

## ROME.

BY F. W. FITZPATRICK.

WITH a new king over "United Italy," too young a man to remember the stirring events preceding 1870, and with a new Pope in St. Peter's chair, as in the natural course of events there must soon be, to whom that period can be but a rather vague memory, there may be entertained a hope that a better understanding and friendlier relations may obtain hereafter 'twixt Vatican and Quirinal than there have been, while the occupants of both palaces were men who had passed through those troublous times, who had played important parts in them, and who had come out of them thoroughly prejudiced and embittered against each other. Aye, there are some people even sanguine enough to hope that this new Pope, through the grace of God, superior diplomacy, or a power lent him by other nations, may wrest to the See of Rome the temporal power over its old Dominions, that its Bishop may again be King in deed as well as in name.

These latter good people are, I am afraid, overly sanguine. True, the Papacy has been dispossessed of its temporal power, and had it again restored many a time, twice even in the past century; but this last dispossession, methinks, is final. One is as justified in expecting to hear Rome ring again with the shouts of "Ave Cæsar" as he is in expecting to ever hear that "Eternal City" again acclaim a pope as its ruler.

I will go a step farther and say that though we may hope that, under these changed conditions, new and younger régimes, friendlier relations *may* obtain between these great contending parties, the hope is based upon no very rock-like foundation. In fact, we may feel reasonably sure that neither this nor the next generation will witness such a change, desirable as it may seem, for the simple reason that neither party can possibly recede from the position

created by its predecessors, a position that neither, indeed, would be justified in receding from, or in changing in any way, and that neither party, its protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, really *desires* to change, strange as that may seem.

Possibly this is treading upon thin ice. Prejudice is such that some people dislike even to hear the name of the Pope mentioned, while there are others who deem it blasphemous to speak that august name except in profoundest reverence. Then, too, the subject may be considered abstract, and we all know how intolerant are our twentieth-century readers of anything of that sort. Still, there are at least thirty millions of thinking Catholics more or less interested in this subject, and surely as many more of other sects who may take a passing interest in it, as well as many unprejudiced students of events and conditions, so that, after all, this brief, dispassionate review of the conditions as they are may not go absolutely unread.

Some may think it was the high-handedness of Pius IX., the last of the Sovereign Pontiffs, that brought about this last and final overthrow of the "temporal power"; others say it was the Italian Revolution of 1860, and still others lay the blame at the door of Garibaldi and of his, one time, not over-zealous superior, Victor Emmanuel, while many claim this undoing of the Pope was the work of the great Cavour. Beyond all these, and still beyond, is the real cause. Modern Thought is the real culprit. As Leroy-Beaulieu aptly puts it ". . . a papal monarchy, the very embodiment of the conservatism of the Middle Ages, is absolutely an impossibility in this nineteenth century that has seen the secularisation of every state accomplished. . . ." For three hundred years has the tendency been that way, the work going on, and the climax was but the logical sequel of that process of evolution. The fact that Rome was in Italy amounted to little. Had the papal kingdom been in any other land or "an island in the sea," the result would have been the same. That structure was sure to crumble, of its own weight and spite of the stays, the props, the flying buttresses that other nations might have applied—for a time.

Undoubtedly the political necessities of Italy on the one hand and the undiplomatic moves of Pius IX., while basking under the scant protection of "Napoleon the Little," on the other, hastened the end.

The world witnessed then a strange paradox indeed: a people in revolt against its many rulers, seeking not to establish a republic, but still clamoring to become subjects of a king whose rule

was to be over "United Italy." State after state petitioned to be allowed to fly the flag of the Sardinian King, Victor Emmanuel II. Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and even the papal Romagna so changed their fealty. The Pope, conscious of the trend of affairs, interposed all of his mighty power in the way of the Republican-Monarchical wave that was sweeping over Italy. He hurled allocutions, ex-communications, and irregular troops, some claim even brigandage, in the way, and he comprehended in his wrath not only those he supposed his enemies, immediately surrounding his territory, but aimed his bolts at the Swiss, the German governments, all those who were not absolutely *with* him. Even then Cavour seems not to have had his eyes turned towards Rome except in protest. Later, in sheer self-defence, he had to threaten a retributive war unless the Pope ceased his direct attacks against and still more dangerous attempts at undermining Italian Unity. These protests availed not. The Pope was misled by the hollow protests many powers made against any interference with the Holy See,—and France's was the merest echo of a protest.

Rattazzi, Cavour's successor, was the first to think of Rome as essential to Italy's peace, and the impetuous Garibaldi the first to plan its downfall; he planned it, advocated it, and set about accomplishing it in spite of the king but with the sanction of the people. Then came the evacuation of Rome by its French garrison, a threatened revolution in Italy, the Revolution of Paris and consequent withdrawal of all moral as well as physical protection of Rome by France, a loud and fierce demand for Rome and all Italy to be one, and particular petitions from the papal subjects for annexation. We are told that the Roman people voted for this under the coercion of Italian bayonets. History does not bear out this contention, and indeed we know that the papal states were grossly mismanaged. To the Church as a spiritual government over one hundred and eighty millions of souls we bow in respectful admiration of its methods and discipline; but, for the Church as a temporal government over even but three million people, history will justify us in withholding all but the veriest modicum of commendation.

The appeal from the Romans to be freed from the papal "yoke," as they called it, found its way to the Italian Parliament while it was in Florence, if not indeed while it was still in Turin, and at a time when papal bayonets were the only ones that could possibly be used in coercing them.

There were a few little brushes between the two armies, but after one day's siege of Rome by General Cadorna, with 4,000

troops, Pius IX., realising the hopelessness of resistance and wishing to avoid bloodshed, ordered his 9,300 soldiers to surrender. The Italian army then entered the Eternal City, on the 20th of September, 1870, and the people acclaimed it as their deliverer!

All Italy demanded that Rome be the capital of the "new Italy." Barring religious sentiment, it was the best political move to make. Italy ruled from anywhere but Rome were a hollow mockery of kingdom, while to govern that ancient country from the city of the Cæsars was but just and meet. We may regret the political necessity but can offer no logical reason why it should not have been done.

Rome became the capital of Italy July 3, 1871. Was it a harsh and unjustifiable measure, or was it merely the inevitable result of war and other complications, matters little to us just now, but Parliament deemed it expedient to take it, to absorb the summer palace, the cathedrals, the art-treasures, all the emoluments, lands, and buildings that for centuries had been the popes', for the use and profit of the new kingdom (many of these palaces and churches had been built, restored, or added to by that "protector of the arts," Pius IX., from funds that that Pontiff could as well have turned to his personal use, therefore was much of this property in a sense personal property, rather than crown lands), leaving to the Pope the rather bald privilege of remaining in Rome (all Christendom would have *sincerely* protested against his expulsion) and enjoying the rather insalubrious and malarial Vatican and Lateran palaces and their respective great Basilicas. It also voted the Pope a sum sufficient in its estimation to maintain the semblance of a Court—money that neither Pius IX. nor Leo XIII. ever touched—and was shrewd enough to accord him all the honors and liberties due a monarch in his own right. To the Italian Parliament and king—I place them in that order advisedly—the Pope is in no sense a subject; they are punctiliousness itself in treating him as rather an unwelcome guest, but a peer to them, a monarch in his own right, nevertheless.

Neither Pope ever took advantage of that alleged liberty, and both elected to remain within the confines of the Vatican. Hence the generally accepted reference, the "Prisoner of the Vatican." It is misapplied, in that the prisonership is purely voluntary, a justifiable, dignified, and perhaps necessary, reclusion, but voluntary withal.

For thirty years have there been more or less vigorous appeals from this or that quarter for the "restitution of the temporal power

of the Pope." Like the Chinese question, it is one of those matters upon which all nations never can agree at the same time, hence is it bound to remain an unsettled one. Unlike the Chinese question, however, it is one in which but one or two outside countries can have the slightest material interest, therefore is it only brought out of the national closets, a poorly articulated skeleton, at such times as it may be of value in scaring this party into submission, or to placate that other one, after which temporary use it is comfortably tucked away again. It is, we are justified in calling it, merely a religious question then, a sectarian one, if you wish. Yet, just such immaterial, very spiritual questions have before now plunged the world into very material if not even bloody strife. The possibility of 180,000,000 people uniting in demanding something of one government, through their respective governments, is hardly to be set aside as of no importance.

For years I have followed with the greatest interest what the Catholic press, their best writers and deepest thinkers, have said and written anent this subject. To-day there seem to be making more strenuous efforts than heretofore, louder protests against Italy, more clearly defined demands, in fact there appears to be a well-planned and directed propaganda, wherever there are Catholics, for the restoration of the Church to its old temporal glory. Of all that has been said and written, however, I think the palm should be awarded to Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, for the clearest and most concise and succinct statement of Catholic hopes and ideas that has yet been given us. I refer to his sermon upon the "Temporal Power of the Pope," delivered at St. Patrick's church here in Washington, Sunday, December 9th last.<sup>1</sup> It was a masterly oration, indeed, and, given in the inimitable style of that arch-master of the art, it must have carried conviction to almost his entire audience.

I would that space permitted me to quote that sermon in its entirety.

Reduced to the lowest denomination in words, the learned gentlemen stated that as the Catholic Church is a divinely created organism, having received its mission direct from Christ, and He having made Peter and the latter's successors His representatives on earth, and they having established their basis of operations at Rome, the capital of what was then the civilised world, those successors must therefore have a right to independence and conse-

<sup>1</sup>The Archbishop's article in the March *North American Review* covers exactly the same ground as did that sermon, varying from it but little in wording and not at all in substance.



quent temporal sovereignty. In other words, we are to infer that, in legal parlance, the right to rule and a deed to Rome were given to the popes directly by God.

The Archbishop fears that the endeavors of the Pope towards establishing amity and justice between nations must be greatly weakened by the Pontiff's being, in a sense, dependent upon the king and Parliament of Italy. He fears that nations, ever jealous and suspicious of any interference with their affairs, might suspect that when the Pope counsels his adherents, their citizens, to do thus and so that advice might be inspired by Italy and be merely a mask or coloring for some political scheme favoring that country and perhaps detrimental, if not positively endangering, the country whose people the Pope was then addressing. He fears that possibly some future pope might yield to Italian blandishments or coercion and even play the part of cat's paw to Italian intrigue among Catholic nations.

If present conditions continue, we were told, and a weak man ever occupy St. Peter's throne, then the papacy would degenerate to the point where the pope would be little better than the court-chaplain to the king of Italy.

"The Church," said he, "has ever stood for freedom of conscience . . . it has sent a message of truth to barbarous lands . . . it has smitten with spiritual weapons the despots of peoples who fain would wrest from them their heaven-born liberties . . . it has summoned Christendom to stem the advancing flood of Mohammedan barbarism. . . . It has rights, God-given rights, the rights of God's Church, and the rights of its papacy. At times, true, it has not enjoyed those rights. . . . We can wait. We, the children of a day, who live but a little while, despair if things are not righted under our eyes. Not so the papacy, which is eternal; it is patient, it can bide its time. Some day it will again enjoy all its rights as it did of yore, when the pope virtually ruled the world! . . . Other Churches than the Catholic do not demand civil independence and temporal power for their chieftains, because no other Church than the Catholic is a world-church; no other Church than the Catholic aims at being at the same time universal and one; no other Church than the Catholic fulfils the injunction of the Saviour, 'Teach all nations!' . . . The whole life of the Church is dependent upon the independence of the successor of St. Peter from all subjection to temporal rulers or temporal governments. . . ."

The Prelate compared the Rome of old, the Rome of the popes, to our District of Columbia, in that both were removed

from the possibilities of any interference on the part of governors or legislatures of special states. He did not question the right of the Italians to pull away, as they did, from petty princelings and foreign domination to form a "United Italy," but he deplored that the Italian government did not leave Rome as a District of Columbia in Italy, that it changed the historical and providential conditions of the Church, by establishing its capital at Rome. The papacy was thereby despoiled of its influence and shorn of its dignity in the name of Unity. He contended the government should have respected history and the wishes of the Pope, and remained somewhere outside of Rome. And he demanded in the name of history that Italy restore Rome to the Pontiffs. "Rome must again be a world-city, not merely an Italian city. It must be the capital of a world-wide spiritual empire, the city of the papacy; for that reason does the Pope continue to demand, vain as the demand may seem, the restitution of the temporal power, and for that reason also should all good Catholics, the world over, exert every means in their power to that end."

The Church has other claims, other arguments, than these, but let us first glance at what the Italians and the other opponents of the "temporal power" answer to the sermon, the argument of the Archbishop. Say they, they are no more opposed to the Pope's tracing his right to rule his followers, spiritually, to a divine gift than they have to Emperor William's theory of the "divine right of kings," provided neither forces those theories down unwilling throats and that their respective peoples are willing to accept such assertions as Gospel truths. But they do contest and claim invalid the suppositious divine deeding of Rome to the Church. And we have to admit that when it failed to hold Rome by arms, the Church lost all record of that deed. It would be exceedingly difficult, not to say impossible, to find any court on earth that would recognise the validity of such a claim and order Rome back to its old rulers, the popes, any more than it would now recognise any Spanish claims to sovereignty over the Philippines. And unfortunately for the Church, it is these terrestrial courts that are regulating affairs these days, irrespective of any alleged but invisible, unproducable divine documents.

As for the lessening of the papal influence for good with other nations, on account of their fear of the pope's furthering Italian interests and schemes, making himself a tool of that country, instead of a great, good, and impartial friend of all men, how much more suspicious would they be if, and were they of old when the

pope was a king himself, with his own temporal interests to further, his kingly and human ambitions to foster, secret alliances to form, and advantages to gain by pitting one country against the other? A great many Catholics, American and foreign, and high dignitaries of the Church, claim, as do the outside opponents to its temporal power, that the Church is stronger, more impartial, chastened, purified, and exalted by reason of that loss of temporal power than it ever was before. The loss was not over-powering, the Catholic world did not suffer, it was more of a personal loss to a few, one might call it, while the gain in spiritual influence by divorcing the Church from State and political affairs, was tremendous and a benefit to the Catholic world. "Agitation for the restoration of the 'temporal power' must necessarily result in producing division and disorder in Italy and even imperil the peace of Europe."

I am still giving you the substance of what is contended by the opponents to the "temporal power."

They claim that it is well for Christendom that advanced thought *has* set the papacy where it belongs, over merely a spiritual realm. It has always "demanded its rights," as the Archbishop said, and has used them, whenever it could, to dethrone kings, to annex territory, to parcel out kingdoms to favorites, to stir up strife, and to wage wars at others' expense and what not in those lines, as well as simply to "smite despots with spiritual weapons." The Church has been a hard mistress in her palmy days. Her rights? Why, she is fully satisfied with but one, and that is to sweep aside all opposition and to dominate the world, with kings and peoples at her beck and call. Not "God-given rights," but the intensely human right to satisfy the most overweening ambitions and fiercest passions. That is what "temporal power" has led to formerly. The trouble is the Church is magnificently egotistical, it recognises no other rights but its own, and it has a divine mission and right to own all things. Away with all others' claims! And there are prayerful souls who still hope that some day all these usurped rights will be restored to mother-church!

The Archbishop's reference to history's sanctioning the restitution of Rome to the pontiffs as a sort of District of Columbia affair was, claim his opponents, an unfortunate argument. They answer it by a parallel. Spain, say they, held Cuba for centuries. That possession was sanctioned by right of conquest, history, sentiment, everything else. When she mismanaged it and we took it



away from her, we ought, at least, to have left her Havana, for sentimental, historical reasons. She should have been permitted to hold and rule that city, regardless of our laws, Cuban wishes, and the rest of it, because, forsooth, of her long and unwise rule of that miserable country!

The illustration is not an inapt one. We can imagine the results of such magnanimity on our part. Similarly would Rome be, if restored to the Pope, not "the Capital of a world-wide spiritual empire," but a very hot-bed, a constant leaven causing fermentation, and trouble, and strife all about. The Italian king might as well abdicate at once as to turn Rome over to the Pope. He would have little time indeed to correct municipal abuses and relegate men like Casale—the "Dick Croker" of Naples—to oblivion, and such other wise reforms. His attention would be all taken up in holding unto his crown. Even with the Pope safe behind the walls of the Vatican, he is a constant menace to the Italian Monarchy and Unity. Monsignor Ireland laments that the papal press, its Italian organs, have been suppressed. What could the Italian government do? Those sheets from merely abusive became absolutely seditious. It meant either their suppression or trouble.

\* \* \*

As matters are to-day, the most complex situations have constantly to be faced. Not the least of these are the social or court matters of both parties. Other sovereigns, or princes, or high functionaries of the courts or governments, exchange visits; but whenever any one of these thinks of visiting Italy it becomes a question of the greatest moment as to whom he will first call upon, the Pope or the King, if, in fact, he can call upon the other at all after once showing a preference for the one. As a result Rome sees fewer foreign notables than does any other European capital. And this exchanging of visits means so very much in European politics.

To the uninitiated it may seem strange that in so Catholic a country as Italy—for it *is* Catholic—there is no clerical party. The fact is that Catholics are forbidden by the Church to take any part whatsoever in politics. They, of course, do indirectly help one or the other existing parties, and both of these, the *reds* and the *blacks*, make high bids for that indirect but nevertheless powerful support of the clergy and the faithful.

One would think that it would be politic for the Catholics to take a hand in State affairs. They are powerful enough. I mean the supporters of the papacy in *all* its claims and ideas. The great

majority of Italian Catholics are Catholic in religion only. Of course, the picture of St. Peter's successor metamorphosed into a party leader is hardly a pleasing one to contemplate, but one would think that the surest, if not the most direct, way back to temporal power. But there again is a two-edged weapon. A political party, even if victorious once, is never assured of a continuous tenure of power. And the papacy knows too much to expose itself to the ups and downs of party strife; besides, such participation in politics would hurt it with other nations, it would too closely identify it with Italian affairs and make it too essentially an Italian institution, it would still further antagonise the king and the supporters of Italy's unity. Yes, such a party, by judicious alliances, might even hope to overthrow the monarchy which is at best "a house of cards," but, strange as that may seem, its fall might involve the papacy in even worse troubles than the latter labors under now; unknown ones, anyway, and they are always dangerous. The Pope can take no "gambler's chances." No, the Pope cannot afford to take a hand in politics; better far the dignified isolation of the Vatican.

A priest, a bishop, a cardinal, may be Italian, French, American, but when once a man becomes pope he should forget his nationality, he is catholic, the chief supreme of all Catholics. He can have no politics, save the Church's own interests, nor can he ally himself to any nation, party, or movement of any sort, unless it be most evident that such alliance be purely in the interests of universal Catholicism. And of all parties or governments Italy's is the last he can with any consistency affiliate with.

It is a notable fact, too, that the Church, day by day, is growing less and less Italian in its organisation. Leo XIII. raised more foreigners to the Sacred College than ever did any of his predecessors, and the effect is already visible in the broadening of Catholic policy. There is little danger, however, of any other nationality soon acquiring the ascendancy at headquarters. Note that of the twelve recent "creations" of cardinals by Leo XIII., ten were Italians, the two others being Austrians. Many of us had hoped that one American, Archbishop Ireland, would have been of that number.

It must not be imagined that Italy dictates to or meddles overmuch with the papacy, even though the Pope be "the prisoner of the Vatican." Certainly not to the degree of justifying one in saying that the Pope is a subject of the King. Italians were too shrewd politicians to force such a condition: it would, if nothing

worse, have made Italy responsible for the Pope's acts and utterances *vis-à-vis* other nations and have involved the country in no end of squabbles. True, Crispi forbade a Conclave from assembling outside of Rome, as had been proposed, and, true, the government showed most pitiable weakness, if not a criminal neglect of its obligations, in the arrangements made for the translation of the ashes of the dead Pontiff, Pius IX., from St. Peter's to St. Lawrence's, in July, 1881, when, as the procession was wending its way, in the dark of night, the government permitted a counter-demonstration, almost a riot, and half-heartedly and just barely saved those ashes, by a tardy police interference, from profanation at the hands of the mob. Still, to all intents and purposes, the Pope has a wee kingdom of his own inside the Vatican, and rules it jealously. Note, for instance, the affair Martinucci, an architect who, having some dispute with the Papal Court in 1880, sued it before an Italian tribunal. The latter, and later virtually the Supreme Court of Italy itself, found that the Italian Courts *had* jurisdiction over even the internal affairs of the Vatican, but they took good care, much to Martinucci's chagrin and cost, never to render a verdict, much less to ever enforce once. And to this day there has never been the slightest indication on the part of the Vatican, that it recognised the Italian laws as applicable to it or to its affairs any more than have the makers of those laws sought to enforce them there.

At the beginning of this paper I said that neither party really desires to change the relations that exist between the Vatican and the Quirinal. I will qualify that by adding that whatever they may desire it would be the poorest policy for either or both to cultivate friendlier relations. And neither dares to aggravate existing conditions, for any step in that direction would, more than likely, lead into still worse complications. Mistakes were made before. Experience has made both parties exceedingly wary.

If friendly, one or the other would absorb the other. It is a good deal like trying to maintain the parity of monetary metals,—according to some authorities. Italy might be benefited by a sort of amicable alliance with the Pope, or even his friendship. That might strengthen her hands and pave the way to still stronger ties on the outside; but one or the other of the two factions would eventually be in the ascendancy. Either the Quirinal would have a sort of mortgage on the Vatican, and, as Archbishop Ireland fears, the Pope would have to become virtually a court chaplain, or else the King would be reduced to no better than a feudal lord

or major-domo to the Pope. There is no middle-ground, and both know it.

Nor would any open rupture be wise. Should the King make things so uncomfortable that the Pope *had* to seek shelter elsewhere—and it is the former's most earnest desire that the successor of St. Peter would find more congenial, healthful surroundings than Italy, or at least Rome, can offer—there would be such a hubbub raised by the Catholic peoples the world over, that their governments might be forced into an interference in favor of the Holy Father,—an unknown, a dangerous territory, perhaps a boundless morass!

And so with the Pope. As Leo XIII. learned, so must his successor learn to read signs. The first was quite content to ask, to sue for things that Pius IX. refused even to consider when offered him. Leo would have been satisfied—and so will this new pope be—with Italy's control of Rome, anything the latter wanted, if it would *only* remove its capital from the Holy City. That is the bone of contention. Yet, all the Pope could do would be to stir up such strife as would disturb the existing government. A full-fledged Republic might possibly be the result. Some may say that anything were better than a king, and that "the tiara of Peter is a crown that revolutions do not tear from its wearer's head." Nor is "the heir of the fisherman of Galilee necessarily bound to or to support monarchies or kings." Other popes, in the Middle Ages, have thrown their strength towards the people in their opposition to the emperors of the North and the kings of the South. But conditions have changed. Catholicity, and consequently the papacy, is synonymous with all that is conservative. Any move or inclination towards a republic or democracy on the part of the Pope would be looked at askance by other monarchs. They all need the fullest conservation of monarchical power and must stand together, Catholic and Protestant, and the Pope must be with them. It would be a dangerous precedent to establish, and to retain their friendship and moral support the Pope can well afford to set aside his personal interests and ambitions. Yes, that very reciprocal antipathy of the papacy and democracy, the two opposite poles of society, is, as a witty Frenchman puts it, "the very best lightning-rod the king of Italy can have over his palace."

All sorts of solutions to the problem have been thought of. Pope Leo has been repeatedly urged to take up his residence elsewhere, and, at times, has seriously debated that possibility with his "cabinet," or official family and friends. He said his position in



Rome was intolerable and could not continue. We all remember the New York Herald's active urging, a few years ago, that he should accept sanctuary in the United States. Canada was also spoken of, and England, and Switzerland. But all these are impossible. The Holy See must be and ever remain in Europe, and in the centre of Catholic Europe at that. Nor do the larger, stronger countries offer an acceptable domicile, and for most obvious reasons. The purchase of Monaco and the turning of that little principality into a Catholic Headquarters, detached from all European politics and influences, essentially the spiritual capital of the world—what a transformation would there have to be in that place!—is the proposition that has met with most favor. There would be perfect liberty, a pleasant place, admirably situated geographically, healthy by contrast with Rome, particularly the Vatican, altogether an ideal spot for the purpose. But where would be the associations? The Pope abandon the tombs of the Apostles, the bones of the martyrs in the catacombs? Perish the thought! The "Pope of Avignon" was a hollow-enough title, but the "Pope of Monaco" would have absolutely no significance, no prestige, an empty, meaningless title. And such things go for so much in the Church.

Besides, to be forced out of Rome is one thing, something Italy will take mighty good care not to do, but to "flee from Rome" is quite another matter. It would be playing right into the king's hands, a tacit acknowledgement of impotency, surrender.

No man can predict the final result of all this. It would seem—and few who have not lived long in Italy can have any appreciation of the exact conditions that could not continue for months anywhere else, that have obtained and will continue there for years,—that both Pope and King have been condemned by obdurate Fate to exist, for perhaps another generation's time, in the present abnormal situation. There appears to be no human help for it. And for the peace of Italy, aye, of the whole world, may they be able to bear the trying ordeal!

The liberalising of the Church, its acceptance of the modern tendencies as something to be worked with rather than obstructed at every step, may go far towards solving the tangled problem. Or, perchance, may there arise some day another Solomon who will mete out perfect justice, and before whose court all these vexed questions may be settled satisfactorily to all men as well as to the high-contending parties.

Whatever the outcome, I think that even in the Church the great majority of thinkers will subscribe to Lyman Abbott's *résumé* of the question, "That a state is purer for not being dominated by a Church, and a Church is stronger for not being supported by a state."