

## CZAR NICHOLAS I. AND THE HOLY SEE (1825-1855).

THE evil policy of Catharine II., temporarily or partially arrested in the reigns of the Emperors Paul and Alexander, was consolidated and rounded out by her grandson, Nicholas. In the annals of modern persecution he holds a unique and ominous place. During most of his reign circumstances made him the dominant factor in continental politics, and he used this prestige to perfect certain traditional purposes of the Muscovite state, prominent among which was the thorough crushing of all Western influence and spirit, preparatory to the assertion of Holy Russia as the heir of Byzantine autocracy, the regenerator of Christendom and the mistress of the Orient.

"His dream," says an accurate historian of Russian Catholicism, "was that of all despots who are conscious of their power and accept unhesitatingly their allotted role, however fatal its ending. The realization of a triple unity, religious, political and national, throughout an immense empire that contained every variety of worship, government and climate; the establishment by every and any means of an unnatural unity similar to that which the Russian uniform stamps upon an army made up from twenty races and peoples; the straining in that sense of all the forces of an ultra-centralization that recolled before no degree of violence or cunning, no succession of failures or defeats—such was the supreme aim of Nicholas I. during the thirty years that Providence tolerated in his hands the iron sceptre that he seemed to have received from Peter the Great himself. His chief obstacle was the Catholic Church, the only power that has at all times and everywhere bid defiance to every despot, however called, and which alone has the certainty of outliving them. Nicholas was to learn this in due time; meanwhile he set about the absolute ruin of the faith of Rome. He would enslave it by cunning regulations, seduce it by deceitful promises, or overwhelm it by the violence of open persecution."<sup>1</sup>

The bureaucratic character of the new empire, as established by Peter the Great, permits and assures the permanency and regular operation of any policy once inaugurated in the Russian state. If we consider the undeveloped condition of the Russian commonwealth and the many human sympathies that feed its hopeless corruption; if we add its territorial vastness, the vague terror of a secret and sudden sanction of every absolute command, the universal ignorance and degradation of the popular mind, the skilful intermingling of racial hate, political dreams and religious fanaticism, we shall grasp in a general way the ease and the confidence with which a born autocrat like Nicholas took up the policy of his wicked grandmother and pushed it unhesitatingly to that degree of success which the God of Nations occasionally tolerates for the sublime purposes that are later made known to His children.

We have seen how the unspeakable treason of Siestrenczewicz laid low all the ready and natural opposition of the Russian Cath-

<sup>1</sup> Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe," Paris, 1903, p. 55.

olic Uniats and kept open all the roads that led to the usual centres of popular resistance to spiritual oppression. For the greater humiliation of Russian Catholicism and of the Holy See, the aged Archbishop of Mohilew disappeared from the scene (1825), only to make way for an even viler character—Joseph Siemaszko. For fifty years Siestrencewicz had drawn from the Russian treasury an annual salary of fifty thousand dollars, together with other perquisites, for which Judas-price he had sold the corner-stone of Catholicism in Russia—its unity with the See of Peter. But Siemaszko was destined to a more wretched fate, that of a public apostasy, entailing the loss of the Ruthenian Catholic hierarchy, such as it then was, and of several millions of Ruthenian Uniats. In the person of Siemaszko was finally consummated one chapter of the patient and crafty policy of Old Muscovy inaugurated on the downfall of Constantinople (1453) and further clarified and consolidated during the reign of Iwan III. (d. 1505).<sup>2</sup> It was just four hundred years (1439-1839) from the Council of Florence to the supreme treason of Siemaszko, from the creation of ecclesiastical unity by Cardinal Isidore, the metropolitan of Kiew, and his nine suffragans of Little Russia and White Russia, to the lamentable overthrow of the same by the most traitorous of the many traitorous agents of Russian imperial bureaucracy.

Ecclesiastical treason is particularly odious. It is committed on helpless multitudes who have passed away before it dawns upon the world that an irreparable wrong has been committed. For obvious reasons the agent of it is usually immune from personal punishment; such a traitor is a father who betrays his children, a tutor who abandons his wards, an administrator who squanders an estate. Cowardice, selfishness and malice dominate in such a guilty heart, and the sweep of the ruin they involve is commensurate with the dignity and responsibility of the offender.

Joseph Siemaszko was born in the department of Kiew and was ordained a priest in the Catholic Seminary of Wilna. In 1812 he was called to St. Petersburg as assessor in the Catholic College of

---

<sup>2</sup> The strongest element of Russian empire is the principle of unity impressed upon it by Iwan III. He created the unity of administration by centering in his own person all sovereign rights; political unity by suppressing the political existence of several provinces and free cities whose distinct forms of government assured a certain degree of independence; religious unity by detaching the Church of Russia from any foreign influence or supremacy and subordinating it to his own will. This triple unity, to which time has added military centralization, fills with its spirit the entire Russian state, and forestalls at every turn the development of any power or influence calculated to weaken it. It is this fundamental Russian unity, the work of Iwan III., that has been for four centuries the source of all Russian governmental action.—Pitziplos, *L'Eglise Orientale* Rome, II.—III., p. 67.

the Russian Uniat. The advent of Nicholas opened a way to the ambition of the young Siemaszko. In 1827 he laid before the new Czar a plan for the abolition of the Units or Ruthenians. Nothing could have been more welcome; it took up the secret suggestions made by Siestrencewicz in 1806, and was itself surrounded with deep secrecy until the accomplishment of its nefarious aims.<sup>3</sup>

He began by recalling the express intention of Catharine II. to extirpate the Russian Uniat in the conquered provinces. But after her death the local authorities relaxed their vigilance, and even looked with favor on the Uniat clergy. An ukase of 1800 treats the Uniats as Roman Catholics, and places them under the direction of the Catholic College at St. Petersburg, than which nothing could have been more disastrous, especially as in 1798 their dioceses had been reëstablished in Lithuania,<sup>4</sup> since which date no more Uniat parishes returned to the State Church.

What are the causes of this reaction among the Uniats? Siemaszko answers that it is partly owing to the influence of the proprietors of the soil—they are mostly converts to the Latin rite, while their dependent serfs continue in the ancestral Greek rite. The Uniat clergy sympathize with their benefactors, the Latin landlords. Moreover, the dispossessed Greek Uniat priests continue to enjoy in their parishes the protection of the Polish proprietor; Greek Uniat priests attend in Latin chapels and churches and even act as curates in the Latin parishes. *Even orthodox Russian parishes quit the State Church occasionally and join the Uniat body.*<sup>5</sup> As many as forty-four had thus gone over in the department of Minsk.

Entire parishes of the Greek Uniats had gone over to the Latin rite in White Russia and in Lithuania; similarly numerous families and individuals. He did not add that this was done in the hope of preserving their faith and escaping a formal apostasy to the State Church. Siemaszko goes on to insist on the simultaneous education of the youth of both rites in the same seminaries. At the same time the wealth and the social position of the Latin clergy

<sup>3</sup> The details of this plan were later made known by the Russian priest Marochkine. Cf. Fr. Martinoff, S. J., "Le plan d'abolition de l'église grecque unie," in *Études Religieuses*, Paris, 1873.

<sup>4</sup> By the Bull "Maximis undique pressis," dated from the Chartreuse of Florence, Pius VI., in accord with Paul I., had reëstablished three Uniat dioceses—Luck, Kamlenec and Minsk.

<sup>5</sup> Count Tolstol is convicted of mendacity by this secret admission of Siemaszko, which he must certainly have read before he wrote ("Le Catholicisme Romain en Russie," Paris, 1864) that the Uniat (Ruthenian) Church had been created by violence, and was sustained by artifice and intrigue. Similarly a formal lle of Catharine II. to Pius VI. (November 4, 1782) is exposed by Père Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

react strongly upon the Greek Uniat clergy. Had time been granted to the Empress Catharine, she would have completely abolished the independence of the Ruthenians.<sup>6</sup>

When Catharine tardily nominated an Archbishop (Litowski) of White Russia he was urged, adds Siemaszko, to obtain from Rome the restoration of the Ruthenian rite as it existed before the Council of Zamosc (1720), *i. e.*, the abolition of the commemoration of the Pope at the Mass and of the Filioque in the creed. What would be her attitude, he argued, now, when the clergy of White Russia and Little Russia no longer conceals its preference for Latinism?<sup>7</sup>

In order to check the growth of Catholicism among the Russian Uniats Siemaszko proposed to the Czar the following measures: First, the creation of a special ecclesiastical tribunal for the Uniats, with the view of checking any additions to their rite and of compelling the exact observance of its ancient elements. This was aimed at the feasts and devotions with which the Ruthenian worship had been enriched since the sixteenth century, through contact with Catholicism. Second, the diminution in number and the territorial extension of the Uniat dioceses, and the nomination to these few vast sees of Bishops thoroughly cognizant of the imperial purpose and willing to execute it, *i. e.*, of traitors to Catholicism. Third, the creation of special schools and seminaries for the Uniats, from which all Latin students and influences should be carefully excluded. Fourth, the diminution of the Basilian convents, and their subjection to the diocesan authorities. As the latter were now to be traitorous agents of Catholicism, this was a double blow at Ruthenian monasticism, hitherto a very strong bulwark of the faith amid the disorder and ruin of the last fifty years. It was this subtle re-casting of the discipline, education and administration of the Ruthenian communities that, as we shall see, finally brought about the almost total extinction of Catholicism among the Uniats. These measures aimed at a gradual but sure segregation of the latter from all spiritual contact with their Latin brethren, at the suppression of all protest on the part of their shepherds, at the official distortion of the theology and history of Catholicism, at the extirpation of all lively piety and ecclesiastical independence

---

<sup>6</sup> In spite of her treaties and her protestations of humanity and tolerance, she did abolish in 1795 all the Ruthenian sees with the exception of Pototsk, and established in their place four Russian eparchies or dioceses. We have seen that in 1798 Paul I. restored three of the Ruthenian sees—Pototsk, Lusk and Brzesk—and in 1809 the diocese of Chelm.

<sup>7</sup> Russian writers usually speak of Catholicism as Latinism; national pride and suspicion are thereby made auxiliaries of systematic distortion and mendacity in matters of religion.

among the clergy, and at the extinction of all ancient habits and customs that could in any way remind the Uniat peasantry of the centre and head of Catholicism.<sup>8</sup>

Had Thomas Cromwell and his descendant, Oliver Cromwell, been gifted with the perspicacity of this priest of "Holy Kiew," what a wreck they might have made of Irish Catholicism! These few large and simple measures, stubbornly carried out in the spirit of the curial advisers of Catharine—Calvinists, Jansenists, Voltairians, Gallicans, Febronians—compassed the spiritual ruin of several millions of innocent Russian peasants, inaugurated a persecution of unexampled tenacity and ferocity, and blasted indefinitely the hopes of ecclesiastical unity that Rome had so long and so tenderly nourished in Lithuania and the Ukraine.

One more useful suggestion was made by Siemaszko—the purchase of consciences at the price of money and honors. Increases of salary, new and special insignia and frequent subventions to the minor clergy are proposed as arguments of an irresistible kind.<sup>9</sup>

## II.

By an ukase of April 22, 1828, Nicholas I. called into existence the Greek Uniat College at St. Petersburg, soon to be a mere tool of the Holy Synod for the thorough Russification of the Uniat Catholics. It was a state bureau operating under the name of the now traitorous hierarchy of the Ruthenians, and destined to accomplish in one short decade the plan of Catharine II. In that time it excluded the Ruthenian clergy, secular and regular, from all control of ecclesiastical education, installed lay agents and Protestants in control of ecclesiastical affairs, imposed its arbitrary decisions on the monastic houses in matters of internal government and discipline, kept vacant with set purpose episcopal sees or filled them with aged, weak or morally unfit appointees, confiscated repeatedly the wealth of the monastic houses and suppressed a multitude of them. After the Polish insurrection of 1830 many thousands of Polish children were deported to Russia, all com-

<sup>8</sup> The Russian liturgy often recognizes the primacy of the Apostolic See, cf. Tondini, "La primauté de St. Pierre prouvée par les titres que lui donne l'église russe dans sa liturgie," Paris, 1867, and Dom Guépin, "Saint Josaphat Kuncewitch, archevêque de Polock, martyr de l'unité catholique et l'église grecque Unie en Pologne," Paris, 1874, c. g. l., 172.

<sup>9</sup> Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 62. On the extensive clerical espionage of Russia, cf. the *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, passim; Döllinger, "Kirche und Kirchen" (1861): "The most insignificant priest in Albania, Corfu, Zante, Cephalonia, receives a small subvention from the ecclesiastical treasury of Nischnei-Novgorod." Similarly, he adds, the Slavs of Austria, the Wallachians of Hungary and Transylvania are subject to Russian influence.

munication with Rome was strictly forbidden, the most severe penalties inflicted on any one who converted a Russian subject to Catholicism, Russian legislation on mixed marriages extended to Poland, with the obligation of bringing up in schism all children of such marriages. At the same time no Catholic priest could legally perform such mixed marriages. Many Catholic parishes were suppressed by the renewal of an old law of Catharine to the effect that no parish should consist of less than a hundred families. Catholic priests of Latin rite were strictly forbidden to administer the sacraments to Greek Uniats, and no community of worship was henceforth tolerated between the two rites. Schismatic Russian sees were established in the old Ruthenian (suppressed) sees, many churches taken from the Catholics even in Warsaw, and a total uniformity of rite established (1834) between Greek Uniats and the State Church. In all these measures and many others Siemaszko was the right-hand and willing tool of Nicholas. He had been made Bishop of the Lithuanian Uniats in 1830 by the Czar, and accepted by Gregory XVI., who was, of course, unaware that for three years he had been maturing the evil plan which he was to pursue, step by step, until his death in 1868, and for whose final completion he was to leave behind him others of the same breed.

Thus, in 1831, become president of the Greek Uniat College or bureau, he ordered the withdrawal of the usual missals, rituals and breviaries of the Uniat clergy and replaced them by similar works printed at Moscow by the Holy Synod, but of course without commemoration of the Pope in the Mass or the recitation of the Filioque in the Creed. Any recalcitrant priest was punished by interment in some prison-convent of Russia or even by exile to Siberia, while his wife and children were taken from him and inscribed on the registers of the State Church. The ancient Catholic cathedrals of the Uniats were transformed externally and internally into Russian churches. The nomination of its pastors was taken from the Uniat Church and confided to the provincial governors, who placed in these offices vicious and corrupt men and removed every worthy and independent shepherd. A wretched subterfuge of Catharine was refurbished in order to withdraw many churches from the Uniats—if it appeared from the parish register that the church had been founded by Russian Greeks or had at any time belonged to them, the church was adjudged to the “dominant religion.” Similarly a handful of malicious or disgruntled parishioners could hand over their church to the state-bishop and fix the stigma of legal apostasy on the faithful majority. Conversions to the State Church were paid for at a rouble per head. Schroeder, the Protestant governor of Witepsk, received from

Nicholas thirty-three thousand rubles for as many Uniat souls converted to the Emperor's religion. Ukase upon ukase, treason upon treason, violence and hypocrisy in quick succeeding acts, mark this decade of sorrow and humiliation. Byzantinism and Slavophilism had so worked upon the soul of the Czar that he came to be as it were eaten by a subtle and fierce mysticism of proselytism unequalled in the history of mankind.<sup>10</sup>

Bulhak, the aged metropolitan of the Uniats, refused to associate himself with these measures, and heroically bore the reproaches and menaces of the government which awaited impatiently the close of a life that yet withheld the consummation of the Ruthenian apostasy. His funeral, at least, was conducted according to the schismatic rite, and he was laid away among the Russian metropolitans in the cemetery of St. Alexander Newski.

Thereupon took place the formal renunciation of Ruthenian allegiance to the Holy See and the incorporation with the Russian Church of the Uniats of Lithuania and the Ukraine. The Official Gazette of St. Petersburg published in February 12 (24), 1839, the decree of a synod held by Siemaszko, with his creatures, the Bishop of Brezck and the Bishop of White Russia, in which three Judases proclaimed null and void the union of 1595, and requested the Czar to permit their return and that of their flocks to "the Church of their fathers." This momentous step was followed quickly by a series of imperial decrees and corresponding acts of Siemaszko and his fellow-traitors that consummated the quasi-total abolition of Roman unity in Russia. The event was celebrated with public rejoicing, the Russian press proclaimed the extinction of a "barbarous superstition" and protested beforehand against the judgment of history. It insisted on the peaceful nature of a triumph of persuasion and the overflowing joy of all the new converts at their restoration to the Church of their origin, their native tongue and their former faith. A medal was struck with the devise: "Separated through hatred in 1595; reunited through love in 1839." It was in vain that Gregory XVI. protested in an allocution of November 22—the Czar no longer feared or needed him. In the Pope's unhappy letter to the Polish Bishops in 1832, on the morrow of the insurrection, the Russian autocracy had secured from Rome all that then seemed desirable and had seemingly exhausted the

---

<sup>10</sup> Pere Lescoeur says (*op. cit.*, p. 74) that Nicholas surpassed even Catharine, and interpreted her decrees in a more odious sense than she intended. Every Uniat priest had to choose between the State religion, imprisonment, the galleys or the mines. It was a mercy when only their families were ruined; Siemaszko's own father refused to apostatize, and reproached his son for his criminal deeds. He owed it only to his advanced age that he was not deported to Siberia.

latter's power of retaliation. Secure against revolution at home, foremost in war and diplomacy abroad, striding with rapidity on the roads of India and Constantinople, the new Byzantium seemed really on the point of presenting to the astonished eyes of the Western "barbarians" another Justinian who should scourge their lawlessness, abate their pretensions, and recast human society on the lines laid down by the Holy Synod, or rather by the dark and cruel spirits who work through that horrid puppet.

### III.

The sufferings of the Uniat clergy and people in the former Russian provinces of the kingdom of Poland since the advent of Nicholas I. have been so often told, and by such authoritative and eloquent pens, that a fresh recital of them seems unnecessary.<sup>11</sup> Suffice it to say that no form of persecution was spared them during his fateful reign. Long and cruel and wantonly distant imprisonment of courageous village priests and Basilian monks who refused to read the new liturgical books, quasi-enslavement under immoral and apostate brethren, confiscation of their small properties, scattering of their families and incorporation of their children with far-away schismatic families, exile to Siberia, frequent scourgings and servile work of specially humiliating character, arbitrary deportation from province to province, enforced ignorance of all outside sympathy, contemptuous betrayal of every appeal to the heart of the "Little Father" of all Russians—what measure of oppression was left untried by the bureaucrats of St. Petersburg and the fanatics of Moscow in the seemingly interminable reign of Nicholas? The cruelties practised on the Ruthenian clergy were repeated with unspeakable severity against the numerous parishes that resisted manfully and openly the power of the Northern Colossus. Several authentic "acts" of these common martyrdoms are extant and cause the pages of Eusebius of Cæsarea and Cyprian of Carthage to

<sup>11</sup> The official history, with its (90) "pieces justificatives," is told in the Allocution of Gregory XVI., dated July 22, 1842; cf. "Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del Sommo Pontefice Pio IX. a riparo de'mali che soffre la Chiesa Catholica nel dominii di Russia e Polonia," Rome, 1866, pp. 55, with one hundred official documents. Cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1867, vol. IX.-X. (sixth series). The facts of Siemaszko's treason and the imperial hypocrisy and violence were revealed to Europe by Theiner in a celebrated (German) work, translated into French under the title of "Vicissitudes de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie," 2 vols., Paris, 1843. Cf. (Horrer) "Persecutions et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie," Paris, 1842. The details of the execution of Siemaszko's plan of 1827-29 may be seen in the work of Dom Bérengier, "Les Martyrs Uniats en Pologne," Paris, 1868; cf. Pelesz, "Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom," 1880; Ed. Litowski, "Geschichte des allgemeinen Verfalls der untern ruthenischen Kirche im 18 und 19 Jahrhundert," Posen, 1885-1887.



pale before these unadorned tales of Russian malice. It may be that a clement and lax execution of rigorous legislation is characteristic of Russian power; if so, the Ruthenians are a certain exception, and their attachment to Rome *the* unpardonable crime of a Russian subject. Who would not be moved to tears by the story of the dragoonings in the villages of Pryzbrodzie (1841), Dudakowitzé (1841-1854), Porozow (1834-1872, Dzirnotwitzé (1858)? All resemble one another in their simple and monotonous brutality of injustice. Protestant governors and Russian "popes" enter the Uniat hamlet, seize the church and the notables, burn the villagers' huts, inflict on venerable men and delicate women the cruel torture of the knout, collect and deport the children and depart with threats of a new visitation. At Dudakowitzé the Uniats refused for eleven years to appear in the Russian church or accept the Russian "pope." They baptized their own children and were married by their aged men, a wretched tolerance being exercised by the "pope" for such money as they could put together. Finally, in 1854, on the eve of the Crimean War, all the brave confessors of the village were exiled en masse to Siberia. These inhuman measures were repeated in many parishes—the reader may peruse with pity the pages in which Père Lescoeur (op. cit., pp. 88-91) describes the treatment of the Uniats of Porozoff and Walkowsyk from 1834 to 1862.

The interrogatory of the twelve-year-old swineherd, Stephen Suchonink, is characteristic of the temper and the principles both of the persecution and the persecuted. It deserves, as do many other pages of this history, to be written on plates of gold. The cause of Catholic unity can never perish while it can inspire such accents of devotion on the lips of babes and sucklings. Moreover, there can be no truth in the charges of ancient wrongs done by the Latin clergy to the ancestors of these Uniats, so long as it can be shown that in the Uniat villages of 1839 there existed not only no resentful memory of this alleged violence, but on the contrary a great respect and love for Catholic unity, visible in the headship of the Bishop of Rome. It is to the accident of her evasion that we owe the knowledge of the sufferings of Irena Macrina Mieczyslawska, Abbess of Minsk, and her companions. These pages, typical of a thousand similar wrongs, stirred the heart of Catholic Europe and revealed abundantly the depths of violence and mendacity that existed in the official heart of Russia, but for any softening of the same they might as well have been cast on the winds that sweep the endless steppes of Muscovy.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Martyre de Soeur Irène-Makryna Mieczyslawska et de ses compagnons en Pologne.* Paris, 1846; cf. Szadowski, "Macrina Mieczyslawska, Aebtissin von Minsk," Freiburg, 1864.

Of such a nature was the storm that tore away from Catholic unity, at one fell gust, some two million Ruthenians<sup>18</sup> and cleared Russian soil of nearly every vestige of Roman influence and authority in matters of religion.

In the seventeenth century Rome could contemplate eight millions of 'Ruthenian Uniats' living in peace and harmony in Little Russia and White Russia, commingling with their Latin brethren of Lithuania and the Ukraine, but retaining their ancient liturgical rites, language and customs, their married clergy and their national and racial habits. It was a noble hope, owing to the efforts of Eugene IV. at the Council of Florence, to the prayers and labors and trials of holy souls in the sixteenth century, to the religious zeal of the Kings of Poland and the tireless devotion of several religious orders, notably the Jesuits. It did seem as if a wedge had been entered in the hopeless mass of apathy and quasi-death that stood for the religious life of Russia, as if the Greek schism might be practically closed could these Catholic Ruthenians continue to increase and eventually draw over the huge bulk of their own race. Divine Providence ordered it otherwise, and even tolerated one more fierce outbreak of imperial hypocrisy and mendacity and of domestic treason in high ecclesiastical office.

After 1839 there remained, not in ancient Russian territory, but in the kingdom of Poland, one Ruthenian see, that of Chelm and Beltz, in the department of Lublin. By decrees of July 14 (26), 1864, and June 18 (30), 1866, Alexander II. confirmed its existence with certain rights and privileges of the Ruthenians of Poland. But this was only in expectation of the proper traitor or rather series of traitors. In 1871 Marcell Popiel, Archbishop of the Cathedral of Chelm, became administrator of the diocese, having first pledged himself in favor of the extermination of this last remnant of the Ruthenian Uniats. The Diocese of Chelm was united by him, May 11, 1875, with the schismatic archbishopric of Warsaw. Popiel was made Bishop of Lublin with residence in Chelm. All the faithful Ruthenians of Poland were pursued anew, in the same spirit and with the same means as of old—the usual place of exile was the province of Orenburg or that of Cherson. The knout of the executioner and the sabre of the Cossack, together with odious comedies of popular submission, soon Russianized the See of Chelm. Its three hundred Ruthenian parishes and 250,000 Uniat souls were inscribed on the registers of the imperial church,

---

<sup>18</sup> Marion, "Histoire de l'Eglise" (Paris, 1905), III., 733. According to official (unreliable) date, there were yet in Russia 87,994 Uniats in 1889. Among them 10,737 were living in marriages not recognized by the government, and 29,289 were yet unbaptized.—*Century Magazine*, July, 1905, p. 460.

and the last official trace of the union of 1595 was wiped out. Schismatically inclined Galician priests of the Ruthenian rite had come over from Austrian Poland to aid this evil work, moved by hatred of Polish influence, by Russian gold and by an insane Slavophilism that the Russian Government carefully nourished in the sense of its own pretensions.<sup>14</sup> It may be added that while Russia was engaged in this infamous business she was preparing to wage war against Turkey (1877) in favor of the Christians of the East, far less cruelly oppressed than her own Ruthenian subjects in Poland and Lithuania.<sup>15</sup>

#### IV.

All the ecclesiastical traitors of the Ruthenians, high and low, put forth as a principal excuse and justification of their conduct the supreme duty of preserving the original purity of the Greek rite as practised in Little Russia and White Russia from time immemorial. They asserted that for the last two centuries great violence had been used by Polish nobles and Latin religious orders to compel the abandonment of their rite by multitudes of Ruthenians, even whole villages and territories. The Latin Catholics were also accused of continually corrupting the Ruthenian forms of worship by the introduction of new ceremonies, feasts and religious customs, and of encouraging the personal transition of Ruthenians from Greek to the Latin rite. Similar accusations are accumulated in Count Tolstoi's "History of Roman Catholicism in Russia" (Paris, 1864), but when asked for the proofs of his charges they were not forthcoming. It is true, says Père Lescoeur (*op. cit.*, p. 19), that the Polish aristocracy did not always govern wisely in the broad lands it had conquered from Russia in the Dnieper Valley during the sixteenth century; that the Ruthenian nobles had almost entirely passed over to the Latin rite before the end of the eighteenth

---

<sup>14</sup> All the unfortunate priests of Galicia, voluntary or involuntary exiles, are attracted to the Diocese of Cheim, where, like Popel, they become canons, parish priests or even Bishops, replacing the faithful shepherds, who are driven out or sent to Siberia. Their condition in life is quite wretched. Being married and fathers of families, they appreciate highly the subventions from Holy Russia. They are also very numerous, and through them the 2,300,000 Ruthenians of Galicia and the 800,000 of Hungary and Transsylvania are exposed to the political intrigues of Russia, whose pretensions to Galicia are based not only on the Russian origin of nearly one-half Galicia, but also on the identity of rite with that of the Ruthenians of Poland."—Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, 438.

<sup>15</sup> Cardinal Hergenroether, "Kirchengeschichte," III., 897; cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1875, v. 632 (series ix.), and *Etudes Religieuses* (1874), 25, 548; (1875) 943. The details of the suppression of Cheim and Belts are given by Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 418-471.

century, and thereby lowered the status of the Greek rite, which was henceforth the rite of the serfs and the poor. It is also true that, in spite of the Papal provisions, the Greek rite of the Ruthenians suffered some corruption of Latin usages. Nevertheless, there are extant no historical proofs of genuine Polish or Latin oppression of the Ruthenians as such. The admirable "Life of St. Josaphat Kuncewitch," by Dom Guépin (Paris, 1874), gives ample evidence of the fact that, unwisely enough, both Polish nobles and clergy were rather prone to discourage the Union of 1595 and to encourage the schismatic efforts of their Russian neighbors and rivals. The Polish Kings of the seventeenth century were, as a rule, tolerant and favorable, in a measure unknown to contemporary European rulers, to whom the peace of Augsburg and the Treaty of Westphalia had left a free hand in the religious affairs of their States. Not only did the elected Kings of Poland tolerate a Græco-Russian hierarchy in the ancient territory of Kiew, but they confirmed and endowed the local university, established by the schismatic patriarch and learned enemy of Rome, Peter Mogilas; they tolerated closer relations between the schismatic patriarchs of Kiew and Moscow, nor had they any reason to regret this attitude, since it resulted in the return to Catholic unity of the Sees of Leopold, Przemysl and Smolensk. In spite of the increasing power and prestige of Russia during the seventeenth century, and the corresponding decline of Polish fortune and constitutional wisdom, the last traces of the Russian schism were steadily tending to disappear throughout Lithuania and the Ukraine. As a matter of fact the sacred Catholic work of the Union of Brzesk in 1595, the outcome at once of religious and political causes, was consecrated by the glorious martyrdom of the Archbishop of Polozck, Josaphat Kuncewitch (November 12, 1623),<sup>16</sup> and the Jesuit Bobola (May 16, 1655). Joseph Velamin Rutzki, Uniat Archbishop of Kiew (1613-1635) escaped with difficulty from the savage hatred of the Russian party, and merited to be called by Urban VIII. "the Athanasius of Russia."

Far from tolerating or conniving at the destruction or corruption of the Ruthenian rite, discipline and customs, the Popes of Rome have never ceased to insist on their maintenance and integrity. What guarantee could be more formal or explicit than the action of St. Pius V. in 1568, when he declared, apropos of the new missal and breviary corrected by the desire of the Council of Trent, that they were not obligatory on any church that was in possession of

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the *Life of St. Josaphat* by Dom Guépin. It contains accounts of other cruel sufferings inflicted on the Uniates by the schismatics. It is also valuable for its historical account of the relations of Poland with the Græco-Russian Church, the Union of Brzesk and the vicissitudes of the Ruthenian rite and people.

its own rite or liturgy for two hundred years? Clement VIII. accepted the Union of Brzesk in 1595 with the precise condition of maintaining the rite, customs and ceremonies of the Ruthenians such as they had been in the days of their ancient and original union with Rome.<sup>17</sup> Since then there has been no change of attitude on the part of the Holy See, and each succeeding Pontiff has renewed the provisions of his predecessors that aimed at a proper respect for the ancient Greek rite of the people of Russian origin in the once vast ecclesiastical territory of Holy Kiew, the cradle, be it remembered, of Russian Christianity.<sup>18</sup> The famous Council of Zamosc in 1720 regulated still further the relations between the Latin Poles and the Ruthenian Uniats. Its decrees were carefully considered

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Baron d'Avril, "Les Eglises autonomes et autocéphales" (451—1885), Paris, 1895, pp. 37-45, gives the petition of the Ruthenian Bishop of Brzesk and the Roman formula or confession of faith in an interesting contemporary French translation by Marc Lescarbot, Parisian lawyer and first historian of Nova Scotia, "un précieux et même touchant document de la langue religieuse de la France à la fin du XVI. siècle," ed. by Prince Galitzin, Paris, 1856. Many official documents of the Holy See, that alone manifest the spirit and intentions of Catholicism in this matter, are indicated by Cardinal Hergenrother, "Kirchengeschichte," III, 328-329, 559. The extensive Bullarium of Benedict XIV. contains many very important documents, and it is to be remembered that his legislation is yet valid and authoritative. The efforts of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. to maintain the purity of Oriental rites and to reassure the Christian races and peoples of the Orient are so numerous that a large volume would scarcely describe them with accuracy. Cf. d'Avril, "Documents relatifs aux Eglises de l'Orient et à leurs rapports avec Rome," Paris, 3d ed., 1885; Nilles, "Kalendarium Manuale utriusque ecclesiae," I, Innsbruck, 1896; "Synbolae ad illustrandam historiam ecclesiae orientalis in terris coronae S. Stephani," 2 v.; Silbernagl, "Verfassung und gegenwaertiger Bestand Sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients," 2d ed. (1904), 325-385; Michel, "La Question religieuse en Orient et l'Union des Eglises," Paris, 1893, pp. 87-93. Cf. also passim "Acta Pii IX." and "Acta Leonis XIII.," Rome, 1846-1903, annual official publications of public Papal documents. The reader may also consult with profit Theiner, "Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae," fol. Rome, 1864, and Fr. Pierling, S. J., "La Russie et le Saint Siège," Paris, 3 vols., 186, 1901; Beurlier, "Le Pape et les Eglises d'Orient," *Revue du Clergé Français*, December, 1894; P. Fournier, "La Constitution de Léon XIII. sur les Eglises Unies," *Revue générale de droit international public*, Paris, January, 1895.

<sup>18</sup> Leger, "La Chronique de Nestor," Paris, 1890; cf. Pisanl, "A Travers l'Orient," Paris, 1897, pp. 117-118: "The Russians never took part in the doctrinal polemics nor in the political conflicts of the Byzantines. They were one element of the Oriental patriarchate, and as such shared its vicissitudes. Hence no precise date, no striking event can be pointed out as the origin of the separation of Russia from Rome. It took place implicitly, gradually, without apparent motives, by reason of the Russian incorporation with the patriarchate of Constantinople. When the latter broke with Rome its obedient subjects everywhere were supposed to follow the example of the dominant see. On the other hand, the influence of the Greeks, who often held the dioceses of Russia, their violent theological quarrels with the Latins, and their perfidious insinuations sufficed to create an abyss whose depth only future ages should ascertain." Cf. Pitzipios, "L'Eglise Orientale," Rome, 1855.

at Rome in 1724 and positive instructions added that aimed at the strict observation of the traditional rite of the Uniats.<sup>19</sup> In this Council, as on other occasions, the Holy See was watchful lest the purity of Catholic faith should be affected by the close contact of the Ruthenians with their schismatic brethren of the Russian race. The commemoration of the Pope in the Mass and the recitation of the Filioque in the Creed were so intimately connected with the Catholic faith that there could be no reason for objecting to them. It was, in all probability, the retention of precisely these two items that quickened the opposition of the Holy Synod under Nicholas and called forth the imperial cruelties. On the other hand, the Latin Church had never ceased to develop a rich and attractive devotional life, while for many centuries the religious spirit, both before and after the loss of Constantinople, the Greeks had been sinking into somnolency and the repose of decay. In close contact with the devotional activity of the Polish communities, the Ruthenians could not but admire and imitate the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, frequent reception of the sacraments, the use of the rosary, the system of confraternities and the like. All this was a scandal in the eyes of the idle and corrupt Russian State clergy, also a menace to the supremacy of the autocratic régime in Russia. Its apathetic millions might one day awake to the promise of better things, cast off the carefully nurtured ignorance of Catholicism, and reconsider this relation with their Christian brethren of Western Europe. The Ruthenian Uniats were the open door for these splendid hopes; hence it must be closed with all due haste and thoroughness. The Catholic statesmen of Central and Western Europe paid little enough attention to the incredible expansion of Russia in the seventeenth century, and the pretensions of the Muscovite to the inheritance of the Palaeologi seemed of little account. In those days Poland was their "sick man." The eyes of European diplomacy seemed closed to the great political use the Romanoffs were making of the racial identity of the great centres of Moscow and Kiew. The former was growing yearly in stable and centralized power, in population and in political use dom. Iwan the Great and Iwan the Cruel had contributed their large share to the work of Russian consolidation, and a Peter the Great could at last look down on the chess-board of European politics from a vantage ground of security created for him in the long reigns of a few predecessors who had trampled under foot systematically the feudal pretensions of boyards and the religious consciousness of patriarchs, while they led the Christian peasantry

---

<sup>19</sup> Its decrees are found in the second volume of the "Collectio Concilliorum Lacensis."

of their limitless plains in successful combat against Mongol, Tartar and Turk. The autocratic soul of Czardom is no development of history, but rather the issue of many centuries of Russian "Sinnen and Trachten," as much a product of the monotonous "Black Earth" plains of the Volga and the Dnieper as their flowery vegetation or their melancholy atmosphere, a curious mosaic of history, race, climate and topography, such as perhaps will never again be shown to mankind.

## V.

The Polish insurrection of 1830-1831 was a very ill-starred undertaking. Russia had indeed done more than enough to rouse the high-spirited Poles to action. Religious oppression, the kindling of race hatred, the constant violation of the Constitution that Alexander I. had forced on the kingdom in 1815, the unpopularity of Grand Duke Constantine, the exclusion of the Polish army from the war against the Turks (1829) and other grievances, more or less urgent and capital, stirred the heart of Poland. It was yet a State in some real sense. An army of 60,000 men, in good condition, kept up the hope of the nation and the military training of a warlike race. The Warsaw outbreak of November, 1830, took on the character of a national uprising. The news of the July days in Paris and similar movements in Europe fed the passions of the oppressed people; brilliant skirmishes and some victories encouraged their leaders, but from the beginning the fate of the movement was sealed. Neither England nor France could lift a hand to help it, for an inimical and conniving Prussia stood guard for her northern co-parcener along the flaming border of Europe's "Dark and Bloody Land." By September, 1831, the Russian general could notify the Czar that Warsaw lay at his feet. "Order reigns in Warsaw!" was the proud laconic announcement of the Russian chancery to sympathetic but weak Europe of the thorough overthrow of the White Eagle. Discordant military counsels and radical dissension as to the main object and character of the uprising lamed all bravery and devotion. A Chlopiczki and a Czartoryski differed from Joachim Lelewel and his followers—the noble and the soldier from the academic thinker and the dreamer over the vanished glories of the Jagellons, so long the buffer of mediæval Europe and the hammer of Tartar and Turk. Nicholas refused to listen to any compromise during the conflict. This apostle of absolutism was determined to exhibit to Europe a clear diagnosis, *in corpore vili*, of the ailments that the revolution was everywhere nourishing. Execution, stern and implacable, walked the land.

Confiscation, imprisonment, Siberian exile, were the fate of all concerned and of many innocent victims of the uprising. There was no longer even a simulacrum of a Polish State. The kingdom disappeared, the Constitution of 1815 vanished, the army was incorporated with that of Russia. Taxation, governmental districts, judicial procedure, were all recast on Russian lines and the administration of Poland confided to a horde of needy and corrupt Russians, with the usual proportion of base and traitorous Poles. It was the Ireland of Oliver Cromwell and King William, with here and there a line of discrimination. In the former Russian provinces of Poland there had been sympathy for the insurgents on the part of their fellow-Catholics, the Ruthenians. Czartoryski's educational propaganda had made some headway, but Nicholas crushed remorselessly the tender plant. The University of Wilna was closed, the Polish tongue banished from the schools and the religious measures set on foot that in less than ten years consummated the scandalous apostasy of nearly the whole Ruthenian rite in Russian territory.

Now the Latin Catholics of Poland were made to feel the weight of autocratic anger. The convents were confiscated en masse; of three hundred there remained scarcely one-third. Vicious and complaisant ecclesiastics were raised to episcopal sees in order to execute the imperial will. Courageous Bishops and priests were exiled for their refusal to concur in the same. Bands of soldiers harassed the Polish land incessantly and expelled on all sides the monks and priests who yet sustained the spirit of the Poles, and bade them never despair of their religion or their fatherland. The official "Esposizione documentata" of Pius IX.<sup>20</sup> contains among other documents the detailed report of Mgr. Holowinski, Archbishop of Mohilew, and alone is sufficient to convict the Czar of mendacity, hypocrisy and utter disregard of all Christian principle in his dealings with his unhappy Roman Catholic subjects of Poland and their protector, the Holy See. Diminution of parishes enforced scarcity of seminary students, closing of Catholic churches, enforced transportation of thousands of refractory Poles to distant parts of Russia, building of schismatic churches, encouragement of bad and insubordinate priests, cruel exile of the steadfast clergy, minute harassing of Catholic life in all its manifestations were the order of the day during all the reign of Nicholas, and while he was as constantly assuring the Holy See that his imperial word was the guarantee of accurate execution of the reasonable wishes of the Holy Father.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Rome, "Segreteria di Stato," 1866, translated into French, Paris, 1868.

<sup>21</sup> On December 17, 1845, shortly after his famous visit to Gregory XVI,



Although the soul of Nicholas harbored so many traits of a peculiarly vicious and immoral nature in a ruler of men, and although he was nearly all his reign, as it were, "on the knees of the gods," he still desired to appear before civilized Europe as a man of honor, a model of righteousness and correct deportment in all things. Otherwise the sanctity of Russia would be affected, and the spirit of the revolution rejoice to point out iniquity crowned and regnant, the lie seated on the prone corpse of truth, sheer force holding by the throat the refined figure of civilization. Hence he is concerned to throw a cloak of reasonableness and equity over all his acts. He appeals, as did his grandmother Catharine, to the current prejudices and sentiments; thus shall his name be sung in the academies of learned men who live on the imperial bounty and in the venal press that alone he tolerates in his Russia. His measures against the Catholic convents<sup>22</sup> are all taken in their interest and in the interest of the Roman Church and according to its spirit and even its laws! He confiscates their property, but to found charitable institutions and schools (!), or even "to free the clergy from cares that are incompatible with their estate." So shall the Paris mob be flattered when St. Petersburg repeats thus patly its lesson. The organic statute of February 14, 1832, is granted to Poland (on the morrow of the insurrection) in the name of liberty of conscience, to be executed as we have seen. He promises the defeated Poles at least provincial assemblies in place of their suppressed Parliament; he never convoked these assemblies, and the Poles were too weak to compel him to keep his word. Knowing the principles, convictions and personal character of Gregory XVI., he entertains him with assurances of the imperial resolution to uphold ancient order and impose silence and restraint on the revolution. Knowing also the Papal sense of duty and the earnest representations of authorized counsellors, he hastens to protest, in autograph letters and by his envoys, that he is resolved to protect his Catholic subjects, respect their convictions and assure them a peaceful condition of life. He granted certain amnesties to the Polish insurgents on paper, but as to their execution let the

---

Czar Nicholas wrote to the Pope as follows: "The Emperor begs the Sovereign Pontiff to believe with all certainty that no one desires more than His Majesty the maintenance of the Roman Church in Russia and in Poland on a footing at once dignified and respectable. The prayers that the Emperor offers up to heaven embrace with equal solicitude, and without distinction of rite, the spiritual interests of all the peoples confided to his care by Divine Providence. Whatever can be done to realize the intentions of the Holy Father without conflicting with the organic laws of the Empire or violating the rights and canons of the dominant Church will be done. *The imperial word guarantees this to His Holiness.*"—"Esposizione documentata," II, 17. Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, 100-101.

<sup>22</sup> Rohrbacher, "Hist. de l'Eglise," XXVIII, 412.

foregoing persecution of the Polish Catholics reply, also such facts as the following: In September, 1831, he ordered five thousand Polish nobles to be transported from Podolia to the borders of the Caucasus; they were to be selected among those who took part in the late insurrection and returned within the appointed time to make known their repentance.<sup>28</sup>

## VI.

The decade of general ecclesiastical history from 1830 to 1840 will always attract the attention of students as one in which came fast to their ending certain lines and currents of European affairs set in motion on the morrow of the Battle of Waterloo. The famous alliance of the three imperial powers, both formal and moral, seemed awhile to check the flow of revolutionary ideas and success. The Congress of Vienna (1815) decreed, in eternal oblivion of the revolution, the restoration of the temporal power of the Holy See, and within the sphere of their influence the three world powers proceeded to restore and consolidate anew an autocracy that for several reasons was more odious than any of the forms of civil absolutism let loose by Martin Luther. On the other hand, secret political societies multiplied on the continent and through Russia and Poland, and nourished among the poor and lowly, *i. e.*, among the European multitudes, feelings of discontent and anger that were destined to find vent in various ways and in several quarters. False or hopeless ideals of civil welfare were held up by the Paris clubs and their imitators and by the miscellaneous Jacobins of every ilk and nation. The St. Simonians of France and the Carbonari of Italy, however different their aims, sympathized in their denunciation of all obstacles, *i. e.*, the existing forms of government. Civil society everywhere felt the ground weak and uncertain. It was a period of reaction, therefore, in its own way violent and extreme and particularly odious to a multitude of the youthful and middle-aged who had been nurtured on the hopes and promises of 1789. To them this period seemed like the threshold of a political hell.

Vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faucibus Orci.

The Papacy was but slowly recovering from the unspeakable humiliation of the preceding fifty years. Traditions of administration, habitual sources of information, continuity of policy, assured contact with the dominant factors of civil life, had all been swept away or so modified as to make it a new world in which the See of Peter was not yet quite sure of its political assiette. The French Revolution had executed all the menaces and velleities of Jansenists,

<sup>28</sup> The Minister of Finance to the Governor of Podolia, September 9 (21), 1831.

Gallicans and Protestants—the future was dark and uncertain. The power and prestige of Russia were very much in evidence throughout Europe and were borne to the clouds by all manner of social and political serfs of the Czardom. The time was propitious for Nicholas to impress on Gregory XVI. the wisdom of coming to an understanding with him. The Polish insurrection was represented by the imperial agents as an outcome of Parisian revolutionary agitation, and the Polish clergy falsely made to appear as the foremost leaders in secret intrigue and open conflict. The Pope was urged to call this refractory clergy to repentance. At the same time he was assured that the repression of the insurrection had been a benefit to Catholicism. It was insinuated that the sanguinary movement was only the opening scene of a vast European rebellion against established order. As a matter of fact, the States of the Church were even then the scene of revolutionary agitation and uprisings. The agents of Prussia and Austria confirmed the desires of the Czar. Gregory XVI. accepted this statement of facts and wrote, June 9, 1832, to the Polish clergy an encyclical letter, in which he treated of the eternal maxims of the Church concerning submission to the temporal power, and asserted that the frightful calamities of the insurrection were owing solely to the cunning and mendacious manœuvres of those who “under pretext of religion lift up their heads in our unhappy age against the legitimate power of princes.” He went on to speak of the abuse of the credulity of the simple people by perverse men and insisted at length on the divine origin and character of civil obedience. Much of what he said was applicable at all times and in every land. The following phrase could concern only Poland:

Your very powerful emperor will always exhibit toward you great mildness, and will always receive with good-will our intercession in your favor; also all requests that you will make for the welfare of the Catholic religion, that the kingdom professes, and to which he has promised me that he will never refuse his protection.

In its doctrine the Papal document was inoffensive and correct, but the circumstances made it especially painful and odious in the eyes of the Poles and their sympathizers. Coming on the heels of an inglorious defeat and while the machinery of vengeance was yet active and urgent, it seemed like a denial of all right of rebellion against intolerable wrong and like a cruel abandonment to the victor of the faithful sons of Poland.<sup>24</sup>

They were condemned on the representations of their powerful

<sup>24</sup> On the right of rebellion against the civil authority in given cases and situations, see Balmes, “Protestantism and Catholicity Compared,” cc. 54-56; also P. Ventura, “Essai sur le pouvoir public,” p. 295, and J. Torres Asensio, “Le droit des Catholiques de se défendre,” Paris, 1874 (cc., VII-VIII), and Crétineau-Joly, “L’Eglise Romaine devant la Révolution,” II, p. 241.

enemy and by that power for whose sake principally they had risen in a revolt that was imprudent enough, but was none the less heroic and objectively justified. Usually all Roman documents were strictly excluded from the empire, but this one was given the widest circulation. It was pointed out to all Poles that the Holy Father made no distinction between the Catholic faithful who had revolted and the irreligious revolutionaries. They were even led to believe that the Holy Father had excommunicated them. A cry of grief went up from a multitude of Catholic hearts. Some of them, like Montalembert, scarcely recovered from the condemnation of Lamennais, bled very deeply on this occasion.<sup>25</sup> Others, like Lacordaire in his "Lettres sur le Saint Siège," penetrated to the core of the situation and found relief in comparing the Papal action with that of Priam kissing the hand of Achilles while he beseeches the slayer of his son for the poor gift of his dead body. In the second edition of his work on the condition of Catholicism in Russia Père Lescoeur communicates a touching interview of the Polish nobleman and general, Count Zamoyski, with Gregory XVI.<sup>26</sup> In the course of this meeting the Polish patriot gave expression to the sentiments of sorrow and dejection which yet filled the hearts of his poor beaten compatriots who had imagined that they were defending the holiest of causes, and yet had incurred the Papal disapprobation. Thereupon the Holy Father seized him earnestly by the shoulders and with a look of reproach exclaimed with vehemence:

"Indeed, I never disapproved you. I did not understand you in the beginning, I admit, but in turn did you take sufficient pains to enlighten me in the course of your conflict? Yes, I have been deceived in your case; my own servants, to whom I am bound to give my confidence, allowed themselves to be deceived, and then led me into error. I deplored your misfortunes; but after all you had succumbed, all seemed finished, it remained to save religion from the wrath of an irritated victor. His menaces moved me profoundly; I trembled at the persecution that seemed ready to rage against you and to surpass all that had yet taken place. *I yielded to a downright challenge: it was stated to me that, to begin with, all the Bishops of Poland would be exiled to Siberia if I did not send them an order to submit.* I asked myself what would become of your unhappy nation, deprived of its shepherds and already so far removed from me that for a long time my voice has failed to reach you. I thought in conscience that in the presence of such dangers I could and ought to consent to address some words of resignation to your Bishops and recall to them what the apostles imposed upon all Christians, something also that the Church has invariably observed, viz., that obedience to the powers that he is a Christian duty, one of conscience and not of fear. I did not fail to add that in no case was it permitted such a power to insist on the commission of acts contrary to the laws of God or the Church. . . . What more was necessary to reassure your consciences? When my letter reached you, were not the rights of the Church and religion already sufficiently trampled on? I might perhaps complain that you forgot to keep me sufficiently informed. Perhaps, too, I might reproach you with not reading attentively enough my letter, with not perceiving in the very delay of the same the constraint that had been put upon me."

<sup>25</sup> Lecanuet, "Vie de Montalembert" (Paris, 1903), I., pp. 311, 354.

<sup>26</sup> Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe" (Paris, 1903), second ed., pp. 110-113.

The Pope, moreover, authorized Count Zamoyski to make known this conversation, but with discretion, he added:<sup>27</sup>

"I had entered the Papal presence," says the Count, "with bitterness and with much prejudice against his person; I quitted it filled with gratitude and the deepest veneration."

In the latter part of 1832 the Pope repeatedly attempted to obtain some redress for the suffering Catholics. He desired, among other things, the presence of a Papal agent at St. Petersburg, but this measure of confidence and justice was never agreed to by the Czar. While the compulsory conversion of the Ruthenians went bravely on, the cruelties practised on Catholic Poland increased. Only evasive or impudent answers were vouchsafed the letters of the Pope, and he could soon convince himself that the Czar had overreached him, played upon his well-known detestation of revolutionary principles and taken advantage of his monastic simplicity and inexperience of the world. What Nicholas had extorted from him was not a weapon against the revolution, but one against Catholicism itself. The Russian Government continued to affect a total ignorance of all the facts quoted by the Pope in his correspondence—oppression of the clergy, confiscation of the convent properties, deportation of thousands of Polish children to schismatic territories. When the Pope invoked the treaty of 1773, that guaranteed the liberty of the Catholic religion, the Emperor replied that since the insurrection Poland had only such rights as he cared to allow! Thus the Czar is *post Deum terrenus Deus*, and keeps locked up in *scrinio pectoris sui* all laws, human, ecclesiastical and divine! This answer was returned in 1833, after the close of the insurrection; moreover, after the publication of the organic statute of 1832, which the Pope had urged as a valid charter of religious liberty that even a Czar could not repudiate. "Be silent," said Repnine in the Diet of 1767, when the Polish deputies demanded the religious rights formally granted by Catharine. "Be silent; it belongs to me alone to know the true meaning of my sovereign's declarations."<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> General Zamoyski's account of his interview with Gregory XVI. is strikingly confirmed by the mute but eloquent fact that this encyclical to the Polish Bishops is not to be found in the Bullarium of Pope Gregory. . . . By this suppression of the document its nullity was publicly avowed. It had been obtained by threats and trickery, and by a false statement of facts which had entirely disfigured in the Pontifical mind the true character of the Polish insurrection.—Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-114.

<sup>28</sup> This quiet nullification by the local authorities of even the miserable privileges of a persecuted race and religion is one of the most odious forms of Russian oppression. The offender is seldom or never punished; he knows too well that he is, above all, an agent of extermination. That the system has not changed may be seen from the following fact: "Appeal to the law and you invite the revenge of a horde of officials, who rarely lose an opportunity of showing their contempt for the laws. A business man

The corruption of diplomacy could go no farther unless, perhaps, we recall the cruel cynicism with which the Czar denied that he had ever given the famous order of April 10, 1832, for the deportation to Minsk of all the children in the Kingdom of Poland between six and seventeen, with the eventual purpose of sending them to the distant and inhospitable "military colonies" of the frontier. Several years afterwards, in 1834 and 1838, the children of Polish nobles were still sold in their native villages at thirty dollars a head.<sup>29</sup> No wonder that a Polish mother cast herself upon the body of her exiled child and plunged a poinard into his heart rather than see him stripped at one blow of mother, religion and fatherland! The Russian agents at Rome continued to implore the Pope not to listen to any reports of religious affairs in Poland, save such as reached him through the hands of the Czar's accredited representatives. But the anti-Catholic matrimonial legislation of 1836, the cruel treatment and forced resignation of the brave Bishop of Podlachia, Marcellus Gutkowski, the ineffable dishonor of the Ruthenian apostasy, the prohibition in 1840 to use any longer the term "Greek Uniat"—these unjust and oppressive acts that cover the decade from 1832 to 1842 moved at last a long-suffering Pope to the magnificent allocution of July 22, 1842, in which he made known to the Catholic world his constant and numerous but useless efforts for the welfare of Catholicism in Poland, and rose above himself by the touching narrative of his deception by the Czar, whereby he had given cause to the faithful of Poland to believe that the Holy See had abandoned them to their enemy.

## VII.

But if Pope Gregory could be deceived, he could not be restrained from making a public confession of the facts in the case. When patience had ceased to be a virtue and the opinion of his own entourage had become noticeably adverse, he broke a long silence and delivered before the assembled Cardinals the famous allocution we have just referred to. Despite all contrary accusations, he had never been wanting in zeal and resolution to improve the condition of Polish Catholicism. He declared that he had been circumvented by its enemies, after their habitual fraudulent manner. He

---

about a month ago went to a certain provincial governor and made a protest against some flagrant abuse of authority. The great man airily waved aside his expostulations. 'But the law?' began the visitor. The governor took a thick book from his table and held it so that the title could not escape being seen—it was the Russian Code—and then put it upon his chair and sat upon it."—*Century Magazine*, July, 1906, p. 457.

<sup>29</sup> Lescoeur, p. 118, Ukase of April 13, 1838.

had long borne the accusations of negligence, complicity and even cowardice, and had come to know that not a few looked on him as a stumbling block and a stone of scandal. He would now, however, relate in their true order and meaning all the phases of the negotiations with Czar Nicholas since the beginning of his pontificate. Then followed an outline of the events in question and a collection of (90) "pièces justificatives" or authoritative documents. The Pope had stooped to conquer. All Europe applauded this brave act of self-denial and Christian humility. Public opinion, enlightened passed to the side of the Papacy and the oppressed. A weak and aged man had stood forth before the world as a champion of truth and affixed the indelible stigma of mendacity upon the forehead of the world's proudest and most powerful monarch. It seemed for a moment as if Innocent III. or Gregory IX. had stepped upon the scene. While the Papal exposé of facts did not greatly relieve the sufferings of the Catholics of Poland, it simplified the political situation by the removal of all equivocal sentiment as to the attitude of the Papacy. It also restored to the latter its liberty of action and arrested a growing discontent among very faithful children of the Roman Church.

Three years later (1845) Czar Nicholas came to Rome. His meeting with Gregory XVI. was an historic one, although no reliable account of their mutual discourse has ever been made known. In his "Recollections of the Last Four Popes" Cardinal Wiseman has left us a graphic account of the imperial visit to the Vatican that has often been quoted, but can never lose a certain racy vigor of expression and a noble breadth and accuracy of historic view:

The most painful of his conflicts, however, was one face to face with the greatest of Europe's sovereigns, a man accustomed to command without contradiction and to be surrounded by complete submission. He did not imagine that there was a human being who would presume to read him a lesson, or still less to administer him a rebuke. It may be proper to premise that the present Emperor of Russia, while Czarewicz, visited Rome and was received with the utmost respect by all ranks and with extreme kindness by the Pope. The young prince expressed himself highly gratified by his reception, and I was told by those to whom he had declared it that he had procured a portrait of Gregory, which he said he should always keep as that of a friend deeply venerated and esteemed. Further, in 1842 the Emperor, his father, had sent very splendid presents to the Pope—a vase of malachite, now in the Vatican library, and a large supply of the same precious material for the Basilica of St. Paul. Still he had not ceased to deal harshly, not to say cruelly, with his Catholic subjects, especially the Poles. They were driven into the Greek communion by putting it out of their power to follow their own worship; they were deprived of their own Bishops and priests, and even persecuted by more violent inflictions and personal sufferings. On this subject the Holy See had both publicly and privately complained, but no redress and but little, if any, alleviation had been obtained. At length, in December, 1845, the Emperor Nicholas I. came himself to Rome. It was observed, both in Italy and, I believe, in England, how minute and unrelaxed were the precautions taken to secure him against any danger of conspiracy; how his apartment, bed, food, body-guard were arranged with a watchful eye to the prevention of any surprise from hidden enemies. Be this as it may, nothing amiss befell him, unless it was his momentous interview with the head of that Church which he had mercilessly persecuted, with him whose rival he considered

himself as real autocratic head of a large proportion of what he called the "Orthodox Church" and as recognized protector of its entire communion. It was arranged that the Emperor should be attended by M. de Bouteneff, his Minister at Rome, and that the Pope should have a Cardinal at his side. He selected, as has been said, the English Cardinal Acton. This was not a usual provision for a royal visit, but gave it rather the air of a conference; and so in truth it was. The Pope felt he had a solemn and trying duty to perform. Could he allow the persecutor of his flock to approach him and depart without a word of expostulation and even of reproof? Could he receive him with a bland smile and insincere accolade; speak to him of the unmeaning topics of the hour, or of the cold politics of the world? Impossible! It would have been at variance not with personal disposition, but with the spiritual character which he held of father of the faithful, defender of the weak, shepherd of the ravened flock, protector of the persecuted, representative of fearless, uncompromising, martyred Pontiffs, vicar of Him who feared no stalking any more than prowling wolf. It would have been to his conscience a gnawing and undying reproach if he had lost the opportunity of saying face to face what he had written and spoken of one absent, or if he had not employed his privilege as a sovereign to second his mission as a Pontiff. He would have confirmed by his cowardice or his forbearance, though it might have been called courtly refinement or gentleness of character, all the self-confidence and fearlessness of a fanatical persecutor, placed above all but some great moral control.

The Popes no longer stood, as in the thirteenth century, at the head of an united Christendom, the mouthpiece of the moral sense and the intimate convictions of all the peoples of Europe. Schism, heresy, apostasy, revolution and indifference had swept away multitudes in every part of Europe from their once affectionate allegiance to the See of Peter. Gregory XVI. could now look forward to no other applause than that of his own conscience and of outraged justice. It was now the case of impersonal right clothed in the simple majesty of a feeble old priest withstanding with successful boldness the greatest of modern autocrats at the acme of his power and prestige.

Certainly, much hung in the balance of that Pontiff's deliberation how he should act. That meekest of men, Pius VII., had not neglected the opportunity of his captivity to enumerate with fervid gentleness to his powerful master the evils which the Church suffered at his hands. Gregory never undertook any grave work without much prayer, and one so momentous as this was not assuredly determined on except after long and earnest supplication. What were the Emperor's intentions, what his ideas, what his desires in coming to Rome, and having necessarily a personal meeting with the Pope, it is impossible to conjecture. Did he hope to overcome him by his splendid presence, truly majestic, soldier-like and imperial? Or to cajole and win him by soothing speeches and insincere promises? Or to gain the interpretative approval of silence and forbearance? One must conjecture in vain. Certain it is that he came, he saw and conquered not. It has been already mentioned that the subject and particulars of the conference were never revealed by its only witness in Rome. The Pope's own account was brief, simple and full of conscious power: "I said to him all that the Holy Ghost dictated to me."

And that he had not spoken vainly, with words that had beaten the air, but that their strokes had been well placed and driven home, there was evidence otherwise recorded. An English gentleman was in some part of the palace through which the imperial visitor passed as he returned from his interview, and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand as it was from statue-like features, stately frame and martial bearing, free and at his ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of ante-rooms, the imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, "with plumes unruffled and with eye unquenched," in all the glory of plinions which no flight had ever wearied, with beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again with head uncovered and hair, if it can be said of man, disheveled, haggard and pale, looking as though in an hour he had passed



through the condensation of a protracted fever; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsuspecting; he waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court and hurried away from, apparently, the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, "from his nest among the stars," his feathers crumpled and his eye quelled by a power till then despised.

The reflections of the illustrious artist of this unique scene concerning the rôle of the Pope are doubtless just and to the point. His conviction that from that day dated a juster treatment of the Polish Catholics was not destined to be sustained by the quick succeeding facts of religious oppression in every odious form it can put on. The deadly Byzantinism of the imperial character was too original and intense, too steadily fed by its native springs to permit him ever to see in free Catholicism anything but a menace against the common welfare of the state as his ancestors had consolidated it and he had inherited it.

But let us be fully just. The interview did not excite rancorous or revengeful feelings. No doubt the Pontiff's words were in the spirit of those on the High Priest's breastplate—"doctrine and truth," sound in principle and true in fact. They convinced and persuaded. Facts, with their proofs, had no doubt been carefully prepared, and could not be gainsaid. The strong emotion which Gregory on other occasions easily betrayed could not have been restrained here. Often in prayer has every beholder seen the tears running down his glowing countenance; often those who have approached him with a tale of distress, or stood by when news of a crime has been communicated to him, have seen his features quiver and his eye dim with the double sorrow of the apostle, the tear of weakness with the weak, the scalding drop of indignation for sin. This sensibility cannot have been stemmed, even by the coldness of an interpreted discourse, but must have accompanied that flow of eloquent words to which, when earnest, Gregory gave utterance.

All this must have told effectually where there could be nothing to reply. Mistaken zeal, early prejudice and an extravagance of national feelings had no doubt influenced the conduct of the Czar towards his Catholic subjects against the better impulses of his own nature, which Russians always considered just, generous and even parental. No one had before possessed the opportunity or the courage to appeal to the inward tribunal of this better sense.

The Concordat, signed in 1848, between Russia and the Holy See was never executed with honesty and equity. Its surveillance in Poland was entrusted to its worst enemy, Skripitzine. As if that were not enough, the new Russian criminal code made penal, and therefore illusory, nearly every right granted by the Concordat. From the days of Pierre de la Vigne some lawyer has ever stood close to the ear of absolutism in nearly every great Christian crisis and pointed out, for a consideration, how religion might be manacled and enslaved in the name of right and justice. In his memorable report of Pius IX. Holowinski, the Catholic Archbishop of Mohilew, laid bare all the ways of oppression, violent and hypocritical, that were followed during the remainder of the reign of Nicholas.<sup>30</sup> The latter died in 1855, after a successful consolidation of his personal authority and an equally successful series of cam-

<sup>30</sup> Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

paigns against obsolete Persia and decrepit Turkey. He had extended the limits of the state, but had not deepened or ennobled the popular life. He created a venal and conscienceless press that in turn begot and justified the most insane forms of revolutionary propaganda. He was on all occasions the enemy of France and played a notable rôle in the upbuilding of modern Prussia and in the burning internal conflicts of Austria. He let loose and encouraged among his people a rabid Slavophilism, yet beneath its shadow he bound them with hopeless knots. He had no confidence in democracy that was to him as sin and hell. Yet he was bound to behold his empire insulted in the Crimean War by the two most democratic nations of Europe. He died in a kind of dumb impenitent despair February 19 (March 2), 1855, an unbending man of iron will, dogmatic confidence in himself and a firm persuasion that the proper destiny of mankind was an unquestioning obedience to the will of the successors of Michael Romanoff.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Washington, D. C.

---

## A CATHOLIC COLLEGE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

IT HAS often been remarked that history, though always repeating itself, is ever new. Not only are fresh documents daily brought to light, but the store of facts already known shapes itself differently, according to the standpoint from which it is viewed. In proportion as some special form of human activity is drawn attention to by the needs or the interests of the moment, it is given more prominence as a factor in the evolution of society. Hence the field of historical research is widened and the ever-fusing ore of history is recast into new moulds.

Thus, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the study of social questions originated a totally new conception of the Past, *i. e.*, from the point of view of political economy. A numerous school of historians have since made it their special object to inquire into the production and circulation of wealth at the various stages of social life. Thus also, *si parva licet componere magnis*, the keen interest in pedagogics roused of late by educational reforms has caused many to turn to the closer study of bygone theories. True it is that a theory as such "can claim but a secondary place in the logical structure of a science, yet no one can deny its primordial influence on the course of scientific research."<sup>1</sup> Hence we may say

<sup>1</sup> D. T. cf. "Revue des Questions Scientifiques," Vol. LV. (1904), p. 611.