

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—APRIL, 1886.—No. 42.

THE ROMAN QUESTION.

MORE than once, since a recent visit to Italy, we have been asked our opinion of the condition of things in that country, and if what we had seen then had given us any hope of an early restoration of the temporal power of the Pope. The questions and the answers we had to give suggested the subject of the present article. In what we have to say we shall draw far less on personal observation than on our reading, and on conversations had with persons better acquainted with Italy than we can pretend to be.

Like all persons who had known Rome before 1870, and who have visited it since that time, we found it much improved, materially. The streets were cleaner than they used to be. New hotels, blocks, and even streets of private residences, in the style of the new Paris boulevards, and large public buildings, had arisen in all directions. Nowhere in Europe had we seen as many soldiers, and especially officers, out of quarters. The streets were filled with them. But though to our unprofessional eye their uniforms were all that could be desired, the men contrasted sadly with the soldierly police, dragoons, and Noble Guard of former days. There was a something about them that recalled an anecdote we had heard of the grandfather of the late King of Naples. He had been present at a review of his troops, at which they appeared for the first time in a new uniform. At the close of the manœuvres he

was asked by the general in command what he thought of the men. "You may dress them as you please," replied his majesty; "they will run away."

Many property owners in Rome had, we were told, become pretty well reconciled to the new order of things. The reason of this was that since it had become the capital, real estate had increased threefold in value. The government had brought with it fifty thousand officials and about as many workmen, and these needed house accommodations, and put money in circulation. This was a serious temptation, even to a people as loyal as the Romans had ever been to the Popes, and it is not to be wondered at that some of them should have yielded to it, to the extent of trying to carry water on both shoulders.

The people, in outward bearing at least, seemed as decorous and grave as ever. The churches were as well attended, the smaller ones as crowded with devout worshippers as of old time. Two things only seemed to point to the growth of modern ideas in the Eternal City, the profanation of the Sunday in many places, and an evident falling off in the moral training of the young. Roman boys, even those of tender years, once so modest, can now smoke cigars and swear in the streets with as much ease and self-composure as those of any other city in Europe or America. This was all of evil that was seen on the streets. We were told, however, that in the theatres, and in too many other places, things were done the like of which had not been known in Rome since pagan times. But as nothing of the sort came under our personal observation, we prefer to pass such matters over in silence.

Business was very dull in Rome last May. It always is at that season. But store-keepers told us that even during the previous winter they had done little or nothing. Hotel-keepers had the same complaint to make. Both agreed that as many visitors had come as in previous years, but that they had remained only a short time and spent little. Everybody complained of the taxes, which amounted to over forty per cent. of every man's income or profits. An American physician, who had settled in Rome some years ago, told us he had attempted to practise his profession there last year, but finding that the tax on the profession exceeded any receipts he could reasonably hope for from it, he closed his office.

And, in point of fact, the whole country is overwhelmed by taxation. "There is nothing left us to tax but the air we breathe," said Senator Iacini, Chairman of the Committee of Agricultural Affairs in 1880. "Rural Italy," said this same gentleman last May, "has to bear an accumulation of taxes greater than that of any other nation in the world. We have in this touched the limits of the absurd." One-fourth of the income from land goes in direct

taxes; one-half the remainder goes to those who till it on shares, or a third to those who till it at the expense of the owner. The rest is all, or nearly all, spent in paying personal or other taxes, of which there are some forty-six in Italy. So that Italians nowadays may be said to till the soil for the national, provincial and municipal treasuries. The *Unita Cattolica* of the 27th of last January informs us that the public debt of all the Italian States, before 1860, was about seven hundred and twenty-two millions of francs, and that it is now, under United Italy, eighteen milliards, eight hundred and eighty-two millions! On this is paid a yearly interest of about five hundred millions. The result of all this has been that tens of thousands of holdings have been sold every year for taxes. The *Gazzetta Ufficiali* of April 28th, 1885, puts the number for each year at thirty-four thousand. The occupants of those holdings have been compelled to emigrate, or go to swell the ever-increasing numbers of the dangerous classes. The confiscated church property, valued at two milliards of francs, has nearly all disappeared. One-half of it had been sold as early as 1870. On the fourth of July of that year, Deputy Bartolucci asked the Parliament if the money thus acquired had made them any richer, and if in that instance, too, the old proverb had not been verified, that "the devil's flour turns all to waste"? and added, on the authority of the Minister of Finance, that there remained of it then "only a black spot."

The prison reports of the Italian kingdom show that of late years it has attained a sad primacy in crime among civilized nations. Want and misery are everywhere on the increase; and even in Rome itself, the place most favored by the patronage and prestige of the government, the poor sometimes faint and die in the streets for hunger. Such a thing had never been heard of under the Popes.

There was no city in the world where the poor were as well cared for as in Rome before the advent of its present rulers. From time immemorial every Pope had his almoner residing near him in his palace, whose duty it was to help the needy poor. "There was not in Rome," says Morichini, "a religious association or institution that did not dispense relief, not a convent, or a monastery, that did not give some kind of food, not a noble or wealthy house that had not its fixed assignment for the poor." "It certainly does appear to be a matter next to an impossibility," says John Francis Maguire, in his book on "Rome, its Ruler and its Institutions," "that one should die of starvation in Rome; for not only are the most ample resources applicable to every human want, and to which the poor may have immediate access, to be found there, but there exist all kinds of charitable associations, directed to the

sacred duty of feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, visiting the sick, and comforting the afflicted. Then there are many well-known public institutions always open to the poor person in distress, and from whose doors want and destitution are never driven by surly porters, representing rather the selfishness of the rate-payer than the charity of the Christian."

Nor was this lavish charity allowed to encourage mere vagrancy, for, as Mr. Maguire remarks, "the most rigorous measures have been adopted by successive Popes, from the time of Pius V., in the sixteenth century, to Pius IX., in the nineteenth, to suppress vagrancy and punish imposture." There were also in Rome various societies, whose object it was to seek out the poor who were ashamed to beg, and give them needed assistance, such as the Arch-Confraternity of the Twelve Apostles, the Urbana Congregation, and the Congregation of Divine Mercy. "The first mentioned," says Mr. Maguire, "employs a number of physicians who visit the sick whom the members have found to stand in need of such succour. They also provide professional assistance for the defence of the poor, and they specially protect orphans and widows, and procure a safe shelter for girls in danger. They likewise arrange disputes and reconcile enemies. The Brothers, who are called 'Deputies,' are all of noble or wealthy families." There was also in Rome a society to give employment to the poor, and especially to the aged poor, on the public works, and one of lawyers and persons attached to the *Curia*, called the Society of St. Ivo, to defend them gratis in the courts.

There were asylums for all the orphans of both sexes in the city, where they were educated and taught trades, and from some of which the girls, after they had left and were about to marry, received a modest dower to enable them to go to housekeeping. There were in Rome no less than fourteen establishments of this description. In one of them, St. Michael's, there were, besides a number of old men and old women, about five hundred boys and girls. The boys were taught all trades, and when they displayed particular talent they were instructed by the best masters in music, painting, sculpture, architecture, and all other branches of the liberal arts. The first time we heard Italian opera was at this institution, and those present declared they had never heard it given with better effect than by the fresh young voices they then listened to. The leading tenor on the occasion soon afterwards acquired a European reputation.

Then in Rome, under the Popes, hospitals were so numerous and so well appointed that their accommodation could never be overtaxed. They had special wards, and even special buildings, set apart for different diseases, from the ordinary indisposition to

the malady that is incurable. And there were even institutions to receive convalescents who had left the hospitals, and keep them till their strength was sufficiently restored to enable them to resume their ordinary avocations.

Such was the charity of Rome under the Popes—a charity that taught men to see in the poor and the sick our Lord himself, and to think that what was done to them was done unto Him.

The Piedmontese seized all the institutions founded by this charity in the lapse of ages, and put them under almost exclusively secular management. The result has been that disorder, and more serious abuses than mere disorder, have crept into most of them; their revenues have been wasted by incompetent and dishonest officials, and the poor and the sick and the orphan have been left to suffer. One lamentable instance of this was brought to light last summer. The richest and the largest hospital in Rome was that of *Santo Spirito*. It was founded by Ina, king of the Saxons, about the year 728. It is located in the Leonine city, or *Borgo*, not far from the Vatican palace. The Popes, and especially Pius IX., expended vast sums in enlarging and adorning it, and providing it with all the best appliances which science had introduced for institutions of the kind. In 1870 it had 1680 beds, though the average number of patients was only from six to seven hundred. Its annual revenue was 1,138,678 francs. Of this, 759,539 francs went for the support of the sick and the foundlings of an asylum that was attached to it. Last June Augustus Silvestrelli was appointed director of this institution; but, before definitely accepting the position, he prudently resolved to look into its financial condition. He did so, and in his report to the Hospital Commission of Rome, on the 20th of June, he informed that body that the annual revenue has been reduced from 1,138,678 to 64,018 francs. "This amount," he says, "is not sufficient to maintain even the conservatory, and nothing is left for the foundlings, or for the support of a single patient in the hospital!" "This immense deficit," he adds, "was at first concealed by the seeming regularity of the accounts, but was finally discovered; and now the true condition of things should be made known to everybody." And thus fifteen years of revolutionary rule sufficed to destroy what it took the Popes centuries to accumulate for the unfortunate in their capital. Some, even, of the radical journals, commenting on this fact, intimated that the same condition of things would be found to exist in only too many of the charitable institutions of the kingdom.

But, even apart from "irregularities" of this sort, the constant drain on charitable institutions, in the form of taxes and expenses of administration, is frightful. In 1878 the assets of these institu-

tions, in all Italy, amounted to 1,626,662,962 francs, with a net annual income of 90,859,521 francs. Of this income, the government took 14,484,332 francs in taxes; 15,062,455 were spent on administration; 14,202,510 went to meet other expenses; so that there remained for the poor but 47,110,223 francs, or only a little more than one-half the income! In view of these facts and figures, it is not to be wondered at that Deputy Sanguinetti should have said in Parliament, March 8th, 1881, that charity in Italy was then organized theft.

The last statement we have seen of the actual condition of things, in the unhappy country, was made by Deputy Romano, in the Parliament, on the 12th December, 1885: "What," he asked, "are the effects of this iliad of sorrows? They are general distress and misery, with the exception of a few colossal old fortunes, and some new ones, that are the fruit of public wrong; a general struggle for existence, by one class of society, which detests the other, believing it to be the cause of its misfortunes, though the true cause is bad government; all the consequences of ill-advising, hunger (*male-sua da fames*), deterioration of character and immorality, the mania of place-hunting, the emigration of those who do not wish to be obliged to choose between a wretched occupation and crime; smuggling, usury, crimes and suicides, and an increasing discontent that is undermining our institutions and the tranquillity of the state."

And now, as to the temporal power of the Pope. We really do not see any human grounds of hope for its speedy restoration. The Revolution went to Rome, not so much to find a historic or a convenient capital for United Italy, as to destroy the Papacy. One of its most prominent leaders said, on the 26th of March, 1861: "Not by excessive devotion, not by theological teaching, but by the ideas proclaimed by the French Revolution, can we succeed in the so-called Roman question." "These ideas," he added, "are those of the encyclopædists, of Rousseau, of Voltaire, of the free-thinkers, and they can redeem us from the Pontiff." And the radical organ, the *Diritto*, of July 3d, 1863, scouted the illogical and hypocritical promise to respect the spiritual authority of the Pope, after having abolished his temporal power. "Our revolution," it said, August 11th, of the same year, "aims at the destruction of the Catholic Church; it must destroy it; it cannot fail to destroy it. Nationality, unity, political liberty, are means to this end, the total destruction of Catholicity, which it (the Revolution) has much at heart." Other journals, and other distinguished revolutionists, have, time and again, given expression to the same sentiments. In 1870, just before the entrance of the Piedmontese into Rome, Mazzini wrote: "The energies of the party must now be

concentrated on Rome, so as to make it impossible for the Papacy to live within its walls." It would be idle, then, to hope that a government that is the creature of the Revolution, and, just now, controlled by its radical Left, will, of its own accord, ever abandon Rome to the Pope. Its adherents have repeatedly declared that, rather than do so, they are prepared to reduce it to a heap of ruins. And this, we are persuaded, was no empty threat.

On the other hand, it is not to be expected that the people of Italy will be able to change or materially modify the present state of things in that country. "The whole electoral body," wrote Cardinal Manning, in 1877, "does not exceed half a million of men. In twenty-six millions there is not so much as a fiftieth part who possess the electoral franchise. . . . Of those five hundred thousand men, two hundred and fifty thousand, that is, one-half, never go to the polls, or record a vote. They are Catholics who, for conscience sake, have from the beginning refrained from voting. They have never voted at all, and that upon these grounds: that if they were to vote, they would recognize the law, they would accept the constitution, they would be partakers in the present state of Rome, and sanction its usurpation. Moreover, any man whom they might elect could not sit in the Chamber without taking the oath that binds him to the Revolution that now holds Italy down, and to the violation of the sovereignty of the Head of the Church. . . . Those two hundred and fifty thousand men are but half of the electoral body, and less than one-hundredth part of the Italian people."

In 1882 there were about 600,000 voters in Italy, but an extension of the franchise, made in that year, increased their number to about 2,500,000 in a population of 28,000,000. Nevertheless, in the general elections of October of the same year, only about a million of votes were cast.

Catholics are permitted, and even urged, to take part in municipal and provincial elections, but, for the reasons mentioned by Cardinal Manning, and because of the positive declaration of the Pope, that it was not *expedient* for them to vote at general elections, they kept away from the polls in October, 1882. Liberal, nominal Catholics, it is true, voted then as on previous occasions of the same kind, but *they* would not give their suffrages to men disposed to favor a restoration of the temporal power.

And, even were all Catholic voters to go to the polls, to-day, in Italy, they would be powerless to return to Parliament a majority of men favorable to such a measure. They are without political organization and training. They are strangers to the arts of the political wire-puller. Their opponents have been schooled to both, in the secret revolutionary societies, and at the point of the

dagger. They have the government and its machinery, and the military power in their hands, and would know well how to prevent the election of a Catholic majority, or, if it were returned, how to declare the election invalid, as they did in Piedmont, in 1857. It is enough to say that, at the municipal elections, in which Catholics are allowed to take part, comparatively few good Catholics are ever returned.

But may we not count on an uprising, at no distant day, of the Catholic masses against the tyrannical oligarchy that now oppresses them? Not at all. As well might you expect a flock of sheep, when driven to the shambles, to turn on their shepherd and his dog. The Italian people have many virtues, natural and supernatural, but courage is not one of them.

Many in Italy, and elsewhere, look to the Revolution itself to bring about a speedy restoration of the temporal power, on the principle that, when things come to the worst, they are likely to mend. The present government, they say, cannot last. The offspring of the Revolution, it will soon be devoured by the monster that gave it birth. The social republic will take its place, and, as this would be incompatible with even the existence of civilized society, a stable government of some sort must follow, a necessary factor of which will be the independent sovereignty of the Pope. This may all be, but, for our part, we cannot see a way to light and order out of the chaos which these persons predict.

The present condition of Italy is sad indeed. Her future is dark and threatening. A crisis in her affairs cannot be far off. But, when the present government shall have been swept away, and an atheistic or social republic shall have taken its place, will the Roman question be any nearer settlement than it is at present? Who can think so that considers the record of the present French republic, which, in satanic hatred of the Church, far surpasses its predecessor of 1793! And, when the republic shall have given place to a dictator, self-appointed, or chosen by a congress of the great powers, will the situation be any better? It is, to say the least, very doubtful. A dictator has power for good, but no less for evil; and dictators have, as a rule, thus far in the world's history, inclined to the latter. Dictators, and absolute rulers generally, have caused more harm to the Church than even anti-Christian republics have been able to do.

In enumerating the causes likely to bring about a restoration of the temporal power, many Catholic writers lay much stress on the probable intervention, to this end, of the European powers. Those writers remind us that no European government has approved the seizure of the Papal territory in 1870; and that leading statesmen, in England and on the continent, and even some of the founders

of Italian unity themselves, have, time and again, asserted that the Roman question is not simply an Italian, but an international question. This is all very true; but we fear the European governments will be only too well pleased to see matters remain as they are in Italy, for long years to come. All those governments are more or less erastian. The non-Catholic governments want no church but a state church, that will be their creature and do their bidding, and take the law from their lips. If the so-called Catholic, but really Febronian, or infidel governments, do not go thus far, it is because they dare not. Certain it is that both Protestant and Catholic governments are ready to do all in their power to hinder, where they cannot wholly destroy, the freedom of the Church. They are, and always have been, especially jealous of Papal authority. If they ever felt any devotion to St. Peter, it was to St. Peter in chains. They might not object to a Pope with a primacy of mere honor, who would leave them the appointment of bishops, pastors and professors, and the bestowal of church benefices, and who would not trouble them with doctrinal decisions, bulls, encyclicals, and the like; but they will never take kindly to one who claims to exercise real, though but spiritual, jurisdiction over any number of their subjects. They are not, then, likely to trouble Italy about putting an end to the present virtual captivity of the Roman Pontiff. So far from this, they rejoice at it. He is not as firmly bound as they would wish to see him, but they are willing to let very-well alone, for the present. Italy is now doing their work for them; and as long as she continues to do it, they will not interfere with her, at least, for sake of the Pope.

But, could the Pope be reconciled to Italy, could he, whilst continuing to exercise his primacy of jurisdiction over Catholics in all lands, become even the first and most favored subject of the Italian King, then, indeed, their non-intervention in the Roman question would soon cease, they would develop a wonderful zeal in upholding the rights of their Catholic subjects, and insist even on the restoration of the temporal power, if there were no other way open to them of putting an end to such an alliance. Short of such a reconciliation, which is impossible, they will never interfere in behalf of the Pope, unless compelled to do so by force of public opinion. When European Catholics rise superior to dynastic disputes and race prejudices, and in their several countries unite in choosing only such representatives as will care for their highest interests at home and abroad, then, and no sooner, can their governments be induced to favor the independence of the Holy See. But, though there are signs of such an awakening, just now, in France, Austria, and Spain, we fear we shall have to wait long for any important results to come of it.

But, though we cannot now see how the temporal power is to be recovered, we should not on this account despair of its restoration. When Rome is in question, we should leave a much wider margin for the direct action of Divine Providence there than in any other place. The temporal power is necessary to the well-being of the Church, and God will give it back, in His own good time and in His own way.

Every legitimate society has a right to freedom. If it have a right to exist, it has a right not to be impeded in seeking the end for which it was organized. If this be true of all societies, it must be eminently so of the Church, which was instituted for the highest and holiest of purposes—the glory of God and the salvation of souls. She has the right to labor for these ends, and, therefore, to use the means necessary to accomplish them. Other societies may change and be changed. They carry within them the seeds of dissolution. Good and beneficial at first, they may, in time, become bad or useless. In such case, the authority under which they were organized can modify or dissolve them. But the Church is immutable. The work she has to do is always, and everywhere, holy and necessary. Her Divine Founder made her a perfect and an independent society. He asked no charter for her from any civil government. For three hundred years she lived and labored and grew, in spite of all the civil governments with which she had been brought in contact. She can do so again; but who will say that fierce and bloody persecution should be her normal condition, or one in which she should acquiesce? No, those centuries of suffering she endured in her early history, were permitted to show that she was divine, that our faith is “the victory that overcometh the world,” and “the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth,” and to encourage her children, who in after times would, here and there, be made to know the bitterness of oppression. Freedom and peace are, to say the least, as necessary to the Church as to civil society, and it is her right, and her duty, to use every means in her power to secure both.

But, unless the Pope be free, the Church cannot be free. No society is free if its central government and executive are, or can be, hindered and hampered in the exercise of their functions, and deprived of the means necessary to discharge them in a proper manner. Such freedom the Pope cannot enjoy, unless he is his own master. If not his own master, his administration must always be, more or less, at the mercy of the government under which he lives. He must, then, be a sovereign. But a sovereign he cannot be without a territory of his own, or, in other words, without temporal power. And here I would remark that the Pope, as a subject, would be more likely to be restricted in his

liberty than anybody else. The reason is, that the civil power has always been most jealous of the spiritual. The Cæsars were so jealous of it that they made themselves chief pontiffs as well as emperors. The Christian Greek emperors constantly interfered in Church matters, and, as far as they could, sought to usurp ecclesiastical authority. The German emperors, and the kings of the middle and later ages, as a rule, did the same. And, at the time of the "Reformation," all the Protestant sovereigns returned, in this respect, to Cæsarism pure and simple. They founded national churches, and took the government of them into their own hands. Queen Victoria is, to-day, supreme head of the Church of England, and every Anglican bishop, before assuming possession of his see, takes the following oath: "I do verily testify and declare that your Majesty is the only supreme governor of this, your realm, in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has any jurisdiction within this realm; and I do acknowledge and confess to have and hold the bishopric of N., and the possessions of the same, entirely, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty, and of the imperial crown of this your Majesty's realm . . . so help me God," etc.

There is, then, a good deal of truth in the saying of Odilon Barrot, that "the two powers, the temporal and the spiritual, had been united in Rome that they might be kept separate in the rest of the world."

Non-Catholic sovereigns claim spiritual authority over their subjects as of direct right coming to them from God or from society. The Popes do not claim their temporal sovereignty for its own sake, but as a means to preserve the independence of their spiritual authority, and only to such an extent as is necessary to secure this object. And yet the claim of civil rulers in this matter excites little surprise and no indignation in those who scout that of the Popes as anti-Christian and subversive of popular rights!

The Pope should be free, not only in fact, but in appearance also. And this is another argument, drawn from the infirmity of human nature, in favor of the temporal sovereignty. Good and enlightened Catholics know and feel that whatever may be the political or social position of the Pope, his action in all that relates to faith and morals and the government of the Church will always be true, and just, and impartial. But all Catholics are not good and enlightened. Many, and especially Catholic rulers, would not give him credit for the foresight or the disinterestedness necessary to keep him from bias, even in such matters, were he to become the subject of a particular power. And as to non-Catholic governments having Catholic subjects, we could not of course expect them to do so. "The Pope," said Napoleon I., "is far from

Paris, and this is well; he is not at Madrid or Vienna, and hence we uphold his spiritual authority. At Madrid and Vienna people can say the same. Think you that, if the Pope were at Paris, the Viennese or Spaniards would consent to receive his decisions? It is, then, a fortunate circumstance that he is in old Rome, holding the balance between Catholic sovereigns, bending a little to the strongest, and then standing erect when the strongest becomes an oppressor. The ages have done this, and they have done it well. It is the best and the most beneficent institution for the government of souls; and saying so, I speak not as a bigot, but as a reasonable man."

This wisdom came too late to Napoleon to avert from himself the consequences of his misdeeds in this very matter.

It was, then, to secure the liberty of the Church, and as far as possible to disarm the suspicions of kings and peoples, that, in the good providence of God, the Popes gradually acquired temporal dominion. It came to them by the very best of titles, by the will of the people and the consent of the secular princes, who thought they had a right to bestow it. In the beginning of the eighth century, to go no farther back in tracing the origin of the temporal power, the people of Rome and of Ravenna, pressed on the one side by the Lombards, who sought to enslave them, and on the other abandoned by the Greek emperor, whose subjects they had been, called on the Pontiffs to assume their temporal government and save them from the fate that threatened them. In 749 Ravenna was taken by the barbarians. Rome was saved from their fury by Pepin, King of France, who confirmed the Pope in the temporal power with which the people had already invested him. His claim to it was further strengthened by twelve hundred years of possession, by countless benefactions to his people, to Italy, and to Europe, and by the recognition of all civilized nations up to the present day.

On the 20th September, 1870, the troops of Victor Emmanuel entered Rome through the breach of *Porta Pia*. Twelve days afterwards, whilst the people were still terrorized by the scenes they had passed through, and by the hordes of camp-followers and desperadoes that had followed the army into the city, a *plebiscite* was ordered by the usurping authority to decide for or against the continuance of the temporal power of the Pope. Groups of hired ruffians were posted at all the polls to intimidate unwelcome voters. None came. Only forty-six votes were given for the Pope, and forty thousand for the invaders! This was over-doing matters with a vengeance. Our own ballot-box stuffers would be ashamed of such work.

Why, in February, 1871, four months after this *plebiscite*, fifty-two Roman noblemen published an address to the Catholic asso-

ciations of the world, in which they say of their fellow-citizens that the "immense majority of them have always remained faithful, and, with the help of God, are firmly resolved never to alter their line of conduct. In testimony whereof they call on the history of the past and the facts of the present, unaltered by calumny and passion." In an allocution, delivered on the 16th of the same month, the Pope says: "I am proud of and thank the Romans for their patient endurance of the present trials, especially of such a number holding official appointments, who, for honor, loyalty, and conscience sake, prefer every privation to betrayal of their trust or felony." And, on the 24th July following, the Primary Roman Society for Catholic Interests presented the Holy Father an address expressive of their loyalty to his temporal authority, signed by 27,161 male Roman citizens of full age, the residence of the signer being appended to each name, and this at a season when thousands of the upper classes were absent from the city. Out of forty-six magistrates in the city, only five transferred their allegiance to the new government. In the Finance Department, out of 1439 employees, only 344 took office under it. In the Interior Department, out of fifty-three, only seventeen remained in office. And in the army, out of 586 officers, only fifty-eight retained their positions. The others, though offered the same rank in the Italian army as they had held in that of the Pope, would not accept it. These facts tell us what we should think of the *plebiscite* held by the Piedmontese after the seizure of Rome in 1870. On the first anniversary of that event the young men of Rome, in an address to the Holy Father, said: "Our hearts burned with indignation when we witnessed the impudence of your enemies, who dared to lie on parchment and marble, representing as a vote of the Roman people that ridiculous *plebiscite*, which was nothing but the vote of a horde of immigrants, strangers, public criminals, and the few cowards who allowed themselves to be drawn over by threats and promises. To this atrocious insult we, to-day, the young men of Rome, your children and subjects, come to oppose a solemn profession of fidelity and devotion, unalterable unto death, to your sacred person, and to the invincible rights in virtue of which you are sovereign Pontiff and our only sovereign."

In 1871 was passed the so-called Law of Guarantees, by which it was provided that the Pope should be regarded and treated as the *guest*, not the subject, of the King of Italy. It made his person as inviolable as that of the civil ruler, and assigned him a yearly pension for his support. But these guarantees did not guarantee. They are mere statutes, depending for their permanence on a parliamentary majority. The authority that made can modify or abolish them at pleasure. The late Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mancini, declared, as he had always held, that they are purely

domestic ordinances, in regard to which foreign powers had nothing whatever to say. The liberty of the Church cannot rest on such a basis as this. Nothing less than the social and political independence of the Holy See can insure its permanence.

Then, in point of fact, the Pope has not been free since the entrance of the Piedmontese into Rome. Infidel revolutionists, in and out of Parliament, have been allowed to insult him with impunity. Several persons have been brought before the tribunals for having spoken or written in a manner disrespectful to the King. No such effort has been made to uphold the dignity of the Pope. He is obliged to remain in his palace, for his presence in the streets of Rome would certainly lead to disturbance of the public peace. The joy of the people at seeing him could not be restrained, and its manifestation would provoke a counter demonstration by the partisans of the Revolution. Only a few years ago the crowd coming out of St. Peter's, on a festival day, caught sight of him at a window of the Vatican. A spontaneous outburst of joy went up to him from his children as they knelt for his blessing. The authorities were soon alarmed, and in a short time the soldiers from a neighboring guard-house were sent to clear the piazza at the point of the bayonet.

Everybody knows how, on the night of the 20th September, 1881, the procession accompanying the remains of Pius IX. to their last resting place was attacked by a band of ruffians, who insulted and struck the mourners, and threatened to throw the body of the dead Pontiff into the Tiber. Next day one of the radical organs, the *Lega della Democrazia*, commenting on this outrage, said: "They," the remains of the Pope, "were laid in the tomb with hisses. Our hearts echoed those hisses. Pius IX. was a fool. He personified the Catholic Church now become a monstrous folly. We applaud those hisses." We may imagine, then, what a living Pope, hailed by the vivas of his people, would have to expect from such miscreants.

The Pope can receive visitors and deputations, but so may a prisoner in the penitentiary or a servant in a private house. He can write encyclicals, but the government can prevent their circulation; and, in fact, it has on several occasions sequestered the newspapers that published them. It has control of the mails, of the telegraph, and of travel, and may, whenever it pleases, limit or cut off communication between him and Catholics in and out of Italy.

It took possession of the pontifical palace of the Quirinal, the place where the cardinals used to meet for the election of the Pope. It seized all the charitable institutions of the Papal States, and took into its own hands the management of the universities for the higher education of ecclesiastics and seculars. It suppressed the

religious orders, which Pius IX. declared to be his most powerful arm in the government of the Church, and appropriated their property; and by forcing all their religious corporations, even the missionary congregation of the Propaganda, to convert their real estate into depreciated government securities, reduced their revenues some forty per cent., and imperilled the remainder. It thus greatly diminished the means placed by the faithful of all nations at the disposal of the Holy Father for the proper government of the Church. It has refused to recognize acts of episcopal jurisdiction, even in regard to the appointment of pastors when the bishops had not received the royal *placet*; and even when they were permitted to present their Bulls of nomination to the Minister of Worship, they had long to wait before being allowed to exercise their functions. No wonder, then, that Pius IX. declared that he was "under a hostile government," and that his successor has told the world that, in Rome, he is not free to do even acts of charity. This was said in allusion to the outcry raised against him by the revolutionists, last year, for having built a magnificent cholera hospital beside the Vatican, so that he might be able to visit the patients without being obliged to pass through the streets.

Catholics are not opposed to the unity of Italy. Why should they be? They have no sympathy with the little despotisms that ruled there before 1859. Those despotisms were not as bad as the Revolution has painted them, but they were bad enough to make their restoration undesirable to all lovers of rational liberty. They did not rob the Church, but they greatly interfered with her freedom of action, and their fall was but a just retribution for their transgressions in this respect. We desire to see Italy united, prosperous, and great. She has, in her people, in her soil, and in her geographical position, everything that is necessary to make her become such. But such she cannot be, as long as her government antagonizes the religion of her people, despoils the Church, and holds its visible Head in virtual captivity. She can become a great nation without the States of the Church, or, at least, without as much of them as is necessary to secure the political independence of the Pope. The cession of Nice and Savoy to France, in 1860, was not thought to have materially injured the prospects of Sardinia. On the contrary, in the opinion of Victor Emmanuel and his ministers, it improved them, by strengthening the alliance between it and Napoleon III. The restoration—let us say—of the Romagna, to the Pope, would be productive of far more beneficial results to the present kingdom of Italy. It would tranquillize the minds of its people in regard to that which they hold most dear, their faith; it would allay the indignation it has excited in the hearts of Catholics, in every part of the world, and, in time, conciliate their respect, and gain an ally with three hundred millions of willing, loving, spiritual subjects,

the truest and the noblest ally any government can have, and the best friend Italy has known in the past, or can know in the future.

But, we confess, we see no reason whatever to hope that the present rulers of Italy will ever willingly consent to even a partial restoration of territory to the Holy See. They are the Revolution, godless and anti-Christian, and the ruin of their country would be a lesser evil in their eyes than reconciliation with the Church.

How long the present state of things in Italy is likely to endure, nobody can now foresee. Nevertheless, the intimate connection between the temporal power and the freedom of the Church bids us hope for its speedy termination. In his letter of March 26th, 1860, Pius IX. says: "The Catholic Church, founded and instituted by Christ, for the eternal salvation of men, being a perfect society, in virtue of her institutions, must enjoy such freedom as that, in the exercise of her sacred ministry, she may not be subject to any civil power. And as, in order to labor with that necessary freedom, she stands in need of certain privileges and prerogatives, corresponding to the conditions and requirements of the times, Divine Providence, with singular wisdom, disposed that, after the fall of the Roman Empire and its division into several kingdoms, the Roman Pontiff, made by Christ the head and centre of the universal Church, should obtain a temporal principality. In this way, it was wisely arranged by God himself that, amongst the multitude and variety of secular princes, the Supreme Pontiff should enjoy that political independence so necessary to him, in order that he may exercise, throughout the entire world, and without let or hindrance, his spiritual power and jurisdiction. It is easy to understand, therefore, how this principality of the Roman Church, although of its own nature merely temporal, in virtue of its sacred destiny and its being so closely bound up with the supreme interests of Christianity, is invested with a character altogether sacred."

"We recognize," said the four hundred bishops assembled in Rome in 1862, "the civil principality of the Holy See as a necessary appurtenance, and manifestly instituted by the providence of God. Nor do we hesitate to declare that this same civil principality, in the present condition of human affairs, is absolutely requisite for the adequate and free government of the Church and souls. Undoubtedly it behooveth that the Roman Pontiff, head of the universal Church, should not be the subject of any prince, or the *guest* of any, but, seated on his own throne, in his own kingdom, he should, from his very position, be perfectly free to defend the Catholic faith, and rule and govern the entire Christian republic. . . . And, indeed, how could the pastors of the Church, with any security, come together here from all parts of the globe to treat with your Holiness on matters of the gravest importance, if

there were in this city, and in these states, a ruler who might be jealous of their principles, or be himself suspected by, or hostile to, them?"

Such being the necessity of the temporal independence of the Holy See, we must, unless some extraordinary trial be in store for the Church, hope for its restoration, at no distant day, by means we do not now foresee.

The present position of the Pope is nothing new in history. His predecessors have often been honored by the enmity of more formidable tyrants than the actual rulers of Italy. More than fifty times have the Popes been deprived, in whole or in part, of their temporal domain. More often still have they had to take the road to exile from their capital. For seventy years they lived at Avignon, in France. Their absence was always disastrous to Rome, and to Italy; their return, an occasion for hope and joy to their people. And they *did* always return. Their enemies were humbled and chastised, but they triumphed. Adolph Thiers once said: "Whoever eats of the Pope, dies of it." The history of the Church attests the truth of this. Among those who, in recent times, meddled with the Patrimony of St. Peter, was Napoleon I. He annexed the States of the Church to his empire, and soon after signed his abdication, in the very palace of Fontainebleau where he had imprisoned Pius VII. And then came Elba, Waterloo, and St. Helena. His son, Napoleon II., was proclaimed King of Rome, but he did not live to wear a crown. Napoleon III. plotted with Cavour to despoil Pius IX., his benefactor and the godfather of his child, of his northern provinces, and immediately afterwards went to Sedan, Wilhelmshöhe and Chiselhurst, and his son, the scion of a military dynasty, was slaughtered by naked savages in southern Africa. Cavour was cut off in the middle of his ambitious career, and Victor Emmanuel and many others who took part in the spoliation of the last-named Pontiff, met with sudden and unprovided deaths.

And what has been, will be. "The hand of the Lord is not shortened that it cannot save, neither is his ear heavy that it cannot hear." He will know how to defend His Church and humble her enemies. "What God's will is," wrote Louis Veuillot, "we all know. It is what He has always willed, and still wishes, the advancement, the greatness, and glory of His holy and immortal Church. Where Bismarck reigns at present, Henry IV. reigned before; and he set up an anti-Pope, and continued the fight, and thought himself the victor. Gregory VII. died at Salerno, in exile, and courtiers of the emperor were heard to say: 'Hildebrand is the last of his race.' But the emperor died, too, and Hildebrand was resuscitated. How many persecutors of the Church have

died!—how many Popes have been resuscitated! Shed blood, then, make bad laws, enroll soldiers. Decree that good is evil, and evil good. You are but mortal. Christianity is not. Christians are endowed with divine obstinacy; they will resist you, they will use you, they will bury you. They will bury your great statesmen, your victorious generals, your powerful writers. You may reduce the world to ruins, they will continue to live. They will rise out of the ashes, and the heap of ruins you have accumulated will serve for your tomb. The earth laid waste by you will always furnish enough of wood to make a cross, and a spot whereon to plant it. In spite of yourselves, you will have the honor—though you deem it an affront—of bearing aloft the standard of Him that liveth.”

ART AND ARTISTS.

GIORGIO VASARI.

RICHES and art go hand in hand. As a land waxes fat, art flourishes: if not true art, then some more or less skilful pretender.

We have been growing rich, and it is evident that art, or some pretender, has settled among us. The Museum of Art, with its pretentious, and not too artistic, exterior, is as much a feature of every self-respecting city as the Opera House or the Soldiers' Monument. We have a *salon* every day of the year at the art dealers, while the Academy, the Black and White Association, the Rejected, the Etchers' Club, the Water Color Society, give us *salon* after *salon* as the seasons chase each other. There is, too, the loan-collection at the club, or the kirmess; the private view at the palace of the railway prince or the coal-oil potentate, and the very public view at the ever-recurring auction sale of the last bankrupted financier. Every daily paper has an art column, the work of an art reporter, if not of a real art critic; and there are many weeklies whose whole subject is art. Our magazines give us clever wood-cuts, after the best old and new masters, with interesting articles about famous painters and famed paintings. The best English, French, and German art periodicals have special agencies in our large cities: we read the "Gazette des Beaux Arts," "L'Art,"