

**BJ**

1874

.U7

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

*Chap.* BJ1874

*Shelf* .47

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.









21

2-3

# FRAGMENTS ON POLITENESS.

(Reprinted from the "Diplomatic Review.")

By  
David Magubart

---

CONTENTS :

27/570

THE SULTAN SHAKING HANDS.  
THE ROYAL FAMILY SHAKING HANDS.  
THE ŒCUMENIC COUNCIL SHAKING HANDS.  
WASHING THE FEET OF PILGRIMS.  
SALUTATION IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.  
HOW TO BE CLEAN.  
TEACHING THE CHINESE TO SHAKE HANDS.  
THE COUNCIL MUST RESTORE ETIQUETTE.



LONDON :  
DIPLOMATIC REVIEW OFFICE,  
24, EAST TEMPLE CHAMBERS, WHITEFRIARS STREET, E.C.

1870.

BJ1874  
.U7

## PREFACE.

---

ON this great subject nothing as yet has been written. A few fragments that at times have appeared in the *Diplomatic Review* are here collected as suggestions for thought. This has been done in view to the Œcumenic Council, which, affording the opportunity for reproclaiming the Law of Nature, of Nations, and of GOD, in respect to the slaughter of men, also affords the opportunity of restoring the habits of decent intercourse between superior and inferior, parent and child, and man and man.

What use is there in conferring dignities secular or ecclesiastical, if the men are not themselves dignified? What mean these, if respect be not generated? This is the product of noble manners—manners which all have ceased to cultivate; which every one desecrates by his acts, and reviles in his thoughts.



## THE SULTAN SHAKING HANDS.

(*Diplomatic Review for July, 1868.*)

IN reporting the reception of the Patriarch of the Armenians and the Chacham-Baschi of the Jews by the SULTAN, a strange expression is used,\* which, if bearing the natural interpretation, is a far graver matter than the introduction of the passport system, or even than leaving an Island to be a free domain for murderers, bandits, and pirates.

The Turks in their immemorial proverb vindicate for themselves dignity. They grant beauty to Georgia, wealth to India, cleverness to Europe, but claim for their own Empire "Sultan-ship."† And, in truth, that Empire has been enabled to endure trials and pass through perils under which any European Government would have sunk a hundred times, by means of certain qualities inherent in the people, and which distinguish them from the present inhabitants of Europe. These qualities have to be specified in reference to the present change; for they all hold together, and the breach effected on this point, the rest will follow.

This people is brave without discipline; it is honest without parade; just without science; it is sober in speech as in temperament, and it is polite in manners.

Were you to touch its manners, and from polite render it vulgar, all the other qualities would speedily disappear; for the manners of the grown men are the mould in which is formed and cast the character of the children.

These characters, in the extant generation, become communicated to the rising generation only by the process of bringing

\* "His Imperial Majesty then accepted the hand of each of the heads of the communities, and an address of thanks signed by the Primates of each nation."—*Reuter's Express*, Constantinople, May 27, 1868.

† Mahalic, Indostan : guzellick, Gurgistan : akilic, Frangistan: sultanatic, Ali Osman.

up the child. In Turkey there is no process visible to us for implanting these virtues. There are no reasonings, no story books, no child's books. The young grow silently into what their elders are, through the ceremonial of that "politeness of intimacy which has been lost amongst us."\* It seizes upon and takes possession of the child, and inspires him with profound respect and unbounded affection for his parents; so that he strives in all respects to please them and to be like them.

The Commandment to honour father and mother, being the only one to which an earthly promise is attached, deserves our utmost attention—an attention which has never been given to it, seeing that we have applied to the individual in a sense which is alike absurd and untrue, that which is a promise to the Race. "Our days to be long in *the land* which the Lord "our God has given us," does not and cannot mean that individuals honouring their parents should be long lived. It means that a race amongst whom that respect is observed, will possess in itself the elements of enduring prosperity. It is not here a promise that is given, but a condition that is stated. If it were not so, it would be in opposition to all Scripture, which nowhere makes well-doing a mercenary matter. There are further inferred qualities in the parents, such as to render "honour" to them both meritorious and possible. Our Maker could not have commanded the young to honour vice and crime, and, as a consequence, to copy those very sins which Religion denounces and forbids, which would be the effect of honouring those who commit them.

The youth in Turkey can, therefore, honour their parents, because they act honestly with their neighbours, are truthful in their words, patient under misfortune, not coarse or idle in their speech, not bloody and unjust in their dealings with other communities, not drunkards, nor given to excess, not uncleanly in their persons; charitable to the poor, tender of dumb animals, hospitable to the wayfarer, polite and respectful in their bearing to their fellow-men, and brave to do or endure when wrong is done them.

But these grounds of due honour from the child to the parent are in themselves the very elements of life by which a people may reckon on long years of possession of the land on which they have entered to possess it.

No one will deny the value of politeness in the fortunes of a State. All hold it prominent in the regulation of a family, and it is accepted as the necessary condition of the discipline of an army. Essayists, Philosophers, Moralists, and Religious

\* Alexandre Dumas.

teachers have dwelt upon it as supremest in the branches of human culture. But no one *has defined* it. It is on their lips or under their pen, but a vague and an unmeaning generality; or, which is worse, each takes his own habits for the standard of Excellence.

BACON, when awarding to it the palm in human affairs, makes no step in the direction of definition. He announces three masters of the human mind: conviction, interests, and feelings. The first he assigns as the conquest to reason; the second to circumstances; and the third to politeness, in these words: "It is manners that touch the heart." But *what* manners? Good manners of course. Still remains the question: "In what do good manners consist?" The question must be difficult to answer since BACON, whilst suggesting it, does not so much as make the attempt.

If we turn to the early Legislators we shall find the matter specified. The code of MENU consists in the regulations by which the human body in its movements shall constitute for itself the language of ceremonial, which we call manners; and so late as a period posterior to BACON, manners were regularly taught, and books written on the subject in Europe.

We cannot pretend to condense such a matter into a sentence. Yet, as regards the points we have undertaken to illustrate, we can offer in a sentence the test by which to judge of the preservation or the loss of that type of manners which has up to the present time continued to exist in Turkey, and by means of which Turkey has continued to exist. It is this: that the child in salutation should kiss the parent's hand.

The antagonistic principles of good and evil manifest themselves in every thought passing through the mind as in every habit unconsciously undergone. We have *either* the one or the other. As Law is known not to be, where there is Public Opinion, so is Public Opinion known not to be where you have Law. In like manner, where the child kisses the parent's hand, there can be no shaking of the hand in lieu of salutation. And where there is shaking of the hand there can be no such dutiful expression of filial affection as that recorded and applied by such practices as kissing the parent's hand by the child, standing before his parent till permitted to be seated, not speaking till addressed, and all the other modes by which the domestic, and therefore the public, ceremonial is established.

It is in this sense that we attach importance to the announcement—ambiguous, and we trust erroneous, as it is—that the SULTAN had shaken hands, for it implies the displacement of the entire habits of the race. It was, indeed, to us a matter of apprehension among the many suggested by the unwonted pro-

posal of a visit of the SULTAN to Europe; on the other hand, a contrary result might have followed from the disgust awakened by the weary sights of the coarseness and vulgarity of the European races. An incident at Guildhall seemed calculated to render this result certain; and the demeanour of the SULTAN on a higher field seemed to confirm that expectation.\* We trust, therefore, that the occasion has not as yet at least arisen in this direct form; but as the practice of shaking hands has been fallen into by Turks in communication with Europeans, and as it began on their part in the first instance, as a subterfuge, in order to evade giving the *Temenas* to Christians, the subject is one which we deem it a duty to endeavour to place before such eminent minds as Turkey may possess; endeavouring to make apparent to them the political consequences of a change in its social *manners*, by a people whose manners are admirable, and in imitation of certain other people whose social manners are detestable, and whose political condition is loathsome.

The process by which power is acquired is also the same by which it is lost: just as growth comes from decay. The SULTAN is not a candidate for the Presidentship of the United States. It may be very expedient for General GRANT to undergo an operation of shake hands, the effects of which should have laid him up for several weeks; but it would not have been so had General GRANT been Sultan of a nation of gentlemen.

But shake hands is not a European practice. It is only an English one. Transferred to the Continent, where it is now only being introduced, it has naturally undergone vitiation. Contemptible as it may be in England, still it is there practised within limits, and is judged by a certain rule. As introduced, it is practised without limit, and held to be simply an English practice; so that grocer and bootmaker come to propose a "*poignée de main* (handful of hand) *à la Anglaise*": than which nothing can be less English or more repulsive to Englishmen.

Though, therefore, exceptionally existing in England, if it is to be introduced into Turkey, it ought to be according to the rules observed in England. There it is known as a familiarity. It is, therefore, only practised among equals. The Sovereign of England does not shake hands. She with her subjects follows the Turkish rule. Her subjects still kiss her hand.

The condition to which things are actually brought in the two opposing scales of politeness and vulgarity is this; that it is impossible that a citizen of the United States should kiss his

\* Refusal of the proffered hand by the Sultan.

father's hand; and that up to this moment it is incredible that a Turkish son should shake hands with his father.

Politically the same contrast holds: the United States being the most unruly and unmanageable of communities, and one in which Government has become all but impossible; Turkey being, in so far as its own subjects are concerned, the most pacific, peaceable, and manageable of communities, where Government is so easy that it has scarcely even to show itself.

---

## THE ROYAL FAMILY SHAKING HANDS.

*(Diplomatic Review for August, 1868.)*

WHILST writing for the last number the first words ever put down in regard to this invention, moved thereto by the astounding act of the SULTAN as reported by telegram, yet dreading to put on paper words in connexion with such a subject, the newspapers were reporting and commenting on a similar feat performed by a member of the English Royal Family.

It seems that the Duke of EDINBURGH, confused and embarrassed by the ovation prepared for him on landing, had taken refuge therefrom by diving into the crowd after a known face, when the operation (shaking hands) was gone through. Interest having been awakened as to this so honoured individual, it was discovered that he was no other than the Master of the Queen's Private Band; in other words, a servant of the Palace.

We have here an important "fact" in regard, not only to the practice of mutually causing the arm to vibrate, but also as to the point of etiquette in the selection of grades between which the degradation is exchanged, not only as regards members of the Royal Family, but also as regards officers in Her Majesty's service.

The visit of the Duke of EDINBURGH to the Australian colonies had been productive of anything but agreeable impressions. The incident at Portsmouth explains this result. The colonists are generally in arrear of the mother country. They still entertain ideas of Royal dignity, and, consequently, feel-

ing themselves highly honoured by this visit, expected to find in the Prince and his companions, dignified bearing, sedulous punctuality and courtly manners. The revulsion of feeling may be apprehended, as also the political consequences.

When the Crown has surrendered power and functions, and has avowedly become but a Pageant, at least it has to be a Pageant. This is, perhaps, the most important of the functions of Royalty, supposing even all the other functions to be duly performed. But, ceasing to be the type and model of politeness, a President immediately suggests itself as a more economical chief magistrate. The unquestioned functions in the model Republic of that officer, are now manifestly reduced to the shaking of hands.\* To us it appears very questionable if even Presidentship can, for any lengthened period, continue on such conditions; but few who will reflect on the matter, will be ready to affirm that the kingly office can long subsist on such conditions. The analogy of the discipline of the Navy and the Army is before us all; and no one would affirm that the service could be carried on, even that of Republican countries, if the captain of a man-of-war or the colonel of a regiment shook hands with his men.

We have the condition of servants and of children before us. No one is blind to the contrast in these classes between the last and the present centuries, or to the deterioration of the present. But no one does or can connect that change with the absence of salutation between master and servant, and the presence of hand shaking between parent and child, because these are things which he lives amongst and practises, and therefore cannot appreciate or even perceive. How different if presented to the unconfused eye. Such a one opened but for a second of time on our intercourse, would link together cause and effect. He would say, "Having dispensed with domestic etiquette, the English children call their fathers by a nickname, and English masters and servants do not form families but hostile classes."

It is necessary here so far to anticipate on what we shall have to say on this greatest of all social matters by laying down the following propositions:—

1st. That to take a man's hand and with it to agitate his arm, is *not to salute him*.

2ndly. That wherever this motion has been introduced *it has superseded the salute*.

3rdly. That salute is the basis of all discipline.

4thly. That no human society has been constituted without it, as shown by the earliest of recorded usages and etymology.

\* At the preparatory meeting in favour of the President, one hour was spent in making speeches, and one hour in shaking hands.

5thly. That such practice has never appeared amongst any people, whether flourishing or, decaying, until the present time.

6thly. That it appeared in England as one of the corrupt practices connected with the solicitation of votes for seats in Parliament.

These propositions will be hereafter established; but it requires that the distinction be drawn between "taking" and "shaking" the hand. The first has in all times been practised by men, the occasion arising. It is analogous to "putting the hand" to a contract. It is a pledge. It belongs to the ceremony or sacrament of marriage. It belongs to the feudal investiture. No greater error can be committed than to confound the two.\*

The importance of the maintenance of dignity as a foundation of the Crown extends to the bearing and the affections of every subject. A vulgar man all despise, or profess to despise; all ought to despise him. A man is vulgar only because he is unobservant of things, and heedless of the feelings of others. He is so because as a child he is not taught to be polite. He cannot be polite without an established ceremonial which all are bound to follow. If not polite, he will not be observant of his parents and elders. The feeling of respect will not be developed in his nature, nor the impulses of affection be generated in his heart. Thus it is that vulgarity offends every rational conviction as well as every unreasoning instinct.

The contrary—politeness—whilst spreading over a land a vast harvest of agreeable sensations, maintains public security by establishing respect of man for man, respect of man for institutions and traditions. Besides the culture of amiable dispositions in those who stand in the lower stations, it tends to enforce desert, and to shame unworthiness in those who are the objects of it.

The Crown is the source of honour, only as being the Palladium of Politeness. In maintaining its own dignity, it is the protection of family affections, of individual character and integrity, of public and political temperance and amiability. It is thus the first of its functions to respect itself, and thereby to prevent its people from becoming coarse, unobservant, disrespectful, and in one word, vulgar.

In a grammar of the middle of the last century, the following passage is given in an exercise.

\* The "joining" of hands (*dextra jungere dextram*) broke out once in the course of time into a usage, but then it appears to have had the same origin as in England. We have no evidence that *jungere* or *prensare* degenerated into that vibratory motion which has made the fortune of the modern English invention. In any case, it died out after the corruption of the Republic sank under the despotism of the Empire.

“When your father enters the room you rise, and do not sit down till permitted to do so.”

This is a landmark. By it we learn that a hundred years ago only, the domestic etiquette of these Islands stood at the level, or nearly so, of Turkey to-day. It is true that the “hand shake” had then been introduced, so that the conflict had arisen between politeness and vulgarity.\*

Our most recent historian declares “change to be the Law of our present condition.”† This term is, however, anything but accurate, and suggests an operation of the mind, when indeed no operation has been performed, and where we have before us only a void, or at best a chaos.

To change the existing practice would have required, not that the son should cease to rise before the father, but that the father should rise before the child. This is not what has taken place. The object of respect has not been changed, but the sense and habit of respect has died away.

It is one thing that the habits of politeness should die out; it is quite another that those of vulgarity should be inculcated. Not to rise before the parent is a negative matter only, but to substitute a ludicrous agitation of the members for the sign of salutation is an active matter.

Capacity and acquirements are distinct from the man; manners are the man himself. A man has to make an effort to display his proficiency; he is conscious that he does so; also of the effect he produces on others. In his manners he reveals himself all naked, when there is an observant eye upon him. He does so unconsciously. Change of manners is, then, a change of being. It will show itself in all their bearing, in all their forms, and in all their speech. This change in the first family in the realm has been already the subject of painful observation to some.‡ It has been effecting an unconscious deterioration in the rest; the tone of English society has been lowered, and a corre-

\* SALUTATION A CENTURY AGO.—To take a man by the arm and shake it till his shoulder is almost dislocated is one of the grand testimonies of friendship which the English give each other. This they do very coolly; there is no expression of friendship in their countenances, yet the whole soul enters the arm which gives the shake. *This supplies the place of the embraces and salutes of the French.*—*M. Grosley's Tour to London in 1770.*

† “So absolutely has change become the law of our present condition, that it is identified with energy and moral health; to cease to change is to lose place in the great race; and to pass away from off the earth with the same convictions which we found when we entered it, is to have missed the best object for which we now seem to exist.”—*Froude's History of England*, vol. i., p. 1.

‡ It may or not be true, that a member of the Royal house, preferring to be addressed by a sobriquet and not in the terms hitherto in use, was answered by one of his household, “I trust, *Sir*, that I shall never forget my place, or you yours;” but when such stories are told, it shows that such things are not held now to be incredible or unlikely.



sponding disregard manifests itself for the kingly office and the dynasty.\*

We have seen the result in France of the attempt to retain or regain favour by familiarity. It is before us, that in the present reign, the courtly standard of manners has suddenly sunk, and that, with a Sovereign pre-eminently deserving her people's gratitude and admiration, no corresponding respect is evinced towards her or her family.† It is in the highest quarter the conviction that Revolution is approaching. But this melancholy prospect is laid at the door of political and speculative measures. It would be better to remain blind to the future than to attribute it to the wrong cause. What matter who elects or who does not elect a House of Commons, itself a nullity when not worse? The causes of Revolution are now what they ever have been, and must be—the acts of the rulers and their manners. It would be to deny a Providence to suppose that such deeds as ours have been for the last thirty years should not bring retribution; and that retribution is revolution first, and extinction afterwards. It would be to ignore human nature to suppose that men will indefinitely submit to a rule of crime and consequent taxation, when, in addition thereto, the habits of respect are broken down. These, the active causes of coming convulsion, are in the hands of the Sovereign, without whose concurrence lawless wars could not be made, without whose permission the bonds of civility could not be broken.

But to return to the SULTAN. For an empire, under any circumstances, it is a great fortune to have a chief with capacity for business, or with qualities such as to attract to himself the respect and affection of his people. How much more so when the two are combined! If this is a great fortune for any empire, how much more so for Turkey at present!

The title of "Picture" has been given by MOURADJA D'OHSSON to his great work on Turkey, and it is appropriate. It is the production of at once a profound Orientalist and a Raya. He was also the Dragoman of a Foreign Mission. This Armenian, combining so unexpected and invaluable a variety of conditions and acquirements, wrote at a period which may be designated the climax of violence and disorder. Yet this Raya, this Dragoman, writing at that moment, laid it down as the result of his examination, that the evils which reigned and the

\* An eye-witness writes in reference to a recent public appearance of the Queen:—"Notwithstanding what the newspapers say, there was not even a murmur of welcome, and few had the grace to lift their hats."

† The phrase was current at Berlin after the marriage of the Crown Prince with the English Royal Family, that "the Crown Princess shook hands with everybody." The King of Prussia has proved an apt scholar, and has gone to the Baltic shaking hands with burghers and peasants.

dangers which threatened, proceeded from no vice in the political or religious system, and from no corruption in the mass of the people. He held that these discords were, on the contrary, in opposition to its constitution, and repugnant to the generality of the subjects. He, consequently, concluded that it was in the power of a great man, whether as Vizier or as Sultan, to restore the Empire at once to its former greatness.

This prevision has been more than borne out, for Sultan MAHMOUD has accomplished the task. It is not the less done, because those who conduct affairs have not the consciousness of the position they occupy and of the power of which they might dispose.

But Sultan MAHMOUD did not fulfil the conditions set down by D'OHSSON. He was not a great man. Greatness requires more than success against circumstances; it requires also success in mental operations.

The present SULTAN has eminent qualities. He, no more than his father, has apprehended the qualities of his race, the resources of his Empire, or the jurisprudence of his religion. But as a man he is peculiarly endowed so as to win to himself the affections of his people, and preserve that first basis of security—respect for the throne. He has imposed restraints upon himself in regard to domestic habits. Following the example of AKBAR THE GREAT, he confines himself to one meal a day—so, at least, it is reported in the public news—and we accept it as a thing which would not be invented.

The importance of this practice will not be apprehended in the West. The idea of indulgence does indeed subsist in regard to a surfeit; but that is all. To eat too much at a meal disgraces a man; not so to repeat those meals many times a day. To attempt to argue on such a point is vain. Let the statement suffice. No man can be in the East the object of deep veneration who eats oftener than once a day.

The SULTAN, then, by this practice has laid the foundation of great and enduring influence, if thereupon he builds with fitting materials. That is to say, if, desiring to do well and being thereon instant and unceasing, he can rule his own passions, discriminate as to personal character and objects, detect fallacies, go to the bottom of all matters in the law and constitution of the State, and set his face and soul against novelty, for innovation's sake.

But this prospect is overcast if he himself introduces into the Imperial ceremonial an operation which is a vulgarism where practised, an object of ridicule where newly seen; and which must have unmade the Turks as gentlemen, if it awakens not in them surprise and indignation.

It is our constant task to show how each man contributes by his opinions to the decline and fall of the Empire. He is equally so occupied in his manners. His misjudgments, his ambiguous phraseology, his passions, and his indifference constitute him a unit of baseness. So, through the new processes of human intercourse in act and speech, he becomes a molecule of vulgarity. Nor let it be supposed that his part therein is negative only. The man who is not in himself upright becomes a disseminator of immorality, for he cannot abstain from re-echoing and approving what is wrong. So the man who has not formed for himself—that is, recovered from former times—a standard of politeness, and acts upon it, in so far as it is possible to do so, instructing therein family, dependants, and friends, does actually contribute to the propagation of baseness.

The power and influence of station cease to be known to exist when not used. It is thus like talking of the agency of electricity before its discovery, to talk now of the influence of the royal office. But let us suppose that ten thousand persons were engaged, as above described, in restoring the standard of manners, it will be admitted that some effects would thereby be obtained, and that in some degree, the tide would be stemmed. But how completely would not this obstacle be overthrown, and the torrent hastened onwards, were the heir-apparent to the British throne one morning to walk into an apartment with his hat on his head, into which he would not have so walked the day before!

Every one will see the influence which station can exercise in this sense. It must, then, be capable of exercising a corresponding influence in the other. Whilst this enormous social power lies in the grasp of a few favoured individuals, these same individuals may, nevertheless, be political nullities. The heir-apparent to the British Crown, who can depress or might elevate the manners of British society, is wholly destitute of all means of influencing those ephemeral operations which the vulgar conceive to be important, and alone to be of importance. He could not influence a vote on the Reform Bill or the Irish Church.

Uprightness is only of relative value. It is in estimation from its rareness. A man to stand at all must stand alone. An upright man must be a resisting man. His uprightness only appears by the occasion. Not less have the manners than the ideas of his age and country to be resisted by any one who has for himself reasoned to just conclusions; that is to say, who is right where others are wrong. If a man were blameless when he is like the rest, and blameable only when worse than others, the judgments of God would be unjust. Nations only perish when all are guilty and base; therefore, there is work—personal, daily, hourly work for every man to do, who among such a people, is not of them.

## THE ŒCUMENIC COUNCIL SHAKING HANDS.

(*Diplomatic Review for April, 1870.*)

IN the *Journal de Bruxelles* we read the following :—

“The fidelity of the Orientals to their external customs is well known. If their politicians, by a mysterious design of Providence, have yielded by degrees to the encroachments of European manners—if they preserve nothing more of the ancient signs of separation than the fez, the people and clergy remain obstinately attached to these customs. After all, there is a reason for their existence; they are derived from the most remote antiquity, and are founded on propriety and dignity.

“Salutation is a thing of considerable importance in the East; and when Mr. URQUHART in his publications, with an energy which appears to us exaggerated, denounces the practice of *shaking hands* which the English have imported into the world, he reasons very justly in reference to the Orientals.

“The Orientals do not tolerate this mode of salutation, and this jerking, bearish shake of the hand is to them a grievous offence. They salute with gravity carrying their hands to their lips and their forehead, in order to testify the respect they profess towards their visitor, which they show by kissing his hand and placing it on their forehead. To accost an Oriental with a smile on the lips is disagreeable to him, and has all the appearance of derision. He receives you gravely with an expression of peace on the countenance. If he comes to your house, to leave him standing when he is not of a very inferior rank, is an impropriety, or rather an insult, &c. . . .

“There are, therefore, in the relations between a European and an Oriental, a number of points on which the latter can be cruelly hurt, and this is what the Latin missionaries have frequently ignored and more frequently set at defiance. Hence arises the antipathy, or more properly speaking the abhorrence, which the prelates have conceived for the greater part of the missionaries, their repugnance to all change coming from Rome, and the facilities possessed by the agents of Russia for inspiring a fear of Latinisation by the Holy See.

“There are missionaries, for instance, who, setting at nought all Oriental customs, and possessing themselves of certain portions of the united population, especially the youth, require the faithful to enter the church with covered feet, and to take off the turban at the elevation of the Host, &c.; which are so many insults in an Oriental point of view.

“Some missionaries, it is true, have discovered that they have taken a wrong course, &c. . . .”

These observations have reference to the first days of the arrival of the Orientals. Their contact with Westerns has spread among them the vulgarity of our manners.

But the assembly of so many bishops, at the present time, has inflicted a heavy blow on that dignity which the prelates maintained in their dioceses. We read in the *Decentralisation de Lyon* :—

“It is useless for us to speak. Modern notions have entered the minds of the ecclesiastical dignitaries, especially of those who have been in the habit of mingling in the political discussions of their country, and we see produced in the sittings of the Council the habits of our Chambers. As soon as a Father has spoken, for instance, those who are of his opinion come to compliment him and grasp *him by the hand*; a thing which rouses the indignation of Mr. URQUHART, who proves that the *shaking of hands* is the manifest sign of the corruption of the times.”

It is evil which propagates itself by contact. The style of the United States has become the fashion of the Fathers of the Œcumenic Council. Must we also add that the rare exceptions are to be found in the Americans? The excess of the evil has brought forth, if not remedy, at least disgust.

With regard to the Orientals, it is not that they have one ceremonial and we another; it is that they retain manners among grown-up people, and that we lose them among grown-up people, and extinguish them in the new generation, which on arriving at manhood will constitute a society of unmitigated rudeness below the most savage races, and which will have of man only his evil passions.

There are, however, some among the Orientals who appreciate the circumstances from the highest point of view, and who are resolved on their return to their country to exclude the manners with the opinions of Europe, in order to preserve those rules of ancient politeness which the Turks derived from their ancestors.

To define infallibility is all very well; but, after all, it is only a negative operation, the interest in which will disappear after the word has been pronounced. To reproclaim the Law of Nations is a necessity for the Church of Rome if she does not wish to perish. PIUS IX. can accomplish these two works, but they will be very far from sufficing for the realisation of his project for preventing human society from falling into ruins. For that purpose, he will have to find the means, as the *Pall Mall Gazette* has well proposed, of recreating gentlemen in modern society, a thing which is very easy for him, and impossible for any one else.

## WASHING THE FEET OF PILGRIMS.

(*Diplomatic Review for May, 1870.*)

SOME of our observations on Eastern manners, in our April number, have produced a great effect on the Orientals at Rome. A letter from that city gives some of the words of one of them :—

“ The last number of the *Diplomatic Review* states the truth, and a truth which is most important. On the one hand, we are not ourselves thoroughly sensible of it; on the other we are unable to speak.”

Another letter says :—

“ I sincerely wish the Council may terminate soon, not only for the repose of the world, but also that the Orientals at Rome may not absolutely lose that flower of politeness which constitutes the charm and poesy of Oriental life.”

The ceremony in which the POPE himself washes the feet of poor pilgrims, and then waits upon them at table, under the same roof, but in a chamber apart, has at the present time quite a peculiar significance. It places in juxtaposition ancient traditions and modern practices; and by so doing, the East and the West. Its solemn and religious character ought to impose upon every Catholic the duty of conforming to this antique ceremonial, and consequently of comprehending it.

Thousands of pilgrims, male and female, have had their feet washed by cardinals, bishops, princes, and princesses. But unfortunately these persons do not know how to wash. The art of ablution has disappeared from Europe with all that concerns social life. It was a very miserable and disgusting scene, and quite calculated to suggest to the Orientals useful reflections on Europe.

A strange thing is it to see these persons, amongst whom all forms of respect have disappeared in their respective relations, *kiss the feet* of the lowest class—feet which they have not washed but only dashed over with water.

We insert on this subject two letters: one addressed to ourselves from a Catholic priest, the other a private letter of a protestant lady:—

### MODE OF SALUTATION IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

*Would it be puerile for the Council to entertain this Question?*

That which in former times characterised the method of salutation in the Catholic Church, was a mixture of respect, of affection, and of humility. Christians considered each other as *members* of JESUS CHRIST, and as *temples of the HOLY GHOST*; from this flowed respect. It was their duty to love their neighbour as themselves, and at the same time to regard the services which they rendered their brethren as services rendered to CHRIST in person; thence came affection mingled with humility.

It was evidently these three dogmas or points of Christian religion and morality which, having passed into the manners and habits of life, led to, and characterised in the highest degree, the monastic salutation.

We see in the polemical writings of St. BERNARD, that he sent to PETER THE VENERABLE, Abbot of Cluny, a criticism at once firm, humble, and charitable, on the abuses which he was of opinion had been introduced into the Cluniac order. We have also the answer of PETER THE VENERABLE, which humbly accepts some of these criticisms, and at the same time justifies his order on several other points and details, into which the great Abbot of Clairvaux had not entered.

Now it appears from these writings, that one of the reproaches which was made by contemporaries against the monks of Cluny, was that of *not prostrating themselves before their guests*, on the arrival or departure of the latter, and of *not washing their feet*; and also of not making the usual response, "*God be thanked,*" (*Deo gratias*) on the first sign of the approach of a guest, that is to say, when they heard him knock at the gate of the monastery.

PETER THE VENERABLE is, in the main, far from despising these reproaches as puerilities. He replies on the latter point, the omission of "*Deo gratias,*" that the gates of the monasteries are always open, and that the people no longer knock at them for entrance. He then shows that in consequence of the large number of guests, it would be impossible for the monks to follow the rule and to fulfil its obligations if they should all go to welcome all their guests and wash their feet. But provision, he adds, has been made for that point of the ancient rule in this:

that the abbot and all his monks never allow a year to pass without *each* washing the feet of three guests, and then presenting them with bread and wine. Some chosen monks are appointed to receive their guests in the accustomed manner.\*

It follows, thence, that at the commencement of the twelfth century the mode of salutation in the monasteries of the principal orders bore the threefold character above indicated of respect, of charity or paternal affection, and of humility.

The writer of this has, on three occasions, visited a Trappist monastery of the nineteenth century. He was received at its gate by a *brother* and one of the fathers, whose duty it is to attend to the guests, who in the first place *prostrated* themselves before him, then rose slowly with a respectful mien, which presently gave place to a lively and frank expression of affection illuminating the countenance, without any diminution of respect. This unusual spectacle struck him with such force on the first occasion, that tears came into his eyes.

He also learned from the monks that their Rule prohibited their asking the name, residence, quality, or anything else of the guests they so received.

The mode in which the French priests still salute one another after a long absence when meeting each other at the commencement or termination of their spiritual exercises, called *ecclesiastical retreats*, and, even more frequently, is the ancient French salutation of the embrace [*accolade*]. This salutation is in itself only the liturgico-roman salutation, called the "Peace be with you," or the *kiss of peace*, the fraternal embrace which was given, and is still given, in the Roman Office immediately before the Communion.

At this day, in certain parts of Germany, and particularly in Luxembourg, and even in that part which is called the German portion of the Diocese of Metz, not only do the priests, but all the population, without distinction, salute each other by a respectful inclination, accompanied with these words, "Praised be JESUS CHRIST," pronounced by the first who salutes; and to which the other responds, "For ever."

A congregation of instructress sisters, whose principal house is at Metz, and who, in the three dioceses of Metz, Verdun, and Rheims, have the direction of numerous popular schools, have adopted this form of salutation. The writer of this has read more than twenty times in letters written by the sisters to each other, or even to their relations, the following form of expression for what are now called the compliments given in charge for third persons to those to whom they write personally: "An *affec-*

\* See "Histoire universelle de l'Eglise Catholique," by Rohrbacher, vol. xv., p. 220 and following. First edition.



*tionate* ‘Praised be JESUS CHRIST’ to such a one of my sisters, or to such a one of my relations.”

Those who know how much sweetness and kindness the name of JESUS contains for Christians, who preserve piety and holy faith, will easily understand that this epithet of *affectionate*, in characterising the salutation, Praised be JESUS CHRIST, is perfectly just, and that this salutation is one of those which best express the respect and paternal affection, the source of which is in the heart of JESUS, and the expression of it in his name.

For my part, I should not experience any disagreeable impression, and the thought would not cause in my mind any idea of charging the Council of the Vatican with having fallen into puerility, nor even into the narrow details which the Prætor ought to neglect (*de minimis non curat Prætor*), if I were to read, on the tokens of honour which Christians owe to each other, a chapter analogous to that which we see in the Council of Trent, in the part where it treats of the ecclesiastical and religious carriage and dress, and which commences with these words: “*Etiamsi habitus non faciat monachum*” (although the dress does not make the monk).

I should, on the contrary, be edified if I read one day in the decrees of the present Council, some disposition in reference to the following thoughts.

“It is true that the external signs of respect and affection which Christians owe to each other—and to all men, considered as images of GOD their Creator, redeemed by the precious blood of our LORD CHRIST, already destined or called to the eternal honour of the glory of celestial blessedness, objects of that paternal charity which is the sum of the law and the prophets—do not constitute in themselves the reality of that honour and of that respect any more than the truth of that charity which should exhibit itself in works: ‘*non diligamus verbo, neque linguâ, sed opere et veritate.*’\* ”

“We nevertheless read in the Old Testament, that the wise man saw in the economy of the All Powerful a *great respect* manifest itself towards his human creatures; † and in the New Testament, we see the Divine Master and true LORD of all, Himself, after having declared that He came to serve and not to be served, as a testimony of his extreme love, ‡ wash in an humble posture the feet of his apostles, and set them this example with an injunction to follow it; and we see him threaten PETER, already pure, and who refused through humility this

\* John iii., 8.

† Cum magna reverentiâ disponis nos (Domine) xii., 18.

‡ Cum dilaxisset suos, in FINEM dilexit eos . . . et cum accepisset linteum.—John xiii., 1, 14.

service on the part of his Master, that he should not share in his authority, if he did not consent to it;\* by which we may understand that no one, not even His vicar himself, is exempt from imitating Him on this point.

“This is the reason why, in desiring that all the faithful of JESUS CHRIST who are docile to these teachings, may perfectly realise in their conduct the precept of the apostle which says: “Inform one another by acts of honour;”† we exhort them to place such external tokens in harmony with the internal sentiments which ought to animate them, in avoiding in these outward signs all that would savour of the buffoonery‡ forbidden to Christians by the same apostle; and generally all that, which, being foreign to the true expression of these sentiments, would be of a nature to compromise them, to debase or to make them forgotten.

“And we further order all the heads of the orders and competent superiors of religious houses, to maintain with care what the ancient rules prescribe for the respectful reception of guests at their door and in the interior of their monasteries; and also the washing of the feet in places where it may be practicable, such as is happily still in usage among our brethren in the East. We enjoin in the same manner the bishops of the Catholic world never to omit, under any pretext, the *Mandatum* of the day in *Cenâ Domini*, and to give it without display, and with simplicity and proper decency, each one in his cathedral, and not otherwise, unless in case of grave and legitimate hindrance, or of a very ancient custom in relation to the place where this rite ought to be performed. Finally, we strongly exhort the bishops, and others of the clergy, to retain amongst them the salutation *in osculo sancto*; we invite the bishops to issue timely monitions, and generally all those who are charged with the cure of souls, to break Christian people off from all the marks of honour which should rather be called marks of buffoonery, that may have replaced the ancient forms of respect and fraternal charity, and to inculcate on them, and principally on young people and children, forms and external signs redolent of Christian faith, mutual love, and proper respect.

“Utinam omnes honore invicem præveniant, caritate fraternitatis invicem diligant, hospitalitatem sectantes benedicant omnibus in Domino, et nulli maledicant aut quemquam quovis modo spernentur, providentes bona non solum coram Deo, sed etiam coram omnibus hominibus, et si fieri potest, quantum ex se est, cum omnibus pacem habeant.”

#### A FRENCH ECCLESIASTIC.

\* Non habebis partem mecum, John xii., 1, 8.

† Romans xii.

‡ Scurrilitas quæ ad rem non pertinet.—Eph v. 4.

## HOW TO BE CLEAN.

(FROM A LADY TO HER GOVERNESS.)

*(Diplomatic Review for June, 1870).*

Rome, April 18, 1870.

THERE is a very interesting institution founded by St. PHILIP DE NERI in 1550, which is a house of reception for pilgrims; that is, for those who come from a distance to visit the churches and tombs of the Apostles and Saints at Rome. What is remarkable in connexion with this, is that the pilgrims are attended by Cardinals and Bishops, as also by Princes and Princesses, and a great many of the strangers visiting Rome, both ladies and gentlemen, particularly in the Holy Week, when large numbers of pilgrims come in. All these persons put on, for the time, a peculiar dress—the same for all—and wait upon the pilgrims, first in washing their feet, and then in serving them at table.

The whole thing is conducted in a most religious manner. Before the washing begins, the Cardinal, who presides, reads prayers, and also at the end. After the feet of each have been washed, the person who has done it kisses them.

You will see at once that all this has no connexion with modern ideas or habits, but is ancient and Eastern, which is the same thing; the difference between the East and the West being that the former has preserved what the latter has lost. According to modern notions, however kind people might intend to be, they would not think of showing that kindness by washing the feet, and this as an indispensable preliminary to giving to eat. The hands are not washed.

The washing of the feet, as the first act of hospitality, belongs to a time and a country where men do wash themselves; for, to quote the words of CHRIST, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet."

To Christians a particular significance is given to the act by our Lord and Master having chosen to perform it just before his death, as the last lesson given to his disciples. Doing the same to the poor, who, he tells us, are His representatives upon earth, and at the time when we celebrate His own washing of His disciples feet, it is impossible that those who do it should not think of Him; and certainly all those who are piously inclined have a pleasure in doing it for His sake.

I went one evening (on Holy Thursday) to the Hospital to see it done, with my mind full of these thoughts. And I saw what, instead of delighting me, only pained and disgusted me, because *those who washed did not know how to do it.* The dirty feet were dipped into a tub of water, sufficiently rubbed to make the water black, while the feet still remained apparently as dirty as ever. Taken out of the black water, they were dried with a clean towel, without the idea of rinsing them, so that the towel and the water were polluted without the feet being cleansed. This is, of course, the same way in which the persons who performed the act of charity wash themselves. But what struck me at the sight was the feeling of the

deadness that is produced both in the outward and inward senses by habits that are unnatural.

In this particular case there was everything that ought to have awakened the senses and the mind. The connexion with the East, in the remembrance, not only of our SAVIOUR'S act, but of many other incidents of the Bible, familiar to us; as ABRAHAM receiving the travellers in his tent, who were Angels, when he says to them, "Let a little water be fetched, I pray you, and wash your feet." Such a connexion might have been expected to make people think of the East, and of how people wash there; and it is known that washing is done there by clean water being poured over the feet or hands, and not by plunging them in the water to pollute it. At least, these thoughts might have been expected to have arisen in those who direct the establishment, so that the arrangements would have been made to that end; and that so, in following the example of Our LORD, the act might have been performed as He did perform it. The more so, as all the ablutions that take place in the Church during mass are by pouring water over the hand. The effect that may be produced by this act, properly and tenderly performed (as it is by some who, having been in the East, understand it), was shown one evening at the Pellegrini, when one of the spectators took the hand of a gentleman, after having observed what he did, and kissed it.

You may ask why I tell all you this. Because, when I saw ladies contentedly wiping the foot taken out of the dirty water on the clean towel, then *kissing the foot still defiled*, and drawing on clean stockings, which they had themselves provided, I immediately thought of my children, and felt that there could be no safeguard for them against the same state of deadness but in having now, while their ideas and habits are being formed, deeply impressed on them, a horror of not making a distinction between the clean and the dirty.

When — was three years old he had a strong sense on this subject, which he explained to a gentleman who came to our bath, in words which were repeated by the latter to me. He had been asked what it was to be clean, and he answered, "To wash yourself with soap and water, and then to wash away the dirty water with clean water." The danger that he and the others are exposed to is that of once neglecting to wash properly; and then gradually slipping into doing as others do. To be secured against this they must observe the proper practice, not only as an act of obedience, but from the sense that to do differently is disgusting and degrading. You will give them the latter feeling not by your words, but by your acts, by never omitting to make them observe it, and, above all by never omitting to observe it in washing yourself. To have once seen you do the contrary may be enough to prevent the guardian sense of horror at pollution from arising in their minds. This sense, that to be clean you must have been not only washed but *rinsed*, cannot be entertained with regard to the body only. It is equally true of all things, and they must feel it so. A place or spot that is clean is a place which has not been touched by what is dirty since

it was cleansed. As soon as it is so touched it has been defiled, and has to be cleansed in the same way as the body, for that is the only way. If, by inadvertence, they touch with their dirty shoes a spot on which shoes do not come—you understand that I speak of the bath—you must not let them content themselves with drawing back, and saying, “Oh, I forgot,” as a European would do, but they must repair what they have done by taking water and washing what they have defiled.

Such habits as these have been those of all the nations of the earth. They still exist where men have remained themselves instead of copying others. In the East the whole house is clean, because it is not entered with the dirty shoes from the street. We can only establish the distinction as regards one spot, the bath. Let that at least be carefully maintained, and then that place will be not only the great source of health for the body, but also produce a most important influence on the mind.

It is an old saying that cleanliness is next to godliness; it is so because it may be made a most important assistance to overcoming all that is not according to godliness. When this habit was practised as a matter of course, its importance could not have been perceived. Like many other good habits which are a restraint, as all good habits are in one shape or other, its value could not be seen except in the consequences that have followed on the loss of it. And to see that, it required that the mind of some one should be awakened to think about it, and connect the cause with the effect. This has happened, and so our children have been brought up differently from others.

But what I want you to feel is, that in helping me to train them in this way you are making it easier for them to keep themselves in all respects pure. You know that I am not undervaluing the teaching that has to be given to them in other respects both by word and example. But what I feel is, that to make them attentive in small matters, to give them a delicacy of mind and touch, is exactly what is needed as a safeguard against those habits of mind and speech, which (as our SAVIOUR said of the false teaching of the Jews in His day), being learned along with the Christian religion makes the latter of no effect. Why do people affect to despise outward observances both of respect and of cleanliness, and why do they speak as if the great charm of life consisted in familiarity between themselves, which is rapidly coming to be grossness and coarseness, and in throwing off all former restraints, and breaking down all distinctions? That people should like this who like to be vicious is nothing. But we see people applauding and teaching the same, who are not vicious. They do it from a false pride in what they call their reason. They will argue that the mind of man is above being influenced by the observances of the body; they will start theories, they will invent objections, they will do anything rather than admit the possibility that the world which they are so proud of belonging to—the civilised world—has been going wrong, and has to go back again and find the road that it has left to get right.

That the *world* should rebel against such ideas is, however, na

tural. But for the same reason those who desire to be not of the world should grasp at them, and see at once how entirely they are in accordance with the whole spirit of the Christian religion. In making the children attend as they ought to do, both in respect to manners and to cleanliness, you will have to prevent others from interfering with you and with them. You should therefore think over the matter well for yourself. I have but just indicated slightly what has to be thought about so as to help you.

## TEACHING THE CHINESE TO SHAKE HANDS.

(*Diplomatic Review for June, 1870*).

A LETTER which has arrived from China contains a phrase which, for some persons, will have a value beyond all calculation. It is there stated in express terms that the process of *shaking hands* is ruining the efforts of the Protestant Missionaries and demoralising the Chinese wherever it is introduced. It is a Catholic who writes. This Catholic little suspects what is actually taking place at Rome. He does not see that there is not here, unfortunately, a difference between England and France; but that it is France who copies an indignity, invented as a means of corruption in the elections to the English Parliament. The American continent has already reached a point in this respect in advance even of England. There the result has been arrived at of arms being disabled by the operation, and public affairs embarrassed by the time that is occupied in performing it. There, by a mistake parallel to that of the Catholic Missionary in China, they believe that it is a republican custom; and a recent writer quite naïvely proposes the introduction of royalty as a means of getting rid of it.

The importance attached to this letter from China by those who foresee the fatal consequences of this levelling process consists in this: that the minds of frivolous men on the one hand are struck by it, and pious men on the other, and that they are led to feel that the endeavour to arrest this vulgarism of manner, and to return thence to those forms of respect which are being everywhere abandoned, is an enterprise which deserves the respect of every upright heart, and the co-operation of every well-born and well-educated man.

We give an extract from the letter in question, and we add some observations of a traveller on the Catholic and Protestant missionaries of Syria.

### THE PROTESTANT MISSIONARIES IN CHINA.

“ Here at Hong-Kong the Protestant Missionaries complain that the Chinese girls do not remain in their schools. The

“reason is evident. They habituate them to shake hands with men. In a word, the Protestant Missionaries are doing no good but much evil, not only with respect to conversion, but also with regard to the well-being and security of Europeans established in China. Their manners and proceedings annoy the Chinese, irritate them, and set the Mandarins and Government against them. I am neither an Englishman nor a Frenchman, but I must say that whilst France is becoming powerful in China by the influence of Catholic Missionaries, England loses ground every day by the ridiculous actions and imprudence of Protestant Missionaries.”—*Letter of Monseigneur RAIMONDI, Apostolic Prefect at Hong-Kong.*

#### CATHOLIC MISSIONARIES IN THE LEBANON.

After having described the school of the Catholic Missionaries at Antoura, the author continues:—

“Thus these children will return to their homes with all their habits changed, and after having lost all respect for their parents and fellow-creatures. On the other hand, they will have learned a foreign language which can be of no advantage to persons in their condition. Contrasted with the Catholic Missionaries, the Protestant Missionaries are at least logical. Their object is to destroy. They are engaged in a war, silent but terrible. For them proselytism is the end: European influence the means. They must, therefore, pull down everything, customs, morals, and manners. But in what position is the Catholic? The Maronite is his co-religionist; the most docile and faithful of all the communities which recognise the supremacy of Rome. He sees, in the Maronite, piety and faith based on the ancient and beautiful simplicity of manners: nevertheless, he sets to work to destroy them. *One or the other must be entirely in error.* It is the Church of Rome herself who is assailed in the customs and the etiquette of the Maronite people (as of every other people), and it is the ecclesiastics of Rome who dare to pull them down.”

“I compelled him (a Catholic Missionary) to confess that neither he nor any member of his Church have devoted a moment’s reflection to these grave subjects; and that it was a few strangers from Rome absolutely ignorant of the country who, seeking to innovate, by their ignorance and their pride had commenced this overthrow of ancient customs, the absurdity of which he perceived in the domestic circumstances which surrounded us, and whose fatal results on the character and destinies of the people he was able to foresee.” — *The Lebanon*, 1860, by DAVID URQUHART.



From this extract it appears that both Protestants and Catholics in Syria alike teach the shaking of hands. The result has been an equal disgust for France and England.

Consequently the empire of the world has now to be won no longer by the most eminent or the most just, but by the most polite; if indeed politeness can yet succeed in finding some harbour of refuge.

We cannot conclude these remarks without taking notice of a most painful scene which took place at the commemoration of the anniversary of the founding of the City of Rome, when the POPE, after being hustled in a tent, was pursued in his walk amid the ruins which he desired to visit, by women, filled no doubt with devotion and love, but strangers to propriety and respect.

The Papacy appeared to be the last refuge of sovereign dignity; but such a scene could not have taken place in the court of the smallest or the most citizen King in Europe.

## THE COUNCIL MUST RESTORE ETIQUETTE.

(*Diplomatic Review for June, 1870.*)

[*Private Letter.*]

Milan, May 20, 1870.

THE proposition that the Council should regulate the mode of salutation, comes no longer from a solitary individual. An English journal, thoroughly Protestant, after having described the brutality of the English in Egypt, says: "Since neither Christianity nor Civilisation has given us the manners of gentlemen, "should not the Œcumenic Council undertake the task?"

I was saying recently to an Englishman at Rome, "Is there any way whatever of preventing you from reciprocally shaking your arms when you meet each other?" He replied, "Yes, a Decree of the Council."

The time which may elapse before the close of the Council offers the chance of obtaining something in this sense. The attention of some persons is already awakened, which is a point of very great importance. You, more than any other man, are fitted by a light and varied touch to arouse this attention. In the presence of this question all others lose their importance. The style, said Voltaire, is the man; and he only spoke of grammar. The question here is that of destroying the very framework of society by a process in which each acts, and on which no one thinks.

Do not suppose that it is impossible to do otherwise. The doing otherwise confers power. I myself have acquired influence through the very infraction of that method which the rest have adopted as a means of conciliating favour, and have thus accomplished things which I should never have otherwise dared to attempt. Existing errors furnish strength to those who oppose them. If this be true of ideas, how much more so is it of manners?

The commencements of all societies may be summed up in the ways which their legislators have laid down. They are

three : first, the rule of cleanliness ; second, the rule of politeness ; third, the rule of justice. Seek the beginning, and you will always find these. Modern society is admitted to be in a state of decomposition. We must return, if we propose to save it, to the work of the primitive legislator. For the first and last of the three rules a commencement has been made. In the ancient Roman *Thermæ* now restored at San Pietro in Vincoli, the modern Romans may learn how to wash themselves. The Œcumenical Council will reinaugurate the ancient code of the *Fecials*. But of what use will be either the one or the other, if you restore not that human dignity and politeness of intimacy which you are bent upon destroying, in substituting for it what you call your “sociability?”

No one will deny that brutality at a certain point must destroy human society ; that rendering all men ungovernable, they will become incapable of faith as of order. Nor will any one deny that we are in progress between etiquette and brutality. The successive steps are taken without being perceived ; in order to to perceive them, we must embrace the whole ; it is requisite that some man living at this hour should be able to feel as those who lived under etiquette, and at the same time be able intellectually to arrive at a perception of pure brutality. For this, it is requisite not to be of those who “habituate themselves,” as Madame DE SEVIGNÉ said, “to everything.” If Europe is to be saved from the last consequences of this “scurrility,” there must be a man, an hour, and a place. Some one, some where and at some time, has to say, “your hand-shaking is a meanness to which I will not accustom myself.” This has been done ; these words have been spoken.

I now ask you, if the Council is not the occasion for re-proclaiming the rule of politeness of the ancient religions and legislators ? I ask you if the Council can reorganise the religious orders without giving them a rule of salutation ? Finally, I ask you if the Council can touch the Cardinalate, a body which owes its dignity to etiquette, which alone in the world is bound by oath to observe it, without enforcing the rule of this etiquette against the point of its infraction in our time ?

I enclose an extract from a letter which I wrote some time ago to an eminent Mussulman :—\*

“ If you will accept as of some value the result of my study of your country and its institutions I will give it you. It is this :—*You possess in the TEMENAS a political palladium.* I therefore must believe that the introduction of the *Poignée de*

\* See *Diplomatic Review* for July, 1870.

“ *main*, which kills it, will prove a political danger for the Ottoman Empire, more to be feared than the cunning of Russia or the imbecility of Europe.

“ Even if you perish by the other causes, respect and admiration will follow the memory of a race, that, according to the Spanish proverb, had preserved

‘ Genio y figura  
Hasta la sepultura.’

“ Should the truth strike you, do not resign yourself, and be not discouraged. A man who sees is stronger than a world who does not see, and he carves his fortune out of their blindness.”

THE END.

LONDON:

CHARLES WHITING, BEAUFORT HOUSE, DUKE STREET, LINCOLN'S-INN-FIELDS.













LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 899 242 0