

voke from men of the most different temperaments, politics and religions, the ostrich-like blindness of all parts of the community to its concededly ruinous effect on religious, moral and civic character—these aspects of this significant fact would seem to suggest the activity and rule of some such central power. The human mind naturally attributes a constant, uniform and universal effect to a commensurate cause.

The educational fact, therefore, consists in this, that virtually there is a national alliance to cut out of the curricula of our public schools those disciplines and studies that are essential to the formation of citizenship and the preservation of civilization, and that this alliance, so far as we can see, is directed slowly, cautiously and progressively towards the accomplishment of this purpose by some central agency unknown to us.

TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN, S. J.

Woodstock College, Md.

---

## ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN RUSSIA (1796-1825).

### I.

THE five years' reign of Paul I. (1796-1801) closed the eighteenth century in Russia in a sombre and inauspicious way, while his violent death opened the series of vindictive assassinations that disfigure the pages of modern Muscovite history, and recall the worst days of imperial Roman and Byzantine administration. He had good natural abilities and had received a suitable education. But the jealousy of Catharine kept him secluded; he was relieved of the education of his own children and forbidden to exhibit himself to the army. Her favorites, moreover, humiliated him.<sup>1</sup> At his accession he had reached the age of forty-two, was skilled in military affairs, but after the style of the Prussian army, and entertained no small degree of self-respect. He was a true autocrat, and said on one occasion: "There is no superior person in Russia except the one whom I address, and he is such only while I speak with him." During his long seclusion from public affairs he had surrounded himself with spies and personal agents, and

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a mixture of contempt and fear in the story told by Count Fedor Golovkine in his memoirs of Emperor Paul, "La Cour et le Règne de Paul I.," Paris, 1905, p. 103. According to Golovkine, Catharine warned Paul, by the mouth of her favorite Panine, that he was her illegitimate child, and not entitled to succeed her—hence he must abandon all intrigues. For a curious trait that throws light on the shameful immorality of contemporary Northern courts, see *op. cit.*, pp. 383-384.

arrived at the throne well posted with notes as to the principal personages at the court of his mother Catharine. His accession was the signal for a reversing of the régime of the dead Empress. He had always been troubled as to his father's death and shown himself something of a Hamlet. Almost his first act was to cause the disinterment of the body of Peter III., that had been ignobly buried in the cemetery of the convent of St. Alexander Nevsky. The remains of the Emperor were re-interred in a catafalque and placed beside those of Catharine. Prince Orloff, the alleged murderer of Peter III., and his accomplice, Bariatinski, were compelled to figure prominently in the ceremonies by which the memory of Peter was rehabilitated; afterward they were exiled. Paul took a delight in undoing the work of Catharine or her advisers, and as an earnest of this temper ordered the destruction of the splendid monument that Catharine had built over the remains of Potemkin. In general he was a violent reactionary. The French Revolution aroused in him feelings of detestation, and while he lived there was an end of the French domination in St. Petersburg; not only the arts and letters of France were tabooed, but especially the political ideas and institutions of the Republic. Native Russian costumes and habits were resurrected, and all the powers of autocracy set in motion in order to undo in Russian society the work of his bold and unprincipled mother. The Russian capital was quickly transformed and began to look more like Moscow or "Lord Novgorod" than Paris. Paul declared himself the protector of the fallen monarchs of Europe and even went so far as to offer (1796) a refuge to Pius VI.<sup>2</sup> What his reception would have been may be gathered from the hatred always shown the Papacy by Platon, the Archbishop of Moscow. He declared that the Popes were a succession of Anti-Christ and the Cardinals agents of the devil.<sup>3</sup> The Emperor was, after all, profoundly religious by nature; he loved the ceremonies of the Church, and was occasionally moved to tears by the discourses of his metropolitan, whom he afterwards treated quite unceremoniously. In the fragment of personal memoirs of Count Golovkine, just published, there is a curious trait of Cæsaropapism that recalls the well-known story of Maximilian I. and his plan to become at once emperor, pope and saint.

There took place about this time (1797) an affair that was kept quiet, but which caused men to reflect. The Emperor made up his mind that as head of the Church he would say Mass. Not daring to commit so great an innovation in the capital, he resolved to say his first Mass at Kasan, whither he was then going. The costliest vestments were made for him. He meant

<sup>2</sup> The Pope was solicited to go to St. Petersburg, but excused himself on the plea of his great age, the climate and the inconvenience of an existence in the heart of a schismatic church. Golovkine, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 141.

also to become the confessor of his family and his ministers. With admirable presence of mind, the Synod saved him from these foibles. At the first mention of his design no surprise was shown, though all were thunder-struck; at the same time it was explained to him that the canons of the Greek Church forbade the celebration of Mass by a priest who had been twice married. He had not thought of this, and, as he dared not or did not wish to change the laws concerning the priesthood, he gave up his project. He consoled himself, however, by putting on, at his prayers, a little short dalmatic of red velvet and embroidered with pearls. His thin and slight figure was certainly a very curious object on such occasions, since he continued to wear at the same time his uniform, long boots, three-cornered hat and powdered queue.<sup>4</sup>

His determination to do ever the contrary of what had been done in the former reign would have inclined him favorably toward the Catholics of his vast domains. He had been favorably impressed by the reception accorded to him by Pius VI. and the Romans on the occasion (1790) of his European voyage while yet only heir-presumptive to the throne of all the Russias. He renewed the relations of the Empire with the Holy See and received with distinction the Apostolic Nuncio, Lorenzo Litta, formerly Nuncio at Warsaw and a member of one of the most distinguished families of Northern Italy. By the bull *Maximis undique pressi* (October 16, 1798) Pius VI. reorganized the diocesan system of the Catholics of Russia. To the United Greeks were allotted the three dioceses of Polock, Luck and Brzesc; to the Latins the sees of Mohilev (metropolitan), Samogitia, Wilna, Luck, Kamieniec and Minsk. As a special favor the Catholics of the Empire were freed from the jurisdiction of the College of Justice, a purely Greek ecclesiastical court. In its place was created a Roman Catholic College of Justice, or Supreme Council, the presidency of which was accorded to Siestrenczewicz, the metropolitan of Mohilev. This is the origin of the ecclesiastical tribunal known as the "Catholic College" of St. Petersburg, which has been often recast, but has never ceased to afflict the consciences of all Russian subjects who acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See. For the present, the mere fact that its action was dominated and directed by the metropolitan of Mohilev could inspire only fear and suspicion among all Catholic Ruthenians, Lithuanians and Poles. It was not long before Siestrenczewicz obtained the dismissal of the Papal Nuncio, and shortly afterward an ukase (November 3, 1798) that placed all Catholic religious orders within the episcopal jurisdiction of Mohilev. Had Paul obeyed his original good impulses, it would have needed no new laws to restore peace and security to so many millions of his troubled subjects; it would have been sufficient to execute the promises, edicts and treaties of Catharine. But of what avail were the parchments of the dead Empress so long as the evil genius of Catholicism lived and continued to apply against its

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150.

adherents all the cunning of ancient Byzantium, all the maxims of the royal Protestantism of Prussia and all the jealous fetters of Austrian Febronianism? It seemed as though the adverse fates of Russian Catholicism had conspired to meet in the brain of one man and to prolong his odious existence in such a way that Peter the Great and Nicholas I. might converse with one another as to the best means of destroying the authority of Rome within the limits of the new Russia. In his quality of president of the Roman Catholic College of Justice the metropolitan of Mohilev united in his own hands the entire administration of Russian Catholicism. There was no appeal save to himself, the final control reserved to the imperial senate being at all times unlikely to favor the interests of Catholicism. Siestrenczewicz was thus in possession of a kind of patriarchate from which all action of the Holy See was carefully excluded. Such a situation was destined to call forth protest from the independent representatives of Catholicism still to be found in Russia. The religious orders, notably the Jesuits, appealed to the Czar against the travesty of justice represented by the presence of Siestrenczewicz at the head of the new College of Justice; he was obliged to hand in his resignation and retire to his diocese. His place was taken by his coadjutor, Benislawski. This ex-Jesuit remained but a short time at the head of the department, long enough, however, to bring its administration into conformity with the spirit of the Church. He obtained from Paul I. the restitution of the property of the Jesuits. They were given charge of the Catholics in St. Petersburg, and were permitted to open schools and colleges in any part of Russia. Finally the Society of Jesus was restored in Russia (March 7, 1801) by Pius VII., at the request of the Czar. A few days later (March 23) the latter was murdered by conspirators headed by the German barons Pahlen and Benignsen. His mutable impetuous temper made even his wife and heir fear for their personal safety; his costly foreign wars had affected the revenues of the Russian nobility and the welfare of the State; the glorious career of his great general Suwarow had ended in such defeats as Zürich and Bergen; his own unselfish principles had caused his betrayal by Austria and England, and the loss of many thousand Russian lives to whom the interests of Europe were of little importance; he was even now thinking of moving like a new Alexander to the conquest of India, as an adequate revenge for the treason of England in his regard. It seemed that the hour of this terrible dreamer had come. He was strangled obscurely in a hand-to-hand conflict with his assailants, to the infinite disgust of his new-found friend, Bonaparte, and the incredible joy of his former ally, England.

## II.

The reign of Alexander I. (1801-1825) is in many ways typical of all Russian life and thought in the nineteenth century. On the one hand we see the noblest aspirations and efforts for the improvement of Russian humanity, and on the other a return to the sternest autocracy. The Emperor began his career under the guidance of such liberal minds as Adam Czartoryski, Nowossiltzof and Stroganof, friends of his youth, with whom he had often discussed the creation of a free and intelligent Russia. It was allowed to speak of rights and duties; the civil administration underwent many reforms in a modern sense; the emancipation of the serfs was taken up with earnestness; public instruction was planned on a broad scale and in a practical manner. It seemed as though a new life had begun to pulsate in the veins of the sons of Russ.<sup>5</sup>

The son of a village pope, Speranskij, who had risen from the office of an ecclesiastical instructor to the highest place in the Empire, was long the mentor of the Emperor and the executor of his liberal ideas. He dominates the first half of the reign of Alexander—when he fell (1812) a new era began, the period of reaction.<sup>6</sup> The decisive share of Russia in the great coalitions against Napoleon had developed the ever-latent Cæsarism of the Russian ruler, and also a mystical feeling of solicitude and responsibility for a universal peace, to be accomplished by measures of reaction and oppression. clearly on the minds of his new counsellors, and with the new consciousness came also the determination to root out all Western forces, all Latin centres of resistance or interference. War and military colonization were opening up extensive regions for the native Russians to enter upon and civilize after their own semi-barbarian Muscovite notions.<sup>7</sup> The first germs of political panslavism were planted, and the policy inaugurated that was to lead Russia to the forefront of universal domination. The old established German influence that had dominated in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and the shorter-lived French ascendancy of the reign of

<sup>5</sup> "Mémoires et Correspondance du Prince Adam Czartoryski," Paris, 1887, 2 vols., and the "Mémoires de La Harpe," Paris, 1864; Bogdanovitch, "History of Alexander I.," St. Petersburg, 1869-1871, 6 vols. (Russian); Schnitzler, "Histoire intime de la Russie sous les empereurs Alexandre et Nicolas," 2 vols., Paris, 1847; Pypine, "The Intellectual Movement Under Alexander I.," St. Petersburg, 1885 (Russian).

<sup>6</sup> Speranski, "Lettres à Sotlichine (1818 ff.), à Zeir (1814-1817)," St. Petersburg, 1870; Korff, "Life of Count Speranski," 2 vols., 1861 (Russian), St. Petersburg.

<sup>7</sup> For the military colonies of Araktschejewf, see Rambaud, "Histoire de la Russie," Paris, 1884, c. 35.

Catharine, were doomed to extinction. The House of Romanoff was to become the leader of the Russian masses, to express and execute autocratically the unconscious Russian idea, even as a Titus or a Trajan stood for the purposes of the Roman people. No doubt there were real forces of a popular character behind all this, **vague and unclear aspirations of a strong race, raw and undeveloped, emotional and religious, yet multitudinous, and placed advantageously on the vast marches between Europe and the remotest Orient.** It had done great things in conflict with the upstart Latin Cæsar; it had fired Moscow and forced the disastrous passage of the Beresina; it had subdued and trained Cossack and Tartar and nameless Oriental hordes; it had found voices of incredible eloquence and pathos, of fresh native grace and distinction, to tell the world of Europe what the Slav thought and hoped; it had looked on the old and the new constitutions of Europe as models exposed in open market, and finally rejected them all, in the hope of adapting its immemorial institutions to the new conditions of life. The indecision of Paul and of the youthful Alexander was pushed aside by such great domestic forces and in its place was set up a Slav world-purpose that really began with Nicholas II. (1825), and has been but now right vigorously challenged and balked by the little brown men of Nippon. We may recall once more that it is scarcely more than a century since Emperor Paul and Napoleon conceived (1801) the "grand plan" by which Russian and French armies were to penetrate into India and overthrow the rule of England. It would seem as though divine providence were bent on compelling an internal renovation of Old Muscovy before she is allowed to set up as the ideal political force among us moderns. Again and again, by fair means and foul, has "Adam Bear" striven to consolidate in the Far Orient the work of the marvelous Macedonian boy-conqueror, and as often has he been driven back. It seems probable, now, that when the "Russian God" again summons his people to overflow Eastward, it will be with a chastened spirit and a healthier sense of the Slav's political place and capacities.

We may return from this digression with the remark that a small percentage of the Russian clergy, the educated monastic element, was largely responsible for the frightful injustices henceforth committed against Roman Catholicism throughout the Russian dominions. No doubt the anti-Romanism of Northern Germany—Encyclopedist hatred, Bavarian Illuminism and Austrian Febronianism—had contributed powerfully to the Russian distrust and contempt of genuine Catholicism. But all these influences found a receptive and favorable atmosphere among ecclesiastics who had for many centuries been under the baleful influence of the Greek clergy of

Constantinople. What that meant is readily understood by every student of the documentary sources of the Greek Schism from Photius to the Council of Florence. The humiliation of the patriarch Nikon (1658-1667) and the extinction of the patriarchal power at Moscow (1700) marked the acme of Slavic Erastianism; henceforth the Russian Church is dormant. A vigorous Christian faith lives on and produces signs and evidences of spiritual life and health. But order, progress, originality, independence are lacking; the true bulwark of popular liberty is overthrown and the meanest of political forces, a salaried and selfish bureaucracy, sets its heel on the necks of the people, silences all free speech and criticism and furnishes the nineteenth century with a spectacle of oppression that Caligula might have imitated with envy. The estates of the Russian Church were confiscated by Catharine in 1764; in return a salary has since then been paid by the government to every ecclesiastic, with the result that the whole order has long since ceased to feel any noble stirrings of independence or any sense of original God-given responsibility for the political or social welfare of the people.<sup>8</sup> Did Gregory VII. need a justification for the resounding defeat he inflicted on Western Cæsarism he would find it in the spectacle of the miserable Russian "pope" of to-day and the servile monasticism of the Empire whose highest ambition is to be the political tool of St. Petersburg at Mount Athos or Jerusalem, New York or San Francisco.

### III.

By an ukase of November 13, 1801, Siestrenczewicz had obtained from Alexander a definitive reorganization of the Roman Catholic College of Justice on lines which made it henceforth the counter-

---

<sup>8</sup> If we pass to the moral authority, to the influence of the Bishops, we shall not be wrong in affirming that it is almost nil. As to pastoral letters, they are never heard of. The discourses they pronounce on solemn occasions no one cares about. They can be haughty in presence of their clergy, can surround themselves with a certain pomp, demand of their inferiors excessive marks of respect, and, alas, are no bolder or more independent in the presence of the great. They know not how to unite Christian humility with sacerdotal firmness; people never hear them speak with an evangelic liberty. Their action on minds, on society, is nil. They seem to be Bishops only for the purpose of figuring in the pomps of the divine office. The ceremonies of worship in the Oriental rite have, it is true, an incomparable majesty; in the Russian Church they are performed with a rare perfection. The voice of chanters lends them a marvelous charm, and all this, as a whole, acquires completeness only by the presidency of the Bishop. This is great; this is fine. But these splendors would make no less impression if the Bishop, on laying aside his magnificent ornaments, remained a Bishop still; if he knew how to raise his voice to instruct the people, to denounce abuses and to defend God's rights on earth and those of the Church, of justice, of the humble and lowly.—Gagarin, "The Russian Church," London, 1872, pp. 194-195.

part of the Holy Synod itself, *i. e.*, a perfect machine for the civil domination of the Catholic Church in the Czar's domains. It was in vain that the Catholic Bishops protested (1804); the momentary yielding of Alexander was followed by hateful suggestions of Siestrenczewicz that the Emperor was modifying the imperial constitution in favor of a Latin power (Rome). The new department was confirmed and its administration turned over finally to the boldest ecclesiastical traitor of the century. He had sought to be a Cardinal; he was now to all intents and purposes an independent patriarch. He filled this governing board of Russian Catholicism with his own creatures, men said to have been devoid of religious morality or conscience; he excluded at the same time all men of virtue and placed in it two dissolute monks, one of whom, the Franciscan Stankiewicz, soon abandoned Catholicism and took a wife publicly in St. Petersburg. Among the members was the Protestant brother of Siestrenczewicz, who, it will be remembered, was a convert. Since then the presence of Protestants in this standing committee on Catholic affairs in Russia has become a tradition. When Pius VII., in the interests of the oppressed Catholics of Russia, sent the legate Tommaso Arezzo to St. Petersburg (1802) the Archbishop of Mohilev procured his dismissal; the presence of a Papal agent would have seriously interfered with the new patriarchal status of Siestrenczewicz. At the same time the latter caused the Emperor to issue an order forbidding Siestrenczewicz or any other Catholic Bishop to hold any communication with Rome. In this act of violence he had the coöperation of the famous Protestant pietist Frau von Krüdener, under whose influence the Emperor had come. A Russian envoy was stationed at Rome (1803), through whose hands all the Catholic affairs of Russia must pass. In 1804 the Russian chancery complimented the Archbishop of Mohilev on his fidelity in executing the imperial will:

The habitual sagacity of Your Excellency and your profound sense of duty, proven by your constant fidelity during a long pastoral life, do not permit us to doubt that you will execute with punctuality the wishes of His Majesty. Thereby you will justify the high esteem in which Your Excellency is held because of your faithful performance of the duties of a good and loyal citizen.

A month later (August, 1804) the Emperor broke off all relations with Rome and practically made the Archbishop of Mohilev the patriarch of all Russian Catholics. He proceeded at once to establish himself as the willing tool of Russian autocracy, but met with a decided opposition from the remaining Catholic Bishops, who insisted firmly on the obedience due to the Holy See and the absolute impossibility of any religious administration of Catholicism whence the former was excluded. In order to overcome the righteous opposition of his brethren Siestrenczewicz suggested to



the imperial chancery a further manipulation of the standing committee on Catholic affairs. Hitherto the six Latin dioceses of Russia had chosen every three years six assessors who, together with the imperial appointees, constituted the "College of Justice" or governing board of Russian Catholicism. Siestrenczewicz proposed to reduce the number of assessors and to withdraw from the dioceses all right of appointment; henceforth the board, diminished by one-half, would be appointed directly and solely by the Czar.

In the above mentioned memoir addressed to Prince Lopouchine, Minister of Justice, and, as we shall see, destined to be kept secret, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Mohilev delivers himself as follows:

These elective members are ignorant as a rule of the civil legislation of the empire; they are also unacquainted with the habits of imperial administration, and are almost entirely unacquainted with the Russian language. The result of all this is seen in the disorder and difficulty that accompany the administration of religious affairs. We may say of these six elective assessors that they are a kind of residents or protectors of all kinds of ancient rights and privileges obtained from Rome. They are not real members of an imperial committee. These men imagine that if they defend the various Roman institutions and privileges they will be held in higher honor by the people of their dioceses than if they execute the laws of Russia. . . . I must say frankly to Your Highness that these six members are nominated according to the imperial decrees of 1800-1801, all of which are contrary to former decrees and to the rules of 1795 for the government of the Catholic clergy. These later decrees are a result of the intrigues and trickery of the monks, whose constant aim it is to have in the college representatives of their own way of thinking. Thereby they hope to maintain the ancient ecclesiastical rights and institutions. We read, for instance, in those decrees that are subsequent to the ancient ukases: "The councils shall be guided in all things according to their own specific rules." Now, these rules dispense them from all submission to any authority other than that of their own superiors. In this way they dispose of considerable ecclesiastical wealth, for which they are accountable and responsible to no one."

Siestrenczewicz dared now to take a further step. To the same memoir he added a proposal for a new constitution to be imposed on the Catholic clergy of Russia. It is nothing less than a revolutionary act, and may be looked on as the first measure of execution of the abominable plans by which the fortune of Catholicism in Russia was all but ruined in the succeeding reigns.

As to the second object (of this memoir)—that is, the proposed constitution for the Roman Catholic clergy—I make known to your Highness that in the composition of this plan I have kept constantly in view the laws and decrees of Russia from 1773 to 1800. The unvarying spirit of this legislation contemplates *the government of the Roman Catholic clergy quite along the lines of that which is provided for the State clergy, according to the same imperial legislation, and without any special exemption or any kind of privilege contrary to the laws of the empire.* This legislation further contemplates the retention of the supreme ecclesiastical authority in the hands of the diocesan Bishop. Each one is to direct in his diocese the entire clergy, both secular and regular, and is to render an account of his administration only to the supreme tribunal for Catholic affairs.

*The plan which I have drawn up is not such as one might expect from a Roman Bishop, but rather such as a faithful subject ought to propose.* Hence, in order to avoid the false interpretations which some ecclesiastics might make of it, on the supposition that the changes thereby effected in the various rules, institutions and privileges obtained by the different dioceses are in some way a violation of religion itself, I humbly beg your Highness, in case you think

It necessary to demand from me the proposed constitution, that it should be communicated to no one else. Your Highness may add to my plan whatever you think useful. You are free also to correct it and, if you desire, to suppress it.

I may state to your Highness that the discontent manifested by badly trained ecclesiastics arises from the fact that *I have at all times tried to guide the clergy according to those ukases of the late Czarina, of blessed memory, and the late Czar, which were issued in 1795, and not according to the Roman institutions and privileges obtained at different epochs, and which are entirely intolerable in a well organized state, etc., etc. St. Petersburg, October 29, 1806.*

In detail the new constitution was the legislation of Catharine in its principal measures, only maliciously recast and arranged by a Roman Catholic Archbishop, who had received from the Holy See the very metropolitan authority by which he was enabled to consummate his daring treason. Among other things he suppressed all canonical collation to benefices and extinguished every trace of independence and autonomy on the part of the religious orders. The chief point of the proposed constitution was the suppression of all appeals to Rome on the plea that by virtue of his canonical institution the metropolitan of Mohilev possessed powers identical with those of the Pope!

Although Siestrenczewicz had asked the Minister to keep secret the contemplated measure, a copy of it made its way into faithful hands. Szantyr, a member of the College, reached the procurator of the Holy Synod, Prince Galitzin, with the complaints of his fellow-Catholics and made it clear that such legislation was equivalent to the extinction of Roman Catholicism. Galitzin was honorable enough to lay these complaints before Alexander, who was a just and kindly man when not deceived by intrigues or blinded by suspicions purposely aroused and nourished. As a matter of fact, the propositions of Siestrenczewicz were abandoned and Catholicism in Russia was saved from the odious yoke of hopeless slavery that its own chief representative had fashioned for it. This did not prevent him from governing in open and contemptuous disregard of the constitutional rights of the other members of the "College;" his known subserviency won only too easily bureaucratic toleration in matters that turned to the disadvantage of Rome and her religion. In particular his laxity in the granting of divorces made him still more odious in the eyes both of Catholics and non-Catholics.

As time wore on the Jesuits became a special object of dislike to Siestrenczewicz. In Russia as in Prussia the civil authority had forbidden the proclamation of the bull of Clement XIV. that dissolved the society. Catharine did not allow its publication even in the Polish provinces, not that she was moved by any interests of Catholicism, but for the sake of education, which would have suffered by the closing of the numerous schools conducted by the Society. She needed them, moreover, for the pacification of a

Catholic population yet smarting under grievous wrongs done by her and whose compulsory apostasy she was yet unable to undertake. She even resisted the demands of the Holy See for the execution of the bull. The Jesuits took the oath of fidelity, after the seizure of White Russia in September, 1772, and were treated thenceforth with distinction and even with partiality. They were assured that the rights of Catholicism would be respected and that they might continue to observe the rules of their order. Siestrenczewicz followed in the footsteps of his imperial mistress, and even permitted the opening of a Jesuit novitiate in 1780. Nor did his attitude change while Paul I. lived. The Emperor was rather favorable to the Society and obtained from Pius VII. (1801) their formal reestablishment in Russia.

The slumbering dislike of Alexander for the Society broke out in 1815. By a decree of December 16 the Jesuit college at St. Petersburg was closed and all members of the society were expelled from that city and from Moscow. No accusation or process, but swift and summary expulsion was their lot. All were arrested in the night of December 22-23, 1815 (January 3-4, 1816), and sent off to Polotzk, whence they were conducted across the frontier. In the homiletic ukase of banishment they are charged with ingratitude, pride and a disturbing spirit. It is said that they undertook to overthrow the immemorial Russian orthodoxy, to sow discord in families and fill the State with disunion, etc. In fact, they had made some remarkable conversions among the better class of Russians, and the haughty ecclesiasticism of Russia had taken umbrage, even begun to tremble.<sup>9</sup> Four years later (1820) they were expelled from Poland, and it was expressly stated that they should never, under any pretext or name, return to the Empire. The principal agent of their disgrace and expulsion was their own co-religionist, Siestrenczewicz, who saw in them only troublesome spectators of his iniquity. He had already (1810) done his best, but in vain, to prevent the nomination of a general in succession to Fr. Gruber, but had been defeated with the aid of Prince Galitzin. Count De Maistre is a sufficient witness of this accusation.

"The true author," he says, "of this great wrong<sup>10</sup> is our wretched felon of an Archbishop, a disguised Protestant. Were I to shake that man's hand I would put on a cowhide glove."

The Protestant temper of Siestrenczewicz showed very clearly in his relations with the propaganda of the Bible Society. Since 1812 the London Society had been making vigorous headway in Russia and eventually distributed nearly 900,000 copies of the Bible, with-

<sup>9</sup> See the interesting narrative, "Les Jésuites en Russie, récit d'un Jésuite de la Russie blanche," Paris, 1872.

<sup>10</sup> Correspondance diplomatique, II., 305.

out note or comment, in all parts of that vast Empire, besides causing the Bible to be translated into some twenty vernaculars. It had also established nearly three hundred branches. This un-Catholic and often anti-Catholic enterprise appealed to so un-Catholic a man as Siestrenczewicz, especially as in the beginning Emperor Alexander was not opposed to the methods and the spirit of the colporteurs. The Archbishop of Mohilev went farther; in a pastoral letter he falsified, with true Byzantine audacity, a decree of the Council of Trent and an almost contemporary letter of Pius VI. For this he was severely reproached by Pius VII. in a letter of September 3, 1816, something that concerned him less than Alexander's contemporary withdrawal of his favor from the proselytizing endeavors of the Bible Society. The Pope's arguments touched the Emperor; he caused the brief to be made public and expelled the agents of the Society.

One of the grievous wounds of Polish society in the eighteenth century had been the ease and frequency of divorce. It is said that only in England was divorce then so common. The nobles and the wealthy were, of course, the principal sinners; as late as 1840 it is stated that every year the small diocese of Minsk could show from two to three hundred divorces. When Alexander sought (1825), at the Diet of Warsaw, the abrogation of civil marriage he was strongly opposed by the Polish nobility, and put his will through only with difficulty and with the aid of the episcopate. Yet the newly adopted Code Civil of Napoleon was in open opposition to the rights of the Church and contradicted formally the provisions of the Council of Trent. Siestrenczewicz made no effort to withstand this product of license and infidelity; on the contrary, his venal court continued to encourage such appeals and gave at all times a wretched example to lesser diocesan chanceries.

The failure of Napoleon, apropos of the Russian campaign (1813), to realize the hopes aroused by his short-lived creation of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw (1796-1813) was followed by the re-incorporation with the Russian state of a multitude of Poles who had been hoping in the last two decades for the restoration of the ancient kingdom. The constitution of 1815 guaranteed the exercise of the Catholic religion, and in 1817 the Polish hierarchy was reorganized by Pius VII. Warsaw was made an archiepiscopal see with seven suffragans. The Uniats had still their see of Chelm, with its two hundred parishes. The Emperor, however, continued to put obstacles in the way of communication with Rome, and no young Pole was allowed to visit a foreign university without special permission. Alexander, however, was not unfriendly to Poland; her sons, not without reason, expected at one time the restoration by him of the

venerable "Respublica." Perhaps the spread in his own dominions by the returned soldiers of political liberalism, the growth of secret societies, the increase of patriotic literature and the unhealthy religious atmosphere that surrounded him, were responsible for the abandonment of the noble ideas that he had once entertained and discussed with Adam Czartoryski, and which that noble Pole enshrined for posterity in his famous castle of Pulawy among the relics of his country's fame and greatness. Certainly he was a truer "Pan Tadeusz" than Napoleon, and might have earned, under better auspices, the immortality that Mickiewicz had the bestowal of. In the very year of his death (1825) he ordered the construction of two Catholic churches, one for the Uniat Ruthenians at St. Petersburg, the other for Latin Catholics at Tsarkoe-Selo. The Uniats, moreover, had increased notably in his reign. In 1801 they were 1,398,048; in 1825 they had reached the figure of 1,427,359, an increase kept up until 1834, when they were 1,504,278.

#### IV.

Did Alexander I. die a Roman Catholic? The evidence for this assertion is not slight or contemptible. In his early youth he seems to have been influenced against Christianity by his French tutor, Laharpe. But the conflagration of Moscow (1812) made a great change in him; thenceforth he resolved to conduct his high office on the most elevated Christian principles. At the Congress of Verona he is reported to have declared that God did not give him an army of 800,000 men for purposes of mere human ambition, but to restore religion, morality and justice to their proper place and to establish anew the reign of order. He became a man of prayer and meditation. It is true that he fell under the influence of German Pietism through Frau von Krüdener, and of the Illuminati through Nicholas Bergasse and Jung-Stilling. But, on the other hand, he was accessible to the religious influence of Madame Swetchine and others of the little coterie of Russian converts to Catholicism. Joseph de Maistre had not lived in vain at the court of St. Petersburg; the elevated concept of the Church and the Pope that shines from that great statesman's pages must have been often laid before Alexander. The Emperor had also met Cardinal Consalvi at London and Vienna, not to speak of many noble and religious émigrés who made Russia their home in those troubled years. Large religious ideas led him to the famous scheme of the Holy Alliance with Prussia and Austria that was supposed to establish compulsory peace on the basis of the Christian Scriptures. The Bible Societies and even the Quakers won a temporary or occa-

sional approval from him; he was an emotional Slav, and as such accessible to profound mystical considerations. Religious unity is the condition of spiritual peace, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that this great warrior, turned an apostle of peace, should come to see that the first condition of lasting religious peace was the restoration of ancient concord. It is said that at the Congress of Aachen (1817) he conversed at length on the Catholic religion with Müllejans, the Catholic pastor of the neighboring village of Würfelen. He sent a donation to the Catholic curé at Geneva and expressed his pleasure that the Holy Father was contented with this gift. In September, 1822, he conversed for two hours on religious subjects with the holy priest Alexander von Hohenlohe. At the end he fell on his knees before the good priest and rising embraced him tenderly. Later he invited him to St. Petersburg, where he frequently saw him. When Alexander was at Vienna in 1822 his mother begged him not to go to Rome, as though she feared the influence of the Father of Christendom. When his brother Constantine married a Catholic Princess of Polish birth he renounced his birthright in favor of his younger brother, Nicholas (II.). Alexander did not make this known officially; it is possible that he meant to wait and see what would follow from his own proposed conversion. If that were accepted by the people Constantine might still reign over Russia.

Alexander was fond of the Piedmontese nobleman, Count Michaud. Moroni states in his "Dizionario" that in 1825 this gentleman was sent by Alexander to Leo XII. with the secret announcement of the imperial intention to put an end to the schism of his people and abjure the errors of Photius, even at the price of martyrdom. Count Michaud was to request of the Holy Father that he send to St. Petersburg a trustworthy religious, either a Camoldolese or a Franciscan. The first choice of the Pope fell on Mauro Capellari, later Gregory XVI., and then on the Franciscan (later Cardinal) Orioli. While the latter was getting ready for his journey the news came that the Emperor had passed away (November 19—December 1, 1825) at Taganrog, in Southern Russia. Moroni asserts (lix., 110, and xxxviii., 57) that he had this information from the lips of Gregory, who also told him that for a certainty Alexander I. had died a Catholic death. In 1844 the Prince de Polignac asserted that he had seen at Paris in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a despatch saying that Alexander had confessed to a Roman Catholic priest, abjured the Greek Schism and received the last sacraments. It is possible that Fedotof, the Queen's confessor, who attended him, was himself a crypto-Catholic. One is naturally reminded of the death-bed conversion of Charles II., the hurried

visit of the Benedictine Huddlesfield and the devotion of the Duke of York. It is said that when leaving St. Petersburg Alexander bade the Dominicans keep ready an apartment for a priest who would come from Rome. During his stay in Poland he paid a nocturnal visit to a Dominican church and had the Blessed Sacrament exposed for the satisfaction of his devotion. It is said also that the Venerable Anna Maria Taigi beheld in her "mystic sun" that the Emperor had died a Catholic death and was in Purgatory. The narrative of Moroni is confirmed by a written statement (August 22, 1841) of the Count d'Escarène, to the effect that Count Michaud had related to him the fact of his mission to Leo XII. Father Gagarin, a distinguished Russian Jesuit and a scholarly writer on Russian affairs, states that he knew a respectable man to whom Count Michaud had related the same. Gagarin also says that it was a Greek Uniat monk who heard the confession of Alexander on his death-bed. It seems certain that there are at Rome and elsewhere authentic documents that confirm the death of the Emperor in the unity of the Roman Church.<sup>11</sup>

## V.

Though Siestrencewicz died in communion with the Apostolic See, he had accomplished, as far as in him lay, the separation of Roman Catholicism in Russia from its rightful head and guide. He was filled with the spirit of schism, and during his too long life abetted all its principles and executed all its designs. He might have imitated a Basil before Modestus, and exhibited a true Bishop to men who had never seen one, or withstood the tyranny of Russian bureaucracy as Eusebius of Vercelli and Dionysius of Milan withstood Constantius when he declared that he was their canon law. Instead of giving full play to the intrinsic power of resistance that yet existed among the Ruthenian and Latin Catholics of Russia he paralyzed all their ardor, misdirected all their efforts, suppressed all their protests, laid bare all their affection for Rome to the worst enemy of Rome. He had only to look about him to behold what ravages had been worked among the Russian clergy by the civil domination of the Czars. It seems as if God had permitted the unspeakable results we yet behold as an eternal warning to the Latin Church of what state control means, and an eternal incitement to enter on the way of martyrdom rather than accept the yoke of secular protection and favor when coupled with authoritative control.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Moroni, "Dizionario," LIX., 110; XXXVIII., 57; "Civiltà Cattolica (ninth series), XII., 349-352; "Etudes Religieuses," July, 1877, 26-50.

<sup>12</sup> Tondini, "The Pope of Rome and the Popes of the Oriental Orthodox

The Archbishop of Mohilev was in reality a Prussianized official of the Holy Synod at St. Petersburg for the suppression of all religious liberty among Russian Catholics of either rite. The conquerors and oppressors of these populations knew too well how profoundly religious the latter were and how fierce would be their resistance to the "benevolent assimilation" contemplated, were they to be left in living contact with the Catholicism of Europe. Hence the cunning plan of cutting the nerve of unity and then overthrowing them at intervals and when occasion offered. Poland made an heroic resistance; the fate of the Uniats remains to be told. It is only when we look upon the pitiable internal condition of Russia that we understand the true significance of St. Anselm of Canterbury and St. Thomas à Becket and a hundred other men of the mediæval world who withstood the contemporary tyrant and suffered, that coming generations might not perish spiritually. The ignorance and apathy of the unhappy Russian peasantry are directly traceable to their clergy, whose only excuse is that they are yet the public serfs of the Russian State. On all sides are heard to-day the voices of Russian men and women demanding that an end be put to their horrible wrongs. Only the voices of the clergy are dumb. No Bishop speaks from his monastic retreat, and no village priest dare open his mouth were he fitted to do so. The monastic clergy despises the poor and brutalized secular clergy, and the latter pay back contempt with hatred. No Bishop dare consult with another Bishop, and in the episcopal committee that governs in minute detail the Russian Church the sole real power is the lay representative of the Czar. Were the alleged spiritual tyranny of Rome to be multiplied a hundredfold it would not equal that which for two centuries has been exercised immediately on every Russian, and for a still longer time has hampered the growth of all true religion. All the rich treasures that lie in the natural development of ecclesiastical personality, *i. e.*, independence of judgment, initiative, active sympathy, progress and development, are wasted. From beginning to end ecclesiastical life in Russia is a professional *carriera*, like that of a notary or a civil servant. "Would you have me

---

Church," London, 1871, and Gagarin, *op. cit. passim*. cf. also "Of the White and the Black Clergy of Russia," Leipzig, 1866 (Russian), for the details of the spiritual ruin of Russia. The reader may also consult "The Patriarch and the Tzar—Replies of the Humble Nicon by the Mercy of God, Patriarch of Moscow," London, 1871. That the condition of the Russian clergy under the State domination has not changed may be seen from many books of travel, particularly from Wallace's "Russia," London, 1881: c. IV. "The Village Priest," pp. 50-67, and c. XXVII, pp. 421-434. This writer is not unfavorable to Russia, and was afforded every facility during six years for the composition of his work. In more than one place he manifests a certain jealousy of Catholic ecclesiastical independence.



become like the Archbishop of Moscow or the Archbishop of Canterbury?" said Leo XIII. one day to a prominent Archbishop of the United States, apropos of his relations with the Italian Government. What surer commentary on the historical steps that reduced these ecclesiastics from their free and independent status to the rank of civil agents? In the wake of civil control of ecclesiastical life follow always ambition and corruption. Secularism of every kind invades the sanctuary.<sup>18</sup> The Gospel of Jesus and the examples of His saints are made vain or serve only the vices they openly condemn. Nepotism becomes an institution, and the civil and ecclesiastical prizes are placed on one level to be struggled for with an equal human ardor of rivalry. Thus the vanquished paganism of ancient life returns to power, the distinction of temporal and spiritual is lost or overlaid, and soon the multitudes envelop in a

<sup>18</sup> It may not be out of place to quote here the words of an estimable historian of the Tudor religious policy, that, *mutatis mutandis*, has been adopted by Russia since Peter the Great:

"Under Henry VIII. the true liberties and independence of the Church, as they had been set forth afresh by Magna Charta, were successfully destroyed. These fell with the fall of the monasteries and their inmates, and became extinct with the old and estimable race of Bishops and clergy. The iron will of a cruel despot, whom anger and covetousness alternately excited to action, with the Machiavellian policy of his selfish advisers, soon brought all this evil to pass. Parliaments and parliament-men, new nobles and pinchbeck knights of the shires were as abjectly subservient to the impetuous monarch as the judges themselves. Old laws were interpreted and new enactments were passed with little regard to aught else than the cruel king's shifting whims. Ofttimes, in the interpretation of such oppressive laws, every principle of truth and justice, of right and fair play was set at naught, so that under this royal house nothing less than the subversion of the ancient Constitution of England was successfully effected. The malign influence of these changes and such as these can be clearly traced, and are practically energizing still. The overthrow of lawful ecclesiastical authority, by denuding the Courts of Canterbury and York of their spiritual character (neither by any rational conception nor reasonable possibility being final courts), made those of a local character unrespected and inefficient; while some of these diocesan courts became at once, and have remained ever since the Tudor age, mere nests of corruption, and little else than sources of revenue to those who were appointed to farm them. The granting of licenses was a prolific and well-worked mine of ready money for their hungry officials. In this and in other changes evil principles were then deliberately scattered and rooted, and still live, while, even in the present generation, a fresh crop of rotten fruit may be expected to be picked up ere long. For the destruction of Church authority, a fair tree cut down, as it were, to its very roots, has alarmingly weakened that of the monarch and the magistrate, and tended directly to destroy all authority. An ancient nation consequently, which, with Christian traditions twelve centuries old, expects to be governed wisely and well without the fear of God or the regard of man, and so long only as a mere contract or understanding between governor and governed can be tolerated and made to work, will be very specially and unusually favored if it does not—which God avert!—sooner or later experience a severe fall and court a supreme disaster.—Frederick George Lee, "Edward VI.: Supreme Head," London, 1886, pp. 243-244.

common contempt the principles of Christianity and the lives of its representatives.

Siestrenczewicz let pass a golden opportunity. Perhaps we ought to take into account that he was an ex-courtier, a not too sincere convert from Protestantism, and that he entered on his holy office *per fenestram*, and not by the open and honorable door of vocation. He betrayed every interest of the Roman Church, as though the dominant instinct in him were always that of his native Calvinism. He betrayed every interest of his Polish fatherland, for had he remained loyal to the cause of Catholicism he might have been a powerful intermediary between the patriots of Poland and their conquerors. The vain insurrections of 1831 and 1864 might through him have accomplished their purpose in a peaceful way instead of leaving their nation bleeding on the cross for a whole century. Above all he might have held up to the enslaved State clergy of Russia an example of ecclesiastical independence that would one day quicken them into the successful resistance of martyrdom. The attitude of the Archbishop of Mohilev is all the more inexcusable, as precisely in those years that noble sufferer Pius VII. was giving the world the example of a renewal of the spirit and temper of Martin I. and Gregory VII. Not the least of the trials of Pope Pius was the conduct of Siestrenczewicz. If the Catholics of Ireland were ever tempted to grant the right of veto to the English Government on the occasion of Catholic Emancipation, the career of Siestrenczewicz and its effect upon the hopes of Polish nationality might well have deterred them. The anti-Catholic advisers of Catharine—German, French and Slav—judged only too correctly when they pointed out Siestrenczewicz as the proper man to fasten the yoke on the neck of Poland. For this purpose he was worth to Russia a million of men and countless treasure. He did more damage to Catholicism in Russia than a great heresiarch could have done. The latter would have roused devotion and purified the Church; the Archbishop of Mohilev stood in the pass and held back the vigorous resistance of that glorious nation which had been for so many centuries the bulwark of Europe against Islam. He also prepared the way for the crowning injustice of Russian policy in the nineteenth century—the destruction of the amity and concord that for centuries had existed between the Apostolic See and millions of Russian Catholics. It is he who is primarily responsible for their compulsory apostasy and inscription on the mendacious registers of schism. He was a true disciple of Photius and Michael Cærularius; there is scarcely an evil trait in the lives of these two bad men which he did not parallel—ambition, venality, hypocrisy, forgery, cant, and ecclesiastical treason too

frequent and manifold to relate. On the other hand, Russia has now begun to pay on the dearest scale for the luxury of such Byzantine rascality. Her legions, returning from the far Orient, decimated, humiliated, deceived, will be a ten-fold worse menace to the criminal autocracy than were those victorious veterans of Alexander I., who nearly wrecked the Russian State. There is no native esteem for ecclesiastical authority; the Russian Church seems a pale mitred simulacrum with an icon in one hand and a cross in the other, but without spirit or voice, without initiative, without historical pride, knowing herself only as a department of the imperial chancery, and destined to share its fate, perhaps its abolition. The makers of the New Russia will be moved by the logic of the situation to neglect a church that has become at once an *instrumentum regni* and a scourge of society. The new education will be conducted without her influence and her spirit, for they exist not. The new principles of government will be perforce borrowed from abroad. Russia will this time undergo a cosmopolitan pressure as she once was subservient to Berlin or Paris. Individual right and personal liberty must grow slowly where the urban population is so small compared with the vast masses of ignorant and debased peasantry. Her only chance will be to go to school again to Roman Catholic models and institutions as she did in the latter half of the seventeenth century. She will need again to appeal to the centre of religious life in the West in order to develop some vigor of spirit, some measure of independent life in the spiritual system that holds torpid and stagnant the hearts of her multitudes. Then will come true the vision that hung before the eyes of her dying Alexander, and will be repaired, though tardily, the villainy of the ecclesiastical tools whom she used to her own destruction.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Washington, D. C.

---

## THE ANGLO-ROMAN CONTROVERSY.

### I.

TWO recent facts have indirectly turned men's attention once again to the controversy between Catholics and Anglicans—the recent High Anglican appeal to the authority of the first six centuries and Bishop Gore's sixpenny reissue (unrevised) of his "Roman Catholic Claims." A word, therefore, on the subject may not seem unseasonable.

The point, and the whole point, at issue between the contending parties, we shall do well to remember, is wholly and solely the question of authority. Who is the Supreme Head of the Church?