

SAINT BERNARD AT CLAIRVAUX.

By J. F. L. D.D.

Vix dabat assiduo vomere fructum. Sic locus hic sterilis imperpetuum fuit.

One of our saint's biographers does not hesitate to say that of all the miracles wrought by Bernard, the founding of Clairvaux was the most stupendous. It is certainly the most acceptable to God.

It is the glory of Clairvaux that it owed nothing to the favor of princes. It was firmly established before the world heard of it. The unassisted labor of a few earnest monks had cleared the forests and filled up the marshes, and some first spoke of it as a romantic spot, where gardens, wheat-fields, orchards and vineyards, artistically laid out on the mountain sides and in the valley, made up a landscape charming to the eye, and yielded their fruit in so great abundance, that the monks, instead of begging from others, were enabled to relieve all the poor in the vicinity.

We are, I think, sufficiently well acquainted with the person, home and companions of St. Bernard; allow me now to introduce you to his friends in the order of their introduction to him.

The first great man who enjoyed the saint's friendship, was William of Champeaux, Bishop of Chalons, famous in the history of philosophy as the champion of Realism. It was he who imparted the episcopal blessing to Bernard after the founding of the new monastery; and it speaks well for the sagacity of the philosopher that he discovered at first sight, the greatness of soul which was hidden in the emaciated body of the young monk.

The good Bishop was deeply concerned for the saint's life. He saw him rapidly sinking under the weight of his labors and penances. Bernard's bodily strength was gone forever. His stomach could not retain food. He was racked with violent pains. His palate was so depraved that he could not distinguish one food from another, and was often known to have drunk oil for wine.

William's charity was praiseworthy, but he made one mistake which spoiled the whole affair. The physician to whom he confided Bernard was an ignorant, tyrannical quack, who solely taxed the saint's patience, and annoyed him more than his bodily sufferings.

It was at this time that Bernard became acquainted with another great man of that day—William, Abbot of St. Thierry—who became his most intimate friend, and to whom we are indebted for nearly all we know of our saint's early years.

I remained several days with this great saint, although I was unworthy of such a favor; and, wherever I turned my eyes, it seemed to me that I beheld a new heaven, and a new earth, and I thought I saw recent footprints in the paths once trodden by our Egyptian fathers.

Then was seen an extraordinary spectacle. Pius IX., robbed of the two thirds of his dominions, declares himself the protector of oppressed nationalities; he twice convokes the bishops of the universe to the foot of his throne; and when all is ended, when nothing more remains to him, he suspends the Council; and Pius IX. is still the conqueror of conquerors: ask Prince Bismarck and Cardinal Hohenzollern!

The future historians of Pius IX. will ask themselves: Had the Council of the Vatican any reason for its existence? Should the Pope remain at Rome in 1870? I will not venture to answer these indiscreet questions. Let it suffice for me, in taking the Catholic ground, to assert that without the infallibility, Catholic dogma would entirely fall to pieces.

No sooner was Bernard's year of obedience to the Bishop of Chalons at an end, than, as the unbent bow returns to its natural state, or as a torrent breaking through an embankment, returns to its own course with increased impetuosity, so did he return to his austere life with new ardor, in order to revenge himself for his forced repose, and to make up for the interruption of his penances.

Let the balance be just, and the weights equal, the bushel just, and the sextary equal. (Levit. xix. 36.)

A PANEGYRIC ON PIUS IX.

BY AN ENGLISH PROTESTANT DIPLOMATIST.

The Paris Journal, not long ago, published a remarkable article on Pius IX., from the pen of an English Protestant, who begins by saying:—I was sent, in 1849, to Pius IX. by Lord Palmerston.

A sweet and slightly defiant serenity is the chief characteristic of the physical and moral physiognomy of Pius IX. I was in Ireland when Cardinal Mastai was elected. Several of my colleagues were in Rome. It is from their lips we should hear the story of what then took place.

No serious historian has refused to the Papacy the glory of having been the sentinel of Italian liberty. The Popes were Guelph kings. The Papacy has gone still farther. It made an attempt, at it foresaw, Italian unity centuries before the House of Savoy.

The movement for complete Italian independence was spreading. The heir of Gregory VII. and Julius II. unfurled his sails. But where was the port? What would result from the heroic attempt? Would it be a modification or a confederation of the States of the Peninsula? If the Austrians were hunted from Italy would the problem be solved?

Pius IX., vanquished along with the liberties of his country by the cosmopolitan revolution, returned Rome, bringing pardon along with him. But if the Pontiff forgave the men, he did not spare the doctrines. The combat of dogma and speech began. Was the moment propitious for Encyclicals and Councils? I am not competent to judge!

Our journals have often received the words of the Vatican with sarcasm. In reality, England and Russia are well aware that these words of Divine morality and justice are the only ones that appeal to the reciprocal duties in the consciences of both peoples and kings; they know that the day on which they will be no longer heard there will be the silence of social death.

Then was seen an extraordinary spectacle. Pius IX., robbed of the two thirds of his dominions, declares himself the protector of oppressed nationalities; he twice convokes the bishops of the universe to the foot of his throne; and when all is ended, when nothing more remains to him, he suspends the Council; and Pius IX. is still the conqueror of conquerors: ask Prince Bismarck and Cardinal Hohenzollern!

The future historians of Pius IX. will ask themselves: Had the Council of the Vatican any reason for its existence? Should the Pope remain at Rome in 1870? I will not venture to answer these indiscreet questions. Let it suffice for me, in taking the Catholic ground, to assert that without the infallibility, Catholic dogma would entirely fall to pieces.

What is certain is that when this mild Pontiff, who has reigned for more than thirty years; shall have disappeared, there will be a lamentable void in the world. No one has loved humanity more than Pius IX. No one has loved Rome and Italy more. There will be wanting to the Eternal City something which I cannot describe, which will not be seen again for a long time.

PROTESTANTISM IN SPAIN.

LETTER FROM VICAR-GENERAL BRUYERS.

Let the balance be just, and the weights equal, the bushel just, and the sextary equal. (Levit. xix. 36.)

DEAR SIR, In a short paragraph of yours in the Free Press of the 16th inst. you ventured to read a sharp lecture to the Spanish Government on account of some real or imaginary intolerant measures taken by it against Protestants in Spain.

Now, permit me, dear sir, to read also to you a lecture, for what I consider a total disregard of that justice and fair play which are due to people of all nationalities and creeds. To be plain, I wish to remind you that Catholics as well as Protestants are entitled to their share of justice and impartiality.

For over five years the German Government has been enacting and enforcing with an iron hand the most tyrannical and oppressive measures against the Catholic subjects of the Empire. In virtue of these cruel edicts, known as the "Falk Laws," the Catholic Church in that country has been put under the ban of proscription; churches built by the worshippers of the ancient faith have been taken away from their rightful owners, and handed over to a handful of sectarians styled "Old Catholics," represented by such wretches as the lascivious ex-Monk Hyacinthe; convents and monasteries without number have been suppressed, and their peaceful inmates have been cast upon a cold world to die of starvation.

Now, let me ask, what are the crimes laid to the charge of the Catholics of Germany, to deserve such cruel treatment at the hands of their rulers? I will tell you.—Staunch attachment to their church and faith; fidelity to the Holy See; refusing to submit to laws and measures, destructive alike of religion and of the rights of conscience.

I might add here that the same system of unrelenting persecution has been carried on for years past by the Protestant Government of Switzerland. Holy bishops and priests are at present undergoing a long and tedious exile on the soil of Catholic France, far away from their sorrowful flocks; Catholic churches and asylums devoted to Catholic purposes, have been turned over to the new sect, the so-called "Old Catholics."

What is the cause, let me ask you again the unpleasant question, of this ominous silence? I will tell you:—The sufferers in Germany and Switzerland are Catholics; the pretended victims of persecution in Spain are Protestants or Communists. You dare not call the attention of the world to the shocking outrages perpetrated by the Bismarckians of Germany and Switzerland.

Like the Protestant emissaries of Mexico, who some years ago inaugurated the work of converting that nation to the Protestant faith, by hawking about indecent caricatures of the most sacred mysteries of our holy religion, thus provoking this simple and faithful people to deeds of reprisal, the apostles of the new-fangled faith in Spain would soon raise, by similar means, a storm of indignation which would not fail to be followed by riots, incendiarism, &c.

It is to ward off such and sad calamities that the Spanish Government has, in its own opinion, wisely introduced an exceptional legislation, which would be unnecessary in our country. The oppressive measures mentioned by you are simply regulations enacted by the Government for the maintenance of order and peace, by preventing fanatic fire-brands from inaugurating in Spain a reign of terror and bloodshed.

Before I bring these remarks to a close, permit me, dear sir, to teach you a lesson of moral theology. You are a clever scholar who can learn much with labor or study. The eternal laws of justice are immutable, and cannot be altered by circumstances of religion or nationality. They are applicable to Protestants as well as to Catholics.

WHO INVITED THE TURKS INTO EUROPE.

The following letter, which appeared in the London Tablet, 26th August, tells us unquestionable authority the true story of the introduction of the Turkish tyrants into Europe.

The following letter, which appeared in the London Tablet, 26th August, tells us unquestionable authority the true story of the introduction of the Turkish tyrants into Europe. It is certainly strange that in so many cases it has been by the invitation of the races who were to suffer most cruelly from their despotism that foreign invaders have first descended upon a country.

THE PAPACY AND THE EASTERN CHRISTIANS.

To the Editor of the Tablet.

SIR, The Servian Government has thought fit, according to the manifesto read by Mr. Farley at the meeting a couple of weeks ago in Willis's Rooms to put forward an utterly unfounded charge against the Papacy by way of appealing to the sympathies of British Protestants.

Every student of history, indeed every educated man, well knows that the Servian people, which previous to their period of suffering possessed a large civilized State, including Bulgaria and extending to the frontier of Epirus, shed their blood and lost their liberty while acting as the bulwark of Western Europe against the invading onslaught of Mussulman barbarians.

Upon this extraordinary paragraph—which might be left unnoticed by Catholics but for its being made a text for systematic misrepresentation—it is sufficient to observe that it is incorrect in the following particulars:—1. The Servian nation did not act as the bulwark of Western Europe against the invading onslaught of Mussulman barbarians.

Not the Roman Papacy, but the Greek Emperor directly, and the Servian ruler indirectly, introduced the Turkish invaders into Europe. The story is fairly summarised in the Slavonic provinces, recently written by Mr. Forsyth, M.P., and it can be quoted here.—In the contest for the Imperial purple between John Palaeologus and John Cantacuzene, the latter had invoked and obtained the aid of Stephen. The Servian ruler was at this time a powerful monarch, and he made it a condition of his alliance that whatever towns were taken should have the liberty of choosing either himself or Cantacuzene as their sovereign.

The internecine struggles of Greeks and Servians rendered Turkish conquest easy, and a generation after the death of the ambitious Stephen Dushan the Turks won the victory of Kousova, over the Servian nation. An attempt of Latin Christendom, under the leadership of Sigismund, King of Hungary, aided by the flower of the French chivalry, to rescue the Greeks and Servians from the lot their own miserable divisions had brought upon them, was defeated on the disastrous field of Nicopolis, seven years after the defeat of Kousova, by the Sultan Bajazet I.

It would be easy to show, that besides organizing the crusades which prolonged the existence of the Greek Empire for centuries, the Popes never ceased down to modern times to insist upon the necessity of opposing the settlement of the Mussulmans on the confines of Europe. Though thwarted by the jealousies of the Christian Governments, the Popes would certainly have achieved their object at last but for the calamitous event, which in the sixteenth century caused Western Christendom to present a spectacle of disunion and anarchy exceeding the wretched plight of the schismatic populations of the East.

THE DISCIPLINE OF DRINK.

It is evident that men are becoming appalled at the hold which drunkenness is taking upon our population generally. It is estimated annually, published show that it is gaining ground, and that the efforts made to meet it, whether legislative or moral, are not being well prosecuted.

It is evident that men are becoming appalled at the hold which drunkenness is taking upon our population generally. It is estimated annually, published show that it is gaining ground, and that the efforts made to meet it, whether legislative or moral, are not being well prosecuted. The interests involved are so enormous that it is dangerous for any party in power to meddle with them.

The question arises as to what would have been the state of England in regard to this vice, independently of the Church's action. If the answer was not to be a mere conjecture, it was necessary to ascertain what was the intemperance before her influence was removed. That the Angles, the Saxons and the Danes were mighty drunkards in their heathen state and continental homes we know. The Church had, therefore, a difficult work to do. We know also that her efforts were only partially successful, for drunkenness to some extent continued to characterize the Christian inhabitants of England.

Some may not see in this, as we do, the divinity of the Catholic Church; but to all who read Father Bridgett's book they cannot fail to come to the conclusion that she was able to cope with drunkenness in England for more than a thousand years; and only when her influence was removed did the vice, like the waters of a torrent long pent up, burst over the face of the land. The means she had of old are still in her hands; and though she no longer issue severe edicts of penance against those who sin, her voice will still be heard, and we trust, as of old, obeyed.

Wonders of the Deep Sea.

In her scientific cruise of three years and half, the Challenger sailed 69,930 miles, crossing both the Atlantic and Pacific—the former several times. The deepest soundings were 4,575 fathoms, in the Pacific, between the Admiralty Islands and Japan; and in the Atlantic 3,875 fathoms, ninety miles north of the Island of St. Thomas in the West Indies.

One often repents of saying too much, but never of saying too little. Our remembering an injury often does more hurt than receiving it.