

THE POPES AND THE TEMPORAL POWER—
1790-1823.

Vicissitudes Politiques du Pouvoir Temporel des Papes de 1790 à nos jours; par Charles Van Duerm, S. J. Desclée, De Brouwer & Cie., Lille. 1 vol., pp. 456. 1890.

AT Valence, on the twenty-ninth of August, 1799, the pious, charitable, intellectual, patriotic Pius VI. died, a victim of the brutal foreigner. Twenty-four years of the eighty-two vouchsafed him had been spent in wisely, liberally administering the affairs of the Papal States, and in defending the Church from the hypocritical and from the daring foes, who—crowned, mitred, cassocked, breeched or *sans culottes*—had striven by the most unhal- lowed means to put an end to the temporal and spiritual authority of the Papacy. To plead the cause of outraged liberty, Pius had sought that pitiful despot, Joseph II., in his capital (1782), and there had borne, patiently, contempt and abuse which, eight years later, when the Belgians rose in arms against the Austrian oppres- sor, he was to repay by a favor wholly undeserved. Against the schismatical Leopold of Tuscany, brother of Joseph, and against Ricci, the grand-duke's Jansenistic bishop, Pius VI. had contended, with spiritual arms, for the liberty and for the law of the Church (1788). With the same smokeless but all-powerful weapons, he had fought a good fight against the tyrannical Constituent Assem- bly, that, not content with robbing the clergy and people of France, would have turned the rabble into a Pope, and the Pope into the slave of the mob (1791). When that cowardly mob, led by "a lot of brigands, the offscouring of the human race,"¹ assassinated the brave, innocent, helpless King Louis, Pius,—the venerable Pope, whose army could not protect his own small territory, whose person and throne were at the mercy of a Saint-Just and a Robes- pierre,—Pius alone, among the rulers of Christendom, had the courage to protest against the monstrous crime, and to denounce the workers of it as forever infamous and forever execrable.² During those awful days of the Terror, when, in the name of the Supreme Being and of Virtue, bishops and priests were banished or massacred, and when prostitution, sacrilege, fury, assumed the name and the garb of religion, Pius, firmly, steadily, defended the cause of Christianity, the rights of God and of men.

¹ Vergniaud's words.

² January 21, 1793.

To overturn the altar, symbol and source of justice, mercy and love, was the chief, the logical aim of the men of 1789. The idea was not wholly new. There was no scourged, thorn-crowned Christ to crucify,—only His Vicar to abase. The wisdom of the foolish has been able to devise only one efficient means of repaganizing the world, the destruction of the Papacy. In order to destroy the Papacy, the wisdom of the foolish has been able to devise only one seemingly sure means, the destruction of the Temporal Power of the Popes. Fools learn slowly in this world. The lesson they learned from Pius VI., a lesson taught them again and again through the ages, they have since unlearned.

Abuse of the Holy See did not satisfy the men of 1789. The party of action added injury to abuse. A first blow was struck at the Temporal Power by the seizure of Avignon and the Venaisin, which for nigh six hundred years had been a legitimate possession of the Papacy. Revolt, bloodshed, robbery were the only bases for the decree of the Constituent Assembly (September 14, 1791), a decree that, violating an incontestable title, abolished the Papal rights without excuse or compensation. Pius VI., both before and after this immoral decree, fearlessly asserted the right of sovereignty vested in the Holy See by a prescription of centuries, and acknowledged by Europe as legal and just.

The Directory received and followed the traditions of the Convention and of the Assembly. The guillotined King was 'the last of the Kings'; the still unguillotined Pope should be the last of the Popes. Thus spoke the *citoyens* rulers of France. Napoleon threatened, with a victorious soldiery behind him. The Pope, like many a Pope before, had attempted to unite the Italians against the invader. Failing, Pius preserved a strict neutrality, joining neither with Piedmont, Naples, Austria, Spain nor England. And yet he was not surprised when Napoleon entered Bologna and assumed the control of the Legations. The Revolution had no conscience, and Napoleon was the worthy 'son of the Revolution.' He dare not go to Rome. The Austrians were ready for a new campaign. He agreed to withdraw from a portion of the Papal Territory, while negotiations were carried on at Paris, provided he received twenty-one millions of francs, a hundred statues, vases and pictures, five hundred MSS., the fortress of Ancona, and provided that the Papal seaports were closed to all the powers at war with France (June 23, 1796). Barbarous as were these demands, they were accepted in the interest of peace, and the Papal government proceeded to satisfy them scrupulously. But when the Directory attempted to limit his spiritual rights, Pius suspended the execution of the treaty, reorganized his little army, and entered into a defensive treaty with Austria and with Naples. Once more

victorious, having parcelled out upper Italy as seemed good to him, Napoleon marched on the Papal States. The Directory insisted that he should 'destroy the centre of Catholicity, giving Rome to another power, or that, having banished Pope and cardinals, he should establish a new government.' Bonaparte wanted money. Vienna in his hands,—an Emperor at his feet,—and the temple of fame was his. Money! On the 4th of February, 1797, he was in Bologna. The Papal forces were driven back. Ancona was captured. The country was pillaged. The Virgin's shrine at Loreto, the richest in Christendom, was robbed outright; even the statue of Her who bore the God-man was sent to Paris. At Tolentino the 'son of the Revolution' halted. Vanquished, Pius sent plenipotentiaries to the conqueror. On the 19th of February they signed the stipulations of a treaty of peace, binding the Pope to revoke all treaties of alliance; to reduce his army; to *cede to France the Venaisin and Avignon*, and the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara and Ravenna; to hand over Ancona to the French until a continental peace had been signed; and to pay a "contribution" of thirty million francs. Rightly did Cardinal Consalvi call the treaty of Tolentino the work of a brigand. Why did the Pope consent to this 'great sacrifice?' The cardinal tells us. Though the injustice of the aggressor was manifest, the Pope felt himself obliged to submit, 'in order to save the centre of Catholicity from an invasion fatal to religion.'¹

Raphael's Transfiguration, the Laocoon, and other glories of the Roman collections, a Virgil of the sixth century, a Terence of the eighth, the artistic brigand despatched to France, under this remarkable treaty. The Pope was at the mercy of Bonaparte. The Corsican did not seize Rome; he did not banish the Pope and the cardinals; he did not set up a new government. He was more calculating than his masters. "It is my opinion that Rome, once deprived of Bologna, Ferrara, the Romagna, and the thirty millions we take from her, cannot last; this old machine will break up of itself."² Thus Napoleon wrote to the Directory on the very day of Tolentino. The Directory had another Bonaparte in its service, Joseph, who masqueraded as French ambassador to the Holy See. His instructions were plain. 'To aid, much rather than to restrain, the *good* dispositions of those who think that it is time to put an end to the reign of the Popes.' Joseph's house was a revolutionary centre. There conspirators organized "popular" demonstrations and street riots. In one of these riots, young General Duphot was killed. Duphot's death was not the

¹ *Vicissitudes Politiques du Pouvoir Temporel des Papes*; par Charles Van Duerem, S. J., pp. 30-32. Desclée, De Brouwer et Cie., Lille. 1890.

² *Vicissitudes Polit. du Pouvoir Temporel*, p. 33.

fault of the Papal government. It was the death which a criminal invites. Duphot was a suitor for the hand of a sister of Bonaparte's. The occasion served Joseph. Demanding his passports, he left Rome. The Directory imprisoned the Papal envoy at Paris, and ordered Berthier to march on the Eternal City. Berthier had an army of 30,000 men. Resistance would have been useless. To save the shedding of blood, the Papal troops retreated—at the Pope's command. Without opposition the revolutionary army entered Rome (February 15, 1798). They planted a tree of "liberty"—the hypocrites!—talked lunatic nonsense about Brutus and Cato—God 'a mercy on their souls!—and abolished tyranny. Hence our restful century! The people 'resumed their stolen rights.' You who love the antique comedy may smile. We shall, perhaps, see it on the boards once again before death comes to us.

Cervoni, now a general of the Directory, formerly a Papal soldier, took Berthier's place, and informed the Pope that Rome was a republic, and that the Temporal Power was at an end. Pius refused to abdicate. To the traitor who, impudently and ignorantly, assured him that his spiritual power would not be impeded, Pius suggested that, as the Pope held this power from God, no man could well take it away. Forthwith they ordered the venerable ruler of Christendom to retire into Tuscany. "Pius VI. entreated his enemies to let him die where he had lived; he was already eighty years old. They replied that he could die anywhere. The room he was seated in was plundered before his eyes—they deprived him even of the trifles required for his personal comfort, and drew the ring he wore from his finger."¹ Pius, rudely driven out of the Vatican on a stormy night, found a temporary refuge at Siena. "These indignities," he said to Manfredini, "make me hope that I am not an unworthy vicar of Christ. They recall to me the first years of the Church—and those were the years of her triumph."²

The Brutuses and Catos robbed as cleanly as Bonaparte—robbed churches, libraries, palaces, tabernacles and kitchens. The men of 'good disposition,' in search of things, made no distinction between places. They carried away sacred vessels; burned vestments for the gold in them; levied contributions on an artist, a banker,—on any one every one; stole statues and paintings, not merely for the National collection, but for private uses. And, of course, they suppressed the Propaganda. The indignities borne by the aged Pontiff—how they stir a man when he thinks of these

¹ Ranke, *History of the Popes*, p. 459. London, 1886.

² Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xi., p. 105.

infamous burglars and bandits! From Siena Pius was removed to Florence. The Italians were fighting for life and home against the foreign invader. In Tuscany the cry of "Long live the Pope!" was not uncommon. Farther from Rome this man of eighty-one would be less dangerous. He was weakly and ill. The Catos had as lief he were a corpse. They brought him to Parma, to Turin, across the Alps to Briançon, and then to Valence. They would have taken him to Dijon, were he not dying. Within six weeks 'the last Pope' was dead. So the philosophers said. The prophet of theophilanthropy wrote to Bonaparte, advising him to prevent the election of another Pope, and to establish a government at Rome and thus relieve Europe of the Papal supremacy.¹ "It might, in fact, have now seemed that the Papal power had been brought to a final close," are the words of Ranke.²

Pius VI. gave his life to the Revolution, but his oath, his honor, his rights, the rights of Catholic Christendom, he did not sacrifice. In exile, as when seated on the Fisherman's throne, he protested against the violent invasion and seizure of the Patrimony. Every government in Europe heard and listened to his voice. The Coalition moved; and the oft victorious French went down before Russian and Austrian and Englishman—and Turk. Within three months from the death of 'the last Pope,' the Directory had fallen and the Conclave had opened at Venice. On March 14, 1800, Cardinal Barnabas Chiaramonti took the name of Pius VII.; on July 3d the Pope-King entered Rome, amid the most enthusiastic demonstrations of the people. His progress through his territory had been one continued triumph

Pius VII. made his peaceable move on Rome, not without opposition. Austria, fighting the French revolutionaries, was the Austria of old. From her rulers the Papacy had to fear what, for ten centuries, it has had to fear from the most "Christian" of governments. An attempt was made to manage the Conclave from Vienna, and to assure the election of a Pope who would cede a portion of the States of the Church to the Empire. When Chiaramonti was chosen, Austria delayed his coronation; and lest the effect of this public act should, by its splendor, arouse the people, and thus interfere with the imperial schemes, the Pope was not crowned in St. Mark's. Hoping to force him to sacrifice the rights of the Church to their ambitions, many devices were used to lure Pius VII. to Vienna. Failing in this, the diplomatists sought from him an acknowledgment of the treaty of Tolentino. Had he conceded, they would have robbed him of the Legations with as little conscience as that of a Directory or of a Napoleon.

¹ Cantu, *loc. cit.*, p. 143.

² *Hist. of Popes*, vol. ii., p. 459.

The successor of the 'last of the Popes' was, like his Master, a friend of the people. Speaking to his flock, when Bishop of Imola, he had demonstrated the harmony of the Gospel with democracy. "Follow the Gospel," said Chiaramonti, "and you will be the joy of the republic; be good Christians and you will be excellent democrats."¹ Strong in the cause of justice, which is the people's cause, Pius VII. refused any concessions to Austria. Bonaparte, nominal Consul and real Dictator, victor at Marengo, was once more master of Italy. By the peace of Luneville (February 9, 1801), he regained possession of the coveted Legations. Pius VII. promptly protested, enunciating once more the Papal rights over these territories, and over Avignon and the Venaissin. At this very time Napoleon, 'persuaded that the Catholic religion is the only one that can confer true happiness on a well-ordered society,' was negotiating with the Pope for a re-establishment of religion in France. Napoleon's end was purely political. The Pope's aim was altogether spiritual. In order to gain his end the Consul tried to intimidate Pius VII. He was threatened with the loss of the Temporal Power.² The Pope made 'extraordinary concessions. He consented to the alienation of church property, a loss of four hundred millions of francs in real estate'—'feeling disposed to yield on all points where he could do so without offence to religion.'³ On July 17, 1801, the famous Concordat was signed. Amid salvos of artillery, on Easter day, 1802, for the first time since 1789, a Christian feast was celebrated in Paris. "The Pope was transported with joy,"⁴ "that the churches were purified from profanation, the altars raised anew, the banner of the Cross once more unfurled, legitimate pastors set over the people, and so many souls that had strayed from the right way restored to the unity of the Church and reconciled to themselves and to God." "

True 'son of the Revolution,' Bonaparte was a trickster, a hypocrite, a bully. To have the benefit of the moral arm of the Church,—without which no government can hope to last,—he recognized the Pope as the Vicar of Christ; to ensure his own autocracy, he falsified the record of his agreement and attached to the Concordat the Gallican "Organic Articles." Audacious is not the word to qualify Napoleon's fraud, but we have no stronger word. 'Disposed to yield on all points, where he could do so without offence to Religion,' Pius VII. had signed the Concordat, though the Consul refused to let go his hold on the Legations. Having gained a religion, which to him was only an inexpensive system of police,

¹ *Hist. Universelle, Cantu.*, vol. xviii., p. 183.

² *Vicissitudes Polit.*, etc., Chas Van Duerm, S. J., p. 56.

³ Ranke, *loc. cit.*, p. 460.

⁴ Ranke, p. 460.

he sought to use the ministers of religion as a Fouché or a Savary handled their pawns. The Consul had not learned the lessons taught by the history of the Church—lessons open to all men, and plain to read. Pius VII. protested and protested, nor did he cease to insist on the rights of the Papacy in the Legations and in the Venaisin. Bonaparte was deaf, and the 'restorer of religion in France' proceeded calculatingly to undo the Church in Germany. "The complete and final ruin of that stately fabric was attributable chiefly to his agency; the transfer of its possessions and sovereign powers to secular princes, indifferent whether Catholic or Protestant, was effected by his means."¹

Napoleon did not strangle the French Republic; he smothered it. Consul for life in 1802, he made himself Emperor within two years thereafter (May 18, 1804). The *sans culottes* that were, now gloried in their Charlemagne. Bonaparte took them at their word. A Charlemagne he would be,—a crowned Emperor, and King of Italy,—crowned not like Charlemagne, at Rome, but in the capital of France. To him the Pope must come—to him, greater warrior and ruler than Charlemagne. And the Pope went to him. To preserve religion, to assure the peace, morality, happiness not of France alone, but of Europe, Pius VII., in his sixty-second year, journeyed to Paris, and there anointed the splendid adventurer who had treated him so unjustly, contemptuously, and who, as he knelt in Notre Dame, at the Pope's feet, was devising in his crooked, subtle mind, indignities even greater than any he had committed. At Paris the Pope would have pleaded with the new Emperor for the return of the Legations, as well as of Avignon and the Venaisin. Napoleon avoided his guest. To the written memorial of Pius he answered in words of double meaning. 'He would assure the Pontiff of his veneration, of his desire that the ceremonies of the Catholic religion should be magnificently celebrated, of his intention to protect the Pope in his present dominions and in the enjoyment of the property that remained to him.' To the Legate of the Pope he had generously donated the corpse of the venerable Pius VI. and the statue stolen from Loreto. The rare jewels had been removed from the statue. A second Charlemagne!

The Italians have always delighted in the rule of an usurper. Napoleon had dealt with them much as an Arab handles a slave-gang. When he was ready he invited them to submit to his kingship. They submitted graciously, and never have they shown a more beautiful enthusiasm than on the May day that he placed the iron crown on his head in the Milan Cathedral. As city after city

¹ Ranke, *loc. cit.*, p. 461.

begged him to exercise an unlimited mastery, he consented with all the courtesy of an emperor, and forthwith levied heavily upon empty treasuries, generously permitting them to improve their finances by "secularizing" the property of monasteries, convents, brotherhoods, chapters, pious associations. Victor Emmanuel, King of Piedmont, resided in Sardinia at this time. Piedmont was known, in France, as the twenty-seventh military division.

Russians, Prussians, Austrians, English, had once more united. Ulm had capitulated. The campaign in North Italy was a fortunate one for the French. At Rome, the Pope maintained a strict neutrality. Suddenly, without excuse, violating the law of nations, and spoken and written promise, the French seized Ancona (Oct., 1805). On the 13th of November, Pius VII. sent to the Emperor a dignified and courageous letter, charging him with invading the Papal rights, rights respected by every other power; accusing him of adding to the Pope's trials instead of relieving them; demanding the evacuation of Ancona; and notifying him that, in case of refusal, the French minister must remove from Rome.¹ The outcome of the war with Russia and Austria was uncertain. Napoleon kept silence. When the victory of Austerlitz and the peace of Pressburg made him the arbiter of Europe, he answered the Pope's letter. One of the world's greatest tragedians, Bonaparte played comedy with an art equalled by no diplomatist before or since. Recalling the third Napoleon and Cavour, this is a high tribute, but deserved. The answer, dated Munich, Jan. 7, 1806, informs the "Very Holy Father" that 'the occupation of Ancona is an immediate and necessary result of the bad organization of the Papal Army.' Furthermore, it is much better for His Holiness that his fortress should be in Napoleon's hands than in the hands of the English or of the Turks. "I consider myself," writes the Emperor, with a straight face, "the protector of the Holy See, and, as the protector, I occupied Ancona. Like my predecessors of the second and of the third race, I have considered myself as the elder son of the Church, as alone having the sword to protect her and to shield her from the defiling touch of Greek or Mussulman." "I will be the friend of your Holiness whenever you consult only your own heart and the true friends of religion." 'If your Holiness desire to send away my minister, you are free to do so, and to receive instead the English and the Caliph of Constantinople.' "God is the judge, who, among all the reigning princes, has done the more for religion."²

¹ See the document in P. Van Duerm's *Les Vicissitudes Politiques*, pp. 68-70.

² See the document in P. Van Duerm's *Les Vicissitudes Politiques*, pp. 70-71.

Insulting, specious, threatening as this letter was, the self-appointed 'protector of the Holy See' wrote under restraint. On the same day he addressed his minister at Rome, Cardinal Fesch, qualifying the Papal advisers as imbeciles, madmen, egoists; threatening to send a Protestant Minister to Rome;¹ ordering Consalvi to do his bidding or resign. "For the Pope," said he, "I am Charlemagne, because, like Charlemagne, I reunite the crown of France to that of the Lombards." "I mean that he shall regulate his conduct with me from this point of view. If they behave well, I will not alter appearances; otherwise, I will reduce the Pope to be bishop of Rome." 'Tell Consalvi that Constantine separated the civil power from the military, and I, too, can name a Senator to command at Rome in my name.'²

Fesch conveyed these reproaches and menaces to Pius VII., who heard them unmoved. On the 29th of January he answered Constantine Charlemagne, demanding the evacuation of Ancona, payment of the many advances made to the French troops, and restitution of the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara and Ravenna. To this letter Napoleon replied on February 13th: 'All Italy shall be submissive to my law. I will not touch *in the least* the independence of the Holy See;' 'but our conditions must be that your Holiness shall have for me, in the temporal, the same consideration that I have for you in the spiritual, and that you cease useless relations with heretical enemies of the Church and with powers that can do you no good. Your Holiness is sovereign of Rome, but I am its Emperor. All my enemies should be yours.' To Fesch he wrote on the same day, ordering him 'to expel the English, Russians, Swedes and Sardinians from Rome and from the Roman State, and to interdict the ports to vessels of these powers. Tell them that I am Charlemagne, the sword of the Church, their Emperor; that as such I should be treated; that they should not know that there is an empire of Russia. I shall make my intentions known to the Pope in few words. If he does not acquiesce I will reduce him to the condition that existed before Charlemagne.'³

To the demand here made, and often repeated, that the Pope should 'consider the antagonists of another as his own enemies,' Pius replied: "That he was the universal pastor, the father of all, the servant of peace, and that the very mention of such a demand inspired him with horror." It was his part to be Aaron, the

¹ He sent one—Alquier.

² See the document in P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, pp. 72-73. We cannot forget De Maistre's happy exclamation, after quoting a passage from Voltaire: "The Mountebank! Where did he learn all these fine things!"

³ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 75.

prophet of God—not Ishmael, whose hand was against every man, and every man's hand against him.'¹ "Your Majesty establishes in principle that you are the Emperor of Rome," said Pius. "We answer with apostolic frankness that the Sovereign Pontiff, who is such, for so great a number of centuries that no reigning prince can point to a like antiquity, the Pontiff become, in addition, sovereign of Rome, does not recognize, and has never recognized in his states, a power greater than his own; and that no emperor has any right over Rome. You are immensely great; but you were chosen, consecrated, crowned, recognized Emperor of the French and not of Rome. There is no Emperor of Rome, there can be none, unless the Sovereign Pontiff be deprived of the absolute domain and of the empire that he alone exercises at Rome."² Whatever weaknesses the Popes have had, they never quailed before a tyrant. The Temporal Power, each one of them has defended against all comers. Pius, mild and irresolute as he was by nature, though less warlike, was no less loyal to his oath than the valiant Julius.

To consolidate his power in Italy, and to round the great empire he had conceived, Napoleon, in February, 1806, sent a force into the Kingdom of Naples. Her army beaten, Queen Caroline fled; and on the 13th of the month the French took possession of the capital. 'By right of conquest,' Napoleon, on the 31st of March, declared the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies a part of the Empire, and his brother, Joseph, King and grand Elector. The Papal court was notified of this event; and, on the 26th of April, Consalvi called the French Minister's attention to the fact that over the Kings of Naples the Papacy held and exercised rights as over a vassal. Enraged at this independent and prudent act of the Pope, Bonaparte, through Talleyrand, presented a note to Cardinal Caprara, ambassador of the Holy See at Paris, more contradictory and more threatening than any of the previous communications. In this note he reiterates his equality with Charlemagne, and demands the recognition of the new King of Naples, unless the Pope desires that he should be treated merely as a spiritual head.³ Without further correspondence with the Holy See, he took possession of a considerable part of the Papal territory. To each new act of violence and of robbery, Pius VII. opposed a protest. Prussia went down before the Emperor's victorious arms at Jena, and Russia at Eylau and Friedland. By the peace of Tilsit (July 9, 1807), his great Empire of the West gained the recognition of the Czar Alexander, who was content with

¹ Ranke, *History of Popes*, vol. ii., pp. 463-464.

² P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 76.

³ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 77.

being Emperor of the East, and Bonaparte felt that he dare now attack openly the aged ecclesiastic in the Vatican. Thirteen days after Tilsit, he demanded that the cardinals should be selected according to his will; and, on the same day, he wrote to Prince Eugene, his viceroy in Italy, a letter that would have shamed Garibaldi, filled with abuse of the Pope and of the Papacy, and repeating his former threats. In this letter it is that he used a sentence oft quoted since: "What does Pius VII. wish in denouncing me to Christendom? To interdict my thrones, to excommunicate me? Does he think that the arms will fall from the hands of my soldiers?" To God, the Judge, Bonaparte had previously appealed. In his case, the judgment of God was made visible.

Within three months Urbino, Macerata, Fermo, Spoleto were occupied by French troops. From the Pope protest followed protest. At the beginning of the year 1808, Bonaparte seized the rest of the Papal States, excepting only Rome. On the 2d of February the tri-color floated over the Castle of Sant Angelo. General Miollis was the hero who captured the Holy City without bloodshed. The *régime*, it is presumed, was that of the days before Charlemagne. "The batallions should '*traverser*' the Vatican. There should be a parade on the *grande place* without troubling yourself about the Pope. The French troops should mount guard at the gates of the Pope's palace, as Italian troops; and the troops of the Pope should be gathered in Ancona." Such were the instructions of the Emperor to the military representative of the "temporal power."¹ Pius VII. did not flinch. The written protest, that ever-accusing witness against usurpers, and that safeguard of lawful rights, was promptly issued. Meantime the invaders heaped indignities on the Pope. The commander of the Papal forces was imprisoned, the Pontifical Guard was dismissed, and twenty-two cardinals were expelled from the city. On April 2, 1808, the States of the Church were *irrevocably* united to the Kingdom of Italy, by an imperial decree, because 'the Pope had constantly refused to make war on the English'; because 'it was necessary that the communications between the armies of Italy and of Naples should not be interrupted by an enemy,' and because 'the donation of Charlemagne, Bonaparte's illustrious predecessor, was made to benefit Christendom and not to advantage the enemies of Religion.'² Popular education must have been very backward in Europe in 1808; otherwise this decree would never have been edited. And yet it is as intelligent and as logical a document on which to base a title to the possession of the States of the

¹ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 83.

² P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 83.

Church as any decree or proclamation issued, or any law adopted, under the Piedmontese King, that, following in the footsteps of the new Charlemagne who made a French military department of Victor Emmanuel's quondam Kingdom, temporarily lords it in Rome to-day.

A despot—such the little corporal had made himself, and such he claimed to be. "*Le peuple, c'est moi*" were his words, travesty-ing those of the *Grand Monarque*; "and the people can have no interest distinct from mine. To contradict me is to attack in me the whole public interest."¹ The twenty-two year old Jerome ruled Westphalia. Louis, twenty-eight, was King of Holland. Italy poured millions into the imperial treasury. Europe was blockaded, in order that England might be ruined. Murat was in Madrid, Joseph, the conspirator, now King of Spain. At Erfurt (September, 1808) the Czar, 'four kings, twenty-seven princes, two grand-dukes, seven dukes, and an infinity of counts, barons, marshals' took Bonaparte's orders subserviently. Austria rose in arms once more, was once more humiliated at Eckmühl, and yielded up even Vienna. The conqueror could now complete the ruin of the Papacy. From Schönbrunn, on May 17, 1809, fifteen days after the capture of Vienna, he dated the famous decree by which he assumed to abolish the Temporal Power. "Considering that when Charlemagne, emperor of the French and our august predecessor, donated several counties to the bishops of Rome, he gave them only as fiefs and for the advantage of his States, and that by this donation Rome did not cease to be a part of his Empire . . . we decree: That the States of the Pope are reunited to the French Empire, and that the city of Rome, so celebrated on account of the great memorials with which it is filled, and the first See of Christendom, is declared an imperial and free city."² Bonaparte had most fully vindicated his claim to the honored title of 'son of the revolution;' but he meant to deserve from posterity the title that his contemporaries dared not refuse him. The new Charlemagne—Brutus Charlemagne, would surpass the Assembly and the Directory in the attempt to 'destroy the centre of Christendom,' and to 'put an end to the reign of the Popes.'

When Miollis entered Rome, from each church door there came a voice of condemnation. "Not to fail in the essential obligation of guarding the rights of his sovereignty, the Pope formally protests in his own name and in that of his successors, against any usurpation of his domain, it being his will that the rights of the Holy

¹ Cantu, *Hist. Universelle*, tome xviii., p. 231.

² The document in P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, pp. 85, 86.

See be, and remain, perfectly untouched." Thus Pius, in the face of force, conserved the rights of the Church. And now, when the usurpation was completed, the dumb doors spoke once more, excommunicating 'all those who, in Rome or in the territories of the Church, have been guilty of sacrilegious attempts upon the temporal rights of the Holy See.' Long before Napoleon's day, and many a time since, the terrible force of a Papal excommunication has been recognized. The mightiest human power cannot hope, with common shot and shell, to bear up against that superhuman weapon of consuming flame.

The scenes in the tragedy Bonaparte had studiously prepared. From his correspondence we can ourselves anticipate what is to follow. On the 17th of June he wrote to Murat, who had been imposed on the two Sicilies in the place of Joseph, promoted to the crown of Spain: 'From my decrees you will see that I have done much good to the Pope; but it is on condition that he keep quiet. If he wishes to form a union of caballers, like Cardinal Pacca, it will not be suffered, and you must act at Rome as I would act with the Archbishop of Paris.' Two days later, Miollis heard from the Emperor: "To you I have confided the duty of maintaining tranquility in my Roman States. You should suffer no obstacle. Bring before a military commission every one that commits an act against the security of the army; arrest, even in the Pope's house, all those who plot against public tranquility and the security of my soldiers. A priest abuses his office, and merits less indulgence than another, when he preaches war and disobedience to the temporal power (*puissance*), and when he sacrifices the spiritual to the interests of this world, which the Gospel says are not his."¹ We have read this letter often. German emperors have written it; French kings, too; and mountebanks of every nationality. The late Mr. Crispi elaborated it into a code. Truth is one. Measured by the measure of originality, error is not one per cent. of one. Is it any wonder that it should not prevail?

On the same day the Emperor gave Murat another delicate hint: 'I have advised that affairs at Rome must move rapidly.' "No asylum should be respected if they do not submit to my decree, and no resistance should be borne with under any pretext. If the Pope, contrary to the spirit of his calling and of the Gospel, preaches revolt, and if he would use the immunity of his house to print circulars, he should be arrested. The time for these scenes has passed. Philippe le Bel arrested Boniface, and Charles V. kept Clement VII. in prison for a long time; and they did much less. A priest who preaches discord and war to the temporal

¹ P. Van Duerm, *loc cit.*, p. 89.

powers, instead of peace, abuses his office.¹ Some well-meaning historians² have kindly relieved Napoleon of any responsibility for the shameful, dishonorable, unmanly outrages to which Pius VII. was subjected. And yet it is he who convicts himself of the great crime. Philippe le Bel was a crowned ruffian. Napoleon knew where to look for a model.

Murat obeyed orders. On the night of the 6th of July, 1809, the Pope and Cardinal Pacca were forcibly removed from the Quirinal, placed in a close carriage, and driven out of the Holy City. To Florence, Turin, Grenoble, Savona, they carried Pius. At Grenoble the Pope was separated from the Cardinal, whom they confined in the fortress of Fenestrelle. "Courage, my children, and pray!" were the words ever on the lips of the Pontiff as the people gathered about him. The Pope was prepared for the worst. Every Pope is. Cardinal Pacca exposes the secret of the calmness with which the Popes of this century have borne their tribulations. "Providence permits this in order to confirm more and more the Divine lesson given to the Popes and to the ministers of the Church, often repeated in the Holy Scriptures, not to put their confidence in the princes of this world." Having no faith in princes, and well advised as to the purposes of Napoleon, Pius girded his loins. "My predecessor," he said, "in his prosperous days was as impetuous as a lion, and he died like a lamb. I have lived like a lamb, but I shall know how to defend myself and to die like a lion." The Pope was strong in his sense of right and in his confidence in Christ. To the despot who was persecuting him he wrote words of warning—prophetic words, that passed unheeded: "Remember that God is over kings, that he excepts no person, and spares no grandeur. Soon he will show himself with a terrible aspect, and the powerful shall be judged with rigor."

At Savona, Pius was a prisoner until June, 1812. There he was surrounded by intriguers, clerical and lay, cardinals as well as bishops; for the Emperor was a master of every wile, and, as a last resource, was ever ready to threaten. The French Senate had, February 17, 1810, declared the States of the Church a part of the Empire; the city of Rome the second city of the Empire; the Prince Imperial the King of Rome. A foreign sovereignty was incompatible with the exercise of spiritual authority, the Senate announced. However, the Pope should have a revenue of two millions. This Napoleonic decree, uttered through the lips of a slavish Senate, undoubtedly served as a model for the more

¹ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 89.

² See Cardinal Wiseman's *Last Four Popes*, p. 76.

recent "Law of Guarantees," with which the Piedmontese government sought to bolster up its attempt to 'destroy the centre of Catholicity.' The Emperor was persistent in his efforts to obtain from the Pope a recognition of this decree. The Austrians, who, as we have seen, had but little respect for the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, endeavored to influence Pius to accept the Imperial demands. He was inflexible. "When opinions are founded on the voice of conscience and the sentiment of duty, they become irrevocable. And, believe me, there is no physical force in the world that can long contend against a moral force of this nature. What we have said concerning the sad events that have affected our Apostolic See has been dictated by such sentiments, and, consequently, can suffer no variation, however frequently we may express our views."¹ Thus Pius answered the Austrian diplomat, Lebzelteru. Napoleon knew the power of this moral force. He was fully conscious of the superiority of the Papal office and authority. "Alexander," said he, to M. de Fontanes, "could call himself the son of Jupiter without contradiction from any one. I find a priest more powerful than I, because he reigns over minds and I only over matter." He wished to be a Sultan—and he took the means.²

An ordinary prisoner, on an allowance of three francs a day, separated from his advisers, spied, persecuted, Pius VII. was as courageous at Savona as at Rome. He refused canonical institution to the bishops appointed by the Emperor; he refused to acknowledge the marriage to Maria Louisa; he re-excommunicated his crowned jailor. The Emperor imprisoned priests, bishops, cardinals; others he swayed. He was determined to control 'the canons, the morals, the discipline, the sacraments, and the dogma of the Catholic Church.' He found docile instruments among the cardinals and the bishops. Even the Pope's confessor was his willing servant. Urged by their selfish and wicked master, these men made the Pontiff's life a life of torture. His age, his feebleness, the perplexity of a half-distracted mind, they used to make a victim of him and of the Church. They had a so-called Council—the Council of Paris—to aid them. 'The worthy old man was at length prevailed on, though not without bitter grief and after violent conflicts with himself, to renounce the right of institution,'³ and to accept an imperial decree, skilfully worded,

¹ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 93.

² In 1884-85, and again in 1887, Vte. De Mayol de Lupé, published in *Le Correspondant*, under the title: *Un Pape Prisonnier*, a series of historical studies on the Roman seizure and the imprisonment at Savona. Based as they are on original documents, these articles will serve the reader who desires an acquaintance with all the facts connected with a monstrous conspiracy.

³ Ranke, *loc. cit.*, p. 465.

which implied, on the Pope's part, a renunciation of the temporal Sovereignty that he had so long and so valiantly defended. (September 20, 1811.)¹ To read of cardinals, archbishops and bishops scheming to induce a Pope to sacrifice the Patrimony of the Church, is to re-learn the lesson of human weakness. Cardinal Pacca relieves his 'colleagues' of 'evil intention,' but he does say that their action imprinted on their reputation '*une véritable tache.*'

Providence had not forsaken Pius. Quickly he saw the far-reaching effect of his concessions; quickly he assumed anew his former position of defence. "The resistance of the Pope made Napoleon furious. He used every form of intimidation, but his august captive remained unshaken."² On the very eve of the Russian campaign Pius was removed to Fontainebleau. There he could not hope for rescue; there he could be even more persistently harassed. Again the cardinals appeared on the scene; again they laid siege to his impressionable heart, picturing to him, in moving words, the sufferings of his flock. Meantime, God showed himself with a terrible aspect and judged the mighty one. Beaten as few soldiers ever have been beaten, Napoleon returned from the Russian expedition (December 18, 1812). In defeat, as in victory, his malice could be fully gratified only by mean persecution of the Vicar of Christ. As yet the Emperor's plans had not been wholly successful. Unmoved stood the Rock. Pius refused to cede the coveted Temporal Power. To attain his end, Napoleon adopted a conscienceless means, one that his guile had taught him the value of,—the physical shock,—a means by which sensitive men have been often wronged. Suddenly he presented himself to his worn, excited captive; smirked, embraced, stormed—and won. The Pope signed the Concordat of Fontainebleau (January 25, 1813). There were cardinals present, time-serving, timid, aiding the astute tyrant. The Emperor disappeared; the bells rang out; the loud *Te Deum* filled vault of cathedral and of humble village church, and throughout the Empire the Concordat was made public.

Conceived in fraud, executed under false representations, fraudulently published, the Concordat of Fontainebleau was null and void. The articles to which Pius had affixed his name were, by the agreement, to be kept secret, and to serve only as 'the basis of a definitive arrangement, to be elaborated when the Pope could consult the cardinals.'³ Cheated by the treacherous Emperor,—

¹ Comte d'Haussonville, in *L'Eglise Romaine et le Premier Empire*, has given the details of the moral, or rather immoral, pressure to which Pius was subjected during this period. See also P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, pp. 94–98.

² P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 99.

³ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, pp. 103–104.

as shortsighted as treacherous,—Pius was at first overcome by grief. The wrong done himself he could have borne. The wrong done the Church he would not bear. Now the lamb was indeed turned into a lion. Publicly the Pope retracted the preliminary agreement of Fontainebleau, and boldly did he affirm his sacred rights as Supreme Head of the Church, and as temporal Sovereign of the Ecclesiastical States (March 24, 1813). The ‘impostor’ threatened him with death, but henceforward Pius was neither to know nor to show fear. On the ninth of May he condemned the various decrees by which Napoleon had undermined the spiritual and temporal authority of the Holy See, and annulled all acts committed under the deceitful forms of imperial law. Then came Murat’s treachery, Moreau’s revenge, the coalition, and the Congress of Prague, that offered terms to him who was accustomed to dictate. From Europe Pius demanded ‘the restitution of that State of which he had been deprived for refusing to enter into a league purely offensive, and because he had sought to conserve that condition of neutrality which his quality of common Father of the faithful, and the interest of the Religion professed in the States of so many Sovereigns, exacted of him.’ “Far from renouncing Our Temporal Sovereignty, we have, on the contrary, at all times and in all places, loudly proclaimed Our rights, all the more legitimate that they are founded on a possession of more than ten centuries, the longest perhaps that can be cited.”¹ The prisoner was still a Pope in the full sense of the word. And Napoleon? Whipped,—at Kulm, Katzbach, Gross-Beeren, Dennewitz, Leipzig. Then the despot knelt, offering to recognize the Temporal Sovereignty, and to replace the Pope at Rome, *provided he would recognize the Concordat of Fontainebleau*. The offer was rejected. At length, on January 18, 1814, he wrote to Pius, proposing a treaty without any exactions. Articles I. and II. of this treaty read as follows: “His Majesty, the Emperor and King, recognizes His Holiness Pope Pius VII. as temporal Sovereign of Rome and of the countries forming, up to this, the Roman States, and actually annexed to the French Empire. In consequence, His Majesty, Emperor and King, will remit, as quickly as possible, into the hands of Pope Pius VII., or of his agents, these countries and their fortresses.”² The Pope’s heart had grown more lion-like. He answered “that he could lend himself to no negotiation because the restitution of his States, being an act of justice, could not become the object of a treaty, and that, besides, whatever he might do outside of his States, would seem to be the effect of

¹ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 110.

² P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, p. 113.

violence, and would be an occasion of scandal to the Catholic world."

Lord Lyons once said that, "it was very difficult to deal diplomatically with the Holy Spirit." The truth of this saying is greater even than its wit. Four days after the Emperor's proposal of a treaty, the Pope was informed that he was free to enter Italy. He doubted the imperial honesty; he feared a new imprisonment and new attacks. The Cardinals he warned to avoid all negotiations about temporal or spiritual affairs, and the doing of any act that would have 'the appearance of recognizing, even tacitly, the pretended sovereignty of the Emperor and of his successors over the domains of the Church.' Pius was only nominally free. Up to the 10th of March a French convoy shifted him back and forth on the confines of Italy. Hopelessly, Napoleon was hoping that he might escape destruction. Had he won a battle or a diplomatic advantage, there is no telling what might have been the Pope's fate. But he won no battles. His kingdoms had tumbled down. Jerome and Joseph were fugitives. Murat turned traitor, held Rome and Ancona, and was denouncing his former master as the representative of 'persecution, artifice, violence, tyranny and consternation.' With an army of 360,000 men, Napoleon was as if he were alone. At Chatillon sur Seine the allies were designing a new map. Well might the ruined Emperor set the Pope free. And this he did, on March 10, 1814.

By the end of the month Pius had crossed the border. As he marched joyously, amid the acclamations of his subjects, the allies entered Paris (April 2d), and in that palace of Fontainebleau which had been the Pope's prison, Charlemagne Bonaparte abdicated his temporal and spiritual sovereignty (April 11th). "On his way to the port from which he was to embark for Elba, he was compelled to disguise himself in order to escape the fury of the people."¹ The prisoner whom he had so terribly abused, did he enter Rome in disguise? No! But in solemn procession, amid the most remarkable expressions of affection.² "The world then commenced a new age, and a new era opened for the Roman See."³ (May 24, 1814.)

Pius VII. did not wait until he reached Rome to exercise his sovereignty. On May 20th he protested once more against the treaty of Tolentino; and, in the person of Consalvi, he sent an envoy to Louis XVIII., the new ruler of France. As Murat still occupied a portion of the Papal territory and greedy Austria

¹ Cantu, *Hist. Univ.*, vol. xviii., p. 303.

² Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xi., p. 253.

³ Ranke, *loc. cit.*, p. 467. By the way, the King of Elba's allowance was just two millions.

maintained possession of the Legations, the Pope, through Consalvi, addressed a note to the Powers, demanding that he should be placed in control of every foot of territory that of right belonged to him, including Avignon and the Venaissin. At the Congress of Vienna (Nov., 1814), Consalvi presented the case of the Papacy. Before a decision had been formulated, Napoleon re-entered France. Once more Murat joined hands with him. When he violated the Papal territory, Pius protested and withdrew to Florence. Waterloo made an end of Bonaparte. Murat was shot on the rock of Pizzo. (Oct. 13, 1815.) Thus, two of the greater conspirators against the rightful authority of the Holy See testified to the power, the goodness of God and to the ever-watchful and active Providence that guards 'the centre of Catholicity' and the Temporal Power of the Popes.

The Congress of Vienna repudiated the treaty of Tolentino and restored the Legations to the Holy See. (June 9, 1815.) Austria maintained a garrison at Ferrara and at Commachio for her own 'protection.' Parma and Piacenza, which the Popes rightfully claimed, were not returned, nor were Avignon and the Venaissin. In good fortune, as in ill, the Papacy is consistent. Consalvi protested against the 'iniquitous alienation, of the Apostolic domain; and Pius, in a public allocution, reiterated the Papal rights to Avignon, the Venaissin and Ferrara.¹ (Sept. 4, 1815.)

Before the last Pope dies the map of Europe will have changed more than once. The Papal claims will, however, stand unchanged until they have been satisfied, conscientiously, justly. Founded in right, the Church must support them in the interest of order, law, equity. Not only every state, but each individual, owes her an incalculable debt for the patience, courage, tenacity, with which she has defended right as against might.

Returning to Rome, Pius VII. had to do what Pope after Pope had done before him—reorganize the government, repair churches, bridges, roads; re-adorn the city; re-endow charities; encourage devotion; revive art and literature; repress the immoral and the disorderly. The task was heavy, but in the *Curia* they have the traditions of good government and a strong sense of their mission as renovators. The burden of administration did not prevent the Pope from giving due attention to the question of the Temporal Power. From Kings the Popes have learned that they need expect no more justice than from despots, Sultans, Directories, Assemblies or the mob. In this new Europe, Pius was determined to conserve the rights that the Papacy had maintained through all the revolutions that slowly or suddenly had formed

¹ P. Van Duerm, *loc. cit.*, 128.

and reformed the world. No Pope can do otherwise. If there be a Church, and a Head of that Church, there must be a centre of Christendom. To recognize this logical conclusion, one need not be either a Constantine or a Charlemagne, a Voltaire, a Lépaux or a Napoleon. Peter's seat, Peter's tomb, has been, is, will be, that centre; and wheresoever the last Pope rules, guides, encourages, instructs the Christian world, whether he be a Boniface, Pius, Sixtus, Julius or Leo, in life, to death, he will, for the sake of the religion of Jesus Christ, protect, defend, protest, denounce, that the spiritual may be preserved, extended, by means of a Temporal independence, assured by sovereignty. The successors of the "King of the Jews" will be rulers forever and by the divinest of rights.

In order that the Bourbons might learn the mind of the Papacy—and the Bourbons were undoubtedly slow—Pius delicately conveyed to Louis XVIII. that the Popes had rights in Avignon and the Venaissin, and that the reigning Pope desired their recognition, by cession or by compensation. This was done in 1816. Nor did the Pope allow the Bourbons at Naples to forget their dutiful obligations to the Holy See. In France he received polite words without other pay. At Naples they answered him with an answer that was first given before a Bourbon had reigned there—an attempt to seize a portion of the Papal territory. Ferdinand IV. was a Bourbon Murat. A King who is not a thief, especially in his dealings with a Pope—deserves canonization; not for keeping one commandment, but because the keeping of this one by kings, is, seemingly, a grace granted only to those who have learned to respect all the ten commandments. However, the Pope, gaining nothing, lost nothing by the action of France or of Naples. Austria would have gladly 'protected' the Pope more efficiently than the Papacy desired; but Austria had enough to do in the territory guaranteed her by the Congress. Indeed, Europe, and more especially Italy, was in a condition of unrest. The allies, to serve the purpose of overturning Napoleon, had everywhere fostered a spirit of revolt. And this spirit they had kept alive, excited, inflamed, by a generous use of the idea of "liberty" and of "nationality." Imagine England, in 1812, propagating a spirit of liberty! It was England—Castlereagh, whose not ill-natured epitaph the liberal Byron wrote—that, more than any other power, tried to upset the 'imperial' throne by a most dangerous appeal to the aspirations of the intelligent and to the passions of the untrained crowd. The attempt to undo the revolution by revolutionary means, is felt over the whole world to this day. To credit France with the full sum of the evil, is to do injus-

tice to the 'mother country.' The Kings and the Emperors deserve their share of the blame—and their share is not small.

Napoleon had won his way in Italy by appealing to the spirit of nationality. He made slaves of the Italians. By appealing to the spirit of liberty, the English rallied the people against the conqueror. The Congress of Vienna could not create a people with the conservative ideas in vogue before Napoleon's day; nor could it moderate the passions, or correct the false notions that had been studiously developed. The country was divided 'among rulers, old, new, some merely temporary, and all with a patriarchal government.'¹ The Italians had the traditions of free government, and before Bonaparte came, enjoyed liberty through representative bodies, the growth of ages, knowing how to protect, organized to protect, the rights of the people. These institutions the French despot had subverted. When he was driven out the people found themselves under a rule they could not bear—the rule of absolutism.² During the Napoleonic sway the Carbonari had taken root. Murat was not the only prince that, for selfish purposes, encouraged the secret political societies. The name of our Lord has been made use of by many men, in and out of the Church, to counteract the beneficent work of His doctrine. Vanity, pride, malice, foolishness, have found in His loved name a resource found not elsewhere. The Carbonari, in the beginning, were vowed to 'avenge the death of Christ and to re-establish His kingdom.'³ Vengeance is the Lord's, and His alone; and yet good, ignorant men might well be misled by the formula of the Carbonari. To trace the development of this association is not our purpose. From it various secret societies took their being. The idea of Christ and of Christianity was speedily lost; and the devil himself has, in time, become the ideal of a considerable class of reckless men in Italy. When Pius VII. returned to Rome the number of secret associations, revolutionary in aim and immoral in their teaching, was already notable. Each year the number grew. In Austria, Naples, Piedmont, they were active—the Socialists of that day. Though the Papal rule was mild, conciliatory, liberal and enterprising, it escaped the attacks of the Carbonari no more than the harsh, illiberal governments that misruled the greater part of Italy and the whole of the rest of the world. From the Neapolitan sectaries the Papal States had most to fear; but the Pope was able to maintain his independent sovereignty until his death, on August 20, 1823.

¹ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xi., p. 285.

² Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xi., p. 286.

³ Cantu, *Hist. des Italiens*, vol. xi., p. 285.

Truly is it a noble prerogative of Rome, Cardinal Wiseman writes, "to be a place where enmities are forgotten and injuries buried in oblivion."¹ When the family of the Emperor was proscribed, where did mother, sisters, brother, seek an asylum? In Rome; in the territory of the Pope who had been so persecuted, so maltreated by the haughty Emperor. There "they were allowed to have their palaces, their estates, their titles, and their position not only unmolested, but fully recognized." Remembering all that this family did 'to destroy the centre of Catholicity,' Catholicity could boast of a noble revenge.

The study of history as a mere catalogue of dates and of facts is a vain study. As a guide in forming wise opinions and judgments in the present and for the future; as a stay and support of the eternal principles of right and justice; as a teacher of the practical value of longanimity, of the uncertainty of the most-carefully devised schemes of contriving, crooked men, and of the hidden, certain, inevitable action of Him who scattereth the proud in the imagination of their heart, putteth down the mighty from their seat, and exalteth them of low degree, the study of history is invaluable.

From the history of these thirty-three years of the Papacy what lesson may we learn? what opinions and judgments should we form in the present and for the future, wisely? The lessons are many; lessons to be learned from a review of the history of the Papacy year after year, century after century. The Church and the world are not one. The world is the enemy of the Church—has been, will be. Of the world, the Church is the one true, unselfish friend. Of all things that men rightly value,—peace, justice, liberty, truth, happiness,—she alone has the secret-guardian, leader, defender, teacher. The empire she would found is not that of a Charlemagne, but that of the Christ. Call to mind the rulers of Europe during the third of a century that we have glanced at; compare one, all, with Pius VI. and Pius VII. The comparison will not be a more telling argument in our favor than a comparison made between the princes and the Popes at any other period, but it will make the beneficent action of the Papacy on mankind as visible, as dazzling, as the noon-day sun. On every page of history read with honest, open eyes, we read, clearly written, with pens dipped in heart's blood, in salt tears, the lesson that Christ came to teach: "without Christianity, no general liberty; and without the Pope, no true Christianity—in other words, no operating, powerful, converting, regenerating, conquering, improving Christianity."²

¹ *The Last Four Popes*, Boston, 1858, p. 186.

² De Maistre: *The Pope*, London, 1850, p. 243.

From the record of these thirty-three years we are forced to draw still another lesson, one that should guide us in forming a *wise* judgment in the present and on the future. Rome has been, will be a battle-ground. Seat of the Papacy, of that wondrous power, directly instituted by the Saviour, a power that, as Napoleon recognized at the height of his glory, rules the spirit and not matter alone, Rome will be coveted as long as the world is not truly Christian. To possess it without right, is to be dishonored. Kings will dishonor themselves. To seize it is to invite the ruin that is not to be avoided. Kings will be ruined; peoples too. But the Popes—prisoners in Rome or out of Rome, threatened with death, wheedled, forced, from within or without—will never cede their rights as Sovereigns. The independence of the Papacy means the sovereignty of the Papacy. Canonists, compromisers with the controlling ideas of an immediate present, ambitious clerics, time-serving diplomatists, maddened mobs, victorious Emperors, shall argue, distinguish, negotiate, betray, fawn, kill, but the Papal *Non possumus* will baffle one and all. 'The voice of conscience and the sentiment of duty' compel the Popes, will ever compel them, to defend their sovereignty. 'Against a moral force of this nature no physical force in the world can long contend.' Pius VI., Pius VII. fought for no dynasty. They fought for religion, for the centre of Christianity, for the salvation of mankind. They could not do otherwise. No Pope until the end of time can do otherwise. Humanly speaking, the end of the Papacy, as a temporal power, will, from time to time, seem to be assured. Students of history will know that the end is not yet. And the Popes! They refresh their confidence daily, calling to mind the words of the Psalmist: The Lord will not suffer the rod of the wicked to rest upon the lot of the righteous.
