EUROPE.

Daring, Adroit and Heavy Robbery in a Bank in England.

Nine Thousand Nine Hundred Pounds Sterling Stolen in an Instant.

M. Rochefort on Citizen Soldier Rights in France.

The Papal Council—Its Progress and Decrees.

German Position Towards Infallibility and the Pontifical "Schemata" in Reply.

The German mail steamship Main, Captain Von Oterendorp, from Bremen the 5th and Southampton the 6th of February, arrived at this port yesterday morning, bringing our special European correspondence and newspaper mail reports, in detail of our cable telegrams, dated to her day of sailing from England.

The London *Echo* of the 7th inst. reports:—

The owner of the schooner yacht Cambria has been elected Commodore of the Harwich Yacht Club.

The Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria will visit Dalmatia and the Hungarian border during the month of April. The steam yacht Greif has received orders to prepare to convey his Majesty.

The Emperor Alexander of Russia conferred on Mme. Patti the Order of Merit, at the same time appointing her first singer at the Court. The decoration is set with diamonds, and surmounted with the imperial crown.

A despatch from Vienna of February 7, says:—"First performance of 'Vert-Vert' at the Carl Theatre. Immense success. Offenbach himself conducted the orchestra. Encores numerous."

In Rome the Maronite Bishops assembled at the Council, and also some French prelates, signed a protest, demanding the suppression of permanent armies, as being contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. At the same time some others, and among them the Patriarchs of the East, declared against the law penalty of death.

The state of the works on the Mont Cenis Tunnel on the 31st of January was as follows:—During the month, 65 metres (3 feet 3 1-3 inches each) were executed from the south and 44m. 55c. from the north; the total completed being 10,707m. 80c. There are still 1,512m. 20c. to be accomplished.

The mails from the Cape of Good Hope arrived at Liverpool on the 7th of February. The dates are:—Old Calabar, 4th; Fernando Po, 5th; Bonny, 10th; Benin, 11th; Lagos, 15th; Cape Coast Castle, 16th; Cape Palmas, 18th, and Sierra Leone, 21st of January. Trade was dull in Brass River in consequence of fighting between the native tribes. Fernando Po, Bonny, Lagos, Accra, Cape Coast Castle, Cape Palmas and Sierra Leone were healthy, but trade at each port dull.

Bombay, India, telegrams of the 4th of February report:—

Seven lb. shirtings, 5r. 6a.; 8¼ lb. do., 6r. 6a.; 40's mule twist, 12a.; market quiet. Cotton quiet; fair Dhollerah, 28sr.; fair Oomrawattee, 30sr. Exchange on London, six months' bank bills, 1s. 11 13-16d. Five per cent government securities, 108½; five and a half per cent do., 112½. Freights to Liverpool—Going ships, 34s.

ENGLAND.

Daring and Most Adroit Robbery in a Bank—Nine Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty Pounds Sterling Stolen—A Bank Clerk Has the Money Chained to His Body, yet Loses It—New York Thieves' Eclat in Danger.

[From the London Standard, Feb. 7.]

A robbery remarkable for its daring and the amount of booty obtained by the thief took place on Saturday. A collecting clerk for the bank of Messrs. Barnett & Co., Lombard Street, went to the Birbeck Deposit Bank on business, and while waiting for his turn put his bill case, containing bank notes for £9,950 on the counter. It was attached by a strong chain to his waist and he kept his hand upon it. The space was much crowded, and some person touched him on the shoulder and said he had dropped a piece of paper, which, on looking, he saw at his feet. The ruse was successful. He stooped to pick up the paper and on rising fancied he saw a hand leaving the bill case. He at once looked at it and saw his notes gone. He gave an alarm, but it was too late. There are four ways of egress from Southampton buildings—three into Holborn and one into Chancery lane, and the robber thus easily eluded pursuit. A reward of £1,000 is offered for the apprehension of the thief.

[From the London Standard, Feb. 8.]

A robbery of £9,950 in Bank of England notes, from a London bank counter in broad daylight, under the very nose of its custodian, is an incident which seems to belong rather to the earlier volumes of the *Annual Register* than to a newspaper record of our own day. Described in a romance, or represented on the stage, it would be set down as a romance, or, at any rate, a sensation. The daring and dexterity of the thief must have equalled, at least, anything attributed, authentically or not, to George Barrington. A clerk, acting as a collector, has secured to his body, by a strong chain, a bill-case containing this large amount of property, which, on entering a banking house in Southampton buildings, he rested on the counter while awaiting his turn. Numbers of persons are present; the space, in fact, is unusually crowded. Some one touches him on the shoulder, pointing to a piece of paper on the ground; he stoops, rises, fancies he sees "a hand leaving his bill-case," looks, and it is empty. The notes are gone; the hand and its owner have vanished. No person near is of suspicious appearance, so he rushes into the street; nobody seems to be hurrying away; but, as he could not look down four thoroughfares, at once pursuit is out of the question. The treasure is as clean gone as if it had been melted away. Now, we will not at present ask how the depository of so much wealth came to be so easily picked or moralize upon the iniquitous deceptive eye, popularly believed to be on everybody at once, in banks especially; but the circumstance is undoubtedly calculated to excite no little alarm, as proving not merely that our supposed precautions are liable to fail in a manner the most unaccountable, but also that we have still among us fingers as light as any immortalized in the Newgate calendar—rogues who can lay their plans to an instant of time, face a hundred hostile chances to one, do their spiriting with electric quickness and, with celerity, disappear. That is to say, unless it should turn out that some of the respectable looking individuals whom the young man did not suspect, and who were not running away, should prove after all to be the criminals. In that event the case would be none the less extraordinary, since it would imply an instantaneous command of demeanor and physiognomy after a moment which must have been one of great excitement, and was certainly one of supreme danger, utterly marvellous. This is the very legerdemain of robbery. It allowed of no preparation—the deed had to be done quickly or not at all. It was done, and in the face of a crowd at the very elbow of the unfortunate collector, and no trace remained. The rogues were off with their booty, leaving him helpless.

DESCRIPTION OF THE MONEY LOST.

[From the London Times, Feb. 7.

* * * Meanwhile, the robbery having been committed within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Police, the circumstances were brought under the notice of Colonel Henderson, the Chief Commissioner, and Superintendent Thomson, of the Bow street police division, is now aiding in discovering and arresting the person by whom the robbery was committed. The two forces being thus engaged in a common object, and brought under the influence of a strong feeling of professional rivalry, to say nothing of a reward, in which, we believe, the police as a rule are precluded from participating, the perpetrator of this daring robbery ought not to be long at large. With this view, we have been asked as a particular favor to describe the stolen notes, in order to put people on their guard against receiving them. The description of the notes is the same as that given by advertisement in the columns of the HERALD.]

Matrimony—Divorce—An Unfaithful Lover.

Mr. Bewicke, of Threepwood Hall, was defendant in an action for slander in the Court of Common Pleas, London. The plaintiff, Mr. Jones, is father to Mr. Bewicke's wife, and the latter had obtained a divorce, upon which Mr. Bewicke wrote sundry abusive letters to Mr. Jones, which contained the passages complained of as "slanderous and libellous." In the course of the trial, Lord Penzance, having been subpœnaed, was called, appeared on the bench, and was about to be sworn to prove the evidence given in the Divorce Court, over which his Lordship presides. Mr. Justice Byles would not allow Lord Penzance to be sworn. A scene also occurred in consequence of defendant accusing Justice Byles of wishing to "malversate" justice. Upon this he was ordered into the custody of the tipstaff, but was forgiven on apologizing. The jury gave the plaintiff £600 damages.

A railroad compensation case was tried in the Bail Court, London, the plaintiff being the nursery governess at Mill Hill, near Hendon, who was found insensible on the line and it was at the time supposed that she had been assaulted and thrown out. Her statement is that she was alone, and that no one entered the carriage; that on the journey she felt a sudden shock and found herself falling through the open door. She received a concussion of the brain. The Midland Railway Company, who were the defendants, expressed regret at the accident, but contended that plaintiff must have opened the carriage door herself. The jury returned a verdict for £500.

A "breach of promise" case, Goad *vs.* Rigg, attracted a considerable audience to the Court of Exchequer. The plaintiff is a lady nineteen years of age, the daughter of a gentleman of very high rank in the British army; and the defendant a gentleman of the highest possible respectability, member of an English mercantile firm. Sergeant Ballantine said he had agreed to accept as damages the sum of £2,000, which had been offered by the Solicitor General on behalf of the defendant. A verdict was accordingly so entered.

FRANCE.

The Trade "Strikes" and Industrial Organization—Tactics of the Parliamentary Opposition—Prospects of Premier Ollivier—The Bonaparte-Noir Case—Traupmann Again.

PARIS, Feb. 6, 1870.

The Creuzot strike is at an end. If it had succeeded there would have been other strikes throughout the country. The government has proofs. A campaign is in course of preparation against the present Cabinet. The big guns are ready to open fire and hostilities will soon commence. Several journals, especially the *Peuple Français* and the *France*, have indicated clearly that a storm is brewing. A direct attack against the government was premeditated when the demand for permission to prosecute M. Rochefort was made. The impossibility of success by direct attack was demonstrated on that occasion and now the Cabinet is to be undermined. Every assurance will be given that it is not the intention of the opposition to create difficulties for the present Ministry. M. Dupuy de Lome will "bell the cat" by making an interpellation in reference to the decrees of the 9th of January concerning *acquits à caution* and *admissions temporaires*. A small committee of the *centre droit* will declare that as the question is purely one of economy each member of that party may vote according to personal desire. Thus the discipline and unity of the right centre, the principal support of the Cabinet, will be damaged. An *ordre du jour* will then be formed, censuring the decrees of the 9th of January, which in reality were illegal, as no law can be modified except by another law. *La France* designates M. Duvernois as having drawn up the *ordre du jour* and as being engaged in obtaining signatures and promises of support. The *Peuple Français* points to M. Louvet as the Minister who must be sacrificed by the Cabinet. Should M. Louvet retire it is probable that M. Buffet may follow in consequence of his participation in the decrees. This is not all. It must be borne in mind that M. Daru only accepted office on the condition that M. Buffet should be in the Cabinet, and therefore it is anticipated that the former will not retain his portfolio for twenty-four hours after the retirement of the latter. The Ministry will thus lose strength in the Chambers and before the public. Should these tactics succeed, the real victors will be those who at the time of voting bring the greatest force. The "right" will thus be all-powerful, and then a Forcade Ministry will take the reins of government. At any rate, whether as a leader or as simple member of the Cabinet, the advent of M. de Forcade la Roquette is not distant.

Two questions of great importance have been asked in the Corps Législatif. M. Esquiros, supported by M. Gambetta, made an interpellation with respect to the presence of 3,000 soldiers at Creuzot. The "left" consider that the troops are a restraint on the liberty of the workmen and a contravention of the law of 1864, which recognizes the right of coalition. The government, by having sent troops to Creuzot has assured liberty to all well disposed workmen. But for the action of the authorities it is certain that those who have now returned to work would have been intimidated from doing so by the men on strike; other strikes had been ordered by the central Committee at Berne. The manifestations and public meetings have not been interfered with by the government and no blood has been shed. The second question was in reference to an act which authorizes the opening of a credit of 17,000,000f. required by the town of Paris for urgent payments. M. Perry took advantage of the occasion to publish the second volume of his "Comptes Fantastiques d'Haussmann." He declared that the floating debt of the town of Paris, which in the month of February last amounted to 59,000,000f. had been increased by 21,000,000f.; that the budget extraordinary for the Ville de Paris should be 70,000,000f.; that the most indispensable expenses amount to 75,000,000f.; that 4,000,000f. must be added for the *entrepôts* at Bercy, making in all 79,000,000. To meet this there is a sum of 41,000,000f. M. Perry has no faith in the Municipal Commission of Paris. That assembly, he exclaimed, "meets still. I say it is a scandal; everything that has occurred during the past month is a comedy; they imagine that matters have changed because they have changed one man." The Minister of the Interior in reply thanked the Municipal Council for the patriotism and devotion of its members who hold functions at all times ungrateful and difficult.

The examination of the different witnesses by the Juge d'Instruction in the Victor Noir affair, is not yet terminated. The trial will, however, take place on the day I named in my last.

M. de Fouvielle denies having said that Victor Noir struck Prince Pierre before he was shot.

The London police paper contained last week a wood cut of Traupmann on the scaffold. When exposed for sale at the kiosques it attracted large crowds. Every copy of the paper was eagerly bought up. We were afraid that we had seen the last of the gentle creature. We like horribles occasionally, they make us enjoy the gaiety, frivolity, debauchery and extravagance of this delightful hell on earth, called Paris, with keener gusto. The only thing that could have made Traupmann's execution more perfect would have been to have named Sunday morning for the expiation of his crimes. The maskers would have gone direct from the Saturday night masked balls to the Place de la Roquette in their fancy dresses, and as at that hour nearly all of the revellers would have been more or less drunk, the execution would have been most pleasingly and impressively solemn.

M. Rochefort on Citizen Rights in the Army.

The Legislative Body of France met February 5, M. Mège, one of the Vice-Presidents, in the chair.

M. ROCHEFORT desired to learn from the Minister of War if he had refused to allow the two soldiers ordered off to Algeria for attending political meetings in Paris to purchase their discharge. Money had been sent to them for the purpose of procuring substitutes, as was proved by letters received from the men in question, but they were still detained in the ranks.

General LE BŒUF replied that nothing could be more exact than that a refusal had been given in the case alluded to. The military regulations had been applied, as they would be on all similar occasions. I have been accused, said the honorable Minister, of having sanctioned by my authority the punishment inflicted on soldiers who had attended public meetings; my reply is that I shall continue to do so. The assertion has been made that the two men, being electors, had a right to attend public meetings, but that is a mistaken idea.

M. ROCHEFORT—I wish to read the letters which have reached Paris from the two soldiers. (Loud cries of "No! no!") Only five lines. ("No! no!")

General LE BŒUF—I request honorable members to listen to M. Rochefort.

M. ROCHEFORT—I read:—"There is not the slightest chance of our being allowed to leave. When we applied with the money we were told that the Minister had given orders to the contrary and that all we had to do was to take care to conduct ourselves well." The other soldier says something of the same kind, and declares that he must give up all idea of returning to his aged mother.

General LE BŒUF—The account just given is quite correct, as a positive refusal was the answer to the application made. The right of procuring a substitute only exists, once that the man has joined the army, when the Minister consents, and that sanction evidently ought to exist.

M. ROCHEFORT—I do not deny it.

General LE BŒUF—In that case I have no need to say more. I only add that I shall continue to use the right in question.

M. ROCHEFORT—I admit the right, but in the present case to refuse to take substitutes for two men who have not committed any offence is positive cruelty.

General LE BŒUF—I reject any such expression, which my whole career contradicts. I have more love for the men in the army than the Deputy who addresses the House.

M. ROCHEFORT—The honorable Minister assumes the right to interdict men in the army to attend public meetings. At the head of the constitution has been placed the principles of 1789. But I hold in my hand a decree of the Legislative Assembly, that nearest to 1789, proposed by Count de Beauharnais, grandfather of the Emperor; it gives soldiers the right to attend popular meetings, and I must say that there is reason to regret that the liberalism of the family has degenerated.

General LE BŒUF—No one can say that the whole army is not devoted to the Emperor and his family.

M. ROCHEFORT—I believe it is.

The PRESIDENT—Several Deputies have presented the following order of the day:—

Considering that the Minister of War has confined himself to his right and his duty, passes to the order of the day.

A division has also been demanded, but such a course cannot be proceeded to on a simple question, such as that now before the House.

The incident then went no further and terminated.

Rochefort as an Ultra Royalist.

A Paris journal has made a curious discovery. M. Rochefort, the republican socialist, the elected of Belleville, is said to be the same person as the Count Henri de Rochefort de Luçay, who in 1861 wrote to Francis II. of Naples, then besieged in Gaeta, to place his sword at the service of legitimacy. The fact is said to have been divulged by the Duke de San-Cesario, who opened the letter in his quality of private secretary of the ex-King.

The Bonaparte-Noir Tragedy—Legislative Proceedings—A Celebrated Astronomer "Taken Down."

President d'Ornano summoned before him M. de Fou-vielle and the architect, M. Archambault, who had drawn up the plan of Prince Pierre Bonaparte's apartment, in reference to the fatal incidents which occurred there on the 10th January. The same person has now to execute a second representation connected with the movements of the parties, according to the version of M. de Fonvielle.

In the Legislature Baron de Mackau drew attention to the situation of the French railway network, and expressed a wish to see the system as promptly and widely extended as possible. His anxiety is not confined to that point, as he considers that the local lines ought to be multiplied, being to the State a source of wealth and prosperity.

The Paris *Siècle* expresses great discontent at the disregard shown of late for the Legislative Body in many governmental proceedings.

The Emperor Napoleon walked for some time on the terrace of the Tuileries garden on the 5th inst.

A grand dinner was given by Count de Stackelber, Russian Ambassador in Paris, to Count Daru, Minister of Foreign Affairs of France. Three Ministers—Admiral Rigault de Genouilly, General Le Bœuf and M. Buffet—were present, as well as most of the member of the diplomatic body, with some distinguished persons belonging to the highest circles in Paris.

The *Journal Officiel* publishes an imperial decree which terminates the dispute so long pending between M. Leverrier and the astronomers attached to the Paris Observatory, and which had led to the resignation of fourteen of the latter, thus completely disorganizing the service of the establishment. The present decision concludes thus:—"We do hereby decree as follows—M. Leverrier, Senator, is removed from his functions of Director of the Paris Observatory."

The Paris journals remark on the statement that M. Rochefort had been summoned to constitute himself prisoner, in accordance with the sentence passed on him by the Correctional Tribunal. The governmental journals argue that were the Cabinet to show indulgence in the case such conduct would be tantamount to weakness, and could only serve as an encouragement to further offences; while the democratic organs maintain that the Deputy in question cannot be removed from the Chamber without an insult to universal suffrage, which has returned him for one of the jurisdictions of Paris.

ROME.

The German Bishops—Their Position and Platform in the Council—How They were Offended and Insulted—Antonelli Prudent as well as Crafty—Jesuits and Dominicans—Fallible and Infallible—Melancholy Death of an American Citizen.

ROME, Feb. 5, 1870.

There was a good deal of talking among the German bishops a few evenings past, among a few of them particularly, that set the *quidnuncs* on the *qui vive*. It appears, so my little bird informs me, that when the German bishops arrived one of the most influential was waited on by Monsignour N——, one of the keenest Italians in the Vatican, who offered his drawing room to the bishops for their meetings, in order to discuss matters previous to going to the Vatican. The offer was gratefully accepted, but *mein herren* found out that the complaisant monsignor had some three or four holes bored in the wall for the purpose of hearing what they said. The discovery astonished them. Some indulged in "donner," others in "blitzen;" all were indignant, but put on as pleasant a countenance as possible to thank him and take leave of him. There has been a good deal of fun over this matter; the German hierarchy don't care much about it, but they think that Monsignour N—— is anything but a gentleman.

Pasquin has had a good hit on Antonelli. He is represented with a crown on his head and sceptre in hand, saying to some parties who carried sacks of money, "*Quod est Cesaris Cesari;*" to some bishops and priests, whose arms were filled with rosaries and devotional things, he says, pointing to Pius IX., who is standing on a cloud, "*Quod est Dei Deo.*" The crafty Secretary of State is looking out for his relatives, and seems to take great pleasure in advancing their fortune. He is building a fine house for them near Trajan's column. They have an excellent one already on the Quirinal. But the last speculation made in Rome or in the Pontifical States in some years was made by a relative of the Cardinal a few weeks ago. He bought all the trees on each side of the road from Velletri to Terracina for fifteen cents each, and sold them a week afterwards, as he bought them, for five lire each, making something like $35,000 by the transaction. This was a pure matter of business, just as if a citizen of Chicago bought 10,000 bushels of wheat at seventy-five cents and sold it for ninety, or a speculator of Porkopolis 200 hogs at ten dollars and sold them for fourteen dollars. There are people here who shake their heads and don't like it because they have not made $35,000 themselves. It seems, after all, that the thirst for gold can rage as fiercely in the bosom of a cardinal or a cardinal's nephew as in that of any other man.

Cardinal Antonelli has a great regard for the Jesuits, but he don't like them to come too near him. He admires them at a distance and takes pleasure in doing so. You know that all the cardinals have a theologian to hunt up the sayings of the fathers; that is an office of great labor and no profit. The Roman Secretary of State, although admiring them very much, would not have a Jesuit; he preferred a Dominican, and he has one of the latter poring over old tomes to enable him (Antonelli) to know the why and wherefore of *jure divino et jure humano.*

A few years ago Bishop Dupanloup delivered a speech in the Sapienza in this city and warmly advocated the personal infallibility of the Pope. He has been twitted lately with his former speech, and has answered all, *Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.* The other day he gave the usual answer to one of those bishops who imagine they are inspired by the holy spirit, but the friend of infallibility persisted in his argument and became rather tiresome. Bishop Dupanloup is one of the most amiable men of France, but the best of us are liable to lose our equilibrium when bored. The conversation grew warm, and the blood of Felix was up a little, when he replied, "Monseigneur, wise men change their opinions; fools never do." The friend of infallibility failed to answer this pointed remark, put on as kind a smile as possible and picked up his broad-brimmed hat and left.

One of those sudden and painful accidents which plunge the brightest and happiest homes into the midst of indescribable and poignant grief occurred on the 19th inst., a short distance beyond Porta Salara, at a place called Fiumarino. Mr. Hartman Kuhn, a native, and when at home a resident, of Philadelphia, died this morning from a fall from his horse on the above date while practising fence jumping. He leaped four times over the fence with ease, but was ambitious to have it raised higher, and at the first trial the unfortunate man was thrown from his seat and the fiery animal fell upon him. He lingered without exhibiting any sign of pain until this morning, when he expired. He leaves a widow and one child—a fine boy of four years. The deceased was thirty-nine years of age, a man of fortune, and has spent four seasons in succession in Rome. His remains have been embalmed, and will leave here in a few days for his home—his last resting place—in the City of Brotherly Love.

Careful returns of the arrivals of foreigners from the commencement of the season to the 1st inst. show a falling off of almost one-third of the number of American and English visitors as compared with last year. The Romans began to fleece strangers a month too soon.

Infallibility Divisions in the Council—For and Against, and Where They Come From—The Propositions for Discipline—Religious Orders and the Masonic System—"Peter's Pence"—The Coming Art Exhibition—Material Progress.

ROME, Feb. 4, 1870.

A rumor has been current that the petition of the bishops favorable to the Infallibility dogma, 410 in number, had been presented to the Pope; but I did not credit it at the time, and I have since ascertained its incorrectness. From what I learn from trustworthy sources, not more than 380 signatures have been obtained to the pro-Infallibility *postulatum*. Against it 162 bishops have signed their names, in the proportion of forty-six French, thirty-five Germans and Austrians, fourteen Hungarians, twenty-nine Americans, nineteen Orientals, fifteen Italians, three English and two Portuguese. Calculating the non-signataries at about 200 we can divide the Council into two nearly equal parts, the larger of which comprises the most ardent partisans of the personal Infallibility doctrine, and the smaller those who are as ardently opposed to it and those who are too indifferent about it or too fearful of offending the sovereign Pontiff, to put their hands to any document, either for or against the proposed dogma. I know of bishops, supposed to belong to the enlightened portion of the episcopacy, who have plainly expressed their intention of supporting the proposition if it should ever be officially presented to the consideration of the Council, "not that we consider the definition of the dogma of the Pope's personal infallibility at all opportune, but that we cannot bear to grieve the venerable old man who has set his heart upon it."

The *schemata*, or propositions elaborated by the preparatory commissions for the consideration of the Council in the category of discipline, are far more numerous than those already discussed in the category of faith. The former are forty-one and the latter eighteen. These eighteen propositions having been rejected by the general congregations are now being remodelled by the Deputation of Faith, which is a sort of committee of twenty-four Fathers elected by the Council for this special duty. They will soon be presented in a new form to the general congregation, and if rejected a second time the government party and the Pope himself must be considered as having encountered a most undeniable *fiasco*. In the discussion of the propositions in the category of discipline the pastors and interests of the whole ecclesiastical body are engaged in a most positive manner, and therefore we are not surprised at the energy with which the Archbishops of Paris and Smyrna and the Bishop of Orleans entered into the debate upon the two first *schemata* in the category relating to the duties of bishops and the discipline of the clergy. Monseigneur Dupanloup's oration, the first he has delivered yet in the Council Hall, produced an excitement and interest which surpassed those taken in any preceding speech during the session, excepting always the harangue of that eloquent and vehement Latinist, Monseigneur Strassmayer, Bishop of Bosnia.

The Hungarian prelates certainly have the advantage over other bishops that the Latin language, which is *de rigueur* in the Conciliary discussions, is almost their natural tongue, but, unfortunately for the cause of Infallibility, it is not used by them in its favor, as may be convincingly deduced from the fact that of the fifteen Hungarian prelates attending the Council at Rome all but one, that one being the Primate of Hungary, have signed the anti-Infallibility *postulatum*.

The discussions in the categories of religious orders and Oriental churches and missions are not expected to be nearly so prolonged or important as those in the categories of faith and discipline. The individual interests of monastic institutions, and the thrilling question of "to be or not to be" that will affect some superannuated congregations, however vital for the worn votaries comprised in such confraternities, will not excite the parliamentary passions of the Council at large, and, with a few trifling concessions, the Oriental bishops and the wandering missionaries who act as pioneers of the *propaganda fide* in the far East will return to their respective fields of action not dissatisfied with the results of the Ecumenical Council. But the zeal of some fervent partisans of the Holy See will bring before the Ecumenical Council propositions tending to benefit the temporal condition of the Papal government for the consideration of which the bishops summoned to Rome *ad synodum* will not have been at all prepared. I allude especially to the project of Mgr. Mermillod, auxiliary bishop of Geneva, for alleviating the financial difficulties of his Holiness, by promoting on a much vaster scale than at present the pecuniary contributions of the Catholic world known as the *Obolo di San Pietro*, or Peter's pence. The influence if not the authority of the Ecumenical Council will be invoked to effect this desirable result, and in order that the sums collected may be equivalent to the emergencies of the Papal government, the auxiliary bishop has applied for an exact statement of its ordinary revenue and outlay to M. l'Heureux, the French financial commissary, who has been for the last three months in Rome acting as mediator between the Italian and Papal governments for the final settlement of some outstanding differences respecting the transfer of the Pontifical debt and the payment of dividends in arrear, &c. M. l'Heureux has promised to supply a copy of the Papal budget as calculated for the present year, 1870. This is supporting the Chair of Peter with material as well as moral means, and much as spiritual infallibility may increase the prestige of the Sovereign Pontiff abroad, financial infallibility will be far more useful to him at home.

It is almost time to speak of the approaching International Exhibition of Catholic Art and Industry, which is to be held next month in the Convent of the Carthusians in the Thermæ of Diocletian. The administration of the Paris and Marseilles Railway and of the imperial steamers to Civita Vecchia have granted a reduction of thirty-three per cent on the freight of all articles destined for this exhibition and fifty per cent for exhibitors off their passage fare. Many objects have already arrived from various parts of the Old and New World. It is said that the richest sacred utensils of the Sixtine treasury will be exhibited. Roman industry, especially in the gold and jewelry department, will be represented by some masterpieces. In the book department bibliomanists will admire two volumes of the "Codex Vaticanus," one of which is on parchment, and the *Pater Noster*, expressly composed for the Exhibition in 250 languages, with 180 different characters and 300 vignettes. In a Bible and red and black breviary, also the resources of the Propaganda Polyglot Typography have been developed to the utmost, as well as in the rich parchment, gold and colored binding, for which Rome is so celebrated.

A great many complaints have been made about the difficulty of obtaining correct information concerning the Council discussions, on the one hand, and the difficulty of keeping them secret on the other. I trust that I have kept your readers supplied with the earliest intelligence possible, as I have occasionally seen the news details sent in my ordinary letters to the HERALD telegraphed four or five days afterwards as something just discovered. It has always been a great object with the Ecumenical Fathers to keep their deliberations secret, and the Cardinal Legate De Luca recently reproved the Bishops for not being so silent to the general public as they ought.

Pope Paul III.'s Secretary to the Council of Trent, Angelo Massarelli, gave a similar reproof to the Fathers of that assembly, which is preserved in the acts of that celebrated Council, exhorting them, for "the honor and esteem of the Sacred Council, and to avoid the scandal that might arise," not to divulge the acts and decrees of the Council outside its pale, even to their own immediate families.

The Papal Schemata or Propositions to the Council—Infallibility and the Annunciation.

[Rome (February 3) Correspondence of London Standard.]

You will remember the title I sent you nearly a week ago of the new *Schemata* distributed to the fathers and what I have since added to the information I then gave. Perhaps you would like to see what is at last said on this matter in official quarters. "The second *Schema* relating to matters of faith treats of the constitution of the Church as the first treated of God." (By this last phrase a reference is intended to rationalism, science, &c., which are supposed to be opposed and derogatory to God.) "This second *Schema* has already been distributed to the Fathers of the Council, and it is most probable that as soon as the discussion of it is commenced the grand point of the infallibility of the Pope will be established." This, you will perceive, completely tallies with my statement that under the *Schema* which concerns the constitution and rights of the Church, those of the Pope—*De Romano Pontifice*—will be brought forward for discussion.

Here is the document. As it is in my hands to-day for only an hour, and the translation has to be made from ecclesiastical Latin during that time, I must ask you to be indulgent to any inelegancies of style:—

SCHEMA PRO INFALLIBILITATE ROMANI PONTIFICIS.

To be logically and clearly defined from principles already received by the Universal Church.

In the chapter concerning the Roman Pontiff, we propose that, after the condemnation of certain errors against his primacy, these or similar words might be added:—We utterly reprobate the temerity of those who have the audacity to appeal from the decisions of the Sovereign Pontiff to an Ecumenical Council. Furthermore, we condemn the perverse cavils of those who have the audacity to say that only an external deference and not an internal assent of the mind and heart is due to the decisions of the Roman Pontiff.

Moreover, we utterly reprobate the way of speaking and teaching common among those who, rashly supposing a preposterous division of opinion between the body of the episcopacy and the Supreme Pontiff, dispute as to which of them hath the greater authority, and thus endeavor to sever Peter from the Church as a head from its body; as if the body of the Fathers, whom Peter is ordered in his successors to confirm in the faith, could ever be cut off from him whose faith Christ promised should never fail, or as if it could be lawful for those who are to be taught and confirmed by Peter to teach and confirm anything against this decision.

Nor do we regard as less reprehensible the opinions and conduct of those who, in order that they may more freely spread those errors abroad which have been condemned by the Roman Pontiff, are not ashamed to declare that the true sense of the books from which have been taken the errors he condemns has not been rightly understood.

Reasons why the above scheme is thought expedient:—

First—It may be safely hoped that a scheme of this kind would find universal favor with the Fathers and be confirmed by their almost unanimous vote, for it contains positive and unshaken principles of Catholic doctrine, which are already accepted throughout the whole Church, and which are acknowledged and professed by all, only a few excepted, whose number is so small that it need not be taken into account.

Second—This full assent of all or nearly all the Fathers is not only expedient, but would seem to be imperatively called for when the matter in hand is the definition of a point of doctrine, especially in a matter of so much moment, which could, if possible, to be defined without any dissent.

Third—At this moment, too, a unanimity of this nature would seem to be particularly necessary on account of the widespread and universally credited reports that there is great discord among the Fathers in this matter. A unanimous definition on the part of the Fathers would utterly close the mouths of our enemies now exulting over us, and would be a source of vast edification to the Church of God. We have, indeed, far too many external enemies for us to think of exciting fresh discord in the camp of the Church itself, and for us to seem in any way to foment it.

Fourth—The proposed mode of implied definition, though an indirect one, would seem to be remarkable for strength as well as for simplicity; for it is clearer and perhaps more comprehensive than any formal and explicit definition would be; for the latter would afford theologians many opportunities for cavilling; it would be perpetually disputed among them when and under what circumstances the Roman Pontiff should be considered to have addressed the Christian world and to have pronounced an infallible decision. All those questions would still remain undecided, even among the most pious advocates of Papal infallibility, which have hitherto been agitated, concerning the private and the public character of the Pontiff, when he speaks, concerning the true signification of speaking *ex cathedra* and concerning what things appertain to faith and morals. Indeed, questions of this kind would perhaps, be agitated more violently than ever, and minds be the victims of still greater contention.

Fifth—In this proposed scheme no express distinction is made or is necessary, for it joins the inerrancy of the Roman Pontiff with the infallibility of the Church itself, and exhibits it as the logical sequence and corollary of his primacy, so that it is as potent and is contained within the same limits as the infallibility of the Church and that same primacy; and what are the principles of the primordial faith of the Church are already sufficiently ascertained and determined. Whereas a formal definition on this head would have a retrospective action over all past centuries, would open up the entire field of ecclesiastical history and the whole succession of bulls to the cavils of theologians and to the recriminations of impious heretics against the Roman Pontiff, at present almost allayed.

By our proposed definition no cause will be given either to theologians or to the faithful to doubt or cavil respecting the commands and decrees of the Holy Pontiff, by whose most wise counsel, while he feeds the lambs as well as the sheep, all matters are lovingly, reverently and finally left to be decided.

I must reserve till to-morrow any comments on this document. If it is to be spoken of as a compromise it is such as I cannot conceive Dr. Manning, for instance, and such as he, accepting, It merits, however, the praise of great dexterity.

Dr. Dollinger on Papal Infallibility.

Dr. Dollinger has written an "open letter" in answer to the Bishops' petition for the declaration of papal infallibility. The following is an abstract of Dr. Dollinger's manifesto:—

The Bishops, he says, are signing an address in which the Pope is besought, on the part of the council, to declare himself infallible. That is to say, "one hundred and eighty millions of human beings are henceforth to be forced, by pain of excommunication, refusal of the sacraments and everlasting damnation, to believe and to profess that which the Church hitherto has not believed, not taught." For it cannot be said that even those who have hitherto held the papal infallibility to be a fact have believed in it. A Catholic can only believe that which he is told and taught by the Church as a divinely revealed thing, as a thing appertaining to the substance of the doctrine of salvation, as a thing beyond all and every doubt, and the refusal to accept which implies disobedience to be punished by exclusion from the community. But in reality there is not a single human creature who ever believed in it in this way, even as one would believe in God or the Trinity. The proclamation of this dogma, therefore, which, at the very best, has been agreed to by some, *fide humana*, as a thing of probability, would mean nothing less than an alteration in the faith and doctrine of the Church, such as has never been heard of ever since Christianity was first founded. The whole foundation of the Church, in fact, would thereby be affected. Instead of, as hitherto has been the case, a Catholic being able to say, I believe a certain thing, because the Church of all times bears witness to it—that Church unto which belongs the promise that it shall ever remain in the possession of truth—he will henceforth have to put, instead of that Church, which compasses all time and all space, a single individual—the Pope to wit. He will have to say, I believe this or that, because the infallible Pope teaches it. And why is he infallible? Because he says so himself. That several hundred bishops—whatever their number—have decreed in Rome, in 1870, that the Pope is infallible matters very little, inasmuch as all bishops and every Council are subject to error without the help of the Pope. Their testimony has only as much value as he who is alone exempt from error pleases to place upon it; and only inasmuch as he approves this, their resolution, is there any validity in it. And thus moving in a vicious circle, the whole matter resolves itself into the Pope's own testimony of himself. True, some 1,840 years ago some one higher has said, "If I testify to myself my testimony is not to be believed."

Dr. Dollinger next enters into four special considerations to which the address gives rise.

The first is that it limits the Pope's infallibility to those of his decrees and emanations which are addressed to the entire body of the faithful—the whole Catholic Church in fact; from which it would follow that the Pope, whenever he addressed single persons, corporations, or particular churches, has always been subject to error. Considering that for twelve or thirteen centuries the Popes have always addressed their teachings on some point or other to particular persons or bishops of certain countries, and therefore did not fulfil the one condition which alone could have made them infallible, it is to be feared that all these emanations, up to the last 500 years or so, were erroneous, and would have to be abrogated. Nor did the Popes themselves know of their infallibility all that time. It was in 1562 that Johann Hessel, the Louvain theologian, first broached the theory. From him Bellarmine took it, supporting it with the testimony of the Isidorian decretals, which are forged, and those of St. Cyril, which are a fiction. Indeed it would only have cost the Popes the addition of a few words to that effect at the top of their addresses if they had believed in their infallibility. But in truth they never dreamed of it.

Secondly, the framers of the petition say that which is not in asserting that, according to the general and constant tradition of the Church the judgments of the Pope are unalterable. The contrary of this is patent to all eyes. The Church has always first examined the dogmatic utterances of the Popes, and then either agreed to them or rejected them, as was done by the fifth Council in 553 and by the sixth in 681. Nor is it, thirdly, correct, when the bishops talk of the second Council of Lyons (1274) having accepted, with the assent of both Greeks and Latins, the doctrine that disputes in the matter of faith must be decided by the judgment of the Pope. Neither Greeks nor Latins said this; but the Pope Clement IV., who sent this formula to the Emperor Michael Palæologue as a condition of his being admitted into the communion of the Church. The unfortunate Michael, sorely pressed by his Latin foes, had no alternative but to accept for himself a formula which alone could ensure him the peace he so much needed; but in his own palace he repudiated the notion of it, his clergy from the outset protested against it, and the nation simply rejected it *en bloc*. As for the bishops assembled at the Council they never even had an opportunity of giving an opinion on the subject of this formula.

The next argument of Dr. Dollinger is still more trenchant. It simply charges the fathers of the address with forgery, or, what is much the same thing, mutilation of their quotations. The decree of the Florentine Council, adduced by them in proof of their assertion, has been clipped. A certain passage, which reads "according to the manner in which it is contained both in the acts and the holy canons of the Ecumenical Councils," has been suppressed. And it was this very sentence upon which everything hinged. The Pope and the Cardinals had demanded that the words, "according to the sayings of the saints," should be put in the definition of the Pope's primacy. But the Greeks knew full well what things there might be read out of or forged into the "saints" thus vaguely made authoritative on that point, and rejected it point blank—nay, declared that they would leave the Synod without having done a single thing if that sentence, which pointed to the testimony of the seven Ecumenical Councils preceding the forged Isidorian decretals, were left out