

I never thought it was so sweet to die." His death is thus described in a circular issued by the Bishop of Agen to his clergy:—"His last moments were those of a Saint. He received the Viaticum several times, with the fervor of an angel. He asked, himself, to have the Sacrament of Extreme Unction administered to him. He then commanded those around him to read to him, in a loud voice the Profession of Faith of Pius IV., and of Pius IX., and he then kissed it affectionately. His thoughts were continually fixed on God, and his lips moved only in prayer. In the midst of his most cruel sufferings he displayed an unbroken patience, and wore an ever-smiling countenance. Two days before his death, a miraculous statue of *Notre Dame de Bon Rencontre* was brought to him, and he venerated it with the most filial devotion. An hour later, a telegram arrived; it was the Apostolic Benediction sent by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. The august patient listened piously while it was read to him, and then putting it respectfully to his lips he kissed the precious despatch, and said in a voice scarcely audible: "Men are making me a very sweet agony, but God is making it very long." The agony lasted for another day, and on Friday, November the 22nd, at half-past one o'clock in the morning, after greeting the Feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin, he went to his eternal rest." *Requiescat in Pace.*

In the *Nineteenth Century* for December there is another excellent article from the pen of Mr. W. H. Mallock, which is most deserving of study and consideration. We would gladly if it were possible for us publish it entire, but as we cannot do so, we shall at least make our own of as much of it as it is in our power to grasp, and recommend it to the attention of our readers. The article is entitled "Dogma, Reason, and Morality," and having laid it down that any revelation that does not claim to be infallible cannot be considered as a genuine revelation,—“It is a hybrid thing, partly supernatural and partly natural; and it has thus the radical weakness of a religion that is wholly natural,”—the writer goes on to show that the history of Protestantism is a demonstration of this. “Long ago it was seen by some that that movement was really neither the restorer of a corrupted creed nor the corrupter of a pure creed; but that logically and essentially it was the solvent of all creeds whatever, and that when it had come to maturity, its essential nature would be visible. And now that time has come. Let us look at England, Europe, and America, and consider the condition of the entire Protestant world. Religion, it is true, we may still find in it; but it is religion from which the supernatural element is fast disappearing, and in which the natural element is fast becoming nebulous.” But those critics who judge Christianity by the essential nature and fate of Protestantism err widely. “They have still the Church of Rome to deal with, which is Christianity in its oldest, its most legitimate, and its most coherent form. They surely cannot forget her existence, or her magnitude.” To suppose this would be to accredit them with ignorance; still they are in a sense ignorant. “In this country the popular conception of Rome has been so distorted by our familiarity with Protestantism, that the true conception of her is something quite strange to us.” She has been exhibited as a lapsed Protestant sect, and attacked for being false to doctrines never hers. Her primary doctrine, that “She is inspired by the same Spirit that inspired the Bible, and her voice is, equally with the Bible, the voice of God,” this doctrine popular Protestantism ignores, or treats as if it were a modern superstition. Hence she seems a mass of superstitions and dishonesties. Our advanced thinkers have accepted this view, and have “taken the Protestants’ word for it that Protestantism is more reasonable than Romanism; and they think, therefore, that if they have destroyed the former, *à fortiori* have they destroyed the latter.” Nothing can be more false than this, the Catholic position is not to be reached through Protestantism. Let us see the relation of the Church of Rome to a natural moral sense, and a simple natural theism, leaving out all question of Protestantism. “The religious world will appear to us a body of natural theists, all agreeing that they must do God’s will, but differing widely amongst themselves as to what His will and His nature are.” Their views will be dream-like, their theories ‘shadowy hopes and fears,’ their practices will be various, but all the time there will be amongst them a tendency to unanimity. Every man will dream his own spiritual dream. “All their dreams, it will be plain, cannot represent reality; and yet the belief will be common to all that some reality is represented by them.” They will compare their dreams, and try to draw out of them the common element, so that all may have the same dream, which will lose its character of a dream, and assume that of a reality. The theists, then, form themselves into a common parliament, in which they compare, adjust, and give shape to their wavering ideas. “The common religious sense of the world is then organised, and its conclusions registered. We have no longer the wavering dreams of men; we have instead of them the constant vision of man.” “Now in such a universal parliament we see what the Church of Rome essentially is, viewed from her natural side. She is ideally, if not actually, the parliament of the believing world. Her doctrines, as she one by one unfolds them, emerge upon us like petals from a half-closed bud. They are not added arbitrarily from without; they are developed

from within. They are the flowers contained from the first in the bud of our moral consciousness. When she formulates now something that has not been formulated before, she is no more enunciating a new truth than was Newton when he enunciated the theory of gravitation. Whatever truths hitherto hidden she may become conscious of, she holds that these were always implied in her teaching, though, at the same time, she did not know it, just as gravitation was implied in many ascertained facts that men knew well enough long before they knew what was implied in them. Thus far, then, the Church of Rome, essentially, is the spiritual sense of humanity, speaking to men through its proper and only possible organ.” Its intricate machinery is accidental only, or necessary only in a secondary way. But the Church is something more than this. She is the parliament of spiritual man guided by the Spirit of God. “The work of that Spirit may be secret, and to the natural eyes untraceable, as the work of the human will is in the human brain. But none the less it is there. . . . The analogy of the human brain is here of great help to us. The human brain is an arrangement of material particles which can become connected with consciousness only in virtue of such a special arrangement. The Church is an arrangement of individuals which can become connected with the spirit of God only in virtue of an arrangement equally special.” If this be a true picture there can be no *à priori* difficulty in passing from a natural religion to such a supernatural one. The difficulty begins when we compare the ideal picture with the actual scene. 1st. The Church is the parliament of a part only of the whole believing world. 2nd. That part of the world that is not hers bears so strong a likeness to her that it is hard to assign her a validity she denies to others. 3rd. The accounts given by her of herself in archives to whose truth she pledges herself seem suspicious to unbiassed criticism. 4. “The supernatural moral conceptions that she presents us with seem out of harmony with those natural moral conceptions of which they profess to be the ratification and completion.” The first difficulty can be acknowledged only, but not explained. It must ever remain a mystery why the one revelation of God should be partial only. It is, however, no new mystery, we have already accepted it in a simpler form—“in the form of the presence of evil, and the partial and capricious prevalence of good.” This difficulty is for many complicated by a further one, wholly imaginary. It is said that orthodoxy tends to aggravate the apparent injustice of the distribution of good by making the presence of good still more partial, that it condemns as evil what to our natural moral apprehensions would seem good of the purest kind, and that it condemns many good and holy men without the Church, “for want of an assent to some obscure formula, which evidently, from the facts of the case, has not been injurious to their purity of life and heart. Hence it has been argued that a special set of doctrines cannot be specially true, since they are seen to be not essential to success in the matters that they deal with.” This line of argument is mistaken. The Church condemns no genuine goodness. “She says explicitly that a knowledge of ‘the one true God, our Creator and Lord,’ may be attained to by the ‘natural light of human reason.’ The mercies of God she declares to be infinite; but, except in so far as they are revealed to her, she can necessarily say nothing definite about them. But what she does say certainly is sufficient to satisfy the largest charity. . . . Her anathemas are on those only who deliberately reject her, by tampering with a conviction that she really is the Truth. They are condemned not because they cannot see that the teacher is true, but that, at heart seeing this, they contrive to close their eyes to it.” The moral offence in denying some obscure theological proposition may lie in the disobedience, self-will, and rebellion, that are the cause and consequence of the denial. From these considerations an assent to the claims of orthodoxy will be seen to add nothing to the difficulty of the partial distribution of good and the wide-spread presence of evil. But it may be asked, if orthodoxy recognises good as attainable by the unorthodox, of what profit is orthodoxy? It might as well be asked, of what good is true physical science? Such a question is absurd; we are not to think physical science worthless because a large number of men know nothing of it and yet seem in no way the worse. A knowledge of the laws of matter will tend to a better preservation of our health; still many individuals may be healthy who are not acquainted with the laws of health. “The mass of men may never be able to understand these matters more than partially; but what they do understand we feel convinced should be the truth, and even what they do not understand we feel convinced will be some indirect profit to them. And the case of spiritual science is entirely analogous to the case of natural science. A man to whom the truth is open is not excused from finding it because he knows it is not so open to all. A heretic who denies the dogmas of the Church has his counterpart in the quack who denies the verified conclusions of science. The moral condemnation that is given to the one is illustrated by the intellectual condemnation that is given to the other. . . . We do not say respecting any individual that a wrong theology need make him a bad man; nor do we say that a wrong theory of medicine need make him an unhealthy man. But we do say this in regard to the world in general.” Another objection is that the Christian revelation cannot be said to contain truth in any special and exceptional manner; it is but one