

and plundered, but it has not been held; and vengeance, even in this world, has generally overtaken the sacrilegious spoiler.

On the present occasion it needs only a word from England to stop the invading host. One word spoken with vigour, and indicating a resolution to act, would be amply sufficient to check Austria in her career of unjust aggression. Will this word be spoken? Lord Palmerston, so valiant against Chinese, and Affghans, and Portuguese, and Greeks, and all kinds of minor Powers that are thought to be powerless—will he speak the one necessary word? We cannot guess. All England would support this just and seasonable exhibition of heroism; but we have little hope that England will have an opportunity.

If the *Times* is to be taken as any exponent of the Ministerial intentions, it is the purpose of the Foreign Office to drive a small traffic with the Pope, before giving any help. What the British Cabinet thinks we are nowhere informed; but the *Times* and its correspondents, speaking not otherwise than with good feeling, have discovered sundry difficulties of a most extraordinary kind. They are thus set forth in so many words:—

“These difficulties, I conceive, are to be found in the following three items:—

“*Imprimis*. Up to this hour the legitimate title of Queen Victoria to the throne of Britain, is unrecognised by the Prince-Prelate of Rome.

“2. Up to this hour, the sentence of excommunication and deposition, put forth by the predecessors of Pius IX. against the Queen of England and all her adherents, are unrevoked by him.

“3. Up to this hour, the Bull “*In Cæna Domini*,” put forth by Paul V., whereby our Queen, our Clergy, our nobles, our whole people, (excepting only the Pope’s adherents among them), are excommunicated and anathematised for disobedience to the Roman Pontiff, which sentence of anathema is appointed to be renewed afresh every year on Maunday-Thursday, is uncancelled, unrepudiated by Pius IX.

What can we make of this extraordinary farrago of absurdities? At least we have a threefold answer.

Imprimis. Up to this hour the legitimate title of Queen Victoria has never been denied. But suppose there were outstanding some antiquated denial of the right of some of Victoria’s ancestors—What then? For four centuries, down to the reign of George III., the monarchs of these realms, so far from “recognising the legitimate title” of the Kings of France, assumed this very title into their own style royal. Yet this did not prevent Anne, Queen of Great Britain and of France, sending ambassadors and making treaties with Louis King of France; nor did it prevent Charles II., King of France, receiving pensions from the same Louis whose title he thus officially claimed for himself.

(2.) There has never been—so far as we are aware—any sentence of “excommunication and deposition” that, in its most strained official meaning, can even nominally be extended to the present Queen. If the Bull of Pope St. Pius V. against Elizabeth is referred to, we beg the diplomatists of the *Times* to read that document. When they have done so they will discover that it contains not one word about Elizabeth’s successors; and that even if it were a revelation from Heaven, its whole earthly force and effect have been exhausted more than two hundred and forty years ago.

(3.) But then the Bull “*In Cæna Domini*,” put forth by Paul V. against our Queen, &c. &c., which sentence is “appointed to be renewed afresh every year,” and has never been cancelled. We desiderate here a little more accurate knowledge of history. Paul V. occupied the Papal Chair from A. D. 1605 to A. D. 1621. When the Bull was first promulgated historians are not agreed. It is certain that in 1536 Paul III. describes the publication of it on Maunday-Thursday as “an ancient custom.” It is certain, also, that in 1510—that is, seven years before Luther commenced his rebellion—it was protested against by the Council of Tours in France. Some writers trace it up to the reign of our Henry V., and some carry it back a century or two further. This Bull then, framed when the English King and nation were both Catholic, contains a general excommunication of heretics, and those who favour them, of the readers of heretical books, of pirates, forgers, and other classes of evil-doers. It has no more special reference to England, than it has to the Grand Turk, or the Emperor of Russia, or the King of Prussia, or the King of Hanover; none of whom, however, find any diplomatic difficulty in the contents of this famous Bull. The *Times* should also be informed that in the year 1770 the publication of it was formally suspended by Pope Clement XIV., and has never been renewed. According to the *Times*, therefore, it would seem that a grand obstacle to diplomatic connection with Rome is a Bull, which from the battle of Agincourt down to the siege of Bender, was regularly published every year, but which, for the last seventy-seven years, has never reared its head in public view.

AID TO THE POPE!

The most important intelligence of the day is from Turin. We give it in the words of the Paris correspondent of the *Times*:—

“Letters from Turin, of the 22d inst., announce that the King of Sardinia had formally protested against the

occupation of Ferrara, and forwarded copies of that protest to all the Courts of Europe. Charles Albert had, moreover, written to the Pope, offering to place at his disposal both his army and navy, should the independence of the Pontifical dominions be menaced by the Austrian troops. It was expected that the protest would appear on the following day in the *Piedmontese Gazette*, and the inhabitants of Turin were preparing a general illumination to celebrate the event.

SYMPATHY WITH THE POPE—A EUROPEAN PROTEST. The following is from the *Semaphore de Marsilles*, in reference to the news from Rome of the 18th:—

“The treaties, the law of nations, the respect and regard due to the holiest of men (says the correspondent of the *Semaphore*), have been trampled under foot by those pretended defenders of the throne and religion—the Austrians. Military possession of Ferrara was taken on the 13th in the most brutal manner. The Legate vainly protested against that act of violence worthy of another age, and vainly requested the Austrian commander, when he found all resistance impossible, to postpone until the next morning the execution of his project. In the broad noonday those barbarous hordes invaded the town, and compelled the Pontifical garrison to surrender the different posts into their hands. To crown their insolence, they sent a guard of honour to the Cardinal Legate, who immediately abandoned the Government house, and removed to the Bishop’s residence. On receipt of this intelligence at Rome, a council of Cardinals was assembled, and, if we are to credit the reports in circulation, the Holy Father, moved by the signal insult thus offered to him, declared that he would protest; and, that if a new protest was disregarded, he would decree a sentence of excommunication against the invaders; and, that if that measure did not avail, he would hoist the *labarum* and march against the Austrians at the head of his people. You may rest certain, that in the present state of the public mind in the Pontifical dominions, and in all Italy, the day the Pope shall unfurl the Standard of the Cross against the Northern oppressors, 25,000,000 of men will follow him. Austria is very imprudent in driving the Pope to that extremity.

“Since the last events of Rome, the Sacred College is animated with better sentiments, and is determined to support the Pope. This change will disappoint Austria, as did the discovery of the horrid machination on the point of exploding, and at the very moment she was about to reap its sanguinary fruit. But Providence, who watched over Rome during the last year, will again cover it with her ægis. We have been assured that English ships will shortly appear in the Adriatic, and that an order to that effect has been forwarded to the British Admiral from Ancona. We trust that the French flag will not suffer itself to be anticipated in the defence of the Sovereign Pontiff. M. Guisot openly proclaimed it in his last speech, and we rely on his word.”

MURDER OF THE DUCHESS OF PRASLIN.

On Wednesday morning all Paris was (to use a Parisian exaggeration) paralysed by the discovery that the Duchess of Praslin, daughter of Marshal Sebastiani, had been murdered in the night, and was found dead in her bed on that morning, having only returned to Paris from the country on the previous day. In the course of Wednesday the tragedy assumed a yet more appalling aspect. The *Times*’ correspondent, writing at four o’clock on Thursday, says:—

“So early as eight o’clock yesterday morning the rumour was general that the Duke of Praslin was the murderer of his wife. The report originated in some expressions of those of the servants who ran out to give the alarm and seek surgical aid for the victim. Immediately on the arrival of the authorities (the Prefect of Police, the Procureur du Rio, the Procureur-General, and several other magistrates), the hotel was closed, and egress from it prevented by a posse of police agents placed at all the doors. A rigid investigation, it will easily be believed, was then commenced, in the course of which matter transpired which induced the magistrates to place the Duke under arrest, so far as the Charter permits. Among other things, it was discovered that a *liason* was said to have existed between the Duke and the English governess of his children, and that in consequences of certain scenes to which the discovery or knowledge of that fact by the Duchess gave rise, she was dismissed, and took up her residence in the quarter of Paris called the Marais. Thither police agents were sent yesterday forenoon, with orders to take her into custody, but she was not to be found. Her papers were seized and delivered into the hands of the Procureur du Roi.

“In the interim, and, indeed, up to this moment (four o’clock, Thursday), the investigation was prosecuted with an assiduity and a perseverance seldom equalled. Blood is said to have been found in the Duke’s room; blood on his person, too, but that is accounted for by the precipitate embrace of the body of his murdered wife.

“Suspicion, however, was first excited by the evidence of the servants, who stated, that for a long while the Duke and Duchess lived separate altho’ under the same roof, and that violent scenes had occurred between them (‘respecting the English governess,’ it is said). The magistrates felt obliged, therefore, to order the Duke to be placed in custody, so far (as I have already said) as

the Charter permits. Will it be believed that the Charter of 1830 contains an article which prohibits the arrest of a Peer of France on any criminal charge, even if caught in the fact, unless by an order of the Court of Peers? He is, however, actually in custody. Two police officers are perpetually with him, and never lose sight of him. They remained in his bedchamber last night.

“In my hurry yesterday I omitted mentioning that a *gardien* (private watchman), had the nightly charge of the rear of the hotel (on the Champs Elysees), whose usual hour for retiring was six o’clock. This circumstance remains unexplained to us as yet. It enabled the murderer to get rid of the weapon with which he committed the slaughter, for it has not been found.

“It is not necessary that I proceed to narrate facts published in the newspapers on the subject. I shall therefore conclude my own portion of the task with one observation—namely, that this crime, no matter by whom committed—strikes a deathblow to the privileges of the peerage, already shaken to their foundation by the proceedings against M. Teste. It is impossible, that in the present temper of the public mind any privileges will be continued to the members of either House of Legislature.

“The following are the articles of the Charter which prohibited the actual arrest of the Duke of Praslin:—

“Art. 34. No Peer of France can be arrested except by permission of the Chamber, and must likewise be tried by his peers for a criminal offence.”

“Art. 25. No member of the Chamber of Deputies can be prosecuted or arrested during the session, except when taken in the fact, unless the Chamber shall have authorised his prosecution.”

Galvani says:—“We mentioned yesterday the murder of this lady, who was the mother of nine children, the only daughter of Marshal Sebastiani, and niece of Lieutenant-General Tiburce Sebastiani and the Duke de Coigny. The details of this lamentable event, which took place at the hotel of Marshal Sebastiani, in the Rue de Faubourg St. Honore, 55, near the British Embassy, are various in many respects, but all the accounts concur in stating that the Duchess, who arrived only on Tuesday evening from the country, had retired to bed at her usual hour; but very early in the morning the bell of her bedroom rang, and a servant rose and went to the room, but could not enter, it being bolted in the inside. The door was forced open, and the Duchess was found weltering in her blood from several stabs, not quite dead, but utterly unable to give any account of the murderer. She expired soon afterwards.

As no robbery had been committed, it was evident that the act was one of private vengeance, but suspicion could not be fixed on any particular person, as the amiable character of the Duchess did not permit her to have a known enemy.

“The late Duchess had not yet reached her 42nd year. She was alike remarkable for her elegance of manners and the superiority of her education; and, in addition to being an excellent mother, was distinguished for her active and extensive benevolence.” She is well remembered in London as having done the honours at the French Embassy when her Father was Minister here.

SUICIDE OF THE DUKE DE PRASLIN.

The Duke de Praslin died at five o’clock on Tuesday last, of poison. The event was announced in the *Mouiteur Parisien* of Tuesday night. The following are the terms in which the *National* notices this anticipated *denouement* of one of the most tragical affairs of modern times:

“NATURAL DEATH OF THE DUKE DE PRASLIN.—We had foreseen this conclusion, and we had been prepared for it two days since. Nevertheless, it appears to us, that the event ought to have occurred a little sooner or a little later. The Duke de Praslin died to-day (Tuesday) in his bed in the prison of the Luxembourg, and the following are the terms in which the official evening journal announces the fact:—

“M. de Praslin died to day about five o’clock in the prison of the Luxembourg. The cause of his death has been ascertained and accounted for by men of science. It was with arsenic, taken in a large dose, that the Duke de Praslin poisoned himself, at the moment when he saw that the charges had become so serious as to render necessary his arrest and trial. The copious vomitings which he experienced on Wednesday afternoon, and during the day of Thursday, appeared alone to have retarded the effect of the poison, which, after having ceased on Friday and Saturday, resumed its entire force on Sunday.”

The *National* proceeds at great length to dwell upon the unsatisfactory nature of this report.

The *National* then ascribes to the moral atmosphere, or, rather, the immoral atmosphere, with which the Duke was surrounded, these awful crimes—denies the possibility of his committing suicide unpermitted, and repeats charges against the general corruption of the noblesse and the complicity of the Ministry.

THE FEVER IN THE NORTH.—Our readers are already aware of the great extent of the fever in the Manchester Union, but large as the number of cases undoubtedly is, there can be little doubt that, but for the great exertions of the board of *gardians* to procure accommodation, and the searching inquiries by the police and union officers,