

we will share them all with you; and pouring forth to God, who has founded the Church and ever preserves her, our most humble and instant prayers, we will implore Him to bend a look of mercy on France, to save her from the storms that have been let loose upon her, and, by the intercession of Mary Immaculate, to restore soon to her the blessings of calm and peace.

As a pledge of these heavenly gifts and a proof of our special predilection, we impart with all our heart the Apostolic Benediction to you, Venerable Brethren, to your clergy and to the entire French people.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on February 11, in the year 1906, the third of our Pontificate.

PIUS X., POPE.

PIUS VI. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

IT IS said that the present Sovereign Pontiff on the day of his election to the Chair of Saint Peter gave as his reason for choosing the name of Pius that it had been borne by the Popes who had defended the Church and the Holy See against the Revolution from its beginning, and that as he, too, was in presence of the same enemy, he had adopted a name which recalled their courageous resistance. The Revolution, indeed, still carries on its warfare against the Church, more especially on the Continent of Europe, and though the Radicals and Socialists of the present day have laid aside the sanguinary methods employed by their forerunners, the Jacobins of the end of the eighteenth century, they are animated by a spirit no less hostile to Christianity than that which abolished every manifestation of religion in France and deluged the land with blood. Their fanaticism was, however, but the inevitable result of the infidelity which had been so actively propagated in the early part of the same century by Voltaire and his followers who formed that school of atheistical writers known as "*les Philosophes*" from their pretension to be guided solely by the light of reason, or as "*les Encyclopedistes*," from the voluminous work which they compiled for the purpose of disseminating their doctrines. The preparatory steps in this campaign, which was undertaken for the express purpose of eradicating Christianity, consisted in seeking to subject the Church to the civil power as much as possible; in severing, or at least hindering the relations of the Bishops with Rome, and in depriving them of the assistance afforded them by the religious orders,

above all others of that order which had fought most strenuously against the teaching of Voltaire, which had shown itself the most zealous in sustaining the authority of the Holy See, and whose destruction, it was clearly foreseen, would bring about that of all the rest—the Society of Jesus.

A plan for effecting the abolition of the religious orders slowly and gradually, so as not to excite too much alarm among the public, by secularizing at first only the smaller communities, and by raising the age for the reception of novices, was drawn up about 1745 by the Marquis d'Argenson (1694-1757), Minister for Foreign Affairs under Louis XV., a friend and a protector of Voltaire, and for over forty years the French Government continued to be guided by it in its dealings with the Church.¹ The suppression of the Jesuits was more especially the work of the Marquis de Pompadour and of the Duke de Choiseul, who, of all the ministers of Louis XV., was the one on whose assistance Voltaire most relied, and he is reported to have said while conversing with some foreign envoys that if he had the power he would destroy the Jesuits alone, as then all the other religious organizations would fall of themselves.² Frederic II. of Prussia also saw the necessity of suppressing the religious orders before attacking the hierarchy, and in a letter to Voltaire of March 24, 1767, he states that he had remarked that in those places where there were most monastic houses the people were most attached to religion, and that there could be no doubt but that their destruction would render the people lukewarm and indifferent. He then dissuades Voltaire from attacking the Bishops first, as it was not as yet time to do so, but that when the religious feeling of the people should have cooled down the Bishops would be like little children and the sovereigns could then treat them as they thought fit. The same idea reappears in the King's letter of August 13, 1775, where, alluding to the Catholic Church, he reminds his impatient correspondent that the edifice must be undermined secretly and noiselessly so as to make it fall to pieces of itself.³

In this warfare against the Jesuits and the other religious orders the "Philosophers" were powerfully aided by the lawyers who composed the various Parliaments of France, which though originally only High Courts of Justice, had gradually usurped the powers of the "*Etats Généraux*" (or States General), which the Kings had ceased to convoke since more than a century. In the earlier times of the French monarchy it had been the custom for these tribunals to register the edicts issued by the sovereign, giving them thereby

¹ L'Abbé Barruel, "*Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire du Jacobinisme*," 1797, Part I, p. 84.

² *Ibid.*, p. 88.

³ Quoted by Barruel, pp. 113 and 117.

publicity and legal force. They had also the right of expressing their opinions and presenting their remonstrances against measures which they considered unjust. Little by little they laid claim to exercise greater control over the acts of the Crown and to make their will be felt in political questions, and though these tendencies had been repressed under the rule of Cardinal de Richelieu and later under that of Louis XIV., the Parliaments regained their ascendancy under the regency of the Duke of Orléans (1715-1722), and their unceasing conflicts with the government during the reigns of Louis XV. and Louis XVI. had no small share in preparing the way for the Revolution.⁴

A large number of the presidents and councillors of these courts were Jansenists, sectarians masquerading as Catholics, and who, though professing great austerity of life and affecting much outward piety, were vehemently opposed to the authority of the Holy See, and were therefore the most bitter and unscrupulous enemies of the Jesuits. Under their influence the Parliament of Paris, followed by most of the provincial Parliaments, exceeding the limits of its jurisdiction, claimed the right to interfere in the discipline of the Church; it dispensed from their vows rebellious members of religious orders;⁵ it commanded the parish priests to administer the sacraments to unrepentant Jansenists on their deathbed; it forbade to teach the supremacy of the Pope in the universities and seminaries; in 1730 it suppressed the office and the feast of St. Gregory VII., and in 1737 it refused to allow the publication of the Bull by which Clement XII. announced the canonization of St. Vincent de Paul.⁶ Such was the tribunal which expelled the Jesuits from France without the formality of a trial.

The series of aggressions of which the Jesuits had been for many years the object in the Parliament of Paris were brought to a climax by a decree of July 18, 1761, ordering the college of the fathers in Paris to be closed. Its execution was, however, suspended by an edict from the King, as he wished to have the opinion of the Bishops of France before proceeding further, and they, with only four exceptions out of an assembly of fifty-four, made a strong protest in favor of the Society. But the Parliament, profiting by the King's dread of another attempt on his life like that of Damion, induced him to withdraw his edict, and then, by a decree dated April 1, 1762, closed the eighty-four colleges belonging to the Jesuits.⁷

⁴ L'Abbé Proyart, "Louis XV. détroné avant d'être Roi," Londres, 1800, p. 324.

⁵ Rev. J. M. Prat, S. J., "Essai historique sur la destruction des Ordres Religieux en France au XVIII^e siècle," Paris, 1845, p. 149.

⁶ L'Abbé I. Bertrand, "Le Pontificat de Pie VI. et l'Athéisme Revolutionnaire," Paris, 1879, pp. 75, 76, 285.

⁷ Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 116. Henrlon x., 422.

By another decree of August 6 the Parliament declared that the Society could no longer be allowed to exist. It expelled the fathers from their houses and forbade them to follow the rule of their order to live in community, to teach or to exercise any religious function unless they bound themselves by oath to accept the doctrines of the Gallican Church as expressed in the declaration of the French clergy in 1682.⁸ Of the 4,000 Jesuits then in France only five submitted to this decree.⁹ The Parliament then published a long report, known as the "*Extraits des Assertions*," etc.,¹⁰ which it had caused to be compiled, mainly with the help of some monks who were ardent Jansenists, a report which professed to expose the erroneous doctrines taught by the Jesuits, and in the 542 pages of which the fathers were able to point out when they published an answer to it in the course of the following year, no less than 758 misrepresentations and falsifications of the original texts.¹¹ It is only just to say that the Parliaments of Douai and Besançon and the Supreme Council of Alsace, as well as very large minorities in other provincial Parliaments, took up the defense of the Jesuits, but the Parliament of Paris would listen to no argument; it condemned the works written in favor of the Society to be burned by the executioner, and hanged a priest who at Brest had spoken disrespectfully of their proceedings.¹²

⁸ Rev. A. M. Cahour, S. J., "Des Jésuites par un Jésuite," II, p. 226.

⁹ Schoell, "Cours d'histoire des Etats Européens," vol. 40, p. 51; quoted by Cahour, *ibid.*, p. 227.

¹⁰ The complete title of the work is, "Extraits des Assertions dangereuses et pernicleuses en tout genre, que les soi-disant Jésuites ont dans tous les temps et persévérément, soutenues enseignées et publiées dans leurs livres, avec l'approbation de leurs supérieurs et généraux. Vérifiées et collationnées par les Commissaires du Parlement en exécution de l'arrêt de la Cour du 31 Août 1761 et arrêt du 3 Septembre suivant, sur les livres, thèses, chiers composés dictés et publiés par les soi-disant Jésuites et autres actes authentiques. Déposés au Greffe de la Cour par arrêts des 3 Septembre 1761, 5, 17, 18, 26. Février et 5 Mars 1762. Paris, chez Pierre Guillaume Simon Imprimeur du Parlement, 1762." Cahour, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

¹¹ Cahour, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

¹² Prat, *op. cit.*, 129.

The following extract explains why the Jesuits allowed so much time to pass before replying to the "Extraits et Assertions:"

L'Abbé Dazès: Il est temps de parler, ou Compte rendu au public des œuvres legales de M. Ripert de Monclar, et des événements passés en Provence et à Paris, etc., à l'occasion des Jésuites-à-Arles, 1764, t. II, p. 250. "Avant que de faire paraître le Livre des Assertions on avait en soin de fermer à Paris et à Lyon la Bibliothèque des Jesuites. La précaution était sage: ces Bibliothèques étaient imenses et bien composées. Quinze jours avec des livres auraient suffi pour confondre ce monstrueux recueil de calomnies et pour charger le parlement de Paris de tout l'opprobre, dont il voulait couvrir les Jésuites; on avait prévu cet inconvénient, et le scellé prudemment appliqué aux grandes Bibliothèques de la Société, en avait été le remède . . . Paris a servi de modèle; à l'imitation de la Capitale, on a fermé en Provence les Bibliothèques des Jésuites: après quoi on les a invités à se défendre légalement sur toutes ces noirceurs que leur impute l'Infâme Extrait des Assertions."

The Parliament also condemned to be burned the pastoral letter in which Mgr. Christophe de Beaumont, the Archbishop of Paris, supported by the other Bishops of France with but three exceptions,¹³ denounced the iniquitous sentence, and at the request of the same body the King, incapable of resisting the evil influence of Madame de Pompadour and of the Duke de Choiseul, banished the courageous prelate to the monastery of La Trappe. It was in vain that Clement XIII. undertook the defense of the Society, and by a brief which he communicated privately to the French Cardinals declared the decrees of the Parliament to be null and void,¹⁴ and that Queen Maria Leeczinska and the Dauphin united their prayers and protests to those of the French clergy. They were unable to persuade the King to reject the decree of March 9, 1764, by which the Parliament of Paris, followed by those of Toulouse, Rouen and Pau,¹⁵ ordered the Jesuit Fathers to ratify by an oath the truths of the accusations which had been brought against them in previous decrees or to be deprived of the small pension of 400 francs which had been allowed them, and to be banished from the country. Louis XV. by the royal edict of November, 1764, while declaring that he had no ill-will against the Jesuits, and that he yielded reluctantly merely with the object of restoring peace in his kingdom,¹⁶ confirmed the sentence, though modifying it to the extent of allowing the fathers to remain in France as private persons; but the Parliament when registering the edict added as conditions that they should not come within ten leagues of Paris; that they should reside in the dioceses where they were born and report themselves every six months to the authorities.¹⁷ The expulsion of the order from Spain, which took place shortly after, gave apparently a fresh stimulus to the animosity of the Parliament of Paris, and by another decree of May 9, 1767, which the King was requested to extend to all France, it enacted that all the Jesuits who had not taken the prescribed oath should be expelled within a fortnight, and the feeble monarch, who feared to irritate the turbulent magistrate, yielded again and signed the decree.¹⁸

In the other Catholic countries of Europe the war against the Society was carried on, as in France, by ministers imbued with the anti-Christian doctrines of the "*Encyclopedistes*" and partisans of the supremacy of the State over the Church, such as Sebastian Carvalho, Marquis of Pombal in Portugal, Count d'Aranda in Spain,

¹³ Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

¹⁴ R. P. de Ravignan, S. J., "Clément XIII. et Clément XIV.," Paris, 1854, I., p. 145.

¹⁵ Cahour, *op. cit.*, p. 231.

¹⁶ Ravignan, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

¹⁷ Henrion, *op. cit.*, xi., p. 187.

¹⁸ Henrion, "Histoire générale de l'Eglise," x., p. 451.

Bernardo Tanucci in Naples, Guillaume du Tillot, Marquis of Felino in Parma, and between the years 1759 and 1768 the property of the Jesuit Fathers in those countries was confiscated, their colleges were closed and they were expelled from their missions in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies and deported to the Papal States under circumstances of the greatest brutality. As it was necessary also to ensure that these unjust and arbitrary proceedings on the part of these governments should be accepted and approved by public opinion, every country in Europe was inundated at the same time with scurrilous and calumnious writings calculated to inflame the minds of the people against the Society.¹⁹ It is needless to enter into any further details on this subject, as it has been so fully treated in the article on Pombal published in the *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW* of January, 1877, and in that on the suppression of the Jesuits in the number for October, 1888. It will suffice to say that the ministers of the Bourbon sovereigns, not content with the spoliation of the Society and its expulsion from their States, insisted on its abolition. The Spanish Ambassador in Rome, Don Jose Moñino, Count of Florida Blanca, was their most ardent and implacable foe, and as he threatened Clement XIV. with the suppression of all the religious orders in Spain and hinted even at the possibility of a schism in case of noncompliance with the wishes of his master, the Sovereign Pontiff yielded at last after a long resistance lest greater misfortunes should befall the Church.²⁰

Owing to the spirit of revolt against the authority of Rome which the insubordination of the Jansenists had created in France, the disturbances and the angry controversies produced by the intervention of the Parliaments in questions of ecclesiastical discipline, and still more to the irreligion and hatred of Christianity which were being gradually diffused among all classes of society by the infidel literature which Voltaire, d'Alembert and their adherents were causing to be distributed gratuitously in every part of Europe, but especially in France, much relaxation and disorder prevailed in some religious houses and afforded to those who aimed at the total destruction of monastic life the opportunity which they sought. Such was not, however, the sentiment which inspired the General Assembly of the French Clergy, but the desire to put an end to these abuses, when in 1765 it resolved to request Pope Clement XIII. to name a commission of prelates who should institute an inquiry into the state of

¹⁹ The Pere de Ravignan publishes (*op. cit.*, II.) a selection of fifty letters from those which were written by prelates from all parts of Europe to Clement XIII. in 1759 and 1760, in which they denounce these pamphlets as "libelli calumniosus, contumeliosus, maledictisque referti."

²⁰ Crétineau-Joly, "Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus," v., p. 350. Cahour, *op. cit.*, part II., p. 273.

the monastic orders and take steps to reestablish obedience and the observation of the rule wherever it was necessary.²¹ The Assembly informed Louis XV. of this resolution in order that he might instruct his ambassador in Rome to obtain the consent of the Holy Father, but the King, acting under the influence of de Choiseul, took the matter into his own hands by an edict dated 26th May, 1776, and, in spite of the remonstrances of the Assembly, by another edict of July 31 he created a board of five Archbishops, to whom he added five lay members of his council, some of whom were known to be hostile to the authority of the Holy See.²² The president of this commission, named *La Commission de la Réforme*, was Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, a secret adherent of *les philosophes* and a friend of d'Alembert, who helped to have him elected a member of the French Academy and praised him in his letters to Voltaire. The prelates associated with de Loménie, who alone was acquainted with the secret intentions of de Choiseul and the philosophers,²³ seem to have allowed themselves to be dominated by his stronger will, and not to have offered sufficient resistance to his insidious projects of reformation, of which perhaps they did not foresee the disastrous consequences, while the laymen, whose number could be augmented at the will of the commission, or rather of its president, were quite ready to take part in promoting any measures calculated to be prejudicial to the interests of the Church. As might have been expected under such circumstances, the reforms projected by de Loménie and his colleagues did not tend to appease the religious controversies raging throughout France or to restore discipline in the cloisters, but to excite still more discontent and insubordination among the more relaxed of the regular clergy, to provoke more hostility on the part of the public against the monastic orders, to reduce the number of religious and to suppress many ancient communities.²⁴

Thus the age at which monastic vows might be pronounced was to be raised to 21 for men and to 18 for women, and all professions which in future might be made before that age were to be declared null. All monasteries containing less than fifteen monks, or in some special cases eight, were to be closed, and no order was to be allowed to possess more than two houses in Paris or one in any other town without a license from the King.²⁵

The Council of State approved and confirmed these measures by two edicts in April, 1767, and in March, 1768, and the commission speedily carried out its operations, inspecting the religious houses,

²¹ Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 157.

²³ Barruel, *op. cit.*, I., p. 123.

²⁴ Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 192, p. 194.

revising and renovating their rules and statutes, uniting some orders together and secularizing others. These new codes and regulations were then sometimes submitted to the approbation of the Holy See,²⁶ but in most cases an edict of the weak-minded Louis XV. or of his equally incapable successor, Louis XVI., sufficed to ratify them and give them force of law, and before many years had elapsed the commission had suppressed several orders, disorganized many others by introducing into them a spirit of insubordination and closed more than 1,500 religious houses without heeding the opposition and the remonstrances of the General Assemblies of the French Clergy.²⁷

The "*Commission de la Réforme*," having thus completed its labors, tendered its resignation to Louis XVI., who by an edict of 19th March, 1780, thanked the members of it for having by their "*care and zeal*" provided the greater part of the religious congregations of his kingdom with a code of statutes and regulations which the superiors of these orders were commanded to obey. Another edict, however, of the same date reorganized the commission as a board for the purpose of examining demands for the suppression, the union or the translation of benefices and ecclesiastical property, and under its new form it continued to exercise its powers for the destruction of monastic life in France until even the Parliament of Paris accused it of destroying more than reforming and demanded its suppression.

These attempts to destroy the Church by gradually eliminating her most faithful defenders and by the circulation of anti-Christian literature were attended with greater success in France than in the southern countries of Europe, where, as a rule, the people still remained attached to their faith and the great majority of the clergy resisted all attempts to separate them from Rome. A large number, however, of the middle class were animated by the same spirit of hostility to the supremacy of the Holy See as the Jansenists, and many of the aristocracy had adopted the ideas of Voltaire and of the Encyclopedia and were guided by them in their relations with the Church.

Thus the Venetian Senate, which, indeed, had sometimes in past centuries already shown a tendency to interfere in purely ecclesiastical matters, published several decrees between 1767 and 1773 which were calculated to infringe the liberties and rights of the Church by the same methods as those which had been recommended by Frederick II. and were at that moment being employed in France. It was prohibited to make any donation or bequest to a church or a religious order without the permission of the Senate. The reception of any more novices in the mendicant orders was forbidden, and in

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 207.

²⁷ Bertrand, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

the others it was not to be allowed until the age of 20, and the final vows were not to be pronounced until the age of 25. The superiors of religious houses were prohibited from inflicting any punishment on their monks without having recourse to lay tribunals, and all the regular clergy were also withdrawn from the jurisdiction of their generals residing in Rome and placed under that of the Bishops of their respective dioceses, especially with regard to the administration of the sacraments.²⁸ In 1770 nine of the Benedictine abbeys in the State of Venice were also suppressed; the monks were allowed a small pension out of their former possessions and the rest was confiscated. Clement XIII. protested strongly against this aggression on the rights of the Church, for he saw that the real object of the decrees was to annihilate the religious orders under the pretext of reforming them, and he ordered the Bishops not to make use of the powers conferred on them by the secular authorities. The Senate replied with most fervent expressions of its veneration for the Holy See and its filial affection for the Holy Father,²⁹ but it would not withdraw its edicts, and though the Venetian Bishops at first refused to submit to them, they yielded little by little and undertook the visitation of the monasteries. Clement XIII. died without having been able to subdue the obstinacy of the Senate, and his successor, Clement XIV., offered no further opposition to the execution of the decrees.³⁰

The cunning policy suggested by Frederick II. was also put in practice in those Italian States which were ruled by members of the House of Bourbon, or rather by the ministers who governed in their name, and who took advantage of the absolute power claimed by the sovereign to invade the rights and plunder the possessions of the Church. The Duchies of Parma and Piacenza formed one of these principalities, a territory which had belonged to the Papal States since the year 730, when the inhabitants had rebelled against the Iconoclastic Emperor of Constantinople and put themselves under the authority of Pope Gregory II.³¹

In 1545 Pope Paul III. (Alessandro Farnese, 1534-1549), who had been married before entering the Church, gave these Duchies to his son, Pier-Luigi Farnese, to be held by him and his heirs male as a fief of the Holy See for the annual payment of 9,000 golden ducats. The male line of the Farnese came to an end in 1731 on the death of Duke Antonio, and the Duchies should have reunited to the rest of the Papal States, but by the treaty of London in 1728 between

²⁸ Gaetano Moroni, "Dizionario di erudizione Storico-Ecclesiastica," Venezia, 1858, vol. 92, p. 595.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 600.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 603.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, vol. 51, p. 222.

the Empire, France, Spain and Holland, Antonio's niece, Elizabeth Farnese, who in 1714 had married Philip V. of Bourbon, King of Spain, as his second wife, obtained the right to transmit them to her eldest son, Don Carlos, a right confirmed in 1722 and 1723 by the treaties of Cambray and of Vienna, in spite of the protests of Innocent XIII. (1721-1724). In the course of the war between France, Spain and Austria, caused by the disputed right of succession to the throne of Poland, Don Carlos, who had taken possession of the Duchies in 1732, became King of Naples under the title of Charles VII., and in 1735 the Duchies were ceded to Austria; but at the conclusion of the seven years' war between the pretendants to the title of Emperor of Germany, Parma and Piacenza were given to Don Philip de Bourbon, the younger brother of Don Carlos, by the treaty of Aix-la-Chapella (18th October, 1748), which disregarded and set aside the claims of the Holy See.

The young Duke, who had married the eldest daughter of Louis XV., had for his Prime Minister a French lawyer, Guillaume Léon du Tillot, whom his father-in-law had sent to assist him in his controversy with the Papal Government about the investiture of the Duchy. He was a good administrator, but like de Choiseul and Tanucci, he was a disciple of the Encyclopedists and acted according to their theories in his relations with the Sovereign Pontiff and the religious orders. He, therefore, is responsible for the Duke's refusal in 1764 to pay the usual tribute of 9,000 ducats, and this was followed by an edict by which testators were forbidden to bequeath to the Church more than one-twentieth of their fortune,²² which should never be more than 300 crowns to be paid in ready money, and the members of monastic orders were obliged to renounce all rights of inheritance with the exception of a small annuity. The Duke died the following year, and during the minority of his son Don Ferdinand, du Tillot published on January 16, 1768 another edict by which it was prohibited to have recourse to foreign tribunals, not even to those of Rome, without the Duke's authorization, which would also be requisite for the collation of benefices and for the validity of any document emanating from the Roman Curia. Clement XIII., who had already often protested against previous measures of due Tillot prejudicial to the rights of the Church, but who had been led to believe that his remonstrances would be listened to, replied on January 30 to this last aggression by a monitorium which declared that this edict and all those which had preceded it were null and void, and that the persons who had had a share in their publication had incurred the censures of the Church. By way of reprisal du Tillot, imitating the action of the courts of France, Spain

²² A. Coppl, "Annali d'Italia du 1750," Roma, 1828, p. 77.

and Naples, arrested all the Jesuit Fathers in the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza at nightfall on February 7 and sent them, escorted by soldiers, across the frontier of the Papal States; while, as a proof that the other Bourbon sovereigns approved of du Tillot's conduct, Louis XV. seized the town of Avignon and the Comtat Venaisin, possessions of the Church situated in France, and the Neapolitan Government not only occupied those in the Kingdom of Naples, such as Benevento and Ponte Corvo, but later on in the year sent troops to Orbitello, a fortress in Tuscany, with the intention of taking Castro and Ronciglione, towns in the Papal States, which had formerly been held by the Farnesi as fiefs, but had been restored to the Holy See since many years.³³

The right claimed by the Duke of Parma of authorizing the publication of acts issuing from Rome and of thereby establishing their validity was known as the *Regium Placet* or *Exequatur*, and had frequently been the cause of protestations on the part of the Papal Government. It appears to have originated at the time of the great schism of the West, when it was often necessary to ascertain whether a Bull or a Brief proceeded from the lawfully elected Pope or from the Antipope, but it was abolished by Pope Martin V. in 1417, when peace had been restored to the Church, and had ceased to be employed for over a century,³⁴ until the Spanish Viceroys of Naples under Philip II. attempted to revive the practice. Thus the Count of Ayala in 1567 and the Count of Olivares in 1596 impeded the execution of certain Papal decrees because the *Exequatur* had not been demanded; but the former submitted after having been excommunicated by Mgr. Orsini, Bishop of Strongoli, the Apostolic Visitor, and the latter yielded to the energetic protests of Clement VIII. and desisted from his opposition.

The spirit of resistance to any manifestation of the authority of the Holy See persisted, nevertheless, in the Kingdom of Naples as in other Catholic States. It acquired greater development in the eighteenth century, according as the teaching of the French philosophers became more widely diffused among the nobility and the very numerous class connected in one way or another with the legal profession,³⁵ and it directed the policy of the ministers who succeeded

³³ Avignon and the comtat Venaisin, Benevento and Ponte Corvo were restored to the Church by the two Bourbon courts after the suppression of the Jesuits, but Clement XIV. had indignantly refused to make their restitution one of the conditions of his consent.

³⁴ Padre Flario Rinieri, S. J., "Della rovina di una Monarchia. Relazioni storiche tra Pio VI e la Corte di Napoli negli anni 1776-1799, secondo documenti inediti dell'Archivio Vaticano," Torino, 1901. Introduzione, pp. xvi., xviii.

³⁵ Calculated at 26,000 in the city of Naples. Tivaroni, "L'Italia prima della Rivoluzione Francese," p. 335.

one another in the government of the country under Charles VII. of Bourbon and his incapable and illiterate son, Ferdinand IV.

Bernardo Tanucci (1698-1783), the first of these, was a lawyer from Tuscany, and had been professor of jurisprudence at the University of Pisa. His violent attack on the privilege of sanctuary which was enjoyed by the Church and of which a Spanish soldier had taken advantage, made him known to Don Carlos when he entered Tuscany at the head of his troops in 1732, as the acknowledged heir of Giovanni Gastone, the last Grand Duke of the House of Medici, and on his way to take possession of Parma and Piacenza. Tanucci then became auditor of the treasury to the Prince and one of his councillors, in which capacity he accompanied him in 1734 on the expedition which resulted in the conquest of the Kingdom of Naples. There he rose to be Minister of Justice, and in 1755 he was made Minister of Foreign Affairs and of the Royal Household.

When the Emperor Joseph II. visited Naples in 1769 he described Tanucci as being an intelligent and well informed man, but a hypocrite and an arrant pedant, full of little artifices and chicanery, which he looked upon as statesmanship, attaching great importance to trifles, extremely jealous of his authority and managing to keep in his own hands the distribution of all favors and places.³⁶ Like most lawyers of that time he was a strong upholder of the absolute authority of the sovereign in religious as well as civil matters, but he does not seem to have offered any opposition to the Concordat which was made in 1741 between Benedict XIV. and Charles VII., in which reciprocal concessions were made with regard to the right of sanctuary in churches, the taxation of church property, the constitution and jurisdiction of ecclesiastical and mixed tribunals and the collation of benefices.

This agreement was not, however, strictly observed for very long by the Neapolitan Government, which interpreted in its own favor, extended and sometimes even exceeded the conditions which had been stipulated.³⁷ Thus by successive edicts it was enacted that the number of priests should be limited to ten per thousand of the population; that the Church should acquire no more real property; that Papal Bulls should have no effect unless accepted by the King,³⁸ and that episcopal censures incurred by persons engaged in carrying out a law should be regarded as null. As an edict of the King's had forbidden the construction of new churches, convents or hos-

³⁶ A. von Arneth, "Maria Teresia und Joseph II. Ihre Correspondenz Wien, 1867," vol. I., p. 262. "Un pédant fleffé, rempli de petites finasseries et de chicanes."

³⁷ Pietro Colletta, "Storia del Reame di Napoli dal 1734 al 1825," Capalago, 1834, vol. I., p. 87.

³⁸ Which meant that the Exequatur was reestablished.

pitals unless his permission had been obtained, a church which had been built in honor of the patron saint of a city in the Abruzzi was ordered to be demolished because the necessary formality had not been fulfilled.³⁹

When Charles VII. succeeded in 1759 to the throne of Spain under the title of Charles III., on the death of his brother, Ferdinand VI., he transferred the crown of Naples to his third son, Ferdinand IV. (1751-1825), then aged eight, and confided him to the care of a Council of Regency, of which Tanucci formed part. In this position Tanucci found himself invested with almost absolute power over the Kingdom of Naples, and thenceforth he lost no opportunity of manifesting still more openly his animosity against the Church. His authority in the Council soon predominated over that of his co-regents, for he maintained a weekly correspondence with the King of Spain, who continued to direct from Madrid the policy and the acts of the Court of Naples.⁴⁰ A serious accusation has been made against Tanucci: that he let the young King grow up without giving him an education which would have rendered him capable of performing the duties of a sovereign,⁴¹ and surrounded him with frivolous and incapable men, who allowed him to neglect his studies and give himself up almost exclusively to field sports,⁴² so that when he attained his majority at the age of sixteen he knew little more than how to read and write.⁴³ Ignorant and coarse, but kind-hearted, indulgent and not deficient in common sense, vulgar in appearance and with the manners and language of a Neapolitan *lazzarone*, which caused him to be idolized by the lower orders, King Ferdinand had an intense aversion to business and left state affairs as much as possible to his ministers and to his wife, the Austrian Archduchess Maria Carolina (1752-1814), the daughter of the Empress Maria Teresa, spending his time as much as possible shooting pheasants in the Island of Procida or hunting deer and wild boar in the forests of

³⁹ Colletta, p. 88.

⁴⁰ Danvila y Collado, "Reinado de Carlos III.," Madrid, 1898, vol. I, p. 138, and II, p. 49. Janucci's correspondence with the Neapolitan ambassadors at Madrid and with Charles III. from 1736 to the eve of his death, on April 28, 1788, in 110 in-folio volumes, as well as that of the King with Janucci from 1759 to 1782, in 39 in-quarto volumes, is preserved in the Spanish Archives at Simancas and in the General Central Archives at Alcalá de Henares.

⁴¹ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, xlii. Henrion, "Histoire générale de l'Eglise," t. xl., p. 182.

⁴² Pietro Calà Ulloa, Duca di Lauria, "Intorno alla Storia del Reame di Napoli di Pietro Colletta," Napoli, 1877. The Duke defends Janucci and throws all the blame on the Prince of San Nicandro, the King's tutor, who had been chosen, as well as the other members of the regency, by the King's father.

⁴³ Rinieri, *ibid.*

Persano and Venafro, or catching fish in the lakes of Patria and Fusano, which he afterwards sold on the quay, bargaining and disputing with his customers like one of the populace.⁴⁴ His mind had, however, been filled from his earliest years with the most exaggerated ideas of the unlimited authority of a sovereign and the prerogatives of the crown, of which his ministers adroitly took advantage and were thus able to render a King who was not deficient in religious sentiments or in respect for the Holy Father⁴⁵ one of their most serviceable tools in their warfare against the Church.

They could also reckon on the coöperation of the Queen, a restless and ambitious woman, with a strong will and a passion for intrigue, which she was enabled to satisfy when, after the birth of her first son, in 1774, she was allowed to take part in the deliberations of the Council of State,⁴⁶ and it is not surprising that the sister of Joseph II. of Austria and of Leopold of Tuscany should have been frequently guided by their advice and have sought to imitate their schismatical attempts to establish the supremacy of the Church over the State.

Tanucci, therefore, who ruled despotically over the King's court and even over his private life, especially during his minority and the early years of his reign,⁴⁷ found no obstacles in his way when carrying out his plans for enslaving the Neapolitan Church and severing every link which united her prelates with Rome. Thus the tithes paid to the clergy were suppressed; the revenues of vacant bishoprics and benefices were seized by the State; the number of priests allowed to be consecrated, which Charles VII. had reduced to ten per thousand of the population, was still further reduced to five; only sons were forbidden to enter the Church, and no family was allowed to have more than one son in holy orders.⁴⁸ Tanucci also declared that the rights of the crown could not be alienated; that the most ancient Papal documents were null and void if they had not been confirmed by the King's acceptance of them; that any concessions made to the Church by a King could be revoked by the same King or by his successors; that the will of a founder could be suppressed or modified

⁴⁴ Tirvaroni, *op. cit.*, p. 414. Colletta, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

⁴⁵ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

⁴⁶ It was one of the stipulations of the marriage contract.

⁴⁷ Von Arneth, *op. cit.*, I., p. 262. "Il tient, outre cela la bourse, tant du Roi que de la Reine . . . Il se rend agréable par les faveurs qu'il accorde du Roi dans la collation des charges, pour les quelles le Roi doit réellement le supplier, de même quand il veut faire une dépense pour son plaisir, ou quand il veut, animé par la Reine, prendre la moindre liberté sur son étiquette espagnole, comme par exemple pour souper seulement au jardin il faut une négociation préalable, et une concession par écrit de M. Tanucci, pour que le Roi puisse la faire." Report sent by Joseph II. to Maria Teresa about the Court of Naples, in April, 1769.

⁴⁸ Colletta, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

according to the pleasure of the sovereign;⁴⁹ that marriage was essentially a civil contract, and that the sacrament was only an accessory. Tanucci also suppressed ten monasteries in the Kingdom of Naples and seventy-eight in the Island of Sicily;⁵⁰ the Bishops were forbidden to interfere in educational matters or to publish any document not approved by the King; the boundaries of several dioceses were changed without consulting the Pope, and every appeal to Rome without the King's permission was prohibited. When the King of Spain caused all the Jesuit Fathers in his dominions to be seized and deported to the Papal States, Tanucci willingly followed his example, and as Ferdinand refused to sign an edict for the expulsion of the members of the Society from Naples, he forced him to yield by employing his usual argument—the express commands of Charles III.⁵¹ In virtue of this decree the 630 Jesuits then in the kingdom of the two Sicilies, who had frequently been assured by Tanucci that they would not be expelled, were arrested during the night of November 20, 1767; 212 of these who were coadjutors or novices were obliged to return to their families; 65 who were too aged to undergo the fatigue of a voyage were sent to reside in different monasteries, and the others, to the number of 353, were escorted by soldiers across the frontier of the Papal States or disembarked on its shores near Terracina.

It was while the clergy was being thus hampered and deprived of their jurisdiction and their independence by sovereigns who still claimed the right to call themselves Catholic, and that the destruction of one religious order after another was allowing greater liberty to the band of atheists who were already rejoicing in the approaching downfall of the Church,⁵² that the Conclave which assembled on October 5, 1774, after the death of Clement XIV., elected as Pope, on February 15, 1775, Cardinal Giovanni Angelo Braschi, who took the name of Pius VI. The new Pontiff, who was born at Cesena, in the province of Romagna, on December 27, 1717, of a noble family, had received his early education at the Jesuits' college of his native town, whence he proceeded to the University of Ferrara to perfect

⁴⁹ Tivaroni, *op. cit.*, p. 407.

⁵⁰ Henrion, "Histoire générale de l'Eglise," t. xi., p. 362.

⁵¹ Von Arneth, *op. cit.*, p. 263. "Le Roi de Naples d'un autre côté est continuellement intimidé par Janucci qui lui représente la cotère de son père, et qui fait même écrire au Roi d'Espagne là-dessus tout ce qu'il veut. Le Roi qui est naturellement timide et inappliqué, est charmé d'avoir un prétexte pour faire toutes les choses que la lumière même de sa raison désapprouve, et il se sert du prétexte de son papa dans toutes les occasions où cela lui convient." Joseph II. to Maria Teresa, 1769.

⁵² "Cet édifice frappé par ses fondements va s'écrouler, et les nations transcriront dans leurs annales que Voltaire fut le promoteur de cette révolution." Frederick II. to Voltaire, May 5, 1767. Quoted by Bertrand, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

himself in the study of law under the guidance of his uncle, Carlo Bandi, who was the auditor of Cardinal Ruffo, the Papal Legate. Chosen by the Cardinal to be his secretary, he accompanied him to Rome in 1740, where as his conclavist he assisted with him at the election of Cardinal Prospero Lambertini, who took the name of Benedict XIV. The Abate Braschi, who already intended to enter the Church, then became the Cardinal's auditor, and was charged with the administration of the Diocese of Ostia and Velletri, in which capacity, as well as in a diplomatic mission on which he was sent to the Court of Naples, he showed so much talent that Benedict XIV., in 1755, made him his secretary and "*cameriere secreto*," as well as a Canon of the Basilica of St. Peter's, and shortly afterwards he was ordained priest.

When Clement XIII. succeeded Benedict XIV., in 1758, the Pope's nephew, Cardinal Rezzonico, who was Camerlengo, or Prefect of the Apostolic Camera, chose Mgr. Braschi for his auditor, and in this important post he gave such proofs of energy and of a thorough knowledge of economical questions that in 1766 he was named Treasurer General, one of the highest posts under the Papal Government. Mgr. Braschi held this important position for nine years, during which his administration was distinguished by the most scrupulous integrity, by his severe supervision over his subordinates and by the desire to remedy whatever abuses had existed under his predecessors.⁵³ In 1773 he was raised by Clement XIV. to the dignity of Cardinal, and then withdrew to the Abbey of Subiaco, which he held *in commendam*, where he passed his time in study until his election to the Chair of St. Peter.

The experience which Pius VI. had acquired in the different official positions which he had held, and especially in that of Treasurer, was soon turned to good account for the purpose of carrying out various reforms and developing the resources of the Papal States. A large number of pensions which had been too generously and imprudently granted by preceding governments were suppressed, and a commission of Cardinals was named to examine the existing system of taxation and to modify it so as to render it more profitable to the State and less oppressive to the people. Duties were also imposed on foreign merchandise for the protection and development of native industry, and the result of these operations was to increase the revenues of the Papal Treasury by a third more than they had been under Clement XIV.⁵⁴ Important public works were also carried out in various parts of the Papal States. The marshy lands

⁵³ Abate Francesco Beccatini, "Storia di Pio VI.," Venezia, 1841, vol. I, p. 20.

⁵⁴ *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 5 Agosto, 1899, p. 267. Beccatini, I, p. 40.

surrounding Città della Pieve, as well as those in the neighborhood of Perugia, Spoleto and Trevi, were drained; the harbors of Porto d'Anzio and of Ferracina were deepened; the State prisons in the fortress of San Leo were rebuilt and rendered more commodious; the prisoners were freed from their chains and provided with better food.⁵⁵ In Rome Saint Peter's was embellished by the construction of a new sacristy and the *Museo Pio-Clementino* was completed. The addition of this gallery to the palace of the Vatican for the purpose of containing the collections of statuary formed by several Popes since the time of Julius II., had been suggested to Clement XIV. by Mgr. Braschi when Treasurer, and Pius VI. enriched it with more than 2,000 ancient works of art, the result of excavations in or around Rome.

But the most remarkable of the works undertaken by Pius VI., and one which alone would have sufficed to illustrate his reign, was the drainage of the Pontine Marshes. This vast extent of swamp, about 25 miles long by 8 to 10 broad, which stretched along the coast at the foot of the Volscian Mountains, and is separated from the sea by a long and narrow sandy plain covered with dense woods, was once a thickly inhabited, well cultivated territory in the days which preceded the foundation of Rome, and in the fifth century before Christ it was there that the Romans in times of scarcity sent to purchase corn. But the conquest of the Volscian land in the early times of the Roman Republic, by laying the country waste and slaughtering the inhabitants, or leading them away into captivity, in order to replace them by small colonies of Roman citizens, began the downfall of its prosperity. The low-lying plain, liable to be frequently inundated by mountain torrents, had been rendered habitable only by an extensive system of drainage, traces of which still remain, and by the continual labor of the numerous population which inhabited the thirty-three small towns mentioned by Pliny;⁵⁶ but with their disappearance it gradually passed into the condition of a pestilential morass. Before, however, the district had sunk into this state, the Censor, Appius Claudius, in 312 B. C., constructed through the midst of it the road from Rome to Capua, which bears his name, and the canal along which is believed to have been made by the Consul M. Cornelius Cethegus in 160 B. C. Julius Cæsar formed the project of draining these marshes, but it was never carried out, though while the Roman Empire lasted the Appian Way was frequently restored and was again reconstructed under Theodoric, King

⁵⁵ Tavanti, Giov. Battista, "Fasti del S. P. Pio VI.," Italia, 1804, I, p. 165; II, pp. 12, 13.

⁵⁶ René de la Blanchère, "Un chapitre d'histoire pontine. Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres," Paris, 1893, tome x.

of the Ostrogoths (454-526). During the Middle Ages, an epoch of continual warfare, no measures could be taken to check the devastation caused by the inundations of the rivers descending from the Volscian Mountains, and though Leo X. and Sixtus V. made some attempts at reclamation and caused two canals to be dug, and plans for the same purpose were drawn up under the reigns of Benedict XIV., Clement XIII. and Clement XIV., they were attended with no very efficacious results. When in 1777 Pius VI. resolved to begin his colossal undertaking the Appian Way was in some places broken and sunk in the swamp, in others overflowed by torrents which could find no outlet through the ruined bridges and which kept a great portion of the land continually submerged. At that date 48,469 acres of the Pontine Marshes were under water all the year round, while in the district comprising the basins of the river which flow into them, 26,444 acres were inundated during part of the year and 248,831 acres were susceptible of being much improved by their neighborhood to the drainage works.⁵⁷

The plans for the drainage of the Pontine Marshes were made by a Bolognese engineer, Gaetano Rapini, and in December, 1777, 3,500 men were set to work. In 1784 the Appian Way had been rebuilt considerably above its original level, the canal running alongside of it had been reopened, and before many years had elapsed the annual produce of the reclaimed lands amounted to 97,200 bushels of corn and 194,000 of maize.⁵⁸ In 1792 the works had already cost 8,677,611 francs (\$1,621,983), and though from time to time much damage was occasioned by inundations, the works were continued until 1796, and would have received further development if they had not been stopped by the invasion of the French revolutionary armies.

At the time of the election of Pius VI. Tanucci was still in power and still continued to seize every opportunity of manifesting his animosity towards the Holy See. It was the year of the Jubilee, and the usual indulgence had been granted to those who should visit, while it lasted, the four principal churches of Rome; but with the intention probably of expressing his desire of completely separating the Kingdom of Naples from Rome, Tanucci persuaded the King to publish an edict to the effect that to obtain these spiritual graces it would be quite enough to visit the four principal churches of Naples.⁵⁹ He then informed the Holy Father that since he refused to confer on Mgr. Filangieri, the Archbishop of Naples, the

⁵⁷ De Prony, "Description Hydrographique et Historique des Marais Pontins," Paris, 1822, p. 94.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

⁵⁹ Henrion, *op. cit.*, xl, p. 362.

dignity of Cardinal, which had been usually held by his predecessors, the King would establish in his States a body of clergy clothed in red like the Cardinals. The threat was never carried out, but the Papal Nuncio at Naples was fully justified in stating in a letter to Rome, in September, 1776: "The principle which rules here is that the King's legislative authority extends also to ecclesiastical matters."⁶⁰

Tanucci's domination was, however, drawing to its close. During his long tenure of office he had so persistently made war on the liberties and possessions of the Church, treating both the secular and regular clergy as dangerous enemies of the State, who should be deprived of all influence and wealth, that he had taken no notice of the progress made by Freemasonry, which had been introduced into Naples probably about 1745 (for the exact date is uncertain), had spread rapidly in all parts of the kingdom in a few years and reckoned many priests and nobles in its lodges. It was only in 1751, when Pope Benedict XIV. had renewed the censures pronounced against Freemasonry by Clement XII. in 1738, that Charles VII. published an edict by which the association was suppressed and his subjects forbidden to form part of it. Its head at Naples, Don Raimondo di Sangro, Prince of San Severo, the first Italian who was Grand Master, promised to abandon it, but the edict remained a dead letter and the lodges continued to multiply and to meet secretly, diffusing without restraint their anti-Christian and anti-monarchical doctrines, while monasteries were being suppressed, religious orders plundered and the Jesuits especially made the victims of a relentless persecution.⁶¹ It was only in April, 1775, that King Ferdinand seems to have had his attention called to the matter by a general officer and informed his father that a number of persons of high rank at his court were Freemasons, and that the country was full of them; but when Charles III. expressed the desire that they should be suppressed he found that the Queen's influence presented an insurmountable obstacle.

Maria Carolina had come from a court where the Freemasons had been longer in power and more openly than in Naples; "she had grown up in an atmosphere of Freemasonry."⁶² Her brother, the Emperor Joseph II., is suspected of having been a Freemason, and her father, Duke Francis of Lorraine, the husband of the Empress Maria Teresa, was enrolled among them. King Ferdinand's correspondence with Charles III. is full of piteous complaints of his wife's tyrannical conduct towards him on account of his desire to obey his

⁶⁰ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, Introduzione, p. lvii.

⁶¹ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 395.

⁶² Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 386.

father; she had found him in tears caused by the reproaches in his father's letters, and had told him contemptuously not to mind them; she protected the Freemasons and assisted at their banquets; she had even asked him to become a Freemason, but he had always refused; she was instigated in her acts by the Court of Vienna, and she always insisted on reading his letters, but would never allow him to read hers.

At last Tanucci, who was extremely jealous of his authority and who saw that the Freemasons, among whom were a large number of members of the aristocracy, were helping the Queen to acquire supreme power at the court, declared war against the sect, and by a royal edict published in September, 1775, the Freemasons were denounced as guilty of high treason and their meetings prohibited; but, though the principal members ostensibly submitted and promised to abandon the association, the lodges still continued to assemble, though in greater secrecy than before. By Tanucci's orders a police magistrate named Gaetano Pallante then surprised, in March, 1776, a lodge while it was engaged in the reception of a candidate at a meeting which had been convoked by spies in his pay, and the prisoners were sent for trial before the "*Giunta di Stato*," a court for the trial of crimes against the State. Intrigues were at once set on foot to obtain the acquittal of the accused. Petitions were sent to the Queen from all sides, powerful personages sought to intimidate the judges, the fall of Tanucci was decided, and Ferdinand writing to his father in June, 1776, evidently at the Queen's suggestion, asked to be allowed to dismiss the minister, as his great age had rendered him incapable of administering the affairs of the kingdom. Charles III. refused to accede to this request, though he was not aware that its object was to save the Freemasons; but on October 25, 1776, Tanucci was informed by a note from the King that he had ceased to exercise his functions.⁶³ He was, however, allowed to remain in charge of the trial of the Freemasons, but the *Giunta* now took the defense of the accused. The meeting at which they had been arrested was not, it was said, meant to be a serious matter; it was a mere jest, and had been convoked at the instigation of Pallante, who had promised immunity to his spies. All proceedings against the prisoners were, therefore, quashed; they were declared not guilty and were set free, while Pallante was made to appear the real culprit and was banished to thirty miles from the city of Naples. The health of Maria Carolina, the protectress of the Freemasons, was drunk at Masonic banquets throughout France, Italy and Germany, and a medal was struck in commemoration of the event;⁶⁴ but

⁶³ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 410.

⁶⁴ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

Tanucci had to submit in silence to his defeat lest he should draw down the Queen's anger upon himself, for he had amassed great wealth, and he feared for his possessions. His successor as Prime Minister was the Marquis de la Sambuca, a Sicilian nobleman who had been Ambassador at Vienna; and under his administration the same irritating policy of interference in every detail of ecclesiastical discipline was carried to even greater lengths than previously, and constituted one of the most painful trials to which Pius VI. was subjected.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE.

TO THE majority of educated Americans the name Guadalupe Hidalgo is familiar as the place where the treaty which closed the war with Mexico was signed in 1848. For Catholics the suburb of the Mexican capital has a higher interest of a kind distinct from politics. It is the seat of the oldest and most remarkable shrine and pilgrimage in the New World, comparable indeed in many respects with those of Loretto, Assisi and Mount Alvernia. The city itself is insignificant, and counts only some six or seven thousand inhabitants, but on the patronal festival, the 12th of December, which is also that of the Mexican nation, the crowd of pilgrims and visitors often reaches a quarter of a million. These conditions have been scarcely changed during three centuries, as the Mexican annals tell us. In 1625 Guadalupe was credited with five thousand inhabitants, and long before that time it was noted as a place to which "great crowds came with special devotion to venerate the sacred picture there." The town is scarcely two miles from the capital, with which it is connected by a railroad since 1857. The service is now by horse cars, and Guadalupe is really a part of the City of Mexico, though with a municipality of its own.

The site is not attractive of residents in itself, though picturesque. It is at the foot of a rocky hill, the sides of which are dotted with thorny cactus and "Spanish bayonets," and beyond which a range of arid mountains rises towards the north. The shallow Lake of Texcoco to the east, and two streams, which in the rainy season become torrents, to the west, give natural limits that cannot be passed to the town's extension. The soil around is mostly alkaline and barren, and the wells mineral in character, and though medicinal,