

I am thirst after the promised vengeance. "Secrecy and caution, my friend" was the response; and Decolnick took his leave. (TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.)

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.—III.

An ignorant and depraved clergy, whose abject servility no demands can exhaust, and in whom all desire of liberty, and all sense of human dignity are extinguished, are fitting instruments of that savage Russian despotism which in many of its features is without parallel in human history, and which surpasses, in its mingled ferocity and hypocrisy, all that was ever attempted by Pagans, Turks, or Chinese. In such men, whose religion is purely ceremonial and has no connection with piety or virtue, as their own official judges, the popular verdict, and the acts of their tribunals proclaim, a senseless and brutal fanaticism, like that of the Turk, but far more intense in its diabolical pertinacity, replaces the spirit of the Gospel and the philosophy of the Cross. Victims of all embracing tyranny, they console their own shame by becoming eager subordinate agents in that system of unrelenting persecution to which Antichrist will hardly be able to add any new horror, and which it will be our duty to describe. If the creed of the Turk was summarised in the phrase, "the Koran or death," that of the Russian has only this article, "the Tsar or perdition." But before we offer to our readers some details of the horrible persecution, authenticated by official documents, in which Russian policy is displayed and Russian energy consumed, three preliminary questions claim our attention. We could hardly understand the scenes and the acts which we are going to narrate without a clear conception of these points: (1) Who are the Russians by whom such fiendish acts are done and applauded? (2) Under what Government, temporal and spiritual, is their lot to live? (3) What do their rulers do for the glory of God and the honour of religion in their own land, to suggest the idea that they are likely to promote either in the regions from which they desire to exclude the Turk, in order that they may reign in his stead? When we have answered these questions, we shall have made considerable progress towards a thorough comprehension of that unexampled system of Russian persecution which otherwise would be as unintelligible in its motive as it is devilish in its aim, and barbarous in its execution.

(1.) When Gregory XVI. spoke of the "hereditary fraud" of the Russian Tsars, he called the attention of Europe to the only feature of their government which can match their cruelty. Everything in the religious action of the Russian Government is fraud, and displays, as we shall see by copious examples, the cunning of the savage. Even their pretence to a Slavonic origin, in order to rule over Slavonic races, is a deception. "Much has been written," says Latham, "about the Slavonism of the Russians. In blood, however, it is only a few that are purely Slavonic." (1) What are the rest? A competent witness will tell us presently that every true Muscovite is, in fact, a Chinese. He has not ceased to be worthy of his origin. The pretence of the reigning family to descend from Rurik is another imposture which educated Russia ridicule. They no longer represent even the modern family of Romanoff, which, as Prince Dolgoroukoff remarks "became established in 1761 in the person of the Empress Elizabeth." To the same candid and courageous Russian witness we are indebted for such revelation as the following of the systematic fraud upon which the whole fabric of Russian government is founded. Under that monster of pride and cruelty the late Tsar Nicholas, of whose crimes we shall hear more hereafter, it was forbidden "by the censure," Prince Dolgoroukoff tells us, (2) to call Nero or Caligula "a tyrant," and much more to apply the same title to that hideous savage Ivan the Terrible, who murdered his own son; it was forbidden to hint that it was the family of Holstein-Gottorp which ruled in Russia; or to deny that Nicholas was descended in a right line from Rurik, who once reigned in Moscow, and with whom he had about as much connection as he had with Philip of Macedon; and in the Roman history appointed to be read in schools Russian students were informed, by his command, "that the Romans lived under a republic only because they were not yet sufficiently happy to have learned to appreciate the beneficent action of the autocracy of a single sovereign." (3) The Chinese officials, who have so many points in common with their Muscovite kinsmen, would not doubt say the same thing, if Roman history formed any part of the literary course which they approve. In mind, in action, and even in physical aspect, the two classes are often identical. An ethnologist of Kiev, the learned Duchonski, asserts that Muscovites are of the Turanian family, and have nothing in common with the Aryan branch, physiologically or physiologically. "The Muscovites of Great Russia," he adds, "are an integral portion of the Chinese race." (4) We shall see, by examples chosen from the highest ranks, that in all which relates to religion, justice, and liberty, they still betray their origin, and are as repulsive barbarians, under the mask of a spurious civilisation, as any equestrian savage who roams through the plains of Turkistan.

(2) Since Pagan times to despotism at once so senseless and so degrading as that of the Russian autocrat has afflicted any portion of the human race. Only barbarians could bow their necks beneath such a yoke. "What is the use of nobles and citizens," the Grand Duke Constantine is reported to have said at Warsaw, "when all that we want is an Emperor and peasants?" (5) This enlightened Prince, who had the face of a Kutnauck and the heart of a Mongol, only put in a crude form the theory of Peter the Great. The object of the latter as he often avowed, was to be to his nation, especially in the spiritual order, what the Caliph is to the professors of Islam, and it is this which constitutes the peculiar character of "tsarodoxy" and of Muscovite tyranny. With this design Peter abolished the patriarchate of Moscow, and invented the "Holy Synod" of which the president is always a layman and a creature of the Tsar, and often a military officer. It assembles only when permitted by its lay president, discusses only what he proposes, and every member of it is forced on admission to take an oath that "the Tsar is the Supreme Judge in spiritual questions." Like a true Antichrist he has taken the place not only of the Church, but of God. It is the Tsar whom every Russian is taught to adore. The very title of the Catechism used in schools, by command of the emperor, is word for word as follows: "Catechism of the worship due to the Emperor of all the Russians, or explanation of the fourth commandment of God, in what concerns the authority in the nation." (6) And this blasphemy has so penetrated the souls of Russians, that even of the worst monsters who have reigned over them they speak as if they had been saints and viceregent of God. An inscription in honour of the hideous Ivan, as foul a savage as ever disgraced humanity, speaks of him as "the Christ-loving Lord." When Catherine, whose whole life was one long debauch, and whose equalled the most degraded pagans both in lubricity and cruelty, came to her

and a Russian historian said of her—"The Catherines slept in peace, after giving her blessing to the newborn child, who was afterwards Emperor Nicholas, for ever memorable as he was. As a matter of fact, the divine Catherine was crushed in her momentary assault on the (7) died under the same circumstances as the Tsar, like the Turk, is the supreme pontiff of a purely national religion, though already reduced in that character by about eight millions of Russian Dissenters, who call him "Antichrist" and whose number increases every year—but still attribute to him the pontificate which he claims, regard him as a sort of Muscovite deity, a view of his perfection which he does his best to sustain, and will probably succeed in perpetuating as long as the Russians remain barbarians. The Caliphate is as purely Russian as it is Turkish. "Mahometanism," observes Father Newman "is essentially a consecration of the principle of nationalism, and thereby is essentially congenial to the barbarian as Christ-ianity is congenial to the civilised." Zingis Khan was "the son of God," and the "divine Catherine."—Such, too, is the strength of the Greek schism, which there only flourishes where it can fasten on barbarism, and extol the prerogatives of an elect nation. "The Tsar is the divinely appointed source of religious power; his country is pointed out as religious power; he is not behind 'Holy Russia.' . . . The Osmanlis are not behind Tartar or Russ in pretending to a divine mission" (8) In other words, Turk, Tartar, and Russ have the same diabolical pontificate, and use it for the same purposes.

And what is the effect upon liberty and human dignity, in Russia as in other barbarous countries, of a government founded on this impious fiction? An eminent Russian will tell us. "Russia, since the Mongol invasion," says Prince Dolgoroukoff, "from the eighth century to our own day, has been nothing but a vast pyramid of oppression. In this huge edifice, from the top to the bottom, reign slavery and arbitrary power, and proportions, official mendacity, lying elevated to the rank of a political institution, dismal and bitter fruit of slavery, of the absence of all individual liberty, all publicity, all serious and effective control. This despotism, already hideous in itself, exercises a moral influence still more fatally deleterious; it withers all noble and generous sentiments, degrades souls, corrupts, prevents, and depresses character, and produces these effects still more in those who exercise it than in those who are its victims." (9) Such a description assists us to understand the barbarous fanaticism with which a people professing a purely national religion, and ignobly prostrate before a spurious national pontiff, assail the Church which is the chief support of the liberty they have forfeited, and the civilisation they never possessed. They hate her because she is in all respects a contrast to their own enslaved sect. And they rage with the same demoniacal fury against all who enjoy the blessings which she alone is able to dispense. "Why have the Poles risen against us?" asks Mr. Dostoevski, though himself a Russian. It is thus that he answers his own question—"The Poles are impelled against us as a civilised people against one which is less civilised, or rather is not civilised at all. Whatever be the immediate causes of the conflict, it is evident that it is aggravated and intensified by the fact that on one side is a civilised people, and on the other barbarians. The Poles may regard themselves as a European people; they may claim to belong to the great West which is the summit of humanity, and carries in its bosom the central current of human history. And we, what are we who are called Russians? We have shared with Europe neither its lot nor its development. Our actual civilisation, our science, our literature, all this dates from yesterday, and has scarcely a history. The Poles may in all sincerity deem themselves the representatives of civilisation, and see in their ceaseless combat with us only the struggle of the spirit of Europe with the spirit of Asia. What can we reply? The whole question is contained in this fact, that we are barbarians, and the Poles a highly civilised nation." (10) It should be added that the journal that printed this statement was suppressed, and Mr. Dostoevski obliged to fly. That is the nearest approach to reason and justice which the Russian Government cares to attain. "There is one God, and Mahomet is His prophet," says the one; "the functions of God are more conveniently discharged by the Tsar," says the other.

(3) The last of the three preliminary questions which we have proposed remains to be considered. It has already been answered in part, by the evidence which we have heard, chiefly from Russian witnesses, as to the profound degradation of both clergy and people under that impious and crushing despotism of "tsarodoxy" which, as Prince Dolgoroukoff has told us, "degrades souls and withers all noble and generous sentiments." The pretence of such a power as Russia to vindicate abroad the religion and liberty which it has destroyed at home is only an example of that "official mendacity" which, in "Holy Russia," has been "elevated to the rank of a political institution." "Russia," says Schouvaloff, "has never produced," since she substituted "tsarodoxy" for the Catholic faith of St. Vladimir, St. Methodius, and all her primitive apostles, "either a single missionary, or one Sister of Charity, who deserves the name." (11) "In the Greek-Russian Church," adds M. Kohl, "no such useful auxiliaries has ever been formed." (12) But

[12] Austria, p. 476. if Russia has never had neither the wish nor the power to promote religion in other lands, whose spiritual interests are as indifferent to her as they are to a Corean or a Japanese, she has systematically degraded it in her own. "It is to the Russian Church," Theimer observes, "that we must attribute the disgrace which attaches to Christian Europe in seeing still in the nineteenth century so many pagans within her bosom. Whole provinces, united during many ages to the Russian Empire, are still filled with Gentiles." As long as they are docile slaves, and barbarous instruments of Russian policy, neither the Tsar nor the Holy Synod care what religion they profess, and in many cases forbid any attempt to convert them. In the single city of Kazan there are nearly twenty thousand Mohammedans. It is a curious example both of the pretended religious unity of Russia, where there are perhaps more sects than even in England or America, and of the utter indifference of the corrupt Russian Church to the conversion of pagans, that in Astrakhan, as Schnitzler relates, there may be seen, side by side with Russo-Greek churches, fifteen mosques, two Armenian churches, a Protestant temple, and a Hindu pagoda. [13] The sole aim of the Russian Tsars has ever been to make not Christians, but Russians. "Not only do the Russian Government, and its slave the Synod," says a former Russian Councillor of State, the Count d'Horner, "remain perfectly indifferent to the sad destiny of so many souls perishing in ignorance; the former even opposes itself systematically and by policy to their conversion to Christianity." The Emperor has formed and taken into his pay several squadrons of cavalry, drawn from the populations of the Caucasus. All these men are Mohammedans; they live in the midst of a Christian camp, where they have mosques constructed and ornamented at the expense of the treasury. Many children also from the countries of the Caucasus are brought to St. Petersburg, and there receive a gratuitous edu-

ation. But these were rigorously forbidden to admit them to Christian instruction. These children are destined to return one day to their native country, and their parents will be obliged to their competitors the advantages which they may derive from absolute and irrevocable submission to Russia. And this is the most atrocious measure of barbarism which has ever been devised. And even this is not all.

Not only are Catholic missionaries, as Dr. Moritz Wagner relates, forbidden to make any proselytising, and threatened with transportation to Siberia if they do; [15] but Protestants also, Mr. Wilson has learned from his own observation, are obliged to hand over their converts to the Russian authorities, and then driven away as the Moravians were from Serepta. [16] Everywhere the same internal policy prevails. "It is incredible," says Bodenstedt, "how ruling and demoralising is Russian influence in." He is speaking of Georgia, and adds: "The only thing the Russians bring with them into conquered lands are new customs, new forms of deceit, of falsehood, and of abuse of the Church for objects of policy." [17] Mr. Schuyler, the American writer who has lately described Russian operations in Central Asia, not only narrates a system of ferocious barbarism which savages could not surpass, but informs us "no efforts have been made to spread Christianity, and that General Kauffmann, no doubt in obedience to orders from St. Petersburg, will not suffer any missionaries to enter the land." [18] It is this combination, displayed in every act of Russian policy, of cruelty with hypocrisy, which made the Cologne Gazette affirm the other day, that "Russia's despotic press presses more heavily on her own Christian subjects than Turkey's misrule does on the Slavic tribes," and proves that "the Russian Government has not the shadow of a right to pretend that it is consulting the precepts of humanity when it interferes in favor of the Christians under the Turkish yoke." What the Christians now under the rule of the Tsar, is a question to which the abject condition of their brethren in Muscovite lands has already supplied the answer.

We shall see more and more clearly as we proceed with our object how vain it would be to dispute the conclusion of the German Gazette. Whatever is not savage oppression in Russian policy is mendacity and fraud. If the Turk leaves a desert wherever he has passed by, the Russian leaves a troop of crouching slaves and a gaoler. That is the only difference between them. The one is not a more barbarous encumbrance upon the earth than the other. "The Convent of Mount Sinai," observes Dean Stanley, "is a colony of Christian pastors planted amongst heathens, and hardly a spark of civilisation, or of Christianity, so far as history records, has been imparted to a single tribe or family in that wide wilderness," where the agents of the Russo-Greek Church have dwelt for centuries. [19] But if the representatives of Russian barbarism and "tsarodoxy" are as unprofitable to humanity as the Turk or the Tartar, they far surpass both in fraud and hypocrisy. "The Greek-Easter," says Dean Stanley, alluding to the shameless imposture enacted at the Holy Sepulchre by Greek ecclesiastics on Holy Saturday of every year, "is the greatest moral argument against the identity of the spot which it professes to honour; considering the place, the time, and the intention of the professed miracle, it is probably the most offensive imposture to be found in the world." [20] "Compared with the annual miracle of the Greek Church," adds Dr. Wilson, an American writer, "in the Crypt of the Holy Sepulchre, the great festival of the Aztecs was replete with significance and moral grandeur." [21] When we come to the story of Russian persecutions, which we are now approaching, and which in many of their features are unique in human annals, we shall see that to an unmatched barbarity they add the turpitude of lying and imposture,—as well as of treaties forsworn and solemn pledges broken,—of which only such profane conjurers as repeat annually the sham miracle of the "Greek fire" were ever capable. [22]—London Tablet.

THE VICISSITUDES OF THE PAPAL POWER.

SPLENDID SKETCH BY CARDINAL MANNING.

His Eminence Cardinal Manning, in a sermon preached recently in London, took for his text the words addressed by our Lord to the disciples on the road to Emmaus: "O foolish and slow of heart to believe in all the things that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered all these things, and so to enter into His glory?" (St. Luke, xxiv) and proceeded to apply them to the sufferings of the Church, showing that, like Christ, the Church must suffer, and so (that is, through these sufferings) arrive at glory. Evil though the days are in which we live for the Supreme Pontiff and Vicar of Christ, they are not so bad as have been in past times. For instance, in the time of St. Gregory the Great, who sent St. Augustine to convert England—for we added his Eminence, are children of St. Augustine, as you are children of St. Patrick—in the time of St. Gregory there was a plague in Rome which carried off thousands of the people, so that, even during a procession to propitiate Divine clemency, eighty men fell down dead. This happened just before St. Gregory's election. On his accession he found two great heresies desolating the Church—those of Nestor and Eutychius—and the greatest part of Europe was buried in paganism. But before the close of his pontificate Christianity was spreading more widely over the West. Then he took the instance of St. Leo III, who was set upon in Rome by the people and imprisoned. Mohammedanism had destroyed four great patriarchates of the East—five hundred bishoprics had been suppressed. Yet St. Leo had the satisfaction to crown the first Emperor of the West in 800, whose advent was a great source of joy to the Church. Next St. Gregory VII saw three great evils afflict the Church. Emperors and kings kept the Church in bondage. Bishops were chosen and made by them; and worst of all, bad, ambitious men actually bought bishoprics, thus committing the horrible crime of simony. Immorality necessarily began to spread itself among clergy and people. St. Gregory, however, set to work to restore discipline in the Church, but met with little co-operation from the Bishops (except in a few instances). Mohammedanism spread in Italy, Spain, and the South of France, and the Christian world became corrupt at heart. After Gregory VII had died in exile, the Church of God again rose up in purity, power, and spiritual strength. On the day of the election of Alexander III the Emperor set up an anti-pope, so that Alex-

MR. FROUDE ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

It is somewhat surprising to find Mr. Froude admitting that the Catholic Church ever was a useful institution, but, in a public discourse, reported in the Manchester (England) Times, he did say:—

"Never in all history, in ancient and modern times, that the world knew of, had mankind known out of themselves anything so useful, so beautiful as the Catholic Church once was. In these our times, well regulated selfishness was the recognised rule of action—every one was expected to look out for himself and take care of his own interests. At the time he spoke of, the Church ruled the State with the authority of conscience, and self-interest as a motive of action was only named to be abhorred. Wisdom, justice, self-denial, nobleness, purity, high-mindedness—these were the qualifications before which the free-born races of Europe had been contented to bow, and in no order of men were such qualities to be found as were found six hundred years ago in the clergy of the Catholic Church. They called themselves the successors of the Apostles, they claimed in their Master's name universal spiritual authority, but they made good their pretensions by the holiness of their lives. They were allowed to rule, because they deserved to rule, and in the fulness of reverence kings and nobles bent before a power that was nearer to God than their own. Over prince and subject, chieftain and serf, a body of unarmed and defenceless men reigned supreme by the influence of sanctity. He did not pretend that the clergy was perfect—they were very far from being perfect at the best of times—and the European nations were never entirely submissive to them; it would not have been well if they had been. The business of the world in the most excellent of priestly catechisms; the world and its concerns continued to interest them, though priests lasted on their nothingness. They could not prevent kings from quarrelling with each other; they could not hinder disputed successions, and civil wars, and political conspiracies; what they did was to shelter the weak from the strong. In the eyes of the clergy the serf and his lord stood on the common level of sinful humanity. Into their ranks high life was no passport. They were for the most part children of the people, and the son of the artisan and peasant rose to the mitre and the triple crown, just as nowadays, the rail-splitter and tailor became President of the Republic of the West. The monasteries of the Catholic Church are another vast feature of the Middle Ages, when they were inhabited by fraternities of men who desired to devote themselves to goodness, and who, in order to do so, took vows of poverty, that they might not be distracted with the cares of a family. Their days were spent in hard

[14] Persecutions et Souffrance de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie, p. 519. [15] Travels in Persia, &c., vol. ii, ch. 3, p. 204. [16] Russian Shores of the Black Sea, Chapters 3, 8, and 20. [17] Life in the Caucasus and the East, by Friedrich Bodenstedt, vol. i, ch. 8, p. 183. [18] Turkistan, by Eugene Schuyler; passim. [19] Sinai and Palestine, p. 56. [20] Ibid., p. 464. [21] Prehistoric Man, vol. 1, ch. 5, p. 126. [22] In the early part of the seventeenth century Theophanes, the schismatic patriarch of Jerusalem, confessed to Meletius Smotrycki, whom he consecrated Archbishop of Polock, that he himself had lighted the fire which he afterwards presented to the Greek fanatics as miraculous. For this and other reasons Smotrycki became a Catholic.—Saint Joseph's t. ii, p. 174.

and was exiled from Rome, and could not be consecrated at St. Peter's, but had the ceremony performed in a small country church. For seven long years he wandered about an exile—driven to and fro from place to place. And yet, after long suffering, the Pope was restored to his rightful position and succeeded in restoring the Church to its former power in every state, and vindicating it from the civil power. In the year 1054 Clement VI. of the Church, and about this time, the whole nations of Europe separated themselves from the Holy See and set up an independent power against it. Luther's heresy was first in Mohammedanism had ventured to the very gates of Vienna. It had Spain and the North of Africa in its grip. The Emperor of Germany sent an army to besiege Rome, took it, sacked it, and committed the most fearful and horrid sacrileges, sparing neither man nor woman, priest nor nun, and other atrocities unparalleled in the history of the Christian world. Had there been such things as newspapers at that time we should have no end of leading article on the "Overthrow of the Church," the "Destruction of the Papal Power," and other tirades of that nature. But even at this wretched time the Council of Trent was in preparation—that great Council whose decrees have governed the Church for more than three hundred years—and restored purity of faith, morals, and discipline. In these five instances the state of the Roman Pontiffs was worse than that had ever been since. But through those sufferings and trials, the Church passed into greater glory and so it would do again. What do you see at present? The Vicar of Christ has gloriously ruled the Church for thirty years, during which time he has been the prey of all the anti-Christian and anti-social revolutions of the period, and even now is morally a prisoner in his palace. He has been despoiled of his temporalities. He has no army, no lands, no territory. The Church has been persecuted in every State in Europe (except, thank God, in the English dominion). Bishops were deposed, priests exiled or left to starve, religious driven from their convents, and even he had read that day that one of the States of South America had decided that the Church there should be no longer dependent on the Holy See. To such insanity has the spirit of revolution driven men. Still, what was this state of things compared with any of the five instances he had taken from the history of the Church? He urged his flock not to give way to depression, nor to lose confidence in the promises of Christ. He had said: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," and when Jesus Christ builds His Church no man can pull it down. Though always dashing itself against the Church, like the restless waves of the sea against the rocks of the ocean, so the world beats against the rock of Peter, but the gates of hell shall never prevail. His Eminence could not claim for himself the gift of prophecy, or a superior interpretation of the signs of time; still, he could not help thinking that there was a Christian world, greater, perhaps than had ever existed. Take a glance at what has been done in the Pontificate of Pius IX. England has regained a hierarchy, and made great progress in the Faith. Holland has had a hierarchy. In the United States of North America, where, at the beginning of the century, there was but a handful of Bishops, there are now eighty, with ten provinces. Look, again, at Australia, with its hierarchy spreading over its vast continent. Formerly Christianity was confined to Europe, now it is spread over East and West. So assured another Christian world will rise up, which shall, perhaps, exceed the extent of the old Christian world, after Pius IX has gone to the reward of his sufferings. For, as the Apostle said in his Epistle to the Romans: "Blindness in part has happened to Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles shall come in." The Jews would not believe, and the apostles preached to the Gentiles the word of God. If the fall of the Jews was the rising of the Gentiles, how much more shall it be in the fulness of time when the veil is taken away from the heart of Israel compared with which all that has gone shall be nothing. The Old World shall be scourged for its disobedience to the Church and Vicar of Christ. Let us, then, apply the words of Jesus Christ to the Church. Ought not the Church and the Head of the Church to suffer like her Divino Master, that she might enter into glory? From twenty-five to thirty of the early Popes suffered martyrdom. Forty-five of them never set foot in Rome, or were driven out of it from place to place. Sufferings and trials were the destiny of the Church. The Church which is not persecuted cannot be the Church of Christ, cannot be the body of that Divine Head which men hated and nailed to the Cross. Suffering was an inheritance from Christ to the Church, and, above all, to the Head of that Church, His Vicar on earth.

The increase in the number of the faithful decided Peter upon making Rome the centre of his action. The cemetery of Ostrianum was too distant, and would not suffice for the reunions of the Christians. The motive which had induced the Apostle to confer on Valerius and Cletus successively the episcopal character, in order to render them capable of sharing the solitudes of a Church whose extent was to be without limits, led naturally to a multiplication of the places of meeting. The particular residence of Peter was therefore fixed at the Viminal, and there was established that mysterious Chair, the symbol of power and truth. The august seat which was venerated at the Ostrian Catacombs was not, however, removed. Peter still visited this cradle of the Roman Church, and often, without doubt, exercised his holy functions there. A second Chair, expressing the same mystery as the first, was set up at Cornelia; and it is this which has come down to us through the ages. Christ willed that this visible sign of the doctrinal authority of His vicar should also have its portion of immortality; one can follow it from age to age in the documents of the Roman Church. Tertullian formally attests its existence in his book, "De Præscritionibus." The author of the poem against Marcion, in the third century; Saint Optat de Mileve, in the fourth; St. Eusebius of Caesarea, in the fifth; the Gothic Gallian Missal of the sixth, all form an indestructible chain of witnesses, which certify to the perpetuity of its preservation. We also know from other documents equally certain that Saint Damasus placed it in the baptistry which he constructed for the Vatican basilica; that for long ages it served for the enthronisation of the Popes; finally that it was exhibited upon the altar the commemorative *scito* which was consecrated to it, February 22nd of each year. This day is designated the *Natale Patri de Cathedra* in the celebrated Calendar of the fourth century, the almanac of Aureus Dionysius Philocalus, preserved in the Imperial Library of Vienna. In 1663 Alexander VII. enclosed the chair of Saint Peter in the colossal and sumptuous monument which the aged Bernini executed for him, and which ornaments the apex of the Vatican basilica. The chair was taken out of this receptacle by order of Pius IX, who in the year 1867, the centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter, caused it to be exposed to the view and veneration of the faithful. The chair itself is decorated with ivory ornaments, and many persons are inclined to think that it is the crulo chair of Pridens, who therewith made homage to his apostolic guest. The examination of the relic shows that it was built of oak, and that the primitive carpentry of portions of the chair, as for instance the four great legs, which preserve their position and bear traces of the pious larceny which the faithful have perpetrated at various epochs are indubitable proof of the great antiquity of the article. The chair is furnished at the sides with two rings, through which staves were passed for carrying it about; this exactly agrees with the statement of St. Ennodius, who calls it *Sedes gestatoria*. The back and panels of the chair have been repaired with acacia wood of a very dark color. A row of open arcades forms the back, surmounted by a triangular tympanum of the same wood. Ornaments of ivory have been fitted to the front and back of the chair, but only on those parts repaired with acacia wood. Those which cover the panel in front are divided into three superimposed rows, each containing six plaques of ivory, on which are engraved various subjects, among others, the "Labors of Hercules." Several of the plaques were wrongly placed, and seemed to have affixed to the chair when the remains of antiquity were employed as ornaments without much regard to fitness. The ivories, however, which decorate the back of the chair correspond with its architecture, and seem to have been made expressly for the purpose. They represent combats of animals, of centaurs, and of men. The centre of the horizontal line of the tympanum is occupied by the figure of a crowned prince holding the globe and sceptre. The countenance and general bearing seem to be those of a Carolingian emperor.

bodily labor, in study, or in visiting the sick; at night they were on the stone floors of their chapels, holding up their shaggy hands to heaven, interceding for the poor souls, suffering in purgatory. The system spread to the farthest limits of Christendom. The religious houses became a refuge for the men of noble birth, kings and queens, and emperors and warriors, and statesmen retired to lay down their bones and their days in peace. Those with whom they dwelt dealt hardly, and those whom it had attracted with its unsatisfying promises, those who were filled with passionate aspirations after heaven, alike found a haven of rest in the quiet cloisters. Gradually leads came to them, and wealth, and social dignity—all grateful extended to men who deserved well of their fellows; while no landlords were more popular than they, for the sanctity of the monks sheltered their dependents as well as themselves."

THE CHAIR OF ST. PETER.

The increase in the number of the faithful decided Peter upon making Rome the centre of his action. The cemetery of Ostrianum was too distant, and would not suffice for the reunions of the Christians. The motive which had induced the Apostle to confer on Valerius and Cletus successively the episcopal character, in order to render them capable of sharing the solitudes of a Church whose extent was to be without limits, led naturally to a multiplication of the places of meeting. The particular residence of Peter was therefore fixed at the Viminal, and there was established that mysterious Chair, the symbol of power and truth. The august seat which was venerated at the Ostrian Catacombs was not, however, removed. Peter still visited this cradle of the Roman Church, and often, without doubt, exercised his holy functions there. A second Chair, expressing the same mystery as the first, was set up at Cornelia; and it is this which has come down to us through the ages. Christ willed that this visible sign of the doctrinal authority of His vicar should also have its portion of immortality; one can follow it from age to age in the documents of the Roman Church. Tertullian formally attests its existence in his book, "De Præscritionibus." The author of the poem against Marcion, in the third century; Saint Optat de Mileve, in the fourth; St. Eusebius of Caesarea, in the fifth; the Gothic Gallian Missal of the sixth, all form an indestructible chain of witnesses, which certify to the perpetuity of its preservation. We also know from other documents equally certain that Saint Damasus placed it in the baptistry which he constructed for the Vatican basilica; that for long ages it served for the enthronisation of the Popes; finally that it was exhibited upon the altar the commemorative *scito* which was consecrated to it, February 22nd of each year. This day is designated the *Natale Patri de Cathedra* in the celebrated Calendar of the fourth century, the almanac of Aureus Dionysius Philocalus, preserved in the Imperial Library of Vienna. In 1663 Alexander VII. enclosed the chair of Saint Peter in the colossal and sumptuous monument which the aged Bernini executed for him, and which ornaments the apex of the Vatican basilica. The chair was taken out of this receptacle by order of Pius IX, who in the year 1867, the centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter, caused it to be exposed to the view and veneration of the faithful. The chair itself is decorated with ivory ornaments, and many persons are inclined to think that it is the crulo chair of Pridens, who therewith made homage to his apostolic guest. The examination of the relic shows that it was built of oak, and that the primitive carpentry of portions of the chair, as for instance the four great legs, which preserve their position and bear traces of the pious larceny which the faithful have perpetrated at various epochs are indubitable proof of the great antiquity of the article. The chair is furnished at the sides with two rings, through which staves were passed for carrying it about; this exactly agrees with the statement of St. Ennodius, who calls it *Sedes gestatoria*. The back and panels of the chair have been repaired with acacia wood of a very dark color. A row of open arcades forms the back, surmounted by a triangular tympanum of the same wood. Ornaments of ivory have been fitted to the front and back of the chair, but only on those parts repaired with acacia wood. Those which cover the panel in front are divided into three superimposed rows, each containing six plaques of ivory, on which are engraved various subjects, among others, the "Labors of Hercules." Several of the plaques were wrongly placed, and seemed to have affixed to the chair when the remains of antiquity were employed as ornaments without much regard to fitness. The ivories, however, which decorate the back of the chair correspond with its architecture, and seem to have been made expressly for the purpose. They represent combats of animals, of centaurs, and of men. The centre of the horizontal line of the tympanum is occupied by the figure of a crowned prince holding the globe and sceptre. The countenance and general bearing seem to be those of a Carolingian emperor.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

Gerald Deane, of Turbotstown, Coole, Esq., has been appointed to the Commission of the Peace.

Died, Oct. 9, at the Mercy Convent, Strabane, after a short illness, Sister Mary Aloysius Higgins, fifth daughter of the late Michael and Rose Higgins, Frayce, Athboy, county Meath, in her 28th year, and fourth of her religious profession, to the inexpressible regret of the Sisterhood, and her sorrowing friends and relations. R.I.P.

The Queen's College, Galway.—The Chair of Jurisprudence and Political Economy in Queen's College, Galway, vacant by the death of William Lupton, Esq., A.M., has been filled by the appointment of Mr. Robert Donnell, M.A., B.L., The Professorship of Midwifery, rendered vacant by the death of Dr. O'Doherty, has been conferred upon Dr. Kinkead, of Tuam. There were sixty-two candidates for the appointments.

Mr. A. M. Sullivan, M.P., was among the gentlemen called to the Irish Bar by the Lord Chancellor in Dublin, on the 9th ult. Mr. Sullivan it will be remembered passed the final examination two terms since, but owing to the decision of the Benchers that he had not attended the full course of lectures, his admission to the Bar was delayed until now, when, having completed the course, he was formally called, and received the congratulations of numerous friends.

The Catholic University.—Cardinal Cullen, in a pastoral letter to the clergy, says: "it would be a scandal and a disgrace for Catholic Ireland to allow her only Catholic University to fall for want of support, and thus to consent that the literary, scientific and professional education of Catholics should be thrown into the hands of men hostile to their religion; and perhaps still more in the hands of men whose views are known to hold chairs in the Government universities of France and in other great universities, in each seat of which there is a Rapplet, issued by the Home Office, and which throws a curious light on Irish taxation, by the income of a certain Balfour, and the fact that the Government contributes, in taxes, six millions, or 1s 8d in the pound, while Ireland contributes eight millions, or 3s 4d in the pound.

(1) The Nationalities of Europe, vol. 1, ch. 36, p. 63. (2) La Verite sur la Russie, p. 317. (3) L'Eglise Catholique en Russie, par le R. P. Lescaur, t. i, p. 892, 1876. (4) Ibid., t. 2, p. 62. (5) La Pologne Contemporaine, par Charles de Mazade, p. 333. (6) Lescaur, t. 1, p. 405.

(7) Lescaur, t. i, p. 93. (8) Historical Sketches, p. 293. (9) La Verite sur la Russie, p. 155. (10) Quoted by M. de Mazade, p. 329. (11) Ma Conversion et ma Vocation, p. 361. (12) La Russie liv., 11, ch. 3, p. 698.