

Cath. Church-Doctrine

Fourth Thousand.

BX
1750

THE PRINCIPLE OF AUTHORITY.

Churches and Pastors. . . .
The Church, Its Authority.

BY

REV. T. F. BUTLER,
ELLSWORTH, MAINE.

“Obey your prelates and be subject to them. For they watch,
as having to give account for your souls.” *Hebrews xv: 17.*



THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
OF AMERICA.

Pamphlet No. 27.

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA.

Deacidified

AER8203



THE PRINCIPLE OF AUTHORITY.

BY REV. T. F. BUTLER, ELLSWORTH, MAINE.

CHURCHES AND PASTORS.

THE gradual waning of the old time prejudice permits in these days the pastors of the various denominational churches of our cities to meet together for the promotion of many movements affecting the general welfare. Papers are read, views are interchanged and much light is derived from such general discussions. One of the subjects most frequently broached at these meetings is the large number of our people who do not attend any church at all and our obligations to them. I shall suppose, then, in the following pages that such a topic had been assigned to me for discussion and that I was reading my essay before such a body of men. I should proceed as follows:

I confess I scarcely know what to write in this paper; for I feel that your views and mine do not move in the same groove. We start differently. Our means for progress in our journey are not at all the same. Our ideals resemble each other only in part. In a word, though our aspirations may be the same in general, they are not the same in particular. How easy, then, it would be for me to touch a theme that would find no sympathy among you. How very easy for me to write what might offend you, though my desire would be the contrary.

But, at all events, I must be frank. Without that quality there would be no meaning in our conference.

The purpose of these meetings, if I am not mistaken,

is to devise some means by which, working in harmony, the clergy of this town might fill their churches with devout followers, and also control all efforts for good now undertaken by societies that are secular.

If the first of these objects be attained, the accomplishment of the second would depend in a large measure on the character of the minister.

To fill the church, however, and to keep it full, is a matter that regards the very nature of the religion professed there. It must not only be definite and appeal convincingly to the mind, but it must hold the conscience. A system of religion that is vague in any important matter, which does not claim to be *the only true religion*, which has not a satisfactory answer to every doubt that may arise, which does not rest each and all its claims on proof, cannot long hold the masses. □

Evidently if it wish the people to assemble on Sunday for Divine worship, one of its claims will be the *right to exact* such attendance, and especially on that day; for 'tis well known that Sunday is not the Sabbath.

The right to exact supposes the power of imposing penalty in case of willful neglect to obey.

Once that matter is settled we have to consider the relative positions of the pastor and his people in the economy of the church. To my mind these are prefigured in the ceremony of the feeding of the multitude mentioned in the Gospel. Our Lord wishes to feed all that are gathered around Him. He tells His apostles to cause the others to be seated. Then He blesses their store, the few loaves and fishes, and bids them to distribute the same to the seated multitude. The office of the Lord is to bless, that of the minister to distribute or give, that of the congregation to be seated and receive. In other words, the position of the pastor is that of master, in the sense of teacher; that of the flock is the position of the pupil. These positions should not be reversed. If they are allowed to be reversed, then the masters, who are many, will do as they please, will come to the church when it suits their convenience or whim, and will dictate the character of the teaching to be given. 'Twill be impossible to please all. If "one cannot serve two masters" how can he serve one hundred? The pastor, in such a case, must be exceptionally able

to preserve harmony for a long period. He can never get *beyond* simple harmony.

These things being considered, let us now become practical and view the situation as it stands right here in this town and most towns of its size. If the view does not please, we have to be honest and ask: How about my religion? How about myself?

The situation, in a few words, is this: There are over five thousand souls in the town. The number of persons who attend divine service on Sunday, together with those who are legitimately excused, might safely be put at, say, one thousand. I think that number is sufficiently high. And this is not in the middle of Africa, but in the civilized State of Maine, within an hour's journey, almost, of cultured Bar Harbor. Where are the four thousand? Who are they? I think you will admit with me that this is a matter worthy of the consideration of a body like this.

As to who they are, I will first answer by stating who they are not. They are certainly not Catholics, and never were such. The Catholics attend divine service almost to a man, and so do their children. We have a full congregation on every Sunday, no matter what the state of the weather may be. The Methodist church, I am told, is also well attended. So we may conclude that the large number of stay-aways are not Methodists. My people number about four hundred, all told. Let us suppose that the Methodist flock is about the same in number. In that case the greater part of the one thousand church-goers is already accounted for. The four thousand of the go-as-you-please party is to be sought, then, outside of these two bodies. They are all of the division known as Protestant.

All of you will at once cry out, perhaps, "They are not of us; they have no connection with us." Perhaps not; but they are the children and the grandchildren of those who built and maintained your churches. They are the children of those who formed the town. Naturally they should be yours if you could have held them. But you have not; *therefore*, they are not yours. Aside from that consideration, however, many of them must be actually yours—otherwise we would not have four thousand. Another consideration which strikes me is this: The Catholic Church and the Methodist Church are composed of the poor. We have not a rich

man in our midst. Ergo, the elite, the wealth and the culture of the town are to be sought among those who go to church when and as they please, or who do not go at all.

Such is the situation. Is it a pleasing one? Where is the fault? for there must be fault somewhere. The three factors in the problem are the people, the religion and the pastor.

Now my theory is that if everything was as it should be in regard to religion and the pastor there certainly would not be such a lapse from duty on the part of the people. Our province, then, is to look to the religion and the pastor. That, I take it, is the heart of the subject. For as the veins and arteries indicate the condition of the heart, so the masses in their way indicate the quality of their sources of religious life. What then about our religion? What about ourselves?

From the evident circumstances of our case it may be neither prudent nor desirable that we each and all discuss the religions and characters of the various members comprising this body. No; save a few remarks in a general way, each must make this part of the examination for himself. I, as the writer of this short, and imperfect article, presume to answer in a general way for my own religion.

The system of religion which by God's grace I hold is exact and emphatic. 'Tis vague in no important point. 'Tis the uncompromising enemy of doubt; for it has a solid reason for every article of faith, and this reason rests on proof. Hence 'tis dogmatic. A system which is not dogmatic is merely a set of theories or opinions. Such we might term a system of philosophy, if you will, but not properly a religion. For it is the property of philosophy that it yield to new light; while religion, if it be of God, never loses a particle of truth once held. New light in religion means *more* light. Development is not change, As ages advance these particles of truth are crystallized.

Further, our religion is direct and clear. It teaches that "he who believes not shall be damned;" that "without faith 'tis impossible to please God;" but that "faith without good works is dead."

As to the preacher in the Catholic Church, "he speaks as one having authority;" for he holds the post and acts by the virtue of the One who so spoke originally. He

is there for the needs, but not at the beck of the people. Our Church knows that its members are convinced. Hence she does not simply ask, she commands her children to attend the holy sacrifice of the Mass on Sundays. She, and she alone, brushes away the old law of "keeping the Sabbath holy;" and says, "I command, by virtue of the authority which I have received from God, that you keep the Sunday holy. If not, you are guilty of sin." The result is before you. All her children, practically all, obey.

Now, how is it with your religions, gentleman? Is your religion definite? Could you tell me from end to end of the chapter precisely what you believe? Would that be in all points exactly what the whole body of your church holds as its faith? Have you no doubt? When doubt comes is your system of religion such that it always furnishes a satisfactory answer? Are all these answers accompanied by proof? If each and every one of these questions does not find in you a favorable answer, then the religion in question cannot hold *you*; *a fortiori*, it cannot hold the people.

A Protestant minister, whom I once met on the train between here and Bangor, favored me with a chat on religious matters. I asked him in the course of our conversation, "What do you believe?" His answer was, "I believe in agreeing to disagree." That I might not misunderstand his answer he explained that he was in favor of allowing divergence of opinion among the members, provided the congregation could be preserved, or rather for the sake of holding the congregation together. Now, I claim that a man holding such views on so important a matter was not qualified to preach a definite religion. And yet he preached in several churches in this town. A man who is not convinced, profoundly convinced, that his religion is true, cannot be a man of faith. A man who is not certain that his religion is the *only* true religion cannot be a man of zeal. Without true faith, without zeal, his place is not in the pulpit. (Fancy St. Paul in that role.) "His voice is but as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals." The man who says, "away with creeds" simply says, "away with all religious belief," for a creed is simply the expression of religious belief.

If you will permit me now, I will say a word about the position of a Protestant minister as pastor, for on

that hangs the question whether one is a leader or not, whatever his title may be.

Ordinarily the minister is placed on trial for a few weeks. Then, if it please the society, he is engaged at a stated salary for a certain term. He knows, and everybody knows, that his position rests on the pleasure of those employing him. He also knows that there is a widespread disinclination to listen to what are called the disagreeable things of religion. If he be over-zealous, if he be strong in reproof, he is reminded that these are disputed questions and should be left to private judgment. He speaks to empty pews. He is told to take his pay and go.

Herein rests the strength of the Methodist Church in the matter of discipline. I am not speaking of doctrine. The society does not choose the minister, nor can they pack him off. That, I understand, is the function of a higher recognized authority.

Gentlemen, you can never be leaders while you are so dependent, while you are so bound at the outset, unless you are eminent for eloquence, or for sanctity, or for learning, or for the power of moving the heart.

Whether you may be so blessed or not does not become me to judge. I am in no sense your judge; nor do I presume to so act as if I were constituted such. I simply point out to you a fact patent to all. Your churches are being deserted and for a part of the year entirely closed. Your people would naturally be composed of the wealthiest and most cultured people of the town. It cannot then be a question of lack of means. What is the cause? If you are the pastors it is your duty to find it out. If you care for my answer to the question I can give it in a few words, but I feel you will not believe me.

Your religion does not hold the people. Therefore it does not satisfy them. My religion does hold my people and draws others. Therefore it has in it what the people need. It satisfies.

Reflect, and draw your own conclusions.

Were I addressing the laity I would show the fallacy of that repose, which their vaunted use of private judgment connives at, but which a good use of good judgment would sadly disturb. Why? I answer:

Most men, I fear, intelligent men too, are not given to thinking, although all are given to talking on religious

matters. Their "judgment" means their "opinion." To form an opinion requires little effort, and often even the opinion is a borrowed one. For while boasting that they do think for themselves many will fling out as a serious objection the stale remains of some "chestnut" that has been roasted and shelled a hundred years ago. We are not afraid of the thinker who *thinks*. But does not that allow a large field for "private judgment?" Certainly; when it is a "*judgment*;" but the field has its fences. To be a judgment the testimony must have been examined and the proof seen. To be a *valuable* judgment requires that *all* the proofs be had and actually examined. To be a *competent* judgment requires competence on the part of the judge; in other words, that he be a judge of the matter. But all real judgment supposes serious thought. One of the objects of preaching is to give impulse and direction to serious thought. The grace of God will do the rest. Another object is to have the case exposed and the proofs examined. But cannot all this be done without church and preacher? No; inclination, business, temptation, lack of ability, stand in the way. Besides God has ordered it otherwise. "Go forth and preach," said He. "Hear the Church." "He that heareth you heareth me." And St. Paul distinctly teaches that faith comes by hearing, adding "And how can you hear unless it be preached unto you."

Now who are they who avoid the church? Those who boast descent from the Pilgrim fathers. Those fathers were men "of sterner stuff." They are more honored in beseeeming lives than by loud words. To them, we are told, religion was dearer than native land, its practice worthy the sacrifice of life. From the wild forest rose their humble temple. Silence and danger lurked without, peace and harmony dwelt within. Has their spirit departed with the forest that is dead, or does it live in their children? Shall it be said that now when peace and industry bless the land without, the silence of the forest shall reign within the temple? They hated Catholics and priests (for in reality they knew us not.) Shall it indeed be said that now the Catholic and the priest shall alone stand to admire and emulate their virtues and cast the mantle of charity on their vices? Or shall we all rather bend an humble



knee to the God they adored and cry—"Oh, Lord, I believe; help Thou my unbelief?"

Some men by their position and endowments are natural leaders of the people. I would ask such, where are you leading them? If they with raised eyebrows, ask, "Am I my brother's keeper?" I answer, yes; as far as example goes. Your position is your stewardship. You will be asked to "render an account of your stewardship." "But who are you that presume to advise me?" I am asked. "I am the voice of one crying out in this wilderness." "But what is your authority?" That is just what I would like to have you examine. The whole question rests there. Therefore I say, *think*, Reading and prayer are good spectacles for a thinker on a subject like this.

THE CHURCH.—ITS AUTHORITY.

"The pillar and the ground of truth." I Tim III—15.

I naturally could not expect that such a paper as the foregoing would be unqualifiedly endorsed by any ministerial body of divergent religious views. While they would and do see the beneficent results of authority, did it exist, they as a rule cannot bring themselves even to remotely suspicion its existence. As a complement, therefor to the task I have proposed, I shall set forth the reasons on which every Catholic clergyman bases his commission to teach.

What is my authority? My authority is that of the Catholic Church; for I am but an instrument in her control for carrying on the great work for which she was instituted. I am in no sense a necessary instrument; nor is any man, nor special set of men. But while the work goes on, each man and body of men in actual use and faithful performance of duty are impelled and led to success by the Spirit that gives life to the Catholic Church. My authority, then, and their authority rests ultimately on the power that called that Church into being and that preserves in it the vigor of life.

What, then, is the Catholic Church? What is its authority? What is the source of its strength and life?

Kind reader, let me introduce to you the Catholic Church. Two hundred and fifty millions stand in solid

phalanx; two hundred and fifty millions with nothing in common but religion, in religion a unit. From the king to the beggar; the highest in civilization, the lowest type of savage; the pure saint, the vile sinner; of all languages, of all races, of every legal political view; all these find their status in the Church universal, in the Church raised for mankind, the Catholic Church. The only common bond of contact is faith; but in that they are one.

Do you wonder that I say the savage and the sinner are there? Why not? The Lord never promised His Church should be composed of the enlightened and saints alone. 'Tis here "to give light to those who sit in darkness," to "raise the sinner." 'Tis the Church of mankind as it is. She embraces in her bosom mankind as it is. Her mission is to draw order out of chaos, to make mankind as it should be; for her life is the life of the new creation. Thus as in the first creation God formed the body of man from clay as it existed; so the function of His Church is to bind men as they exist into one harmonious whole. The breathing of the Spirit into the body is the life-work of the Church. This is accomplished by means of the various avenues of grace, mainly the sacraments. And 'tis thus that "men are made perfect even as their Heavenly Father is perfect." This formation of men into a common body is accomplished by *faith*. "One faith" makes "one fold."

Now all these millions (numbering about four times the population of these United States) acknowledge the spiritual rule of one man; for to them he is the representative of Christ the Founder and always Chief of the Church. And in the world at large, irrespective of nation or creed, the position of this man is unique. He stands alone in influence; for his word is recognized as from the mouth of the Catholic Church. Thus all admit the principle of the unity of the Catholic Church. He claims descent from Peter. She claims descent from Christ. The doctrine has no descent; 'tis the same now, and ever will be, as when it came living from the lips of the Lord, or was inspired by "the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth," who was promised "to teach them all things." Such is the Catholic Church; "One fold under one shepherd."

But its authority; what of that? The first act of candidates is an act of submission, a petition. "What dost

thou ask of the Church of God?" is the opening question to each and all. "Faith," saith the candidate; receiving, then, the mark of faith he is of the faithful.

This first act of the candidate indicates the life of the member, as such. 'Tis a life of submission. Submission to what? To the authority that resides in the Church. But what, and whence, is this authority? It is the law of the Church's existence; and it is from Him who gave the Church its field, its work, its being. What is its field? Humanity and time. What is its work? The salvation of men. What is its being? The continuance of the active presence of Christ among men. For "the Church is the spouse of Christ." As, then, in wedlock the parties become one, so is there a mysterious union between Christ and His Church making them one, hence it follows that he who is in the Church is united to Christ. He who lives fully according to the spirit of the Church lives by Christ and can truly say, "Now it is not I that live, but Christ that liveth in me." It is thus, and thus only, that men may merit for salvation; not by sentimental, but by *actual*, union with Christ. In this you may understand the doctrine that the Church was established for the salvation of man. We have no record of any other means established for that purpose.

Are we to understand, then, that Christ is *really* in the Church? Certainly we are. He has Himself declared it—"Lo, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of time." Then, if we receive those words literally, He must have been always in His Church from its beginning? Undoubtedly; that's the plain meaning of the words. Even at the "Reformation?" It must be admitted. There is no reservation. There was no other Christian church. If I admit that, I must admit that those who left the Church actually left the Church in which Christ was? That is quite logical. There was no other Christian church. Certainly the Church did not leave them. Therefore, I see no escape from that conclusion.

But if Christ be in the Church where is He? Why do we not see Him? I said *really* present, not *physically*. But how, then, can He deal with men, since men are to be reached by physical means?

There we come to the law of the Church's existence. It pleases the Lord to reach men through men. Those

men who stand for Him must have the power to treat in His name. In their functions representing Him He must be recognized in them. The Lord acts through them. The recognition of this, the scheme of the Christian religion, is the basis of the faith of the Church as it exists today. Hence the bond of union; hence the *authority* necessarily claimed and necessarily allowed. The authority of the Church is the authority of Christ. That, you may say, is a strong statement. Certainly it is; and yet, according to the light of my reason, I cannot understand how any body of men can logically claim to be a Christian church without making that statement the basis of its very existence as such. If its authority be not of Christ, then of whom is its authority? If it has no authority, then on what ground does it exist? Our Lord Himself stands as sponsor for our claim; for He has said, "He that heareth you heareth Me."

The true Christian church must claim the authority of Christ. Therefore, it must claim to be founded by Christ. Therefore, it must be able to prove its line of descent. Therefore, it must teach now what it taught at the beginning. Therefore, the history of its teachings must be free from contradictions.

As a matter of simple fact I know of no body of men on the face of the earth that lays claim to the above statements save the Catholic Church. What they contain may be regarded as subject for historical investigation. We invite that investigation.

Here is our statement of facts in support of our claims. The Lord came to save sinners; to save them by His merits, but through themselves. In other words, He was to save man as man. Man, however, is a being of free will. He was to save those who willed to be saved. As to the conditions, He is Master. To convince the intellect He proved Himself superior to all the powers of nature; and then declared, "All power is given to Me in Heaven and on earth." He proved Himself to be both God and man. Therefore, when He says "given," I understand Him to refer to His humanity. What can be given to God, the possessor of all? Already, then, in the hands of humanity rests "all power." He declared His mission, "I came to save that which perisheth." "I come to call sinners to repentance." By His infinite merits He had secured all power. To accomplish His end, then, He assembled a

body of men and gave to them the power given to Himself. Could He do this? If He could not, then there would be one power not given to Him, the power of transmitting power. But it is on record that He actually exercised that power in its full sense—"As the Father hath sent Me," said He to His disciples, "So I send you." "Go forth (so empowered) and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." "He that heareth you heareth Me;" for "Lo! I am with you all days, even to the consummation of time."

And as regards the special object of the Church, the freeing from sin; for without freeing from sin the Church can have no special power; our Lord is explicit both as to the power itself and as to its source. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," said He. That is the source of power. "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain they are retained." That is the power itself. Finally, to complete the edifice, His Church, He fixed the foundation of its authority on one as chief of the others, saying, "Thou art Peter (a rock) and on this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

The physical work of the Lord ended in His Church. His spiritual work, then, began in His Church. The rest is the life of the Church; the drawing of order out of chaos, the continuance of the active presence of Christ among men, the binding of mankind into a harmonious whole by the common bond of faith; that faith which makes "one fold" of true Christians under "one shepherd."

The work has not been an easy one; for even today a multitude cries out, "We will have no king but Cæsar." Yet the Church has been crowned in nearly every nation; but beneath each crown are found the marks of thorns. On the whole, however, the road has been a royal one, but 'twas "the royal road of the cross." We briefly indicate it here.

The Jewish nation opposed. 'Twas a long struggle. But the night passed and the Jewish nation had perished. The morning sun found the cross. The Church was there stronger than before. The Roman power

opposed the Church with all its violent skill. The struggle was longer still. The mantle of night settled upon the Roman empire, and when morning came 'twas the Church alone which drew aside the mantle. All Rome was dead. The Church alone survived, and she was stronger than before. On every side the hosts of barbarians confronted her. 'Twas a long and tedious struggle; but at the end none but followers of Christ were left. The Church remained alone. Then came strife within the fold. Kings would be absolute. The Church stood for conscience, right and liberty. Perished are those kings, their kingdoms divided. But the cross protects a larger fold; the Church remains upon "the rock." At last came "the Reformation." No longer the king, but the priest, revolts. The kings aid; for in this they see more power for the throne. Each king wants his own church. Well, what is the result? Simply this: The reformers have been reformed. Again and again reform comes in, till today the doctrines of the original reformers have mainly disappeared. Absolutely now no one bows to *all* the doctrines of the first to revolt; absolutely now no one of those who followed admits authority. Hence, no cohesion exists amongst them. Where among them can you point to "one fold and one shepherd?" Are we to regard that sentence, then, as a figure of speech? No; thank God! For the Church, the grand old Church, looking back over her nineteen centuries of undimmed life, feels like

"The ocean old, centuries old,
Strong as fate, and as uncontrolled."

She stands today a solid phalanx of two hundred and fifty millions; more united than ever, stronger than ever. On the throne of Peter, Peter sits, today the only living exponent of world-wide authority. There is the "one fold and one shepherd." How much better if all would recognize that fact and that all would join their forces once more. Of what avail is all the bickering and quibbling? If we are Christians we should be one. Many men profess to yearn for unity. Surely, then, if they are in earnest, the place to find unity is where it exists. The "religion of the future" is the religion of the past.

If you could prove that last statement, some one says, I think I might be induced to become a Catholic myself, and at once. Well, it seems to me that I can. Thus—

no religion, save that which has in it the assured presence of the source of enduring strength and life, can be relied on for the future. The Catholic religion is the only religion which *claims* that assurance. Therefore she alone claims what is reliance for the future.

What, then, is the source of strength and life in the Church? Is it the Bible? All Christians profess to revere the Bible as "the word of God;" that means an inspired work. All Protestant sects rely on the Bible as their source of strength and life; that is, the portion of the Bible accepted by them, and as by them interpreted. Surely the Catholic Church is not behind hand in this matter. No one esteems the sacred book more than does the earnest, fervent Catholic. The Catholic Church relies on the Bible as the highest written testimony to prove its claims. But as to the *fact of existence*, our Church was anterior to, and actually formed, the Bible as it now exists. The simple facts in the case are these: The Church was in existence for a long period before Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote their versions of the gospel. St. Paul was engaged in persecuting the Christian church before his conversion. After he became a Christian he wrote several letters, as did other of the apostles, to various parts of the Church then in existence. In time the Church had all these documents collected and, together with the Apocalypse, written sixty-four years after the ascension of our Lord, they were entitled the New Testament. The Old Testament was united to it. Both received the stamp of the authority already recognized by Christians and on that authority alone have been received as the inspired word of God. Remove, if you can, the authority of the Catholic Church, and you will find it impossible to prove the Bible an inspired work. You may *accept* it as such but to *prove* it is quite another thing. The Church, then, is the source of the Bible, not the opposite.

What, then, is the source of the strength and life of the Church? 'Tis the indwelling spirit. 'Tis "the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth," that was promised "to abide with her forever." 'Tis the actual union that exists with the divine Son, who promised to be with her "till the consummation of time." 'Tis the fulfillment of the promise that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." 'Tis the enduring presence of "the rock," its foundation stone. The Lord has pledged His word.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away; but His word shall not pass away." 'Tis because men rely on His promises that they bow to His church.

If the Catholic, then, uses the New Testament to prove the right of his Church; and he certainly does; 'tis as testimony after the fact, not anterior to it. If he wishes to use additional proof, he points to its phenomenal life. It has survived every attack. It has outlived every nation that opposed. It has seen customs, nations, languages, buried as forest leaves; the old yielding life to new. But itself stands before us to-day clothed and speaking and acting as in the days of its infancy. How often men have wondered at the garments, the language and the ceremonies used in the Church. Perhaps they have even smiled at them. And yet here we have a material proof of the Church's age and of its unchanging character. When the Church began its office of preaching "to all nations," it found that a certain garb was worn by grave and reverend men. It adopted that garb. Fashions have changed since then; but the Church is not a creature of fashion. We are in the nineteenth century; but the Church is of the first century, and of such is her dress. In developing her work she found the world subject to the rule of the Latin, or the Roman, nation. So she adopted the language best calculated to inspire respect and to reach the world's limits. The nation died. Providentially, then, the truths of our religion are embalmed in the language of the dead. Religion and truth change not their meaning; but living languages are constantly changing. Fittingly, then, the changeless one speaks a changeless tongue. Besides, 'tis the tongue of her infancy. Ceremony is the language of action; its home is in the East. That same East was the cradle of our Church. She has not forgotten the language of action taught at her cradle. And thus she comes down to us. Her footsteps are impressed on the ages. But the ages have marked her only as one not born for death, nor for decay.

All this was, however, foretold by our Lord Himself. Remember the parable of the mustard seed. Where, if not in the Catholic Church, can the exemplification of that parable be found? Indeed the parable is a prophecy, the Church its fulfillment. Deep and strong are its roots; and to the utmost regions spread its branches fitted for the wants of every clime. And even now, as

the evening of the nineteenth century is coming slowly on us, we mark the nobler birds that everywhere leave the earth to seek its shelter. 'Tis the home of peace and security, the home where all the weary find rest. The air that stirs its deep recesses is not silent, but like a voice it comes to the inmates—"peace be to you. My peace I give you." Amen.

Believe me, nothing which is contained in the above is presented in a spirit of bitterness, but merely in the interest of truth. For a true Catholic necessarily loves his fellows whether they agree with him or not. If I have erred in any statement made I am quite willing to be corrected. But I am quite certain of my ground. Doubt is a feeling entirely unknown to an intelligent and properly instructed Catholic. May God grant the same blessing of certainty to all who favor this humble effort with a careful reading. After you have read it once, I beg that you pray for true light and then read it again.



OF AMERICA.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS.

PAMPHLETS AT NOMINAL COST.

POSTPAID.

- No. 1.—Refutation of Some Calumnies—Rev. J. C. Byrne, per...\$1.00
2.—What Is The Use Of It?—Wm. Jefferson Guernsey, M. D., per... 1.00
3.—How Catholics Come to be Misunderstood—Rev. Thos. O'Gorman, D. D., per... 2.00
4.—Who can Forgive Sins?—Rev. Patrick Danahy, per... 2.00
5.—Church or Bible—Rev. Arnold Damen, S. J., per... 2.00
6.—The Catholic Church and the American Republic—Wm. F. Markoe, per... 1.50
7.—Sacrificial Worship Essential to Religion—Rev. P. R. Heffron, D. D., per... 1.50
8.—The Catholic Pages of American History—J. L. Macdonald, per... 2.50
9.—Our Rights and Duties as Catholics and as Citizens—Wm. J. Onahan, per... 2.00
10.—Agnosticism—Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, D. D., Bishop of Peoria, per... 2.00
11.—On The Condition of Labor—Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII, per... 2.50
12.—Purgatory—Rev. Henry A. Boann, D. D., per... 1.50
13.—Miracles—What are they, and what is their use?—Rev. John Gmeiner, per... 1.50
14.—The Conservative Power of Catholicity—Conde B. Pallen, per... 1.50
15.—How Christ Founded the Church—Rev. Jas. L. Meagher, per... 1.50
16.—The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic—His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons, D. D., per... 2.00
17.—The Real Presence—Rev. C. F. Smarius, S. J., per... 2.50
18.—Jesus Christ is God—Rev. Walter Elliott, per... 2.00
19.—Catholicity and The American Mind—George Parsons Lathrop, per... 1.50
20.—Were the Middle Ages Dark?—Rt. Rev. T. F. Brennan, D. D., Bishop of Dallas, Texas, per... 2.00
21.—Indulgences—Rt. Rev. John J. Kain, D. D., Bishop of Wheeling, per... 1.00
22.—Where is Religious Truth?—R. G. Rives, per... 1.50
23.—The Invocation of Saints—Rev. E. McSweeney, D.D., per... 1.50
24.—Thoughts from Lacordaire, per... 1.50
25.—The Mass, The Proper Form of Christian Worship—Rev. J. M. Lucey, per... 2.00
26.—The Holy Ghost and the Church,—His Eminence Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, per... 2.00
27.—The Principle of Authority.—Rev. T. F. Butler, per... 1.50
Assorted Lots of 100, same ratio.

Leaflet "A"—Things Catholics do not Believe, per 100...15c, 1000...\$1.00
Leaflet "B"—Catholic Converts, per...100...25c, 1000... 2.00
Leaflet "C"—A Fearful Responsibility, per...100...15c, 1000... 1.00

If larger quantities of the Pamphlets are desired, the same should be sent by express, up to 600 copies; more than 600, to distant points, should go by freight.

Please send funds with orders for postpaid quantities.

F. O. B. quantities, to be sent by express or freight, range from 20c. to 50c. per 100 under postpaid rates.

Single copies by mail 5c.; any seven, at any time, by mail 25c.

Sample copies mailed free, to the Rev. clergy, upon application.

Address,

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY,

218 East Third Street, ST. PAUL, MINN.

The pamphlets published by the C. T. S. are but brief, simple aids towards the removal of prejudice regarding Catholicity. More complete instruction can be found in "The Faith of Our Fathers," "Catholic Belief," "Rational Religion," "Points of Controversy," "Notes on Ingersoll," etc., to be obtained of Catholic and other book sellers.



OF
AMERICA.