

PIUS IX. AND THE REVOLUTION.—1846—1848.

“LONG Live Pope Pius the Ninth!” The close-packed crowd that swayed and pushed in the Piazza di Monte Cavallo, on the morning of June 17, 1846, shouted loud and long. Amid the boisterous cries of excited men and women, the waters of the modest fountain ceased their song. The giant Horse Tamers, masterful in gesture yesterday, seem now subdued with awe. The wall of the Quirinal opens. A white-robed figure appears on the balcony and lifting a trembling hand blesses the just and the unjust. Few of the crowd that cheered and cheered again, knew even the name of John Mary Mastai-Ferretti. He had, however, played no inconsiderable part in the Church as a Vicar Apostolic, as an Archbishop, as a Bishop and Cardinal. Loving the poor and the suffering, he had given himself to charitable work rather than to public affairs; and yet, on the second day of its meeting, the Conclave had unanimously chosen him to fill the chair of Peter. Of those in the Piazza who could see the new Pope’s intelligent features and most winning smile, the good were surely attracted to him for all time. Probably not one that saw, or knelt, or huzzaed, imagined that this same John Mary Mastai-Ferretti was to prove himself—as he did prove himself—one of the holiest and one of the greatest of the long line of holy and great Popes that have been vouchsafed to the Church and the world.

Pius IX. was in his fifty-fourth year. Of his life, thirty-eight years had been devoted wholly to the service of God. Ordained in 1818, he had been promoted to the Cardinalate in 1840. The lamb-like Pius VII. was in Bonaparte’s grip when young Mastai received the tonsure. He had been a witness of the trials of four Popes. In a revolutionary jail he had tasted the sweets of “liberty.” The tyranny of democratic “nationalism,” he had experienced in a so-called republic of the new world. Five years at Spoleto and eight years at Imola, where he bore the burden of the episcopal office, had familiarized him with the revolution and the revolutionaries. There he received an education that should have been much enlarged during the six years he passed in Rome as a member of the Sacred College.

The condition of the Papal States between 1840 and the death of Gregory XVI., has been already sketched in these pages.¹ By

¹ In the CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1891, pp. 591-592.

his firmness, by his alertness, by his prudent and progressive reforms, Gregory had maintained his sovereign independence, but the conspirators had not laid down their arms. Throughout Europe they were more than ever active in devising, combining, doing, secretly, boldly, persistently, with the frankly disclosed intent of destroying both the spiritual and the temporal power of the Papacy and making themselves masters of that Rome from which "alone can modern unity go forth." Pius IX. knew the skill and the determination of these enemies of all good. There were "friends," however, whose fidelity or prudence he could measure only when they had betrayed him and his holy cause.

The welcoming huzza that went up from the Piazza di Monte Cavallo was echoed and re-echoed round the world. Pius deserved the praise of all good men. From the good among his own people, and, still more, from many that had been far from good, he deserved affection. Beginning his reign with the generous amnesty of July 16, 1846, he introduced reform after reform in the administration of the government and conceded freely liberties enjoyed under no other government in Italy, or indeed in Europe. To the press he allowed a latitude unusual in the world of fifty years ago. To the laity the greater number of the offices were committed. The municipal system was developed in the direction of home rule; the finances were carefully regulated, and the army was re-organized with a view to maintaining order in the States of the Church without foreign aid. Patriots the Popes have been always; the only patriot princes in Italy. To the rule Pius was no exception. He was most Italian of Italians, the most liberal of true liberals. The pacification, the unity, the happiness of Italy, he desired with his whole heart.

The applause of the world was partly generous, honest; partly senseless, unintelligent; partly false, deliberately, calculatingly fraudulent. With the absolutism of European politics the Pope had resolutely broken. He had gone to the people, inviting them to a new and rare freedom. His concessions compelled Piedmont, most unwillingly, to follow in his footsteps; compelled the other Italian princes to remove restrictions that were no longer wise or possible. Metternich looked upon Pius as a declared enemy. Austrian paternalism was essentially opposed to the extension of liberty among the masses; and Austria's paternalism was not exceptional in Germany. Had Pius IX. received patriotic support from the other rulers of Italy, and from the rosewater aristocrats who insisted that they were Italy and the Church as well, he would have united the Italians,—under no single king—and he would have shown the people of Italy how peaceably to acquire and to enjoy a freedom that they do not enjoy to-day.

This fact was immediately apparent to the revolutionaries. It was no less apparent to the ex-carbonaro, Charles Albert. To unify Italy was the revolutionaries' ambition—the unification of an anti-Christian socialistic mobocracy. To unify Italy was the ambition of the Sardinian king—the ambition of an ordinary Cæsar. Rome was the goal of King and revolutionist. "Perish the Papacy, and long live Italy!" was the watchword of the Revolution; and of the Sardinian, "Papacy or no Papacy, long live the King!"

The popularity of Pius IX. excited the jealousy, the fears of actual absolutism, of an expectant dynasty, and of the dictators of the republic of assassination. Mazzini was quick to sound the alarm, and Beelzebub—a most active political agent at all times and in all places—suggested means to suit the occasion. An almost incredible policy of deceit was promptly adopted, a policy pursued with that mad energy and vicious persistence which only the evil spirit can supply. Macchiavelli has long borne a bad name. One day in the Italy of the forties, and he would have re-entombed himself hurriedly, face down. A bold opposition to the Pope at this time, would have been fatal to the conspirators. Pius had won the affection of the real people by his generosity, self-sacrificing devotion to their welfare, and constant proof of honest love. The banished Carbonari who swarmed into the Papal States, who knelt at the feet of Pius, weeping, gesticulating, swearing endless gratitude and fealty, and whose only regret was that his slipper was so easy to reach,—for they would wish to bend their heads even lower down,—they could not well rise up and stab their benefactor instantly. The greater number of them were hypocrites, perjurers, and had been thoroughly trained in low cunning. From the real people, who were then, as they are to-day, Catholic; and who were in 1846 as they are in 1892, devoted to the one unselfish friend they have had, have, or will have in this world,—the Pope,—open traitors to the cause of God and humanity could hope for nothing but a reaction that would have made an end of them. God is patient, and Satan still guileful, serpent-like. The word passed around: Praise, Praise! everywhere, loudly! Lead the chorus! Lead! Lead! Audaciously Lead!

And the enemies of Christ, of virtue, of law, of peace, the perjurers, the murderers led. Mazzini boasted of his part in organizing this campaign of deliberate, monstrous lying; boasted in writing and in public speeches. The real people, the conspirators had not reached. Every criminal, as well as those who were meditating fresh crimes,¹ had joined the Carbonari before Maz-

¹ Colletta, *History of Naples*, Edinburgh, 1858, vol. ii., p. 318.

zini had reached his twelfth year. During the twenty years that the Genoese had plotted, a new crop of criminals had been gathered in; but of Mazzini and his ravings the "people" knew as little as they do to-day. Imagine the Italian laborer of this year of grace conning Mazzini's "Complete Edition of the Duties of Man," or his "Address to the Italian Working Class!" Nor was it the "people" that the revolutionaries wished to gain over. The students, the commercial class, the nobility and the clergy—to these Young Italy appealed, and among these many converts were made. Money, influence, a modicum of skeptical instruction, were forces which, supplemented by the dagger, could be used effectively to overturn the social order, and to rob the people of their rights, their desires, their hopes.

"Write and conspire, riot and conspire, stab, lie, teach falsehood and conspire!" Such had been the instructions repeated to Young Italy year after year since 1833. Now a new clause was added. From Paris in October 1846, Mazzini wrote to his Italian agents: "Take advantage of the slightest concession (by the Pope), to gather together the masses, if it be only to testify gratitude. Feasts, songs, assemblies, frequent relations established between men of all shades of opinions help to spread ideas, to make the people conscious of their force, and to render them exacting."¹ "Speak often, much and everywhere of the sufferings and needs of the people." "There are regenerating words that contain everything, and which should often be repeated to the people: Liberty, rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity. These are the words the people will understand, especially if these words are contrasted with the words, despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery, etc., etc."²

Throughout Italy the same disgraceful farce was played every day in every community—processions by day and by night, meetings, dinners, balls, street cries, hymns and songs, all in honor of *Pope Pius IX.* In Rome the round of demonstrations continued for more than a year. Several times a day "enthusiastic" crowds gathered in the Piazza of the Quirinal, where they sang the new Hymn of Pius IX., and cheered the Pope until he came out on the balcony and blessed them. Men carried busts of the Pope through the streets, that the people might see and know their benefactor. At the cafés the glorification of the Pope had neither beginning nor ending. Orators were lauding him in the piazzas from early morn to midnight. At the theatres the actors halted while the audience cheered the Pope. By night the houses were illumi-

¹ *Histoire de la Revolution de Rome*, par A. Balleydier, 4 ème édition, Paris, 1854, p. 12.

² Balleydier, *loc cit.*, p. 15.

nated, and with banners flying the devoted friends of the Pope marched through the streets, candle in hand. When Pius IX. took an airing, his carriage was followed by a pack of revolutionary hirelings who saluted him with complimentary phrases. Occasionally they removed the horses, and joyfully dragged the vehicle with their more than unclean hands. Into the churches they crowded to make a pretense of devotion to the God they had foresworn, and, on great feast-days, they did not hesitate to establish relations with the masses by pressing to the chancel rail, and there, terrible to relate, receiving the holy communion, sacrilegiously.¹

By these methods many simple, well-meaning folk among all classes were wholly deceived. To witness such constant and general exhibitions of admiration for the Holy Father delighted the optimists—and they are always with us. There were nobles, lawyers, physicians, clergymen, students, encouraging the demonstrations. How beautiful it was to see this rare, this hearty "unity!" Meantime the words "Liberty, rights of man, progress, equality, fraternity, despotism, privileges, tyranny, slavery," were used with discretion. And by degrees the character of the speeches, processions, street cries, was altered. Even when awaiting the blessing in the Piazza, the crowd no longer hailed Pope Pius IX., but merely Pius IX. On a memorable occasion (Sept. 8, 1846), the conspirators made a bold stroke. As the Pope advanced through the flower-strewn Corso, framed in with hangings, with portraits of himself, with banners and inscriptions, he read mottoes whose significance he could not mistake: "The first year of Italian redemption: The end of tyranny: The beginning of the new era of liberty and brotherhood," and others of like intent. Three months had not passed since the Pope's election, and yet the revolutionaries were evidently the masters of the city of Rome.

Reject the gratulations of loving subjects, a prince may not who would retain their love. To repress popular manifestations of confidence could only render him odious. An optimist himself, Pius IX. had hoped that even the ill-minded would have been won over by his unselfish efforts to serve the whole people and to elevate them politically as well as materially and morally. When he discovered that he was the victim of his own simple heart and of that malicious guile which, since a fatal day in beautiful Eden, has never ceased to operate, through human souls and human hands, against the truth and peace of God, the day for repression had passed. From Rome as a centre, the whole of Italy had

¹ For details of this campaign of education see Cantu, *His. des Italiens*, vol. xii., p. 140; Mazzini's *Life and Writings*; *La Rivoluzione Romana* S. B. Firenze, 1850.

been organized, openly, by the Revolution. The Holy City was divided into districts. Each district had its club, fully officered. From a central directing body, the district officials took their orders. The club was only the Carbonaro lodge under a more specious form. Daily the clubs received their instructions from headquarters, and thus acted as a unit. The Romans lived a cyclonic life of "demonstrations." At a few hours' notice the clubs were prepared for a procession, a banquet, a meeting, a "popular" manifestation in favor of "reform," and, of course, for a hymn in the Piazza and a blessing from Pius IX. Not alone centres of agitation were the clubs. Their purposes were largely educational. Each club had its journal, a small, well-filled, flowing sewer of lies and immorality. The spoken subserved the written word. False principles, libels, were passed from mouth to mouth. In every important city of Italy similar clubs were formed. The aim, the methods of all were uniform; and the members acted as a unit, often "demonstrating," meeting, banqueting on the same day, and ostensibly, in commemoration of the same event or in honor of the same person.

The club journal was not the only literary venture in which the conspirators were interested. Freedom of the press they had long claimed as a right, only because they desired freely to propagate revolution, irreligion and socialism. "Young Italy," "Young Europe," were professedly socialistic bodies. All the efforts of the former were directed to the unification of Italy under a government socialist and democratic. For the democracy of the United States, Mazzini and his followers had a contempt only second in degree to that which they bore to Protestantism. Their democracy was of a more radical character, and implied a governing power with an undefined "social mission;" a national Church, supreme over the Pope; "a national capital composed of public property, the possessions of the clergy, railways and other great industrial enterprises;" a national system of education which should exclude the dogma of direct revelation. "You shall have no God but God and no interpreter of His law, but the people." The beauties of this system were not easily to be comprehended by laboring men. To youths, at the universities, to tradesmen with a smattering of Voltairianism, to clientless lawyers and doctors with large or small ambitions, the conspirators looked for a full appreciation of their noble ideals and endeavors. In order to reach these various classes, a press was established in Rome as well as in other Italian cities—a press that covertly at first and afterwards boldly, broached the vilest doctrines, the most disgraceful lies, the foulest abuse of good principles, of good men and of good institutions.

The disorderly propaganda of the Social Democracy was not the only obstacle in the way of the pacification of Italy, nor the only enemy that threatened the Temporal Power. A so-called "moderate" party, directed from Piedmont, had its agents in every city. This party was, like Mazzini's, "nationalist" and revolutionary. Mazzini's plans were definite and complete. It is probable that, even at this time, the leaders of the Piedmontese party had a plan no less definite, which they prudently kept to themselves. An Italian nation they would have, but a royalist nation. To realize the idea of nationality, the Austrians must be driven from the Italian soil. On this point royalists and Mazzinians were agreed. What the Austrian lost, the King of Piedmont should acquire. To this part of the scheme the Mazzinians made no objection. Austria defeated, the revolutionary movement fairly started, they expected to unite the people against the princes, and to abolish kingship. When Piedmont ruled Lombardy and Venice, how should Italy be united? The royalists were not of one mind. A league of some sort would be necessary. Should the King of Piedmont, or the Pope be the head, the president of the league? Nothing was settled. The Pope had many "friends" among the royalists. They vied with the Mazzinians in sounding his praises in books, in journals, in speeches. They also advised him on all questions of Church and State, instructed him in religion and politics, and certainly warned him sufficiently against all other friends. *Veri Italiani*, the only true Italians, were these Piedmontese royalist liberals, for they were professedly liberals—liberal Catholics. Like Lammenais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, these inexperienced and not too well balanced men, of whom d'Azeglio is fairly representative, were crammed full of fine phrases about liberty. No one else knew the full and proper meaning of the word. They were the first and the only authorized expounders, the only lovers, the guardians of liberty. Religion and liberty had, unfortunately, never been harmonized, as certainly they should have been; but the "liberals" would supply the harmony. By what means? By the very same means that Mazzini would employ—by making a religion of liberty. They did not say this, because they did not see the conclusion that logically flowed from their premises. It was as true then as it is to-day that the philosophical and doctrinal miseducation of the liberty-shrieker are the prime causes of his dangerous aberration.

This Italian liberalism, like French liberalism, attracted a large body of instructed Catholics—real and nominal. In Italy the number of nominal Catholics has always been formidable. Here, in the new world, we are apt to assume that the Italians are eminently Catholic. Our assumption is probably based on the fact

that the blessed remains of St. Peter and St. Paul lie entombed in Rome, and that the successors of St. Peter rightfully rule the Church from Rome. These facts are undeniable, and yet our assumption is groundless. The Pope is always Catholic, and thanks to the Holy Spirit cannot be otherwise, but the Italians cannot claim to be a chosen people,—chosen of God. During this century instructed Italians were sadly handicapped. Every prince, North and South, was practically anti-Catholic. As long as they were absolute the princes hampered the Church in every possible way. The bishops were their creatures, chosen generally, not for those qualities which fit a priest for the episcopacy, but rather for their subservience to the person and their devotion to the policy of the ruler. The schools, the universities, were controlled by the State; and the whole atmosphere of these institutions was tainted with the noxious gases of Josephism and of a qualified Voltairianism. Nor were the seminaries much more Catholic than the universities. The standard of education was low, and the teachers were, on the average, well fitted to keep down to the standard. Naples was not the only kingdom in which the clergy, as a class, was positively anti-papal. Neither from the universities nor from the seminary could the Church hope to draw loyal, obedient, devout, intelligent support; but “liberalism” was sure of a mighty following.

Between 1830 and 1846 the “national liberals” became a power in Italy, thanks especially to the efforts of one man, Vincenzo Gioberti. “Father of the Fatherland,” are the words inscribed on the base of the statue set up in his honor in the Piazza Carignano, at Turin, his birth-place. Born in 1801, Gioberti passed more than thirty years of his life somewhat quietly. As a priest he had the reputation of a studious man in search of a mission. Had he not been hot-headed, and too much given to politics, he would not have been banished from Piedmont, as he was in 1833. In Paris and Brussels, teaching and writing, he passed the next fifteen years of his life. After the election of the new Pope, the army of knaves and of fools called Gioberti “the precursor of Pius IX.” From the end of 1845 up to the beginning of 1848, Gioberti was morally the Dictator of Italy, says Ausonio Franchi, who well knows the man and the time.¹ “Father of the Fatherland,” “Dictator of Italy,”—these are sounding titles. What manner of man was this exiled priest?

In the fourth number of Mazzini's *Giovine Italia* (1834), Gioberti, under the name of *Demofilo*, published an article on “Christianity and Democracy.” Let us make his acquaintance at

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi, Milano, 1889, p. 162.*

the age of thirty-three. "All hail to you," he writes, "the precursors of the new political law, earliest apostles of the new-born gospel I predict to you the success of your undertaking, for your cause is just and pious, being the cause of the people; your cause is holy, being the cause of God Your cause is eternal, and therefore more lasting than the ancient formulas given by him who said, God and our neighbor; but who now, through your voice and the voice of the country, proclaims God and the people."¹ These are the words of a revolutionary, an anti-Christian. Perhaps the writer, in time, corrected his youthful errors. If he did not, the moral dictator of Italy was a curse to the "Fatherland."

In 1834 Gioberti was a Mazzinian. He did not join the Carbonari, some say. He "accepted our leadership," writes Mazzini. Like Mazzini, ambitious, Gioberti broke away from "Young Italy" and struck out for the leadership of a party, distinct and yet not very different. The Mazzinians looked upon him as a traitor, and thus openly condemned him. Jealous of a rival, Mazzini attacked him on every convenient occasion. Their intercourse was not however, wholly interrupted. In 1847 they met in Paris. Gioberti, be it remembered, was "morally the dictator of Italy" at the time. "I know we differ on religious matters," said Gioberti to Mazzini, "but, good God! my Catholicism is so elastic you may put anything you like into it." If Gioberti used these words as Mazzini states, then we cannot doubt that, in 1847, the Turin exile was quite the same man we knew in 1834. It is possible that Mazzini forged the sentence we have quoted, but even then we cannot charge him with doing an injustice to Gioberti. From first to last what he was pleased to call his Catholicism was elastic, wonderfully elastic; and he found in it a place for everything except Catholicity. This is an assertion and a sweeping assertion; an assertion, however, that can be substantiated by an overpowering array of proof. "I would not exactly say," Manzoni did say "that Gioberti was wholly outside of the bark (of the Church); he has one foot inside, but the other foot he dangles in the water somewhat too confidently." Italians are not always polite when criticising foreigners, but of a fellow-countryman they can be considerate—witness Alessandro Manzoni. A Saxon, or even a Celt, would not have so tenderly, gracefully, lifted Gioberti's other and not too willing foot out of the water.

At Brussels Gioberti was not idle. Four years after the

¹ Mazzini's *Life and Letters*, vol. i., pp. 312-313. In 1849 the Mazzinians republished this article under Gioberti's name. Of its authenticity there can be no doubt. See Ausonio Franchi, *loc cit.*, p. 147

² Mazzini's *Life and Letters*, vol. v., p. 24.

"Demofilo" letter his name was often repeated among cultivated Italians. The author of the "Theory of the Supernatural" (1838) gave promise of great things. Two years later he gained a larger public through the "Introduction to the Study of Philosophy." In 1843 he published a work that made him famous, the "Primacy, Civil and Moral, of the Italians." Until Balbo popularized it, the "Primacy" attracted little notice. Then of a sudden the book was treated with a reverence much above that accorded by many "liberals" to the Bible. The "Prolegomena" appeared in 1845, the "Gesuita Moderno" in 1846, and the "Apologia" in 1848. Meantime Gioberti's dictatorship had been joyfully accepted. The school children were taught reading out of his books. In the universities he was held up as the model for Italian writers. From him a crowd of Seminarians took their theology, philosophy and politics. "Priests and friars in their sermons, bishops and cardinals in their homilies, theologians and apologists in their books, vied one with another in quoting texts from Gioberti as if he were a 'half-father' of the Church."

A theologian, a philosopher, Gioberti assumed to be; but in fact he was only a calculating, and, painful to say, an immoral politician. Among the many admirable pieces of critical work done by Ausonio Franchi, the best, perhaps, is the delicate, incisive analysis of Gioberti's mind, character, system, an analysis based on his letters as well as on his works. The warmest admirer of Gioberti could not ask for a tribute more generous than that Ausonio pays to the man who furnished the despoilers of the Papacy with the ideas and arguments that inspired and supported them during a long and a wicked campaign—and that inspire, support them now. Nor can the same admirer well refuse to accept Ausonio's severely just judgment on the man and on his work. However we shall not be wholly guided by the acute author of the "Ultima Critica," though we shall in the interest of the truth, present a fair summary of his discerning and comprehensive argument.

In 1834 Gioberti was consorting with revolutionaries, and anonymously preaching anti-Christian revolution. When next we encounter him, in 1838, he is a pretentious Catholic; orthodoxy itself, and much more Papal than the Pope. He is likewise a conservative, a monarchist, the most positive, combative supporter of princely authority. A good part of the world takes him at his own measure. During fourteen years, friends and opponents try to follow him through a tortuous, intricate maze of contradictions. When they halt, Gioberti is once more openly, vigorously preaching anti-Christian revolution.

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*, pp. 156-157.

Between 1834 and 1852, had there been any change in Gioberti? Did he cease to be a revolutionary in 1838? Was he when he published the "Theory of the Supernatural," or at any time thereafter up to his death, in 1852, an orthodox Catholic, an honest supporter of the Temporal Power, an honest believer in the monarchical principle? To these questions, there is a single answer—No! And yet, toward the end of his life, when having fully disclosed his mind, men reproached him for so flatly contradicting himself, he could, as he did affirm that: "My present opinions are those I held in 1838, and in no respect vary from them." Other men's opinions he had changed, leading them speciously from orthodoxy to "liberalism," and filching from them every conservative principle. He alone had been consistent. The crowd of misinformed believers and unbelievers who are occasionally or generally shocked at the narrowness of the Church, might well pause and ponder when they read that Gioberti died in her communion. It was a sad death, sudden and without warning. Friends found his cold body, kneeling on the mean bed in the poor Parisian apartment where he spent his second exile. Beside him lay the "Following of Christ" and Manzoni's "Promessi Sposi." According to report, he said Mass daily in the Church of St. Louis d'Antin. Evidently the man had a kind of faith. However, even though he exercised priestly functions to the last, no one will think of him or write of him as a priest. He lived the life of a political partisan. This was the mission to which he called himself. The love of God or of His Church did not possess his soul, control his aspirations, or direct his efforts. He had set up an idol, Italy; an idol that during his lifetime had an existence only in his own mind. This imagined Italy he worshiped. It was for him, in a certain sense, the Absolute.¹ And this Italy should become a reality. He, Gioberti, would be the creator. To Gioberti, his own Italy was the world. To be the creator of a world, is to satisfy a mighty ambition. Out of the chaos that Gioberti perceived, he purposed evolving an order, a harmony, a unity, pleasing to himself, and therefore modelled after the eternal archetypes.

Instantaneous creation Gioberti did not aspire to. Step by step he devised the processes by means of which his ideal Italy should be developed into the real Giobertian Italy. When all the parts of his conception had been carefully fitted together, he proceeded to action. Before men he appeared as a theologian and philosopher. In fact he was neither the one nor the other. Nor did he mean to be, except inasmuch as theology and philosophy could

¹ *Ultima Critica di Ausonio Franchi*, p. 151, note.

² *Ultima Critica*, p. 153.

be made to serve his political aims. Were all his metaphysical speculations extended even through a hundred volumes, he would have had but a scant following, unless among the very few who take pleasure in transcendental abstractions; nor would he have had any influence upon the national thought and life. Take away the superlatively dialectical part of his philosophical writings, and he will be still the Gioberti that all Italy knew, loved, acclaimed as the regenerator of its civil life.¹

In the books, Gioberti's "Philosophy" is rightly dismissed as one of several illogical systems of ontology. Mazzini, curiously enough, says that "the regenerator of the civil life of Italy" as his friends called him—"started from the doctrines of Giordano Bruno,"² and the statement is probable. We know that the modern "regenerator" condemned his inglorious predecessor; and yet it is well to remember that some political philosophers have been very subtle, to use a polite word. Modesty is a fault with which no writer has charged Gioberti. He was not the only Italian philosopher, among his contemporaries, who patched up a system. "Orthodox Gnosis" was the name he sought to patent. This fine name covered an old, worn-out piece of baggage. The notion that mankind is to be served by providing it with a scientific religion, of purely human manufacture, is a worm-eaten and indeed a rotten notion. The regenerator, creator, politically, was content, with being a second-hand philosophical upholsterer. He had calculated the effect of his brand-new trimmings.

To harmonize extremes is not an easy problem. Gioberti proposed harmonizing contradictories. Evidently he was satisfied with his success. He was so consistently contradictory that, as the critic we have more than once quoted happily puts it, he can be understood only by those who can appreciate him as a man gifted with "a genius for contradiction."³

From start to finish Gioberti was a rationalist, with quasi-Catholic tendencies. His rationalism and his Catholicism were, however, mere political expedients. Theorizing, he had ever in view a practical end. About the truth of his system he was not exercised. Opportuneness was his guiding principle. Italy he saw divided among contending philosophical and political sects. How to unite them all as worshipers of his private idol, Italy, how to make a nation of "patriots"—such the problem the exile had put to himself. And the answer came: By sacrificing all other things to "Italianism," to "patriotism." Religion, philosophy, democracy, monarchism, he considered thenceforward, as means and only as

¹ *Ultima Critica*, p. 169.

² Mazzini, *loc. cit.*, vol. v., p. 24.

³ *Ultima Critica*, p. 149.

means to an end, means to be used as circumstances might demand.

In order to effect his purpose, he deemed it of first importance that he should encounter no opposition from any constituted authority. Hence his glorification of Catholicity, of the Papacy, of the monarchy. The conservative elements, the religious elements of society, were captivated. "From every page, from every line of the early works, they were inspired with the love of Italy. No word of apology, invective, theory or criticism, did Gioberti write, without adding the word Italy—glorious Italy, beloved Italy, Italy that would one day be united and supremely great." Absorbing his "gnosis," readers were unconsciously Italianized; absorbing his "patriotism" they were unconsciously gnosticized. When the glowing rhetoric of the "Primacy" was poured out on the "moderates," from afar the exile could see the form of his idol concreting out of chaos. Forthwith he proceeded to give a new direction to the uncertain elements.

The Church, Catholicity, the Papacy, Gioberti had extravagantly lauded during the first creative period. Now in the "Gesuita Moderno" he made war on the "grenadiers of the Church." Originally, the Jesuits received their share of his opportune applause. Later in the "Prolegomena" he turned on them, unexpectedly, contradictorily. There is an explanation of his infamous book, the "Modern Jesuit." The writer, pretending to be justified in attacking a great and good Order, was in fact aiming his vulgar and impotent blows at the Church, at Catholicity, at the Papacy. Denouncing abuses that existed, opportunely, in his own false heart and soul—and there alone—he skilfully pushed forward his catholicism, his creed, his church—a rationalistic, materialistic, natural, immoral creed and church. In the hands of a well instructed man of any creed, the "Gesuita Moderno" will ever prove to be a defence, a eulogy of the Order, and a condemnation of the malicious, falsifying author. For in this book Gioberti exposes himself so completely that volumes of self analysis, scientifically minute, could not add to our knowledge of the man. When Mazzini connected Gioberti's name with Bruno's, he assured the conspirator did not express his whole thought. The modern Gnostic and the "philosopher of nature" were in many ways similarly gifted. They had the same voluminous, extravagant volubility, the same inordinate self-conceit, the same power of opprobrious abuse, the same spirit of self-contradiction. Gioberti libelled good women as well as good men, for he spared the Ladies of the Sacred Heart no more than he did the Jesuits,—a piece of wanton cowardice, which in a virile country would certainly not have been repaid by abject hero-worship. The author of the

"Gesuita Moderno" is not only filled with malice, jealousy, vanity; he is not only ready to tell monstrous lies, consciously, in order to serve a wicked purpose, but he is also directly and indirectly—for he was a master of indirection—traitorous to the cause of Christian faith, morals and piety. It is easy to see that, in great part, his most malignant attacks on persons, principles and institutions, are really poor defences of his own weaknesses, failings, vices. A man who goes to Ariosto for his morals, and who could speak slightly of the purity of a Stanislaus and of an Aloysius; a man who looked upon "*civil* corruption, which is the spiritual death of nations"¹ as a greater evil than moral corruption, may appeal to some varieties of "liberal" Catholics, but will not be recognized by those who hold to sound doctrine and Catholic practice.

Under cover, in this mean and degrading fashion, Gioberti had prepared the "people" for the revelation of his whole thought. This revelation was put in writing, only after he had failed in realizing, with his own mind and hand, an important part of his well-planned scheme. Providence was generous to him, and saved him from getting possession of Rome or of the Pope, and from having a chance to put the finishing touches to his monstrous pagan idol. When he spoke the last word, he was what he was in 1834, rationalistic democratic. The sovereignty of reason and of the nation, are the only sovereignties he recognises. His Church had always been a purely Italian organization, and his Pope never more than the "first citizen in Italy," quite like Mr. Rudini's. Pretendedly, Gioberti recognized the Church as a body independent of the State. Now he proclaimed that the Church neither did nor should exist except as subordinate to the State.

Gioberti we have called a revolutionary; and he was no less a revolutionary than Mazzini. Of the two men, Gioberti was the more dangerous. He had a wit that the other lacked. He reached and influenced minds that Mazzini could not affect. Even Italy can boast of few politicians as consummately Macchiavellian as the "regenerator." Consistent, and at the same time contradictory, we have said he was. His contradictions were deliberate. They formed an essential part of his scheme. And that scheme, artful, mysterious, he pursued during the whole fourteen years of his active life. To succeed, deception was necessary. Therefore, he adopted deceptive means. Any means that would bring success were rightful means in his estimation. His conscience he had formed on a law which he entitled "the law of gradation," according to which self-constituted reformers "should move by steps and

¹ *Il Gesuita Moderno*, Lausanne, 1846, p. 302.

not by bounds, should attack neither error nor inveterate abuses openly; should never reveal the whole truth, but, in order to attain success, should expose their ideas according to the times. To render the truth accessible it is often necessary to hide a portion of it."¹ The means justify the end.

Guided by this law of his own making, all Gioberti's contradictions became consistencies, all opportune means were good. He could not be immoral because the moral was his will or fancy. Liberalism adopted his principles, which were in no whit different from Mazzini's. The theories of the revolutionaries Gioberti did not blame or condemn, on the ground of their immorality, or because they were anti-social, irreligious, anti-Christian, but solely on the ground of their inopportuneness. His "liberalism" was in fact theirs. He and they were legitimate children of the Revolution. He was doing their work, and with "gradation" gave them most substantial aid in their attack "on the Papacy, on the Church, on Christ, on God, on everything that is related to the supernatural, the spiritual, the religious."²

Mazzini appealed to the force-men, to those who wished to reach a goal by leaps and bounds; the other, made friends among those who were not sure as to what they desired, but preferred being decent under all circumstances. The two "patriots" looked to the clergy for support. Mazzini had not forgotten them when he organized Young Italy. He invited them to aid him in establishing a "good parochial system, and the suppression of clerical aristocracy." "Religion and politics are inseparable," he wrote to the priests of Italy. "Without religion political science can only create despotism or anarchy." On his followers he had long sought to impress a right notion of the power of the clergy. If the revolutionists would maturely reflect on the aim of their enterprise, and on the means by which it must be achieved, "they would learn that if liberty is to be durably founded on the earth, the decree must go forth from a sphere no human power can reach; that had they begun by seeking this sanction, had they appealed to the priests in the name of the gospel, and of Christianity expiring through the faults of those who dared not become its interpreters—they might not now count in every priest an enemy and in every church a centre of opposition and resistance."³ Mazzini's efforts were not unavailing. Too many clerics went over to him. Gioberti, as we have seen, a considerable number of them worshiped.

¹ *Ultima Critica*, pp. 179, 182.

² *Ultima Critica*, pp. 174, 186.

³ "Thoughts Addressed to the Priests of Italy," etc., *Life and Works of Mazzini*, vol. i., p. 246.

Against the Jesuits Mazzini was less voluminously abusive than Gioberti. His instructions were brief and pointed: "The power of the clergy is personified in the Jesuits. Following the tactics of the Socialists, make the name hated in Italy." The Order was the right arm of the Church in the contest with "liberalism" and with the Revolution. The aim of the Revolution the Jesuits had not been slow to discover; the logical outcome of liberalism they had reasoned with certainty. Liberal philosophers they handled without respect to the "law of gradation." Fully equipped, courageous, devoted, they were the scouts, the sentries, as well as captains, colonels, generals of the army of Catholicism. Mazzini's vision was clear, and Gioberti's no less so. If the Church was to be deprived of her temporalities, and to be despoiled of her liberty in things spiritual, then was it highly important that the Jesuit should be driven from the battlefield. Gioberti was not a man of blood, but moral assassination he recognized as a proper, opportune means of political action.

Between 1846 and 1848 the anti-Jesuit cry gradually grew stronger and stronger. "Morte ai Gesuiti!" Not unlikely you may read the words to-day, freshly stencilled on some Italian church wall. From the press, the pulpit, the school-master's desk, the club, the Jesuit and "Jesuitism," were made hateful. Gioberti's lies were exhausted; but not so the malice of "liberal" and revolutionary. When the campaign of "education" had been perfected, the campaign of action was opened. In the streets novice and Father were vilified, stoned, chased. The houses of the Order were attacked, windows were broken, colleges sacked, altars wrecked, sacred vessels stolen or dishonored, statues smashed, pictures destroyed. Assassinations? Why ask the question? Was not the dagger "an excusable fact"—the one bright object that glittered amid the darkness which covered the land? Finally by riotous bands, by court decrees, the Jesuits were forced out of one establishment after another, one town after another, one territory after another. Charles Albert suppressed the Order in Piedmont, at the demand of the rabble. Gioberti's evil plot had not miscarried. His compatriots assailed the convents of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart as well as the houses of the Jesuits. Well might Silvio Pellico say: "Great enterprises begun with acts feeble and unjust are ill-begun."¹

From Rome the anti-Jesuit movement in the States of the Church was prepared and managed. Mobs violently drove the young and the old out of Fano, Ancona, Sinigaglia, Faenza, Casentino. Pius IX. as soon as he had mastered the plan of campaign was not slow in defending the Jesuits and in warning un-

¹ *Cantu, loc. cit.*, p. 173.

wary citizens. To the glorious Order he paid a deserved tribute ; but his words of praise and of warning could not stop the conspirators. Officials, soldiers, policemen—Mazzinians, Giobertians—either helped or tolerated the mob. The Pope was powerless. In Rome itself his commands, his affectionate appeals were as ineffective as if they had never been spoken. There the Jesuits were submitted to unheard of outrages. Night did not put an end to insult or to blasphemy. Candle in hand, with mock or mocking priests to lead, the ribald members of the clubs marched around the houses of the Jesuits, after sundown, singing the Miserere, and mimicking the holy office for the dead. For the sake of peace, and to save lives most valuable to mankind, the learned, pious members of the noble Order left the Holy City to whose fame they have so much added during three centuries.

“ Jesuit ” was a name deliberately chosen by Gioberti to represent not alone the Society, but all men who remained true to the faith of Christ and to the See of Peter. And Mazzini’s use of the word agreed wholly with Gioberti’s. Persecuting the Order first, “ liberals ” and revolutionists next turned their attention to monks, nuns, congregations. The fated name “ Jesuit,” “ Jesuitical,” was applied to religious in general. Insult and violence followed. Then giving the name a still wider extension, all honest citizens, all men of principle, all persons of devout life, were marked as “ Jesuits ; ” and to be marked was to be martyred—in reputation ; to be maltreated, boycotted, forced out of office however honorably attained, made a victim of, in one or many of a hundred ways. Passion once excited, and who shall fix its limit ? After the good men had been persecuted, the wicked turned one against another. And what more convenient means of reviling a rival, an adversary, a benefactor, a friend who had made his way, than to hold him up to scorn as a “ Jesuit.” Every one of the rascals had his own particular “ Jesuit,”—the man he would ruin. A just judgment pursued Gioberti. When, “ Dictator of Italy,” he had been suddenly lifted into the Ministry of Piedmont and as suddenly deposed, the rabble hooted the disappointed, characterless, ruined politician as—a “ Jesuit.” Some wrongs time corrects after a fashion.

Here and there, outside of Italy, a voice was raised in protest against the illiberal, savage treatment of scholarly, virtuous and zealous clergymen. From the narrow and prejudiced world then called Protestant, praise came rather than blame. Here, in the United States, at least one democratic, liberty-loving voice was heard, protesting in manly words against the shameful persecution of the Jesuits—the voice of Orestes A. Brownson.¹ The “ patriots ”

¹ See *Brownson’s Quarterly Review*, April, 1846 ; July, 1847 ; July, 1848.

were the only "popular" men in Italy. And who were the "patriots?" Ausonio Franchi will tell us. He believed that being Mazzinian, anti-Catholic, he was a pure patriot; but even he was nauseated, horrified at the company in which he found himself. "Yonder man is a cheat, but a patriot," his cronies said to him; "that other is a usurer, but a patriot; and his neighbor is a thief, but a patriot; a forger, but a patriot; an assassin, but a patriot; a sodomite, but a patriot; a trafficker in justice, but a patriot—and the list is not ended."¹ Book-makers and book-reviewers there are, American, who, now and then, regenerate the old anti-Jesuit lies. Have these pretty gentlemen ever considered that, perhaps, a public opinion of considerable weight in this country knows how to qualify them, and rates them duly as no better than Italian "patriots?"

Against absolutism, "liberal," moderate and revolutionary were ostensibly arrayed. Could there be an absolutism more odious, more detestable than this despotism which brutally mastered Italy? Following the lead of Pius IX., all the princes had given proof of an honest desire to grant every reasonable demand for a modification of the existing forms of government. Peaceably, concessions could have been gained that would have made each separate people the controllers of their lives, their liberties, their happiness; but peace had no place in the plan of campaign. And strangely enough, the sole friend of peace, the Church, was always excepted when liberties were enlarged. Practically, there was not a single government in Italy. The mob ruled. To-day's concession was sure to be followed to-morrow by a new demand. Princes halted for a day and talked bigly about their rightful authority and their prerogatives. The next day they had given more than was asked of them. Charles Albert, "sword of Italy," is a fair type of these princes. By his orders the soldiers sabred and shot down men old and young, women, children, because, moved by his windy promise to fight, some fine day, for the independence of Italy, they collected in the streets and expressed their "patriotism" by singing the hymn of Pius IX. Then hurrying from Turin to Genoa, Charles presented himself to the crowd, waving a flag once captured from the Austrians. He had another ready for the priests—the flag of Gioberti.²

Naturally the mob neither respected nor feared such rulers. Governments determined on preserving order could have assured it had they throttled disorder promptly; but a constant show of weakness had made the governments weak and the revolution

¹ Ausonio Franchi, *loc. cit.*, p. 186.

² Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xii., pp. 150-151.

strong. On a par with the clergy Mazzini placed the soldiery; and therefore the conspirators worked incessantly to gain converts in the army, and were notably successful. In the States of the Church—for Rome was always the objective point—the propaganda among the soldiers was most active. A goodly number of the Carbonari who had taken advantage of the Papal amnesty showed their loyalty to the Holy See by joining the army. The Pope's government forgiving all, forgot all. Old conspirators received commissions, honorable and responsible, and used their opportunities to corrupt the men serving under them. The clubs, the journals, educated the troops into a code that our State militias have not yet adopted. Of this code the first article was: The soldiery should never fire on their brothers, the "people." However, the conspirators were not satisfied with corrupting the army. They had determined to organize a powerful army at the expense of the government—an army which they could control, and which could be used, at command, against the very power that created it. On July 13, 1847, a terrible plot against the Pope was suddenly disclosed. The Jesuits, several Cardinals, the King of Naples, the Duchess of Parma, and a number of citizens of undoubted character, had conspired with Austria—thus ran the word—to fall upon the Romans, massacre them, seize the Pope, compel his abdication, and place the city under Austrian control. Names were not only stated, but details as to time and place were faithfully recorded. During two whole days and nights the city was full of frightened, noisy, thankful "patriots." Te Deums were sung in the churches—the Pope and the people had providently escaped. Sworn testimony was produced against the leaders of this vile plot. Everywhere was heard the cry: To arms! But where were the arms? How neglectful we have been! Let every man be armed hereafter; let there be a civic guard! And a civic guard there was. The mob gathered about the Quirinal, a deputation of loving citizens begged, demanded, that every able-bodied *Roman* should be enrolled and armed, so that the Pope and the people should thereafter be sure of defenders against bloody conspiracy. Pius IX., granted the mob a part of its request. A few days later, the "patriots" forced from him all they desired—"forced" is the word, for the Pope stated openly that his action in this matter was not free.

A lie, consummate lie, was the story of this plot; a lie, studied, as were all its consequences. The accused were all loyal Catholics; the accusers were knowing perjurers, and yet they went into court, and adding crime to crime, tried to convict the men whom they had libelled. The Te Deums were burlesques, the lamentations and jubilations mere acting; but the purpose of the con-

spirators was effected. At once the Civic Guard was established in every town in the Papal States. Then the clubs agitated in the other principalities and were almost as easily victorious as at Rome. The Italian mob was armed and accoutred. Each company of the Civic Guard had its quarters—a new revolutionary club.

Mazzini writes of a "species of delirium which took possession of men's minds in 1847"; and yet records the calculated methods by which this delirium was excited. The powerlessness of all the governments, and the tyranny of the patriots, are equally astounding.¹ Mazzini was never idle. His agents, his secretaries, carried his orders to his leaders, and, in special cases, assisted in putting these orders into effect. At Rome he had a number of worthy lieutenants. Charles Bonaparte, Prince of Canino, if not the ablest of the staff, or the most vicious, was perhaps the maddest. To the Papacy he was indebted for his title and estates; and yet he had for years been one of the meanest of conspirators; a spy in the Papal palace and in the houses of the Cardinals, where his name and his dissimulated loyalty gave him admission. During the reign of Gregory XVI., it was Canino's habit to visit the Holy Father, frequently, and, at the Pope's feet, to offer a devout homage. Returning home he hatched conspiracy with all the secret enemies of the Church. Superior to Charles Bonaparte in mental qualities, in finesse, in character was Terenzio Mamiani, who philosophized and conspired, though not equally well. He was one of those re-admitted to the States of the Church by the amnesty of Pius IX. Though he declined to take the oath of loyalty after his return, Mamiani was not disturbed. Like many other Italian rationalists he claimed to be a genuine Catholic, while working with all his might to uproot religion. Smooth, cool, deep, he practised the "law of gradation" much more successfully than it was possible for the expounder of that law to do. As knavish as Cavour, his principles were just as immoral, his purpose the same. His methods, could he have controlled the circumstances, would have been similar to those of the Piedmontese politician. Pietro Sterbini was not less knavish than Mamiani, nor less mad than Canino. As early as 1831, he had been compelled to fly from Rome, with other disorderly characters whose efforts to excite a rebellion had failed. Hiding, conspiring in various Italian cities, after a time he went into France. Later he made his home in Naples, where he adopted the patriotic trade of a government spy. Under the amnesty he returned to Rome, and was at once given a place of authority on the revolutionary committee. Besides editing a scandalous sheet, the *Contemporaneo*,

¹ See *Mazzini's Life*, etc., vol. v., pp. 18, 26, 46.

Sterbini wrote popular hymns, and "spouted" revolution incessantly—in the clubs, in the streets, at banquets and meetings. He boasted of having prostituted the sacraments of the Church, with the intention of deceiving the Pope and of gaining a place of trust in the municipal government. High in the councils of the conspirators, he was an organizer as well as a declaimer, and to him were chargeable many of the demonstrations of all sorts that were so common in Rome, and elsewhere. Giuseppe Galletti—another honored leader, deserved the confidence of these three gentlemen, for his record was quite as immaculate as theirs. A Bolognese, he had been a Carbonaro in 1831. During thirteen years he promoted rebellion in the States of the Church. Though guilty of blood, again and again, he invariably escaped punishment, so skillful was he in covering his tracks. At length, in 1844, he was surprised. Letters and documents that fell into the hands of the authorities, proved him to be the prime mover in an atrocious plot. Churches and houses he would have fired. Of the ensuing commotion the criminal conspirators would then take advantage; to rob the public treasuries; to seize and imprison the cardinals, prelates, employees of the government, the clergy, nobility, land-owners, police officials and judges—excepting only such as were favorable to Young Italy; and last of all, not publicly, but in the jails, to kill their prisoners, informing the public that they had fled, or been exiled, or were secretly confined. Found guilty, Galletti was condemned to life-imprisonment. The amnesty freed him. He wept as he knelt at the Pope's feet, and swore everlasting fidelity to the Holy See. A good part of his time was spent in telling cardinals and prelates how deeply he loved the Pope. In the Piazzas he addressed the crowd, lavishing praise on Pius IX., and appealing for union and submissive obedience. After he had played his allotted part in the comedy, Galletti resumed the rôle of an audacious revolutionary. A typical "patriot!"

These men fairly represented the intellect of the Roman managers. The material force of the revolution was centered in Angelo Brunetti, better known as Ciceruacchio. An American slang word aptly portrays Ciceruacchio. He was an ideal "tough." The Carbonari conferred a cousinship on him in 1831. A powerful and passionate brute, he soon made himself boss of the rabble. Ready for anything, drunk or sober, he respected neither life nor property. As his power increased, so did his ambition. The leaders courted him; nobles were his cowardly familiars. He became an orator, the mouthpiece of the "people." Indeed he was the people—the Carbonaro, "patriot" people. His influence was not confined to the City of Rome. In the neighboring villages

he had agents through whom he controlled the riff-raff of the country, and doubtless many ignorant and many timid laborers. Terror he exercised when he deemed it needful; money and drink he used with discretion. Canino, Sterbini, Galletti, Mami-ani, were not his masters, but his political chums. Gavazzi, Bassi, Rambaldi, Arduini, dall' Ongaro, to name only a few among the recreant clergy—for the "patriot" priests had their club in the Holy City—were admirers of Brunetti as well as of the other proper Signori whose acquaintance we have made distantly; and, in their own way aided the "popular" movement against the Temporal Power.

Were the patriots satisfied with demonstrations, hymns, newspaper editorials, lies, salacious books, banquets, meetings, sacrileges? Oh yes! generally. The dagger we do not emphasize; an intermezzo, a dessert, an item, an "excusable fact." And yet it may be that the "patriotic" Italian dagger is so uncommon in our day, that we are apt to think of it as having been sheathed when Pius IX. came, full of love, of liberality, of peace to the world. "He has done great things," said Guizot, "such as had not come to the mind of any sovereign for centuries; he has voluntarily and sincerely undertaken the interior reform of his States." Revolutionary reform was based on the dagger. Persistently was it plied in the States of the Church, in Piedmont, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena. Many a "patriotic" rejoicing ended in tears. A convicted assassin was a "martyr," but a decent man's corpse was well out of the way. During the nineteenth century, the Primacy of Italy, in the use of the dagger, is unassailable.

The hopes of the Sardinian dynasty for leadership in Italy could only be realized after Austria had been whipped out of Lombardy and Venice. Hence the monarchists, moderates, Giobertians, "agitated" in the Austrian possessions and outside of them. The German name was abused, patriotically. 'Away with the German! The shall Italy be united.' In this agitation, the monarchists found willing helpers among the Mazzinians. After the Papacy, Austria was their greatest enemy. To acquire the coveted Rome, they could not hope until the German had been deprived of his power to assist the Pope. A war must be. Charles Albert was willing but timid. Could Austria be irritated, or the King's hand forced, the designs of the conspirators would be forwarded. A broil between Austria and the Pope, how advantageous that would be!

The agitators, in 1847, did all the Mazzinians could wish. Monarchists, moderates, liberals there were who innocently injured their own cause. Austria looked askance at Pius IX., fear-

ing that he was an ally of the nationalists. At home and abroad the conspirators had glorified him as the enemy of Austria. The German and the Jesuit they coupled together. Pius had put himself on record as to the Jesuits. The Papacy had again and again proved its independence of Austria. An enemy the Pope could not be. However his position was seriously complicated by the anti-Austrian demonstrations that were introduced into the plan of campaign. A war of extermination, the orators preached in town and village. At length Metternich, taking advantage of a clause in the Treaty of Vienna, re-enforced the garrison of Ferrara (July 16, 1847), an imprudent act, as events proved. The Mazzinians, nationalists of all shades, demanded that the Pope should declare war. Pius IX. was not moved by their clamors. He protested diplomatically against the Austrian invasion of his sovereign rights. He negotiated with France for military support, if needed. When Austria still further increased its army, the Papal legate at Ferrara formed a camp, and adopted every means necessary for defence against further aggression. Before the expiration of six months, the Austrians agreed to withdraw the larger portion of their forces, and the affair was settled by a compromise.¹

When Pius IX. was elected, the liberals claimed him as one of their own. It was said that the influences which directed the Conclave were Giobertian; and that the new Pope would be an Italian of Italians. Pius had been careful to set himself right before the world. 'He lost no opportunity to declare himself a Catholic Pope, father of all the Faithful and not alone of the Italians. Nor was he less open in announcing that he purposed² "preserving intact all the rights of the Holy See of which he had been made the depository."³ His dealings with Austria made it apparent that he would not falter where the question of the Papal Sovereignty was concerned; and also that as a sovereign he did not intend to declare war against any nation in order to assist the Italian revolutionaries to form a nation. His Catholicity, thus unmistakably established, made new enemies for him in Germany as well as in Italy. Young Italy was prepared to take advantage of his difficulties. To Rome conspirators from every country hurried. A *coup* had been arranged. The city was absolutely in their power. Pius had tried to rule the mob by words, reasonable words, kindly, sympathetic words, fatherly words; but Ciceruacchio, Sterbini, Canino, had a language better suited to the men they had educated, and they acted as well as spoke. Freely,

¹ *Vicissitudes Politiques* etc, P. Van Durm, S. J., Lille, 1890, pp. 175, 177.

² Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 139.

and under duress, the Pope had granted many demands. The conspirators determined to compel him to give them the control of his government. As it was, they forced him to change a Ministry whenever they felt in the humor for a change.

On January 1st, 1848, a mob surrounded the Quirinal, and Ciceruacchio, in behalf of the "people," was deputed to present the Pope with a written demand for immediate reforms, twenty or more: Secularization of the Ministry, abolition of the ecclesiastical courts, suppression of the regular orders, etc. The deputation was not received. During the month following, the city was in a constant condition of tumultuous disorder. On the seventh of February Cardinal Bofondi was appointed Secretary of State, replacing Ferretti. Four days later the mob demanded a new Ministry, and reiterated their former "conditions." The crisis had come, and the Pope was equal to it.

At four o'clock in the afternoon of February 11th, 1848, Pius met the chiefs of the Civic Guard, for whom he had sent, and thus he addressed them: "Conditions, gentlemen, I shall never accept from anybody. Understand it well! Never shall it be said that the Pope consented to things contrary to the laws of the Church, to the principles of religion. If ever—and pray God it may not be—an attempt be made to do violence to my will, to force my rights from me, if ever I see myself abandoned by the men I have so loved and for whom I have done everything, I shall throw myself into the arms of Providence, and Providence will not fail me."¹ The words were clear as strong. Their meaning could not be misapprehended.

This speech did not please the conspirators; nor did it arrest their contemplated movements. On the evening of the 11th, a mob took possession of the Quirinal Piazza, calling for the Pope. His blessing they hungered for. Pius came out on the balcony. Suddenly there was a cry: "No more priests in the government!" Lifting his right hand, and motioning for silence, Pius IX. addressed the multitude. "Before the benediction of Heaven descends on you, on the Roman States, and, I repeat it, on all Italy, I recommend to you union, concord, and I desire that your demands should not be contrary to the sanctity of the Holy See. Certain cries, which do not come from the heart of my people, are uttered by a small number of unknown men. I cannot, should not, will not listen to them: *Non posso, non debbo, non voglio*. On the express condition, therefore, that you be faithful to the Pontiff and the Church—(Yes, yes, Holy Father we swear it!)—on this condition I pray God that he will deign to bless you, as I

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, pp. 60-61.

do with my whole soul. Remember your promise; be faithful to the Church and to the Pontiff.”¹

Their promise they did not remember; but the Pope's declaration was public and final. He did not forget it. The enemies of the Papacy were forever separated from the Pope. “Patriots,” nationals, liberals, moderates, from this day forth, whatever their honesty, were none the less culpable. Pontiff and Church spoke, as with one voice, the courageous: *Non posso, non debbo, non voglio.*

JOHN A. MOONEY, LL.D.

CATHOLICITY IN ENGLAND FIFTY YEARS AGO—A RETROSPECT.

PART I.

WE have been given to understand that certain justly revered American Catholics wish to put on record some personal reminiscences with respect to Catholicity in England. In deference to their wishes we have written the following pages, but we have done so not unwillingly for the following reasons:

It is obvious that there must be very much resemblance and affinity between “Great and Greater” Britain and that both exercise a powerful influence on the world external to them. We have been informed and believe that the American portion of the Catholic Church has a very great future before it. Records of facts as to Catholicity in England may be expected (on account of the resemblance and affinity above referred to) to be of use to the Catholic Church in America, and through it (on account of its great future) to have a very wide-spread utility throughout the world.

But there is one possible misunderstanding against which we wish especially to guard. It is the mistake, which might arise, that what we shall say here is meant by us to refer indirectly to some person or party, to some school or tendency of thought, or to some prevalent or exceptional practices, now existing in the American Church.

Although we take a very lively interest in all that concerns the United States and, of course, in the Church in the United States,

¹ Balleydier, *loc. cit.*, p. 62.