

violence of that kind, which, on the contrary, can only do it injury. But in condemning the stone-throwing it must not fail to be well noted that Tipperary has had to suffer during the past week from violence of quite another and far more dangerous kind. Ugly as missile as a stone is, it is harmless compared with bullets and buckshot, and regrettable as are the broken windows which the people in their excitement left after them on Wednesday night, they are a very small grievance beside the bullet-wounds and the buckshot-wounds for which Dr. O'Ryan treated the poor boys with whose blood the demoralised police sought to celebrate the anniversary of Mitchelstown. It is easy for us to blame the stone-throwers, but when we think of Tipperary town as it now is, in possession of a regular army corps of swash-buckling Royal Irish, who, at the slightest provocation, take to discharging their murderous rifles down narrow streets at groups of boys, and who appear possessed with the ambition to emulate in Tipperary the bloody glories of Youghal and Mitchelstown and Timoleague, one begins to understand the angry spirit which is roused there. Two wrongs don't make a right, however, and self-restraint under provocation and quiet contemptuous reliance on its own invincible might is the most becoming policy for gallant Tipperary.

ORIGIN OF THE TEMPORAL POWER.

(From a paper read by Mr. W. J. Sparrow, L.L.D., at the Conference of the Catholic Young Men's Society of England, in Hull, on Monday, August 5.)

FOR 30 years the Christian is continued to be the most loyal of the subjects of the empire, and in all things lawful to render obedience to the Emperor of Rome. But from the time when Constantine removed the seat of the empire to Constantinople, there never reigned in Rome a temporal prince to whom the Pontiff owed a permanent allegiance. From that moment God liberates this Church. The donation of Constantine, as it is called, does not mean, as is generally supposed, a deed of gift, a formally signed piece of parchment, nor any other charter; it consisted in the fact that, moved by God, the Emperor Constantine departed from Rome to Constantinople, and removed the seat of the Roman Empire to the latter city. It is sometimes urged that Rome was included in the empire of the Greek Emperors, and appeared in the list of territories subject to their sway; but, although it may have been so described by courtly sycophants, and although the emperors may have called themselves monarchs of a domain which included Rome within its ambit, yet, in truth and in fact, Rome enjoyed complete independence under the Roman Pontiff from the time when Constantine departed from Italy. A not widely known state of facts existed in the case of our own country (England). Britain was included in the Roman Empire, and the Roman Emperors professed to regard it as part of the land over which they exercised dominion long after the last of the Roman legions had departed from its shores, and, nevertheless, all historians agree that from that moment Britain became independent. Why should anyone, then, hesitate to apply the same principles of reasoning to the city of Rome? Rome itself was saved from the barbarians, both Greek and Hun, only by the fortitude of its Bishops, who turned back Attila and Genseric when in sight of its walls. We find this fact—that is, the independence of the Roman Pontiff—recognised again and again in the history of the world. When Pepin drove out the Lombards, we are expressly told that he made restitution to the Church and the Commonwealth of the city of Rome of the territory that had been wrongfully taken from them by the Lombards. Again, when Charlemagne delivered Rome from its foes, he expressly declares that he restored it, not gave it, to the Pope; that he made a restitution, not a donation. Rome and the surrounding country have, from the time when the seat of empire was removed to the East, stood clear of all sovereignties. Resting on a sovereignty of their own, they have owed allegiance to none—have been included in no Empire. From that time the Pope has reigned as a temporal prince. No man has given him his rights. He is first and earliest in the list of Christian sovereigns. When Britain was a mixture of swamp and forest, amid which the painted savages wandered and fought, the Vicar of Christ was a temporal prince. If there be any property sacred upon this earth the patrimony of the Church is pre-eminently sacred. The patrimony of the Church consisted originally of twenty-three distinct portions, and wherever was the patrimony of the Church there was the seed of civilisation, there were savages freed, arts and learning flourished, and order rose out of chaos. So imperfectly are Englishmen, even of the educated classes, acquainted with history that although the story of Europe teems with countless examples of the works of love and charity of the Church from which her temporal and political power arose, few of our compatriots have any knowledge of the fact, but regard the Papal power as the growth of despotism and darkness, raised by the usurping ambition of avicious Pontiffs and the exercise of what they call presteraft. The Pope, then, claims his temporal power and the Papal dominions by titles such as no other sovereign can show. We are some times told by our opponents that St. Peter had no temporal power, that the early Church possessed neither patrimony nor sovereignty, and this is true. The Church will flourish without the temporal power, but it will flourish in strife and persecution. The choice is between the Vatican and the Catacombs. A picture is sometimes held up to us of the Pope without any temporal dominions ruling his Church as a purely spiritual prince, free from all earthly cares and independent of all earthly princes; and this picture has its attractions for some Catholics; but, alluring though it may be, it is quite impossible of realisation. The Pope could not be the subject of any sovereign and if he resided in the dominions of any prince he must either be subject to him, or possess temporal power and be an independent sovereign. If the Pope were residing in the dominions of some monarch, perpetual difficulties would arise as to relations with that monarch, all the existing questions between the Church and the State would in his person arise in tenfold, nay, in a thousandfold greater degree. But

those who desire the attainment of this dream more commonly propose to themselves the idea of the Pope with absolute independence, although with no special locality under his temporal dominion. Knowing what we do of the history and feelings of mankind, we can hardly think that the authors of this scheme have ever seriously considered the possibility of its realisation. That earthly prince who would permit the Sovereign Pontiff to reside in his dominion without attempting to exercise any pressure upon him, without attempting to interfere with his spiritual functions, has never yet existed, and never will exist so long as human nature remains what it is. In short, it is a dilemma. If the Pope is to be subject to the civil power of some one else, he cannot exercise his spiritual functions, and if, "assuming it to be possible, which it is not," he were not to be subject, he would be an independent sovereign. The terrible complications that would ensue if the Vicar of Christ were resident in the dominions of some other prince transcend description, nay, almost surpass imagination. What political intrigues! what treachery! what confusion! The temporal power is the shelter, the guardian and protector of the spiritual. Destroy the temporal power, and you return to the times of persecution. The Church will not perish, the gates of hell will not prevail against her, but she will have, as in the beginning, to exercise her spiritual power through seas of fire and waves of blood, through constant struggles and through endless persecutions. At the present moment, in this year of Our Lord, 1889, the rulers of the Kingdom of Italy dare not grant to the people the right of voting. Their Parliament is elected by an insignificant minority of the nation, and the reason for this miserable mockery of freedom is, as they themselves admit, the intense Catholicity of the great mass of the community. The real people of Italy are Catholic to their hearts' core, and were they allowed to express their wishes, were they but entrusted with a constitution like England or America, they would speedily sweep out the swarm of infidels and renegades who are masquerading as the representatives of the Italian people. But even if the facts were the reverse of what they are, it is probably the first time in the history of the world that the desire of a robber for the goods of his victim was solemnly urged as a justification of his robbery. The inhabitants of the Papal States were well contented with their lot, as indeed they had good reason to be. A revolution may be lawful under certain circumstances. If the people find their rulers acting in such a way as to involve in fact the moral and social existence of the State, the people in self-defence are justified in protecting themselves. And so has the Church judged again and again; but not only was there no justification for a revolution in the Papal States, but in fact there was no revolution. By force, by the guile and arms of foreigners was the Holy Father deprived of his dominions. But this is no new or strange experience. Nine times has the city of Rome been in the hands of usurpers. Thirty Popes have been compelled to leave Rome; four were imprisoned; seven reigned in exile at Avignon; four were unable even to visit the Eternal City. There has hardly been a century during which the Papal dominions have not been ravaged, dismembered or usurped. The Temporal Sovereignty, as history teaches us, is always being assailed, but history always teaches us it invariably is restored. Nowhere is the marvellous manner of Providence shown more clearly than in the story of these restorations. The hands used to do this service have often been the most unlikely, humanity speaking, for the purpose. Often has the Pope been restored by those who, judging by the world's standard of reason and policy, were most interested in his destruction.

REFRESHING A FRIENDSHIP.

(From the *Nation*, September 7.)

THE great meeting in the Leinster Hall on Tuesday night—a meeting larger in point of numbers than any indoor meeting ever before held in the city, and as enthusiastic and unanimous in spirit and feeling—occurred at a most appropriate moment. When the air is full of rumours as to the plots of Mr. Baifour, and the weak surrender of the Irish people to his blandishments, it was well that this great demonstration of welcome to the representatives of our English allies should have taken place, and that the principles of the alliance should be affirmed and republished before all men. The demonstration was participated in by all classes and creeds; and if the prophets who cheer the idea of a sectarian wedge could have seen the welcome accorded to the Protestant Rector of Kenmare by the large body of Catholic clergymen present, and heard the derisive laughter with which the latter greeted the prophecy that they were to be bribed from their allegiance to a cause to which they have always rendered the services of loyal and unselfish patriots, the prophets would be silent for a while. The whole proceedings were a grand exhibition of the charitable and tolerant spirit that is the breath of National life in Ireland, and a testimony that neither flatterer nor firebrand shall change it. They witnessed, too, to the unbreakable union that exists between the people of Great Britain and the people of Ireland. It is a union founded on a basis that transcends the petty policies of the moment—a basis of high intention, lofty motive, and truthful and righteous purpose. When the orators set themselves, as Mr. Stansfeld declared at the start he would do, to sink temporary and accidental issues, and to turn to the "principles, policy, and great objects," which are the life of the present movement, the mists disappeared. It only needed the eloquent statement of the position of the great Liberal party which Mr. Stansfeld made to do that, and it only needed the hearty acceptance of his position on the part of the assembled thousands, to show that the attitude of the advocates of Irish liberty here and Great Britain towards one another is unchanged and unchangeable.

For what is the position which Mr. Stansfeld takes up? He does not mounce his words in order not to frighten the old women of the political arena. He defines it as the characteristic of the Liberal attitude towards Ireland that they believe in the fact of Irish nationality. Whatever plan, or scheme, or Bill they offer for the settlement