

the Pope is free and independent, except when he is sovereign, for only the sovereign power depends on none. And it is seen how this question of sovereignty which can be political everywhere, is in Rome a question essentially religious. In Rome there can be no sovereign people, nor sovereign assemblies, nor kings, nor dictators, nor consuls, nor tribunes. In Rome there can be no other sovereign power than the Pope, much as it may pain the revolutionaries. The States of the Pope belong to the Catholic world, and the Catholic world wish that they be respected, that he may be free and independent. Not the very Pope can despoil himself of his liberty and independence.

On the same subject, Cardinal Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, has written the Holy Father, much to the annoyance of M. Gambetta:—

PARIS, July 18, 1881.

*Most Holy Father*,—I could not repress a feeling of indignation and deep sorrow on learning what has just happened at Rome on the occasion of the removal of the mortal remains of Pius IX. Not even the natural respect for the dead could restrain the hatred of the wretches who are a disgrace to humanity. They chose the moment when a pious and contemplative crowd was escorting to their last resting-place the venerated remains of the late Pontiff, to give vent to their profane fury, threatening to throw the body into the river, insulting the deceased by their barefaced attempts. What is to be expected from revolutionary passions when conscious of impunity? The scenes that took place during that awful night of the 12th of July, in the centre of Christian civilization, are worthy of the darkest days of barbarism, and will leave an indelible stain of disgrace upon the period, full of sadness, in which we live. Indeed, if these men cannot allow the hearse bearing the remains of a saint and great Pope to pass by in peace, how are we to expect that they will show respect to your august person? And we may gather from that what we are to think of the so-called liberty guaranteed, we were told, to the Vicar of Jesus Christ by those who usurped his States. I wish before all to lay at the feet of your Holiness the expression of the feelings oppressing my breast, and which are shared by my venerable coadjutor. These feelings are those of all Christian people. The clergy and faithful of my diocese are imbued with them, and I feel sure I am the faithful mouthpiece of them when I state, most Holy Father, that we shall strive to cheer your heart by fresh marks of respect, love, and devotedness.

The Encyclical of his Holiness Leo XIII. (says the *London Weekly Register*) though addressed to Catholics and understood by them in the light of their own faith and theological knowledge, is commented upon by Protestants with the same unscientific conjecture which they generally apply to the study of the Scriptures. They should, therefore, be told that the recent Encyclical contains nothing new, nor even fresh, and that commentaries upon those passages which have offended them were written long ago by such eminent theologians as St. Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine, and Suarez, a summary of whose opinions has been set down by Balme. "The kingdom is not made for the king, but the king for the kingdom," says the Angelic Doctor, "for God has constituted kings to rule and govern, and to secure to every one the possession of rights; such is the aim of their institution: but if kings, turning

things to their own profit, should act otherwise, they are no longer kings but tyrants." According to the same Saint, "whenever laws are unjust (and observe that in his opinion, says Balme, they may be so in many ways), they are not binding upon conscience, unless for fear of creating scandal or causing greater evils...Laws are unjust...because they are opposed to the common weal; or on account of their aim, as is the case when a Government imposes upon its subjects onerous laws, not for the good of the commonweal, but for the sake of self-interest or ambition; or on account of their author, as when any one makes a law without being invested with proper faculties; again, they may be unjust in form, as when the taxes are unequally divided among the multitude, although in other respects tending to the public good. Such laws are rather outrages than laws."

"Kings, princes, magistrates," cries out the venerable Palafox, "all jurisdiction is ordained by God for the preservation of His people...for man's right, not for his injury." "When Louis XIV, said, 'I am the State,'" says the Spanish Abbe, "he had not learned the maxim from Bossuet, Bourdaloue, or Massillon. Pride, exalted by so much grandeur and power, and infatuated by base adulators, was here speaking by his mouth. How unsearchable are the ways of Providence! The corpse of this man, who said he was the State, was insulted at his funeral; and, before the lapse of a century, his descendants suffered death on the scaffold!" Further, it is historical that Rome forbade the book (of course the precise reason for the prohibition is not explicitly stated) in which Don Felix Amat, Archbishop of Palmyra, makes use of these words: "Jesus Christ, by His simple and peaceable answer, 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's,' has sufficiently established that the mere fact of a Government's existence is sufficient for enforcing the obedience of subjects to it." "Every man," says Balme, "who is jealous of his rights might acquiesce in the decree of the Sacred Congregation" with respect to such a book. "I have quoted remarkable passages," pursues the same author, "from a work of Suarez, written in refutation of a publication of King James of England. This king could not bear the idea of Cardinal Bellarmine's having established that *power of kings does not emanate directly from God, but is communicated through the medium of society.*"

The above are mere jottings from the mass of exalted Catholic opinion. The Divine Right of legitimate civil power, to whomsoever delegated—King, President, or Senate, is one of the most lofty and ennobling doctrines of the inspired and infallible Church of God; but "Divine Right," as some of our Protestant contemporaries have accused us of upholding it, is the very burlesque of a high dogma, as obnoxious to the heart made free by truth as it is to the councils of the highest authority upon earth. Among the many instances of insurrection to which the words we have quoted give sanction, the case of America rising against the imposition of a merely selfish tax will occur to every mind. The Encyclical teaches politics fundamentally only. The Holy Father assuredly will not and cannot descend into the details of application, which are left to the collective conscience of the people, to the individual conscience of the legislator, the publicist, and the citizen. Nothing is so striking as the necessary reticence with which the Encyclical passes by the special cases of nations.