present state of society, necessary for the freedom of the Roman Pontiff, II., 141, in Note.
- DOMINIS, MARCANTONIO DE.** His apostasy, recantation, and problematical sincerity of repentance, III., 457.
- DOMITIAN.** His persecution of the Christians, I., 45.
- DONATISTS.** Their history, I., 187. They did not appeal to the emperor from the decision of Pope Melchisedes, 193.
- DROSTE-VISCHERING,** Archbishop of Cologne, V., 254, 258.
- DUBOIS, CARD.** His character, IV., 361.
- DUPANLOUP.** Early career, V., 349. His controversy on the classics with Mgr. Gaume, 354. Champions the cause of the Pope-King, 355. His attitude in the Council of the Vatican, 358.
- DUTCH.** Trample on the Cross in Japan, III., 558. Vain efforts of Protestant writers to justify this sacrilege, V., 402.
- EASTER CONTROVERSY.** Its origin, I., 105. The dispute concerned discipline alone, 108. Terminated by the Council of Nice, 112.
- EBION.** His heresy, I., 30.
- EDICT OF NANTES.** Its provisions and its effects on France, IV., 271. Its revocation, 275. Popularity of the revocation in France, 276. Even the "great" Arnauld favored it, 277. By this revocation France lost less than fifty thousand citizens, 277. By it she lost no considerable amount of wealth, 281. By it she lost no military strength, 284. The rebellion of the Camisards, 286. Mme. de Maintenon did not procure or counsel the revocation, 291. The bishops of France were not consulted in the matter, 298. The provisions of the revocation were conformable to that Protestant invention, the Peace of Westphalia, 301.
- EDWARD, ST., LAWS OF.** Attest the right of the Pope to depose wicked or heretical rulers, II., 214.
- ELECTIONS, PAPAL.** Their history down to the days of Hildebrand, II., 162. Their freedom defended by St. Gregory VII., before and during his pontificate, 166.
- ELEVENTH GEN. COUNCIL.** Its convocation, II., 284. Provides that a two-thirds' vote will elect a Pope, 285. Condemns the Waldenses, 286. Invigorates discipline, 288. Protects the clergy from episcopal extortion during

- visitations, 288. Ordains that all bequests to Religious Orders must be shared with the parish churches, 289. Prescribes free schools for the poor in the neighborhood of all cathedrals, 290.
- ELIZABETH, Queen of England. Undoes the work of Queen Mary, III., 475. Institutes her new hierarchy, granting all requisite dispensations, 477.
- EMANCIPATION, CATHOLIC, in the English dominions, V., 159.
- EMERY. Quotes Bossuet against Napoleon, V., 40.
- EMPIRE, HOLY ROMAN. Its foundation, II., 23. It was, in a sense, a fief of the Holy See, 209. By its creation, did Pope St. Leo III. benefit the Church? 25. Need for study of its nature, 26. The Roman Pontiff was the source of all the emperor's authority, 28. Meaning of the title "Patrician of the Romans", borne by the early emperors, 36. The emperor did not owe his position to the Senate and People of Rome, 39. Condition of the Empire in the seventeenth century, IV., 58. In the eighteenth, 373.
- EMS, CONGRESS OF. Quasi-schismatical, IV., 600.
- ENCYCLOPEDIA, DIDEROT'S. Judged by its own founders, IV., 534.
- ENFANTIN, "PERE". Supreme father of Saint-Simonism, V., 380.
- ENGLAND. Conversion, I., 395. Transformation of the phenomenally barbarous Anglo-Saxons, 397. The early English Church was "papistical", 398. Its belief in Transubstantiation, 400. Its constant practice of Auricular Confession, 405. Its belief in Purgatory, 406. It gloried in its spiritual subjection to the Roman Pontiff, 408. Its clergy were celibitic, 414. Its Protestantization, III., 463. Religious Orders still illegal, V., 181, in Note. See also BRITISH CHURCH.
- EPHESUS, GEN. COUNCIL OF. History, I., 280. Œcumenical because Pope Celestine consented to its convocation, presided over it by means of his legates, and confirmed it, 283. The synodals did not examine juridically the decrees of the Pontiff, 284.
- EPIPHANIUS, ST. Shows that St. Peter founded the See of Rome, I., 12.
- EQUADOR. Ravaged by the Freemasons, VI., 64. The murder of President Garcia Moreno, 71.
- ERASMUS. His career, III., 324. His uncompromising Catholicism, 337.
- ERRINGTON, GEORGE. His "officious" mission from the English government to Pope Leo XIII. in the matter of Irish Home Rule, VI., 220.
- EUCHARIST, HOLY. The doctrine on the Real Presence underwent no change in the tenth century, II., 107.
- EUGENIUS IV, POPE. Rebukes the emperor, Sigismund, III., 97. His pretended deposition, 115. His character, 119, in Note. His rejection of the Basilean decrees on Conciliar supremacy, 122.
- EUTYCHIANISM. The opposite of Nestorianism, I., 329.
- EXARCHS OF RAVENNA, Exercised very little influence in Rome, I., 504, in Note.
- EXCLUSION, RIGHT OF, in the Conclave. Its meaning and history, VI., 139.
- EXEGESIS, THE NEW. Founded by Ernesti, V., 366.
- EXOTERIC AND ESOTERIC DOCTRINES. In the Discipline of the Secret among the early Christians, I., 39.
- FABER, F. W. His connection with the Oxford Movement, V., 450.
- FALSTAFF, SHAKESPEARE'S. Meant to represent Sir John Oldcastle, II., 580.
- FEBRONIANISM. History and significance, IV., 397. Its essential difference from Gallicanism, 400.
- FENELON. Explains the power of the Pope to depose wicked and tyrannical rulers, II., 205. His controversy with Bossuet in the matter of Quietism, IV., 310. His alleged duplicity and philosophism, 326. Meaning of his "Telemachus", 333.
- FELINSKI, Archbishop of Warsaw. Victim of "Holy Russia", V., 107.

- FERDINAND OF BULGARIA.** Delivers his infant son to the Photian Schism, VI., 178.
- FERGHIL.** See **VIRGILIUS.**
- FERRY LAWS.** Their origin, meaning, and effects, VI., 114.
- FICHTE.** His "philosophical" aberrations, V., 370.
- FIFTH GEN. COUNCIL.** Œcumenical because confirmed by Pope Vigilius, I., 366. Not contrary to the Council of Chalcedon, 371. Not favorable to the superiority of a General Council over the Pontiff, 378.
- FLACCIUS ILLYRICUS.** Chief of the Centuriators of Magdeburg, II., 27. An illustration of his calibre, 34.
- FLAMINIO, MARCANTONIO.** His orthodoxy, III., 460.
- FLEURY, CLAUDE.** His virulency toward Pope Innocent III., II., 344.
- FLORENCE, GEN. COUNCIL OF.** Its first sessions at Ferrara, III., 123. Transferred to Florence, 127. The leaders of the Photian Schism acknowledge the Papal supremacy, 130. The Gallican theory concerning the œcumenicity of this Council, 132.
- FOURIER.** His Phalansterian system, V., 382.
- FOURTEENTH GEN. COUNCIL.** The emperor of the Greeks, Michael Paleologus, and the Constantinopolitan patriarch abjure the Photian Schism in the name of their compatriots, II., 381.
- FRANCE.** The attempted Protestantization of, III., 368. Some of the reasons for its failure, 392. The Third French Republic as a persecutor of the Church, VI., 111.
- FRANCIS I., King of France.** Reconciled with Pope Leo X., III., 283. His candidature for the crown of the Holy Roman Empire, 292. His character compared with that of the emperor, Charles V., 293.
- FRANCIS II., King of the Two Sicilies.** His weakness, rectitude, and heroism, V., 537.
- FRANKLIN, BENJAMIN.** His adoration of Voltaire, IV., 540, 542.
- FRANKS.** Their conversion, VI., 585.
- FRATICELLI.** Franciscan schismatics, II., 500.
- FREDERICK II., Holy Roman Emperor.** His excommunication, II., 372. His probably impenitent death, 379.
- FREDERICK II., King of Prussia.** His relations with Voltaire, IV., 521. His unnatural immoralities, 523, 525; 551, in Note. His Political Testament, 562, in Note.
- FREE CHURCH IN A FREE STATE.** As differently interpreted by Montalembert and by Cavour, V., 552.
- FREEMASONRY.** Its origin, organization, and object, IV., 408. Its first condemnation by the Holy See, 411. How can it be studied? 412. Its "Powers", 418. Its development by Cagliostro, 420. By Weisshaupt, 427. It is a religion, 430. Its "Secret", 431. Why is it more virulent in Catholic than in Protestant countries? 437. Has it one directive centre? V., 497. Its connection with Socialism, VI., 359. With the "International" and Anarchism, 384. Its origin in Spain, V., 262, in Note. In Portugal, 266. In Austria-Hungary, VI., 243, in Note. In Belgium, 312, in Note. Its ravages in Brazil, 50. In Columbia, 59. In Equador, 64. In Argentina, 76. In Venezuela, 78. In Chili, 77. In Peru, 81. In Mexico, 82. The Masonic Anti-Council of 1869, V., 576. The projected Universal Congress of Masonry for 1882, which was to openly proclaim the Masonic denial of God and of the immortality of the soul, VI., 160. The Lodges prevent a monarchist restoration in France in 1873, 112. Reasons for which Leo XIII. renewed the condemnations of the sect launched by many of his predecessors, 186.
- FREPPPEL, Bishop of Angers.** His judgment on the French Revolution, IV., 617, in Note.

- FRÈRE-ORBAN. Aids the Masonic campaign against freedom of education in Belgium, VI., 310.
- FROUDE, J. ANTHONY. Blames the Oxford Movement for his agnosticism, V., 477.
- FROUDE, R. HURRELL. His influence on the Oxford Movement, V., 437, in Note.
- GALILEO. Restorer of science, IV., 81. The Church and the heliocentric system, 83. First trial of Galileo, 88. The second trial, 95. The imprisonment of the scientist was merely nominal, and there was no torture, 96. The alleged protest "And yet it moves" is unauthentic and intrinsically absurd, 98. Various conclusions of Catholic polemicists who have treated this matter, 102. Galileo's teachings were not condemned by the Church, but by the Congregation of the Holy Office, 106.
- GALLICANISM. Its meaning, IV., 229. The Assembly of the French Clergy in 1682, 231. Their famous "Declaration", 254.
- GANGANELLI. See CLEMENT XIV.
- GARIBALDI, JOSEPH. His murderous career during the Roman Republic of 1848, V., 521. His opera-bouffe "campaign" in the Two Sicilies, 535. His defeat at Mentana, 546. As "the first Mason of Italy", he proclaims "reason" as his "religion", IV., 435. Elected Grand-Master of Italian Masonry, V., 544.
- GARNET, HENRY, S. J. His alleged complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, IV., 41. His alleged equivocations, 46.
- GAUME, JOHN. His controversy with Dupanloup on the classics, V., 354.
- GENTILE, VALENTINO. His Unitarianism, III., 451. Put to death by the Calvinists of Berne, 452.
- GEORGE III., King of England. Opposes Catholic Emancipation, V., 186.
- GEORGE IV., King of England. His alleged religious scruples in regard to Catholic Emancipation, V., 215. Curses Daniel O'Connell, 217, in Note.
- GERBET, Bishop of Perpignan. His relations with Lamennais, V., 279, 285.
- GERDIL, CARD. His learning and ability, V., 9, in Note.
- GERMAIN OF AUXERRE, ST. Preserves the early British Church from Pelagianism, I., 395.
- GERSON. Value of his assertion that Gregory XI. regretted the abandonment of Avignon, II., 493. Accuses Huss, III., 3, 16. His course concerning the Council of Pisa, 19, 24. He would have given to the laity a right to vote in General Councils, 32. His treatise on the removability of the Pontiff, II., 533.
- GESTA DEI PER FRANCOS. VI., 590, 608.
- GIBBON, EDWARD. Judged by Cantù, II., 6.
- GIBBONS, CARD. Defends the Knights of Labor, VI., 368.
- GILDAS. Asserts the unbroken submission of the early British Church to the Holy See, I., 418.
- GIOBERTI. Calumniates the Jesuits, IV., 442; 503, in Note. His semi-rationalism, V., 388. Effect of his writings on many of the younger Italian clergy, 240. His polemics with Curci, VI., 400.
- GLADSTONE. His false interpretation of Montalembert's motto, "Catholic above all", V., 348. Refuses to condemn Ward in the Oxford Convocation of 1845, 465. Refuses to protest against the claim of the Royal Privy Council to define the faith of the Church of England, 474. His influence on Döllinger, VI., 415, in Note.
- GLEICHEN. The alleged two-wived Count, VI., 666.
- GNOSTICS. Meaning of the term, I., 28. Their doctrines, 31. Their wickedness imputed by the Pagans to the faithful, 32.

- GORDON RIOTS. Their occasion, V., 175. Their chief promoter was John Wesley, 178.
- GORHAM, G. C. The Royal Privy Council defines that Gorham, a minister of the English Establishment, can deny the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration and still exercise his ministry, V., 471.
- GRATIAN, DECREE OF. Never approved by the Holy See, II., 97.
- GRATRY. His opposition to the definition of the Dogma or Papal Infallibility, and his final submission, V., 592.
- GREGORY NAZIANZEN, ST. Not begotten while his father was a bishop, II., 195.
- GREGORY THE GREAT, ST., POPE. Checks the ambition of the Constantinopolitan patriarch, I., 382. Adds to the Liturgy and institutes his Chant, 383. Resists Mauritius, 384. Exercises civil authority, 386. His alleged hostility to learning, and his alleged burning of the Palatine Library, 389. He destroyed no monuments of Roman grandeur, 392. His eulogy by St. Iudephonsus, 394.
- GREGORY VII., ST., POPE (HILDEBRAND). The Hildebrandine Age, II., 144. His election, 145. His decree against Investitures, 149. Excommunicates the emperor-elect, Henry IV., 149. Receives the submission of Henry at Canossa, 150. Renews the excommunication, 152. He never rescinded this second decree, 154. Judgments on this Pontiff, 155. His spirit illustrated by his Epistles, 158. See INVESTITURES.
- GREGORY XI., POPE. Restores the papal residence to its legitimate seat, II., 493. His alleged regret for having abandoned Avignon, 494. Absurd suppositions of Maimbourg in support of this allegation, 495.
- GREGORY XVI., POPE. His election, V., 237. The revolt in the Romagna, 242. Impudent interference of the powers, 244. Condemnation of Hermesianism, 251. Condemnation of the doctrines of Bautain, 255. Resists Prussia in the matter of civil marriages, 256. Recognizes the Isabellist government in Spain, 263. Condemns the slave-trade, 268. Rebukes the czar, Nicholas I., 101. Gives an audience to Lamennais, 289. Condemns the *Arcier*, 291.
- GROTIUS, HUGO. Asserts the Roman residence of St. Peter, I., 3. Contends that every sovereign has a right to prescribe the religion which his subjects shall profess, IV., 60, in Note.
- GUICCIARDINI. His authority as a historian, III., 206; 209, in Note. His judgment on Savonarola, 235.
- GUIDO OF AREZZO. Determines the musical scale, II., 7.
- GUISCARD, ROBERT. Makes his kingdom of the Two Sicilies a fief of the Holy See, II., 139, 215.
- GUIZOT. His insult to the Dominicans, II., 355.
- GUNPOWDER PLOT. The condition of the English Catholics of the time explains, though it does not justify the plot, if there was one, IV., 20. The commonly received story, 25. It is very probable that Cecil manipulated, if he did not indeed concoct the plot, 29. Cecil's object in furthering the plot, 39. The trial of Father Garnet, 41. His alleged equivocations, 46.
- GUNTHERITES. Censured by Pius IX., II., 448.
- GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS, King of Sweden. A foe to religious liberty, IV., 69, 73, 75.
- GUYON, MME. JEANNE MARIE. Her "Quietism" frequently blasphemous, IV., 308. She persuades Fénelon of her sanctity, 310. See FÉNELON and QUIETISM.
- HALLAM. Historian. His calibre, II., 6; 7, in Note; 344.
- HAUGWITZ, Prussian statesman. His revelations on Masonry at the Congress of Verona, VI., 48.
- HEGEL. His "philosophical" theories, V., 372.

- HEGESIPPUS. Asserts the Roman residence and martyrdom of St. Peter, I., 10.
- HELEN, The paramour of Simon Magus, I., 27.
- HELOISE. See ABÉLARD.
- HENRY IV., King of France. His abjuration at Saint-Denis, III., 427. Absolved by Clement VIII., 431. Sincerity of his conversion, 433. Protects the Jesuits after the attempt of Chatel, 553.
- HENRY VIII., King of England. His Defence of the Seven Sacraments against Luther, III., 312. The affair of the Boleyn, 353.
- HENRY IV. Holy Rom. Emp. See GREGORY VII. and INVESTITURES.
- HENRY V. Holy Rom. Emp. See INVESTITURES.
- HENRY VI. Holy Rom. Emp. His brutality and perfidy, II., 320.
- HERMESIANISM. A pretended reconciliation of Revelation and Reason, V., 251.
- HILARY, ST. His so-called "Fragments" are forgeries, I., 224.
- HILDUIN OF SAINT-DENIS. Deceived in the matter of the Areopagite, I., 89.
- HIPPOLYTUS, ST. Shows the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter, I., 13.
- HOME RULE, IN IRELAND. Action of Pope Leo XIII., VI., 216.
- HONORIUS, POPE. His alleged heresy, I., 432. The incriminated letters were private epistles, not pontifically dogmatic, 436. They were orthodox, 440. The Sixth Gen. Council did not condemn him as a heretic, 442. His defence by St. Maximus Martyr, 447. By Anastatius the Librarian, 448.
- HOPITAL, The Chancellor de l'. An equivocal Catholic, III., 378. This so-called "apostle of religious liberty" denounces the Huguenots as "a seditious rabble, without God", 379.
- HOSPITALERS, KNIGHTS. Their heroism at Rhodes, VI., 662.
- HUGUENOTS. Their atrocities, III., 358. See the MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY.
- HUME. Historian. Judged by Cantù, II., 6.
- HUNJADY. III., 142, 143, 154.
- HUSS, JOHN. His career, III., 1. Doctrines, 6. Possibility of his sincerity, 13. The matter of the safe-conduct, 14.
- HUTTEN, ULRICH. His diatribes on Pope Julius II., III., 258.
- HYACINTH, FATHER (Charles Loyson). His apostasy, V., 623.
- IBAS OF EDESSA. One of the occasions of the Controversy on the Three Chapters, I., 360.
- ICONOCLASM. Originated by the Arabic Jews, I., 466. Strengthened by Constantine Copronymus, 469. Spurned by King Pepin, 471. Condemned by the Seventh Gen. Council, 472. Resuscitated by the emperor, Leo the Armenian, 493. Adopted by Claude of Turin, by the Albigenes, and by Luther, 499.
- IGNATIUS, MARTYR, ST. His Epistles, I., 80.
- ILLUMINATI. A development of Freemasonry, IV., 427. Many German priests join the sect, 428. Conversion of Weisshaupt, its founder, 430.
- IMAGES, SACRED. Their veneration not condemned by the French hierarchy in 825, I., 495. Superstition of the Greeks of that time in this matter, 497. See ICONOCLASM.
- INGELBURGA, Queen of Philip Augustus. Her matrimonial rights protected by Pope Innocent III., II., 331.
- INNOCENT III., POPE. His relations with his temporal subjects, II., 324. With the Empire and Sicily, 326. Excommunicates Otho IV., 330. His relations with Philip Augustus of France, 331. Interdicts that kingdom, 332. Submission of Philip Augustus, 334. Relations of Innocent with King John of England, 336. John excommunicated, 339. John yields, and becomes a vassal of the Holy See, 340, 349. Reason for the Pontiff's condemnation of the revolted English barons, 364, in Note. Innocent not blamable for the excesses of Simon de Montfort, 258. His efforts to terminate the

- Greek Schism, 341. Armenia and Bulgaria resume their unity with the Church, 343. Fleury's insinuation that Innocent narrowly escaped eternal damnation, 345. Judgments on this Pontiff, 346.
- INNOCENT VIII., POPE. Early career, III., 155. Insists on the Papal suzerainty over the Two Sicilies, 197. Condemns certain errors of Pico della Mirandola, 200. His alleged permission to dispense with wine in the consecration of the Holy Eucharist, 202.
- INQUISITION, THE HOLY. Antiquity of the idea, II., 387. St. Augustine favors it, 388, 389. This tribunal was founded neither by Innocent III. nor by St. Dominick, but by Gregory IX., about the year 1229, 390. It is not to be confounded with the Venetian "Inquisition of State", a purely political institution, 392; nor with the Spanish Inquisition, a royal tribunal, 397. Creation of the Roman "Holy Office" in 1542, 392. Its general mildness, 394. The falsehoods of Llorente, Limborch, and Mme. d'Aunoy concerning the Spanish Inquisition, 397. Its code of procedure, 407.
- INTERNATIONAL, THE. Its connection with Freemasonry, VI., 354.
- INVESTITURES, QUESTION OF. Its significance, II., 170. Abuses of Investitures, 171. Gregory VII. struck at the root of the evil, 175. Nearly all his immediate successors imitated his firmness, 176. Pope Paschal imprisoned by the emperor, Henry V., 181. Paschal allows the imperial claim, but afterward revokes his "Privilege", 182. The imperial pretensions satisfied by the Anti-Pope Borodino, 183; but Pope Calixtus II. reasserts his prerogative, and the emperor submits, 184. Henry resumes the contest, and is excommunicated, 185. At length Henry yields definitively, and the struggle is practically ended, 186. The contest was not a dispute about nothing, 187.
- IRELAND. Her conversion, I., 289. Her faith always that of Rome, 292. Her share in the Easter Controversy, 114, 118. Her early Christian missions to foreign lands, 327. Innumerable Irish saints are patrons of foreign cities, 327. Irish Home Rule in the mind of the Holy See, VI., 216. The "official" mission of George Errington to Leo XIII., 220.
- ISIDORE MERCATOR. See DECRETALS.
- ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, ST. Not the author of the False Decretals. II., 99.
- ISLAM. Its doctrines, I., 455. Their chief Christian opponents, 458. The propagation of Islam contrasted with that of Christianity, 460. Its turpitude, 461.
- ITALY. Attempts to effect her Protestantization, III., 441. Apparent waywardness of certain Italian literati, 459. Italy lost no worldly prosperity by her rejection of Protestantism, 461.
- JAMES I., King of England. Prescribes a Test Oath for Catholics, IV., 15.
- JANISZEWSKI, Auxiliary Bishop of Posen. VI., 1, 6, 8, 19, 21.
- JANSENISM. Its history, IV., 108. The distinction of "fact" and "right", 122. The Case of Conscience on "respectful silence", 129. The pretended miracles of Jansenism, 132, 140. Its seditious spirit, 133. Judgments of Cousin and Voltaire, 134. Reasons for the obstinacy of the Jansenists, 138. Characters of the chief Jansenist leaders, 113, 115, 141, 143. See PASCAL.
- JAPAN, Christianity in. Origin, V., 390. Persecutions, 392. Dutch Protestants trample on the Cross whenever they land in Japan for the purpose of trade, III., 553; V., 402. Discovery of the descendants of the first Japanese Christians, V., 408. Indifference of the Western governments toward Japanese Christianity, 420. The native priesthood in Japan, 424, 429. Statistics of the Japanese Church in 1835, 428. The religious future of Japan, 430.
- JE FUMI. The formal apostasy of Dutch Protestants in Japan, V., 402, 403, 405.
- JERUSALEM. An Anglo-Prussian endeavor to create a Lutherano-Anglicano-Calvinist "bishop" for the Holy City, V., 458.

- JESUITS.** Their colonies of Indians ("Reductions") in Paraguay, IV., 447. Their labors in Japan, V., 392. Their conduct in the matter of the Chinese and Malabaric Rites, VI., 671. The preludes to their suppression, IV., 439. The inconsistent allegations of the Parliament of Paris, 440. The fable of the *Monita Sacra*, or "Secret Counsels" of the Society, 441. Persecution and abolition in Portugal, 445. Abolition in France, 456; although the Jesuits of the Province of Paris promise that they will henceforth teach Gallicanism, 459. Persecution and abolition in Spain, 468. Abolition in the Two Sicilies and in Parma, 471. In Austria, 476. Final and total abolition of the Society by Pope Clement XIV., 472. Explanation of the continuance of the Jesuits as such in Russia and in Prussia, 493. Absurdities and wickedness of Crétineau-Joly when he treats of this suppression, 442, 476, 491, 497. Restoration of the Society by Pope Pius VII., V., 51. Made a victim of Bismarck's "War for Civilization", VI., 13. Its experience of the Third French Republic, 118, 119, 130.
- JESUITESSES.** Condemned by Pope Urban VIII., IV., 54.
- JEW, THE WANDERING.** First traces and probable meaning of the legend, VI., 502.
- JEWS.** Their condition in Poland when Poland was a nation, V., 142. In enslaved Poland and in Russia, VI., 290, in Note. In Austria-Hungary, 265, in Note. Döllinger's opinion, 423.
- JOACHIM, ABBOT.** His errors concerning the Trinity, II., 362, in Note.
- JOAN OF ARC.** Her account of her visions, III., 55. Her campaign, 61. Her capture, and her sale to the English, 64. Her mock trial, 66. The trick of the substituted recantation, 72. The English trap for the ruin of the Maid, 73. Her accusation of Cauchon, 74. The catastrophe, 76. The rehabilitation, 77. Lingard's English prejudices lead him to calumniate the Maid, 82. Should the glory of Joan be given to the royal concubine, Agnes Sorel? 83. The alleged connection of the Church with the murder of Joan, 83. Prevalent ignorance concerning the Maid, 86. The supernatural evident in her public career, 89. The predictions of Merlin, 89. The strange ability of the Maid as a military strategist, 90. The calumnies of Voltaire, 92; IV., 530. The imminent glory of the sweet child of Domremy, III., 93.
- JOAN, THE ALLEGED POPESS.** Contrary judgments of Protestant writers, II., 40. Pretended testimony for the truth of the fable, 41. Intrinsic marks of its own falsity presented by the story, 44. Refuted by chronology, 48. Probable origin of the yarn, 52.
- JOHN X., POPE.** His character and his murder, II., 161, in Note.
- JOHN XII., POPE.** His pretended deposition by the emperor, Otho I., II., 114.
- JOHN XXII., POPE.** His private opinion concerning the Beatific Vision, II., 498. He condemns the Fraticelli, 500. His struggle with Louis the Bavarian, 502. Sismondian and other Protestant lies concerning his character, 505.
- JOHN, King of England.** See INNOCENT III.
- JOSEPH II., Holy Rom. Emp.** His boorishness toward the General of the Jesuits, IV., 475. His quasi-schismatical enterprises, 583. He Protestantizes the children of mixed marriages in Hungary, VI., 242. His experience with the Congregation of Rites, 454.
- JOSEPH, FRIAR.** The "*alter ego*" of Richelieu. His ability and sanctity, IV., 64.
- JULIAN THE APOSTATE.** His career, I., 178. Vain attempt of incredulism to ridicule the prodigy which attended his effort to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, 183.
- JULIUS II., POPE.** Variously judged, III., 257. He was not a mere Mæcænas in tiara, 261. The meaning of his cry, "Out of Italy with the barbarians!", 262.
- KANT, EMMANUEL.** His philosophical theories, V., 368.

- KEBLE, JOHN. The prime author of the Oxford Movement, V., 436. His sermon on National Apostasy, 439.
- KORAN. Its chief doctrinal points, I., 455. Its innumerable shameless untruths, 458. Its constant redolence of gross ignorance, 459.
- LABOR QUESTION. Teachings of Pope Leo XIII., VI., 362.
- LACORDAIRE. His early career, V., 272. *The Avenir*, 285. At La Chênaie, 292. Conferences at Notre Dame, 294.
- LA LUZERNE, CARD. Refutation of his assertion that General Councils have examined juridically the decrees of Roman Pontiffs, I., 481.
- LAMENNAIS, FÉLICITÉ. His early career, V., 280. The "Essay on Indifference", 281, 283. *The Avenir*, 285. Lamennais has an audience with Pope Gregory XVI., 289. Papal condemnation of the *Avenir*, 291. The "Words of a Believer", 296. The catastrophe, 297. Death of Lamennais, 298. His Satanic pride, 300. His philosophy Pantheistic, 302.
- LAMORICIÈRE. His campaign of Castellardo, V., 540. Such campaigns do not ill become the servitors of the Vicar of the Prince of Peace, II., 140.
- LANGTON, STEPHEN, CARD. Consecrated by Innocent III. as Archbishop of Canterbury, II., 337. Retaliations by King John, and interdict of England, 339. John submits, and becomes a vassal of the Holy See, 340.
- LAUNOY. Styled "the un-nicher of the saints". He denies the sanctity of Pope St. Stephen I., because of the Pontiff's action in the case of St. Cyprian, I., 140. He opines that according to the Fourth Lateran Council Easter Confession must be made to one's parish-priest, II., 369, in Note. Launoy was a favorite of the Protestant polemics of his day, I., 353, in Note.
- LAVALETTE, ANTOINE, S. J. Injures the Society of Jesus by his unauthorized commercial speculations in the Antilles, IV., 457.
- LAVIGERIE, CARD., Archbishop of Carthage. He "rallics" to the French Republic in deference to the sentiments of Leo XIII., VI., 207. His anti-slavery apostolate, 201.
- LEABHAR BREAC. The oldest MS. treating of Irish Church History, I., 316.
- LEAGUE, THE FRENCH. Attitude of the Holy See toward it, III., 386.
- LEDOCHOWSKI, CARD. A victim of Bismarck's "War for Civilization", VI., 20, 23, 33.
- LEGNANO, BATTLE OF. One of the great decisive battles of history, II., 280, in Note.
- LEIBNITZ. His controversy with Bossuet, IV., 377. His real belief, 393.
- LEO I., ST., POPE. His Dogmatic Epistle to Flavian of Constantinople written because of the appeal of Eutyches to the Holy See, I., 331. This letter was not examined juridically by the synodals of Chalcedon, 337.
- LEO III., ST., POPE. Founds the Holy Roman Empire, II., 24. Question as to the utility of his action, 25. See EMPIRE, HOLY ROMAN.
- LEO IX., ST., POPE. He resists the Norman invaders of his dominions, II., 137. Battle of Civitella, 139. Civitella compared with Castellardo, 140.
- LEO X., POPE. His early career, 275. His literary and artistic merits, 279. His treaty with Francis I., 283. The conspiracy of Cardinal Petrucci, 285. The Pontiff tries to incite a Crusade, 289. His relations with the emperor, Charles V., 294. His attitude toward Luther, 297. He was not a "great Pope", 298. False charges of Rauke against him, 299. His rebuke to a transmuter of metals, VI., 531.
- LEO XIII., POPE. His election, VI., 139. His early life, 143. His nunciature in Belgium, 148. Declares his determination to uphold the temporal sovereignty of the Pope-King, 154. His mediation in the affair of the Caroline Islands, 167. Institutes a hierarchy in Hindustan, 170. The matter of the nunciature in Pekin, 173. The "New Schism" among the Armenians, 175. The so-called "conversion" of the baby prince-royal of Bulgaria, 178. The Encyclicals of this Pontiff, 181. His reasons for his renewal of the con-

- demnations of Freemasonry, 186. His admonitions concerning so-called "Liberalism", 188. His relations with the Third French Republic, 203. His attitude toward Home Rule in Ireland, 216. His reiteration of the olden decision on the invalidity of Anglican "Orders", 225. His course during the Masonico-Judæo-Calvinist campaign in Austria-Hungary, 236. His relations with Germany, 265. The phenomenal boorishness of Prince Henry of Prussia and of Herbert von Bismarck in the Pontifical apartments, 273. His relations with Russia, 283. His attitude toward the educational question in Belgium, 310. His encouragement of the anti-slavery Crusade of Cardinal Lavigerie, 290. His treatment of the school-question in the United States of America, 319. His condemnation of so-called "Americanism" not fatuous or Quixotic, 334. His attitude toward Socialism, 354. Toward the Knights of Labor, 367. Judgments on this Pontiff, 194.
- LEO OF OSTIA.** His identity, II., 247, in Note.
- LEO THE ARMENIAN.** Resuscitates Iconoclasm, I., 493.
- LEO THE ISAURIAN.** Starts the Iconoclast heresy, I., 466.
- LEPERS.** Their lot in the Middle Age, VI., 566.
- LERINS, MONKS OF.** Most of them, including St. Vincent, were Semipelagians, I., 263.
- LEROUX, PETER.** His philosophy, V., 381.
- LETI, GREGORIO.** His buffoonesque "Life" of Sixtus V., III., 536.
- LIBERIAN CATALOGUE (Of the Popes).** Asserts the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter, I., 14.
- LIBERIUS, POPE.** Not a heretic, I., 220.
- LIBERTIES OF THE GALLICAN CHURCH.** Meaning of this phrase, IV., 230.
- LITTRÉ.** His character and conversion, V., 354; 385, in Note.
- LOMBARDI, GIACOMO.** His false mysticism, IV., 197.
- LOMBARD LEAGUE.** Its origin, II., 274. Pope Alexander III. not blamable for his negotiation for a separate peace, 282.
- LOUIS IX., ST., King of France.** His character and reign, VI., 614. He was not the author of the Pragmatic Sanction issued by Charles VII., III., 170. Refutation of the calumnies of Michelet, VI., 639.
- LOUIS XI., King of France.** His contest with Pope Sixtus IV., III., 192. His character, VI., 624.
- LOUIS XIV., King of France.** His dissensions with the Holy See, IV., 200. He believed in Papal Infallibility, 209. His alleged saying "I am the State" supposititious and baseless, 216, in Note. The French bishops chiefly blamable for the king's differences with Rome, 217, 223. Justification and consequences of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 271. The influence of Mme. de Maintenon, 291.
- LOUIS OF BAVARIA.** His schism, II., 502.
- LOURDES.** The miraculous nature of its prodigies, VI., 455.
- LUKE, ST., EVANGELIST.** His silence regarding the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter no argument against that fact, I., 7.
- LUTHER.** Begins his agitation, III., 303. The 95 Theses, 304. Declares his submissiveness to the Pontifical authority, 305. Excommunicated, 307. His translation of the Bible into a vernacular not the first, by many centuries, 310. He ridicules Henry VIII., 312. He causes the Peasants' War, 314. He "marries" Catharine Bora, 315. His inconsistencies, 319. He sanctions polygamy, 320; VI., 666. His character, III., 325. Reasons for his success as an innovator, 326. He contributed in no way to the Renaissance, 328. He condemned the Copernican system, IV., 84.
- MAGH-LENE, SYNOD OF.** Sentiments of St. Cummian in the matter of the Easter Controversy, I., 115.
- MAGI, THE THREE.** Their identity, VI., 497.

- MAHOMET II. Takes Constantinople, III., 144. Writes to Pope Nicholas V., 145.
- MAIMBOURG. His lamentations over the end of the "Babylonian Captivity", II., 495. His defence of the Avignon Idea, 541.
- MAINTENON, Mme. de. She did not procure or even counsel the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, IV., 291. Her career and character, 294. Her marriage to Louis XIV., 296. Døellinger's judgment, VI., 423.
- MAITLAND, Historian. Judged by Abp. Martin Spalding, II., 7, in Note.
- MALABARIC RITES. Question of their toleration by the Jesuits, VI., 675, in Note.
- MALAGRIDA, GABRIEL, S. J. His trial and execution, IV., 452.
- MANICHEANS. Origin and doctrines, I., 37.
- MANNING, CARD. His conversion, V., 474. His Christian Socialism, VI., 364, in Note.
- MARCELLINUS, POPE, ST. His alleged idolatry, VI., 510.
- MARCION. His heresy, I., 32. His reason for enjoining absolute continence on all, 33, in Note.
- MARCUS AURELIUS, Rom. Emp. Persecutes the Christians, I., 49.
- MARGARET OF VALOIS. Her eroticism and Calvinism, III., 365, 371.
- MARIANUS SCOTUS. His unreliability, II., 42.
- MARK OF EPHEBUS. Chief champion of the Greek Schism at the Council of Florence, III., 125, 127, 130, 131.
- MARONITES. Never Monothelites, I., 428, in Note.
- MAROZIA, Duchess of Tuscany. Procures the election of her paramour to the Papacy, II., 162.
- MARTIAL, ST. His mission in Gaul, I., 88.
- MARTIN I., POPE, ST. Persecuted by Constans II., I., 423.
- MARY, QUEEN. Checks the Reformation in England, III., 474.
- MASSACRE OF ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY. It was not prompted by religious zeal, 397. Cardinals Birague and De Retz had nothing to do with it, 400. It was an affair of worldly policy, 403. It was meant to be restricted to Paris, 405. It was not long premeditated, 408. The number of its victims grossly exaggerated, 415. The popular version of the remorseful death of Charles IX. is absolutely false, 418.
- MATTHEW (*aliter* OF) PARIS. His unreliability, II., 377, in Note.
- MAXIMIN, Rom. Emp. Persecutes the Christians, I., 53.
- MAZZINI, Founders "Young Italy" and dominates the Alta Vendita, V., 500. Decrees the assassination of Count Rossi, 515. His responsibility for the horrors of the Roman "Republic" of 1849, 521. He forces Victor Emmanuel to selze Rome, 547. Judged by Proudhon, 537.
- MELANCTHON. Drafts the Confession of Augsburg, III., 318. Is upbraided by Luther for his lukewarmness in the Protestant cause, 320. He condemns the heliocentric system, IV., 84.
- MELCHIADES, ST., POPE. His decision against the Donatists was regarded as irrefragable, I., 192.
- MENANDER. His heresy, I., 28.
- MERLIN. His predictions of the deeds and the murder of Joan of Arc, III., 89.
- METHODISM, EARLY. Its persecuting spirit, V., 180. See WESLEY.
- MEYENDORF. Russian ambassador. Insults Pope Pius IX., V., 113.
- MICHAEL THE STUTTERER. Greek emp. Testifies to the superstitions of the Greeks of his day, I., 498.
- MICHAEL OF CESENA. A leader of the Franciscan "Spirituals", II., 501.
- MICHELANGELO BUONARROTI. His orthodoxy beyond suspicion, III., 460.
- MIDDLE AGE. Not a barbarous epoch, II., 3. Not one of ignorance, 7. Services of the mediæval monastic orders, 10. Mediæval universities and schools, 13. The mediæval clergy did not keep learning to themselves, 15. It is untrue that the mediæval nobles were generally ignorant, 16. Super-

- stitution was not rampant or even extraordinary, 19. The alleged panic of the year 1000, 20. The Middle Age was a period of gestation, 22. It was not excessively addicted to astrology, alchemy, and sorcery, VI., 529. Trades-Unions were the order of the day, 537. Business features of mediæval days, 545. Let the modern miner reflect on the condition of his mediæval brother, 550. The lot of the mediæval peasant, 551. Mediæval serfdom, 555. Mediæval hospitals, 560. Mediæval treatment of lepers, 566. A typical mediæval bishop, 571. Mediæval legends of the saints, 579.
- MIGUEL, DOM. King of Portugal. Story of his dethronement, V., 264.
- MILL, JOHN STUART. Detested the royal supervision of English Protestantism, V., 435.
- MILNER, JOHN. Chief champion of English Catholic Emancipation, V., 191, 198, 201.
- MINSK, NUNS OF. Their martyrdom under Nicholas I., V., 145.
- MIOLLIS, Bishop of Digne. Travestied by Victor Hugo in the character of "Myriel" in *Lcs Misérables*, V., 32, 42, in Notes.
- MIRACLES. Their place in History, VI., 448. Those of Lourdes, 454.
- MOHAMMED. His hatred of learning, I., 459. He never pretended to have miraculous power, 461.
- MOLIÈRE. His "Tartuffe" was probably directed against the Jansenists, not against the Jesuits, IV., 165, in Note.
- MOLINOS. Apostle of Quietism, IV., 305.
- MOMMSEN, THEODORE, German epigraphist. His boorishness in the presence of Pope Leo XIII., VI., 274.
- MONOTHELITES. Their doctrines, I., 419. They did not vitiate the Acts of the Sixth Gen. Council, 428.
- MONTAIGNE. Rejects the Copernican system, IV., 86, in Note.
- MONTALEMBERT. His early career, V., 320. Combats the University monopoly, 323. Defends the Jesuits in the Chamber, 333. His attitude toward Napoleon III., 337. His invention and proper conception of the formula, "A Free Church in a Free State", 340. His attitude toward the proposed definition of the Dogma of Papal Infallibility, 342. His writings, 345. His endeavor to convert Father Hyacinth, 346. Meaning of his saying, "Catholic above all", 348.
- MONTANUS. His heresy, I., 35.
- MONTI DI PIETÀ. "Mountains of Charity", or Christian pawnbroking-shops. Their institution, III., 271.
- MORENO, GARCIA. President of Equador, the "Modern St. Louis", and victim of Freemasonry, VI., 64.
- MORTARA. His withdrawal from his Jewish parents' custody by order of Pius IX., V., 607, in Note.
- MOST CHRISTIAN KING. Proudest title of the French monarchs. Its antiquity, III., 369, in Note.
- MOURAWIEFF, MICHAEL. His atrocities in Poland, V., 109.
- MUN, ALBERT DE. His combat for political unity among French Catholics, VI., 206.
- MURATORI. His works condemned by the Spanish Inquisition, and Pope Benedict XIV. condemns the Grand-Inquisitor's action, III., 188, in Note.
- MYSTICS, FALSE. Of the seventeenth century, IV., 196, 304.
- NAPOLÉON. Tries to dominate the Conclave of 1800, V., 3. He himself did not restore, but he contributed to the restoration of religion in France, 14. His Concordat with Pius VII., 15. His rupture with the Holy See, 30. He is excommunicated, although not by name, 33, 36. He did not strike the Pontiff, 45. His pretended divorce, 56. He founds the University of France

- on the ruins of the University of Paris, 324. His connection with Freemasonry, 480.
- NAPOLEON III. He deserves no credit for the restoration of the Pope-King in 1849, V., 521. His interview with the assassin, Orsini, 530, in Note. Tells Cialdini to "act quickly" in the matter of the invasion of the Papal States, 540. He betrays Lamercièrre, 541. His fatuousness in "making Italy", 547, in Note.
- NEANDER. Asserts the Roman residence of St. Peter, I., 3.
- NECTARIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE. His abolition of "public confession" no comfort to Protestants, I., 166.
- NERO, Rom. Emp. His persecution of the Christians, I., 43.
- NESTORIUS. His errors, I., 277. Condemned at Ephesus, 280. Doctrines of the modern Nestorians, 286. Their false appreciation by Protestant polemics, 287. The "Christians of St. Thomas", 288.
- NEWMAN, CARD. Joins Keble and Hurrell Freude in the Oxford Movement, V., 436. Starts the "Tracts for the Times", 443. His sermons at St. Mary's, 447. His motive in writing "Tract 90", 455. His conversion, 468.
- NICE. First Gen. Council. Its convocation, not by Constantine, but by Pope St. Sylvester, I., 201. The Pontiff presided, by means of his legates, 202. Papal supremacy not subverted by the Sixth Nicene Canon, 205.
- NICHOLAS V., POPE. Early career, III., 140. His efforts against the Turks, 142. The conspiracy of Percaro, 147. Literary merits of this Pontiff, 149.
- NICHOLAS THE DEACON. His heresy, I., 30.
- NICHOLAS I., Czar. His virulent persecution of Catholics, V., 93. Scathingly rebuked by Pope Gregory XVI., 101.
- NICHOLAS II., Czar. Persecutes the Catholics, V., 143.
- NINTH GEN. COUNCIL, FIRST LATERAN. First Œcumenical Council held in the West, II., 266. The Prefect of Rome partially relegated to his proper place, 267. Monks forbidden to administer the Last Sacraments, and ordered to contribute their share to the support of Church and State, 268.
- NOAILLES, LOUIS-ANTOINE, CARD. Archbishop of Paris. His weakness and tergiversations in the matter of the Bull "Unigenitus", 347. Finally accepts the Bull, 366.
- NOVATIAN. First Anti-Pope, I., 127.
- NOVATUS. Instigates the Novatian Schism, I., 128.
- NUNCIO, PAPAL. His powers not simply diplomatical, VI., 166.
- NUNS. See VIRGINS.
- OAKLEY, CANON. Judged by Newman, V., 450.
- OCCAM, WILLIAM, A leader of the Franciscan "Spirituals", II., 501.
- OCHINO (TOMMASINI) O. M. Cap. His apostasy and theological vagaries, III., 443. Denounced as a lying and lustful wretch by Bullinger and Beza, 446.
- O'CONNELL, DANIEL. Thanks Milner for his opposition to the Veto Bill, V., 201. Takes the lead in Irish Catholic politics, 206. Unjustly censured for ordinary courtesy to George IV., 217. The Clare election, 228. Absurdly charged with Freemasonry, 235. Judged by Ventura, Lacordaire, Veuillel, and Cantù, 236.
- "OLD CATHOLICS". Origin and history, V., 607. See DŒLLINGER.
- OLIER DE VERNEUIL. Founder of the Society of Saint-Sulpice. His career and character, IV., 169. Judged by St. Vincent de Paul, 179.
- OLIVA, PETER JOHN, O. S. F. Condemnation of his errors by the Fifteenth Gen. Council, II., 447.
- OLIVANT, PETER, S. J. Murdered by the Paris Communists of 1871, VI., 102.
- ORDEALS. Never authorized or approved by the Church, III., 241, in Note.
- ORDIBARII. A sect of the Waldenses. Their peculiar errors, II., 311.

- ORGANIC ARTICLES. Surreptitiously added by Napoleon to his Concordat with Pius VII., V., 23. Abrogated by Louis XVIII., 25.
- ORIGEN. His heterodoxy problematical, I., 379.
- ORTLIBENSES. A sect of the Waldenses. Peculiar errors, II., 311.
- OTHO OF FRISENGEN. His judgment on the tenure of the Holy Roman Emperors, II., 29.
- OTHO IV. Holy Rom. Emp. See INNOCENT III.
- OXFORD MOVEMENT. Origin and history, V., 434. Anglican judgments concerning its importance, 475.
- OZANAM. Founds the Conferences of St. Vincent de Paul, V., 308. His course at the University, 312. Value of his writings, 319.
- PALATINE LIBRARY. Not burned by Pope Gregory the Great, I., 389.
- PALEOLOGUS, MICHAEL. Gk. Emp. Abjures the Photian Schism, II., 381.
- PALMARIS SYNOD. Refuses to judge Pope Symmachus, I., 351.
- PALMER, WILLIAM. His calibre, and his conversion, V., 440, in Note.
- PALMERSTON. His impudence to Pope Gregory XVI., 243. His revolutionary role as "Grand Orient of the Orient", 511. He was the efficient cause of Garibaldi's Marsala expedition, 535.
- PANIC OF A. D. 1000. A mere myth, II., 20.
- PAN-SLAVISM. Its mission, V., 109, in Note. Socialism its tool, VI., 391.
- PARAGUAY, "REDUCTIONS" OF. Colonies of Indians, formed and protected by the Jesuits, IV., 448.
- PARKER, MATTHEW. Elizabethan incumbent of the See of Canterbury, III., 477. Invalidation of his "consecration", from a historical point of view, 499. Invalidation, from the theological standpoint, VI., 230.
- PARRIS, A Dutch Unitarian, burnt by order of Cranmer, III., 472.
- PASCAL. His early career, IV., 144. His scientific attainments, 151. His alleged skepticism, 152. His alleged eroticism, 157. His "Provincial Letters" a tissue of immortal lies and of sublime forgeries, 159.
- PASCHASIUS. His explanation of the Real Presence, II., 108.
- PASSAGINI. Their heresies, II., 313.
- PATARINES. A sect of the Waldenses. Their peculiar errors, II., 311.
- PATRICIAN OF ROME. Meaning of the title, as given by the Popes to Pepin and Charlemagne, I., 508; II., 36.
- PATRICK, ST., APOSTLE OF IRELAND. His apostolate, I., 289. His doctrine was thoroughly "papistical", 293.
- PAUL, ST., APOSTLE. He had no joint jurisdiction with St. Peter in the Bishopric of Rome, much less was he sole Bishop of Rome, I., 20.
- PAUL OF THE CROSS, ST. His esteem for the Society of Jesus, IV., 483.
- PAUL II., POPE. He was not a foe to learning, III., 176.
- PAUL IV., POPE. He did not approve the Protestant "Book of Common Prayer", III., 476, in Note.
- PAULICIANS. Their Manicheism, I., 463. Their opposition to the veneration of the Cross was an innovation, 464.
- PAZZI, CONSPIRACY OF THE. The extent of the participation of Pope Sixtus IV., III., 187.
- PEACE, LETTERS OF. Given by the early martyrs. Their meaning, I., 122.
- PEARSON. Anglican incumbent of Chester. Asserts the Roman residence of St. Peter, I., 9, in Note.
- PEASANTS' WAR. Luther's connection with it, III., 314.
- PEDRO I., Emperor of Brazil. Grand-Master of Brazilian Masonry, VI., 50.
- PEDRO II., Emperor of Brazil. A tool of Freemasonry in its persecution of the Brazilian Church, VI., 52.
- PEEL, ROBERT. Abandons the claim to a right of veto on Catholic episcopal nominations, V., 202. He introduces a Bill for Catholic Emancipation, 231.

- PELAGIANISM. Its doctrines, I., 254. Condemned by Pope Innocent I., 257. This pontifical action shows that Papal definitions in matters of faith were then regarded as irreformable, 259.
- PENANCE, PUBLIC. Its nature among the early Christians, I., 160. The system obtained for twelve centuries, 164. Public, not private and Sacramental Confession, prohibited by Nectarius of Constantinople, 166.
- PEONS, MEXICAN. Their lot far happier than that of laborers in other countries, VI., 382, in Note.
- PEPIN THE SHORT, King of the Franks. Spurns the bribes of Copronymus in the matter of Iconoclasm, I., 471. His so-called "donation" to the Holy See, 507. It was rather a restitution, 511, in Note.
- PERSECUTIONS, EARLY CHRISTIAN. Vain endeavors of Voltaire, Gibbon, Basnage, Dodwell, etc., to belittle their woes, and to excuse their authors, I., 45, 49, 53, 57.
- PETER, ST., ROMAN PONTIFICATE OF. Position of its deniers, I., 1. It is proved by the testimony of St. Paul, 5. By that of Pope St. Clement I., 8. By that of St. Irenæus, 9. By that of Tertullian, Hegeppus, and Dionysius of Corinth, 10. By that of Sts. Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustine, 11. By that of the later Fathers, 12. By the ancient "Catalogues of the Pontiffs", 13. By the vivid and absolute tradition of the Roman people, 14. A belief in it could not have arisen from the ambition of the Roman Pontiffs, 15. The question of chronology, 17. Sts. Peter and Paul were not co-bishops of Rome, 19.
- PETER "LEONIS". Usurper of the Papal throne, II., 269, in Note.
- PETER OF VAUX-CERNAY, Summarizes the errors of the Albigenses, II., 351.
- PETER OF CASTELNAU. Papal legate, murdered by the Albigenses, II., 354.
- PETER MARTYR (of Verona) ST. Martyred by the Patarines, III., 446, in Note.
- PETER MARTYR VERMIGLIO. Apostatises, and Cranmer gives him a chair of theology in Oxford, III., 446. After consultation with Calvin, he allows a married apostate to take a second "wife", because the legitimate spouse remains a Catholic, 448.
- PETIT, JOHN. His defence of the doctrine justifying tyrannicide is condemned by the Council of Constance, III., 39.
- PETRUCCI, CARD. Executed for his attempted murder of Pope Leo X., III., 285.
- PHILIP AUGUSTUS, King of France. See INNOCENT III.
- PHILOSOPHUMENA. Of Mt. Athos, not written by St. Hippolytus, I., 13, in Note.
- PHOTIUS. See SCHISM, GREEK.
- PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA. Sincerely orthodox at heart, praised by Innocent VIII., but expresses views which are condemned by the Holy See, III., 200. His sanctity, 201.
- PIETISTS. German Protestant false mysticists, V., 363. The Jansenists of Protestantism, 365.
- PIFRES (PATRINS). A sect of the Albigenses, II., 350, in Note.
- PIMODAN, GEN. DE. Assassinated at Castelidardo, V., 534.
- PISA, COUNCIL OF. Assembled for a termination of the Great Western Schism, III., 18. Deposits the rival Pontiffs, Gregory XII. and Benedict XIII., 21. Election of Balthassar Cossa, 22. Arguments for and against the œcumenicity of this Council, 24.
- PISTOJA. Pseudo-Synod, IV., 502. Pius VI. condemns its Jansenistic and Josephist doctrines, 507.
- PITT, The Younger. His course in regard to English Catholic Emancipation, V., 159, 186, 192.
- PIUS II., POPE. Early career, III., 160. Urges a Crusade, 161. His Bull of Retractions, and his condemnation of all appeals from a Papal decision, 167. His condemnation of the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII., 170.

- PIUS VI., POPE. His character and election, IV., 562. His dissensions with the court of Naples, 567. His imprisonment by the French Directory, and his death, 575. His resistance to the quasi-schismatic enterprises of Joseph II., 588, 600. His condemnation of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy in France, 610.
- PIUS VII., POPE. Tricks of Bonaparte and of the German emperor in reference to the Conclave of 1800, V., 2. Early career of Gregorio Chiaramonti, 10. Pettiness and boorishness of the German emperor toward the new Pontiff, 13. The Concordat with France, 14. The "Organic Articles" surreptitiously added to the Concordat by Napoleon, 23. The consecration of Napoleon as emperor, 27. The imprisonment of the Pontiff, 33. The extorted Concordat, and the firmness of Consalvi, 45. The Pontiff is restored to his capital, 47. His hospitality to the Bonaparte family, 50, 243. His character, 53. His course in the matter of the pretended divorce of Napoleon, 58. His refusal to nullify the Jerome Bonaparte-Patterson marriage, 65. His decision in the question of the English royal veto on episcopal nominations, 208.
- PIUS VIII., POPE. Condemns the Prussian law which forbade the exaction of a promise of fidelity to Catholic conditions from a Protestant party to a mixed marriage, V., 257.
- PIUS IX., POPE. His early career, V., 505. His election, 509. Grants a Constitution to his subjects, 512. The assassination of his prime-minister, Count Rossi, 514. The flight to Gaeta, 518. The restoration, 520. Cavour shows his hand at the Congress of Paris, 525. The campaign of Castelfidardo, 540. The Pontiff gives the lie to an envoy from His Sardinian Majesty, 548. The seizure of Rome by the Piedmontese, 549. Pius IX. refuses a pension from the usurpers, 551. The definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, 558. The "Syllabus", 561. The alleged Freemasonry of Pius IX., 564. His death, 569. His remains outraged by the Italian Unitarians, VI., 155.
- PLATINA. His declamations against Pope Paul II., III., 176.
- PLETHO. His schismatic effrontery in reference to the Council of Florence, III., 126, 139.
- PLINY THE YOUNGER. Testifies to the rapid spread of Christianity, I., 59.
- POBEDONOSTZEF. Procurator of the Russian Holy Synod, and prime instigator of the persecution of Catholics, V., 140, 143.
- POLAND. Her conversion, V., 73. Catholicism and patriotism are synonymous in Poland, 75. Origin and significance of the United Greek Rite among the Catholics of Poland, 78. Sufferings of the Polish Catholics under the infamous Catharine II., 80. The practical apostasy of Siestrzenczewicz, 82. Falsehoods and absurdities of Dimitri Tolstoy, procurator of the Holy Synod under Alexander I, in the matter of Polish Catholicism, 88, 89, 94, 95, 115, 116, 129, 136. Paul I. and Alexander I. comparatively tolerant, 92. Nicholas I. rivals Catharine II. as a persecutor, 93. The betrayal of the United Greeks by Siemaszko, 94. The cruelties of Nicholas I. revealed to the Western world by Pope Gregory XVI., 100. The meeting of the Pontiff and the autocrat, 101. The persecution under the "gentle" Alexander II., 103. Ferocity of Michael Mourawieff, 109. The protests of Pius IX., and the insult offered him by the Russian ambassador, Meyendorf, 112. "Russification" not justified by the "Polonization" of the olden time, 122. The Uniates of Galicia frequently accomplices of the destroyers of the Uniates of Russian Poland, 127. The Russifying enterprises of Kuzlemski and Marcellus Popiel, 128. Alexander III. at first tolerant, but yields to the influence of Pobedonostzef, and nearly rivals Nicholas I. as a persecutor, 139. The massacre of Kroz , 141. Nicholas II. begins his reign with a wholesale deportation and exile of Polish priests, but there are hopes of amelioration, 143.

- POLYCARP, ST. His Epistle to the Philippians, I., 74.
- POLYCRATES OF EPHESUS. Obeys Pope St. Victor I. in the matter of the Easter Controversy, I., 24.
- POMBAL, SEBASTIAN CARVALHO, Marquis of. His character, IV., 445. Denounces the pretended crimes of the Jesuits to Pope Benedict XIV., 446. His accusations refuted by the history of the "Reductions" of Paraguay, 448. Resolves to imitate Henry VIII, if otherwise he cannot destroy the Jesuits, 451. Banishes the Jesuits, 452. Executes Father Malagrida, 454. His rupture with Pope Clement XIII., who supports the Society, 455.
- POMPONAZIO. Contends that the immortality of the soul cannot be proved by reason, but afterward retracts this view, III., 300.
- POMPONIO LETO. Leader of the Italian Humanists. Eccentric, but orthodox, III., 178, in Note.
- PONTIFICAL BOOK. "Diary of the Popes". Its value, I., 226.
- POOR MEN OF LYONS. The original Waldenses, and irreprehensible, II., 308.
- POPESS. See JOAN.
- PORT-ROYAL (of Paris and Les Champs). Jansenist shrine and headquarters, IV., 115, in Note. Its spirit, 116, 133, 141, 160, 166.
- POSITIVISM. Not originated by Comte, but as old as Enesidemus and Sextus the Empiric, V., 355. The Positivism of Littré, 385, in Note. That of Proudhon, of certain Liberal clerics, of some would-be scientists, and of some would-be artists, 386.
- PRAGMATIC SANCTION. Meaning, III., 170. The Sanction ascribed to St. Louis of France was never issued by him, 171.
- PROPERTY, RIGHTS OF. Theory of Proudhon, VI., 357. Of Robert Owen, 356. Of Fourier, V., 382. Teachings of Leo XIII., VI., 362.
- PROTESTANTISM. Its birth, III., 304. Its propagation, very differently from that of the Church, was assisted by the spirit of the world, 326, 333. It had nothing to do with the "rebirth" of learning, 328. Philosophy owes it nothing, 330. It did not even give to men a new freedom to discuss the doings of churchmen, 331. Its triumph in England, 463. Its efforts to intrench itself in France, 368. Its attempts to seduce Italy, 441. Its rejection entailed on Italy no loss of worldly prosperity, 461. See LUTHER.
- PRUSSIANS. Originally a Slavic, not a Teutonic tribe, IV., 374, in Note. Not converted from barbarism and paganism until the thirteenth century, II., 10, in Note.
- PULCHERIA, ST. Roman Empress. Her influence over Theodosius II., I., 280, in Note.
- PURGATORY. Formed an article of faith for the early Anglo-Saxon Church, I., 406.
- PUSEYISM. See OXFORD MOVEMENT.
- QUESNEL, PASQUIER. His "Moral Reflections" the occasion of the Bull "Unigenitus", IV., 346. Condemnation of 101 of his propositions, 351. See "UNIGENITUS".
- QUIETISM. A legacy from the Origenistic mystics of the fourth century, IV., 304. Vagaries of Molinos, 305. His theories condemned by Innocent XI., 306. The super-exaltation of Mme. Guyon, 308. Her erotic blasphemies, 309. She is unmasked by Bossuet, 314. This question not one of mere words on unintelligible matters, 323.
- RANKE. His injustices toward Pope Leo X., III., 299. His foolish observations on the Council of Trent, 532. Value of his "unearthed documents" concerning this Council, 534.
- RATIONALISM. Its path opened by the Protestant "Pietists", V., 363. Aided by the Wolfen "philosophy", 365. The New Exegesis, 366. Champions of

- Rationalism, 368. French Rationalism more baneful than the German, because more logical, 375. Semi-Rationalism of Gioberti, 388.
- RATISBONNE, THE BROTHERS. Their conversion from Judaism, V., 255, in Note.
- RATRAMN OF CORBIE. His triple distinction as to the Body of Christ, I., 402.
- RATTAZZI. His judgment on Leo XIII., VI., 153.
- RAYMOND VI. Count of Toulouse. Protects the Albigenses, and is deposed by Pope Innocent III., II., 352.
- REFORMATION. See PROTESTANTISM.
- REGALIA, QUESTION OF. For its German phase, see INVESTITURES. Its meaning in French history, II., 386, in Note; IV., 211. The question was not merely one of money, IV., 213. The mistake of Louis XIV. due to the subserviency of the French bishops, 217. Justification of the course pursued by Pope Innocent XI. in this matter, 218. The Concordat between Pope Leo X. and Francis I. responsible for much of this trouble, 220.
- REINKENS. His consecration as bishop of the "Old Catholics", V., 614.
- RELATIONS OF VENETIAN AMBASSADORS. Their value, III., 206, in Note.
- RELIGIOUS ORDERS IN ENGLAND. Still prohibited by law, V., 181, in Note.
- RENAISSANCE. Its pagan tendencies, III., 232. Chief lights, 329, in Note.
- REVOLUTION, FRENCH, OF 1789. Judged by Mgr. Freppel, IV., 617, in Note.
- RHODES, SIEGES OF. The Knights-Hospitalers, VI., 646. D'Aubusson elected Grand-Master, 648. Repulse of Mesis Vizir, 651. L'Ile-Adam Grand-Master, 657. Besieged by Soliman, 660. Rhodes capitulates, 664.
- RICCI, LORENZO. General of the Jesuits. His dying protest, IV., 488.
- RICCI, SCIPIO. Bishop of Pistoja. His religious innovations, IV., 592. His Josephist synod at Pistoja, 594. His submission and edifying death, 599.
- RICHELIEU, CARD. His ecclesiastical character irreproachable, IV., 274, in Note. He did not cause the fall of Wallenstein, 64. His object in aiding Gustavus Adolphus, 70. Withdraws his aid when the Swede refuses to spare the Catholic princes of Germany, 74. Openly wars on Austria, 77. His attitude during the Thirty Years War, 79.
- RICHER, EDMOND. His errors, IV., 354.
- RIENZI. His career, II., 551. His character, 567.
- RIMINI, COUNCIL OF. The synodals were not guilty of heresy, I., 235.
- ROBERTSON, W. As a historian his spirit is Voltairian, III., 293. He misrepresents gravely the work of the Church in Latin America, V., 270, in Note. Judged by Cantù, II., 6.
- ROHAN, LOUIS RENÉ DE, CARD. His connection with the affair of Marie Antoinette's diamond necklace, IV., 570.
- ROSSI, PELLEGRINO. Accepts the invitation of Pius IX. to "constitutionalize" the government of the Papal States, V., 514. His assassination, 516.
- RUDOLPH OF HAPSBURG. Conditions on which he became emperor, II., 380.
- RUFINUS. A forerunner of Pelagianism, I., 253.
- RUNCARI. A sect of the Waldenses, II., 311.
- RUSSIAN "ORTHODOX" CHURCH. Not synonymous with the schismatic Greek either in origin, or in language, or in polity, or in government, II., 127. Its own liturgical books admit the primacy of St. Peter and his successors, although it refuses submission to that primacy, 128, in Note. Its lethargy and superstition, 134. Reasons which militate against its submission to the Papacy, 135. Persecuting spirit of its Holy Synod, V., 140, 143. Heterodoxies of "Russian Orthodoxy," VI., 687. See POLAND.
- SABELLIUS. Held that the Son and the Holy Ghost are not subsistent Persons, but attributes or emanations of the Father, I., 37.
- SACCHO, REINERIUS. A converted Waldensian bishop, II., 308.

- SAGASTA, PRAXEDES. Grand-Master of Spanish Freemasonry, proposes to Judaize Spain, VI., 46.
- SAINT-CYRAN (John du Verger de Hauranne). His character as judged by St. Vincent de Paul, IV., 113.
- SAINT-SIMON, LOUIS DE. A complete expression of Jansenism, IV., 133.
- SAINT-SIMON, CLAUDE DE. His philosophistic theories, V., 378.
- SALISBURY, JOHN OF. His authority, I., 391, 392, in Note.
- SAMOSATIANS. Their doctrines I., 144. See ANTIOCH, COUNCIL OF.
- SANCTA CLARA, FRANCISCUS DE, O.S.F. Grants the validity of Anglican "Orders", and afterward denies said validity, IV., 53, in Note.
- SARDICA, COUNCIL OF. General, but regarded as an appendix to that of Nice, I., 209. This Council did not initiate the right of appeal to the Roman Pontiff, 212. Falsity of the Febronian interpretation of the third, fourth, and seventh Canons, 216.
- SARPI, PAOLO. His "History of the Council of Trent", III., 521. His course during the dissension between Pope Paul V. and Venice, IV., 9. His orthodox problematical, 13. His judgment on the alleged *Monita Secreta* of the Jesuits, and his charges against the Society, 441.
- SATURNINUS. Disciple of Menander. His heresy, I., 28.
- SAVANAROLA. His rise, III., 230. Proclaims the necessity of purifying the sanctuary, 232. Becomes omnipotent in Florence, 235. Disobeys the pontifical command to abstain from preaching, 237. Excommunicated, 238. Loses his influence in Florence, 239. The fiasco of the ordeal by fire, 240. The Church never authorized or approved such ordeals, 241, in Note. Alexander VI. tries to save the friar, 243. The Christian death of the agitator, 245. He was not a precursor of Protestantism, 247. His intense and orthodox piety, 249. He is praised by Saints and by Popes, 253. Reasons, justifiable or foolish, for sympathy with him, 255.
- SCANDERBEG (George Castriota). Helps the Hungarians to save Christendom from the Osmanlis, III., 142, 156.
- SCARAMPO, CARD. Pontifical naval commander, protects the Mediterranean islands from Mahomet II., III., 156.
- SCHELLING, FRED W. 'Banishes all objective existence in favor of the *Ego*, V., 371.
- SCHILLER. His "History of the Thirty Years War" a platitudinous effort, IV., 58, in Note.
- SCHISM, GREEK. Its first stage under Photius, II., 55. Its revival by Cerularius, 123. The Schismatic Greek Church differs from the Russian "Orthodox" in origin, language, polity, and government, 127. Attempts of Protestants to communicate with the Schismatic Greeks, 130. The enterprise of Cyril Lucar, 131. The submission of the Schismatics to the Holy See does not mean their Latinization, 135, 136, in Note.
- SCHISM, GREAT WESTERN. Election of Bartholomew Prignano as Pope Urban VI., II., 522. Discontent and final revolt of the French cardinals, 525. Joined by two of the Italian cardinals, they venture to "elect" a new Pontiff, Robert of Geneva, who takes the name of Clement VII., 527. Christendom soon divided into two "obediences", 528. Some apposite reflections on the nature of this Schism, 529. The election of Urban VI. was free, and therefore valid; therefore his successors, Boniface IX., Innocent VII., and Gregory XII., were legitimate Pontiffs, 532. Arguments advanced by the partisans of the line of Robert of Geneva, 541. Termination of the Schism, 548.
- SCISCIDENSES. A sect of the Waldenses, II., 311.
- SHAFTESBURY (Anthony Ashley Cooper). Skeptic and indifferentist, IV., 291, in Note.

- SCOTIA. The ancient name of Ireland, the land now termed Scotland not having been so styled before the eleventh century, I., 114.
- SCOTUS ERIGENA. Not the author of the treatise on the Eucharist which was condemned by the Synod of Vercelli in 1049, I., 315. Not to be confounded with Duns Scotus, *ibi*, in Note. Probably a layman, II., 108, in Note.
- SECRET, DISCIPLINE OF THE. Its nature, I., 96. It furnishes a proof of the early Christian belief in Transubstantiation, 103.
- SEDULIUS. Vainly cited to prove the "anti-papistical" doctrines of the early Irish Church, I., 312.
- SEMPIELAGIANS. Held many errors, but they were not involved in the condemnation of Pelagianism, I., 263.
- SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, Rom. Emp. Persecutes the Christians, I., 50.
- SERFDOM, MEDIEVAL. It was a mere memory and a name, VI., 551.
- SERVETUS. Burnt alive as a heretic by order of Calvin, III., 361. Melancthon justifies the deed, 362.
- SEVENTH GEN. COUNCIL, SECOND OF NICE. Condemns Iconoclasm, I., 473. The synodals did not examine juridically the Letters of Pope Adrian I. to Tharadius and to the sovereigns Irene and Constantine, 480.
- SIEMASZKO. His apostasy, and his persecution of the Ruthenian Uniates, V., 94. His atrocities toward the Nuns of Minsk, 145.
- SIESTRZENCEWICZ. Betrays the cause of the United Greeks in Russia, and practically apostatizes, V., 82.
- SIMON JULES. Condemns the educational laws of the Third French Republic, VI., 122, 129, 131.
- SIMON MAGUS. Rather a false Messiah than a heretic, I., 26.
- SINUESA, PRETENDED SYNOD OF. Its "Acts" apocryphal, VI., 510.
- SIRMIUM, THREE FORMULAS OF. So-called, but only the first was issued by the Sirmian synodals, I., 229. If Pope Liberius signed any Sirmian formula, he signed the first, which was perfectly orthodox, 230. The word *homoousios* is not found in the first formula, but the doctrine presented implies it, 231.
- SISTERS OF CHARITY. Founded by St. Vincent de Paul. Their prime characteristics, IV., 179.
- SIXTUS IV., POPE. His character, III., 185. His connection with the Conspiracy of the Pazzi, 186. The severity of this Pontiff toward Florence was in accordance with the Canons, 192. His relations with Louis XI. of France, 193.
- SIXTUS V., POPE. Reliability of Gregorio Leti, the apostate writer of the buffoonesque "Life" of this Pontiff, III., 536. The story of the discarded crutches, and that of the phenomenally vigorous exhortation, are impossible yarns, 537. The zeal of Sixtus V. was prudent, and his severity was not injustice, 541. As for the affairs of France, the influence of Sixtus over the League counterbalanced that of Philip II. of Spain, 544. His Bull of Deposition against Henry IV., 545. His reason for refusing the customary Papal Mass of Requiem in the case of Henry III., 549.
- SLAVE-TRADE. Always condemned by the Roman Pontiffs, V., 268. Apposite Bull of Gregory XVI., 270. The united action of Leo XIII. and Cardinal Lavigerie against the traffic, VI., 291.
- SOCIALISM. Meaning and history, VI., 354. Difference between the French and German theories, 357. Connection with Freemasonry, 359. Teachings of Leo XIII., 362. The right of private ownership is according to the Natural Law, 363. Iniquity of Statolatry, 364. The question of wages, 366.
- SOCINUS, FAUSTUS. His notions different from those of Arius, and from those of many other Unitarians, III., 453.
- SOCRATES. The historian. His proneness to mendacity, I., 111, in Note.

- SOKOLSKI. Bulgarian archimandrite, submits to the Holy See, is consecrated bishop, and then apostatizes, V., 131, in Note.
- SORCERY, MEDIEVAL. Sorcery not peculiar to the Middle Age, VI., 534. Witchcraft was scarcely known until nearly the close of the Middle Age, 535.
- SPECIES, HUMAN. Three of them, according to Valentinus, I., 34.
- SPENER, PHILIP. Founds the Protestant school of Pietists, V., 363. Refuses to recognize religious teaching authority in the German civil governments, 364.
- SPINOLA, CRISTOFORO, O.S.F. Projects a reconciliation of the German Lutherans with the Holy See, IV., 377.
- STRAUSS, DAVID. His theory of myths as applied to the life of Jesus, V., 372. Reply of Rousseau to the assumption that miracles are impossible, 374.
- SULLY, MAURICE DE. Bishop of Paris. A typical bishop of the Middle Age, VI., 571.
- SWEDEN. Cause of its Protestantization, IV., 68, in Note. See GUSTAVUS-ADOLPHUS.
- SYLLABUS. Collection of eighty errors already condemned by Pius IX., but again reprobated in 1864, V., 561. It is a condemnation of the intellectual, social, and religious heresies which are characteristic of the spirit of the world at the present time, 563.
- SYMMACHUS, ST., POPE. Not judged by the Palmaris Synod, I., 352.
- SYNESIUS. Bishop of Ptolemais. Allowed to retain his wife, II., 192.
- TACITUS. Testifies to the large number of Christians in the empire when Nero mounted the throne, I., 59.
- TALLEYRAND. His lies in furtherance of Bonaparte's interference with the Conclave of 1800, V., 3.
- TASSO. Made laureate by Pope Clement VIII., III., 559. His last days, 560.
- TATIAN. His heresy, and his "Diatessaron", I., 35.
- TEMPLARS, THEIR SUPPRESSION. Origin of the order, II., 454. Beginning of its corruption even in the time of St. Bernard, 457. Most authoritative works to be consulted on this subject, 458, in Note. Horrible charges against the Knights, 459. Nearly all the members of the preceptory of Paris admit their guilt, 460. But Pope Clement V. disapproves of the high-handed procedures of Philip the Fair, and calls the question to the Holy See, 461. At the pontifical inquiry the cited knights avow the truth of the confessions made at the Parisian investigation, 463. The same guilt was evinced in the cases of the Templars of Lombardy, Tuscany, England, and Aragon, 465. The order abolished by the Roman Pontiff, 466. The supposed value of the arguments deduced from Villani, St. Antonine of Florence, Dante, Boccaccio, etc., in favor of the Templars, 470. The confessions of the Templars were not wrung from unwilling lips by torture, 479. The suppression was not due to the covetousness of Philip the Fair, 482. Much of modern sympathy with the Templars is due to the desire of Freemasonry to vindicate for itself a respectable and romantic origin, 484.
- TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPES. See DEPOSING POWER and DOMINION, PAPAL.
- TENTH GEN. COUNCIL, SECOND LATERAN. Remedies the evils caused by the schism of Peter "Leonis", condemns the errors of Peter de Bruis and of Arnold of Brescia, and enforces ecclesiastical discipline, II., 268.
- TENTH CENTURY. Belied by Protestant polemics when they term it one of intellectual and moral darkness, II., 110.
- TERTULLIAN. Asserts the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter, I., 13. Becomes a Montanist, 36. Shows the wide spread of Christianity in his day, 60.

- THEOBALD.** The chosen patron of the Carbonari, V., 482.
- THEODORE OF MOPSUESTE.** Forerunner of Pelagius, I., 253. Prime cause of the Controversy of the Three Chapters, 359.
- THEODORET.** Asserts the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter, I., 5. Pronounced a Catholic by the synodals of Chalcedon, but his writings against St. Cyril of Alexandria are condemned by the Fifth Gen. Council, 360.
- THIERS.** Connives at the destruction of the Archiepiscopal Library of Paris in 1831, V., 249. Partly responsible for the murder of Archbishop Darbois, VI., 94. His inordinate passion for power, 111.
- THIRTEENTH GEN. COUNCIL, FIRST OF LYONS.** Preludes, II., 370. Deposition of the emperor, Frederick II., 375.
- THIRTY YEARS WAR.** See GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS and RICHELIEU.
- THOMAS OF AQUINO, ST.** Renaissance of his philosophy under Leo XIII., VI., 181. Absurdly charged with skepticism by Michelet, 642.
- THOMAS À BECKET, ST.** See BECKET.
- TISZA, KOLOMAN.** Hungarian statesman. Forces civil matrimony on the Hungarians, VI., 245.
- TOLSTOY, DIMITRY.** Procurator of the Russian Holy Synod, V., 78. His value as a historian, 79, 88, 94, 95, 115.
- TOURNON, CARD. DE.** His sufferings because of his fidelity to the Apostolic See in the matter of the Chinese Rites, VI., 675.
- TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.** Their origin and history, V., 443. Tract No. 90, 455.
- TRADES-UNIONS.** Their universality, perfect organization, and influence in the Middle Age, VI., 537.
- TRAJAN.** Rom. Emp. Persecutes the Christians, although he issues no new decrees, I., 46. The yarn about his alleged release from hell, 391.
- TRANSFERS, EPISCOPAL.** Discipline in the first centuries of Christianity, I., 94.
- TRANSMARINE APPEALS.** Not prohibited by the Second Council of Carthage in the sense of an exclusion of appeals to Rome, I., 267.
- TRENT, COUNCIL OF, EIGHTEENTH GENERAL.** Preludes, III., 511. Its sessions, 513. The Canon on the indissolubility of matrimony, and the practice of the United Greeks, 520. Character and authority of the assembly, 524. The synodals enjoyed perfect freedom of discussion, 527. It was not a failure, 529. Reception of its decrees, 530. Criticisms of Rauke, 532. Reliability of Sarpi, the prized authority of Protestant critics of this Council, as gauged even by Ranke, 535.
- TRIAVERDINS.** Albigensian rapers and pillagers, II., 287.
- TRUCE OF GOD.** Its nature, II., 258. It was not a usurpation of civil governmental authority, 264.
- TRULLIAN OR "QUINISEXT" SYNOD.** Not regarded as œcumenical by the Holy See, I., 449. Reasons for its respect by the Greek Schismatics, 451.
- TWELFTH GEN. COUNCIL, FOURTH LATERAN.** Condemns the errors of the Albigenses, II., 362. Shows no regard for Otho IV., and recognizes Frederick II. as King of the Germans, 363. Refutation of Mosheim's assertion that this Council introduced the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and the practice of Auricular Confession, 369.
- "UNIGENITUS", THE BULL.** Issued by Clement XI. in condemnation of the distinctive doctrines of Quesnel, IV., 350. The recalcitrant Quesnellists supported by Cardinal de Noailles, 354. The aberrations of Petitpied, 360. Submission of the cardinal, 366. Course of the Faculty and of the Parliament of Paris, 368. Afflictions entailed on the Church of France by the appellants from the Bull, 270.
- UNIVERSITY OF FRANCE.** Founded by Napoleon on the ruins of the University of Paris, V., 324. He orders that its provosts, principals, and

- prefects shall be celibates, 326. The combat of Montalembert and other Catholic champions against the Universitarian monopoly, 277, 327.
- URBAN VI., POPE. See **SCLISM, GREAT WESTERN.**
- URBAN VIII., POPE. Revises the Roman Breviary, IV., 49. The mission of Panzani to England, 51. The abolition of the Jesuitesses, 54. Attitude of the Pontiff during the Thirty Years War, 79. His friendship for Galileo, 92. His attitude during the prosecution of Galileo, 93. He emitted no decision in the matter of the heliocentric system, 106.
- MARTYROLOGIES, ROMAN. Those compiled by Usuard, Ado, Bede, Florus, and Notkerus, I., 88, in Note.
- UTRECHT, JANSENIST CHURCH OF. Its birth, IV., 339
- VALDEZ. First emissary of the Reformation in Naples, III., 442.
- VALENTINIANS. Their heresies, I., 34.
- VALERIAN. Rom. Emp. Persecutes the Christians, I., 54.
- VANINI. Burnt for atheism and blasphemy by order of the Parliament of Toulouse, III., 455.
- VATICAN, COUNCIL OF THE, NINETEENTH GENERAL. Its convocation, V., 571. Reciprocal attitude of the Pontiff and the powers in the matter, 572. Invitation to the Oriental Schismatics, but none to any of the Protestant sects, 573. Impotent blasphemies of Freemasonry excited by the Council, 575. Regulations for the guidance of the synodals, 579. The Pontifical Dogmatic Constitution, *Dei Filius*, 581. Efforts of the opponents of the definition of Papal Infallibility, 584. Popular objections against the doctrine, 587. Agitation among the "Liberal" Catholics, 591. Catholic declaration of Dupanloup, 593. Reasons adduced by the inopportunist, 593, in Note. The votes, 596. The Pontifical Definition of the Dogma of Papal Infallibility, 599. Protestant and infidel hysterics after the definition, 600. The argument of the inopportunist that the definition would impede the work of conversion, 602. The sessions of the Council were calm and grave, 603. The Council of the Vatican was a supreme remedy against the evils of pretended "Liberalism", 605.
- VAUDOIS, PIEDMONTESE. Those of the thirteenth century not to be confounded with the Waldenses, and their belief was not that of the Vaudois of to-day, II., 318.
- VENICE, INTERDICT OF. Independent Venice firmly Catholic in faith, but addicted to Statolatry in matters outside the body of doctrine, IV., 3. The Most Serene violates the right of Ecclesiastical Immunity, and the Republic is interdicted, 5. Effort of Bellarmine to restore peace, 6. England and Holland foment the difficulty, 8. Sarpi adds fuel to the flame, 9. Henry IV. refuses to countenance them, and the oligarchs submit to Rome, 10. In this conflict the Venetians did not even question the indirect power of the Pope to interfere in the affairs of States, 12.
- VERGERIO. He offered no bribe to Luther in the name of the Pope, III., 449. His innovations in his diocese, and his refusal to justify himself at Rome, prevent his admission to the Council of Trent, 450. His apostasy and his insubordination to Luther, 451.
- VERNACULAR, IN BIBLE AND LITURGY. Pre-Reformation vernacular versions of the Scriptures, III., 310. The Liturgical languages of the Eastern schismatics are not vernacular, II., 128.
- VETO, RIGHT OF. In a Conclave. See **EXCLUSION.**
- VEUILLOT, LOUIS. Life and principles, VI., 427.
- VICTOR, ST., POPE. Merely threatened to excommunicate the Asiatic bishops because of their course in the Eastern Controversy, I., 109.
- VICTOR EMMANUEL II. King of Sardinia. Annexes the Romagna, Tuscany, Parma, and Modena to Piedmont, V., 523, in Note. Excommunicated.

- although not by name, 535. Attacks his cousin, Francis II. of Naples, without a declaration of war; embraces Garibaldi; and proclaims his annexation of the Two Sicilies, 536. In conformity with the permission of Napoleon III. to "act quickly", he invades Umbria and the Marches, and annexes them to his kingdom, 540. He assumes the title of "King of Italy", 542. Openly aids the attempt of Garibaldi which is thwarted at Mentana, 546. Frightened by Freemasonry, he seizes the Eternal City, and installs himself in the Quirinal, 548. Offers a pension to Pius IX., but it is refused, 551. His death, 568.
- VILLANI, JOHN. His authority as a historian, II., 437.
- VIRGILIUS, ST. Disputes with St. Boniface, and appeals to Rome, I., 305. See BONIFACE, ST.
- VIRGINS, CONSECRATED. Among the early Christians, VI., 520. Nunneries began with the freedom of Christianity, 521. Age of profession, 523. Blessing of the veils, which were of three kinds, 524. Duties of "deaconesses", 525. The "canonesses" of mediæval times, 526.
- VOLTAIRE. Value of the "Lives" by Condorcet and Duvernet, the sources of nearly all Protestant and infidel writings on Voltaire, IV., 505. François-Marie Aronnet adopts the more aristocratic name of "M. de Voltaire", 508. His relations with Bolingbroke, 509. His "Henriade", 511. His "Brutus", 512. His apotheosis of the infamous Adrienne Lecouvreur, 513. His best prose work, "Charles XII", 514. His "Philosophical Letters" burnt by the public executioner, 516. Audaciously dedicates his "Mahomet" to Pope Benedict XIV., 518. The Pompadour causes his appointment as historiographer of France, 519. His relations with Frederick II. of Prussia, as narrated by himself, 521. His "Age of Louis XIV", 526. His rupture with Frederick, 529. His lubricious insults to "The Maid", 530. Becomes the Sage of Ferney, and first pronounces his *écrasez l'infâme*, 531. His opinion of Diderot's "Encyclopædia", 534. His "Essay on the Morals and Spirit of Nations", 535. Tries to establish a philosophical "convent" in order to wage more successful war on "the infamous one", 536. Ferney the Mecca of philosophists, 538. Returns to Paris, where he is idolized, 540. He is embraced ecstasically by Benjamin Franklin, 542. The Freemasonry of Voltaire, 523, in Note; 542. His last days, and the sacrilegious comedy of his retractation and confession, 543. His death one of rage and despair, 546. The remains now venerated in the Paris Pantheon are probably not those of Voltaire, but those of an unknown monk, 548, in Note. Voltaire was no friend of "the people", 549. His contempt for Rousseau, 550. His hatred for Poland, and his veneration of his "Saint", Catharine II., 551. He was no partisan of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity; and he despised France, 553. He was no historian. His travesties and falsifications in his "Age of Louis XIV.", 556. His justification of mendacity, 560. He was neither a genius nor a philosopher, 561. His calumny on Fénelon, 326.
- VORAGINE, JACOBUS DE. Value of his "Golden Legend", VI., 579.
- WALDENSES. Origin and doctrines, II., 308. Their divisions, 311. They were not forerunners of the Protestant Reformation, 314. Not to be confounded with the Vaudois of Piedmont, 318. Justification of Pope Innocent III., in the matter of his treatment of the Waldenses, 319.
- WALLENSTEIN (ALBERT RALSKO). His origin and career, IV., 63, in Note. His fall not due to Richelieu, 64. Urges the emperor to sack Rome, 80.
- WARD, WILLIAM GEORGE. His connection with the Oxford Movement, V., 451, 459, 461. His "Ideal" condemned by the Oxford Convocation, 465. His conversion, 469.

- WEISSHAUPT. Founds the Illuminati, IV., 427. Corrupts German ecclesiastics, 428. His doctrines, 429. His conversion, 430.
- WELLINGTON. Insists on Catholic Emancipation in order to avert civil war, V., 232.
- WESLEY, JOHN. Virulent persecutor of Catholics, and chief author of the Gordon Riots, V., 179.
- WESTPHALIA, PEACE OF. Simply a consecration of "accomplished facts", IV., 77. Loss it entailed on Germany, 78. Reason for its reprobation by Pope Innocent X., 79.
- WHITE FATHERS. Instituted by Lavigeric, VI., 299.
- WILFRID, ST. His history a proof that the early Anglo-Saxon Church acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, I., 412.
- WILLIAM I. German Emperor. His duplicity, VI., 2, 30. He was an ardent Freemason, 10.
- WILLIAM II. German Emperor. His visits to the Vatican, and the boorishness of his brother Henry, VI., 272.
- WILLIAM III. King of England. His provision "for the further preventing the growth of Popery", V., 161.
- WINDTHORST (of Meppen). Parliamentary champion of the German Catholics, VI., 14, 28, 38, 141.
- WULSTAN, ST. Resigns his diocese at the tomb of St. Edward, II., 174, in Note.
- WYCKLIFFE. The affair of Canterbury Hall, II., 568. Becomes an innovator, 569. His condemned propositions, 571. He was neither the author of the first translation of the Bible into the English language, nor the author of the so-called Wyckliffe's Translation, 576. Differences between the Wyckliffian and the Protestant tenets, 577. Comparative leniency displayed toward the Wyckliffites, 579.
- XAVIER, FRANCIS, ST. Founds the Jesuit missions in Japan, V., 392.
- ZISKA. Leader of the Thaborite Hussites. His character and exploits, III., 11, in Note.
- ZIZIM, PRINCE. Son of the sultan, Mahomet II. The question of the guilt of Pope Alexander VI. in procuring his death, III., 215, in Note.
- ZOSIMUS, ST. POPE. He did not approve a heresy when he designated the book of Cælestius as "Catholic", I., 261. He received appeals from the African dioceses, 264. The famous "Transmarine" Canon was not directed against appeals to the Holy See, but against appeals to the "Transmarine" bishops of Milan and Arles, 272.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



0315024806

DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY

931
P25
v. 6

07. 25

