

Hunt, Duane G.  
ADS 1869

816751

# THE APPEAL TO REASON





# THE APPEAL TO REASON

by

Most Rev. Duane G. Hunt, D.D., I.L.D.  
Bishop of Salt Lake

Seven addresses delivered in the Catholic Hour, produced by  
the National Council of Catholic Men, and broadcast  
through the courtesy of the National Broadcasting  
Company and associated stations.

	Page
June 12: The Need for Authority .....	3
June 19: The Divinity of Christ .....	11
June 26: The Divinity of the Church .....	20
July 3: The Apostolicity of the Church .....	29
July 10: The Sacraments .....	37
July 17: The Real Presence .....	46
July 24: The Sacrament of Matrimony .....	56



National Council of Catholic Men  
Producer of the Catholic Hour  
1312 Massachusetts Avenue,  
Washington, D. C.

---

Printed and distributed by Our Sunday Visitor  
Huntington, Indiana



Imprimatur:

✠ JOHN FRANCIS NOLL, D. D.,  
Bishop of Fort Wayne

## THE NEED FOR AUTHORITY

Address delivered June 12, 1938.

My subject as announced, "The Appeal to Reason," indicates the general point of view of my present series of addresses. As you judge at once, I shall bring before you certain doctrines of the Catholic religion; and I shall try to demonstrate that these doctrines are attractive inasmuch as they appeal to your reason.

In using this approach to religion I do not mean to imply that it is the only one. Man's nature is not one sided; it is made up of soul and body, and the soul has a free will as well as an intellect. Furthermore, affecting both body and soul are the emotions. Man himself is complex; his need for religion is complex. It would be unreasonable, therefore, indeed it would be contrary to my own thesis as contained in my subject, to suggest that there is but one approach to religion. Reason itself tells us that religion is greater than reason.

If you ask, then, why I limit my discussion to one approach, the answer is readily given. Limited time makes anything else impractical. And why do I choose the appeal to the intellect? Is it more important than the appeal to the will or to the emotions? Perhaps not more important; but it does seem to come first. The very first question that the inquiring mind raises about an article of faith is "why should I believe it", or "how do I know that it is true." This question, as applied to Christian doctrine, can be, and in my opinion should be, answered frankly.

It seems to be taken for granted nowadays that the young people of the present generation, more so

than those of previous generations, demand satisfactory reasons before they will believe in any Christian doctrine. It is not sufficient for them, so it is said, that their parents believe; they are no longer willing to follow the example of others. They stand as individuals; and as individuals they challenge the Church to present convincing evidence of her doctrines.

Perhaps this description is more or less correct. From one point of view, we may hope that it is correct. For precisely to the degree that our young people are ready to think about religion, ready to criticize and analyze it, to that degree there is hope of convincing them. The Church can ask for no better opportunity than that of presenting her doctrines to minds that are ready to reason honestly about them. And since the impression has been widely formed that the Christian religion is not reasonable and that it can survive only so long as it is not analyzed too closely, it is most important, I believe, to demonstrate that the impression is false, as false as it is harmful.

This afternoon, in the first of my series of addresses, I discuss the subject of authority. In particular, I call attention to man's need of God's authority, a need which is evident from the facts of life. And that God must have provided for this need would seem to follow from the further facts that He is the author both of religion and of man and that He made the one to serve the other.

In my discussion this afternoon I shall refer to "the churches", and to the authority of "the churches". By such general terms I do not mean to imply that all churches are the same, or that Christian authority is or can be divided. Neither do I at-

tempt to speak for any of the non-Catholic religious organizations. I am a Catholic and I speak as a Catholic. To the best of my ability I am trying to serve the Catholic Church, as an expression of gratitude for the gift of faith which came to me some years ago.

In doing so, however, I find myself drawn inevitably into the consideration of problems which affect other churches. The wave of indifference, for instance, which is sweeping through the country today is affecting all of the churches. It is a common enemy, a fact which we may as well recognize.

That this indifference is but the logical result of the loss of respect for authority is evident, I believe, from what has happened in our society during recent years. Of course, there is nothing new in the protest against rightful authority; that protest is as old as religion. During recent years, however, the protest has taken on new forms and a new emphasis. And so it may be discussed as something modern.

During the last century there arose a rather definite movement in the religious life of our country, heralded by its sponsors as a move for freedom. They complained that under the leadership of the churches Christianity had become top-heavy, too formal, too highly organized, and too dictatorial; and that it had robbed the individual man of his freedom. It was their great mission to correct all this. And they would do so, they promised, not merely for the sake of the individual but also for the sake of Christianity itself.

Their protest was threefold. They complained that the churches were wrong in formulating creeds for their people, wrong in laying down standards of

conduct for them, and wrong in dictating forms of worship. You will recall from your own experiences, I am sure, having heard these complaints.

Concerning matters of belief, you have been advised to think for yourself and to break away from servility to the churches. You have been told that the beliefs which you discover for yourself, even though they differ from those of your neighbors, are the correct ones for you.

Concerning conduct has come a similar criticism, namely, that you do not need the help of the churches to know the difference between right and wrong. You have been urged to work out your own standards of morality, in the assurance that, though they may differ from the standards of other times and of other men, they are right and sufficient for you.

And in respect to the manner of worshipping God, once again you have been advised to follow your own tastes and judgments. You have been assured that you need no religious organization to devise forms of worship for you, that your own way of worshipping God, regardless of how different it may be, is best for you.

These doctrines, attractive and alluring as they are, have been urged upon the American people with especial emphasis for the past few generations. They have influenced the lives of millions of our people; so much so that their logical effects may now be judged. We need not speculate as to what the effects may be in the future; we know from observation what they are in the present. To these effects I now call attention.

Consider first the protest that the churches should not formulate creeds for their people. Now that millions of our people have come to this point of



view and have abandoned the creeds of their churches, has their religious faith been helped or harmed? The boasted emancipation, has it made its beneficiaries believe more or less strongly in religion? Apply any test you wish; name any religious truth you care to; the answer is the same. There is the belief in the divinity of Christ, for instance. Has it been strengthened? There is the belief in the inspiration of the Bible; belief in the power of God to forgive sins; belief in a future life; belief in the efficacy of prayer. Is any one of these beliefs strengthened in its hold over our people? You know better. They are all weakened.

Remember, it has been urged that if people would cut loose from the creeds dictated by the churches they would find their own beliefs. But it hasn't worked out that way. For the most part, no creed now takes the place of the church creeds which have been abandoned. Instead of the average American's saying what he would have said formerly, "I believe what my church teaches," he says today, if he speaks frankly, "I don't know what I believe; probably not much of anything." And what else was to be expected?

In the field of morality the results are equally unfortunate. Millions of our people have been converted to the notion that morality is a matter of individual opinion. And with what result? Has morality improved? Read the answer all about you. Read it in the increased criminality. Read it in the prevailing sex madness. Read it in the ever-increasing number of broken homes and neglected children. Read it in social strife and class hatred. Read it in the degeneracy of literature. Read it in the indecencies that are boldly hurled at us from all sides.

Read it in the increasing unhappiness and discontent.

The explanation is simple enough. When our people forsook the moral codes laid down by the churches they did not find new or better ones. For the most part they merely drifted, drifted downward. They became indifferent. In ever increasing numbers they are using the freedom recommended to them. They are doing as they please. Religious motives gone, standards gone, sensitive consciences gone, free reign is given to impulse, to appetite, and to passion. And again I remind you that nothing else was to be expected.

It has been similar with individualism in worship. We have been told, you know, that the way to save the worship of God for enlightened persons was to encourage them to worship in their own way. I now ask if, as the result of this emancipation, worship has been improved? Do those persons who have deserted church services worship more or less devoutly than they did before?

You know the answer. There has been no substitution; there has been only abandonment. For the most part, no worship now takes the place of the worship in church services which so many have given up. It sounds very well to talk about worshipping God out in the woods and streams and mountains, under the stars, and along the shore, as we have heard so eloquently recommended; but it is seldom done that way. It is all well and good to talk about worshipping in the stillness of one's room. And that is a splendid Christian habit certainly, praying to God in private. But who are the Christians who have this habit? Those who worship in the churches on Sunday. It sounds very well to talk about wor-

shipping God by reading the Bible; and that also is a practice that is to be encouraged. But, unfortunately, persons who do not hear the Bible read in public services usually forget to read it in private.

The freedom from religious authority offered to the American people has done nothing but destroy. It hasn't a single good accomplishment to its credit. It has lured millions of persons away from the creeds taught by the churches, and in place has left them with no creed. It has lured them away from the standards of morality prescribed by the churches, and in place has left them with no standards. It has lured them away from worship as conducted in church services, and in place has left them with no worship. Faith destroyed, habits of morality weakened, the worship of God abandoned; these are the only results.

It is about time that we were thinking seriously of turning back the other way. Most of you listening to me this afternoon deplore the tendencies of which I speak. Many of you have boys and girls growing up, and you are worried about what is happening to them. You would like to see some counter-movement; something to stimulate religious faith, something to elevate standards of morality, and something to rekindle the worship of God. And you are looking for that something. With real concern you look about at the various efforts being made to uplift society. You examine the programs of reformers, of writers, lecturers, and cultural leaders. And, very candidly now, you shake your heads about them. You know that they are failing. Conditions become worse rather than better.

Under the circumstances, it is only reasonable that we turn our minds to something that has been

tried, to something that has saved human society in many a former period of weakness, to the Christian faith. To the best of my ability, I shall explain this faith to you in the next six programs of the Catholic Hour, hoping that to some slight degree I may do justice to its dignity and to its right to your respect.

## THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

Address delivered June 19, 1938.

In bringing before you this afternoon the Author of Christianity, as my subject does, I propose to examine the question of His identity. Who is He? Is He divine or merely human? The importance of the question can scarcely be over-emphasized. As no religion can rise higher than its source, the Christian religion cannot be divine if its founder was merely human.

That Christ lived nineteen hundred years ago is merely a matter of history. That He was a great and good man, that He lived a life of charity and humility, and that He has had an unparalleled influence upon the course of civilization, are facts generally recognized even by those who are not of His following. It is commonplace to heap words of praise upon Him, comparing Him in superlative terms with other great men, always to His advantage. Such comparisons, however, are unfair. They beg the question, the very question that is to be answered. They presume that Christ is merely human. For if He is divine, mere men cannot be compared with Him.

By the divinity of Christ is meant something very definite. It does not mean that Christ was closer to God than other men, that He understood God better, or that He obeyed God's precepts more perfectly. It does not mean that in purpose or intention He was one with God. By divinity is not meant anything within the realm of human possibilities. The divinity of Christ means the deity of Christ. It means that He is a divine person, the

Second Person of the Holy Trinity. It means that He possesses two natures, the nature of God and the nature of man. It means that God became incarnate, that is to say, that He came on earth, taking human flesh and living for a time among men.

That Christ was truly man is now universally recognized; so much so that it may surprise some of you that one of the earliest heresies with which the Church had to contend was the denial of His real humanity. Today, as you know, the doubt is just the contrary. It is His divinity that is now so widely lost sight of. It is His divinity, therefore, that calls for explanation and defense.

It may be suggested, contrary to my thesis, that the divinity of Christ is so wholly above everything human that it cannot be approached by human reasoning. Let us correct that observation by noting an important distinction, the distinction between natural and reasonable. The two, although often confused, do not mean the same. Many phenomena are above nature and yet are reasonable. The divinity of Christ is supernatural, by very definition; but it does not follow that it is unreasonable.

The divinity of Christ is reasonable in that it can be demonstrated as other truths can be. It is reasonable because it fits in with the facts of history and the experience of the race. It is reasonable because it satisfies, as nothing else can, the deepest yearnings of the human soul.

For a moment now let us detach ourselves from the historical record of things as they are and indulge in a little speculating about things as they should be. We start with man's needs, tracing the line from them back and up to God who alone can

satisfy them. It is only reasonable, I submit to you, that there is a providential connection between the two.

There is the need, first of all, for revealed truth, for a few glimpses of God's infinite knowledge to help man rise above his own limitations. And in what more fitting way could God bring this revelation to man than by coming to earth and speaking through the medium of a human nature? Identifying Himself so that He could be recognized as God by at least a few chosen followers, what a great advantage would thus be given to His Gospel! It would be left among men as a definite deposit from which all later generations could draw.

Moreover, by coming to earth and assuming a human nature, God could instruct a few followers very thoroughly. By means of close and daily associations He could give them special training, rehearsing with them the constitution of His religion and preparing them to teach others. He could make them the secondary source of all religious truths.

There is the need, secondly, for divine government. And government means authority. We need over us the authority of God; we need it in a form easily recognized and readily respected. Note again the appropriateness of the Incarnation. The authority which God expects all men to acknowledge could be brought to earth and made definite and concrete. The incarnate God could form an organization, directly selecting its officials. Speaking through His human lips, He could appoint them to be His agents, to act for Him and in His name, delegating them to perpetuate His authority by handing it on to their successors.

There is the need, finally, for sanctification. In

the nature of things we cannot save ourselves. We can cooperate with God; indeed, we must do so. But salvation itself is not a human attainment; it is a gift from above.

The moment we speak of human cooperation, we come upon the difficulty. It is difficult to worship God, as you know well enough; difficult for one thing, because God, being purely spiritual, is not a visible object. Surrendering to this very difficulty, pagan peoples have often made artificial images of their false gods, thus placing before themselves tangible objects of worship. The truth is that for worship man needs the presence of God in some visible form.

It is difficult too, indeed it is impossible, for man to devise religious services that fully satisfy. Anything that he himself creates is purely human. Through the Incarnation, however, God could give to man what he needs, means of worship that are divine. Moreover, by the sacrifice of Himself, He could demonstrate the value of penance and suffering; He could perpetuate the grace-giving sacrifice so that all men of all time could draw help from it.

This reasoning does not demand that God dwell among men indefinitely. Such a blessing is not called for. All that is needed is that God should dwell on earth for a time, long enough to instruct a few followers in the doctrines of faith, create and authorize His organization, and establish the method and means of sanctification. And does not such reasoning, I ask, bring us to the divinity of Christ?

Perhaps it may be said here, by way of reservation, that the conclusion is not contained in the premises. Granted that human nature needs the



Incarnation of God; does it necessarily follow that God became incarnate? Let us see.

It is true, of course, that God could have chosen other means of redeeming the human race. He could have chosen other means of revealing truth; other means of placing His authority in the world; and other means of sanctifying human souls. Once the reality of these needs is recognized, however, it seems only reasonable that God should provide for them; the author both of religion and of man, surely He would adapt the one to the needs of the other. And when those needs are analyzed, as they can be, it seems that a most fitting way for God to provide for them would be the Incarnation.

Perhaps it may be said, however, that such considerations are far removed from the critical problems of historical evidence. Perhaps the appeal to reason requires that the divinity of Christ be examined in the light of history. Very well; in opening up this phase of the subject, however, I remind you that in a discourse of a few minutes nothing like an adequate treatment is possible. All I can do is to indicate lines of thought, supported by a few bits of evidence.

The historical record which comes closest to the life of our Lord, which is indeed nearly contemporary, is contained in the New Testament; in the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John, supplemented by the Epistles of St. Paul. From these writings we learn about our Lord's life, death, and resurrection; we learn about His ministry, what He said and did; in particular, we learn what He said of Himself.

This last point is of primary importance. Whom did He claim to be? If He represented Himself

merely as man, we should accept Him as such, ruling out the thought of divinity. If He identified Himself as God, however, what then? How should we value such testimony?

In answering the question, let me assure you that the statements I refer to are not isolated ones. They are part and parcel of our Lord's ministry; they cannot be detached from it. His testimony about Himself is as much a part of the Gospel He preached as any other doctrine.

When He said, for instance, "I and the Father are one," He uttered a truth that fits in with everything else. In and by itself it might present a problem of interpretation. But in the light of other statements it evidently refers to the union of nature between our Lord and the Father. And precisely to prevent being misunderstood, our Lord Himself added the explanation, "he that seeth me seeth the Father."

God alone can be worshipped; such is the clear teaching of our Lord. And yet, knowing baptism to be an act of worship, indeed intending it to be such, our Lord commanded that it be administered in His name, as well as in the name of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. By so doing, He commanded that He be worshipped.

On one occasion a sick man was brought to Him, with a plea for restoration to health. Our Lord's words, "Thy sins are forgiven thee", brought out an immediate protest from the bystanders. "Who can forgive sins", they asked, "but God only?" This challenge, our Lord met by persisting in His purpose; not only that, but He performed a miracle in proof of His claim. "But that you may know," He said, "that the Son of man hath power on earth to

forgive sins (He saith to the sick of the palsy). . . Arise. . . and go into thy house". Evidently, then, He claimed for Himself the power to forgive sin, the exclusive prerogative of God.

When brought before the court and accused of blasphemy, He admitted frankly that He was the Son of God. What He meant by the title is evident from His further words and from the way He was understood by the court. Indeed, it was because He claimed to be divine that He was pronounced guilty and condemned.

He described Himself as eternal, in the same way that God the Father is described. He declared that He possessed the same knowledge as the Father, infinite knowledge. He declared that He was the judge of all men, and that on the last day He would separate the just from the unjust in accordance with their love for Him. He performed miracles in His own name, not as mere men must do by acting in the name of God. He not only forgave sins in His own right, but delegated others to forgive, as His agents. When addressed as the Lord and God, He expressed His approval. There are many other indications of the same unique claim. These are all that I have time to give; and they are sufficient, I believe, for the present purpose.

Now let us appraise this testimony. It is one thing, it may be said, for Christ to claim to be God, and quite another thing for Him to be God. How then, I ask, are we to judge Him? Was He insane? Was He an impostor? Was He a self-deceived fanatic? If He was none of these things, then, He must have been a true witness about Himself.

That He was insane may be ruled out at once as ridiculous. Similarly, that He was an impostor; all

men agree that He was honorable, beyond question. Could He then have been honestly deceived, fanatically thinking Himself to be God? The record shows not a sign of deception about Himself or anything else; not an indication of fanaticism.

Positive proof of His truthfulness is provided by His miracles, particularly by His resurrection from the dead. It may as well be recognized that God alone can put life into a dead body; such a restoration is wholly beyond the power of man or of nature. And for God to raise a man back to life again would be to mark that man with His public approval. It would seem only reasonable, therefore, in the light of His resurrection, that Christ was a true witness about Himself, carrying God's unmistakable endorsement.

What makes the conclusion all the stronger is that our Lord predicted beforehand His resurrection from the dead, even fixing the time within which it would take place. For God to raise Him back to life, under the circumstances, and fulfill His prediction, would be misleading and unreasonable, if He had been an impostor or a self-deceived fanatic. The facts, my friends, cannot be fitted together if our Lord's testimony is left out. But when the testimony is accepted, as it reasonably must be, then, the divinity of our Lord is established.

That a truth of tremendous importance is thus reached, no doubt you fully appreciate. It is a truth with which nothing else can be compared. It is a truth to which everything else must be related.

The claim of our Lord presents itself to each of us; it calls for decision; it creates obligations. By its very nature it changes us from what we were

---

before. It leaves the world different from what it otherwise would have been.

Logically speaking, and assuredly with no reflection on any one's honesty, there can be no compromise about our Lord. Either He is to be accepted for what He claimed to be, or He is to be condemned for claiming to be what He was not. Between the two extremes there is no possible reconciliation. Logically speaking, again, the claim of our Lord cuts clean; it separates believer from unbeliever.

The degree of acceptance demanded by our Lord is extreme. It is complete. It can be no half-way attitude. It is not the mere intellectual appreciation of Christ as a great teacher or philosopher or religious leader. It is not the endorsement of His code of ethics. It is not even the imitation of His unselfish manner of living. Above and beyond these, it is accepting Him as God. It is believing in Him, obeying Him, and worshipping Him. It is knowing, serving, and loving Him for life, and hoping to possess Him as the reward for all eternity.

## THE DIVINITY OF THE CHURCH

Address delivered June 26, 1938.

In the midst of present day disorders and turmoil, it is but prudent to look for the way out, the way of salvation from impending ruin. It is but prudent to look to God for guidance. In the very nature of His relationship with us, He must have a program to secure us against evils such as those we are now cursed with, wars, communism, economic depressions, slavery, race suicide, and others similar. To say merely that the program calls for human obedience to God's will is to state it too abstractly. God's will is not something far off in heaven and remote from human affairs. It is here with us, identified with something concrete, with human leadership, in brief, with an institution.

If I say that this institution is none other than the Christian Church, you, some of you at least, will hesitate before giving assent. You will propose questions. By what authority, you will ask, does the Church presume to lead us? What right has she to our allegiance? Does she understand our problems? Can we not get along some way without her? These are pertinent questions; they require attention. They are all included, however, in one question that is primary: Is the Church divine or merely human? If the Church is divine, we can be sure that her leadership, conceived in the mind of God Himself, is essential to the welfare of His human creatures. If she is only human, however, we can be sure of nothing, save only that we must look for something else.

In answering this question, as I shall do this afternoon, let me assure you that I am not trying to

belittle those who disagree. I am trying merely to present the Catholic explanation of the Church, hoping that it will appear reasonable and convincing.

The explanation begins by noting the parallel between the Church and our Lord. He established the Church to perform His ministry, to do among men of all time what He was doing for a very few men at the moment. Taking His place, the Church partakes, to a certain degree, of His power and character. Being like Him, as she must be, she attracts the same friendship, the same loyalty and devotion, that He attracted; and, by the same token, she arouses the same opposition and hatred. To understand the Church, then, it is necessary first to understand Christ.

Now Christ is a divine person, possessing two distinct natures, the nature of God and the nature of man. Any attempt to interpret Him with one of these natures left out or obscured does violence, I believe, to the historical record. To try to picture Him as divine merely, for instance, rules out the clear facts of His humanity; the fact that He could be seen and heard and touched; that He walked, that He wept, that He hungered; and, in particular, that He suffered and died. These and similar facts describe a man. On the other hand, to judge that He was human merely, that He was man but not God, is equally inaccurate. It closes the mind to the facts of His divinity; the fact that He forgave sins, for instance; that He claimed to be eternal, infinite in knowledge, and the judge of all men; that He demanded to be worshipped; and, in particular, that He arose from the dead in fulfillment of His prediction. These facts describe God.

In criticizing the contemporaries of our Lord,

those who failed to recognize His dual character, let us not be too uncharitable. They made a mistake that is common and natural, trying to find a simple and single explanation to fit Him. We ourselves might have made the same mistake. Had we been in His presence nineteen hundred years ago we might have been tempted, along with others, to regard Him merely as a man. If so, we would have protested whenever He acted as God.

It is not necessary, however, to imagine ourselves back in our Lord's presence in order to test our attitude toward Him. We have plenty of opportunities today. How we would have judged Him nineteen centuries ago may be indicated fairly well by how we judge His Church here and now.

At this moment, at every moment in fact, we are in the presence of the Church. We are contemporaries of her ministry. We know that she claims divine agency to forgive sins, for instance. Are we critical? Perhaps we say that only God can forgive and, therefore, that the Church is unreasonable and inconsistent. We listen to her claim of perpetuity. Perhaps we point to the decay and passing of other religions as precedents for her. We witness modern persecutions of the Church. Perhaps we join the scoffers and challenge her, if she be from God, to come down from the cross and save herself.

There is no understanding the Church if she has but one nature. There is no explanation that makes sense. If that alleged single nature is divine, for instance, there is no possible way of explaining the facts of her humanity; the fact that her members may fall into sin, that her officials may use poor judgment, and, in particular, that in whole countries she may be annihilated. These facts describe some-



thing human. On the other hand, if the single nature of the Church is human there is no way of explaining the facts of her divinity; the fact that she teaches infallibly, that she has divine authority, that she forgives sin, that she has the Real Presence, and, in particular, that she comes back to life and health again after each crucifixion. These facts describe something divine.

The distinction between these two natures in and by itself is perfectly clear. It can scarcely be misunderstood. The problem arises, as it seems to arise for many persons, when these two natures are brought together, as of necessity they must be, by and in the Church. How, it is asked, how can one and the same institution be both divine and human? No doubt, this very question is put to me this afternoon by some of you. Very well; I am glad to explain.

Before calling attention once more to the parallel between the Church and Christ, by which the problem is solved, I must digress for a moment to explain something else. It is true that the Church, being like our Lord, has two distinct natures, the human and the divine. It does not follow, however, that these natures of the Church are exactly the same as the parallel natures of Christ. In each case there are clear differences.

The human nature of our Lord, as I need scarcely tell you, was perfect. It had none of the weaknesses and defects which mark the nature of other men. At all times it was perfectly conformable to the mind and will of God, the Father. The human nature of the Church, however, as again is obvious, is imperfect. Made up of human beings, the laity and the clergy, it reflects the frailty of this membership;

it displays the characteristics of other human institutions.

The difference in respect to the divine nature is likewise clear. With our Lord, the divine nature means deity itself. It means that He is God, possessing all the divine attributes in their infinite completeness. With the Church, however, the divine nature means merely partaking of certain divine attributes, those necessary for her to function in God's place. There need be no confusion here. I am not saying, and would not think of saying even in the most figurative language, that the Church is God. I am saying, however, that the Church, as the spokesman of God, possesses divine attributes. In this respect she is like Him; in this respect she has a divine nature.

It is from this point of view, and this only, I believe, that the Church can be correctly understood. Let there be no attempt to minimize the reality of her divinity, by softening it to meet critical opinion. Let there be no attempt to minimize the reality of her humanity, by covering up the mistakes of her people and leaders. Let each nature be fully and correctly appraised for what it is.

That the Church is human would seem to be so obvious as to require no proof. And yet, strange to say, it is many times overlooked. Precisely as the first Christian heretics tried to suppress the humanity of our Lord, later Christians, particularly new converts, are sometimes inclined to minimize the humanity of the Church. Being a convert myself, I understand this inclination. In our first zeal and enthusiasm for the faith we find it difficult to understand how anything in the Church can be imperfect. And we are tempted to deny the evidence, the his-

torical and present-day evidence, of human weakness. In time, of course, we gain our balance. Increasingly conscious of our own imperfections, as well as those of others, and noting that the Church is not contaminated by them, we come eventually to the point of view of those born and raised as Catholics. It is a clear appreciation of the fact that the divinity of the Church is not and cannot be compromised by anything her people and leaders may do.

The mistake that is commonly made today, however, is precisely the contrary; it is to overlook, not the human side, but the divine side of the Church. It is to this, therefore, that we must give attention.

The divinity of the Church is disclosed in her ability to rise above things human. And here again we start with our divine Lord. While on earth among men, He performed three functions; teaching, ruling, and sanctifying. And the Church, being set in the world to take His place, performs the same three functions. Presumably, therefore, it is in respect to these very functions that the Church partakes of divine attributes.

Let me explain here that I cannot discuss all of these in one address. Next week, I shall discuss the function of governing; and in the two following addresses, that of sanctifying. This afternoon I shall devote my remaining moments to the function of teaching. I shall explain how the Church, in teaching the Gospel, partakes of a divine attribute.

It is human to make mistakes. And if the Church were human only, she would make many mistakes. But she was appointed to teach. To the Apostles and all later officials of the Church, our Lord gave the explicit command to teach all nations and to preach the Gospel to every creature. He declared, more-

over, that the Gospel they preached was essential to salvation. He said, "He that heareth you, hearth me" . . . "As the Father hath sent me, I also send you" . . . "He that believeth not, shall be condemned." It follows that the officials of the Church are bound to preach the Gospel correctly; otherwise, our Lord could not make it a requisite for eternal salvation.

Furthermore, He guaranteed them to the world. He promised that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church. And one of His Apostles, St. Paul, in the inspired writings, described the Church as the "pillar and ground of the truth", "holy and without blemish". In these statements there is contained divine assurance that the Church is infallible.

But the Church, it may be pointed out, is made up of men. And how can men be infallible? Depending upon their own resources, upon human wisdom and human experience? Certainly not. No matter how wise and learned they may become, they can never attain infallibility. For all of their learning they remain human and, being human, they are liable to error. How, then, can they be set before the world by our Lord as infallible teachers? Only if and as He Himself makes them so.

This fact cannot be stated too clearly. The infallibility of the Church is not a human virtue. In no sense is it to be credited to the men themselves, those who at the moment happen to be the officials of the Church. Infallibility is a gift from above; it is a divine and supernatural protection given to the officials when they pronounce a doctrine of faith or morals.

Can we be sure that they are so protected? Our

Lord Himself said at the very moment He commissioned them to teach, "And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Once again, when comforting them against His departure, He promised that the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, would come to them and abide with them forever. He promised that the Holy Ghost would teach them all things and recall to them all that He had taught.

It is precisely because of the presence and help of the Holy Ghost that the Church can rise above the human weaknesses which otherwise would corrupt her teachings. That she does so is confirmed by her record. There have been times, a few at least, when the leaders of the Church were affected adversely by the low standards of the society in which they lived. They made grievous mistakes. But, and here is the unique fact, in not one instance was a Church doctrine affected.

Do you not appreciate how extraordinary this is? You know how easy it is for nations and institutions to accommodate their principles to the practice of their leaders; how easy it is for them to allow a mistake to become a tradition which they seek to excuse and defend; how easy it is for them to be compromised by the personalities of their officials. But with the Church there is this singular difference; not once has the human weakness of a leader or that of millions of members been translated into a doctrine. The doctrines themselves, in spite of nineteen centuries of preaching through human lips, have remained on the same super-human plane where they were first placed by our Lord Himself. And here, my friends, is one indication of the divinity of the Church.

It is because the Church is divine that she has a rightful claim upon our allegiance. Because she is divine, she is able to point the world to the path of salvation.

## THE APOSTOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

Address delivered July 3, 1938.

There is something impressive and inspiring in the unbroken history of the Church. For nineteen centuries now, without a moment's interruption, she has been ministering to the souls of those entrusted to her. More than the mere accumulation of wisdom and experience, the Church enjoys the advantage of physical continuity. Her organization today is united in an unbroken line with the organization that was established nineteen centuries ago.

To appreciate how remarkable this is, you need merely review the experiences of nations and empires over the course of the same centuries. How many dynasties have come and gone! How many apparently solid governments have fallen! How many constitutions have been scrapped and replaced by radically different ones! There have been so many changes in recent generations that our own nation, which is one of the youngest, has today one of the oldest constitutions.

In marked contrast is the experience of the Church. Her constitution remains the same. At no time has it been altered or remade. The organization likewise, and it is to this that my subject calls attention, has remained the same. Not once has it been found obsolete and unadaptable. Not once has the Church been compelled to start anew, even if that were possible.

Whenever the record of the Church is thus held up for approval, criticism of the opposite type is suggested. This is but natural, I suppose, and is to be expected. So while I have been praising the

Church, no doubt some of you listening to me have recalled historical episodes in which the conduct of Church leaders was anything but exemplary. In fairness, you feel perhaps that this side of the record should at least be noted.

I understand your point of view. I was once a non-Catholic, and I did my full share of criticising the Church for the misdeeds of her leaders. What I did not see at first, however, and what so many others fail to see, is that these misdeeds constitute a peculiarly strong argument in favor of the Church, rather than against her. Because of this very type of thing, as you know quite well, the governments of nations have fallen and will continue to fall. Suppose, by way of imagining the impossible, that a government could have perfect administration, with its officials always doing the right thing, always using perfect judgment, and at all times living blameless lives; it would last indefinitely. For such a government to persevere from one generation to another would certainly not be remarkable.

Let this fact be fully appreciated whenever the conduct of Catholic leaders is criticized. Then let the case against them be made as strong as possible. Let the truth be supplemented by imaginary tales and irresponsible accusations, such as those which have been invented so many times. Do you not see that such criticisms make the perseverance of the Church more remarkable than ever? If only a few of the things said against her are true, the unbroken continuity of her organization for nineteen centuries appears as an unparalleled miracle. It is by this very record, unique among all institutions and contrary to all human experience, that the Church is set aside and marked as something more than human.



To some of you, if I may judge correctly from modern comments, it seems objectionable that religion should be identified with an organization. And your point of view, while it is by no means general, is important enough to deserve comment. Idealizing purely spiritual things, you prefer that the Christian religion be detached from everything physical.

Now it is quite true that spiritual things come first. The catechism studied by Catholic children teaches them to give more care to their souls than to their bodies. Even so, the body is not to be neglected. Similarly, with the Christian religion. Let the spirit of Christianity be placed first, if any one is interested in an order of precedence. Let the spiritual union of the human mind and will with the mind and will of Christ be emphasized above the place and functioning of the Church organization. Even so, the organization remains a necessity.

Reason tells us that the human soul is not complete without its body. So the soul of Christianity is not complete without its body, the organization. Without the body, how could the soul function? How could Christian truths be taught and preserved? How could questions about the meaning of the Gospel be answered? How could the mind and will of our Lord be known? How could the divinely established means of grace be administered? These and similar queries reveal the necessity for the organization.

For this conclusion we are not dependent upon human reasoning. While it is my purpose in this series of addresses to explain Catholic doctrines as they appeal to reason, I feel no hesitancy in turning to history for confirmation. And so, concerning the

nature of the Church, I draw upon the record of early Christianity as found in the New Testament.

Therein is described a very concrete organization. It had its officials, for instance, a board of managers and a president. It administered property. It appointed certain men to collect and distribute alms. It selected preachers. It held official meetings in which were debated matters of law and policy. It sent delegates from one community to another. It performed ceremonies. It held a rite of initiation. It chose new officials when they were needed. In brief, it did everything an organization ordinarily does.

If a question be raised about the origin of this organization, whether from God or from man, it can be answered from the same historical record. The earliest Christians, those who were contemporaries of our Lord and who surely understood the constitution which He gave His Church, believed that He Himself established the organization. They declared that He personally appointed the first officials and instructed them in their duties.

Their testimony may be supplemented by the words of our Lord. One quotation will suffice: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth," He said, "it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." This declaration He made on two occasions, once to the officials as a group and once to their chief alone. It means, evidently, that our Lord gave to them governmental authority, power to make laws, power to interpret the constitution, and general power to administer the affairs of the Church.

On other occasions He specified other powers, granted to the same men. He commissioned them,

for instance, to teach and preach the Gospel. He gave them the right to administer certain means of grace. In brief, it may be said that He designated them to be His official representatives.

These officials, the first bishops of the Church, were the original twelve Apostles. For them, perhaps as a mark of special reverence because of their close association with our Lord, the term "Apostle" has been more or less exclusively reserved. In this reservation are included, with the original twelve, St. Paul, to whom our Lord appeared later, and usually also St. Barnabas. Thereafter, however, the term Apostle is abandoned and the term bishop is retained.

The apostolicity of the Church, which is my subject for this afternoon, means that the Church was built upon the Apostles. It means that in the beginning the Church was governed by them, and that in succeeding generations she has been governed by their legal successors. Incidentally, it has a further meaning, relative to preaching the Gospel, but that is aside from my purpose this afternoon.

To the Apostles, our Lord entrusted the duty of choosing successors. And their very first act, it is significant to note, at least the first act of which we have any record, was to choose a bishop to fill the place left vacant by Judas. One by one they chose others as they were needed, so that when they were all gone their places had been filled. These newer bishops in turn appointed others to take their places. Generation after generation the process has been repeated. And thus the authority given by our Lord to the original Apostles has been brought down to us at this very moment.

Because of its importance, there need be no

surprise that the consecration of a bishop, the process of which I have been speaking, was elevated by our Lord to the dignity of a sacrament. In it, God not only appoints a new agent but also gives him the grace and supernatural help which he will need. Most appropriately, furthermore, the contract between God and the new bishop is expressed in outward signs, in words and gestures, both ancient and symbolic; and all in an atmosphere of solemnity and holiness.

Particularly to be noted, because of its significance, is the "laying on of hands." The consecrating bishop lays his hands on the head of the priest whom he is consecrating. He himself, only a few years before, knelt before another bishop, whose hands similarly were placed on his head. And the latter had on a previous occasion felt the touch of yet another bishop. Back generation by generation this contact can be traced, back finally into the presence of the Apostles as they were consecrated by our Lord Himself.

Not without reason, then, has the apostolic succession, so vital to the existence of the Church, been the object of special attacks from the powers of evil. If only it could be stopped! If only the consecration of new bishops could be prevented, even for the span of a human life time! If only all of the bishops in the world could be simultaneously destroyed! The end would be in sight. Because bishops alone can confer the Sacrament of Orders, no new bishops could be consecrated. For the same reason, no more priests could be ordained. There being no new priests to replace those who die each year, it would be only a matter of time until there would be no one left to say Mass, no one to hear confessions,

and no one to give Communion. And the lay Christians, those who might escape the persecution, being left without the Sacraments and the Mass, would be sure to lose their faith in time. Moreover, they would be helpless to restore what had been lost. The great plan of Christ would thus have been brought to an inglorious close.

As I speak these words, you are reminded no doubt of present day persecutions. Very probably you call to mind the laws in certain countries which forbid the Church to have seminaries wherein to train priests. You recall laws which simultaneously forbid priests to come in from other countries. You recall the policies which exile and even destroy priests and bishops. You recall, also, the efforts made to arouse censure in your own mind for those who are being persecuted. You need not be deceived about what is back of it all. It is the hope of the powers of evil, instinctively shrewd in their choice of means, to strike the Church at a vital point. If body and soul can be separated, the Church will die. If the organization of the Church can be destroyed, her spirit will fly away.

It was against this very calamity that our Lord gave us His assurance: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" . . . "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Thus divinely and supernaturally protected, the Church cannot be destroyed. Although her bishops may be driven out of one country, there always remain others in some other country. They are ready and waiting to consecrate new bishops and send them back at the first favorable moment. No persecution of the Church

has been or can be so general as to annihilate all at the same time.

Last week I spoke of the divinity of the Church, pointing out that for the performance of her mission she partakes of certain divine attributes. By way of illustration I mentioned the privilege of infallibility, by virtue of which the Church is able to teach the Gospel. Her divinity is further illustrated by what I have discussed today, the continuity of her organization. If the Church were human only she would have collapsed centuries ago, the victim of human weakness and merciless persecution; but she has proved to be immune to the diseases that destroy everything else. That she lives today, that she is young and vigorous, full of promise for the future, is to be credited to the divinity with which her human nature is united. And for this blessing every Christian should daily thank Almighty God.

## THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS

Address delivered July 10, 1938.

It is the purpose of the Church to bring man and God together; to lift man up to God and to bring God down to man. It is to help man worship; to adore God, thank Him for His benefits, beg forgiveness of sins, and present petitions for spiritual and physical blessings. More than all this, however, infinitely more, the purpose of the Church is to bring to man God's response to worship.

It is but natural that prayer be expressed in some outward form. Man is body as well as soul. The two parts are intimately united, so much so that what affects the one affects the other also. So it is that while prayer comes from the soul, as of course it must, it finds expression through the body. It may be expressed in words or in gestures; in music or in other forms of art; or in ceremonies which combine all of these.

The outward expression of prayer is not needed in order to attract God's attention, as some pagans seem to think; neither, to give information to God, as might sometimes appear. God knows the interior workings of man's soul as well as the actions of his body, just as He knows everything else. When you think a prayer, when you think, for instance, "O God, have mercy on me a sinner," or "Give me courage to endure grief and hardship," God knows all about it. He knows, furthermore, the degree of your sincerity, whether you are deserving of His help or not. Nothing further is needed, insofar as God is concerned.

Something further is needed for you, however,

and that is expression. If prayerful thoughts and feelings are shut up within you and closely stifled, they die. You quickly cease to pray. On the other hand, if you express your prayer you become more earnest. Your faith is increased, your will power is strengthened, and your love for God is intensified. Expression makes for more perfect worship. And the more perfect the worship, the greater is God's reward. He proportions His grace to man's cooperation.

One function of religious ceremonies is thus indicated; it is to help man in his approach to God. There is another function, however, more pertinent to our subject this afternoon, and that is to bring God's response to man's approach.

If it is natural for man to put his prayers in an outward form, and we know that it is, it is but natural for him, also, to look for an answer to them, likewise identified with an outward form. The penitents who came to our divine Lord, in love and in sorrow for their sins, wanted to hear "thy sins are forgiven thee." They would not have been satisfied by merely thinking that they were forgiven; they would not have been satisfied by reminding themselves that they were truly sorry and, therefore, deserved to be forgiven. They wanted to hear, with their physical ears, the words of forgiveness spoken audibly by our Lord.

It is similar with men generally. They want outward assurance that God hears them; a demonstration that He has provided for them; an indication that He grants their petitions. They ask not to be left to judge for themselves that they are blessed from above, or that they deserve to be blessed. This craving for a sign, no less than the desire



for self-expression, has been at all times a major influence in various religions, driving men ahead to find or invent or beg from God forms of worship which satisfy.

How far, we now ask, can men go in creating for themselves what they need? The answer is to be found in the history of religions; it is to be found in partial successes and in more definite failures.

As the means of expressing worship, natural gestures, as is to be expected, have freely been drawn upon. Kneeling, for instance, because it expresses humility, is a religious ceremony. Bowing the head, likewise, striking the breast, clasping the hands, extending the arms, uncovering the head, and similar acts, precisely because they are expressive symbols, have become religious ceremonies. Singing is universal as a ceremony of praise. More comprehensive is the offering of gifts and sacrifices. The list which could be added to these is all but unlimited.

Concerning these ceremonies, the only just verdict is that they are not adequate. The motives which underlie them may be commendable; and the human resourcefulness which they display is amazing. But the results are not satisfactory. Man cannot devise a ceremony that perfectly expresses the worship of God.

What, then, of a ceremony to express God's response to worship? This would seem to be even further removed from man's capabilities. It may be taken for granted, of course, that if men at all times had been left without religious directions from God, they would have found many expressive ceremonies. Some of them, no doubt, would be more or less adequate, adequate as symbols. To illustrate:

water is universally used for cleansing the body. It seems only reasonable, therefore, that men would think of using it in a ceremony to symbolize cleansing the soul. They would look upon it as a sign of God's forgiveness.

Without my illustrating further, you will recall other ceremonies which are suggested by human needs. And it is reasonable to judge that even without directions from God they would have been thought of and used by man. To be sure, there would be no uniformity either in their use or understanding; and there would be never-ending changes. Furthermore, some of the ceremonies would become fantastic and grotesque, and even indecent; precisely as pagan religions have demonstrated.

It should be evident, however, that no matter how ingenious man may be in devising ceremonies, he is utterly helpless to make them anything more than ceremonies. To some extent he can find symbols of God's grace; but he cannot put God's grace into them.

You see the point at once. Man prays to God for help, not for the mere appearance of help. He asks for and needs an answer, not the symbol of an answer. He is to be saved by God's grace, not by the sign of grace.

So it is that if man's religious needs are to be fully ministered to, God Himself must provide the ministry. And we may be confident that He does so. As I have remarked repeatedly in this series of addresses, God is the author both of religion and of man; surely He relates the one to the needs of the other.

On this reasoning, Christianity, if it comes from God, and we may be sure that it does, must provide

God-given forms of religion. And these, my friends, are the Sacraments. They are not the expression of man's worship, although they are related to it. They are not mere signs of God's answer to worship, although they are excellent signs. Over and above expressions and signs, they are channels of grace.

There are seven Sacraments: Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Holy Eucharist, Holy Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction. That they were established by our Lord Himself, and entrusted by Him to the care of the Church is evident from the fact that they have been in the Church from the beginning. They could not have come from any other source.

Time does not permit a discussion of our Lord's authorship of all of the Sacraments. Neither is it necessary. As a matter of fact, I have already spoken about the Sacrament of Orders; and in my next two addresses I shall discuss the Sacraments of the Eucharist and Matrimony. So for today I shall limit my attention and very brief attention at that, to Baptism and Penance, as illustrations of the others.

On one occasion our Lord said to His Apostles, and through them to their successors, "Going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In these words the divine institution of Baptism would seem to be clearly indicated. It is nothing less than a command.

What is to be said, however, about the nature of Baptism? Since the use of water is an appropriate sign of cleansing, it seems that our Lord intended it as a sign of cleansing the soul from sin. But is that all that He intended? Does it seem reasonable?

Would our Lord command the performance of a mere symbol, form without substance? Is there anything in His whole ministry to warrant such an opinion?

Our Lord Himself gives the answer: "Who believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Evidently, then, Baptism is a means of salvation, chosen and used for that purpose by our Lord. Evidently it is far more than a symbol; it is a cause of grace.

As a second illustration take the Sacrament of penance, that in which sins committed after Baptism are forgiven. That our Lord appointed priests to be His agents in hearing confessions is evident both from His own words and the practice of the early Church. Again we ask: Did He intend that they perform merely an outward sign?

No one is or can be forgiven who is not truly sorry for his sins. The penitent in confession, therefore, must sincerely and sorrowfully come for God's forgiveness. Is he to be met by a mere sign of forgiveness, an empty symbol? The words of the priest, "I absolve you from your sins," are perfect as a sign. But is that all that they are?

Again our Lord gives the answer. To His priests, those who stood before Him and those who live today, He said, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Note, He did not say, "Whose sins you shall appear to forgive appear to be forgiven." He said, rather, that they *are* forgiven. All of this means that the Sacrament of Penance, in which the priest is the agent of God, is the channel through which God forgives. From similar facts and by sim-

ilar reasoning the divine authorship of the other Sacraments is proved.

Because of the occasional criticism that the Sacraments are superficial forms, I explain their functioning a little more fully. And for the purpose I use a rather homely analogy, one which although not perfect, is close enough to throw some light on the subject. Suppose that you write a letter. There is a three-fold cooperation, of you, the pen, and the paper. You, of course, are the author of the letter. But both pen and paper, also, are necessary. And each must be under your control. The pen must be guided by your mind and hand, otherwise it can write nothing. The paper, likewise, must be open to you. If it is buried under books, or if it is too badly soiled, it cannot be written on.

You see what I mean. For yourself, substitute God; for the pen, put the Sacraments; and for the paper, put the human soul. It is desired that God should write a message on the soul, giving or increasing sanctifying grace. God alone can write that message. He is free, be it noted furthermore, to choose His method; and He chooses the Sacraments. To be useful, the Sacrament must be under His control; otherwise, it is a mere outward sign. And the human soul must be open to God. If there are obstacles between it and Him, if it is black with unrepented sin, it can not receive His help.

It is because one or another of these factors is overemphasized that the efficacy of the Sacraments is misjudged. God's part can be exaggerated, for instance, by saying that He gives grace regardless of man's dispositions. And this is wholly unreasonable. If a person should receive Baptism, for instance, while intending to live in sin, certainly he

would get no good from it. If he should go to confession, not promising to avoid future sins, he would not be forgiven. Similarly with each of the other Sacraments. God's part is essential, of course; it is the primary requisite. But God's part is not all.

The function of the Sacrament, likewise, may be exaggerated. To say, for instance, that it produces its effect through psychological appeal or through impressive symbolism, or to regard it as a trick of magic, is wholly wrong. It seeks to remove the Sacrament from the realm of religion.

Finally, the contribution of the soul can be overplayed. It is true, as I have insisted, that the soul must approach God and must remove the obstacles in the way. But to go further and declare that good dispositions of the soul alone are sufficient is to declare that something merely human has become divine. Moreover, it disregards the plan of God. After all, if He established the Sacraments and commanded that they be received, it would seem unreasonably rash for man to ignore them and depend solely upon himself. No matter how perfect his dispositions may be, they are only human. They are not and cannot be the cause of grace. That is a gift from God. Good dispositions are necessary, but so also are the Sacraments; made necessary by the will of God.

Perhaps it is unnecessary for me to add, but I do so for fear of being misunderstood, that the Sacraments of the Church are not substitutes for prayer. Catholics are instructed to obtain God's help in both ways, through prayer and the Sacraments. Each is an aid to the other. And, if we may judge from outward signs, those Catholics who most frequently receive the Sacraments give the most time to daily

---

prayer. In the practical test of effect upon life, therefore, it can be said that the Sacraments, among other benefits, stimulate prayer among Catholic people.

To Catholics listening to me I conclude with this word. When you receive a Sacrament you are taking your part in a divine plan. You are fulfilling a condition made by our Lord nineteen centuries ago, by which you are to obtain special help from Him. His promises are unailing. Eagerly you should take advantage of them.

As an infant, you were met with a Sacrament. At the close of life, your soul will be comforted by another Sacrament. Between the two, at all great moments of life and in all unfortunate defeats, you are met with other appropriate Sacraments. They are God's way of lifting you above the world, of holding you close to Himself, and ultimately of saving your soul.

## THE REAL PRESENCE

Address delivered July 17, 1938.

Man's relationship with God, speaking historically, may be divided into three periods, each definitely marked both in time and by distinctive characteristics. These periods, before, during, and after our Lord's dwelling on earth, tell the story of progressive opportunities given to man for union with God.

In the first period men struggled along as best they could without God's presence among them. Yielding to the need for tangible objects of worship, pagan peoples frequently made idols out of wood and stone and metal. These idols, although merely the products of their own handiwork, they set before them and worshipped, attributing to them supernatural powers. The worshippers of the true God, however, while often tempted, were forbidden to stoop to idolatry. To them, God had revealed Himself as a spirit. Their need for Him as a concrete object of worship thus had to await the unfolding of the plan of redemption.

In their desire to adore God, men at all times have turned to the offering of sacrifices. But from their own resources they could find nothing perfect to offer. Their gifts, such as food and animals, although the best they had, were only natural. Even the sacrifices which God Himself prescribed were imperfect. The instinctive need for a perfect sacrifice thus pointed ahead, ahead to something which man hoped for and was being helped to expect.

There was the need, also, for communion with God. Commonly, this found expression by the vari-



ous religions in ceremonies wherein the communicants took as food the gifts which had been offered on the altars of sacrifice. Thus they symbolized a mystical union with the deities whom they had sought to please. Not fully satisfying, of course, such ceremonies prefigured the perfect communion which was to come.

The second period began with the coming of our divine Lord. From the first days in Bethlehem, when He was visited by the shepherds and the wise men, to the last moment on the mount of ascension, when He was taken up from the midst of the Apostles, He was the object of worship. To Him, men came for truth and forgiveness. From Him, they begged grace for their souls and miracles for their bodies. Before Him, they knelt down in adoration, pouring out the deepest love of their hearts.

With a few faithful souls to mourn Him, our Lord offered Himself as the victim on the cross of Calvary. Here at last was the perfect sacrifice. The object offered to God was infinite, being none other than our Lord Himself. Those who knew Him for what He was, those who were brave enough to stay with Him to the end, joined their sacrifice to His. They gave up everything that was dear and precious to them. Never before had man offered, or even been in the presence of, such a sacrifice.

The presence of our Lord on earth made possible, also, the perfect communion. The night before He died, at the Last Supper, He gave Himself to His chosen Apostles. In comparison with this, all previous communions are dwarfed, for the Apostles received not merely a sign of grace but the Author of grace Himself. They took part in a ceremony which not merely symbolized union with God but

which in an extraordinary manner *was* union with God.

As we contemplate our Lord's return to heaven, leaving His followers behind, we cannot but ask if these marvelous privileges had all come to an end? Were all men, from that moment on, to know of God's presence on earth merely as an incident of history? Were they never again to have God in their midst as an object of worship, or to offer Him as the victim of sacrifice, or to receive Him in communion? Had God lifted the human race for a brief moment of exalted intimacy, only to drop it back again forever? Was the clock of God's providence to be turned backwards? Were men to be thrown back again on their own human devices, for the worship of God, for sacrifices to Him, and for communion? Does it seem reasonable?

The questions are suggested by my general subject, "The Appeal to Reason." And I submit that in the third and final period of God's relationship with man it is only reasonable that the move should be forward, rather than backward, and that men should be drawn closer to God, rather than pushed away.

In coming to this conclusion, as we reasonably do, we are halted for a moment to reflect that perfection cannot be made more perfect. Our Lord's presence on earth could not be made more real than it was. Neither could His sacrifice on the cross, nor the communion given to the Apostles. Wherein, then, is there the possibility of anything beyond or above these perfections? Not in quality, of course; but in quantity. There would be a great advance in God's plan if the blessings once limited to a few could be made available to all Christians, everywhere and always.

---

Reasonably, then, we look to our Lord for such a plan. We look to Him for a method whereby He can do for us today what He did for the few who knelt before Him nineteen centuries ago, who stood at the foot of the cross, and who received Him in communion at the Last Supper. Our reasoning thus brings us to the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

It is the Sacrament that contains the body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine. It has its origin in the mind and will of our Lord, as expressed at the Last Supper. There, surrounded by His Apostles, He took bread in His hands, broke and blessed it, giving thanks, and then pronounced these startling words: "Take ye, and eat. This is my body." In similar manner, likewise, He took wine, and blessing it, said: "Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood. . ." And then He added: "Do this for a commemoration of me."

Stated thus in a few brief sentences, are the events which have changed the whole course of religious history. The facts are learned from two sources, oral tradition and the written records. The former was quickly transformed into Christian life and customs which, from the very beginning, centered in and around the Eucharist.

The written records, four of them, are found in the New Testament; written respectively by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul. Two of these are from eye witnesses. St. Matthew, an Apostle, was present at the Last Supper. St. Mark, the companion and scribe of St. Peter, wrote what the latter preached; and St. Peter, also, was present at the Last Supper. The other two, not being there,

wrote what they learned from the Christian community.

It is noteworthy that all four accounts agree, agree on the essentials. There is divergence, of course in the order of details and in emphasis. There is exactly the type of difference that must be expected from honest and independent reporters of the same fact. But all agree that our Lord said, "This is my body," and "This is my blood."

Our Lord's meaning is indicated not merely by His own words and by the circumstances, but also by the way He was understood by His contemporaries. It appears that all who knew Him—there is no evidence of an exception—understood Him to mean exactly what I have stated. In confirmation, I call attention to two events, one that occurred a few months before the Last Supper, and one that occurred a few years after.

You recall from your Bible the occasion when our Lord fed the thousands of persons by multiplying a few loaves and fishes. Shortly thereafter, perhaps because the miracle was a fitting introduction, He declared His intention of giving His body as food for His followers, insisting that they must partake of that food. The pronouncement, as you anticipate, was received with protest from some of the bystanders. How, they asked, how could He possibly give His flesh as food?

The response is significant. If He had been misunderstood, it would have been easy to say so. Instead, however, He only emphasized what He had said before. Once more there was a protest, this time from some of His disciples. "This saying is hard," they insisted, "and who can hear it." It was a "hard saying," if our Lord really meant it. Once

more He had the opportunity to explain. Once more, however, He reasserted the same "hard saying." And then, according to the inspired writer, St. John the Apostle, some of His disciples left Him and walked no more with Him. Without a word He let them go. Evidently, they had understood Him correctly.

The second event is a letter written by St. Paul to the Corinthians, sometime within twenty-five years after the Last Supper. It is valuable in showing what the early Christians thought about the Eucharist. In the words which I shall quote, St. Paul is not teaching something new; rather, he is referring to a truth which his readers already believed. It seems that some of the Corinthians, converts as they were from paganism, occasionally slipped back again to their former temples and received communion there. To impress upon them the gravity of their offense, St. Paul reminds them of what their Christian communion really is.

I now quote: "The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? . . . You cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils." "Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord." Without any comment, because comment is scarcely necessary, I submit that the early Christians in Corinth believed, having been so taught—and their teaching goes back still closer to the time of Christ—that at the Last Supper He meant to say that He was really present under the appearance of bread and wine.

The question arises as to how the Last Supper is carried over into the daily practice of the Church. You recall the words of our Lord, "Do this for a commemoration of me." Therein He commanded His Apostles, and through them all later priests, to do what He had done. Thus it is that in each Mass said throughout the world, the Last Supper is reenacted. As the priest pronounces the words, "This is my body" and "This is my blood," the miracle of transubstantiation takes place, exactly as it did when our Lord Himself first uttered them. And He comes present on each altar today as truly as He was present nineteen centuries ago.

In the Eucharist He is thus before His people as an object of worship. He is in the tabernacle of each Catholic church. You can enter at any time and worship Him; and you will be conscious of His presence.

The Eucharist makes possible the preservation of the Sacrifice which was offered on Mt. Calvary. Our Lord can be and is offered daily on the altar of each church, as the victim of sacrifice, offered at the hands of the priest appointed for the purpose. And thus we have the Mass. And thus it is possible for Christians, throughout the world at all times, to join in the experience of those few who stood at the foot of the cross.

The Eucharist makes it possible, also, for Christians everywhere to receive the same communion which the Apostles received. They may claim for themselves that very experience and blessing. What was once a peculiar privilege for twelve men has thus become the daily privilege of millions. It has been so for nineteen centuries of the past; it will remain so for countless more centuries of the future.

The criticism of the doctrine today is the same as when our Lord first declared it. There is no satisfactory explanation, so it is said. Let me make it clear that even if I had unlimited time at my disposal, instead of a few moments, I would not and could not attempt a complete explanation of transubstantiation. In certain respects it is a mystery, and will always remain so. But that fact, my friends, is no sufficient reason for rejecting it. We believe many things in the natural order which cannot be explained; that electricity produces light, for instance; also, that ether waves can carry the human voice across the continent. No one can explain how a plant converts inanimate matter into living leaf and blossom. We accept such phenomena, although we cannot understand them, because of the evidence. Why not take the same reasonable attitude toward transubstantiation? Although it cannot be fully understood, it is supported by excellent evidence, the testimony of our divine Lord Himself.

It is often contended, however, that a change from one substance to another is impossible. I ask how anyone can make such a statement. Every moment of our lives we demonstrate that changes of substance take place. For example, the substance of bread, when consumed as food, through some mysterious process is changed into the substance of the human body. If this can be done by nature, within a few hours of time, why can it not be done by the Author of nature, without the lapse of time? Let it not be forgotten that God is above the laws of nature; certainly He is not limited by His own creation.

Concerning the substance of matter, from which the criticisms arise, even the scientific world knows very little. Theories generally accepted by one gen-

eration are often discarded by the next. For example, take the so-called laws of the conservation of matter and energy. Only a few years ago, in 1929 to be exact, Sir James Jeans, whose standing as a scholar and scientist is unquestioned, went so far as to say this: "The two fundamental corner-stones of twentieth century physics, the conservation of matter and the conservation of energy, are both abolished." And yet, remember, my friends, many times these very theories have been appealed to in order to disprove the doctrine of the Real Presence. No doubt, some Catholics have lost their faith and many prospective converts have been driven away, because of these theories, now abandoned.

Scientists have recently declared that certain particles of the atom, the unit of matter, travel through their infinitesimally small space at the amazing velocity of twelve thousand miles a second. If this extraordinary statement is true, and perhaps it is, the scientists of a few years ago knew very little about the composition of matter; to them, the idea of such velocity within the atom would have appeared most ridiculous.

Let us profit from this experience. Let us be humble enough to recognize that in a few years our present theories about the substance of matter also may be discarded. And if we are humble we shall not hold up mere human opinion about transubstantiation against the clear statements of our Lord. Rather, we shall imitate the prudence of Cardinal Newman who, after a lifetime of study, declared: "What do I know of substance or matter? Just as much as the greatest philosopher; and that is nothing at all."

Being intellectually humble, our minds will open



---

to the truth. Repenting of doubts, we shall do as St. Thomas did, bow down before the Real Presence and say, "My Lord and my God." We shall offer Him in sacrifice, as He truly comes present on the altar in the Mass. And we shall receive Him in communion, preparing our souls and bodies to be in some small degree worthy of so great a gift from above.

## THE SACRAMENT OF MATRIMONY

Address delivered July 24, 1938.

Among the forms of religion given to man by Almighty God, none is more important to the welfare of society than the Sacrament of Matrimony. It is of importance, superlatively so, because it touches human nature at a point of unusual sensitiveness. In no other respect is the fall of man so clearly evidenced as the relationship of the sexes. In no other respect does the human family lose its ideals so completely. In no other respect does it require such constant watchfulness and extraordinary protection.

In considering this subject as it appeals to reason, as I do this afternoon, a major difficulty is at once disclosed. This is one subject about which men and women do not like to reason. Instead of logic, they incline to follow emotions; for principles, they substitute personal preferences. When they wish to form matrimonial unions which are attractive but forbidden, they begin to invent excuses of justification. Historically speaking, out of these forbidden unions have often come practices and customs, thus carrying individual mistakes over into the very fabric of society.

The characteristic of marriage that absorbs attention today is its freedom, the freedom of the contracting parties. But this indicates only a partial truth; it must be carefully defined or it obscures the whole truth. Without any doubt each man and woman is wholly free to enter or refuse to enter the marriage state. Marriage is a contract; it is the meeting of two minds. Being like other contracts

in this respect, it does not exist unless there is mutual consent. And there is no consent without freedom. A man or woman who is coerced into a marriage relationship, whether the coercion is physical or moral, is not married.

Incidentally, the Catholic Church, with all of her strictness toward marriage, perhaps I should say precisely because of her strictness, demands freedom for the contracting parties. She does not hesitate to condemn as invalid any so-called marriage wherein freedom is violated, even at the risk of being misunderstood and criticized.

But is freedom all that is required? One would think so, to judge from modern commentaries and modern legislation. It would seem that there is a conspiracy in our midst to bring about one single end, the freedom of men and women to enter and to break marriage relationships as they please, regardless of everything else. It is at this point that reason rebels.

We do not demand such unrestrained freedom in other matters. Man has the right to own private property, for instance. He may choose freely to own or not to own. But it does not follow that he is justified in taking what belongs to another. His freedom is limited by law, by the laws of nature and God. Man has the right of free speech. But it does not follow that he may speak falsehoods and blasphemy. Again, his freedom is limited by law. Why should anyone think that freedom in marriage is different, that it is above law?

What I am saying is this: Freedom is one of the essentials of marriage, but it is not the only essential. Marriage is far more than an individual contract; for one thing, it is a social relationship.

The unit of society is the home; the beginning of the home is marriage. Whatever affects marriage, therefore, affects the home and society. When the ideals of marriage are generally violated, society tends downward. It can rise again only when respect for those ideals is restored. For very good reason, therefore, society must be interested in the purity of the marriages by which it is vitalized.

The spokesman of society is the State, or the civil government. Within its proper sphere, it has the duty of regulating marriage. It does so by requiring publicity, for instance; by requiring ceremonies in the presence of designated witnesses; by securing freedom to the parties. It should do so by carrying over into civil laws the natural and divine laws governing marriage.

In our country this authority is generally recognized. Our young people do not attempt to set up homes without complying with the rules and ceremonies prescribed by their local governments. Fortunately, we have not yet fallen into general defiance of those laws. We may come to it, however, before long; it is only one step removed. Already it is being approached in some of the other countries.

Up to date, however, the right of civil government to regulate marriage is recognized by the American people. The danger is that it is recognized too much, or rather, let us say too exclusively. The State is being made the sole authority, outside the contracting parties themselves, to pass judgment on marriage. It is as if there were nothing from above, no laws or principles or ideals above those compounded by the various legislatures.

Is this changed attitude, for it is a change, a part of the modern mania for State absolutism?

Are the American people unwittingly helping the cause of the totalitarian civil government? It would seem so. At least in respect to marriage, they are actually doing so.

That this attitude is unreasonable should be obvious; and again I appeal to comparisons. Civil governments regulate the ownership of private property. They do so on the theory, not that they themselves create the right of property, but rather that they apply the objective principles of justice according to which their citizens have the right. Similarly, they forbid murder; not because their officials have *decided* that murder is wrong, but rather because murder *is* wrong, being forbidden by nature and by Almighty God. Governments recognize over them, at least in our country they are supposed to recognize, certain principles which they are bound to respect.

Now why should a different theory be applied to marriage? Why should the American people think that their civil governments can create the principles to govern marriage, as distinguished from the principles to govern everything else? The answer is, of course, that they do not think so. The present tendency is not the result of thought and decision; precisely to the contrary, it is the result of a lack of thought and a lack of decision. It is merely a surrender to temptation and weakness.

I have called attention to two modern tendencies concerning marriage: First, the demand for more and more freedom from regulation; and second, the inclination to give civil government exclusive regulative power. Does it seem, at first thought, that these two tendencies are inconsistent one with the other and that, therefore, they cannot develop simultan-

ously in the same society? The truth is that one is the sequel to the other.

Civil government cannot be trusted to be the exclusive or even the principal regulator of marriage. Sooner or later it draws its principles from the wrong source; sooner or later it compromises with low standards, with the weaknesses of human nature. Particularly is this true of a popular government, where the people are in control. So it is that to the degree that civil government monopolizes the function of regulating marriage precisely to that same degree does marriage tend to fly away from regulation. And that means unreasonable freedom for the individual; freedom from external restraints; freedom to yield to any impulse, regardless of morality.

Whenever civil government steps outside its own proper sphere, attempting to take the place of nature and of God, it upsets the whole scheme of things. Undertaking to do too much, eventually it does too little. Claiming an authority which God does not intend it to have, it loses the exercise of the authority which God gave it. It becomes merely a barometer of popular standards, a mere register of social diseases, rather than a leader in morality and a promoter of justice. Theoretically it continues to regulate; actually it permits, under the name of law, anything that the people wish to do.

In summary to this point, I have said first that marriage is an individual and freely formed contract, and second that it is a social relationship. To be properly understood, however, marriage must be viewed on a still higher plane, the plane of religion. It is free, of course; it is social, obviously. But above

either of these designations is its dignity as an act of religion.

If marriage is important to the welfare of society, it is equally important to the preservation of the human race. It forms the beginning of the home wherein are reared not merely citizens of the State but children of God. In the home the parents cooperate with God, being procreators of the human family. God has every right, therefore, to be concerned about the homes in which His plan for perpetuating the race is carried out.

As the civil government is the spokesman of society, so the Church is the spokesman of God. As civil government brings to marriage the regulations demanded by society, so the Church brings to marriage the regulations demanded by Almighty God. It is true, of course, that society draws its authority from God no less than does the Church, although in a different way. Civil government, furthermore, should cooperate with the Church in applying to marriage, to everything else for that matter, the laws of God. But since marriage is a part of the program explicitly entrusted to the Church by our divine Lord, the Church is authorized in a very special sense to protect God's interest in it.

The elementary laws governing marriage come from nature and from God. That marriage is the union of one man and one woman is written clearly in nature itself. No matter from what starting point the approach is made, biological, economic, educational, cultural, or sentimental, the same conclusion is reached; namely, the endorsement of monogamy.

Nature condemns, also, the remarriage of separated persons. Since the primary purpose of marriage is the procreation and education of children,

and since for the ideal attainment of this purpose an unbroken home is necessary, it follows that divorce is condemned.

So important is it that these principles be clearly understood that our divine Lord Himself stated them. Knowing the weakness of men and women, He knew that they needed more than the unwritten laws of nature to keep them close to the narrow path. And so He spoke openly to His followers about the nature of marriage, defining its unity and indissolubility.

More than that, again because He knew human nature, He understood how much men and women need supernatural help in order to obey laws. To that end He placed in His religion certain means of grace, acts of worship, whereby this help may be obtained. He even elevated matrimony itself to the dignity of a Sacrament. It is thus more than a contract; it is the means of calling upon God and receiving from Him the blessings and help which husband and wife need.

It is this religious character of marriage that is now so generally overlooked. One evidence of this, one among others, is the increasing willingness of young people to be married by civil officials, rather than by the ministers and clergymen of their religious organizations. This marks a decline from the religious plane to the mere social plane; and because there is no logical stopping there, it is prophetic of a still further decline.

The religious regulation of marriage, in contrast with mere social and political regulation, is true and uncompromising. The Church draws her principles from above, not from below, from God, not from man. She asserts and defends those prin-



principles, regardless of what the whole world may think. She may be condemned; she may suffer; she may lose many of her own people. Even so, she does not compromise the principles of marriage. In nineteen centuries she has not compromised; in nineteen centuries more she will not compromise.

Very often the point of view of the Church is misunderstood by non-Catholics, a fact which I am quick to recognize, because I myself was once a Protestant. And the legislation of the Church concerning matrimony, being misunderstood, is often criticized. Let me assure you that what the Church is trying to do is to make this a better society for you to live in, and a safer society for your children to grow up in.

She declares, with all of the power at her command, that the principles which govern matrimony have been given to the world by God Himself, and that they bind men and women in conscience. She declares that these principles are immutable, that they cannot be changed either by civil governments or by private persons. She declares that to her was entrusted the guardianship of the principles as well as the Sacrament of Matrimony, which fact she is ready to prove. And she declares that it is in fulfillment of this divine trust that she makes necessary rules and regulations, which must be obeyed by her children.

Among these laws is that which requires Catholics, if and when they contract marriage, to do so in the presence of an authorized priest. He is identified, both by calling and position, with their religion. It is he who ministers to their spiritual needs. He baptizes them as infants, hears their confessions, says Mass for them, preaches to them, buries their

dead, gives them communion, and is their leader in all matters of religion. It is to this same official that they must go for their marriages. I speak of this law because it shows the mind of the Church; it is one means, and it is typical of the others, by which the Church tries to accomplish her high purpose.

Marriages must be brought back and preserved as acts of religion. They must be surrounded by religious influences. The principles by which they are governed must be sought from God; also, the help by which these principles are to be obeyed is to be sought from God. And man's contact with God is through religion. There is no other way.

In her crusade to protect the sacredness of marriage, the Church deserves your support, my friends, and I speak to Catholics and non-Catholics alike. She will succeed if you and other high minded persons will reasonably cooperate with her.

## CARDINAL HAYES STATES PURPOSE OF CATHOLIC HOUR

(Extract from his address at the inaugural program in the studio of the National Broadcasting Company, New York City, March 2, 1930.)

Our congratulations and our gratitude are extended to the National Council of Catholic Men and its officials, and to all who, by their financial support, have made it possible to use this offer of the National Broadcasting Company. The heavy expense of managing and financing a weekly program, its musical numbers, its speakers, the subsequent answering of inquiries, must be met. . . .

This radio hour is for all the people of the United States. To our fellow-citizens, in this word of dedication, we wish to express a cordial greeting and, indeed, congratulations. For this radio hour is one of service to America, which certainly will listen in interestedly, and even sympathetically, I am sure, to the voice of the ancient Church with its historic background of all the centuries of the Christian era, and with its own notable contribution to the discovery, exploration, foundation and growth of our glorious country. . . .

Thus to voice before a vast public the Catholic Church is no light task. Our prayers will be with those who have that task in hand. We feel certain that it will have both the good will and the good wishes of the great majority of our countrymen. Surely, there is no true lover of our Country who does not eagerly hope for a less worldly, a less material, and a more spiritual standard among our people.

With good will, with kindness and with Christ-like sympathy for all, this work is inaugurated. So may it continue. So may it be fulfilled. This word of dedication voices, therefore, the hope that this radio hour may serve to make known, to explain with the charity of Christ, our faith, which we love even as we love Christ Himself. May it serve to make better understood that faith as it really is—a light revealing the pathway to heaven: a strength, and a power divine through Christ; pardoning our sins, elevating, consecrating our common every-day duties and joys, bringing not only justice but gladness and peace to our searching and questioning hearts.

# 94 CATHOLIC HOUR STATIONS

In 41 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii

Alabama	Birmingham .....	WBRC,	980	kc
	Mobile .....	WALA,	1380	kc
Arizona	Phoenix .....	KTAR,	620	kc
	Tucson .....	KVOA,	1260	kc
Arkansas	Little Rock .....	KARK,	890	kc
California	Bakersfield .....	KERN,	1370	kc
	Fresno .....	KMJ,	580	kc
	Los Angeles .....	KECA,	1430	kc
	Sacramento .....	KFBK,	1490	kc
	San Francisco .....	KPO,	680	kc
	Stockton .....	KWG,	1200	kc
Colorado	Denver .....	KOA,	830	kc
	Pueblo .....	KGHF,	1320	kc
Connecticut	Hartford .....	WTIC,	1040	kc
D. of C.	Washington .....	WRC,	950	kc
Florida	Jacksonville .....	WJAX,	900	kc
	Lakeland .....	WLAK,	1310	kc
	Miami .....	WIOD,	610	kc
	Pensacola .....	WCOA,	1340	kc
	Tampa .....	WFLA-WSUN,	620	kc
Georgia	Atlanta .....	WSB,	740	kc
Idaho	Boise .....	KIDO,	1350	kc
	Pocatello .....	KSEI,	900	kc
Illinois	Chicago .....	WMAQ-WCFM,	670	kc
Indiana	Evansville .....	WGFB,	630	kc
	Fort Wayne .....	WGL,	1370	kc
	Indianapolis .....	WIRE,	1400	kc
	Terre Haute .....	WBOW,	1310	kc
Kansas	Wichita .....	KANS,	1210	kc
Kentucky	Louisville .....	WAVE,	940	kc
Louisiana	New Orleans .....	WSMB,	1320	kc
	Shreveport .....	KTBS,	1450	kc
Maine	Portland .....	WCSH,	940	kc
Maryland	Baltimore .....	WFB,	1270	kc
Massachusetts	Boston .....	WBZ,	990	kc
	Springfield .....	WBZA,	990	kc
Michigan	Detroit .....	WWJ,	850	kc
Minnesota	Duluth-Superior .....	WEBC,	1290	kc
	Mankato .....	KYSM,	1500	kc
	Minneapolis-St. Paul .....	KSTP,	1460	kc
	St. Cloud .....	KFAM,	1420	kc
Mississippi	Jackson .....	WJDX,	1270	kc
Missouri	Kansas City .....	WDAF,	610	kc
	Springfield .....	KGBX,	1230	kc
	Saint Louis .....	KSD,	550	kc
Montana	Billings .....	KGHL,	780	kc
	Butte .....	KGIR,	1340	kc
	Helena .....	KPFA,	1210	kc
Nebraska	Omaha .....	WOW,	590	kc
Nevada	Reno .....	KOH,	1380	kc
New Mexico	Albuquerque .....	KOB,	1180	kc
New York	Buffalo .....	WBEW,	900	kc
	New York .....	WEAF,	660	kc
	Schenectady .....	WGY,	790	kc
North Carolina	Asheville .....	WISE,	1370	kc
	Charlotte .....	WSOC,	1210	kc
	Raleigh .....	WPTF,	680	kc
North Dakota	Bismarck .....	KFYR,	550	kc
	Fargo .....	WDAY,	940	kc
Ohio	Cincinnati .....	WSAI,	1330	kc
	Cleveland .....	WTAM,	1070	kc
	Columbus .....	WCOL,	1210	kc
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City .....	WKY,	900	kc
	Tulsa .....	KVOO,	1140	kc
Oregon	Medford .....	KMED,	1410	kc
	Portland .....	KEX,	1180	kc

## 94 CATHOLIC HOUR STATIONS

In 41 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii		
Pennsylvania	Allentown .....	WSAN, 1440 kc
	Altoona .....	WFBG, 1310 kc
	Erie .....	WLEU, 1420 kc
	Johnstown .....	WJAC, 1310 kc
	Philadelphia .....	KYW, 1020 kc
Rhode Island	Pittsburgh .....	WCAE, 1220 kc
	Providence .....	WJAR, 890 kc
South Carolina	Charleston .....	WTMA, 1210 kc
	Columbia .....	WIS, 560 kc
	Florence .....	WOLS, 1200 kc
South Dakota	Greenville .....	WFBC, 1300 kc
	Sioux Falls .....	KSOO-KELO, 1110-1200 kc
Tennessee	Chattanooga .....	WAPO, 1420 kc
	Nashville .....	WSM, 650 kc
Texas	Amarillo .....	KGNC, 1410 kc
	Beaumont .....	KFDM, 560 kc
	El Paso .....	KTSM, 1310 kc
	Fort Worth .....	KGKO, 570 kc
	Houston .....	KPRC, 920 kc
	San Antonio .....	WOAI, 1190 kc
	Salt Lake City .....	KDYL, 1290 kc
Utah	Norfolk .....	WTAR, 780 kc
	Richmond .....	WMBG, 1350 kc
Virginia	Seattle .....	KOMO, 920 kc
	Spokane .....	KHQ, 590 kc
Washington	Madison .....	WIBA, 1280 kc
	Honolulu .....	KGU, 750 kc
Wisconsin	Schenectady, N. Y. ....	WGEO, 9.53 meg
HAWAII		
SHORT WAVE		

(Revised as of January 6, 1940)

## CATHOLIC HOUR RADIO ADDRESSES IN PAMPHLET FORM

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR is the authorized publisher of all CATHOLIC HOUR addresses in pamphlet form. The addresses published to date, all of which are available, are listed below. Others will be published as they are delivered.

### Quantity Prices Do Not Include Carriage Charge

"The Divine Romance," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"The Moral Order" and "Mary, the Mother of Jesus," by Rev. Dr. Geo. Johnson, 64 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per 100.

"A Trilogy on Prayer," by Rev. Thomas F. Burke, C.S.P., 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"The Philosophy of Catholic Education," by Rev. Dr. Charles L. O'Donnell, C.S.C., 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"Christianity and the Modern Mind," by Rev. John A. McCloy, S.J., 64 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per 100.

"The Moral Law," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 88 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$9.50 per 100.

"Christ and His Church," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph M. Corrigan, 88 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$9.50 per 100.

"The Marks of the Church," by Rev. Dr. John K. Cartwright, 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Organization and Government of the Church," by Rev. Dr. Francis J. Connell, C.S.S.R., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Moral Factors in Economic Life," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis J. Haas and Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"Divine Helps for Man," by Rev. Dr. Edward J. Walsh, C.M., 104 pages and cover. Single copy, 25c postpaid; 5 or more, 20c each. In quantities, \$11.00 per 100.

"The Parables," by Rev. John A. McCloy, S.J., 128 pages and cover. Single copy, 30c postpaid; 5 or more, 20c each. In quantities, \$12.00 per 100.

"Christianity's Contribution to Civilization," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$10.00 per 100.

"Manifestations of Christ," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 123 pages and cover. Single copy, 30c postpaid; 5 or more, 20c each. In quantities, \$12.00 per 100.

"The Way of the Cross," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 32 pages and cover (prayer book size). Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 5c each. In quantities, \$3.00 per 100.

"Christ Today," by Very Rev. Dr. Ignatius Smith, O.P., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Christian Family," by Rev. Dr. Edward Lodge Curran, 68 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$7.00 per 100.

"The Dublin Eucharistic Congress," by His Eminence William Cardinal O'Connell. An address rebroadcast from Dublin, 12 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 5c each. In quantities, \$3.75 per 100.

"Rural Catholic Action," by Rev. Dr. Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B., 24 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 5c each. In quantities, \$3.50 per 100.

"Religion and Human Nature," by Rev. Dr. Joseph A. Daly, 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Church and Some Outstanding Problems of the Day," by Rev. Jones I. Corrigan, S.J., 72 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"Conflicting Standards," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"The Hymn of the Conquered," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 128 pages and cover. Single copy, 30c postpaid; 5 or more, 20c each. In quantities, \$12.00 per 100.

"The Seven Last Words," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, (prayer book size) 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 5c each. In quantities, \$3.00 per 100.

"The Church and the Child," by Rev. Dr. Paul H. Furfey, 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Love's Veiled Victory and Love's Laws," by Rev. Dr. George F. Strohaber, S.J., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Religion and Liturgy," by Rev. Dr. Francis A. Walsh, O.S.B., 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"The Lord's Prayer Today," by Very Rev. Dr. Ignatius Smith, O.P., 64 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per 100.

"God, Man and Redemption," by Rev. Dr. Ignatius W. Cox, S.J., 64 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per 100.

"This Mysterious Human Nature," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P. 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Eternal Galilean," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 160 pages and cover. Single copy, 35c postpaid; 5 or more, 25c each. In quantities, \$16.00 per 100.

"The Queen of Seven Swords," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen (prayer-book size), 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 5c each. In quantities, \$3.00 per 100.

"The Catholic Teaching on Our Industrial System," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"The Happiness of Faith," by Rev. Daniel A. Lord, S.J., 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c. In quantities, \$3.00 per 100.

"The Salvation of Human Society," by Rev. Peter J. Bergen, C.S.P., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Catholic Education," by Rev. Dr. George Johnson, 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Church and Her Missions," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. William Quinn, 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"The Church and the Depression," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"The Fullness of Christ," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 176 pages and cover. Single copy, 45c postpaid; 5 or more, 30c each. In quantities, \$16.50 per 100.

"The Church and Modern Thought," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"Misunderstood Truths," by Most Rev. Duane G. Hunt, 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Judgment of God and The Sense of Duty," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. William J. Kerby, 16 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 5c each. In quantities, \$3.50 per 100.

"Christian Education," by Rev. Dr. James A. Reeves, 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$3.50 per 100.

"What Civilization Owes to the Church," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. William Quinn, 64 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per 100.

"If Not Christianity: What?" by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$10.00 per 100.

"The Prodigal World," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 140 pages and cover. Single copy, 35c postpaid; 5 or more, 25c each. In quantities, \$16.00 per 100.

"The Coin of Our Tribute," by Very Rev. Thomas F. Conlon, O.P., 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Pope Pius XI," by His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes. An address in honor of the 79th birthday of His Holiness, 16 pages and 4 color cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Misunderstanding the Church," by Most Rev. Duane G. Hunt, 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Poetry of Duty," by Rev. Alfred Duffy, C.P., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Characteristic Christian Ideals," by Rev. Bonaventure McIntyre, O. F.M., 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Catholic Church and Youth," by Rev. John F. O'Hara, C.S.C., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Spirit of the Missions," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. McDonnell, 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"The Life of the Soul," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$10.00 per 100.

"Our Wounded World," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 112 pages, and cover. Single copy, 25c postpaid; 5 or more, 20c each. In quantities, \$11.50 per 100.

The first six addresses in this series published separately under the title "Freedom and Democracy: a Study of Their Enemies," 56 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per 100.

"The Banquet of Triumph," by Very Rev. J. J. McLarny, O.P., 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"Society and the Social Encyclicals—America's Road Out," by Rev. R. A. McGowan, 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"Pius XI, Father and Teacher of the Nations" (On His Eightieth Birthday) by His Excellency, Most Reverend Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, 16 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 5c each. In quantities, \$3.00 per 100.

"The Eastern Catholic Church," by Rev. John Kallok, 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Joy In Religion," by Rev. John B. Delauney, C.S.C., 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The 'Lost' Radiance of the Religion of Jesus," by Rev. Thomas A. Carney, 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Some Spiritual Problems of College Students," by Rev. Dr. Maurice S. Sheehy, 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"God and Governments," by Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"Saints vs. Kings," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$10.00 per 100.

"Justice and Charity," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen.

Part I—"The Social Problem and the Church," 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$11.00 per 100.

Part II—"The Individual Problem and the Cross," 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"In Defense of Chastity," by Rev. Felix M. Kirsch, O.M.Cap., 72 pages and cover, including study aids and bibliography. Single copy 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.



"The Appeal To Reason," by Most Rev. Duane G. Hunt, D.D., LL.D., 72 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"Practical Aspects of Catholic Education," by Very Rev. Edward V. Stanford, O.S.A., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each; in quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Mission of Youth in Contemporary Society," by Rev. Dr. George Johnson, 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each; in quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Holy Eucharist," by Most Rev. Joseph F. Rummel, S.T.D., LL. D., 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"Cardinal Hayes—A Eulogy," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 16 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c, postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"The Rosary and the Rights of Man," by Very Rev. J. J. McLarny, O.P., 56 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"Human Life," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$10 per 100.

"Pius XI—A Eulogy," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 24 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per hundred.

"Freedom," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen.

Part I—"Social Freedom." 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

Part II—"Personal Freedom." 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$11.00 per 100.

"The Holy Ghost," by Very Rev. J. J. McLarny, O.P., S.T.D., 56 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more 8c each. In quantities \$5.00 per 100.

"Towards the Reconstruction of a Christian Social Order," by Rev. Dr. John P. Monaghan, Ph.D., 48 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"Marian Vignettes," by Rev. J. R. Keane, O.S.M., 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"The Peace of Christ," by Very Rev. Martin J. O'Malley, C.M. 32 pages and cover. Single copy, 10c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.00 per 100.

"God's World of Tomorrow," by Rev. John J. Russell, D.D., 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"The Catholic Tradition In Literature," by Brother Leo, F.S.C., 40 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

"What Catholics Do At Mass," by Rev. Dr. William H. Russell, 72 pages and cover, including study club questions and suggestions, and brief bibliography. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"Prophets and Kings: Great Scenes, Great Lines," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., 96 pages and cover. Single copy, 20c postpaid; 5 or more, 15c each. In quantities, \$10.00 per 100.

"Peace, the Fruit of Justice," by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 64 pages and cover. Single copy, 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$6.00 per 100.

"The Seven Last Words and The Seven Virtues" by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, 80 pages and cover. Single copies 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 10c each. In quantities, \$8.00 per 100.

"1930—Memories—1940"—The addresses delivered in the Tenth Anniversary Broadcast of the Catholic Hour on March 3, 1940, together with congratulatory messages and editorials. 80 pages and cover. Single copy, 25c postpaid; 5 or more, 20c each. In quantities, \$10.00 per hundred.

"What Kind of a World Do You Want," by Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., 40 pages and cover. Single copies 15c postpaid; 5 or more, 8c each. In quantities, \$5.50 per 100.

Complete list of 89 pamphlets to one address in U. S., \$10.25, postpaid.

Price to Canada and Foreign Countries, \$13.00.

**Address: OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, Huntington, Indiana**





