

58004  
SEVENTY-THREE

# CATHOLIC TRACTS

ON

VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

NEW YORK :  
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.,  
9 BARCLAY STREET.

—  
1882.

43

# SPECIAL NOTICE.

---

Any one, or any number, of the TRACTS in this Volume will be printed, in quantities of not less than 1,000 copies of each TRACT, at the following rates :

1,000	copies of a	4-pp.	tract,	\$3	00
1,000	"	8	"	"	6 00
1,000	"	12	"	"	9 00
1,000	"	16	"	"	12 00
1,000	"	24	"	"	18 00

The above are NET prices. The number of pages in each Tract is given in the Table of Contents.

SEVENTY-THREE

# CATHOLIC TRACTS

ON

VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

---

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR LIBRARY  
HUNTINGTON, INDIANA

NEW YORK:  
THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.,  
No. 9 BARCLAY STREET.

—  
1882.

AEA 3911

Deacidified

# CONTENTS.

---

NO. OF TRACT.	NO. OF PAGES.
1. Religious Indifferentism and its Remedy, . . . . .	8
2. The Plea of Sincerity, . . . . .	8
3. The Night before the Forlorn Hope, . . . . .	4
4. The Prisoner of Cayenne, . . . . .	12
5. What shall I Do to be Saved ? . . . . .	8
6. "The Plea of Uncertainty," . . . . .	8
7. What My Uncle said about the Pope, . . . . .	8
8. How shall we Find True Christianity ? . . . . .	8
9. On Catholic Tradition, . . . . .	4
10. What is to be Done in Such a Case ? . . . . .	4
11. The Senators of Sherburn, . . . . .	8
12. The Catholic Doctrine of the Real Presence, . . . . .	8
13. A Conversation on Union among Christians, . . . . .	8
14. The Gospel Door of Mercy, . . . . .	8
15. What shall I Do to Become a Christian ? . . . . .	8
16. The Church and Children, . . . . .	8
17. A Voice in the Night, . . . . .	8
18. The Gospel Church, . . . . .	12
19. Who is Jesus Christ ? . . . . .	12
20. The Trinity, . . . . .	12
21. Control Your Passions, . . . . .	4
22. Heroism in the Sick Room, . . . . .	4
23. Is the Sacrifice of the Mass of Human or of Divine Institution ? . . . . .	8
24. Why did God become Man ? . . . . .	8
25. The Catholic Church, . . . . .	12
26. Who Founded the Catholic Church ? . . . . .	4
27. The Exclusiveness of the Catholic Church, . . . . .	8
28. Children and Protestantism, . . . . .	4
29. How to Keep Lent, . . . . .	8
30. Is it Honest ? . . . . .	4
31. What Does the Bible Say ? . . . . .	4
32. The Roman Gathering, . . . . .	12
33. The Religion I Want, . . . . .	4
34. How to Have a Happy Christmas, . . . . .	8

## CONTENTS.

NO. OF TRACT.	NO. OF PAGES.
35. Progress and the Pope's Encyclical, . . . . .	4
36. How's That? No. I., . . . . .	4
37. How's That? No. II., . . . . .	4
38. Popery and the Apostles, . . . . .	4
39. Converted by an Infidel, . . . . .	4
40. What think ye of Mary? Whose Mother is She? . . . . .	8
41. Œcumenical Councils, . . . . .	8
42. Devotion to Mary a Duty of Justice, . . . . .	4
43. The Duty of Obeying the Pope, . . . . .	8
44. The School Question in its Relation to Catho- lics, . . . . .	4
45. The Love of Jesus Christ, . . . . .	4
46. The Pope's Temporal Power, . . . . .	4
47. A Short Reading for the Sick, . . . . .	4
48. Is it True? . . . . .	4
49. The Mission of the Press, . . . . .	4
50. How to Utilize the Press, . . . . .	4
51. Who shall have the Child? . . . . .	4
52. Be Sure you are Right—and then Go Ahead! .	4
53. Pastoral Address of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, . . . . .	24
54. Progress in Religion, . . . . .	4
55. How to Get Married, . . . . .	4
56. How to Die, . . . . .	4
57. Sally Branch, . . . . .	4
58. Something about Indulgences, . . . . .	4
59. How to Find the True Religion, . . . . .	4
60. Saint Worship—The Mediation of Saints, . . . . .	4
61. An Appeal for Christian Education, . . . . .	4
62. Saint Worship—The Invocation of the Saints, .	4
63. Practical Piety, . . . . .	4
64. The Last of the Pope, . . . . .	4
65. Baptism, . . . . .	4
66. How to Make a Good Confession, . . . . .	4
67. Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, . . . . .	4
68. No Sect in Heaven, . . . . .	4
69. The Sacrament of Confirmation, . . . . .	4
70. Devotion to the Angels, . . . . .	4
71. Too Good to be True, . . . . .	4
72. Purgatory, . . . . .	4
73. A Pastor's Plain Talk, . . . . .	4

## PREFACE.

---

IN the Spring of 1866 THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY issued its first tract. Since that time it has published seventy-three tracts on different subjects. More than four millions (4,000,000) of these short and popular papers have been sold and circulated. This is sufficient evidence of their value and popularity.

Some of the ablest writers in our country have contributed to this work. Although we have never given the names of the authors, we feel at liberty to say that eminent prelates and learned theologians—men who have a world-wide reputation—have written many of these tracts. A well-written tract often costs more labor than an essay or an article for a magazine.

Nor have these tracts been written and circulated without good effect. We know of Protestants converted and received into the church by their means. Countless prejudices against our religion have been removed, even when persons have not been led to become Catholics. Their minds have been thus prepared for accepting the truth at some future day. In addition to this, we must remember that many of the tracts are written for the instruction of Catholics. Numerous letters from those in charge of

## *Preface.*

Hospitals, Asylums, and Prisons, in various sections of our country, bear testimony to their value in this respect.

An objection is sometimes made to the word "tract." We do not altogether like the word ourselves. If any friend can suggest a better, we will cheerfully adopt it. Until then, we must continue to use it. Surely Catholics have a right to any word in the English language. Sometimes an objection is made to the tract form of publication. Those who have scruples on this score are relieved by the publication of this volume. These tracts now form a book. No one can fairly object to the matter it contains.

We trust, therefore, that they who find benefit from this little volume of tracts, will endeavor to increase its circulation. To the clergy we recommend Tract 50 as one intended to place before them a practical method of circulating Catholic literature among their people. We cannot close without expressing the strong desire to see this volume spread over the length and breadth of our land.



# RELIGIOUS INDIFFERENTISM

## AND ITS REMEDY.

---

INDIFFERENTISM in matters of religion is a prevalent and probably the most crying evil of the times. Men now-a-days either affect to believe nothing beyond certain obvious first principles which even heathens do not reject, or they believe what they please; and they even profess to defend this course as conformable to the true laws of religious liberty. They are either indifferentists or latitudinarians.

What is the origin of this singular unsettledness of religious principle; what is its remedy? We propose briefly to answer these two important questions—very important because closely connected with man's religious welfare here and with his eternal happiness hereafter. We entreat our readers' patient attention to our essay, which will not detain them long.

### I. ORIGIN OF INDIFFERENTISM.

We often hear such conversation as this :

*Catholic.*—"Why do you not diligently inquire into and promptly embrace the one only true religion of Christ?"

*Protestant.*—"Really there are so many religions in the world, even among those calling themselves Christians, all of them professed and sustained by good men, that I am greatly embarrassed to find out which is the true one, or whether any one is true to the exclusion of the others; and hence I have made up my mind that it really matters not which of them a man will embrace, or whether he will embrace any; and that, provided we be good moral men, faithfully doing our duty to our fellow-men in all the relations of

life, it really matters not what religion we profess, or whether we belong to any particular church. When we come to be judged, God will not ask us what we have believed, or to what sect we have belonged, but only whether we have been good and honest men. It is not, therefore, necessary for salvation to belong to any particular religion or church."

Herein is contained, as in a nutshell, the whole secret of modern religious latitudinarianism and indifferentism. Sectarianism is the fruitful source and parent of both. It has unsettled men's minds to such a degree that even the sincere and the honest-minded are often embarrassed to know where to find the true religion. Only think of it! Eighteen hundred years have elapsed since Christ taught this one true and holy religion, and died on the cross to seal its truths with his precious blood; and still it remains an unsettled question, and men are yet in doubt what it is and where it is to be found! He built his church upon a rock, and pledged his sacred word that the gates of hell should not prevail against it.\* He promised that he would abide with his divinely commissioned teachers "all days even to the consummation of the world;"† he commanded all mankind "to hear this church" under the awful penalty of being reckoned "with heathens and publicans"‡—still it remains uncertain where we are to find that religion and that church which he founded, and for which he died; and it therefore matters not whether we find it or not!

Surely, there must be something grievously wrong somewhere; and it is not difficult to find out where the wrong lies. Sectarianism has plainly unsettled faith; but who introduced sectarianism? Clearly not the old church of all ages and of all nations; for the old church always did condemn, and she still condemns, all sectarianism whatsoever. She still places all sects in the same category in which St. Paul placed them in his epistle to the Galatians—along with mur-

\* St. Matt. xvi. 8.

† St. Matt. xxviii. 20.

‡ St. Matt. xviii. 17

ders and drunkenness; and, with him, she still says of them all, "Of the which I foretell to you, as I have already foretold, that they who do these things shall not possess the kingdom of God."\* She still earnestly exhorts the wandering to return to the "one fold of the one shepherd;"† and to those who sow dissensions, and set up conflicting sects, she puts the significant question of St. Paul to the schismatic Corinthians: "Is Christ divided?"‡ After eighteen hundred years she continues to proclaim the great truth which St. Paul so emphatically witnessed in chains: "that there is but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism."§

Yes, as surely as there is but one God in the heavens, as surely as there is but one Christ, so surely is there but one faith taught by him and one church established by him for the salvation of mankind. Had there been many Christs, there might have been many religions; as there is but one Christ, there cannot, in the very nature of things, be but one religion and one church, founded by him to teach this one religion; unless, indeed, you are prepared to say that he contradicted himself, and was therefore neither God, nor even a wise or consistent human teacher! This no one pretending to be a Christian would assert, or even think.

For fifteen hundred years after Christ died on the cross to establish his one true and divine religion, there was but one church on the earth; or if there were occasional sects, who "separated themselves," they were generally insignificant in point of numbers, as well as short-lived in duration. The Greek schism formed the only important exception; but the Greek schismatics always believed nearly all the important doctrines and adopted all the important practices of religious worship, against which the founders of the modern sects protest. When what is called by its friends the *Reformation* began, Christendom was substantially both one in faith and in worship.

Who sowed the seeds of religious dissension? Who rent

\* Gal. v. 20, 21

† St. John x. 16.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 13.

§ Eph. iv. 6.

into fragments the hitherto seamless garment of Christ? Who divided Christ himself? Those who "separated themselves," who would not "hear the church;" who, setting up their own private opinions against the authority of the church officially proclaiming the hallowed and hitherto unquestioned faith of ages, erected altar against altar, and founded new churches in opposition to the old one established by Christ. Once they had begun their rebellion against divinely constituted authority, they knew not where to stop; divisions followed divisions; every gifted preacher claimed, and with reason, as much right to establish a new church as Luther, Calvin, and Henry VIII.; thus sects multiplied over the land; and, instead of a hitherto undivided Christendom, men saw a seething mass of conflicting and ever-changing creeds—a new Tower of Babel erected on the hitherto peaceful and smiling plains of the Christian earth! The prestige of authority and unity and antiquity was swept away wherever this revolution triumphed; and men, instead of being taught by Christ through his church, which he solemnly commanded all to hear as himself, were now left to the devices of their own hearts, and "were tossed to and fro like little children by every wind of doctrine."\*

The result was, that vast numbers of the separatists, following out to its ultimate conclusions the logic of error, went off into the ranks of disguised or open infidelity, while the rest were unsettled in their faith, and, yielding to the logical embarrassments of their position, at length settled down in latitudinarianism and indifferentism. Is there any exaggeration in this picture? Is one light of it made too strong, or one shade too deep?

The whole question resolves itself into this: Is the church of Christ human, or is it divine? And this again depends upon the answer to another, which is cognate: Is Christ a mere man, or is he God? If Christ be only man, then his church, which is "his body," of which he is "the head,"†

\* Eph. iv. 14.

† Eph. i. 23; Coloss. i. 24.

is only human, and therefore liable to all the changes of human things, and in this hypothesis sectarianism is right and the Catholic Church wrong. But if, on the other hand, Christ be God, blessed for ever, then his church, his body, is plainly divine, and therefore certainly one and unchangeable; and, in this case, the church is surely right and the sects as surely wrong. Logic, history, and revelation all combine to establish the soundness of this principle; and we are willing to rest the issue upon their united verdict. Christ and his church, the head and the body, stand or fall together; either both are divine or both are human.

“It matters not what a man believes, so he be a good man!” As if a man could be good without believing what Christ taught and doing what Christ commanded: without subscribing, heart and soul, to his solemn declaration, “He that believeth not shall be condemned!”\* As if St. Paul were deceived when he so emphatically stated that “without faith it is impossible to please God!”† As if a man can be good without complying with the first and greatest commandment: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, with thy whole soul, with all thy mind, and with all thy strength!”‡ Only think of men going to heaven who seldom, if ever, think of, much less love, God with their whole heart and soul; who think only of and love the world, and who believe that merely being honest in their dealing with their fellow-men, and being benevolent towards those in distress, will suffice for their salvation! Even the respectable heathens had, at least, as high a standard of holiness as this! If this be true, what was the use of Christ’s coming or dying at all? Socrates or Pythagoras might have done as much for mankind.

“It matters not what a man believes!” Then why did our blessed Lord do and suffer so much to teach men what they should believe in order to be saved? Why did he establish a church at all, if it was not necessary for men to enter it in order

\* St. Mark xvi. 16. † Heb. xi. 6. ‡ St. Matt. xxii. 35; St. Luke x. 27.

to be saved? Why did his apostles and ministers, in every age, endure so much privation and suffering to extend the boundaries of this church and to bring mankind into its ever-widening fold? Why did they even willingly lay down their lives, as their divine Lord and Master had done before them, to secure this object, if, after all, it was not necessary for the salvation of men that they should belong to this church? Instead of being the wise and holy men we have always taken them for, they were the veriest fools and drivellers, if this hypothesis of the indifferentists be correct.

“But we can be saved if we only believe the fundamental truths; it is surely not necessary to believe in all the minor details.” Another sad delusion, my good friends! Who authorized you to make a distinction, where Christ and his apostles plainly made none? “He that believeth not, shall be condemned,” embraces all that Christ taught and commanded his apostles; it clearly excludes all exception whatsoever, on the principle that “he that offendeth in one point [of the law] is guilty of all.”\* But where is the foundation, either in Scripture or in reason, for the distinction between essential and non-essential doctrines, now so popular among our modern enlightened latitudinarians? How dare you say that anything which God revealed is unimportant, or even non-essential? Is not his authority as great, and as much to be respected, in what we poor, puny mortals may regard as small things, as it is in those which we may choose to regard as important and fundamental? So your theory is totally fallacious; it has no solid ground whereon to stand; and you should abandon it at once.

## II. THE REMEDY.

The remedy is as simple as the disease is inveterate. It consists in a return to first principles, to the original point of divergence, thence to take a fresh start. This is precisely what the bewildered traveller does when he has gone

\* St. James xi. 10.

astray from the right road; and this is clearly what you should do, my honest friend, if you, really wish to re-enter upon the old paths hallowed by the footsteps of saints and of martyrs, by which they went so safely to heaven. Thus only can you be fully assured of being in the way of salvation. We *know* that this road leads to heaven; have you any reliable assurance that yours does? The matter is vital and all important; eternal salvation is at stake; and “WHAT DOETH IT PROFIT A MAN, IF HE GAIN THE WHOLE WORLD AND LOSE HIS OWN SOUL? OR WHAT SHALL A MAN GIVE IN EXCHANGE FOR HIS SOUL?”\* If you do not take our advice, my Christian brothers, it may be too late to retrieve the consequences of your error after you will find it out, as find it out you surely will. Better be advised in time. Time is short, eternity never ending.

“But how am I to find the truth amidst so many conflicting denominations?” Nothing is easier, my friend. You have only to obey the teaching of Christ himself: “Ask, and it shall be given to you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you. For every one that asketh, receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened.”† You have but *to ask, to seek, to knock*; to ask, in humble, fervent, and persevering prayer, for divine light and guidance; to seek after the truth with diligent and persistent industry; to knock with earnest zeal at the portals of the temple of truth—the church of God—“the pillar and the ground of the truth;”‡ and you shall most assuredly obtain what you ask for and seek after; the wide doors of the temple will fly open, and the superabounding treasures of the inner sanctuary of God shall be revealed to you in all their brightness and exhaustless riches. Do but try the experiment, and see whether your earnest efforts will not be crowned with success.

But you must ask “in faith nothing wavering;”§ you must ask with the confiding humility of a little child, mindful of

\* St. Matt. xvi. 26. † St. Matt. vii. 7, 8. ‡ 1 Tim. iii. 15. § St. James i. 6.

what our blessed Lord said: "Unless ye be converted and become like unto little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven;"\* above all, you must ask with earnest perseverance, for he only "who persevereth to the end shall be saved."†

You must seek and inquire with laborious diligence and eager earnestness, knowing and feeling in your inmost soul how all-important is the object of your search, how infinitely more important than the discovery of a treasure—whether of gold or of oil—in the bowels of the earth. You who have been taught to protest against the old church should surely, in common justice, labor to find out that against which you protest by inquiring with earnest interest into the real teachings of the old church, and into the grounds upon which rest her claims to be the one true church divinely established, which you are bound to hear under the penalty of being cast out with heathens and publicans. How can you logically protest against what you are not acquainted with, or concerning which whatever meagre knowledge you may possess is derived from the imperfect statements or malicious misrepresentations of enemies? Is it fair or just to base your opinions on such a foundation as this? Would you yourself like to be judged by such a standard?

In conclusion, we earnestly implore all sincere inquirers after the truth to follow faithfully the advice which God's plaintive prophet, Jeremiah, addressed to the Jews, who had wandered from the true path:

"Thus saith the Lord: Stand ye on the ways, and see, and ASK FOR THE OLD PATHS, which is the good way; and walk ye in it, and ye shall find refreshment to your souls."‡

You can find unity, peace, and "refreshment to your souls" nowhere else but in these OLD PATHS so long trodden and worn by the hallowed footsteps of your fathers as well as mine.

\* St. Matt. xviii. 3.

† St. Matt. xx. 13.

‡ Jer. vi. 16.



## THE PLEA OF SINCERITY.

---

“It is a matter of no importance what a man believes, if he be only sincere.”

POPULAR CREED, Art. 1.

---

NOT many years ago, I happened to be on board a steamer on one of our Southern rivers, having been ordered by my physician to spend a few months in the old town of A——. The passengers were men of all classes and of different pursuits; and every morning after breakfast a number gathered together in the cabin for conversation, when all things knowable and unknowable were discussed. One morning the following dialogue on religion took place between a professor, a lawyer, and a missionary; a lieutenant of the U. S. army, two planters, and a merchant sat by as listeners.

*Prof.*—“It is curious how widely men differ in their religious beliefs; but this is not perhaps to be regretted, for, after all, it is a matter of no importance what a man believes, if he be only sincere.”

*Lawy.*—“So says the poet, too, and I agree with him:

“For forms of faith let graceless zealots fight,  
He can't be wrong whose heart is in the right.”

*Mis.*—"Allow me to say that, while I agree with you in prizing sincerity very highly, at the same time it seems to me you put a pretty low estimate on truth."

*Prof.*—"How so? We do not undervalue the excellence of truth."

*Mis.*—"It seems to me you do; for, if it be a matter of no importance what a man believes, then, whether a man is a Pagan, Jew, Turk, or Christian, it is all the same, provided he is only sincere. On your theory all religions are equally good, for sincerity is the important thing, not truth, and therefore Christ's death, for the conversion of the Jews and the Gentiles to Christianity, was a mistake!"

*Prof.*—"Why! What would you have more than a pure and honest love of truth?"

*Mis.*—"Truth itself! Because truth is to the mind what light is to the eye. Deprive the eye of light, and soon it becomes weak, falls into decay, and is rendered useless—useless as the eyes of the fish found in the Mammoth Cave of Kentucky, where the light never penetrates. Deprive the mind of truth, and it becomes feeble, imbecile, dies, great as your sincerity may be. The mind was made for truth, and must have truth to live."

*Prof.*—"But if a man is sincere he will seek earnestly for the truth."

*Mis.*—"Grant it; so will a man who is hungry seek earnestly after food to eat. But hunger is not food, no more than sincerity is truth. To say that it is of no consequence what a man believes, if he only be sincere, is as absurd as to say it is no matter whether a man has anything to eat provided only he has got a keen appetite!"

*Plant.*—"You will, however, admit that a man may be in error and yet sincere?"

*Mis.*—"That is possible; but I do not admit that a man's being in error, though sincere, is of no consequence. For if you give to the stomach bad or poisonous food, dyspepsia will soon declare itself, and wretchedness and death

will soon overtake the man, it matters not how great his hunger. You give to the mind error and falsehood to feed on, and scepticism and doubt will soon appear, and despair or suicide will soon close up the account, it matters not how great a man's sincerity may be."

*Prof.*—"At any rate, if a man is really sincere he will find the truth; you won't deny that sincerity is the way to truth?"

*Mis.*—"Certainly not; but the way to a thing and the thing itself are not the same, or to be esteemed the same. Do not confound sincerity with truth."

*Lawy.*—"That's so. Gold is a mighty good thing to have, but a trip to California, and the digging for gold, is no joke; that I know!"

*Mis.*—"Just so. The gold we seek is truth; sincerity is not truth, but is the way to truth, and is to be esteemed only in view of truth."

*Plant.*—"I never saw things in that light before! I have heard so much said about sincerity that I have taken it for granted it is all one needs to care about."

*Mis.*—"That is the popular error. He who is content with sincerity without truth, is as foolish as one who has made the journey to California for gold" (here our missionary gave a glance at the lawyer). "comes home without any, and fancies himself satisfied!"

*Plant.*—"If sincerity is not truth, and never can stand in the place of truth, then the question what a man believes is, after all, rather a serious one, I reckon."

*Mis.*—"Of course it is; it is a question which will have rather a serious settlement one day."

*Prof.*—"Will you admit the promise, that he who hungers after righteousness shall be filled?"

*Mis.*—"Not only will I admit this promise, for it was made by Christ, but I most sincerely believe in its fulfilment. Pray tell me, Professor, what is it to hunger after truth?"

*Prof.*—"Why it means to desire it earnestly, and to seek it with all sincerity."

*Mis.*—"But a man who neglects to inform himself of the truth, or neglects, when informed, to follow his convictions, can he be said to hunger after righteousness?"

*Prof.*—"Of course not; but I believe most men seek after truth sincerely."

*Mis.*—"I share that opinion with you; however, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that there are not a few who profess to be sincere and are not."

*Prof.*—"What sort of people do you mean?"

*Mis.*—"Well, for example, there's our friend A. His neighbor, a Unitarian, makes him a visit. He rejects the divinity of Christ, and calls the religion of millions of Christians, for nineteen centuries, 'a remnant of idolatry,' and A. has not a word of contradiction to offer. On his way to his place of business he meets an old friend, a Trinitarian, and is ready to agree with him that his belief in the divinity of Christ is the corner-stone of Christianity, and it is unworthy of an honest man to call himself a Christian and deny it. Another time he gets into conversation with a Quaker friend, who tells him that religion is entirely an affair between God and the soul, Christianity is exclusively spiritual, and that a priesthood, sacraments, ceremonies, are Jewish ordinances and mummeries, and he is inclined to think that quite an enlightened view of religion. Now he meets a high-church Episcopalian, who assures him that Christianity without a church, a priesthood, sacraments, and a ceremonial, is at best only a dream, and he begins to think of taking a pew in an Episcopal church. At an evening party he finds himself in company with infidels; they declare that all religion is an invention of priestcraft to keep men in darkness and to tyrannize over them, and by his silence he seems to assent to what they say. One morning, on his way to his counting-house, his friend, a Presbyterian or Methodist, gets him by the button-hole of his coat, and drags him off to a prayer-meeting. This man, on the

theory that all religions are equally good, if one is only sincere in his belief, cares not a toss of a copper for truth.

“Here is B., who is a faithful husband, a kind father, a warm friend, and an upright man in his dealings with his fellow-men. He is a man of good intentions, generous impulses, and a worthy citizen. ‘His heart,’ as you would say, ‘is in the right place.’ He wrongs no one. I retract; he does wrong, a grievous wrong, to himself, to his own soul. For what does he know of the great truths of divine revelation, and their claims upon his intelligence for recognition and belief? What does he know of the positive duties which he owes to his Creator and God? Scarcely anything. You can hardly say that this man is insincere. So far as he goes he is sincere, but his sincerity only goes half-way; it includes only his relations with this world. Let me ask what will it profit a man if he lives ever so well in the round of duties connected with this world, if he does not open his eyes to the next? Men do not perish when they die, like the beasts of the field. I said he wronged no one but himself—this was a mistake; he wrongs his wife, his children, his friends, his neighbors, he wrongs everybody, for to be a man and to be satisfied with a vague sentiment of religion, and not to have true personal relations with God; to inherit and enjoy the benefits of Christian civilization and not share its duties and labor for its perpetuation and perfection; briefly, to be a man and not a Christian, is a wrong to one’s own soul, to all society, the race, and to God!

“There is C., who has given some serious thoughts to religion. He has some doubts concerning some of its doctrines. He promised himself on his sick bed, or at the death of a child, or a friend, or a parent, or a wife, that he would give to the subject the time and attention which its importance demands, and clear up his doubts. He has made some efforts to keep it. Books were bought, but there they lie on the table, or in his book-case, with their leaves uncut; he remains in ignorance and doubt, and probably will die so. He

persuades himself he is sincere all the time, but never puts his sincerity to any use.

“There, too, is D., who is a great reader of the Bible; he knows its contents almost all by heart, and should you doubt the sincerity of his belief it would be taken as a gross insult to his Christian character. On the one side he reads of the humanity of Christ, and he accepts it; and on the other he reads of the divinity of Christ, and this he rejects. He finds in it that there is a heaven for the just, and he rejoices; and at the same time he reads that there is a hell for the unjust, and this he explains clean away. He learns by its pages that faith is necessary to salvation, and this becomes an article of his creed; while, in the same book, he is told that good works are equally necessary, and he calls them ‘filthy rags.’ He reads that Christ pardoned sinners their sins, and feels consoled by it; and he reads also that Christ gave the power to pardon sins to his apostles, and he exclaims: ‘Oh, we do not interpret that text as you do!’ Does not all this mean that our friend D. sincerely believes what pleases him best, and not the truths God has revealed in Holy Writ?”

*Plant.*—“Now that you bring it to my mind, it seems to me I have heard a good many persons talk just as you have described.”

*Mis.*—“Of course you have. We should not be obliged to go ashore, I imagine, to find some one who would repeat just what I have said. And there is our friend E.; he stoutly maintains that the Catholic church is the old woman in scarlet, that the Pope is anti-Christ, that Catholics pay their priests for the pardon of their sins, give divine worship to the Blessed Virgin, the saints, and their relics; that an indulgence is a permission to commit sin, and the Pope has recently declared the Blessed Virgin equal to God!”

*Plant.*—“That’s true, sir, every word of it; you have photographed my neighbor Deacon E. to a T.”

*Mis.*—“And your neighbor Deacon E., will he listen to the

refutation of these calumnies? Has he ever read a Catholic book to be rightly informed? Is he willing to do so?"

*Plant.*—"Catch Deacon E. reading a Catholic book! The other day he heard that a friend of his had joined the Roman church, and he went to convince him of the errors of Popery, as he called it. I was present. He thought he would have an easy time of it; but, in the course of the discussion, he got the worst of it. But that did not hinder him from repeating afterward the same old story again."

*Mis.*—"Where, then, is there that pure love of truth in these sincere believers? Give me a man truly sincere, and you will find him not indifferent to the claims of truth, or shutting out the light of truth, or hugging error to escape the force of truth; but one open to conviction, earnest in search after truth, not content until he finds it, and when found, embracing it, cost what it may, with his whole heart. Away with that sham and cant, which under the cloak of sincerity puts truth and error on the same footing, and makes the possession of truth a matter of no consequence!"

*Prof.*—"Do I understand you, sir, to say that the Catholic church invites inquiry?"

*Mis.*—"That is precisely my meaning; and all that the Catholic church fears is ignorance and the want of fidelity to truth when once known; in a word, the lack of sincerity where she is concerned."

*Lawy.*—"Why, you would not have us all to become Catholics, would you?"

*Mis.*—"Why not? The Catholic faith is the *true* Christian faith, and sincerity ought to lead a man to the truth, as our Professor has just now observed."

*Lawy.*—"But '*all men cannot believe alike.*'"

Kind reader, that is the second article of the popular creed, that "all men cannot believe alike!" and if you will get "Tract No. 6," you will find the conversation on board the steamer continued on that point.

Before we part, sincere reader—for I trust you are such—

be on your guard lest you confound sincerity with truth, or substitute sincerity for truth; and remember that no man has the right to put in the plea of sincerity who is ignorant of the truth and neglects the means of knowing it, or who knows the truth and neglects to follow it. All such are in a bad way. Last of all, do not forget that "tract" on the second article of the popular creed: "We cannot all believe alike."





## THE NIGHT BEFORE THE FORLORN HOPE;

OR,

PRAYER A RESOURCE IN ALL DANGER.

DURING the war between the United States and Mexico, the commander of a battalion of United States troops who were fighting their way towards the capital had taken possession of a Mexican town and quartered his men there for the night. He perceived that he would be obliged to march his troops the next morning over a narrow road, leading through a morass, which was commanded by a small battery in the possession of the enemy. After reconnoitering the ground and making his dispositions for the work of the next day, he ordered a young lieutenant of his command to prepare to lead a forlorn hope detailed to carry this battery by assault at the point of the bayonet. The lieutenant occu-

pied a room in the same house where the headquarters of his commander were established, and divided from his sleeping apartment by a glass door. The colonel retired to rest as usual in the evening, but was wakeful until a late hour, and observed that there was a light burning in the apartment of his subaltern until after midnight. ¶ He was surprised at this; and, knowing the well-tryed courage of the young officer, wondered that he had not gone to sleep as usual, to refresh himself for the arduous duty of the next day. He thought to himself, can it be possible that a sentiment of fear and dread on account of the imminent danger in which his duty requires him to place himself has overcome him? Is he thinking of his wife, and, oppressed by a sad presentiment that the hour of death is at hand, employing the little time that he is sure of in writing to her his last, farewell letter? He loved the young man tenderly, for he had a warm and generous heart, and in his solicitude for him he arose quietly from his bed, and went softly to the door, to see how he was occupied, and, if need be, to speak a word of encouragement. ¶ The lieutenant was kneeling at a little table, with his prayer-book in his hand, busily engaged at his prayers with a tranquil and composed air which bespoke no emotion of cowardly distress unworthy of a soldier, but only the earnestness of a good Christian intent on preparing himself to face death with a good conscience and at peace with God. The colonel looked on for a moment, with respect and admiration, and then withdrew as quietly as he came. In a few moments the light was out, and sleep closed the eyes of the two brave soldiers. ¶ The next morning early all were astir for the march, the young man took his place at the head of the assaulting party, and they charged steadily and swiftly upon the battery, expecting every instant that it would open upon them with deadly effect. In a few moments, the silence of the artillery and the cheers of the soldiers told their comrades that they had possession of the battery without the firing of a gun; for the Mexicans had spiked their guns and retired during the night. Both these officers came safely through the dangers of the campaign. The colonel lived for some years afterward as a good and devout Catholic, and at last died the death of the just. ¶ The young lieutenant also died, and, in his last moments, met death himself with the same composure that he had shown in view of his expected approach at the time I have describ-

ed. There was no shadow of fear or sadness on his brow as he awaited his coming, but with cheerful and heroic calmness he called his wife and child, his servants and neighbors, around his bed-side, and bade them farewell without a tear or sigh of regret. In the act of pronouncing the sweet names of JESUS, MARY, and JOSEPH, he breathed his last, just as the priest of the parish was offering up the Holy Sacrifice in the neighboring church and recommending his soul to God. Perhaps he had often, as men usually do, anticipated this last struggle as the forlorn hope in the spiritual combat. But its terror and danger vanished as he approached it, and he found the guns of his adversary spiked and the adversary fled.

There is many a forlorn hope in our earthly warfare, when our narrow path through a treacherous world seems to be crossed by a barrier which can only be passed by the most resolute courage. It seems like walking up to the cannon's mouth to go forward in the path of duty. On these occasions, the proper resource of the soul is prayer. Light the lamp of faith, watch in the night, and pray; then gird yourself for the strife and go forward. You will find your enemy has spiked his guns and fled while you were preparing to meet him. There is no real danger before a soul that is in the grace of God, so long as it is firm and courageous in carrying out its good resolutions, full of confidence in God, and constant in prayer. No real disaster can befall it; and whatever seeming adversities may beset it in its earthly progress, it will walk over the course in perfect security. The only danger is in halting or falling back through cowardice, or in neglecting to have recourse to God as the only source of strength.

Is it temporal evil and suffering which you have to encounter? Poverty, sickness, hardship, family affliction, the unkindness of others? These are trials, and severe ones. It requires great patience and courage to surmount them. But they are not dangerous to the spiritual welfare of one who walks steadily up to them, and prepares himself for all that is before him by assiduous, fervent prayer to God. They are so far from hindering the soul in its progress toward the City of God, that they are the occasions of winning merit, and a title to the most brilliant rewards when the campaign of life is over. All the trials, miseries, and afflictions of life vanish like phantoms before the resolute Christian who is

duly fortified with prayer. They are like a spiked battery from which the enemy has fled in the night.

Are you beset by temptations? Christian soldier! your Captain has ordered you on a forlorn hope, because he confides in your bravery and wishes to prove it. Light your lamp, watch and pray! He does not sleep or cease to be solicitous for you. He draws near and watches you during the night, and if he sees you vigilant, calm, and resolute, a smile lights up his divine countenance. Your enemy, if he sees you determined to advance upon him, will retreat; for although he does not fear you, he fears your leader. You will find your enemy's guns spiked, and your enemy fled.

Ah! how often life seems like a forlorn hope to the weary, wayworn, timid, weak-hearted human pilgrim. How often death lowers at him darkly, closing up his path with his portentous frown as the cannon looks gloomily down the narrow pass which it defends. Prayer and confidence will prepare you to meet it. Struggle after struggle will be won; barrier after barrier will be carried; until you have surmounted the last eminence, and see the City of God in full view before you. The campaign of life over, you will go to your repose in peace, and receive the reward of the faithful and the valiant. Remember, therefore, now, while you are still engaged in the Christian warfare, that this is the time for you to watch in the night in continual prayer, your only resource in the trials and dangers which beset your way to Heaven

## “THE PLEA OF UNCERTAINTY.”

—•••—  
 “ALL men can not believe alike.”—POPULAR CREED, Art. II.  
 —•••—

IF you wish to know when and where the following conversation took place, you will get Tract No. 2, entitled “The Plea of Sincerity.” Having shown that sincerity is not truth, and it is truth that is needed and can be had, the conversation was continued as follows :

*Lawyer.*—“ You surprise me, sir, in not acknowledging the truth of the saying that ‘All men can not believe alike!’ It is so well established, that it stares every body in the face.”

*Missionary.*—“ If you think that I doubt the fact that all men do not believe alike, you are mistaken. What I doubt and dispute is the assertion that ‘All men *can* not believe alike.’ ”

*Law.*—“ Why, where were you born not to have learned what every school-boy knows, that

‘ Many men of many minds,  
 Many birds of many kinds,  
 Many fishes in the sea,  
 Many minds *can not* agree ! ’ ”

*Mis.*—“ I was born where those words were made as familiar to my ears as to yours. And it puzzles me to know how it is that you, who are so prone to doubt and dispute about every thing, should not have entertained suspicions of the error contained in those lines.”

*Professor.*—“ There is no mystery to puzzle one in that. Nine men out of ten believe the same. As for my part, I not only think that ‘all men can not believe alike,’ but hold that it is not desirable they should.”

*Law.*—“ That’s so. Variety is the spice of life. If all men believed alike, there would be no free play to thought, and all individuality would be crushed out.”

*Mis.*—“ If I understand you, you say, first, ‘All men can not believe alike,’ and second, it would be bad for them if they did believe alike. But, in my judgment,

each of these statements is a mere assertion, and I take the liberty of questioning and disputing their truth."

*Law.*—"What every body believes? that is ridiculous!"

*Mis.*—"If every body believes these assertions of yours, then there are, at least, some points on which all men can believe alike! How is it that you assert so boldly and with so much assurance, that 'men can not all believe alike'? You overshot the mark, my friend, that time! There are not a few, I assure you, who question these assertions."

*Law.*—"Who are they?"

*Mis.*—"Do you call two hundred millions nobody?"

*Law.*—"Who are these two hundred millions, pray?"

*Mis.*—"Catholics, my dear sir, who hold that all men can agree in their religious belief, and consequently ought to agree. Until you make it plain by argument and proof, I shall take the liberty of calling your statements mere assumptions."

*Prof.*—"Whatever Catholics may say, men do differ. It is in their very nature. Open your eyes, did you ever see two men alike?"

*Mis.*—"It appears to me I have. All men, in all essential respects, are alike. All men have the same nature, and the same capacities. Consider this a moment."

*Law.*—"There you are mistaken. Here is a man, gifted with eloquence, but has no talent for mathematics. Another has a good ear for music, but has no tact for business. This is every-day experience. Your argument will not stand. What you and I learned in our childhood—'Many men of many minds'—is true, sir. There is no getting around it. Men must differ. A little more experience would have taught you that. It is in their nature, as our friend, the professor, has just said."

*Mis.*—"You are too fast, my legal friend. The question in dispute is not that all men possess the same capacities in an equal degree. Nobody asserts that. The question is, whether all men do not possess the same native capacities. Do you understand the point?"

*Prof.*—"I see your point. It is well taken, and true. All men have the same native capacities, otherwise a man would not be a man. All men are integrally the same."

*Law.*—"I don't see it. Don't you, Professor, give in so soon. If you do, we shall all be upset before we know it. Be on the look out!"

*Prof.*—"What do you mean? Upset! is it that we shall see truth, and have to yield what is false? If so, the sooner the better."

*Law.*—"Yield nothing. Dispute as long as you can, that's my advice. That's practice."

*Prof.*—"That may be practice in defending a client in a court of law, but it strikes me as poor advice in seeking for truth."

*Law.*—"We agree, Professor. But this point is an important one. The whole dispute hinges on it. Be slow; it admits of argument, and there is always something gained by delay; trust a little to my practice." Turning to the missionary, he said: "Your statements are not clear, and I dispute them."

*Mis.*—"That they are not self-evident, I admit. They may be made clearer; and if you will explain wherein lies your difficulty, I shall try to make them so."

*Law.*—"All right! You see here is a man who can not see."

*Mis.*—"I am well aware of that fact. 'None so blind as those who will not see.'" (Here all joined in a hearty laugh at the lawyer's expense.)

*Law.*—"But I am serious. What I meant to say was, that some men are born blind, or deaf, or with some other defect. Now sight, hearing, etc., are integral parts of man's nature. Hence all men are not integrally the same."

*Mis.*—"These men you speak of have the same capacities to see, to hear, etc., as all other men have. But these capacities are inactive, because their physical organs are defective. All that constitutes a man is the same in all men."

*Prof.*—"That is clear enough. But what does it prove?"

*Mis.*—"It proves that if all men have like capacities, there is no reason why they should not all believe alike. The assertion that men must differ on account of their nature, therefore, falls to the ground."

*Law.*—"There goes your maimmast by the board! I knew it. You are out of court."

*Prof.*—"But suppose that all men have the same

capacities, and vary only in possessing these in a greater or lesser degree, which you admit, will not this variance make them disagree?"

*Mis.*—"No more than the additional knowledge of the stars gained by the telescope, disagrees with the knowledge gained of the stars by our naked and unaided vision. For instance, if I look out to sea and perceive three ships sailing, and you look out and discover a dozen or more, with a steamer to boot; your knowledge is more than mine, because your sight is better. It does not differ from mine, but includes it. Hence, greater gifts enable one man to see and know more than another man, but this does not imply difference or contradiction."

*Planter.*—"That is so. There is no reason, if you consider things rightly, why men should differ and contradict each other. Why is it, then, that men do differ? There must be a cause for it. There is a wrong somewhere."

*Law.*—"Did I not, Professor, tell you, that unless you were more careful we should all be caught?"

*Prof.*—"Grant that there is no reason on the part of their capacities why men should hold opposing and contradictory beliefs, the question, as our friend the planter says, still remains, 'Why do men differ?' I should like to have your opinion on this point," addressing the missionary.

*Law.*—"Stop a moment. Let me have a word. May it not be in the nature of truth? You see truth presents itself to the mind not all at once, but, by degrees, and in different aspects?"

*Mis.*—"That point is already settled, that the greater or lesser knowledge of truth does not involve disagreement or contradiction. As for one aspect of truth contradicting another, that can not be, for truth is one, and consistent always with itself."

*Law.*—"I don't know about that. You do not remember, perhaps, the story told by Carlyle and others, about the two knights. They were traveling the same road from opposite directions, and meeting at the foot of a sign, one said it was white and the other that it was red. From words they came to blows. They disagreed. You see, it is the old story again, 'Many men, many minds.'"



*Prof.*—“Excuse me, my friend, that does not prove your case. For it turned out that they were both right. After having, as the story goes, given each other mortal blows, they fell, and in their fall, they changed sides, and each saw his folly, for they discovered that the sign was white on one side and red on the other.”

*Mis.*—“And the moral of this story?”

*Prof.*—“Why, it is not, as its author and our friend here would have us think, that because these two knights were one-sided and contradicted each other, therefore all men must be and do like them. The moral of it is this—all men have the capacity to see both sides of the truth, if they would only take time to do it, and control their hasty temper. It shows also that the same thing may have different aspects, and not be contradictory.”

*Mis.*—“*And such is the nature of truth, my friends.*”

*Law.*—“There you go, Professor, I told you so!”

*Prof.*—“If there be no ground on the score of man’s capacities, or on the side of truth, why men should differ, and disagree, why is it that contradictions and sects increase as time goes on? New sects arise, daily; almost all men differ.”

*Mis.*—“Not almost all, Professor, you forget yourself. There are two hundred millions at this moment, of all races, climes, and nations, who hold in perfect accord the same great truths, which truths have been held by the great body of Christians since the dawn of Christianity. Believe me, where there is discord, there is error.”

*Law.*—“I do not concede that. God would not have all men believe alike. It is his providential plan that each sect should adapt itself to the various modifications of human nature. Each sect embodies religion in a form suited to a class; meets some want; and answers thus to some great principle of the soul. Sects constitute the strength of our Protestant religion. It is in this way free play is given to thought, and human nature is developed.”

“God gives not the realm of truth  
 Into the selfish rule of one sole race;  
 Therefore each form of worship that hath swayed  
 The life of man, and given to grasp  
 The master-key of knowledge, reverence,  
 Enfolds some germs of goodness and of right!”

*Mis.*—“God’s plan of religion, if we may venture on

an interpretation of it, will be found in harmony with man's nature and capacities. He made all men the same, and therefore all men can know and believe the same truths. To suppose that he has divided up the realms of truth into wrangling creeds, is as contrary to all honorable ideas of God, as it is to the dictates of common-sense. Human nature developed by discordant sects! You mean human nature mutilated, stunted, and marred of all noble growth."

*Law.*—"What have you to say, Professor? Why not help me out? This is all your fault. Why did you not take my advice?"

*Prof.*—"What can I say? If all men have the same capacities, and God has revealed the truth, (which no Christian man can deny,) there is then no reason that I can see, why Christian men can not believe alike, and should not believe alike."

*Law.*—"I told you so. I told you so. Every one of our assertions has gone by the board. This is what you have got by your concessions. I object, and concede nothing. There is no other way of holding one's ground."

*Prof.*—"What ground have you got to hold, my friend? You are not two moments in the same place. A religion that will not stand the scrutiny of man's intelligence, or the test of common-sense, is not worth having."

*Law.*—"I take my stand on the fact that men differ, therefore they can not believe alike. No one will dare dispute that."

*Mis.*—"Why, that's the old story over again!"

*Law.*—"Suppose it is, what does all your proofs amount to? Men *can* believe alike, not that they *do*!"

*Mis.*—"Precisely; since you admit, then, men can believe alike, it is false to say that 'men can *not* believe alike.'"

*Prof.*—"Look out, my friend! No concessions! You have forgotten yourself! Argue, deny, object, protest! That's practice."

*Law.*—"Who cares for your fine-spun theories? Practically it is true, men do differ, no one can deny that fact. What, then, does all your argumentation amount to? You have your opinions and I have mine. We

might have spared our time and breath. ‘Many men, many minds’—that’s the upshot of it all.”

*Mis.*—“The upshot of all the argumentation, as you call it, amounts to this: God has made all men alike, and, therefore, all men can believe alike. Do you see it?”

*Law.*—“See what? They don’t do it, and that’s enough. Settle that if you can.”

*Plant.*—“That is so; there must be error or wrong somewhere—perhaps both.”

*Prof.*—“That is the question,” addressing the missionary, “that I put to you when our friend interrupted you with his story about the two knights. Why is it, then, that men do differ? Give us your opinion on that point.”

*Law.*—“Yes, answer that! No dodging, but plain words.”

*Mis.*—“If all men have the capacity to know and believe the same truths, and they do not, *it is either because they neglect to apply their capacities sufficiently to find these truths, or do not apply their capacities rightly.*”

*Prof.*—“That is plain. Strange I never thought of it before! A new light breaks on my mind! Men were made to agree; and if they differ, it is not the fault of God, or of their capacities, or of truth, but their own fault. I see.”

*Plant.*—“Why, sir you have us all back again to the old question of sincerity.”\*

*Mis.*—“It is so. For the truly sincere man will leave nothing untried until he finds the truth; and when he has found it, will embrace it at all costs.”

*Prof.*—“And the truth is one; nobody can deny that. Therefore it ought to make all men of one belief.”

*Law.*—“Be on your guard! Our only safety is in denial. I protest!”

*Mis.*—“And the truth will make all men free.”

*Prof.*—“Christ says so. ‘You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free;’† these are his words.”

*Mis.*—“Christianity, therefore, was given to make all men one, and all men free. And this unity our Lord

\* See Tract No. 2. † St. John 8:32.

said should prove to the world that his religion was divine, and that he came from God to teach it. You recollect the words?"

*Prof.*—"O yes! 'And not only for them do I pray, but for those also who through their word shall believe in me. That they may *all be one*, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.' "\*"

*Plant.*—"If oneness of belief be a mark of true Christianity, what becomes of our legal friend's assertion of 'all free thought and individuality being crushed out by all men believing alike'?"

*Prof.*—"Gone, I fear, with his theory of development of human nature by onesidedness."

*Plant.*—"But is there such a Christianity as that? and how are we to find it out?"

*Law.*—"I knew there was some answer to all this. Here we are, all afloat again."

*Mis.*—"That is a serious question, 'How shall we find true Christianity?' It is a question of the highest importance."

*Law.*—"Of course it is. You should have thought of that before. For of what avail is it, if men have the capacity to know the truth, and can not find it without being mistaken?"

*Mis.*—"Surely, if God has made known to man a religion, there must be a way of finding it without any fear of mistake. There can be no doubt on that point."

Here the steamer stopped at a landing-place, and the conversation at the time was interrupted.

And if you are interested in the question, How to find true Christianity with certainty? then take my counsel, and get Tract No. 8, and read it. But before we part, earnest reader, let me beg of you never to assert that "all men can not believe alike," for it is degrading to man false to truth, and dishonorable to God.

\* St. John 17: 20, 21.

## HOW SHALL WE FIND TRUE CHRISTIANITY?

---

“The Bible, the whole Bible without note or comment, is the only true rule of faith.”—POPULAR CREED, Art. 3.

---

IN Tract No. 2 it was shown that sincerity is not truth, but leads to truth. In Tract No. 6 we learned, that as all men have the same natural capacities, all men, therefore, can believe alike; we have now to solve the question, “How shall we find true Christianity?”

---

*Prof.*—“As we all agree that the Christian religion is the way of salvation, the precise question now is: Which is the way to find true Christianity?”

*Mis.*—“The knowledge of true Christianity being granted as necessary to salvation, you will also agree that God must have pointed out the way to gain this knowledge with certainty, and made it plain to all men.”

*Lieut.*—“Most assuredly there is a way about which there can be no doubt—one which ‘wayfaring men,’ as the Bible declares, ‘though fools, shall not err therein.’”

*Plant.*—“Is that so? I for one should like to know it, for when I look around me, I find almost as many different ways as there are men.”

*Lieut.*—“That is their fault. The way to learn the truth is before every man—the Bible, the whole Bible, without note or comment.”

*Mis.*—“How can you say before every man, when half of even the civilized world do not know how to read? Then how are the children who are too young to read,

and the blind, and the people into whose tongues the Bible has not yet been translated—how are all these to save their souls?”

*Plant.*—“The Protestant rule certainly does not apply in these cases.”

*Mis.*—“These cases! Why, sir, these cases include the great bulk of mankind even in our own day, when by the press the Bible is spread so widely, and common schools have taught so many how to read. How much less this rule could apply in the ages before the invention of printing and general education, I leave you to imagine.”

*Plant.*—“Indeed, what did people do then to find out true Christianity?”

*Mis.*—“*Do?* Why, if we go back to the primitive times of Christianity, we shall learn that the Bible, collected in book form, such as we now have it, did not exist during the first four centuries.”

*Plant.*—“Do you mean to say, sir, that the primitive Christians, whom we look up to as our models, did not learn their Christianity from the Bible?”

*Mis.*—“I do, for some churches had not so much as one of the gospels, and yet their members held the true Christian faith. There were thousands of martyrs and faithful Christians who never read one word in the Holy Scriptures; yes, who died even before one word of the gospels were written.”

*Plant.*—“I never knew that before!”

*Mis.*—“It is a historical fact; and this Protestant rule of faith was only one among many other pretended discoveries made by the so-called reformers sixteen centuries after the world had been Christian! It has neither common sense nor history to support it. That the Bible is the rule of faith, is a mere assumption.”

*Lawy.*—“I beg your pardon, sir, the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures is the great principle of the Protestant movement. All Protestants agree on this point.”

*Mis.*—“Suppose they do, an assumption is no less an

assumption because of the number who make it. Not only common-sense and history are against the Protestant rule of faith, but the Holy Scripture itself is against it. You will find it nowhere on its pages."

*Lawy.*—"In that you are wrong, for Christ himself tells the Jews: 'Search ye the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me.'\* And the inspired writer commends the Jews of Berea because 'they received the word with all eagerness, daily searching the Scriptures, whether these things were so.' " †

*Mis.*—"What do these texts prove? Your assumption? By no means. 'Search the Scriptures!' What Scriptures? The New Testament? No! for it was not yet written. 'Search the Scriptures!' and what for? because 'they testify of me!' You will find in them testimony in proof of the divine mission and Messiahship of Christ. We should now say the same to those who question the divinity of Christ."

*Plant.*—"If this be all the proof Protestants have, it seems to me that it would take a quantity of notes and comments to make out of these texts that the only rule of faith is the Bible without note or comment—including the New Testament."

*Lawy.*—"We have, however, a text of the Holy Scripture that proves our rule plainly. Here it is: 'And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.' " †

*Mis.*—"Certainly every part of divine Scripture is profitable for all these ends, but this does not prove your

\* St. John 5 : 39.

† Acts 17 : 11.

† 2 Timothy 3 : 15, 16, 17.

assertion, that the Bible and the Bible alone is the rule of faith. For what Scriptures is St Paul speaking of?"

*Lawy.*—"Why, of those that Timothy had known from his infancy, I should infer."

*Mis.*—"Right! and which were these?"

*Lawy.*—"The books of the Old Testament, I suppose."

*Mis.*—"Of course they were. This being so, St. Paul referred then only to the Old Testament, as the only rule of faith, and the New Testament therefore is to be regarded as superfluous! You see what absurdities you fall into by twisting the texts of Holy Scripture from their true sense to make out your rule!"

*Lieut.*—"I won't give up the Bible. I will cling to the blessed book as long as I have a breath in my body."

*Mis.*—"No one wishes you to give up the Bible. The Bible is not in question at all. The question is, What is the rule of faith? How shall we find true Christianity?"

*Lawy.*—"You will not deny that if any one reads the Bible sincerely and honestly he will learn the true Christian faith, and that is enough."

*Mis.*—"Allow me to tell you, my legal friend, that is begging the question!"

*Lawy.*—"But do you deny it?"

*Mis.*—"Deny it? Why! if there be any evidence in logic and facts, I have shown that the Protestant rule unchristianizes the great body of Christians for sixteen centuries before this rule of theirs was known, and excludes the vast majority of mankind ever since from knowing Christianity."

*Lawy.*—"But do not the practical results of the Protestant rule of faith lead to the knowledge and belief in true Christianity, and is not that enough?"

*Mis.*—"Practical results of the Protestant rule of faith lead to true Christianity! Look at the case as it stands plainly before the eyes of the whole world. One sect of Protestants reads the Bible and believes that Christ is God and man; another reads the Bible and thinks that Christ is only a man, denying his Godhead. Here



is one denomination that tells us that it is plain from Scripture that all men are born wholly depraved ; and from the same source it is affirmed, by a large and intelligent class, that men are born altogether good. The Calvinist tells you, only the few, the elect, will be saved ; and the Universalist answers by saying no one will be damned. One Protestant proclaims if a man only believes aright he will be saved, it matters not what he does ; and another maintains that it is no matter what a man believes, if he only acts rightly. One sect asserts that the only way to be baptized is by immersion in water ; and another says it is enough to be sprinkled with water ; while a third declares that no water at all is necessary, baptism being altogether spiritual. The Shaker says no one ought to marry ; the common Protestant says that a single life is unnatural, and a man ought to marry, but only one woman at a time, and marry another only in the case of a divorce from the first ; and the Mormon assumes, on the authority of the Scriptures, that a man may marry as many women as he likes, all at the same time, provided only he takes care of them all. In truth, it would take a volume to enumerate the endless contradictions and confusion among those who all profess to take the Bible as the only rule of faith."

*Lawy.*—"Do you pretend to say that *honest men read the Bible and come to contradictory conclusions concerning what it teaches?*"

*Mis.*—"I do, and the facts I have stated confirm it, and therefore *the Bible was never given by God to honest men as the way to find out true Christianity.* One of two things—either God has given a rule of faith that does not tell the same truths to all sincere men, or the followers of this rule do not read the Bible with sincerity. Take either horn of the dilemma you please."

*Lawy.*—"God can not be the author of confusion. These differences come, I suppose, from want of sincerity."

*Mis.*—"That is, my doxy is orthodoxy, your doxy is

heterodoxy; or in other words, if the testimony of one sect can be taken against another, there is no sincerity among them all."

*Plant.*—"Well, sir, if one is not to learn Christianity by reading the Bible, in what way is it to be learned?"

*Mis.*—"By the rule which the Bible points out. For though the Bible is not that rule, it however points out what that rule is."

*Plant.*—"Where, sir? show me it, and I for one shall not fail to follow it."

*Mis.*—"This is not difficult to show; for when Christ was upon earth he made to his Apostle Peter the following promises: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'\* And it is this Church he commands us to hear when he says, in the same gospel: 'He that heareth not the Church, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican.'"<sup>†</sup>

*Plant.*—"But what follows from these texts of the Holy Scripture?"

*Mis.*—"It follows, first, that Christ kept his promise, and built his Church upon St. Peter; and, secondly, that we are to hear this Church or to be regarded as heathens and publicans."

*Plant.*—"This does not solve the difficulty. For which, of all the countless churches that claim to be Christ's Church, is the one he promised to build and we are bound to hear? Tell me that!"

*Mis.*—"Why, the one which has at her head the true successor of St. Peter. Now it so happens that there is only one Church which claims to have at her head the successor of St. Peter, and that Church is the Catholic Church, therefore the Catholic Church is the Church of Christ."

*Plant.*—"Well, that argument is plain enough, to be sure; and it seems to me to be sound too."

\* St. Matthew 16: 18.

† Ibid. 18: 17.

*Mis.*—"It is both plain and sound, and there is no escape from it."

*Lucy.*—"Not so fast, if you please. No one acquainted with history will refuse to admit that the Catholic Church was the first Church. You forget, however, that she fell away into error, superstition, and idolatry!"

*Mis.*—"Did she, indeed! Do tell where, and in what, and when that happened."

*Lucy.*—"Well, it is not quite settled, but some say that it happened in the days of the Apostles; others say in the second or third century; others, again, place this apostasy in the fourth or fifth century; but the great bulk of us Protestants believe that the Catholic Church became utterly corrupt about the sixteenth century, and then broke forth the glorious light of the Reformation, which gave to the world a purified gospel."

*Mis.*—"The first mark of error is that the witnesses do not agree in their testimony. You do not agree as regards the time *when* the Church fell away; and if I should ask in *what* she fell, you would again all differ—one would say in this and the other in that. You differ, therefore you are wrong. Again, you err, because you forget what the promise of Christ was to his Church. It was that 'the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.' Now, that error, superstition, and idolatry are gates to hell no one will dispute. *How can you, who profess to believe in Christ, assert what is contrary to his divine promise?*"

*Plant.*—"I suppose it is in view of this promise of Christ that St. Paul declares the Church to be the 'pillar and ground of the truth'?"

*Mis.*—"It is so, and to say she has erred, is to give up the Bible and contradict Christ."

*Lucy.*—"I don't know about that. Christ did not build his Church upon Peter, but upon the faith that Peter confessed in his divinity."

*Mis.*—"Suppose we let Peter stand aside for the mo-

ment. The Church that Christ built you will admit was never to fail ?”

*Lawy.*—“Yes, that was the purport of his promise.”

*Mis.*—“This then is certain, once the Church of Christ, always the Church of Christ; and as the Catholic Church was the only Church of Christ in the beginning, it follows that she must remain the Church of Christ now and forever.”

*Prof.*—“My legal friend, you do not seem to have the gift of mending matters by your captious objections.”

*Lawy.*—“It is not for you, Professor, to abandon the grounds of our common Protestantism.”

*Prof.*—“Why, sir, would you have me to defend a system of Christianity that can stand the test neither of common sense, history, nor Holy Scripture ?”

*Plant.*—“Well, sir, from what I have heard, I should judge that the things said against the Catholic Church by her enemies must be misrepresentations, and on my return home to C., I shall make it my duty to procure the necessary books, and study her history and doctrines.”

*Mis.*—“This is the proper course; but let me give you a word of warning: be sure that you get and read her own authentic books, which contain her *true* history and doctrines.”

Sincere reader, I would advise you to go and do likewise; and you will find what thousands of others have found, that the history of God’s Holy Church has been grossly misrepresented, and her divine doctrines distorted and falsified. And were you once to know her as she is, you would join with St. Augustine in exclaiming: “I give thee thanks, O God, my enlightener and deliverer, for that thou hast opened the eyes of my soul to know the truth. Alas! too late have I known thee, O ancient and eternal truth, too late have I loved thee!”

## ON CATHOLIC TRADITION.

---

I REMEMBER well the days when travelers, going north from Troy, were glad to take passage for Whitehall by way of the canal. The packet-boats were generally well crowded; and such was the case one day in the autumn of 1844, when I myself was *en route* for Lake Champlain. I had for traveling companion a young lawyer, an intimate and dear friend. Two Millerite preachers were also on board. They asked permission to preach, and no objection being made, one of them arose and entertained the passengers in the cabin for about the space of a half hour. Beside the ordinary views of his sect in regard to the second Advent of our Lord, he broached several other strange and peculiar notions, and which, if recognized as true, would put an entirely new face upon the Christian religion.

When he resumed his seat, my friend, who sat opposite, rose to reply.

“My principal objection,” said he, “to the religious views advanced by my excellent friend opposite is, that they are too new. They are perfectly new to me, and are new, I venture to say, to almost all of us on board this boat. What is a still more serious and fatal objection to them, they were altogether unknown to our Christian fathers before us. Although my reverend friend professes to find support for them in texts of Scripture drawn from the New Testament, these texts have never been so understood by the followers of Christ in any other age. Now I consider this as perfectly fatal to his doctrine. The world did not begin with us, nor did Christianity begin with us. The Christ-

ian religion has been in existence these eighteen hundred years. Christian doctrine has been widely preached and taught during all these centuries; Christian students have spent their lives in studying it; saints have practised it, and martyrs innumerable have died for it. And yet they knew nothing of the strange doctrines which we have listened to this morning."

"Pardon me, my dear sir," continued the young lawyer, "if I venture to think that this great multitude of Christians have not been deceived; that they have understood the real features of the Christian religion better than yourself. It seems to me that, in endeavoring to understand the Scriptures rightly, we can not do better than follow the interpretations of our Christian forefathers, through whom all we have of Christianity has come down to us. I respect your zeal, sir, and your apparent sincerity, but can not think that the Lord has spoken to us this morning by your mouth."

"Sir," replied the preacher, "do you mean to tell me that I need any thing more than this blessed Bible, which I hold in my hands, to understand the Christian religion aright?"

"Why, yes, sir; permit me to say, without offence, that after your interpretations of this morning — which, I doubt not, are your honest convictions — it is evident to my mind that you do need something more. If, before commencing to preach, you had studied more carefully the interpretations of Christians who lived nearer to the days of Christ, you would understand the Bible better, and be more able to expound it safely."

"You oppose my doctrine, then, if I understand you, because it is new?"

"Yes, sir."

"But, upon such a principle, there could be no progress in Christian knowledge."

"Progress in Christian knowledge, my dear friend, consists in *developing* the *old faith*, not in changing it.

I do not find fault with your preaching merely because it presents new views of old doctrine, but because it is in opposition to the old faith. It is not only new, but *radically* new. Christianity did not commence like human sciences, in darkness, but in light. It did not grow from a seed but was planted a perfect tree. It can grow only as the tree grows, by the putting forth of new leaves upon the old branches, and the extension of its branches upon the old trunk which God first gave it."

The passengers, who had listened eagerly all this while, applauded these sentiments heartily. I could not perceive that our Millerite preacher had the sympathy of any one in the cabin, his Millerite companion excepted.

During the progress of the debate, I noticed one person in particular, who seemed well pleased while my friend spoke, and often nodded his head in approbation. His dress and general appearance had something unusual about it, I could not say what. Some time afterward, as we sat conversing together, he approached us and joined in the conversation.

"Are you aware," said he to my companion, "that what you have said this morning to our Millerite friend is nothing more nor less than the Catholic doctrine of *Tradition*?"

"I presume it is."

"And yet, all these passengers who applauded it are Protestants. Is not that strange?"

"It is somewhat strange."

"It proves clearly enough, however, that all sensible men must acknowledge the authority of Tradition when once they understand what Tradition means."

"I think so myself."

"And yet you are a Protestant?"

My friend was silent for a moment; at length he said to the other :

“And you—you are a Catholic, of course?”

“I am.”

“And a priest?”

“Yes, a priest. And I shall pray God most fervently to increase the light which He has already given you — that you also may soon be an acknowledged Catholic and (if it may be) a priest, for you have shown yourself already this morning a ready preacher of Catholic truth.”

Not a great while after, my friend and I were both united to the Catholic Church, and at the present time we are Catholic priests, holding and preaching in our native land the ancient doctrines which tradition has brought down to us from Christ and the Apostles. In our ears, as in those of every true Catholic, are ever ringing the clarion tones of St. Paul: “Therefore, brethren, stand firm! And hold fast the traditions which you have learned, whether *by word* or *by our epistle.*” 2 Thess. i. 14.



## WHAT IS TO BE DONE IN SUCH A CASE?

## PART FIRST.

JOHN EGAN'S PICTURE, BY HIMSELF.

You don't understand how I can behave so! I suppose you don't. I don't understand it myself. Look here, my friends, it is all very well to cry "Shame!" and turn up your noses; but here is the question, "*What is to be done in such a case?*" Tell me that.

That's my house, sir. One story and two rooms. A front door that shuts with a latch, and a back door on one hinge, that stays where it's put, without a latch. That's my wife, sir. A good-looking woman, sir, and a handy one to work when she's well. You don't like that black ring about her eye! It was a present from her husband, sir, last Saturday night. She sold her wedding-ring long ago, to buy bread. She gets this kind of jappanned jewelry from me, now and then, to remind her that she is my wife.

There are my children, sir. What do you think of them? Dirty! Of course they are. Why shouldn't they be? It's their native land, sir, and they don't like to part with it. I see you don't like the pattern of their clothes. What would you have? The biggest boy has no pantaloons to be sure; but he has a coat on big enough for three. His brother, Tim there, took the pantaloons. What's Tim crying for? It's a way he has. He's crying for something to eat, I suppose. I should cry for the same reason, except that I'm put to it worse for the want of something to drink.

You don't like to hear me laugh, eh? You think I talk too lightly, do you, considering the ruin that lies around me? Well, perhaps I do. But, my God, sir, what would you have? If I were to follow my feelings, sir, I shouldn't trouble any one with my laughing. If I were to listen to the devil that whispers so often in my ear, I should soon be lying cold and quiet

at the bottom of the river. Why, man alive! you don't know how often I've stood looking from the dock by the river-side upon the quiet water that seemed to call me to come and lie down in its bosom, and be at rest. If it weren't for the little I remember of my catechism, and the fear of hell that still clings to me, I shouldn't be sitting here a terror to myself, and a show to my neighbors, and a shame to my family. God help them! And God help me!

I don't need preaching, sir. Nobody need tell me how bad I am. I know it all better than any one can tell me. I ought to be ashamed of myself! Of course I ought. And do you think I am not? My friend, let me whisper it in your ear, *that's what is killing me!* I am so low down in my own estimation, that I am ready to die with the disgrace. It's only when I have a little whisky in me that I feel like a man again.

Now, my highly moral and religious friend, you have a picture of me drawn by myself. If you can make a better, do it. If not, don't stand there, pouring misery into a bucket that's already full, but tell me something I don't know already. Tell me what is to be done in such a case?

---

## PART SECOND.

### JOHN EGAN'S REMEDY, BY A FRIEND.

I think I understand your case, John. And I think I know what ought to be done.

I. In the first place, don't be discouraged. The devil will whisper a great many foolish lies in your ear. He will tell you that there is no hope for you; that it is useless to try to help yourself; that your character is all gone, and nobody will ever respect you or trust you again. These are all lies. Many a man before you that has been as far gone in intemperance as yourself has broken loose from his bad habits, and taken his rightful place in society again; perhaps got to the top of the heap. You can do the same thing. Bright days are before you, if you will only make the right effort.

II. In the second place, *begin with a strong resolution, and make it before God.* Don't take any oaths,

or make any vows. Oaths and vows are very extraordinary things, and ought not to be made lightly, or without great caution. But do this. Go into some room alone by yourself, or into the church, and there upon your knees promise God to set about reforming yourself with all your power, and ask his grace to guide and help you. There also, on your knees, make a firm promise not to touch or taste the least drop of intoxicating drink, of any kind, until you have spoken to the priest, and arranged matters with him. Don't go to the priest while there is the least sign of liquor upon you. Wait until your head is as clear and cool as a glass of fresh spring water. And in the meanwhile wash your face, comb your hair, clean your shoes, and make yourself look and feel as much as possible like a respectable man. There is a great deal in brushing up the outside, although of course that's not the principal thing.

III. Then go to the priest's house, ring the bell and ask for him. Don't make any long speeches, but tell him the state of the case at once. Let him know that, if he approves of it, you are ready to take the total abstinence pledge for one year, five years, ten years, or for so long a period as he may advise, and that once taken, nothing on earth shall ever make you break it. This done, ask when it will be convenient for him to hear your confession, and prepare you for Holy Communion.

IV. It is important now to get your soul into a state of grace. Begin at once to prepare for a good confession. This means, of course, not only to tell the sins you have committed, but to come before God and His priest with a true hearty sorrow for your sins, and a firm determination to avoid all kinds of sin, and to commence at once a holy life. Coming in this way, the priest's absolution pronounced over your head will be a real pardon from God. After this you need not be afraid to receive the Holy Communion. This holy food will give you strength from heaven to resist temptation, and keep your soul in grace. I would advise you to come once every month to confession and communion, until you become thoroughly confirmed in your new life and good habits.

V. In order now to insure your perseverance, you need above all these three things—prayer, industry,

and great watchfulness against temptation and the occasions of sin.

*Pray.* Pray at least every morning and evening. I do not say, make long prayers, but pray! And after saying your usual prayers, add this: "My God! I offer my pledge to Thee! I firmly resolve once more to keep it to the end. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

*Be industrious.* Idleness is the parent of many vices, and especially it is the father of drunkenness. Besides, remember that you owe it to your family and your friends to make up for the lost time.

*Avoid the grog-shop and other occasions of sin.* Be careful of your companions. If your company won't suit them unless you drink with them—why then, the sooner you separate the better. Don't make any false excuses for not drinking. Tell them plainly and openly that you have taken the pledge, and would rather die than break it.

Keep away from the places where liquor is sold. There's danger there. People get together in these places to chat and talk, and that makes attraction for a man in the evening when his work is over. I know it does, but that is an attraction which you must resist. How much better to spend your evenings at home! How happy you would make your wife by doing this, and what a benefit it would be to your children! Ah! there is no place like home for true happiness, when love lights the fire and spreads the board. The first society that God made was the Family, and He gave it His blessing.

There, John, I have answered your question. I have given you my very best advice. What will you do with it?

## THE SENATORS OF SHERBURN ;

OR,

## A LAWYER'S RULE OF FAITH.

---

IN the northern part of the State of New-York, and on the borders of that central tract of high hills and crystal lakes, from whose copious watersheds originates the Saranac River, and the Racket, and the Black, and the glorious Hudson, and a host of other streams running to every point of the compass, is situated a little village, which for present purposes we shall call Sherburn. It had no court-house, no academy, nor even a hotel of any repute. But what of that? It possessed Russel's store, and that was enough. Here the farmers and the farmers' wives all traded; here stopped every team that was driven over the road; here all the beauty of Sherburn came to select its appropriate ornaments; here, too, was gathered, almost every evening, the intellect of Sherburn. Beside Abram Russel, himself an oracle of wisdom, here came Seth Adams the miller, Dall Whipple the Deacon, Dan Sloane the smith, with many others; and, towering above them all because of his college education, and of two years spent in the Legislature, here presided, at many a deep discussion, the Hon. Ira Bloss, commonly known as Squire Bloss.

These gentlemen constituted the Sherburn Senate, so named by the younger wits of the neighborhood.

One evening in December, 1859, the circle in this store was enlarged by the presence of a stranger that nobody knew. A few friendly inquiries of a general character, intended to elicit some indirect intelligence of the stranger's quality and pursuits having proved unsuccessful, the Senate finally fell back upon its usual routine of business. Squire Bloss was in the religious mood that night, and so was Deacon Whipple, but they did not precisely agree. Both were regular members of the same church; but the Deacon was a stickler for

church discipline, while the Squire was what is commonly termed a man of enlarged and liberal views. One could have seen that in his very attitude. He sat with his back to the counter, his chair resting on two legs, his left foot upon the round in front, and his right crossed upon the left knee, while his two hands hung suspended by the thumbs from the armholes of his vest. His upper lip was overlapped and held in subjection by the under. One eye was closed, and the other fixed upon a bend overhead in the stove-pipe.

"It's all very well for you, Deacon," said he, "to stand up for church regulations and church formularies. Perhaps I would, myself, in your place. But, after all, I ask, What is the rule, Deacon Whipple? We are bound to square our faith and practice by something, of course. But what is the rule, Deacon Whipple?"

"Why, Squire," the Deacon replied, "the great rule undoubtedly is the Bible."

"The *great* rule, Deacon Whipple? Why the *great* rule? Is there any other rule, Deacon Whipple? Tell me that, Deacon Whipple; tell me that."

"Why, yes. Wall, no, not exactly another rule, as you might say. But we have our Catechisms, long and short, and our Confession of Faith, and our Directory, and other church rules, Squire Bloss; and as a good church-member, Squire, you ought to be the last to break 'em, or say any thing agin 'em."

"All very well, Deacon Whipple, all very well. Order is a good thing, and therefore discipline is a good thing. But we were talking about rules to regulate our *belief*. Now, I hold that the Bible is the *only* rule of Protestants. Do you dispute that?"

"Wall, no. Every body knows that, I 'spose."

"Is there any other authority to regulate our faith, Deacon Whipple?"

"No, not 'xactly another authority, as you might say."

"Then, sir," retorted the other triumphantly, "don't fling catechisms and confessions of faith in my face when we are talking about religious doctrine. I follow the Bible alone, Deacon Whipple; and you might as well put thumb-screws on at once, as to fasten me up to any rule but the Bible. No, gentlemen of the jury—I

mean, Deacon Whipple—the Bible, and nothing but the Bible for me.”

The rest of the company looked at the Deacon as if they thought he was in a very tight place. The Deacon looked as if he thought so himself. To the surprise of all, the stranger came in to the rescue.

“Are you a lawyer, Squire Bloss?”

There was a quiet confidence in the stranger’s tone that startled the village oracle. It brought the two thumbs out at once from the armholes of his waistcoat.

“I have a license to that effect, sir,” he replied.

“Of course, then, you know what makes law.”

“Law, sir! Why, yes, sir. Let us understand each other, if you please. Law is a very general term, sir. Of what law do you speak? There is statute law, and there is common law; there is marine, martial, and commercial law; there is also what we call practice. In fine, what is the precise drift of your inquiry, my friend?” Squire Bloss was afraid of the stranger, and anxious to take his measure before closing in.

“I mean law in general, sir; that science in which gentlemen of your profession are supposed to be educated.”

“Ay, ay, sir; very good, very good; well, what then, sir?”

“Questions of law must, of course, be decided by some authority. What authority do you recognize?”

“Authority, sir! Why, we have various authorities,” replied the lawyer. “We have, in the first place, our *Jus Scriptum*, or written law—”

“Precisely,” interrupted the stranger. “And pray, what do you mean by that?”

“By the *Jus Scriptum*, or written law, we mean the whole body of statutes or enactments made by the legislative power at any time, and still remaining in force. We call it *written* law, sir, not because it is the only law that we have in writing, but because it was properly put on record at the very time of making, and has come down to us in that form from the beginning. Then we have our ‘Common Law,’ sir, a body of ancient customs and recognized principles of justice, which we also call *Jus non Scriptum*, unwritten law, because it is older than any record we have of it. In other words, it was practiced first, and got upon record afterward.”

"It appears to me, Squire Bloss, that this *Jus Scriptum* corresponds very nearly with what is called in Christian science the Holy Scriptures; and the *Jus non Scriptum* is very like oral, or unwritten tradition."

"It may be, sir."

"And this *Jus non Scriptum*—this traditionary law—is it not of equal authority with the other?"

"It is, sir."

"But how can you admit it as authority, when you have no record of its enactment?"

"Because our forefathers did. It is to be supposed that they knew what law they lived under. If, at any time, attempts had been made to foist upon them false rules or practices, under the name of law, they would have expostulated, or even rebelled, as did the English barons against King John. In such case history would have brought down the news of it to us. On the contrary, in the absence of all such protest, and when our fathers in every generation always hold up a prevailing custom or principle, as a legacy from their fathers, it must be held for well founded and authentic law."

"Of equal authority with the *Jus Scriptum*, sir?"

"Yes, sir, of equal authority with the *Jus Scriptum*; and for the plain reason that it emanates from the same source."

"You speak like a true lawyer, Squire. And now I ask you: Does not the same principle hold good in religion? Ought not the same authority to attach to immemorial doctrines and observances in the Christian Church?"

The lawyer was silent.

"When our Christian fathers from time immemorial held to certain observances and doctrines as derived from our Lord and the Apostles, ought we not for the same reason to accept their testimony as sufficient authority, even although the Bible, our *Jus Scriptum*, may be doubtful or even silent in the matter?"

"What you say, sir, would be very reasonable," replied the lawyer, "in questions of mere human law. But our Lord Jesus Christ was a divine legislator, and therefore an all-wise one. It is not to be supposed that he would have left any thing important unwritten, and exposed to the chances of tradition."

"But, my friend, our Lord never drew up a *code* of



laws, or doctrines, nor was any such code made in his lifetime, nor did he leave directions to have any such code made, nor is the New Testament a code in any proper sense of the word. But even supposing it to be so, and written by our Lord himself, is it possible to provide for all contingencies in any code?"

The lawyer was silent.

"As a matter of fact, does the Bible obviate this difficulty? Are you and your neighbors agreed upon the true meaning of it? Do you find all questions settled by it?"

"Well, yes, sir—all questions of vital importance."

"All questions which involve the necessary means of salvation are of vital importance, are they not?"

"Why, yes, of course," said the lawyer.

"On the question, then, whether we are saved by faith alone, or by faith and good works united; whether baptism is a means of regeneration; whether Jesus Christ is God, or only man—are you and your neighbors all agreed here?"

"No, no," said Seth Adams, the miller, "not by a long shot. Neighbor Russel here, who is a Methodist, has had many a tussle with the Squire on that first question. I myself was raised an Episcopalian, and I hold with our prayer-book, that every baptized child is 'regenerate.' We have Unitarians around here too, for the matter of that."

"It seems to me," said the stranger, "that the Bible, although a most excellent authority in all religious questions, ought not to be considered as the only one. The *Jus non scriptum*, the early traditions of Christianity, ought also to carry some authority—at least to the mind of a lawyer."

"All very well, my friend," replied Squire Bloss, "all very well, my friend. But I hear a great deal of controversy about these traditions too. The authority of the fathers is dragged in on both sides of many a question. With the Bible and tradition both together you are not out of difficulty yet."

"What do you lawyers do, sir, in such a case? When, with all your statute-books and rules of common law, you can not agree upon the merits of a cause, what then, Squire Bloss?"

"We try it before a judge, sir."

“ Ah ! yes ; and the final judgment of the court is the final settlement of the question, is it not ? ”

“ It is, sir.”

“ So, then, we are approaching now to the true philosophy of the whole thing. It seems that there are in law two kinds of authority—a passive, *monumental* authority, which is to be examined, and an active, *living* authority, which examines and decides. These other rules, of which we have been speaking, are simply monuments of the law. The decision of all questions is left finally to a living judge. Am I right, Squire ? ”

“ You are right, sir, undoubtedly.”

“ Is this an arbitrary arrangement of the lawyers, or is it necessary in the very nature of things ? ”

“ It is necessary, sir. If every one were his own judge of the law, law would soon become another name for confusion.”

“ And if every one is his own judge in religion, will not religion become another name for confusion ? ”

“ It is that already,” said Dan Sloane, “ at least in this part of the world. Why, bless your eyes, sir, there isn’t a text in Scripture but has been hammered out, over this very old stove, into as many shapes as any bit of iron on my anvil.”

“ We need some living rule, I think,” said the stranger, “ in religion as well as in law ; and even more so, if religion is more important than the civil law.”

“ We do,” said Dan, “ by George ; and if any such thing can be got up, it shall have my vote.”

“ It was got up long ago, my friend,” replied the stranger, “ and by orders that no good Christian ought to dispute. You will find an account of it in the Bible, which I hold to be an excellent rule of faith, although not, as this gentleman has insisted, the *only* rule. The Church, the ever-living Church of Christ, instituted and organized and officered by Christ himself, she is the tribunal established by him to settle all differences in religion. She is the BOND of peace, so named by the Apostle Paul, because it is her office to bind all Christians together in one harmony of faith and love. ‘ *Be careful,*’ he says, ‘ *to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace ; one body and one spirit, as you are called in one hope of your vocation ; one Lord, one faith, one*

*baptism.*\* In order to guard against all confusion of doctrine, he has left us in this his Church a perpetual succession of orthodox pastors, by following whose teaching we may all believe alike and believe right. The Church, speaking through this body of legitimate pastors, is the living rule or authority in all questions, and our Lord has made it obligatory upon us to obey her authority and believe her doctrine. For he it is who said to the first ministers and missionaries of that Church, '*He that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me.*'† And also, '*If any man will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican.*'‡ And again, after giving his commandment to go and preach the Gospel to the whole world, he adds: '*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.*'§ If this does not mean that the voice of the true Church of Christ, speaking through her legitimate clergy, is a *rule of faith* prescribed to us by Christ himself, why then I do not understand the force of language."

"It is a hard rule then," said Squire Bloss, "to oblige us, under such heavy penalties, to believe what after all might not be true."

"So it would be a hard rule," replied the stranger, "if there was any danger that the true Church of Christ could become the teacher of false doctrine."

"Well, is there no such danger?"

"No, sir."

"This Church, then, must be infallible, and that is more than we ever claimed for our judges, necessary as they are."

"She is infallible, and therefore her authority is infinitely superior to that of your courts of law. She is infallible, for the plain reason that the infallible spirit of God dwells in her and guides her. '*I will ask the Father,*' said Jesus, '*and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever; the spirit of truth.*'|| Infallibility is a gift expressly promised to her by her Master and founder: '*I say to thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*'¶ I can not conceive what greater victory the gates

\* Ephes. 4 : 3.  
§ Mark 16 : 16.

† Luke 10 : 16.  
‡ John 14 : 16.

‡ Matt. 18 : 17.  
¶ Matt. 16 : 18.

of hell could gain over the Church than to bring her into false doctrine. Moreover, the Son of God has promised to be always present with his Church; but in what sense can he be said to be present with a false, heretical, and misguiding Church? Yet such would be the character of a Church that could lead us wrong in any essential matter. It seems to me that, thoughtfully considered, there is a world of meaning in the great commission given by our Lord to his Apostles: *‘Go, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.’*”

“All nations!—all things!—all days!” repeated Dan Sloane, very slowly. “I’ll be hanged if there isn’t more in them words than I ever thought of before. They seem to spread over pretty much every thing, and yet somehow they seem to hold every thing pretty cluss together too.”

“You are right, Mr. Sloane,” said the stranger; “you will find in those words both the catholicity and the unity of the Church. And, if you examine them closely, you will find there also a living authority to decide all questions of faith.”

“The Bible,” he continued, after a pause, and turning to the lawyer, “the Bible is undoubtedly a rule of faith furnished us by the kind providence of God, but not the entire rule. The Bible, illuminated by the sacred traditions of Christianity, and interpreted by the Church of God — that is the true Rule of Faith, Squire Bloss; that is the true Rule of Faith.”

THE  
CATHOLIC DOCTRINE  
OF THE  
REAL PRESENCE  
SHOWN FROM HOLY SCRIPTURES.

---

“I will not now call you servants, . . . but friends: because all things whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known to you.”—JOHN 15 : 15.

WHAT does our Lord and Saviour mean by these remarkable words, “I will not now call you servants, . . . but friends: because all things whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known to you”? Now it is certain that he neither *did* nor *could* manifest to them all that he heard from the Father. Human language could not express *all* that he had heard from his Father. He, as God, was the eternal word, in whom the Father, in begetting him, infused his immense wisdom. And, as Paul says, in the man-God, Christ Jesus, “dwelt all the fullness of the God-head corporally.” Even if he would extend the power of human language so that it might express, if possible, all that he heard from his Father, human intellect could not comprehend it. You, beloved brethren, you will understand this impossibility.

Further, in the next chapter, the 16th of Saint John, Christ says: “I have yet many things to say to you: but you can not bear them now.” And several other times, before and after his sacred death, our Lord declares, or insinuates, that he has yet much to tell them.

A mystery is hidden under the sacred words of my text. A passage from the twenty-first Psalm will aid us to understand and develop this sacred mystery. The passage I will cite is the more wonderful because it is in the twenty-first Psalm, the first verse of which our adorable Saviour intoned on the cross, as priest and victim, when his agony began. His priests now, as human shadows of the eternal priest, who has an everlasting priesthood, intone the first verse of a prayer or Psalm, and often continue and finish the prayer in silence. Learned and holy men assert that Jesus began aloud the Psalm, “O God my God, look upon me: why hast thou forsaken me?” and continued the holy sacrificial Psalm in awful silence as the darkness of night grew over midday.

This prophetic Psalm, written about one thousand years be-

fore the coming of Christ, pictures the Saviour-God in all the terrors of his martyrdom of love, in all the agonizing circumstances of his passion. The royal prophet sees the true Lamb of God, surrounded by a furious, insulting mob, like wild beasts, raging against him, uttering the very words that were really uttered under the Cross, when they mocked the victim, and shouted this *Vah* of derision, as they marked how he, through wounds and bruises, had become "like a worm and no man; the reproach of men and the outcast of the people." The prophet tells us of his limbs most violently stretched out; of his hands and feet that were *dug* with the nails; of his garments, for which they cast lots, and other awful events of his sacred passion. A little more than half of this long Psalm is devoted to the humiliations, internal woe, and dreadful torments of Jesus. But after the middle, the Psalm changes its tone: it becomes a song of triumph, of joyous, rapturous, grateful praise to the eternal Father. Christ sees the mighty fruit of his deadly battle with hell, he sees the fruit of his sacred death: "A great Church, which shall be his praise. All the ends of the earth shall remember, and shall be converted to the Lord: and all the kindreds of the Gentiles shall adore in his sight. The poor shall eat, and shall be filled; the rich, too, shall eat, and adore" what they have eaten; all that go down to the earth shall fall before him; it is no longer *me*, or *I*, as in the prior verses, but *him* that was eaten and adored.

A book might be formed by merely collecting the many texts, similar to this, in which a lamb was eaten, after holy preparation with worship, prayers, hymns, and praise. Just before Jesus uttered the words of my text, "I will not now call you servants, . . . but friends: because all things whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known to you," as related in the thirteenth chapter of Saint John, he had given to his apostles, and left for us, his very body and blood in the most holy Sacrament. And with his body and blood, he also gave his soul and divinity. He, the eternal word of the Father, giving them himself, gave them, made known to them, all that he had heard of the Father, under sacramental veils, the only way in which, during our present state, such a gift could be received. Whilst on earth, he hid his glory, and his ravishing beauty. On Thabor and at the Ascension he showed some rays of it, but not its fullness, (mortal man could not see his full glory and live;) and yet those few rays shown on Thabor made the apostles fall to the ground as dead men; still it was a most rapturous approximation to death, and they would willingly have remained forever there. Even in heaven, our divine Lord dwells with his Father in inaccessible light. The angels desire to behold his face. With his Father, he gladdens the blessed by unveiling at times more or less, of his majesty, to throw a halo of joy, and glory, and bliss over all the intervals from one revelation to the other.

Then in my text Jesus means, "I have made all things known to you, whatsoever I have heard of my Father," for I have just given to you myself, the word of the Father, the fullness of his truth and wisdom. But it is under a veil, the weakness of your present state requires that it should be so. When, however, you prepare well, and try to correspond to the grace of such a visit, I will rend more or less of the veil, to make you see something of my eternal beauty, to feel something more of the power of my truth, and to burn with more and more of my love. And truly, has not each one felt at times, in approaching worthily and after due preparation, some flashes of glory from above; could we not at times have said with the apostles of Emmaus: "Were not our hearts burning within us as he spoke to us in the way?" Oh! what wondrous, joyous transports are recounted, in most authentic history, of saintly men and women, when Jesus occasionally rent the veil, and revealed to them his sweetness.

This mystery of boundless infinite love is great and wonderful. But God is love, and there surely is no mystery that Christians believe, which is revealed more clearly than this. Twice under the form of an oath does Christ pronounce it. Four times in the sacramental act does he most solemnly assert it. Then he sat as a Father making his last will and testament, and for this the words should be most plain and clear. He sat as a lawgiver, making a law, under awful penalties, and surely, for this his words ought to be plain and clear. He sat as a God-man, establishing a sacrament, and for this his words should be plain and clear. They could not be plainer and clearer than they are. It is an axiom that when you have announced a judgment in sufficient words to tell what you mean, every redundant word appended to your assertion, only gives room for cavil and doubt. God as the Saviour was, I do not see how he could say more plainly, "This is my body," than by saying, "This is my body." Yet we may say that in the original Greek there are two pronouns to say "my." Christ takes precisely that pronoun "my," which asserts most emphatically the identity of his body.

There are fourteen texts of Scripture which, under awful and most solemn circumstances, declare this sublime and glorious mystery. The enemies of the holy doctrine have often been invited to show a single text which denies the doctrine, or asserts that real absence which is generally believed by non-Catholics, who even accuse Catholics of idolatry because they worship the Lord of glory in the sacrament by which indeed he does not leave them orphans. Non-Catholics are content with adducing, to disprove the most solemn words of Christ, such passages as "I am the door," "Christ is the rock," etc. But Christ explains in the context what he means; nor is this kind of language uncommon among men; nobody misunderstands it. A man will say, "I am a horse," etc.; but no man will say, "This horse is myself;" or, if we speak ungrammatically, "This horse is

me." "I am the bread of life," though it has, no doubt, reference to this Sacrament, is widely different from the words of the institution: "This is my body," "This is my blood."

What lawyer that values his reputation would take a few texts, confessedly obscure, to place them as triumphant refutations of fourteen plain, energetic texts, spoken even with solemn adjuration, and in sacramental act? Can we for a moment think that God would leave his Scriptures full of texts that assert what many call an idolatrous falsehood, and not put in them one single text to say plainly the truth on so important a subject?

It might seem astonishing that the apostles did not start when Christ, at the Last Supper, said: "This is my body which is given for you; take and eat." But we, dearly beloved, must remember that one year before, at the Passover before the last, our divine Lord had prepared their minds for it under circumstances so wonderful as to make it impossible for them to forget the solemn declaration made through a divine Teacher that never spoke at random or in vain.

Never, perhaps, in the life of the Redeemer was there a time when his hearers would be more prepared to believe all that he would say. On that day he had fed five thousand *men*, with five loaves and two fishes. They sat down in bands of fifty, that is, in one hundred companies. Saint Matthew says that there were five thousand men, without counting the women and children. And Saint Mark tells us that they sat down "in ranks by hundreds and fifties." The women and children then swelled some companies, or, as was more usual, companies of females, so there would probably have been there from six to eight thousand persons. Christ broke the five loaves and two fishes among them. He did not create new bread, for he said afterward to his disciples: "When I broke *the five loaves* among five thousand, how many basketfuls did you take up?" The same bread must then have been in many hands at once—most miraculous must have been the multiplication. When all were fully satisfied, he ordered his disciples to gather up the fragments, lest any should be lost, "and they took up of the leavings twelve full baskets of fragments."

The fragments must have been many times more than the few loaves with which the Saviour began the feast for six or eight thousand persons! They wanted to take him by force and make him their king. But he ordered his disciples to cross the lake, dismissed the people, and went up into the mountain to pray.

Very late that night, a storm raging, and the waves running mountain high, Jesus had pity on his disciples, who could hardly make any headway. He then came to them walking amidst the roaring wind over the rolling waves; as he approached near enough to be seen, the disciples uttered a cry of fear; they thought they saw some evil spirit. But Jesus cried out to them not to fear, because it was he. Peter recognized his voice, and begged leave to walk to him on the troubled water. Jesus said:



"Come." Peter stepped on the sea, and walked with safety, until, as he advanced further in the wild waste of raging waves, and receded farther from the ship, he began to doubt, and as he doubted, did he also begin to sink. Peter cries out, "Lord save me, for I perish!" Jesus says, "O man of little faith, why didst thou doubt?" and stretching out his arm, he raises Peter; in an instant they are aboard the ship. The Lord commands the winds and the waves, and they obey him; all is at once calm; the vessels, too, immediately reach the port; the disciples run through the town and country to bring all the sick and afflicted; Jesus cures all; a word, a look, a touch, is all that is needed to expel devils, to restore the sick to perfect health, to cure the cripple, the deaf, the dumb, and the blind. Never do we read of so many stupendous miracles being concentrated in so few hours. The thousands whom he had fed take vessels, come across the lake; hear all the wonders I have narrated, and the proofs of his wonderful charity and love, and of his divine power. Never was there a time when they might be better expected to hear with docility, and believe without doubting the teaching of such a Master. It would lead me too far, were I to pause upon each verse of this remarkable chapter, the whole of which is evidently a preparation for this mystery. It is sufficient to say, that from the forty-eighth verse to the fifty-third, his words assume a more solemn and awful tone. He ends that part by saying: "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The Jews were scandalized, and said: "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" They understood him clearly and distinctly to say what we know that he said; they soon left him, and in leaving him, they left their eternal salvation. Ah! if the merciful Jesus had not meant and intended just what he did say, his loving heart would have forced him to save that crowd of Jews, and the many disciples who afterward also left him on account of this sublime and mysterious doctrine, that the sacred victim, the true lamb of God, was really to be eaten by those for whom the adorable victim was to be offered. In his mercy he would have said to them: "Do not leave me, for in leaving me you rush to death eternal. I did not mean that you should eat my very flesh and blood; I only meant that you should eat some bread, and drink some wine, and think of me." Would they, after the wonders of the past few hours, have been so scandalized at a rite which even a mere mortal man might establish and might cause to be observed? But did Jesus give such an explanation? The very contrary; his words became more awful and positive; in words that approximate to the solemnity of an oath, he, according to the Protestant version, says: "Verily, verily, I say unto you: unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you." In the Catholic version, it reads: "Amen, amen, unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of man,

and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you." He goes on promising eternal life and blessed resurrection to those that eat his flesh and drink his blood. As reasons of so glorious a promise, he says: "For my flesh is *food* indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. As the living Father hath sent me, and as I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. Many, therefore, of his disciples, hearing it, said: This saying is hard, and who can hear it?" Jesus adds words of powerful import, which unbelievers try to suppose intended to explain away the force of his words; but it is easy to show, through the usual force of human language, that they strongly confirm his intention of giving to them the flesh and blood of the very victim that was to be slain for them. Without taking up, dearly beloved, too much of your time in critically examining these words, it is sufficient to point out to you that at the end of all the words of Jesus regarding the real presence in the Eucharist, the Scripture says in the sixty-seventh verse: "After this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." Not only he does not make the easy explanation which would have calmed their deep discontent, "I don't mean what you gather from my words; I only mean that you shall eat bread and wine and think of me;" not only he does not do this, but because he did mean just what he said, he turned to the twelve, and said: "Will *you* also leave me?" The power of human language would imply that he meant: "If you will go, *go*; but what I have said I will do. Out of these stones I can raise up children to Abraham, and I will do rather that, than retract my loving promise, or not fulfill all the noble figures of the lamb slain from the beginning of the world, and eaten by those who offered the victim to the eternal."

Peter seems troubled; his answer indicates amazement and bewilderment. But in strong faith and ardent love he cried out: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known that thou art the Christ, the Son of God." As if he said: What you declare is most strange; the highest seraph could not do what you say that you will do. But we know who you are; therefore we will not leave you, for all things are possible to you. You are the Son of the Living God; whatever you say, you can do; and, as the Truth Incarnate, will do all that you say. One year after, on the last passover of our divine Lord, in miraculous manner, *He* had the "upper chamber" prepared for celebrating the last passover of the Jewish law, and the first of the Christian Church. To clear up an apparent difficulty in St. Luke 22: 18, it may be well to cite something of the present Jewish rite, which is identical with the ancient Jewish rite, as far as change of circumstances will permit. The paschal lamb could not be immolated outside of the city of Jerusalem; in place of the lamb, they have now but the shank-bone of a lamb, surrounded with bitter herbs. He who presides, after

suitable prayers and blessings, takes one cake or large wafer of unleavened bread from the little pile on the table, and lays it aside for the end of the service; the wine is to be passed *four times*, the last time it is to be taken with the *wafer set aside* at the beginning of the repast. Jesus eat the last Pasch with them: "With desire I have desired to eat this Pasch with you before I suffer." As St. John says: "When supper was done, . . . he riseth from supper, . . . and, having taken a towel, he girdeth himself. After that, he putteth water into a basin, and began to wash the feet of the disciples, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. . . . Peter saith to him, Thou shalt never wash my feet. Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part in me. Simon Peter saith to him, Lord, not only my feet, but also my hands and my head." Jesus washes their feet, though they had *all* been already *purified* by the sacred rites, sacrifices, and purifications of the old law. To show them how much nobler is the passover of the new law, how much more sacred the victim, he himself, the Incarnate God, washes their feet; then, seating himself at table, he takes the large wafer first set aside, and pronounces on it the word which, when he pronounced it on nothing, called the universe into existence.

He says: "This is my body, which is given for you; this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins." By these noble sacramental words of the Incarnate God, he makes the bread and wine all that he declares it to be—his very body and blood.

I need not adduce the many texts of St. Paul which clearly and strongly announce this sublime truth. You can read them at your leisure. I will only call your attention to the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, where St. Paul, after telling us that Christ himself revealed to him the sacramental words, says: "Whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. . . . For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." How could any one be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, *even by eating the bread alone*, unless under that sacramental form there was the living body of the adorable Victim, his body and blood, his soul and divinity? Or how could a man be damned, (as the Protestant version has it,) for not discerning in that sacramental bread the body of the Lord, when really there was no such body there?

This doctrine of God giving himself to prepare us for a life of glory, may appear strange to those who have not in them the life of God. But if they will only reflect on the words of Scripture, which assure us that we shall become "partakers of the Divine Nature;" if they remember what St. John says in his first epistle, "that when we see him, we shall become like unto him;" or what Jesus said when he was going to die for us,

“And not only for them do I pray, but for these also, who through their word shall believe in me. That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us;” they will feel that infinite condescension of divine love, immense helps of almighty power are philosophically and logically to be expected in order to prepare man for the sublime state of glory which is promised to him.

Look around and see the fruits of this sacred gift. The adorable hidden God not only prepares us, in this august sacrament, for a union of eternal glory with himself in his blessed eternity, but also *so* feeds and nourishes the soul as to make the duties and sacrifices of Christian life, in every state, not only possible, but also light and sweet. Look at the learned and venerable bishops, bowed down by the cares, anxieties, and arduous duties of their sacred office. What gives them the strength to renounce all the hopes and all the joys of earth, to devote themselves to your service, and to that of the Church of God? Is it not the bread of angels, which each morning strengthens their hearts, makes the world and its joys fade away from their minds, filling them with zeal and heavenly aspirations? See those holy and learned priests, whose talents might have assured them riches and high positions in civic life. But they preferred the poverty and humility of Christ. Day and night, unterrified by cholera or contagious disease, in the poorest cabins as well as in the mansions of the great, they minister to you the sacraments of the Saviour-God. What gives them the apostolic courage to brave death almost daily and nightly in consoling the dying? Is it not the sacred, divine bread which they receive daily at the holy mass? What gives many talented and well-educated ladies the grace to renounce the world and make the same sacred vows that Jesus so well kept, and devote themselves to instruct and educate your children, bringing them up so as to be your joy here below, and your crown of glory in heaven? What makes them dearly love a life which mere nature could not relish? Is it not the holy Sacrament? When the fury of most bigoted hatred had passed, those that had forced, at the point of the bayonet, crowds of faithful nuns from their convents, felt the want of such institutions. Often, within the last hundred years, they tried to get up *nuns* for their new-fangled religions; but every effort has been a sad, mortifying failure. They have no blessed Sacrament. They have bread, earthly bread, enough; but it does not fill the soul. And how cheerless would life be to you if you could not often receive your Lord, the pledge of eternal glory, and hope that at death he would come to give you the last kiss of peace, and, taking your anxious soul in his sacred arms, bring you safe through the narrow gate, and carry you safely to your blessed eternal home!

A

## CONVERSATION

ON

# UNION AMONG CHRISTIANS,

BETWEEN

MESSRS. BRIGHT AND TRUMAN.

---

*Truman.*—"Good morning, neighbor Bright. Did you attend the meeting, last night, for the promotion of union among Christians?"

*Bright.*—"A very good morning to you. I did attend it."

*T.*—"And how did you like it?"

*B.*—"Not at all. Instead of being a meeting to promote union among Christians, it seemed to me like a meeting to promote discord among Christians."

*T.*—"I am sorry to hear you say so. I have been in hopes something important would grow out of this movement, to bring Christians together. Do give me an account of the proceedings."

*B.*—"The first speaker was a reverend doctor of the Dutch Reformed Church. He stated, that although he gave his name to the movement, he had really never had any confidence in its success. He knew too well the obstacles to be overcome. There were, for example, the Episcopalians with their exclusive ordination by bishops, and the Baptists with their exclusive baptism by immersion. These were bars in the way, and they could not be removed. Such pretensions were, he considered, an insult to their common Protestantism; they would come with a better grace from the Church of Rome, with her pretended infallibility. Such things, he said, ought to be put away, so that all the Prot-

estant denominations might unite against the twin enemies of true Christianity, Infidelity and Romanism."

*T.*—"Seems to me this was rather hard on the Catholics, and in very bad taste in a meeting to promote unity among Christians. The Catholics are three times as numerous as the Protestants of all sorts put together. Any union which does not embrace them can not be called a union among Christians. I was in hopes they would have been invited to give their views among the rest. They might, after all, have thrown some light on the subject, for they have succeeded far better than Protestants in maintaining union among themselves. The doctor was right in saying that no union among the denominations was to be expected. All movements to this effect have failed; there is plenty of splitting up, but no uniting. When people get an opinion into their heads, they do not give it up so easily. But tell me what the other speakers said."

*B.*—"The next one was an Episcopalian. He agreed that there was no hope of the union of Christian religious bodies, but repelled the charge of arrogance on the part of Episcopalians. He put the case of one of them reading antiquity and becoming convinced of the Apostolic succession, and contrived to make out quite an argument for his own church. He wound up by saying, that he did not think it desirable that all the denominations should unite in one. They put a more agreeable face on Christianity as they were. They made variety, just as the different flowers in the garden make it more beautiful. All the union they needed, or that was desirable, was a coöperation in benevolent enterprises, such as the Bible or Tract societies. Such union, he considered, presented the most sublime and exhilarating exhibition the world had ever seen."

*T.*—"It is very poetical and imaginative to talk of the flowers of the garden, but I can not see either any beauty or sweet odor in this division of Christendom into sects. It always has and always will tend to destroy that love and harmony which ought to prevail among the followers of a common Master. It is a little too much to call these divisions, which are a scandal to Christendom, sweet-smelling flowers. They smell bad enough in my nostrils. What did the doctor consider the special advantages of these divisions?"

*B.*—"He said they created emulation, and prevented Christians from going to sleep; that it made them more careful of what they said and did, because they knew they were watched by others; and more to the same effect."

*T.*—"What a strange idea this presents of the Christian religion. This seems to me to make our Lord produce evil in order to bring good out of it. I can not and will not believe that the Lord ever set Christians at variance in order to make them active and watchful."

*B.*—"I agree with you. What the Saviour established must have been entirely and purely good, without any mixture of evil. When there is, in any state of things, a mixed good and evil, we may be sure the devil has had a hand in it. Love must be the moving principle of Christians, and not hatred or dislike or disagreement."

*T.*—"Well, then, I suppose they all gave up the idea of any union among the different denominations?"

*B.*—"Yes! The last speaker, a Congregationalist, gave it up very pleasantly and good-humoredly. The gist of his speech was, that difference of opinion was inevitable. We might just as well get reconciled to it and take it easy. If any believed him wrong, he believed himself right, and he could afford to let them have their own opinions. Let them unchurch him if they pleased, he did not thereby consider himself unchurched. He might pity what he thought their folly, but he did not see how he could blame them if they were sincere in their notions. The doctor threw oil on the troubled waters, but every body felt that he and all the rest were giving the movement for union a decent burial, and were glad enough to get the dead body out of their sight."

*T.*—"I am sadly disappointed. I have shared in the desire which seemed to swell the hearts of all Christians, that the present state of division should cease, and have looked with hope upon any movement to put an end to it. Perhaps I was foolish to form any such hopes, for these unfortunate divisions have gone on increasing ever since the reformation was first established. What can we expect? Every one puts his own meaning on the Bible. He is right, and every body else is wrong. He is sincere, and the Holy Ghost guides him to the true meaning; the rest who differ with him are all insincere, and all mis-

taken. With the Bible for a rule and guide to each one, say what you please, people will differ, and they will disagree. Perhaps, after all, our Lord intended these divisions, or he would, certainly, have appointed some other way of ascertaining the truth. What do you think about it?"

*B.*—"What! Our Lord intend Christians to be divided up into different sects! The idea is monstrous; I can never reconcile myself to such a thing. He arrange his religion in such a way as to produce these bickerings and heart-burnings and divisions of society and the family which we see all around us! Never! His last prayer was for unity; that all his disciples might be united in the closest bond of love and concord. 'Father,' he cries, 'that they may be all one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee, that they may all be one in us!'"

*T.*—"But can we not be united in charity or love, though divided into different denominations?"

*B.*—"No, we can not. Why is there any division into different denominations? Is it not because there is a difference of doctrine or opinion, and when there is such difference, there is estrangement and disagreement? Look at any of our small towns or country villages, what do we see? The community and the family at variance on the score of religion; charity, instead of being diffused as it should be, confined to the limits of the religious society, and dissension and strife without end. These things grow as naturally out of the organization of the church into sects as weeds grow in the garden. Depend upon it, our Lord never intended any such state of things."

*T.*—"You are right. As long as we are divided into sects, love will be at a discount. And as long as we are divided in opinion, sects will abound. To be of one heart and soul, we must be of one mind. How can we all be of one mind? Is it possible to secure such a basis of union?"

*B.*—"It must be. Our Lord prayed for the union of his followers; therefore, union must be possible, and he must have provided the means of realizing it."

*T.*—"But as long as each one puts his own meaning on the Bible, and thus constructs a religion for himself, there will be difference of opinion, and no union will be possible."

*B.*—"Very true, and therefore that is not the way appointed by God."

*T.*—"Please tell me, then, what is the way."

*B.*—"We must get the true meaning of the Scriptures, and not any other meaning which is different from the true meaning. Then all accepting this one true meaning, our differences would disappear, and there would be no hindrance in the way of uniting."

*T.*—"Yes; but how to get this true meaning is the very question. Who can explain it to us, so that we may be sure of it? Any man or any body of men are human like ourselves,



and liable to be mistaken. It would be useless to expect mankind to submit to their interpretation."

*B.*—"I know that, and therefore I conclude that the way of ascertaining the true meaning of the Bible must be appointed by God himself, and have God's sanction upon it. It must be essentially divine and not human."

*T.*—"I agree with you; we may be asked to submit to God, but not to man. But you do not mean to say that God directs each sincere reader in such a way that he can find out his religion for himself?"

*B.*—"No; I mean nothing of the kind. This pretense leads to the most obstinate and wrong-headed fanaticism. It is destructive of unity, and its effects are plainly enough to be seen in the hopeless divisions around us."

*T.*—"What, then, is the way appointed by God to agree as to the truth and live in unity? In your reading of the Bible, have you found any thing to throw light on this subject?"

*B.*—"I did read, not long ago, a passage which set me to thinking. It is this: 'The church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth.' (1 Tim. 3 : 15.) The church must be the guardian and the interpreter of the truth, otherwise I do not see in what sense she can be called 'the pillar and the ground of the truth.'"

*T.*—"How was it that this text made such an impression on your mind?"

*B.*—"The more I reflected upon it, the more reasonable the idea seemed to me. We need some tribunal to decide in case of disagreement as to the meaning of the truth, and we need one to whose decisions we should feel ourselves bound to submit. This is the only road to unity. Where can we find such a one, unless it be 'the church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth'? I was so much impressed by this consideration, that I was led to look farther, and I found much more to confirm my opinion."

*T.*—"Pray give me the benefit of your researches, for I am very much interested in the matter."

*B.*—"In the twenty-eighth chapter of St. Matthew, Christ says to his apostles: 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.' Here is the establishment of a 'ministry to last to the end of time.'—Here, the truth, and the whole truth, is intrusted to this ministry that they may teach it. And Christ makes himself responsible for the truth of this teaching, for he promises to remain with them always."

*T.*—"This amounts to constituting the church the perpetual tribunal to decide differences, with a divine guarantee that her decisions shall be true. I do not see how we can avoid the conclusion."

*B.*—"We can not. When Christ made his church the interpreter of the meaning of his truth, she must necessarily have made her unerring, not liable to be deceived, or infallible; for how could she otherwise discharge her office, and be the fit instrument to produce a unity among all Christians? He said very fitly: 'He that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me.' When we obey the church, we obey not men, but God."

*T.*—"When people, then, say, as I have often heard them, 'I will not pin my faith to any church or any set of men,' they forget that Christ promised to be with his church, and to send the Holy Ghost to teach all truth, and to abide forever with her; and what they say is sheer folly."

*B.*—"It is; but they have reflected very little on the matter, or they would hesitate to express themselves in such a way. But you objected to each one picking out his own religion for himself from the Bible. Are we not doing that very thing now?"

*T.*—"No; I do not think we are. Being convinced that we can not construct a religion for ourselves out of its pages, we look into them to see if Christ has pointed out any other way. And we find that he has, and that this way is the church. Is it not so?"

*B.*—"I was only bantering you a little."

*T.*—"Well, please, let us pursue the conversation, I feel already much indebted to you for the light I have gained from your explanations. I am convinced that unity is to be secured by means of the Church of God. Now, let us come to the practical question, Where is the church at this moment? How can we find her?"

*B.*—"Your enthusiasm for the truth edifies me very much, and I feel that I am as much indebted to you as you are to me. But you ask, How shall we find the true church? I answer, by examining the different churches, and seeing which one of them corresponds to the idea we have formed of the true church. If only one shows such correspondence, then that one must be the true church, and our task is at an end. Does any one of the churches claim to be the judge of the true sense of Holy Scripture, and require us to accept her decisions in regard to it? Does the Episcopal Church make such claims?"

*T.*—"She does not. I doubt if any one of her members would have the hardihood to say so. It is true she has her thirty-nine articles of religion, but they are not pretended to be of divine authority, or to bind any body to believe them, because set forth by the church. We see her split up at this moment into two factions, at swords' points with each other, and no one dreams their difficulties could be settled by the authority of the church. It is all individual judgment, as well among the High as among the Low Church parties."

*B.*—"Does any other Protestant denomination assert such a claim?"

*T.*—"All agree in remitting the individual to the Bible to settle his doctrine for himself."

*B.*—"Thus far we have done with the different Protestant denominations. They all originated in the same principle of the individual interpretation of the Scripture, and of the right to set up against the existing religion. This is their distinctive mark, and it will remain impressed upon them as long as they exist. How is it with the Catholic Church?"

*T.*—"I must admit that the Catholic Church has claimed to teach us the true doctrine through all ages. I remember what Doctor Jarvis, an Episcopalian clergyman, wrote against her: 'It is useless to expect Rome to reform her errors, for a doctrine she has once committed herself to, she can never change.' She teaches one and the same doctrine everywhere as the very doctrine of Christ, and requires the individual to accept her judgments."

*B.*—"Enough on that point. It is no use to waste words; her claim is known to any one who has any information. Let us pass to the next point. What church claims to have her teaching protected by God, or, in other words, to be infallible? Does the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, or any other Protestant denomination?"

*T.*—"No, not one. They all profess to be exceedingly shocked at such claim. Why they should be, I can not see, since it is plainly scriptural; but such is the undeniable fact."

*B.*—"Then none of them can be the Church of Christ, for not one possesses the means of securing unity within its own borders. How is it with the Catholic Church, does she claim infallibility?"

*T.*—"We all know that she alone does."

*B.*—"Then she alone can be the Church of Christ. She alone has a principle suitable to secure the union of divided Christendom. She alone can possibly allay the conflict of opinions. Now, one more test before we conclude. Christ prayed for the unity of his followers, and provided a sufficient means for securing it. These means are in existence to-day. But Christ's means, it seems to me, ought not to prove inefficient or inoperative. Means adapted to an end generally accomplish great results. Christ's means ought to produce unity in a wonderful and striking way in actual practice. What is the actual state of the Catholic Church in regard to unity? Do her principles work in practice? Do her members agree in doctrine?"

*T.*—"In a wonderful manner. To see 200,000,000 of people, by far the larger part of all Christendom, agreeing as they do, in the profession of one and the same faith, is as striking a spectacle as the world affords. The means here have secured the result. It is not theory, but actualization."

*B.*—"Are they all of one nation or language or climate or political principle, or do they agree in any other respect so as to produce a disposition to unity in religion?"

*T.*—"No; they are of all nations, climates, governments, and

languages under the sun. This makes their unity of belief truly a wonderful phenomenon."

*B.*—"Do they all worship God in unity and peace?"

*T.*—"Yes, that is evident. A Frenchman or a German coming into a Catholic Church here, finds himself as much at home as in his own country. If an American Catholic goes to any quarter of the globe, it is the same with him. They have substantially the same worship everywhere."

*B.*—"Is religion with them an element of love and concord everywhere?"

*T.*—"It is; it tends to smooth away all other asperities and differences. When a Catholic meets another Catholic, their agreement in religion is a true bond of union, and mutually warms their hearts toward each other. Witness in our own country the sacrifices of the members of this church to build their churches and found their benevolent institutions. Catholics of all nationalities are ready enough to join hands when the prosperity of their religion is concerned."

*B.*—"My friend, I think we may as well stop. Enough is as good as a feast. To tell you the truth, I am convinced of the divine character of the Catholic Church. The elements of conviction were in my mind before, but our conversation has brought them out, and made me see them more clearly and distinctly. I shall seek admission into the Catholic Church."

*T.*—"And I also, in spite of all my prejudices, must do the same: for we must obey our convictions; we must obey God when he calls, even if we have to forsake houses or lands, father or mother, wife or children, yea, even life itself, to do so."

*B.*—"The movement for the union of Christians has not entirely failed. It has brought us back to the very bosom of Unity itself."

*T.*—"And God grant that a strong desire for unity may open the minds of all Christians to the truth, and thus bring them to the realization of their desires."

## THE GOSPEL DOOR OF MERCY.

—•••—  
 “An open confession is good for the soul.”—POPULAR CREED,  
 Art. 4.  
 —•••—

It is a sad, it is the saddest of all things, to have to say that all men have sinned! That no one can look up in the face of heaven and declare: “I am innocent, and have no sin!” This, after all, is only repeating the words of the apostle when he said, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”\*

Sin, then, is a most common thing. That is not the worst of it. Sin robs man of peace, tortures the conscience with the stings of remorse, and makes the soul sick. It is the most dreadful evil that can befall man, for the anguish of a guilty conscience outweighs all other torments.

“Trust me, no tortures which poets feign  
 Can match the fierce unutterable pain  
 He feels, who, night and day devoid of rest,  
 Carries his own accuser in his breast.”

Sin is also the greatest of all evils. For “the soul that sinneth, the same shall die.” You are strong; but your strength will come down when the trumpet sounds in your ears, “Come to judgment!” You are prosperous; but you will be stripped of that when your time comes, as come it surely will. “Say not, How mighty am I? who shall bring me under for my deeds? For God will surely take revenge. Say not, I have sinned, what harm hath befallen me? For the Most High is a patient rewarder.”†

Is there no way of getting rid of this evil? Is there

\* 1 John 1 : 8.

† Eccles. 5 : 8, 4.

then no remedy for sin? There is. The primary war of man's heart, when moved by any strong impulse of feeling, whether of joy, or of surprise, or of guilt, is expression. Man must have some one to whom he can unbosom himself. "I am lonely, lonely, lonely! There is a secret in my heart that devours me, that tortures me! Sometimes I fear to go mad of it; sometimes I hope to die of it; but neither of the two happens. Oh! if I could but whisper it to only one human soul!" Such is the cry of the alarmed and guilty conscience. Man has power to commit sin; but he is powerless to conceal it: and the first effort of the soul to relieve itself of the weight of sin is an open confession.

The child can not yield to sleep until it has opened its heart and whispered its little fault to its mother, and received her pardon with a kiss. Confession is a natural instinct, and on this instinct is based the common saying, "Murder will out." Men have been known to confess their misdeeds and crimes at the cost of their lives. A case of this kind occurred about twelve years ago, in Bristol, England. A man had been guilty of murder, and all traces of the deed had been covered up for twenty years or more. The tortures of his conscience were so great that he could conceal his crime no longer. He wrote to a magistrate, acknowledged the deed, was put on trial, and expiated his crime with his life. The same thing took place in Fredericksburgh, in the State of Pennsylvania, about fifteen years ago. The murderer voluntarily made known his crime, was tried, condemned, and hung.

"Foul deeds will rise,

Though all the earth o'erwhelm them to men's eyes."

Sin, like poison, can not be concealed, and the only outlet to the guilty conscience is confession.

The human heart seeks to unbosom itself to one who has the sympathies of a friend; one who not being ex-

empt from human weaknesses, can have compassion on its miseries. It seeks a sincere and disinterested friend who will not betray its confidence or take advantage of its secret guilt. But the conscience is sacred, and hence it asks for a sacred friendship, which will enable it to make known its faults and show its wounds, without fear that its sanctuary will be profaned. Oh! where shall the poor sinner find such a friend?

Surely religion should take up in its scope these strong inclinations of the soul. Christ was such a friend to the sinner when he walked upon earth. He was full of compassion and tenderness toward sinners, forgave them their sins, and bade them sin no more. Can it be that Christ came down from heaven to walk among men for only a few years, and then withdrew with all his powers and gifts to an eternal silence, leaving man as before—alone in his sins, misery, and wretchedness? Or did he communicate his powers and gifts to men, to be employed by them as his representatives in the salvation of mankind until time shall end?

No one who believes in the Holy Scriptures will deny that Jesus Christ had the power to pardon sin. He forgave Magdalen, the leper, and the man sick with palsy, and in this latter instance, confirmed his right to forgive sins, and his authority to do so, by working a miracle. No Christian, either, will deny that Christ could communicate to men as his representatives the power to forgive sins, if he chose to do so. Did it please Jesus Christ to communicate this power to men? This is a question of fact, and may easily be settled by referring to the record of his life and actions in the New Testament.

There is no fact in Holy Writ more plain than this. Open St. Mathew's gospel at the sixteenth chapter, and you will find that after Christ had promised to build his church on St. Peter, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, he spoke these words: "And I will

give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." The power to loose and bind sins is conveyed in these words by Christ to Peter, without limitation, and its exercise by him upon earth Christ pledged to ratify in heaven. Is it not clear from this passage that Christ contemplated the continuance of his work of pardoning sinners, through the agency of men, after he should leave the world ?

Some persons may be disposed to quibble and say, The pardoning of sin is not expressed in these words of Christ. True enough ; but the words, " Whatsoever you shall loose," etc., are ample enough to include the power of forgiving sin, particularly so, when you consider that our Lord prefaced these words by promising to Peter " the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Christ himself, however, has anticipated your objection.

Open your New Testament again, and this time at the twentieth chapter of St. John's gospel. Begin at the nineteenth verse and read : " Now when it was late that same day, the first of the week, and the doors were shut, where the disciples were gathered together for fear of the Jews, Jesus came, and stood in their midst, and said to them : Peace be to you. And when he had said this, he showed them his hands, and his side. The disciples, therefore, were glad, when they saw the Lord. He said, therefore, to them again : Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent me, I also send you."

Let us stop here for a moment and ponder on this passage : " As the Father hath sent me, I also send you." By these words Jesus Christ conveyed to his apostles the mission he had received from his heavenly Father. It is the same as if he had said, " My Father sent me upon earth to preach the gospel, to convert sinners, to forgive them their sins ; and as I am now about to



leave the earth, I choose you to go on with my work, and, in my name, preach the gospel, convert sinners, and forgive them their sins;" for "as the Father hath sent me, I also send you."

Continue now the text: "When he had said this, he breathed on them: and he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Stop there and mark the meaning of these solemn words: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Why does Christ invest his apostles with this divine power? Evidently it must be to exercise by its virtue a divine prerogative. What is this office they are to fulfill by the power of the Holy Ghost? Read on, and slowly, and weigh well the words, and you will learn: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Here, by these plain, simple, and expressive words, Christ bestows upon his apostles the power to forgive sins. After this, can any one who trusts his own eyes and reads the gospel, and is a Christian, deny it? The words of Christ are too plain and direct to be perverted to any other meaning than that which they bear on their face and naturally signify. There is no escape from their meaning except it be to give up the Bible and deny the authority of Christ. Had I not reason when I said that there is no fact in Holy Writ more plain than that Jesus Christ gave to his apostles the power to forgive and retain sins?

"Suppose Christ did give to his apostles the power to forgive sins, it does not follow that one must tell his sins to a priest in order to obtain their forgiveness."

But it does follow, and follows necessarily, as you shall see. When Christ gave the power to forgive sin, he also gave the power to retain sin. There is, therefore, a question to be decided when the sinner comes to the priest: Shall his sins be forgiven or shall they be retained? He must forgive the sins of those who are truly penitent

and condemn those who are not. It would be a sacrilege to pronounce forgiveness over a sinner who is impenitent and not resolved to avoid offending God in the future. How then is the priest to know whether he should use the power to forgive or to retain sins unless the sinner manifests his sins and the disposition of his heart? This manifestation is nothing else than confession. The power to forgive and retain sin, and confession, are inseparable; the former can not be exercised rightly and with discretion without the latter. And as the power to forgive and retain sin comes from Jesus Christ, it follows that confession is also of obligation and of divine institution.

It is in the priest, who "is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, . . . who can have compassion on them that are ignorant, and that err: because he himself is compassed with infirmity,"\* the sinner finds that disinterested and sacred friend to whom he can pour out the secret sorrows of his soul, and make known its wounds: in the priest he finds a spiritual physician who has the science and skill to cure the soul of the ravages of sin, and to prescribe such rules as will place it out of the danger of falling again; in the priest he finds a spiritual father who feels in his breast an interest akin to that felt for souls by Christ, and whose duty it is to counsel, encourage, and console the sinner. Moreover, the priest is a friend who not only consoles, but who also, by the authority of Christ and in the name of the Most Holy Trinity, pronounces the forgiveness of his sins; which, being ratified in heaven, frees the sinner from the bonds and guilt of sin, and fills his soul anew with a peace and joy above all earthly possessions. Here are all the wants of the human heart satisfied by the fulfillment of a religious duty. Here friendship takes the character of religion, and by a divine power, is transformed into a sac-

\* Hebrews 5 : 1, 2.

rament. Confession, at the same time that it is adapted to meet all the wants of man's nature, has for its authority the express words of Holy Scripture, and for its author Jesus Christ!

“Grant that Christ gave the power to forgive sins to the apostles, but when they died it ceased.” Who told you that? Why should the apostles forgive sins, and their successors not? Is there any reason in the one case which is not equally good in the other? There is no word in Holy Writ about it. It is a mere assertion of yours, and that has no value in matters of this kind, and of such great moment. Did the power to preach the gospel, or to baptize, cease with the apostles? If not, where do you find in the Bible that the one was to be transmitted to the successors of the apostles and not the other? Your assertion carried out would overthrow Christianity entirely. If all sin had ceased when the apostles died, your words would have some real value; but as for sin and sinners, there is no lack of them nowadays, hence the power to forgive sins is no less necessary for us than it was in the times of the apostles.

“But I confess to God alone!” There is no objection to that; it is a devout and praiseworthy exercise to confess one's sins to God alone. But do you in this way obtain forgiveness of your sins? That is the question! In a matter of such serious importance it will not do to trust to mere fancy, or a theory spun out of one's own brain. Confess your sins to God alone, if you please, but there is no word in the gospels to assure you of their forgiveness for it. To trust to your own authority here, is like leaning on a broken reed. Saint Augustine, fourteen hundred years ago, answered well those who would set up their fancy of confessing to God alone, against the words of the Bible and the authority of Christ: “Let no one say I do penance in secret before God; God knows what passes in my heart, and it is he who par-

dons. Is it then in vain he has said, 'Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven; whose sins you shall retain they shall be retained'? Is it uselessly that Christ has given the keys to the Church?" The obligation of confessing sin to those who have the power to forgive sin, is not left optional, for this is the way appointed by God to obtain forgiveness. And who can hope for pardon, if he neglects to seek it in the way God has appointed?

Is it not degrading to our manhood to be obliged to tell our sins to a fellow-man? It is a necessity and law of our nature, as has been shown, and there is no argument, as you know, against necessity. Degrading! why degradation comes from sin, and confession is the very means by which we get rid of sin, assert our true manhood, and again rise to the dignity of a Christian.

Does not confession take away the feeling of personal responsibility to God? No! for it is in obedience to God that you make your confession; in confession the man is forgotten in the priest, whom God has intrusted with power as his agent.

The Catholic doctrine concerning the sacrament of confession must be full of consolation to those who can believe it! Can believe it! Why, my friend, do you not see that it requires a greater stretch of faith to hope for pardon of your sins without confession than with it? The one has in its favor the plain words of the gospel and the express authority of Christ, and the other has no ground at all to stand on!

Truly the Catholic Church alone, answers the cry of the soul for confession, and opens in the confessional the gospel door of mercy to sinners, and thus faithfully represents him who came to save sinners. His spirit actuates her, and she can, with the accents of truth, address sinners in his touching words, "Come to me, all you that labor, and are burthened, and I will refresh you: . . . and you shall find rest to your souls."

## WHAT SHALL I DO TO BECOME A CHRISTIAN?



My name is George. I have a dear, good aunt, whose name is Mary, and we live on the old Righter farm, which, you know, is just on the outskirts of one of the prettiest towns in our State. Aunt Mary was a Presbyterian of the Old School, as my parents also had been, and as I grew up I was sent regularly by her to meeting, to the Sunday-school, and to the Bible-class. I had never been baptized, as my parents were among the non-communicants of the church whose children were denied that rite until "conversion;" and as I never got converted, I remained, in spite of Sunday-school, Bible-class, and sermons, an unbaptized heathen, as were not a few of the people, I am sure, known in the community as Presbyterians. Not that I ever for a moment imagined I was a heathen. I never was told, nor did it occur to my mind that, until I had made some act of profession as a Christian, I was nothing but a heathen in the sight of God, else the penny subscription for the conversion of "the heathen" in Allahabad and other places where "golden sand rolled down," might have appeared to my mind as an inconsistent offering sooner than it did. I lived very happily with Aunt Mary, and the only source of anxiety which she seemed to have was, that I still remained unconverted. She prayed for that desired end, I have no doubt, every day of her life, but never nerved herself to speak to me about it seriously but once. Fired with zeal by her attendance upon a revival then going on, she ventured one day to say to me, "George, dear, you are the one object of my love and my prayers. There is but one thing I have asked of the Lord for you that I did not get"—and here her dear old eyes filled

with tears—"you haven't yet laid hold of the precious promises of the Gospel. I know you have not resisted, for you have never been wild or dissipated; and I know it is the Lord's doings, and we must wait for his time of grace; but"—she added, letting her affection get the better of her principles—"I do wish, George dear, that you would once try seriously to feel convicted, just to see if the Lord may not be ready for you."

"Well, Aunt Mary," said I, "I'm ready enough, not only to *feel* convicted, but to *be* convicted, yet I don't precisely see how much more conviction I need. I believe the Bible to be true, and that religion is good; I believe in the Creed; I believe one ought to be good, and so forth. I'm convinced enough, Aunty, if that's all."

"But you have not yet felt yourself to be a sinner, dear?"

"Oh! yes I have, Aunty; more than once, I can tell you."

"A child of wrath, sold under sin, justly condemned for the utter depravity of your heart and doomed to—to—eternal woe?" she added inquiringly.

"No, Aunty," I replied, "I can't say I do feel all that, neither do I think that you believe me to be quite as bad as that. *Do* you believe now, that I am an utterly depraved wretch, and that because I have not acknowledged myself to be one, I should fall into everlasting fire, if I died here by your side?"

"No, George," she answered, rather taken aback by my way of stating the case—"you are not an utterly depraved wretch, certainly not; but your heart, dear, you know you need a change of heart. The Scripture says, 'The heart of man is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.'"

"But it does not say that God made him so," said I, "it is wholly repugnant to reason; and equally so to say that God will punish a man with everlasting fire for being just what He created him. Why, Aunt, it's sheer nonsense, and when I am told that I must believe all this to be a Christian, I am simply told to put my reason under foot and act out what seems to me to be as blasphemous as it is nonsensical; and now you know why I never joined the church."

"But you have hopes?" asked my aunt, dreadfully chopfallen and disappointed.

"No hope, Aunt, as long as that doctrine is held out to me as Christianity. But don't you fear," I added, "I'll be a good Christian one of these days, when I can find out how to be a good one without calling myself in the same breath a bad man."

"You will come to the revival, won't you, George dear?" she asked, with her hand on my shoulder. It was hard to say no, but my principles were at stake, and so I answered:

"I don't think I will, Aunt, though I'm very sorry to do any thing to distress you; but the whole thing is a preposterous contradiction; for they preach — 'Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters;' and yet they say that I can never come one step until I am forced to come; and that I mustn't complain if I am not forced, and am left to die of thirst for all eternity. It is all very well for those who think they are elected and sure of heaven, to say that they deserve to go to hell; but for those who are left out it is quite another thing. I feel, Aunt, that if I went to this revival, I should be doing something against my conscience, and you would not have me do that, I know, for all the revivals and churches in the world."

"No, my dear," said my aunt, "I'll never ask you to do any thing against your conscience; but I'll never cease to ask the Lord to give me this last and greatest blessing of all his mercies."

I was pleased to hear her say that; for to tell the truth, I was half afraid she would be true to her doctrine, and reply that as my conscience was a part of my utterly depraved and deceitful nature, the more directly I acted contrary to it the better it would be. So taking her hand, I said:

"And I will pray too, that my dear Aunt Mary and her good-for-nothing nephew may yet both serve God faithfully together as good Christians before they die."

Aunt Mary went to her room and I walked out to stroll about the farm. Naturally my thoughts reverted to our conversation, and I fairly trembled at the thought of my thus unchristianizing myself at one blow. I had never spoken my thoughts out before, and the bit

ter reality was for the first time apparent to me. Was I then indeed no Christian? Plainly not in the eyes of those who had been my spiritual guides and teachers from my youth. I had never felt "conviction" in their sense of the word. I had never experienced the change of heart which was regarded by them as the sign of being selected as a member of Christ's fold. But I couldn't understand it. I never doubted that Jesus Christ was the Saviour of the world or that Christianity was true, and yet I was a heathen. If I ask them what I must *do* to be saved, they tell me to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the same breath that I can't *do* any thing, not even believe. Believe! believe and be saved, I kept repeating to myself; "the devils believe and tremble" and are not saved. Can't we do as much as the devils any way? There is something wrong about the devils' belief. They know what's right, but they won't *do* it. Now to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ in the right way is to *do* what you believe, I should say, and have your heart in your belief as well as your head. But then I can't be a Presbyterian, or a Protestant at all, if I stick to that. They say that a man's heart is totally depraved and knoweth not the things of God. Now, how can a totally depraved heart believe in Jesus Christ, and love to do what he has commanded? But then, they say, you can have a "change of heart." Yes, but they won't be reasonable, and allow that your heart *is* changed one whit for all that, but that it remains, as Luther said, "as ugly and as black as the devil almost," just as it was before.

There, said I, musing, is that revival going on, and when it is over they will be calling the converts Christians, and baptizing them into the church. Now, if the baptism only meant something, and washed *some* of the black off, it might pass as not an empty and unmeaning ceremony; but there they are, baptized Christians, elect saints, as ugly as the devil and as black as—as old Tat, over there, I added, my eye accidentally falling upon our old negro coachman industriously cleaning the harness on the sunny side of the barn.

Tat had once been a slave, but had purchased his freedom and come North, where he was hired by my aunt, in whose service he had continued ever since, now *some*



twenty years. When asked his name, he replied, "Cato is my baptize name, but de chill'uns allers calls me Tat, an' ob de two pronounciations, Tat is my 'special preference;" and Tat he was called from that day forth. On this occasion Tat was indulging in one of his old hymn-ditties:

"De reason why I tells you dis,  
 Glory! glory! glory hallelujah!  
 De debbil hates de Methodists,  
 Glory! glory! glory hallelujah!"

Just then I came up to him.

"Day, Tat."

"Day, Mass' George." Tat never got over his Southern habits.

"Tat, what is the reason why the devil hates the Methodists, as you were singing, just now?" I was thinking of Luther.

"Dunno, Mass' George, 'cept dey prays an' sings so dat de debbil can't git near to 'em."

"Were you ever baptized, Tat?" I asked.

"Yaas I war, Mass' George, when I war de leastest little mite ob a pickaninny. Ye see, I b'longed to ole Mass' Tom Lantrum, down in Georgia, an' he war a desp'rate strict member ob de 'Pistipul church, an' nebber got no niggers but he had 'em baptize on de spot. 'Kase,' as I heered him say one day, 'I won't hab no unbaptize heathen niggers 'round me.' P'raps you've heered tell o' Mass' Tom Lantrum, one ob de fust, if not de bery fustest, fam'lies in Georgia; high connected too, wid de Voshs an' de Polters an' all dem dere. O' course you knows *dem*. Ebery body *mus'* know dem; and den, dere was de——"

"But, Tat," said I, interrupting him, you said your master had his slaves baptized, so as not to have them heathen. Were you made a Christian then, when you were baptized?"

"Dere you ax me too much, Mass' George, kase you see I was too young to receibe information on dat subjeck jus' den."

"Well, you are a Christian now, I suppose," said I.

"Bress de Lord, I is."

"When did you become one, Tat?"

"Laws! Mass' George, dere you has me agin. I 'spect

de Lord choosed me some time or oder, and so I be, from dis time fort', now and for eber mo', Amen. Kase when de Lord done choose you, den he *done* choose you, and dere's an end ob it. You's baptize, Mass' George?"

"No, not yet, Tat."

"Well, you b'lieves in de baptize, I s'pose, de same as you b'lieves in de catechize; and I reckon it don't make a heap o' diff'rence to a man, 'long as he b'lieves in de baptize, wedder he *is* baptize or no: jus' as if one only b'lieves in de catechize, it don't matter wedder he *has* a catechize or no."

I could not help smiling at such a practical application of "faith alone;" but feeling more and more interested in old Tat's religious career and notions, I ventured to ask him what made him turn Methodist.

"Now, g'way, Mass' George, you ain't serous, to say dat I, dat b'longed to one ob de bery fustest fam'lies, mus' be a turnin' an' a turnin' an' a jumpin' Jim Crow like yer low, mis'able fellers dat don't 'long no whar!"

"But you said your master had you baptized into the Episcopal church."

"Golly! what has got into dis yer harness?" grumbled Tat, pretending to finding it tangled in order to give himself time to get out of the difficulty about the baptism. "As I was a sayin', Mass' George, my ole massa was a desp'rate strict 'Pistipul, an' 'longed to de High Church. In course, he couldn't 'long to no oder, kase he come o' de highest fam'lies, an' war high connected all 'round; but den, ye see, we sarvants didn't 'long to dat. 'T'wan't o' no kind o' use to us, kase dat took larnin'; high larnin' too, ebery sort o' readin', writin', an' eipherin'. We 'longed to de Methodis' church. I allers 'longed to it, kase dat war our church. Baptize a 'Pistipul! No sar! I war borned a Methodis'. I war a Methodis' 'fore I war baptize, an' I'se a Methodis' now I is baptize. Don' yer see de circumstantial ebidence ob it, Mass' George? You's a Prisbeterian now, 'fore you is baptize, an' you is jis' de same after you is baptize. Dat is de consiquential logic ob de whole ting. G'way, baptize don' hurt nobody!"

"No," thought I, "it don't wash any of the total depravity out, according to Protestant notions. But, Tat," said I, "the Catholics say, I'm told, that a man is

actually made a Christian when he is baptized, and your High Church Episcopalian master thought the same thing, and the Bible says, you know, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' That looks as if one could not be saved by Christ except he be baptized."

"I'se done been baptize myse'f, I has," said Tat, rubbing away hard at the harness.

I envied old Tat the happiness of being able to say that. I felt that he was something more than I was. He was baptized and had a right to the Kingdom of God. But, as I thought to myself, it is one thing to be made a Christian, and another to live one. Surely, even if a man is baptized, if he does not live as Christ commanded he can not be saved.

"Tat," said I, "what do you think a man has to do to live like a Christian, so that when he dies he is sure of going to heaven?"

"Don' you know, Mass' George, de words ob dat bressed hymn"—and here he broke out into singing, while his old black face lighted up with a devotion and joy that thrilled me to see:

• "Do you lub the Lord Jesus?  
Oh! come away! oh! come away!  
The gates are open to receive us,  
Oh! come away! oh! come away!"

Dar you see, lub de Lord Jesus wid all dy mind, wid all dy heart, and wid all dy strength, dat is de whole ob de law an' de prophets."

"He that loveth me will keep my commandments," I involuntarily muttered to myself. But that is what the Catholics say again. Be baptized and be a Christian. Keep the commandments of God, and save your soul. Now, here is this poor ignorant old negro, baptized by chance, as most of his sect are, actually carrying out the whole Catholic doctrine without knowing it, and in direct opposition to the teachings of all of the Protestant sects, who say that a man is totally corrupt and depraved, and can not keep the commandments or please God at all, and can not love him with any of his heart, least of all with his whole heart. "Tat," said I again, "what do you think about the Catholics?"

“Wall, Mass’ George, I tinks a heap about ’em. When I war down to Charleston, dey had a Bishop dere named England, I b’lieve, an’ one Sunday I went ’round wid Ginger Trumbull to hear him preach; an’ golly! *he* could preach, Mass’ George, you better b’lieve it. He said one ting I nebber forgit, longest day I live. Says he, “Faith widout works am dead,” ’cordin’ to de ’postle. Now de true Christian say, “I b’lieve all dat God hab revealed,” dat am faith.’ “Lord, what will you hab me to *do*? only say de word, an’ I do it, sho,” dat am good works.’ Eber’ sence dat I say, don’ talk to me ’bout Cath’lics; dat is de doctrine fur dis chile; an’ ef a Cath’lic church comes in dis yer town I’s bound to gwine dar, ef I *war* borned a Methodis’. And den, Mass’ George, dat is the only white folks’ church what don’t make a diff’rence wid colored people; fur, after de Bishop England preach, I seed the sarvants myse’f gwine up to receibe de Sacrament ’long side ob der own missuses.’”

I did not think it worth while just then to tell him that with his doctrine of faith and good works in believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, being baptized as he commanded, and striving to love God and keep his commandments, he was an inconsistent Protestant, for I thought he could not understand it. But, as for myself, I saw my duty clearly enough. My talk with Tat gave me new light on the whole subject, and I saw plainly now, what I half suspected before, how there was a reasonable and plain system of religion as taught by the Catholic Church, which I could embrace without stultifying myself; which teaches that God loves man, and that man can love and please him; and therefore that no one is cut off from grace in this world, or lost in the next except by his own grievous fault; a religion in which, as I said to Aunt Mary, I might be a good Christian without calling myself in the same breath a bad man:

## THE CHURCH AND CHILDREN.

A CONVERSATION BETWEEN

MESSRS. BROWN AND GOOD, TWO PROTESTANTS, AND  
WHITE, A CATHOLIC.

*Brown.*—Well, neighbor, I have been revolving in my mind for some time an important question. Why is it we find so much opposition and dislike to religion all around us? The greater part of the people who attend church seem to stop there, and never go any farther. A large proportion never go to church at all. Many do not profess to believe in the Christian religion; they scoff and ridicule. Others speak of religious matters with an ill-concealed contempt and dislike. In short, it is unnecessary to particularize; for you, and every one else of any observation, know perfectly well the state of things I allude to.

*Good.*—Yes; there is no disguising the fact. How do you account for it?

*B.*—Various reasons may be assigned, but it seems to me one of the principal ones is, that the religious training of the young has been conducted on false principles, and has been calculated to induce an aversion and hatred to the Christian religion in the young mind, which shows its proper fruits in more mature age, and produces the very state of things I have spoken of.

*G.*—There is some truth in what you say, for I have experienced it myself. I had much distress on account of religion in my childhood. What was it in the religious training we received to produce this?

*B.*—I must first lay down the principles which, it seems to me, ought to be strictly adhered to, in the religious training of children, so that we may have a standard to go by, and be able to see in what respects our training differed from this standard, and was false. A child ought to be taught, as soon as he is able to understand, that God is good and a real Father to him. He ought to be persuaded that nothing but willful disobedience

on his own part, can separate him from the friendship of God. He ought to know, that when he has done wrong, he can be reconciled to God again, by a simple, heartfelt sorrow for his sin. There should be no mystery in these things which the child's mind can not take in at once. Thus he will learn to obey, from the motive of love and gratitude, and his religion will be his comfort as well as his guide, and the impression produced will remain with him as long as he lives.

*G.*—These principles commend themselves to me, as being, beyond all dispute, true and right.

*B.*—Now, let us examine the way in which children are actually trained among us. The child arrives at an age when he begins to understand. He is taught that there is a God who made him and all things; that this God rewards the good and punishes the wicked. Very well! A little later, as his intelligence unfolds, he begins to be taught the particular doctrines of religion. He learns a catechism. These catechisms may differ from one another, in the different denominations. But if they undertake to explain what religion really is, they involve questions which are not easily understood. Now, the explanation of these things is handed down in the denomination, and is in the words and actions of the grown-up people, and particularly in the preaching constantly delivered from the pulpit. The child listens to this preaching, and forms his religious notions from it principally; also, in less degree, from what he hears all around, as well as from his catechism. He hears of death and judgment, and of heaven and hell. His mind is filled with a desire for the one, and an intense fear of the other. He listens, to find out how the one is to be attained and the other avoided. The child picks up, so to speak, his religion in this way. The theological opinions which constitute the atmosphere around him are the ones which he must breathe in. His mind is formed upon them. He hears it constantly repeated that we are all by nature children of wrath and doomed to misery, and that we must escape this doom in some way. Instead of God being his Father, God is presented to his mind as a severe judge, and he as a sentenced criminal. It is a very injurious impression to start with. Then how he is to escape becomes the all-engrossing problem of his

mind. He listens with all his ears. He is told that it is in some way through Jesus Christ. It is by having faith in him. Now what is faith? To understand this is just his difficulty. He is told that it is an inward change wrought in him, by which he realizes that he is no longer under condemnation; that makes him confide without doubting, in a full pardon by Christ's merits; which fills him with such a joy and love of God, that all sorts of good works grow out of it as a matter of course. He thinks if I only had this faith, how happy I should be! but he experiences nothing of the kind, and is distressed at the want of it. He watches older persons, and sees them profess to become pious and experience this change. They profess to have found peace and satisfaction. His own anxiety is a clear proof to him that he is in the wrong way. He thinks it is of no use to try to be good; for without this faith all his works are represented to him as worthless and even sinful. The poor child is thrown into the utmost perplexity. He prays, but that does not bring him to faith. He is in agony for a while, then it wears off, and he becomes careless and reckless. Something renews the impression. Then comes another unavailing struggle and a deeper conviction of its uselessness. God is considered the author of the cruel suspense he finds himself in, and which he can see no way to get out of. The child begins to have an aversion to Him, and to hate religion. He is fitted by such a method of instruction to become an infidel; alas! too many have actually become embittered enemies of Christianity from this cause. The memory of the long years of agony he has passed through is, in after life, a standing proof to him of the falsity of religion. I think he is right in one thing: Such a religion can not be true, though I am glad to think that such is not the real religion of Christ.

*G.*—But then are there not some exceptions to your description? Do not some of the denominations teach their children in a different manner?

*B.*—There is no essential difference in the teaching of the most of them. Wherever it is held that we are born in sin and out of God's favor, and that the only way of recovering this favor, or to be justified, is through faith in Christ, and through faith alone, this teaching

must prevail. These are called the cardinal doctrines of the Reformation. "Without this doctrine of justification by faith alone," says Luther, "all knowledge of the truth will fall to the ground." The principal Protestant churches hold them, the Episcopal Church among the number. It is true the catechism of this church speaks of baptism, "Wherein we are made members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven," and the office for the baptism of infants speaks of the child "being regenerate," with more to the same effect: yet there is great dispute as to the meaning of such words; probably one half or more deny baptismal regeneration altogether, and of the others very few hold it as a living and practical reality. This church holds to "justification by faith only;" her Eleventh Article of Religion says, "Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine and full of comfort." Now if faith, and faith alone, is the cause of justification, or of passing from God's disfavor into favor, justification through baptism can not stand. The infant can not make an act of faith, and it must remain unregenerated or unjustified until it does. Children in this denomination are brought up in the same state of uncertainty and gloom as they are in the others. In the Sunday-school library of one of the chapels of Trinity Church, we found a volume of "Hymns for Children," containing the following lines, which illustrate the matter:

"Sin is the substance of each thought:  
Each word, each deed, with sin is fraught;  
Your little hearts are all unclean,  
And quite the dwelling-place of sin."

When are these children brought to the Bishop to be confirmed?

*G.*—Seldom or never till they are grown up.

*B.*—When does the church catechism direct them to be brought forward?

*G.*—So soon as they can repeat the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the rest of this church catechism.

*B.*—And how old must they be to do that?

*G.*—I should think at eight or nine they would be well able to do it.

*B.*—Well, you see then, the direction is a dead letter.



"Justification by faith alone" has given it its death-blow. They never come before they are fifteen or thereabout. With them as with the rest, children regard themselves as not really members of the church and in the way of salvation, and look forward to a time when they may become so. They are mere attendants and not full members of the church, according to their own opinion and that of the community. They talk of joining the church, which is a proof that they do not consider they belong to it already. This is a hateful and injurious religious training, say what you please.

*G.*—But if you condemn it, you must condemn the main principle of the Reformation, "justification by faith alone," from which as you have shown, these ideas naturally arise in children's minds.

*B.*—Well, I can not help it if I do. Our Saviour has said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Since these doctrines produce such a crop of bitter and poisonous fruit, I must condemn and abominate them with my whole heart. It was not a reformation, but a deformation which produced them, and all the misery which poor children have suffered from them. I have been brought up with strong prejudices against Roman Catholics; but prejudice is but a poor guide, and I feel inclined to give the Catholic Church a fair hearing. "Perhaps some good may come out of Nazareth," much as we despise it. My Catholic friend, how does your church proceed in teaching young people? Give me as short and as clear an account of it as you can.

*White.*—It gives me the greatest pleasure to answer your inquiries, and your candor encourages me that I shall give you complete satisfaction. In the first place, all Catholic children are baptized in early infancy. An exception is almost unheard of. And the reason is, that the church teaches that through original sin, or the sin of Adam, the human race is placed in a disability to enter the kingdom of heaven, and that through baptism this disability is completely removed. Every old woman knows this, and holds it as firmly as the Bishop himself. We believe, every one of us, that when the water of baptism is poured on the child's head, he is truly born not only "of water, but of the Holy Ghost;" that sanctifying grace is infused into his soul; and that

he becomes entitled, to call God his Father, and to the kingdom of heaven. We spread a pure white cloth over him at the time, to signify the state of his soul in the sight of God.

*B.*—That is very well to start with, as far as the individual child is concerned. But is it not making God unjust or unkind to other children, who do not receive baptism, to leave them in the anger or displeasure of God?

*W.*—No, nothing of the kind can be said if the doctrine of original sin is rightly understood. It creates a disability to see God in his essence and partake of the unspeakable happiness which arises from this, so to speak, participation with God; but we are not entitled to this from our nature—it is a gift of God's bounty. He can give it to me and not to another without injustice or unkindness. So long as he provides another happiness for the children who die without baptism, all that our reason demands is fully satisfied. Now, it is the general opinion in the church that such infants are happy. St. Thomas, the great Doctor of the church, says, "Though these infants are separated from God as to the union of glory, they are united to him by a participation of natural goods, and thus they will be able to enjoy him by natural knowledge and love."

*B.*—This is certainly a sufficient answer; for when God provides sufficiently for me, I can not complain if he chooses to do more for another. Go on.

*W.*—When the child is old enough, he is taught the doctrines of religion. He is taught about God; that God is goodness itself; that God created him to be happy forever; and that he is God's child even now, all disability having been removed in his baptism. He is further taught that he will remain God's child unless he himself turns away from God by his own sins. Moreover, that nothing is a sin except what is deliberately and willfully wrong, and that although all sin is evil and injurious, it is not every sin which breaks friendship with God, but only those of a deeper dye or graver character. He is taught that it is quite possible and even easy for him to avoid all grievous sins, if he is sincerely anxious to remain God's friend; for God will never fail to help him if he will only ask for help. The child is filled with

hope and confidence, and walks cheerfully in the way of virtue and obedience.

*B.*—But suppose the child yields to temptation and does something which his conscience tells him is very wrong, will not gloom and perplexity and despair rush in on his mind, and put him in the same condition that our Protestant children usually continue in, for so many long weary years?

*W.*—Not at all. We teach him in such a case to be sorry at once for his sin and sincerely ask forgiveness, for God is already ready and anxious to forgive him as soon as he is sorry. To make the matter sure, and to comply with an institution of Christ, he is taught to go to his spiritual father, the priest, and make a sincere confession, and that the priest, as the minister of Jesus Christ, has power to forgive him. For Christ has said, "Whosoever's sins you forgive they shall be forgiven to them, and whosoever's sins you retain they shall be retained." The child does so, and comes away with a joyful heart and new resolution to serve God better in future. This institution is admirable for all, but especially for children, for they especially need an external complete assurance of pardon, that they may cheer up and recover their confidence and innocent joy.

*B.*—Yes! and also as a corrective for vices and secret sins, which, if allowed to fester in concealment, might destroy them before they are aware of their danger.

*W.*—Very true! children being taught that the priest is in Christ's stead and that they are bound to confess to him every grievous sin, will open to their spiritual father wounds which they would conceal from every living mortal else, and thus be warned in time, and saved. Confession is not only the consolation, but the medicine of the soul, and a most efficient one at that.

*B.*—But may not, on the other hand, the innocent child learn the knowledge of evil, of which he knew not before, through this very means of confession?

*W.*—No! the confessor is bound to the utmost prudence and discretion. The wound must be manifest before it is probed. Questions not necessitated by the actual condition of the penitent are prohibited.

*B.*—Your answer is entirely satisfactory. Go on with your explanation.

*W.*—Children are taught to go regularly to confession as soon as they are old enough to know what sin is. They see no difference made between themselves and grown people. They are members of the church, and as much children of God as any one. There is nothing wanting to them if they are only sincerely disposed to be good. That is the only change of heart they ever need; as to faith they never doubt; it is not in them to doubt the truth they have been taught. They have faith all the time, and never give themselves any trouble on that score. *Do right* is their formula, and right well do the little things understand it.

*B.*—This is just as it should be. It is the right theory of the thing. Does it work well in actual practice?

*W.*—Excellently well. Catholic children love their religion, they like to come to church, they like to serve the priest in the sanctuary, they come to confession willingly, they love and respect the priests, and are most anxious to make their communion, which is permitted to them at about ten years of age.

*B.*—I should like to see it; it must be a beautiful sight.

*W.*—Nothing can be more affecting. To see perhaps a hundred little ones, in one of our city churches, coming forward to receive their first communion, all dressed in their best, the girls in white, with lighted candles, as a symbol of their faith, in their hands, walking two and two, so modestly and reverently—they look like little angels, and they are so, for when in later life will they ever so much resemble the angels in the purity and innocence of their hearts? No sight can be more affecting.

*B.*—Yes, our Saviour said of the little ones, "Suffer them to come unto me, and forbid them not." I am glad that in the Catholic Church they are not forbidden to receive the communion. Enough for the present. I am strongly impressed with what you have told me. The Catholic Church treats her little ones as the true church of Christ ought to treat them. It is a mark that she is divine, as she claims to be. I will examine honestly her claims, and if, as I suspect, they prove true, nothing shall hinder me from following my convictions.

## A VOICE IN THE NIGHT ;

OR,

## LESSONS OF THE SICK-ROOM.

---

I HAD been ill for months. My illness was accompanied with much pain. Under many severe paroxysms, I cried aloud and wept involuntarily. At times my courage failed, and, with sorrow and shame I say it, I murmured against the providence of God. Oh! those weary nights as I now recall them, each a long, long year! Time has since smoothed down their rough edges. I speak now of one night in particular. My nurse had left me at ten o'clock, wishing me what he really hoped, a good night's rest, although the rule had been the reverse. An hour's doze, an awakening, restlessness, pain, more pain, continuous pain hour after hour, this was the fulfillment of his fallacious hopes. As I lay tossing about those wearisome, lonely hours, thoughts came thronging in upon my mind, some from *below*, but more, thank God, from *above*. The night had advanced into those hours of perfect stillness—the burglar's hours—when, except from the street lamps, no light could be seen unless from the window of a sick-room like my own. The latest wagon had rattled its way over the stones, and all was still. "All things pass away, God only does not change;" and, true to the proverb, there came at last a lull to my pain, and, with the gratifying sense of rest to my poor body, there spread

over my soul a peaceful calm, accompanied with many most sweet and profitable reflections.

“Child of God!” for thus it seemed an interior voice addressed me, “why this impatience? and why these inconsiderate, unkind murmurings? You tire of these lonely hours of suffering, but will you refuse your rightful share of the heavy cross which I bore so cheerfully before you? You have not been so much alone as you fancy, for tender, sympathizing spirits have kept unremitting vigil at your bedside. Unseen they were it is true, but for a thoughtful, devout soul, more really companions than the nurse and friends of the daytime. Thy angel guardian has fanned thy feverish brow with his protecting wings, and it was he who whispered in thy ear the resignation, so many acts of which have been recorded in thy favor, against thy well-nigh involuntary complainings. She too, thy chosen patroness, the history of whose life, years ago, so completely won thy admiration, and whose example has quickened thy devotion ever since, moved at the sight of thy pain and tears, has been putting up before my throne many and earnest appeals in behalf of thee her adopted son. One day thou shalt know the number of graces which I sent thee for her sake. But with more interest still than either of these, and with a deeper love, I, thy God, have been with thee. I purposely brought thee to this seemingly pitiful condition that I might get a hearing from thee. The holy Scriptures say truly of me that I am ‘*a jealous God.*’ I had seen with impatience and alarm how deeply engrossed thy affections had become in creatures, and repeatedly I called out to thee; but ‘the world made such a noise in thy ears’ that my ‘still small voice’ could not be heard. At last illness has obtained an audience for me, and I make my appeal to thy filial heart. In the stillness of this night, lying helpless on thy bed of pain alone with me, nothing intrudes to break the charm and

power of my advances and admonitions. Ice will not form when the rough winds agitate the waters to and fro; but on a still night, at even a higher temperature, the chilled waters will quickly congeal and the morning sun will find its rays brilliantly reflected from a smooth hard surface, where, at its setting the evening before, it had but faintly seen its image in the troubled waves. Such a mirror I have long wished to form in thy heart, upon which my graces might sweetly fall, and from which in return thy love and gratitude might be reflected back to me. Believe me, my child, thou hast no true conception of the ardent longing which I have for the inseparable union of thy soul with myself. I made thee for myself, and perfect peace and rest thou canst never find until thou hast found them both in me. The blood-stained cross of Calvary tells thee how true is this love of mine; the altar with its sacrament of love renews perpetually before thee the assurance of it, unceasingly proclaiming that welcome of mine, "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy-laden, and I will refresh you." "

As the voice which had thus spoken to me died away, I was moved to tears at the thought that God should bestow such love and care on one who had been so faithless to him. My heart swelled with compunction, mingled with a peculiar joy such, as I am confident I had never experienced before. Are hours of loneliness and pain, I thought, the moderate price at which one can purchase such delight as this? and with this I bade them welcome, and earnestly too, for I meant it, although so short a time before I had prayed to be released from them.

Whilst I lay absorbed in the enjoyment of these thoughts, the same interior voice spoke again: "My child, the sick-room has yet another lesson; so listen again. It is no small advantage that I offer thee in the

opportunity of making amends to me for thy sins past. Look back over the years of thy life. Along their pathway lie strewn the remembrance of many grievous sins, repented of and forgiven, it may be, but for which no fitting reparation to me has ever been made. Moreover, no intelligence less than an angel's can count the numberless sins, which, without being grievous offenses against my Majesty, have yet been to me an ever-recurring source of displeasure; have stopped the course of my graces which I had destined for thee, and which would have contributed in thee, and through thee to others, to my greater glory. Would it be generous of thee, would it be just that thou shouldst accept the reward of the faithful servant, whereas thou hast been untrue to thy trust, even though by an unmerited act of condescension I had overlooked and forgiven thy misconduct? Shall my eagerness to forgive supplant thy sense of what is honorable and fair? 'No, Lord,' said Saint Augustine to me, 'my sin shall not go unpunished. I know His justice whose mercy I seek; it shall not go unpunished. But therefore do I seek that thou punish me not because I punish my own sin. Therefore do I ask thee to forget because I forget not.' Now in the suffering of these months past I have afforded thee the means of forestalling the rigor of my judgments, when the days of mercy and probation shall be over. What if then, when, as thou thinkest, thou art about to repose eternally on the bosom of thy God, what if an angel's sword, such as kept the garden of Eden, should flash before thee, warning thee back from ground where '*nothing that is defiled can enter!*' What if, thy soul now untrammelled by any affection to things of earth, panting like the hart for the waters which flow '*from the fountains of the Saviour,*' thou be suffered to parch with a supernatural thirst, that so the ravages of irregular and unholy desires indulged in during life may be atoned for!



Dost thou not remember the severity of that penalty which I exacted of Moses, the leader of my people in their journey of forty years through the wilderness?—that faithful son among his faithless brethren! Look at the old man as he stands upon the summit of the mountain overlooking the promised land, the land represented as *‘flowing with milk and honey.’* Its fair fields lie beneath and before him, which his eye indeed sees, but which his feet shall never tread. Never! why, how is this? Has it not been his special work to lead his people there? Was it not for this that God made him successful in breaking the Egyptian yoke which lay so heavily upon the neck of his people? Was it not for this that he opened for them a way of escape through the dividing waters of the Red Sea? Was it not he who alone was able to still their rebellious outbreaks, matchless in their frequency and violence? Now he has brought this headstrong race to the long-wished-for goal of his and their hopes, and shall he after all be excluded? Surely his must have been some extraordinary offense! No, you are wrong. His sin was only a lack of patience and confidence in me; and I willed that he should be an example to those who had done worse, that my judgments are sure even though they be delayed. This it was for which I pronounced upon him the sentence: *‘Because you trespassed against me in the midst of the children of Israel at the waters of contradiction, thou shalt die in the mountain . . . Thou shalt see the land before thee; but thou shalt not enter it.’* Hard-seeming, heart-breaking sentence! For this is he taken as a type of a soul in Purgatory—heaven in sight, but entrance to it denied for a time, in punishment for past sins.” With this there came into my mind the thought of the holiness of God; the outrage upon his honor which sin is, and the severity of that reparation which should be of right exacted, to be at all adequate; and I said, “O pains of

illness! so distressing up till now, how calmly I can face you! In view of the penalties from which it frees me, penance now wears the face of a friend. I understand now that eagerness with which the saints embraced it through a long lifetime. I appreciate now Saint Jerome's praises of Saint Paul the Hermit. 'You,' he said, 'who possess so much that you can not keep count of it; whose palaces are of marble; who have in one necklace of diamonds and pearls the value of many estates; I ask you what want had this old man, who had none of this world's goods? You drink from goblets set with precious stones, he from the hollow of his hand. You dress in garments trimmed with gold; he is clad poorer than the meanest of your slaves. Heaven has opened to this poor man, and your magnificence will not save you from being cast into hell. Poorly clad as he was, he kept his baptismal robe pure; while you with your rich clothing have lost it. What will it avail you to bury your bodies in silk and gold? and why cherish your vanity in a land of sighs and tears?' Whoever you may chance to be who read this, remember, I pray thee, the sinner Jerome, who would love better, if God gave him the choice, the poor tunic of Paul with his merits, than the purple of kings with their power.'" How changed the remembrance of my illness had become in a single night! I had found courage to wish for more opportunities of suffering. I felt ashamed of my past cowardice, and I said with a full heart, "Try me once again, O my God! and pardon my childish fears." In a measure only, but yet with truth, I could say with Saint Paul, "I can do all things in Him who strengthens me."

Rocked to sleep by the sweet consolation of these interior communications, I awoke to find the bright sun of a frosty winter morning breaking its way through my curtains, while my nurse was standing by my side ready to assist me in making my toilet for the day. I really

believe I was extremely good-natured that morning, and in spite of my want of sleep, bright and cheerful. That night and morning are now among the things that were long ago, but never can the impression then made be effaced from my memory. Alas! however, how frail is poor, fallen human nature. Its willfulness is deep-seated, and can not be rooted out but by a long process of self-denial and mortification, the reverse of that by which it has been acquired. The lessons taught me that night are still most imperfectly learnt; but many is the time I have thanked God for that illness, as being among the most precious of His gifts to me. I learned more in those few hours than in all my life before, of my own helplessness; of the vanity of all earthly things in comparison with the things of heaven; of the value of solitude, of silence, and of suffering, as so many helps to bring my soul into closer union with God. I learned how suffering makes the soul a willing and profitable listener to the penalties of sin, and teaches it as nothing else usually does at how great a cost of pain a little pleasure is purchased. I had numerous and devoted friends; my heart was warm, and I clung fondly to them: but I had now found a friend who had won the first place in my affections. "*Taste, and see how sweet the Lord is!*" is the invitation of Holy Scripture, and I had found how truly he is so. To become completely his by an unreserved offering of myself to his service, to spend my strength in helping to spread the true Faith, to fan the flame of interior devotion in my own heart, that others more cold than myself might be attracted to a holy life by my example, then became the one idea for which I cared to live, and in doing which I hoped to be found at my death.

Christian sufferer! whom I suppose to be holding this little Tract in your feeble hand, or who it may be art listening with painful effort as some kind soul at thy

bedside is reading it to you, I sincerely pray that the experience which I have related to you may become your own. The hope that this may be so, has made the writing of this little Tract a pleasant task, and with this hope I send it on its unknown way, remembering how the Scriptures say, "*Cast thy bread upon the running waters: for after a long time thou shalt find it again.*"

---

"ON a joyful Easter-day, Henry Suso, being in very blithesome mood, and sitting for a short time, according to his custom, in the repose of contemplation, desired earnestly to hear from God what meed of delights they shall receive from him in this life who have borne manifold sufferings for his sake. Whereupon, being wrapt in ecstacy, a light shone into his soul from God to this effect: Let all who suffer with detachment rejoice, for their patience shall be gloriously rewarded; and as they have been here below an object of pity to many, even so shall many rejoice eternally at the deserved praise and everlasting honor which shall be theirs. . . . Three special gifts I will give them, so precious that no one can reckon up their value. First, I will give absolute power to their wishes in heaven and on earth, so that whatever they wish shall come to pass. Secondly, I will give them my divine peace, which neither angel, nor devil, nor man, nor any other creature can take away from them. Thirdly, I will so inwardly kiss them through and through, and so lovingly embrace them, that I in them and they in me, and we together, shall abide eternally, one undivided unity forever. And since long waiting and praying are painful to restless hearts, this love shall not be withheld from them during this short present hour of life which lasts but for a moment, but it shall begin even now, and be enjoyed eternally, so far as man's mortal nature can in each case more or less support it."

## THE GOSPEL CHURCH.

---

AMONG the variety of opinions that prevail about the Catholic Church, one of the most charitable, and perhaps the most common is, that, be it good or bad as a religious system, at all events it is not the church of the New Testament. On this ground men affect to ignore it, and feel it their duty to oppose it. This tradition, the growth of a few generations, has no foundation in either the letter or the spirit of the Gospel. I am in hope of being able to prove the truth of my declaration by what follows. I shall give three principles peculiar to the teaching of the Catholic Church, and by these test her claim to being the church of the Gospel.

First, *She claims the right to speak with authority, and declares that every one without exception is bound to listen to, and obey her teaching.* In conformity with this, she denies that religion is just what one may chance to think it; but maintains, on the contrary, that it is just what God made it. She upholds the principle of authority as the guardian and teacher of this revelation, and maintains that faith and obedience are the true tests of love, and the only sure ground for hope. Thus, she delivers a body of revealed doctrine to be embraced, because it is true, as coming from God; and prescribes a rule of conduct to be followed, involving self-denial and the control of the passions, which she declares to be God's way of training the soul for heaven. She contends, in fine, that this principle is the only one which is in harmony with the idea of faith, without which, says the holy Scripture, "it is impossi-

ble to please God." Let us see how far the New Testament will support her in this. I give first the testimony of St. Paul. He thus describes the process by which we are able to make an act of faith. "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." "How then," he asks, "shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how can they preach unless they be sent? As it is written: How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, of them that bring glad tidings of good things!"\* The conclusion which St. Paul draws from his argument, is this: "Faith then cometh by hearing: and hearing by the word of Christ." In other words, St. Paul declares that if you would hope to be saved, you must pray. To pray aright, you must believe aright; to believe aright, you must be taught aright; to teach aright, one must be divinely commissioned, as Christ himself was, of whom it is written, "God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting."† Thus St. Paul has reasoned out, and insists upon the principle of faith, which he makes identical with the one for which I am contending.

St. John, too, confirms it with his testimony; and he is as little likely as any of the New Testament writers to give an unnecessarily harsh judgment, since he is eminently the apostle of love. He says, "Whosoever secedeth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God: he that continueth in the doctrine, hath both the Father and the Son. If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house, nor say to him: God save you."‡ Strong language this, in any one's mouth, but doubly strong in the

\* Romans 10: 13-15.

† John 3: 16.

‡ 2 John 9, 10.

moul. of this gentle-hearted Apostle! I am at a loss to know what those whose religion is purely of the heart, to the disparagement of the intellect, can make of such passages as this from the writings of their ideal teacher and patron. You hear it often said in regard to religious discussions, "After all it's only two ways of looking at the same thing; and if one is only sincere, it will make little difference here or hereafter." In plain language the meaning of this is, "There is no creed in heaven, why should there be any upon earth?"

"The toilsome journey of life was done;  
 And all who in Christ the Saviour died  
 Came out alike on the other side.  
 No forms or crosses or books had they;  
 No gowns of silk or suits of gray;  
 No creeds to guide them or MSS;  
 For all had put on Christ's righteousness."

No creed in heaven! how monstrous! Is it not true in heaven that there is one God, and but one? That in that one God there are three distinct Persons? That the Son, the second Person, became man in the womb of the Virgin Mary? That he died for our sins upon the cross? Are not the resurrection from the dead, and life everlasting, such truths as there is no freedom for saint or angel to deny? And if so, is there not then a definite creed in heaven? Sentiment is a fine thing in its place, but truth, not sentiment, is the food of the soul. St. James says, "If a brother or sister be naked, and want daily food, and one of you say to them: Go in peace, be you warmed and filled; yet give them not those things which are necessary for the body, what shall it profit?" As then the body will starve on sympathy, so the soul will starve on the emptiness of sentiment.

Again St. Paul says, "Though we, or an angel of God,

preach to you any other gospel than that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.”\*

Lastly our Lord himself says, “As the Father hath sent me, so I send you. Preach the gospel to every creature. Whosoever heareth you heareth me, and whosoever despiseth you despiseth me; whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but whosoever believeth not shall be condemned. In vain do they worship me, teaching doctrine and commandments of men.”

This is not the connection in which these passages actually stand, but I feel sure that no fair-minded person will say that it is not legitimate to bring them together, as the idea in each is the same. Again the Gospel says, “And it came to pass when Jesus had fully ended these words, the people were in admiration at his doctrine, for he was teaching them as one having authority, and not as their Scribes and Pharisees.”† Now, connect with this passage the words I have already quoted, “As the Father hath sent me so I send you.” As it is plainly contrary to the justice of God, that such severe denunciations as the above passages contain should be made by his authority for the violation of that, in reference to which there is liberty of choice, therefore I consider my point proved; namely, that the Catholic Church in her claim to teach with authority, and to exact obedience, is supported both by the letter and spirit of the teaching of Christ and his Apostles.

A second principle which is characteristic of the Catholic Church is this: *Divine power is ordinarily transmitted through the medium of material things, with a certain ceremonial.* In other words, the Catholic religion is a sacramental, and a ceremonial religion. Now what is meant by a sacrament? By a sacrament is meant some outward ceremony to which our Lord by promise has attached a secret, definite, divine power.

\* Gal. 1: 8.

† Matt. 7: 28, 29.



If we may venture to ascribe a motive for his having willed to impart his graces in this, rather than in another way, we say it was in order to teach us humility, through the practice of faith and obedience. These two virtues, I have already said, are the surest tests both of our love of God, and of our hope in him; and at the same time, the most destructive of the greatest obstacle to the union of our souls with God; namely, self-love.

Accordingly, the Catholic Church teaches that an authorized ministry, with a legitimate form of words, and the use of water, can wash away the disgrace of the Fall from a soul, restore it to perfect beauty and sanctity, and make it a child of God, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven.

She maintains that, under similar circumstances, she can change the substance of bread and wine into the body and blood of the living Jesus, the accidents or appearances of bread and wine remaining unchanged. She teaches that as the body is nourished by food, so really is the soul made strong in virtue and holiness by the sacramental presence of Jesus Christ.

She teaches again, that by still another form of words, with a like authority, oil will effect what neither water nor wine can; namely, impart to the soul a suppleness and activity, such as shall enable it to elude the grasp of the devil in its last struggle with him at the hour of death; as the putting of oil upon their bodies enabled the combatants in the Roman amphitheatre to slip away from one another in their public wrestling matches.

She claims, moreover, by the laying on of hands of this same authority, to be able instantaneously to invest a man with more dignity than the longest line of royal ancestry can do, and with more power than a monarch's unlimited rule. This twofold power of forgiving sins and consecrating the Holy Eucharist, as completely distinguishes a priest among men, as the

Mother of God was distinguished among women in being at once Virgin and Mother. Now, are these, and similar claims, audacious forgeries upon the revelation of God, and unblushing assumptions of fancied power? If Luther's doctrine of justification by faith *alone* be true, then they are such. Let us see.

Our Lord said to Nicodemus, "You must be born again."\* You must be re-formed, re-modeled—taken to pieces and put together again, as it were. This complete change must take place in you before you can see heaven. "Except a man be born of water, and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter the kingdom of God."† Both are necessary. Water is declared to be the medium through which the Holy Spirit communicates himself to the soul. To show us what is effected by this sacrament, our Lord was pleased to be baptized himself; on which occasion we read, "And behold the heavens were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, and coming upon him, and behold a voice from heaven saying, This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased." Does the Catholic Church then claim any thing more in the case of the baptism of each one of her children than Christ has led her to expect, in having been pleased to reveal these phenomena at his own baptism, which illustrate so accurately and so beautifully the effects which she ascribes to this sacrament?

We come now to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. Our Lord feeds five thousand people with five loaves of bread. In connection with this miracle of his, he refers to the manna, "the bread of angels," with which he had fed the children of Israel on their way to the Promised Land. But as if referring to both, only in order to disparage their excellence in favor of another bread more miraculous than either, he says,

\* John 3: 3.

† John 3: 5.

“Moses gave you not bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.” “I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever, and the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, the same shall live by me.”\* Some of his disciples are scandalized, and say, “How can this man give us his flesh to eat?” and they leave him. Time passes; it is the eve of his death. The Master and his disciples have kept the feast of unleavened bread, true to the requirements of the Jewish law, when our Lord takes water and a towel and begins to wash their feet. St. Peter is distressed at this act of humility, and protests, “Lord thou shalt never wash my feet.” Our Lord replies: “If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.”† St. Peter, in alarm, and, in the fervor of his devotion, exclaims, “Lord, not my feet alone, but my hands and my head.” How the Apostles must have wondered as Jesus went the round of their little company! What can this mean? they must have thought, as they exchanged looks with one another. Now he has finished his humiliating task, and he returns once more to the table. He takes up bread in his hands, and as I think we may fairly conjecture, reminds them of what had passed; saying, “Do you remember the day I multiplied the loaves of bread, and how I said to you, ‘I am the living bread, which if a man eat he shall live forever;’ the day that your companions, my disciples, left me, because I said this? You said rightly, ‘Thou hast the words of eternal life,’ and on this assurance you stayed with me. Here, then, is the reward of your faith and of your fidelity. ‘This is my body; take and eat.’ ‘This is my blood; drink ye all of this.’‡ This is my parting legacy. I am going from

\* John 6.

† John 13.

‡ Matt. 26: 26, 27.

amongst you. Do not forget me who have loved you so well. To-morrow I give my life for yours. 'He is at hand who shall betray me.' 'Do this in remembrance of me.'" A lady now living, at the time a Protestant, hearing it said that the sixth chapter of St. John was strongly corroborative of the Catholic doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood, sat down one evening beside her maid, and taking her Protestant Bible on her lap, said, "Dolly, I am going to read to you the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John. The Catholics say that it teaches their doctrine of Transubstantiation, by which is meant the changing of bread and wine into the Saviour's body and blood." She accordingly read it through, and was much struck with the force of the wording of it. "Dolly," said she, "I am puzzled, I shall read it over again." When she had finished she shut up the Bible, and turning to her maid said, "Dolly, I never will say a word against this belief of Catholics as long as I live." It was not long after this that she became a Catholic.

The letter of the New Testament is equally plain as to the sacrament of Extreme Unction. Indeed, it is so clearly an ordinance of the newly established Christian church, that St. James speaks of it as if he were only reminding those to whom he was writing of what they already knew. "Is any man sick among you? let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." This is exactly what is done in administering this sacrament in the Catholic Church. As the priest anoints each one of the sick person's senses, he prays, and instructs both the sick man, and those who kneel around, to pray that "by this holy ointment, and by his sweet mercy, the Lord will be indulgent to the sick man on account of whatever sins he may have committed by his eyes, his ears, his mouth, his hands,

etc." Has this ordinance of the early Christian church ever been abrogated? Since clearly it never has been, how is it that its practice is confined to the Catholic Church alone?

We come now, last of all, to the ordinance of "the laying on of hands." In the ordinations performed immediately by our blessed Lord, there was no necessity for this formality. It was enough for him to say, "Thou art Peter . . . to thee do I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven."\* Or, again, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you do forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins ye do retain, they are retained."† Or, once more still, "Do this in remembrance of me." Take bread and wine, and repeat my own words, "This is my body," "This is my blood." My word of command is your power of execution. But for the better ordering of the Christian society, as we have said, it was fitting that a definite ceremony should be created. Accordingly, when the Apostles proceeded to their first ordination of successors to themselves, they chose out men "of a good reputation, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," who being placed in their midst, "praying, they laid their hands on them."‡ On a later occasion in Samaria, when the Apostles had conferred the sacrament of Confirmation, the impious Simon Magus, "seeing that by the imposition of hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also power, that upon whomsoever I shall lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost."§ Tell me, candid reader, have I, or have I not, proved my second point?

It is characteristic of the Catholic Church in the third place, "*that she encourages in her children the highest standard of self-denial and mortification, as a necessary means of uniting the soul most closely to God.*"

Her celibate priesthood stands before the world in proof of this. Her convents and monasteries rise from among the roofs of every considerable town in Christendom, and adorn and sanctify many a hill-top and mountain slope the wide world over. In these sacred retreats,

\* Matt. 16 : 18, 19.

† John 20 : 22, 23.  
§ Acts 8 : 18, 19.

‡ Acts 6 : 6.

communities of men and women find their highest happiness in the practice of the three exalted virtues of chastity, poverty, and obedience.

To the same end the Catholic Church promulgates her laws of fasting on but one meal a day; and abstinence on given days from the use of flesh meat.

For this she has constructed her science of interior and exterior mortification, called Mystical Theology; by means of which self-love and creatures are deposed from their usurped thrones upon the human heart, and Jesus Christ, its rightful sovereign, is set up in their place. For this third characteristic, perhaps more than for either of the other two, is the Catholic Church disliked and frowned upon. Let us see whether, consistently, the infant church of Christ ought not to share her disfavor.

With regard to chastity, St. Paul says, "Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give counsel as having obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful. I would have you to be without solicitude. . . . He that is with a wife is solicitous for the things of the world how he may please his wife, and he is divided; and the unmarried woman, and the virgin, thinketh on the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit. . . . Therefore he that giveth his virgin in marriage doth well, and he that giveth her not doth better."\* It is on this ground, taken by St. Paul, namely, that a married person's affections are ordinarily and properly *divided*, that the Catholic Church grounds the greater perfection of celibacy as a state of life; while, at the same time, she does not deny the possibility of perfection of the highest kind to individuals in the married state, of whom she exhibits many illustrious examples, as for instance, St. Louis of France, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, and others. It is this undivided devotion to the cause of holiness, which has made the Catholic missionary the sole converter of the nations; which has raised the Sister of Charity to that point of reverence and honor, which even the unbelieving world cheerfully accords to her; and which assures the community in which pestilence in its most malignant form may have broken out, that the Catholic priest shall surely be

\* 1 Cor. 7: 28, 33, 34, 38.

found at his post to give the last sacraments to the dying at the risk of his life.

But let me confirm the disciple's words by the Master's. St. Paul's by our Lord's. He had been denouncing divorce and adultery by subsequent marriage of the divorced person, when the people said to him, "If the case with a man and his wife be so, it is not good to marry." To this he replied, "All receive not this word, but they to whom it is given. He that can receive it, let him receive it."\* What is this but saying that virginity is a gift whose excellence is so great, that like all great gifts it is rare; and few have sufficient zeal for the honor of God, and for their personal perfection, or sufficient courage and spirit of self-sacrifice to accept the mortification which it involves? Moreover, our Lord himself, his blessed Mother, his reputed father, the husband of the Virgin Mary, St. John the Baptist, and St. John the Evangelist, each enroll their names on the side of virginity.

What shall I say of poverty? Can one practise it more perfectly than when he freely chooses a rude cattle-shed open to the rough winds of winter as his birth-place, with straw his only bed and covering? when, in after years, he can say truly of himself, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head"? when at his death his executioners cast lots for the one poor piece of clothing he had worn? His example is the interpretation of his advice to the young man who was seeking how to lead a perfect life: "If thou wouldst be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and come, follow me."† This is, in fact, what the Apostles did, for they say, "Lord we have left *all things* and have followed thee." This complete renunciation, under certain circumstances, is binding even now, for our Lord says, "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother, and wife and children, and brothers and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple."‡

With regard to the law of abstinence from flesh meat, and fasting upon one meal a day, some may think it an idle practice; but let him say why Moses fasted forty days and forty nights before promulgating the Ten Com-

\* Matt. 19: 10, 11.

† Matt. 19: 21.

‡ Luke 14: 26.

mandments? Let him explain, too, why the prophet Elias did the same, and that under the guidance of an angel? Let him say, again, why St. John the Baptist kept a fast of thirty years in solitude in preparation for his short public life as the forerunner of Christ. But more than all, let him tell us why the all-holy Son of God himself, "was led by the Spirit into the desert for the space of forty days . . . and did eat nothing in those days." If there be no virtue in fasting, why should our Lord tell his Apostles that one species of devil could not be cast out "but by prayer and fasting"??\*

To give up what one has, or might have, is little in comparison with giving up what one is. In reference, therefore, to the virtue of obedience, our Lord's hidden life for thirty years at Nazareth, during which, as the Gospel says, "he was subject to them," namely, to the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph, is sufficient to account for the fact that the church encourages her children to follow our Lord's footsteps along this way of perfection also.

My task is now done. I have shown that in three respects, in which the Catholic Church differs from all forms of Protesantism, her teaching and practice coincide with those of the New Testament. I have left a far larger number of points untouched, which are equally distinctive, and as clearly capable of proof.

Reader, are you not a Catholic? The Bible is professedly your only guide, and yet the New Testament portion of it, by my showing, confirms Catholic, in opposition to Protestant, teaching and discipline. Is it not true that this fact has a serious bearing upon your intelligence and conscience? The knowledge of truth necessarily involves the obligation of embracing it. On what ground can you consistently refuse to do so?

\* Mark 9: 28.



## WHO IS JESUS CHRIST?



ONE Monday morning Mr. Mayflower was sitting in the cosy private office of his counting-house, absorbed in deep thought. A certain literary air was given to the room by the presence of a number of books and periodicals of a more intellectual sort than are usually found in the private cabinets of our merchant princes. The countenance and bearing of the man himself, also, betokened that, although his energies were chiefly employed in the direction of his commercial affairs, he still had time and inclination for the higher pursuits of the mind. Descended from an ancient Puritan family of Boston, he had been well educated in his youth, and had engaged in business for the sake of acquiring wealth, in order that he might provide himself and his family with the means of indulging all the most refined intellectual tastes to the utmost, and that he might be able to promote the schemes of general philanthropy in which he was interested. He was addicted to the so-called Liberal school of theology, and one of the principal members of the select congregation of the Rev. Mr. Mythic.

On this particular Monday morning he was thinking over the sermon of the preceding day with a great deal

of misgiving and dissatisfaction, and imagining what the old pastor of his boyish days would say about it if he were still alive. Just then a familiar step and tap were heard at his door, and in walked another portly, middle-aged gentleman, with a very wealthy creak to his shoes, who was his old and bosom friend from boy hood, Mr. Oldcastle.

As this gentleman's visits were of frequent occurrence, and the two friends always dropped very speedily into some serious discussion, we will waive all ceremony, and begin at once with the conversation of this morning, which naturally turned upon the subject Mr. Mayflower was thinking about as Mr. Oldcastle tapped on his office door.

*Mr. M.* We had a very singular sermon yesterday, or rather, I should say, a very singular series of sermons came to their climax yesterday, not greatly to my satisfaction.

*Mr. O.* Let us know what particular article of faith was destroyed yesterday, to clear the ground for the Church of the Future, in which, no doubt, you will be a shining light!

*Mr. M.* You are satirical. But, this time, I think you have good reason to be so. Our pastor is certainly a clever man and an ingenious reasoner, and I have hitherto taken pleasure in following his arguments, without much thought of the direction their drift was taking. But yesterday I seemed to catch a sight of the breakers upon which all that I have venerated as true Christianity is to be dashed in pieces. His topic was the character and mission of Christ, and, upon my word, he seemed to leave but little of either remaining. If I were to adopt his views, I should regard the gospels as no better than Lemprière's Classical Dictionary. A droll sensation came over me of the absurdity of our pastor's position, and of all our doings in the congrega-

tion. Here is a man, standing up in a pulpit, calling himself a Christian minister, reading the Bible, offering prayers, giving out hymns, taking a text, and preaching a sermon, according to the outward forms which have come down from our Puritan ancestors, and the doctrine itself of the sermon is not one tenth part as Christian as the lectures of old Socrates and Plato. Cicero is an orthodox divine to him, and if either one of these old pagans were alive, I would propose to build a marble church for him in the Fifth Avenue, and start a new congregation.

*Mr. O.* Well done, son of the pilgrims! The latent orthodoxy in your blood is stirring at last. I am both astonished and delighted to hear such a staunch Unitarian as you talking in this strain. I think you have experienced a change!

*Mr. M.* It is precisely because I am a true, old-fashioned Unitarian that I talk as I do. I am sure that Dr. Channing, Dr. Ware, and all our old divines would agree with me, if they were alive. Last night I felt so miserable at the thought of getting mythicized and *Renanized* in my old age, leaving all the faith I learned from my good mother and turning pagan, that I could only quiet myself by reading the New Testament for two hours,\* after which I said my prayers more fervently than I had done for years, and went to sleep thinking of these words I had just read, "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Hang this mythical sophistry! The gospels are true after all, and I will never cease believing that Jesus Christ is just what he says he is himself, for he spoke the truth if ever man did.

*Mr. O.* A very sensible conclusion! But let me ask, What do you think the gospels really teach about the character and mission of Jesus Christ?

\*This is a real incident, related to the writer by an esteemed friend, who is a Unitarian minister.

*Mr. M.* Why, that he was a perfectly holy man, and the greatest of all the inspired prophets of God, who gave mankind a perfect example and a perfect doctrine, which he sealed with the blood of martyrdom. The humanity of Jesus Christ appears to me so plainly set forth in the New Testament that I wonder how any reflecting person can question it. Pray tell me why it is that you believe that Jesus Christ had a divine and not a human nature ?

*Mr. O.* With your permission I will postpone answering that question for a while. I am very anxious to hear from you a full explanation of your own views; afterward I have no objection to explain mine if you desire it. Will you please give me some conclusive reasons from the Scripture for your belief that Jesus Christ was a man, with a human nature like ours ?

*Mr. M.* What is a man ? and what is human nature ? A man, I suppose, is an individual of the human race, whose first progenitors were created by God, and which has been continued by generation from them. Human nature is that which is common to all the individuals of the race, and makes them one genus. The most essential parts of human nature are soul and body. Therefore we say that man is a creature composed of soul and body. Now, if Jesus Christ was descended from Adam and Eve, and inherited from them a nature composed of soul and body, he had a human nature, that is, he was a man. Am I right ?

*Mr. O.* Perfectly so.

*Mr. M.* Now, Jesus Christ was born of Mary, and the Evangelist himself traces his genealogy through the kings and patriarchs to Adam. He had a human body which was nurtured and grew to maturity, which was capable of suffering and subject to death. He had a soul also, for the human body is not a body without the soul, which is its form or vivifying, animating principle,

giving it life, form, and sensibility. This soul could not have been the divine nature dwelling in a material form, for the divine nature cannot suffer; and so, if the soul of Jesus Christ was not a real human soul, his human acts and sufferings would have been all phantastic, mere appearances. Moreover, the gospel tells us that he "grew in wisdom and in favor with God and men," and that he complained, "My *soul* is sorrowful, even unto death." Have you any objection to make, and do you require me to give more proofs that Jesus Christ had a real human soul and body ?

*Mr. O.* I am perfectly satisfied with what you have said. It is evident that Jesus Christ was really and truly a man. Will you now give me your reasons for believing that he was a prophet, divinely inspired, and having an immediate divine mission from heaven? If he was a man, like one of us, why is it not reasonable to suppose that he founded his religion by the mere natural force of genius, wisdom, and moral excellence ?

*Mr. M.* For two reasons. First, because the creation of such a work as Christianity is altogether above the power of human genius. And second, because, apart from supernatural gifts, Jesus Christ was not placed in those circumstances which are necessary to call out genius and to concur with it for producing great effects in a natural way.

The greatest geniuses of the world have failed to find that form of divine truth which is at once complete and universal. You know very well that the only ancient philosophers worth mentioning are the Greeks and the Hindoos. Now, what an imperfect, unsatisfactory system is that of Plato, with his eternal matter out of which God formed both souls and bodies; and that of Aristotle, in which God and the universe have each independent, self-existing being! How little were those wonderful men, Socrates and Plato, able to accomplish,

in the way of promoting elevated views and high moral principles. As to the Hindoos, they never rose above Pantheism, and their social system was a grinding, merciless tyranny. Religious and moral institutions, before Christ, were never propagated except as they spread with the growth of particular nations into whose polity they were interwoven. Even Judaism, superior as it was to all religions and philosophies of the world, was barren of all results, so far as the rest of mankind were concerned.

Now, Jesus Christ has broken down all these barriers, surmounted all these difficulties, and regenerated mankind. He was born and bred in seclusion from all the means of acquiring learning or philosophy, or studying the laws and politics of the great nations. He did not teach a philosophy, or propose any new political doctrine. He did not and could not set on foot any system of human, natural means, by which his ideas should be propagated and become dominant in the world. Studying his life, character, and doctrine, apart from its connection with a system of supernatural revelation and providence, whose messenger he was, I find no adequate cause whatever for the effect he has produced in the world. And such an effect! He has given, in his pure, perfect doctrine of the One God in his relation to the created universe, to Greek philosophy the solution of all its vexing problems, and has made that philosophy do homage to the creed of the children of Israel, henceforth to serve it as a handmaid. He has given to the Roman empire a law which has overmastered her imperial jurisprudence, and turned her world-conquering power into an instrument for the universal diffusion of the traditions preserved in the institutions of Moses. This combination of all the forces contained in the Jewish, Greek, and Roman civilization into one doctrinal and moral code, could not have been the work of mere human genius. It comes from the same hand which created the human race, and assigned each portion of it its special task in the grand plan of human regeneration. Prophecy foretold it, a long series of miraculous events prepared the way for it. Jesus Christ was the last and greatest of a series of prophets. He claimed to be a prophet, his entire religion was based on the belief that he was a prophet. It is impossible to vindicate his

character as a truly great and good man, without maintaining his prophetic character. If he was not a prophet, Socrates was far superior to him. Yet, the world, that is, the true *élite* of the race, the portion of mankind which has carried on the work of intellectual and moral progress, has venerated him as the Ideal Man. The power of that idea of Jesus Christ which has been stamped upon Christendom has regenerated mankind. Either it is a true idea, or mankind has been regenerated by an illusion, a myth, and all the future hopes of the race depend on the perpetuity of the illusion. That is more than I can believe. Of all credulous mortals in this world, commend me to your Colensos, Renans, and other mythics, who believe in effects which have no efficient causes.

*Mr. O.* I can not express how much I am delighted with your reasoning on this subject. It is not altogether new to me, it is true, but it strikes my mind with a new force, as you represent it. Christendom is the great miracle which proves the divine mission of Jesus Christ. It is a work above the order of created and secondary causes. It is supernatural. The idea which really constitutes Christianity must be looked for in the mind of Christendom, and must have been first in the mind of Jesus Christ himself. This idea must be the truth, for it could not regenerate mankind unless it came from the same God who created mankind. We are to look, then, in the mind of Christendom for the true idea of Jesus Christ, and then to trace this idea to its source in the original himself as he presents himself to us in the gospels. In few words, whatever Jesus Christ affirms himself to be, or is declared to be in the gospels, and is universally believed to be through faith in this original word, that he really is.

*Mr. M.* Yes, I can assent to that statement, as I interpret the words. I suspect you will try to slide in something I can not accept, under that last clause of universal belief, and endeavor to trace some of your orthodox, metaphysical abstractions, or the exaggerations of popular theology, to a forced, irrational explanation of some of the texts of the New Testament. But I think I am a match for you there.

*Mr. O.* Doubtless! I know you too well to think that sophistry or logical artifices of any kind can with-

stand the hard blows of your common sense. I will not pretend to establish any thing which is not contained in clear, distinct statements of Jesus Christ himself and the Evangelists. You admit that whatever is clearly affirmed respecting Jesus Christ there, must be true ?

*Mr. M.* Of course ! Is not that what I proved myself ? Did I not prove to your satisfaction that Jesus Christ is a true man, and a prophet of God ? You have admitted this, in a most frank and sensible manner. You can not, then, prove any thing contrary to it. The true humanity of Jesus Christ being admitted, together with the doctrine of the unity of God, I have my fundamental Unitarian creed secured. You can not differ from me essentially in idea, whatever strange, old-fashioned words you may use. In fact, there is no controversy between us, since you have acknowledged so candidly that the nature of Jesus Christ is a real human nature.

*Mr. O.* I beg pardon, my friend. You have overlooked one essential point. You have proved that Jesus Christ has a human nature, but you have forgotten to prove that he has not also a divine nature. Your whole argument was superfluous so far as I am concerned, for all the orthodox have always believed in the true humanity of Christ and in his prophetic office. But we affirm his divinity also. He is really and truly man, but he is also really and truly God.

*Mr. M.* How can a human nature, composed of soul and body, created, and finite, be *also* a divine nature, simple, uncreated, infinite ?

*Mr. O.* It can not be ; no orthodox theologian ever said it could. But a human nature can have its completing principle, its personality, in the divine nature, and thus be so closely united with it that the two distinct natures converge and coalesce in one Person. You believe that "in God we live and move and have our being." Now, can you show that it is impossible for a created spirit to have its being in God in such a perfect way that it has its personality as well as its efficient cause of existence in him ? Is your reason competent to say beforehand that God can not reveal the possibility and reality of this union of the divine and human natures in one person ? If there is good evidence that God has revealed it, can you reject that evidence on the ground that the doctrine is incredible ?



*Mr. M.* You have brought me so suddenly into deep water, that I can hardly give an answer at once. I am not prepared to say positively that the doctrine you have presented is incredible. If it appeared to me that there were good grounds to believe that Jesus Christ did really teach it, I should examine those grounds most carefully. If you are prepared to prove that he did teach it, I am ready to give you a candid hearing.

*Mr. O.* I begin, then, from the point agreed on between us, that Jesus Christ had a true human nature. I affirm that Jesus Christ said things of himself that can not be true of his human nature, and, therefore, that his person was superhuman; and, moreover, that he said things which can not be true of any created nature, and, therefore, that his person is divine. In the first place he says of himself, (St. John, iii. 13,) "No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended from heaven, the Son of Man who is in heaven." Now, mark the force of these words! They affirm that Jesus Christ was in heaven before his earthly life began, that he came from heaven to earth, and that he remained in heaven while he was on the earth. That shows that he had a superior nature, pre-existing to his human soul, and existing simultaneously in heaven and on earth. Moreover, it is the *Son of Man*, the very person born of Mary, who existed in heaven before his human birth, and who declares with his human lips that he is at that moment in heaven. This shows that it was the superior nature of Jesus Christ in which his personality subsisted, and that the superhuman and the human nature were united in one person. Does it not?

*Mr. M.* It does, so far as I can see at present. Please to proceed.

*Mr. O.* Jesus Christ also affirms that his superior nature is eternal, self-existent, that is, divine. "Before Abraham was, I am," (St. John, viii. 58.) He does not say, "I was," but "I am," repeating the words in which Jehovah revealed his eternal, self-existing being to Moses, which proves that he claimed to be the same person who thus revealed himself to Moses. He calls himself the "only-begotten Son of God," (St. John, iii. 17.) showing that he claimed identity of nature with the Father, and not the mere similitude which is in all created spirits; and he said also, "I and my Father are

one," (St. John, x. 35.) All these and similar passages in St. John's gospel must be explained in harmony with the principal purpose he had in writing it, which appears plainly in the preface of the gospel. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made," (St. John, i. 1, 2, 3.) It is evident that St. John here affirms the divinity of Jesus Christ, ascribes to him the creation, which is the exclusive work of God, and proposes the exhibition of this doctrine as the principal topic of his gospel. According to your own principles, that Jesus Christ is a true prophet, and that the Evangelists give a true exposition of his life, character, and doctrine, you must admit his divinity. I know that you Unitarians have never been fond of St. John's gospel, and have frequently tried to disprove its authenticity.

*Mr. M.* That is so; but it was only on account of the difficulty of explaining it. I am not one of that sort. If it is proved that St. John wrote it, I say we must take it, just as it is, and admit that it expresses the doctrine of St. John, and consequently the doctrine of Jesus Christ. Tischendorff has fully vindicated its authenticity against the shallow objections of German critics, as one of our learned Cambridge professors admits, in the "Christian Examiner."

I think we have conversed enough for one sitting, my dear friend. I must think and read carefully on this point, before I can make up my mind about it. All that I desire is to know and believe the truth which God has revealed through Jesus Christ. Good-by, Oldcastle, I am extremely obliged to you. This has been to me an exceedingly interesting conversation.

## TEXTS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

---

BLESSED be the Lord God of Sem. May God enlarge Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Sem. Gen. ix. 26, 27.

The Lord shall glorify the boundary of Japheth, and his sons shall become proselytes and shall dwell in the school of Sem. R. Jonathan, (Jewish author.)

May he dwell in the tents of Sem; that is, in the church which the apostles, the sons of the prophets, have founded. S. Aug.

In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. (Said to Abraham.) Gen. xxii. 15.

Abraham your father rejoiced that he might see my day. He saw it and was glad. S. John viii. 56.

The Lord thy God will raise up to thee a Prophet of thy nation and of thy brethren like unto me. (Moses.) Deut. xviii. 15.

Then these men when they had seen what a miracle Jesus had done, said: This is the Prophet indeed that is to come into the world. St. John vi. 14.

The Lord hath said to me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. (David.) Ps. ii. 7.

Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of uprightness. Thou hast loved justice and hatedst iniquity, therefore God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. Ps. xlv. 8.

The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool. Ps. cix. 1, 2.

And the Pharisees being gathered together, Jesus

asked them, saying, What think you of Christ? whose Son is he? They say to him, David's. He saith to them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said to my Lord, etc. If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son? St. Matt. xxii. 42-45.

God having spoken on divers occasions and many ways, in times past, to the fathers by the prophets; last of all, in these days, hath spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the world: who, being the splendor of his glory, and the figure (express image) of his substance, making purgation of sins, sitteth on the right hand of the majesty on high; being made so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name above them. For to which of the angels hath he said at any time, Thou art my Son, etc.? And to the angels, indeed, He saith: He that maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But to the Son: Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, etc. Heb. i. 1-14.

God said to Moses: I AM WHO AM. Exod. iii. 14.

See ye that I alone am, and there is no other God beside me? Deut. xxxii. 39.

The Jews then said to him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said to them, Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made I AM. St. John, viii. 57, 58.

Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel. Isa. vii. 14.

For a child is born to us, and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, GOD THE MIGHTY, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of peace. Isa. ix. 6.

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us; and we saw his glory, the glory as of the Only-Begotten of the Father. St. John i. 1, 14.

## THE TRINITY.



### A SECOND DIALOGUE BETWEEN MR. MAYFLOWER AND MR. OLDCASTLE.

*Mr. Oldcastle.*—"Well, my friend, have you made up your mind about the subject of our conversation of last Monday?"

*Mr. Mayflower.*—"Partly; but not altogether. I am convinced that it is necessary to acknowledge the divinity as well as the humanity of Jesus Christ in some sense that is compatible with the unity of the Godhead, and that, at the same time, gives a sufficient value and force to those passages of Scripture which you have cited. I am not quite clear, indeed I am extremely confused and perplexed, as to what this sense is; but I hope, with your help, to clear up some of my difficulties about it. I find that some Unitarians are willing to acknowledge the deity of Christ; that some of our best writers, at the present time, admit that St. John teaches it; and I think, from what I can remember, that Dr. Channing held it, at least during the latter part of his life. Let me try to express what these good people think; what has been the idea floating before the eye of my soul since I was a boy; what I suppose is the doctrine on which is based that sentiment of the Lordship of Jesus Christ over men which is so strong and sacred in our hearts.

"The Father dwelt in Jesus Christ in an essential manner, which was more than prophetic inspiration. St. Peter says that we are made 'partakers of the divine nature.' I accidentally opened that superb edition of the works of St. John of the Cross, which you have in your little study at home, one day, at a passage wherein he says that the blessed become God by participation. We are, now, sons of God, if we really love God. Why

can we not say that Jesus Christ is called God because he is the first and highest of the sons of God, partaker in the highest degree in the divine nature, the most intimately united of all men to the Father?"

*Mr. O.*—"If you will consult the notes of our last conversation which I see lying on the table, you will find that we agreed upon two conclusions. The first was, that Jesus Christ had a human nature composed of a created soul and body. The second, that he had also a superior, preëxistent nature, in which the personality of the two natures united in him was seated. Divine names and works are attributed to him on account of this superior nature, as I proved at our last interview. I will confirm this, however, by a little more proof. Let us take up the text: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was *with* God, and the Word *was* God.' Is it not plain that the Word is distinguished from the Father, and also called God? Is he not declared to have created the world? Again, our Lord, in his last, sublime prayer, says to the Father: 'And now, glorify thou me, O Father! with thyself, *with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.*' (St. John 17:5.) Do you not see from these and many other passages that the question really is, How is the Word, or Son, distinct from the Father, and yet rightly called by the name of God?"

*Mr. M.*—"I see it. But may not the names Father, Son, or Word, and also Holy Spirit, denote different aspects, relations, offices, or personified attributes of God, which are thus represented in order to be more intelligible to our minds?"

*Mr. O.*—"If you mean real, necessary, eternal relations in the Godhead, yes! If you mean merely abstract distinctions, or relations toward men, no! Christ is Prophet, Priest, and King. Do you mean to compare the names Father, Son, and Holy Ghost as applied to God, to these three names as applied to Christ?"

*Mr. M.*—"That is precisely what I meant."

*Mr. O.*—"Such a definition of the distinction of persons is purely arbitrary, and without foundation in the sacred writings. Moreover, it is palpably absurd to say that Jesus Christ spoke in this forced and dramatic style when he prayed to the Father to glorify his human

nature with the glory which he had, before the world was made, with him, in his divine nature. The Scripture expresses everywhere a real, personal distinction between the Father and the Son. 'He whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God.' 'The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand.' (St. John 3 : 34, 35.)"

*Mr. M.*—"I believe the notion I just now expressed is untenable. I am forced to admit that the Son, or Word, is distinct from the Father, and that his existence precedes the date of the creation of the universe, which the Father accomplished through him as a medium. It is necessary, therefore, to find some way of explaining how the same deity which the Father possesses in himself in plenitude could be essentially indwelling in the Son, and that the Son could thus be called God without implying that he was another God, independent of the Father, and distinct in being from him.

"The person of the Son is distinct from the person of the Father. We are agreed on that.

"It is the divine nature of the Father in which the Son participates which constitutes the divinity of the Son. Are we agreed on that, or not?"

*Mr. O.*—"If you will admit that, and stand by all the consequences of your admission, I will ask no more."

*Mr. M.*—"Very well! The Word, then, considered as a distinct person, is not God. Therefore, he must be a creature of God; the first created, the highest and most perfect of creatures, the model and archetype of all intelligent creatures. The Father, having created him, gave him such a communication of his own divine attributes that he might be called a counterpart, an image, a reflection of himself. He gave him power to create the universe, and to rule over it as supreme Lord. In respect to us he is divine, because through him God created and rules us. It is as manifested through him and represented by him, that we know the Father. He is called the Son of God, because he is an image of his perfections and the object of his special love, the heir of his kingdom and the first-born of all his rational children."

*Mr. O.*—"Your theory, my dear friend, is as leaky as a cullender. St. Athanasius made an end of it in the

fourth century, and you will hardly be able to revamp it now so as to give it even an appearance of plausibility. God can not communicate the creative power to a creature. 'He who created all things is God.' (Heb. 3 : 4.) The power to create out of nothing is the most mysterious and incomprehensible of all the divine attributes. You might as well say that God could communicate self-existence or infinity to a creature, or say at once that he could create another God, as to speak of his communicating creative power. You admit that the Word created the universe. Therefore, the Word is God, in the strict and proper sense, and, of course, uncreated. The notion of a subordinate divinity, such as you imagine, is the very principle of polytheism. If there is one such divinity, there may be thousands. According to this notion, the Word is an Æon, emanating from the unknown, silent, unrevealed God. He is a Demiurge, or subordinate creator. The union of the human nature with his superior nature becomes an absurdity. In fact, it is rank Gnosticism that you have advanced. Now, we know that St. John wrote his gospel expressly against these Gnostics and their emanations. It is impossible to read St. John's gospel, or the Scriptures generally, and not to see that they mean God when they speak of God; that they teach pure theism, and put an infinite distance between the one God and Creator and all creatures. It is God who is present by essence to all existing things, especially to all rational spirits, as creator. In God we live and move and are. Now, if the Word is our creator, if we live and move and have our being in him, he is God, by being one with the Father in essence, or consubstantial with him. That is the reason why he is called the Son, because he is consubstantial with the Father."

*Mr. M.*—"But are not angels and men sons of God—children and heirs of the eternal Father—brethren and co-heirs of Christ? How can that be true if the filial relation to God the Father requires identity of nature?"

*Mr. O.*—"You overlook the important fact that Jesus Christ is the *only-begotten Son of God*. All other sons of God are sons only by adoption and grace in Christ. Jesus Christ is the Son of God by nature—begotten, not made—proceeding from the Father by an eternal genera-



tion. The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us: and we have seen his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.' 'No one hath seen God at any time: the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' (St. John 1:14, 18.) If Jesus Christ is the Son of God merely because God dwells in him by his Spirit, communicates to him glory and beatitude, and raises him to an intimate communion with himself, he may be said to have the primogeniture among his brethren, but he can not be called the only-begotten Son of God. All Christians are temples of God, and the indwelling, sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit in them is an essential presence of God, far superior to mere prophetic inspiration. Christ, therefore, would differ from the other sons of God only in the rank or degree of his adoptive filiation, but not in its nature and kind. Yet the sacred writer affirms most positively that his sonship is entirely different from that of angels or men; and that on account of this difference he is called God. Here is a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews which settles the matter: 'Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath inherited a more excellent name above them. For *to which of the angels hath he said at any time: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again: I will be to him a Father; and he shall be to me a Son? And again, when he introduceth the first-begotten into the world, he saith: And let all the angels of God adore him. And to the angels, indeed, he saith: He that maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But to the Son: Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved justice and hated iniquity: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above them that are partakers with thee. And: Thou in the beginning, O Lord, hast founded the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt continue; and they shall all grow old as a garment: and as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the self-same, and thy years shall not fail.'* (Heb. 1:4-12.)"

Mr. M.—"This passage is, indeed, very clear and strong. It shows both the distinction there is between

the Father and the Son, and also the equality or identity of nature. I see that the eternal generation of the Son is something quite different from creation or adoption. Jesus Christ is the Son of God by nature, and therefore he must have the same nature and essential attributes with the Father. In the same chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews from which you were reading, the sacred writer calls him 'the splendor of his glory and the express image of his substance.' It is idle to invent forced interpretations of the Scriptures to make them square with our Unitarian theories. They teach the true and proper divinity of Christ too plainly for any subtle evasion to deceive me any longer. Either we are bound to believe that doctrine, or we are not. Either that doctrine is reconcilable with pure theism and the primary truth of the divine unity, or it is not. Any way, the doctrine is there; and I see that I must either believe it to be true, or say right out that all the prophets and apostles, and Jesus Christ himself, were mistaken. This last supposition is a little too much for me. I think it more likely that I have been mistaken, and have had confused ideas about the orthodox doctrine. Jesus Christ appears to me to have had the perfection of reason and understanding. I think if there were a point-blank contradiction between the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Unity in God, he would have seen it. Moreover, he says positively that he has seen the Father, and that he was with him before the world was made. I think he must have known who he himself was, and who the Father was. I have no doubt at all that he saw God as plainly as I see you. And I think he was wise enough to teach his apostles what his true doctrine really is. I am going to believe St. John and St. Paul and the other disciples of our Lord, and quit chasing the jack-o'-lantern of rationalism. I am satisfied that they teach the divinity of the Father and of the Son in such a sense that there is no division in the substance or oneness of the Godhead. But there is the third person in the Trinity—the Holy Spirit. We have said nothing about his personality or deity. Will you be kind enough to throw a little light on this point?"

*Mr. O.*—"The distinction of persons in the Godhead being once established, the great difficulty of admitting

the distinct personality and the divinity of the Holy Spirit is removed. The number of persons in the Godhead is to be learned from the divine revelation. That the name, Holy Spirit, in the Scripture, is one of the names of God no one can or will deny. The only question that can be raised is, whether he is a distinct person from the Father. This is settled by the baptismal formula prescribed by Jesus Christ himself: 'Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' (St. Matt. 28 : 19.) If the Son is a distinct person from the Father and equal to him in the Godhead, then the Holy Spirit is a distinct person, equal to the Father and the Son. The three terms, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the formula, are introduced as equal, and as constituting the name of God. The doctrine of the divinity of the Holy Spirit has always been inseparably associated with the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. The doctrine of the divinity of Christ has always been held as included in the doctrine of the Trinity. The universal ascription of praise, 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost: as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen,' expresses the ancient and universal faith of the church. The beautiful book of worship used in some of your Unitarian churches contains this Doxology, and is a witness to the fact that in the speech and language of universal Christendom God is known and worshiped under the threefold name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

*Mr. M.*—"This is true. Nevertheless, God is one being. He possesses all those perfections and attributes which are necessary to constitute the plenitude of being in a most pure and infinite act of intelligence, life, and beatitude, but no more. God can not add to his own being. All that is in God is necessary to constitute him the infinite, concrete, living, self-existing being. Therefore, these terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit must express certain relations in the one God without which he could not be completely constituted in the unity of his being as the infinite intelligence, the adequate object of his own contemplation, sufficing to himself as the principle and term of the act which makes him infinitely blessed. Do you agree to this?"

*Mr. O.*—"Certainly. The Trinity is not a trinity of distinct beings, each one of whom completely fulfills the idea of God, each one of whom could exist in most pure and perfect act if the others did not exist. That would be mere tritheism, which is an utter absurdity, not only incredible, but unthinkable. The term Trinity does not qualify the unity of the one God, whose being can be demonstrated from the primitive idea and first principles of reason, by the addition of two more unities. It discloses and unfolds the contents of the unity which is affirmed alike by reason and revelation. The Father can not exist or act except in relation to the Son and Holy Spirit, or the Son except in relation to the Father and the Holy Spirit, or the Holy Spirit except in relation to the Father and the Son. The exclusion of either one of these three terms of relation is the annihilation of the idea of the unity of God, just as truly as the exclusion of one of the three terms of a syllogism is the annihilation of a logical proposition."

*Mr. M.*—"I like that way of stating the case very much. But pardon me if I object that it does not appear to me consistent with the terms of the orthodox formula, that there are three *persons* in God."

*Mr. O.*—"Why not?"

*Mr. M.*—"Because personality includes all that is necessary to constitute an intelligent substance in its complete act. If the Father is a distinct person, his person includes all that is necessary to give to his being or substance its last complement, that is, to make him infinite intelligence in act, self-sufficing, perfect, and blessed in himself."

*Mr. O.*—"How do you prove what you have asserted?"

*Mr. M.*—"By analogy from created natures. In every man there is one distinct intelligent substance individuated in one, and incapable of constituting more than one. This substance has its principle, medium, and term of thought and volition in itself, and is thus made intelligence in act without passing out of its own personality."

*Mr. O.*—"I deny that. A created intelligence completely isolated and confined within its own limits could neither think, will, nor act. The individual soul,

or spirit, lives only in communion with other individuals and with God. A creature is not self-sufficing because finite, and, having in itself no relations of plurality, it must go out of itself for its objects of thought and love. God is self-sufficing because he has only the perfection and not the imperfection of unity of nature. Therefore he has in himself, though he is one, the perfection which constitutes plurality of beings in creatures. That is, he has, without passing out of his own being, or dividing his unity, that which constitutes in him plurality of persons. He has in himself society, fellowship, life, love, beatitude."

*Mr. M.*—"Nevertheless, there appears to be a contradiction between the terms unity of substance and plurality of persons. In human nature unity of substance is identical with unity of person. One self-conscious, intelligent subject makes one substance and one person. You can not have another distinct person without another distinct principle of self-consciousness, intelligence, and will, that is, another distinct spiritual substance. By analogy we should conclude that it is the same in the divine nature."

*Mr. O.*—"Is the idea of God primarily derived from analogy, or is it original, primitive, and positive?"

*Mr. M.*—"It is original, primitive, and positive in its first principle, but evolved by demonstration from the analogies of the creation."

*Mr. O.*—"Are these analogies perfect and adequate, or imperfect and inadequate?"

*Mr. M.*—"They are imperfect; and by them we see God only, as it were, reflected in a glass, darkly."

*Mr. O.*—"Very well. Then, by these analogies, we can not comprehend the eternity, the infinity, the omnipresence, or the other attributes of God, which can be demonstrated to reason. If we apply these analogies as a measure of the divine attributes, we shall err greatly. Much more must this be the case if we apply these analogies to measure that divine substance and those divine relations which we can not perceive by our intelligence. The words person, nature, substance, unity, plurality, are analogical terms which only inadequately represent the infinite realities for which they stand. You can not argue that the divine substance can subsist in one person only, without division or multiplication, because the

substance of the human soul is thus limited. It belongs to the infinitude of the divine substance, to its plenitude of being, that it can subsist in three persons, without being divided or multiplied."

*Mr. M.*—"Are there, then, three principles of intelligence, life, and action included in the one divine substance?"

*Mr. O.*—"No; there is but one. The Father is the sole principle in the Godhead, from whom the Son and the Spirit proceed."

*Mr. M.*—"Why, then, is not the intelligent act of the Father, in which he contemplates his own infinite being, and is supremely blessed in the knowledge and love of its infinite beauty, complete within his own personality, exclusive of any relation to the Son or the Spirit?"

*Mr. O.*—"Because by this act of contemplation he necessarily generates the Son, or Word, his own express image; and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as the necessary consummation of the act, through which it returns to its principle and unites the three terms in one."

*Mr. M.*—"Then the Word is like an idea which the Father produces as the term of his infinite thought, and the Spirit is like the complacency which his infinite intelligence may be conceived to have in this idea?"

*Mr. O.*—"That expresses in part what we can apprehend of this great mystery."

*Mr. M.*—"But why does this act produce two persons distinct from the person of the Father, and not rather two modifications of his intelligence? Why is not the Word merely ideal, like the conception of a poet or a philosopher, and the Spirit a mere emotion or sentiment, like that which the poet has when he is pleased with the images of beauty which his imagination shapes?"

*Mr. O.*—"Because in God act is identical with being. He is most pure act. His act is essential. His being is in his act and in its term, and in his interior relations. The image produced by his intelligence is equal to himself, because it is the term of an infinite necessary action into which his whole being passes. Moreover, the term Son necessarily implies the personality of the Word, and the generation of the Son denotes that he proceeds from the Father by an act which is the archetype of human

generation. The human father produces a living, equal similitude of himself. So the Eternal Father begets a coequal Son, in whom the total substance of the Father is impersonated. The spiration of the infinite love of the Father and the Son finds its term in a third person, the Holy Spirit, for the same reason that the act of God is identical with his being, and has all the infinite reality which is possible. This act being necessarily consummated in the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father as principle and the Son as medium, there must be three persons in God, and there can be but three. The necessary being of God is constituted by Trinity in Unity."

*Mr. M.*—"Do you think that this can be demonstrated by pure reason?"

*Mr. O.*—"By no means. Reason could not discover the Trinity. It is disclosed by revelation. Nor can reason, even when in possession of the revealed formula, demonstrate its necessary truth by its own principles. It can only make the terms partially intelligible from created analogies, refute objections, and show that not only is there no adequate explanation of the most pure act of God without the Trinity, but that the Trinity is itself an adequate explanation, *so far as we can see*. But then we can see but a little way, and that dimly. Wherefore, the rational argument for the Trinity would never make it more than probable. Certainty, undoubting faith, is generated only by the word of God, and it is only on the veracity of God that we rest our firm belief in the Trinity."

*Mr. M.*—"I have one more difficulty to propose. The orthodox statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, and of the two natures united in the person of Jesus Christ, appears to furnish a key to the explanation of the Scriptures both of the Old and the New Testament. But what is the authority of this key, what is the evidence that it is the true key? How was Athanasius, how were the Nicene fathers able to make their precise dogmatic statements respecting the three persons, their relations, the consubstantiality of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the distinction of natures in the unity of person in the Son? They apply a standard and rule by which they interpret the Scriptures, evidently derived not from the Scriptures themselves, but

from some other source. It is the same now with all that are called orthodox, and I am inclined to think that it is the same even with Unitarians, rationalists, liberal Christians, as they are called. There is already in the mind a formula, in the spiritual sense an idea, which is obtained from somewhere before the Scripture is read, and which is the medium through which we read it."

*Mr. O.*—"What you say is most true. And this shows the necessity of tradition, or of the oral teaching which came from the mouth of Christ and the apostles, and has been preserved pure and uncorrupted in the church. By the aid of this tradition, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit, the chief pastors of the church were able to express and define with unerring exactitude the true and orthodox doctrine of the Trinity as it is revealed in the inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Those Trinitarians who have rejected the authority of the church have retained the orthodox definitions made by the early councils, and the Christian sense which they received from their Catholic ancestors. Thus it is that they are able to interpret the Scriptures correctly, although they fancy that it is through their own private illumination and private study of the Bible that they believe in the Trinity."

*Mr. M.*—"What a sublime view does the revelation of this glorious mystery give us of the interior being and relations of the living God! How wonderful and adorable does Jesus Christ appear when we understand that he is indeed God as well as man! I perceive that I am but a child as yet in true Christian knowledge, and that I have much to learn. But by the grace of God I am resolved to seek after his divine truths with the docility of a child, and to believe them on his divine word. Pray for me, my dear friend, that I may be guided into all truth."

*Mr. O.*—"I will do so with all my heart; and now, farewell for the present, for I perceive that I have made a very long visit, and Mrs. Oldcastle will be wondering what has become of me."



## CONTROL YOUR PASSIONS.

---

As I now look back upon the years I served an English work-house as its chaplain, very many pleasant memories come up fresh before my mind. The Catholic poor, always devoted to their priesthood, were particularly so there. The interest and care of their pastor were brought out in strong and favorable contrast with the heartlessness of many of the officials placed in charge by the board of guardians. There is one incident connected with my services there which hangs like a cloud over the otherwise bright picture. It may profit some one if I relate it, and with this hope I proceed.

In a room of the old men's bedridden ward were eight men, two of whom were Catholics, McIvan and Molloy. Dear McIvan, how his face would brighten up when the priest appeared in the door-way! The fingers of his poor hands were cramped up in a heap, and bent backward to the wrist with rheumatism; but they were not so useless that they could not push up the white cap which he always wore, the better to get a look "at his reverence." By this time the priest was at his side, and the deformed hands, in their own awkward fashion, would clasp his, when up it would go to the lips, while a tear, partly of joy, partly of sadness, would start to the eye of this noble-hearted Irishman. Tall, strongly made, brought up on the mountains, McIvan would boast that he could run and jump like a deer; and, as in honest pride he said this, a sigh would

break from him, like one of those youthful bounds, which needed no interpreter. It was like the low moan of the panther as he turns at each corner of his iron cage in his quick, nervous walk, which says, as plainly as words can do, "Oh! for a roam through the woods once more!" But my story is connected not with McIvan, but with Molloy. He, too, was a victim of rheumatism, which had deprived him of the use of his legs. Day and night the year round, there lay the two prisoners of God's mysterious providence. Molloy could read well, and his favorite reading was the lives of the saints, with which I kept him regularly supplied. As a rule, both these men received holy communion every month. Each bade fair to receive a large share of his purgatory in this world. On an ill day, as it proved for poor Molloy, another bed-ridden Catholic was put into the room. This poor man was half-witted, and, in all candor, I must admit not at all neat in his personal appearance or orderly in his habits. He may fairly be said to have had a kind of hydrophobia, such was his aversion to water, at least as an ablution. I can not deny that his absence would have been far more agreeable than his company. This is what Molloy thought too, and his first move was to expostulate with the poor man. Dirt and he, however, had so long been fellow-travelers that it was no easy matter to part them now. He had been brought up in slovenliness and ignorance, and indolence had fostered it in after life, until, losing his home, and becoming a "tramp," he had wandered on in an aimless, fruitless march from work-house to work-house, until at last sickness had laid him on his back beside Molloy. From expostulation, Molloy now began to use insulting language. The other patients remonstrated with him for what they considered his unfeeling severity. The nurse was now called in to interfere. He in turn appealed to me. I endeavored to get the poor man removed, as the

speediest and surest means of restoring peace. It was found inconvenient to do so; and as we Catholics enjoyed our privileges there by a kind of sufferance, I thought it prudent not to press it, and he remained. I then had several serious talks with Mollay. I tried to persuade him that this unfortunate man was not accountable for the annoyance he was giving, and, therefore, rather to be pitied. I urged him to take this opportunity of imitating the saints of whom he had been reading, whose acts of heroic self-denial he had spoken of with such admiration. I made no sensible impression upon him, however, and I left the room, hoping to find a better state of mind on my return. Going there a few days after, I found matters had grown worse. Not content with using his tongue to vilify this poor man, he had gone so far as to throw at him dirty water, or whatever came to hand. I now told him that it had become my duty to refuse him the sacraments, even though he were at the point of death, unless he gave up his enmity, and expressed sorrow for the scandal he had given his religion. As though completely in the power of the demon of hatred, even while I was speaking, his raging tongue became so violent in its abuse that I closed his mouth with my hand, and pressed his raised head back upon the pillow; but I could not quell his infuriated spirit even in this way; and again I left him. My next visit to the work-house was on Sunday morning. I was accustomed to get from Mrs. Carey, my acting sacristan, the names of such as might have died during my absence, that I might ask prayers for them, as well as remember them myself, in the mass I was about to offer. The weather-beaten, half-famished frames of the larger proportion of the inmates held so feebly upon life that a trifling addition to their ordinary ailments was sufficient to shake them off into the lap of death. In reply to me, she exclaimed: "O father! something dreadful hap-

pened last night in the old men's ward! The men were awoke in the middle of the night by the meanings and struggles of Molloy, who could not speak, but turned and twisted about as if to rid himself of some one who was strangling him. After a few desperate efforts, which horrified every one, he died." "Molloy dead?" I said, "What! dead without a priest? dead without the sacraments? dead without signs of repentance? How awful! this the end of one whose sufferings and piety had given promise of a saintly death—of a martyr's reward! How very awful!"

Reader, this story is as true as it is painful. Can we turn it to any account for ourselves? The warning which it gives is this. Salvation is not secure without solid religious principle. The love of God and our neighbor is indispensably necessary to true piety. The passions must all be made to conform to the requirements of the twofold commandment, "Love God with thy whole heart, and thy neighbor as thyself." This poor man disregarded his duty in both these respects. Had he repressed his repugnance and dislike when they were first excited, all would have been well; but in spite of the law of God, in spite of the voice of the church, and in spite of the entreaties of his priest, he indulged his ill will, and it hurried him with fearful speed—where?

Reader, are you now at enmity with any one? Remember the words of our Lord, "If you will not forgive men, neither will your Father forgive you." *Matthew 6: 15.*

## HEROISM IN THE SICK-ROOM.

---

It is now about six years since we lost him. By losing him, I do not mean that all relations between him and us were then severed, but only that at this time we were deprived of his society, and of his edifying example of Christian piety. No; I really do not believe that his death has been a loss to us; on the contrary, I am convinced that it has been a great gain to the parish. St. James (5 : 16) assures us that "the continual prayer of a just man availeth much," and I do not question that unseen and manifold mercies have come among us through his intercession. The latter years of his life were passed in almost uninterrupted suffering. In his case we may piously believe the purging fires of purgatory were anticipated on earth. If our friend could be summoned back to his sick-room, where I saw him last, and there questioned as to the existence of purgatory, I am inclined to think that he would be obliged to acknowledge that practically he knew nothing at all about it. It lay, indeed, on his way, as a nobleman's castle, with its parks and wide domain, might lie on the route to the metropolis; but his testimony would be confined to the fact that he saw the open gate and souls thronging in, while his "chariot of fire" was driven swiftly by, straight into the gates of the Eternal City. But, you say, perhaps, how is this? No purgatory? Does St. Paul not say, "But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire"? Very true; but tell me, what think you of a raw, swollen, putrid cancer, which

like some loathsome reptile has fastened upon the cheek, and is poisoning the blood as it eats its way around and within—is this not “fire”? I do not mean to say, what indeed would not be true, that this alone, or that any kind of physical pain, necessarily purifies the soul; unfortunately we know that oftentimes it only exasperates the proud, unsubmitive spirit, and thus becomes the occasion of its greater condemnation. No; disposition of soul is what purifies, and bodily ills do but furnish the occasions for acts of patience, penance, resignation, confidence in God, and self-abasement before him. Only blessed is he who has the dispositions with which to meet the occasions. Neither were wanting in the case of the good man of whom I am speaking. During his long imprisonment and martyrdom—for such his illness really was—it was my privilege to make him several visits. I frankly confess that the administration of the sacraments to him was a trial to me, for the hideous disease had settled about the roots of his tongue, and, as he opened his mouth to receive the body of his Lord, it was presented to my sense of sight and smell in the most horrible and repulsive manner. In spite of this, I never left that bedside when there did not come up full in my soul the sentiment, “Lord, it is good for me to have been there!” My conviction was, that we had conferred a mutual benefit upon one another. On my part, I had given him the encouragement of Christian sympathy, the cleansing of pardoning words for his slight imperfections, and the Bread of Life. On his part, he had given me an example of cheerful, devout resignation, under a prolonged trial more severe than any of which, up to this very moment, I have ever had personal knowledge. “Not a murmur!” “So resigned!” are expressions commonly met with in memoirs where the pen of a relative or an admirer is allowed a certain license, and where statements as to traits of character are only required to

be in the main correct ; but in the case of my Christian brother, I use them in their strictest sense. The testimony of every one who knew him will bear out my own in this. A word expressive of the hardness of his trial, or of his anxiety to be released from it, never came from his lips. A tear wrung almost involuntarily from a sense of the weariness of the struggle never coursed its way down his swollen cheek. A craving for sympathy as from one who, though submissive, felt himself hardly dealt with, I never could detect. On the contrary, his thoughts seemed always of us who were around him, as though we were the ones to be compassionated for being obliged in charity to wait upon him. He lay upon his bed of sleeplessness and pain, to the eye of the body an object of extreme commiseration, while to the eye of the soul he was a Christian hero covered with wounds of glory, and whose countenance bespoke an interior strength and peace such as it is the hallowed privilege of religion alone to impart. His condition and temper of mind were a living copy, the most perfect I had ever seen, of what I suppose to have been those of holy Job.

So he lived on, praying and waiting, watching and hoping, suffering and loving. He had one great consolation, a devoted family. It was hard to say whom to admire most, the patient under his affliction, or the affectionate, self-sacrificing wife and daughter in attendance upon him. At length the day of deliverance came. Without any great stretch of the imagination, we may fancy the great lover of souls, Jesus Christ, thus addressing this faithful disciple of his cross in the words of the book of Canticles : " Arise, make haste, and come ; for winter is now past : the rain is over and gone. The flowers have appeared in our land ; the time of pruning is come ; the voice of the turtle is heard in our land." (Canticles 2 : 10, 11, 12.) The meek sufferer clasps more tightly the image of his crucified Master, which ever lay

by his side, and, setting his eyes upward where his treasure and heart had all along been, his soul is caught up to the judgment-seat of Christ, to receive the sentence of approval, and the crown of reward, for years of silent, cheerful, heroic endurance.

And now, Christian reader, why have I told you this little incident in the history of my ministry? As though it had no parallel in the experience of others? In order to gratify your feeling of satisfaction at the recital of noble traits in a fellow-man? No; I have another, a higher motive than either of these, namely, your encouragement in suffering of whatever kind. Coupling the glorious termination of our friend's life with its previous years of trial, who can say that he was not a favored son of heaven? But is it usual to look upon the sufferings of life with complacency? Is it not the rule to view them in the light of misfortunes? Let his example correct the false judgments of the natural man. Grace invariably forms her heroes in the crucible of suffering; for even of the Son of God it is said, "He learned obedience by the things which he suffered." (Heb. 5: 8.) And among the many examples of true Christian heroism, is the one of illness and disease borne with fortitude and patience, which I have just related.



## IS THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS OF HUMAN OR OF DIVINE INSTITUTION ?

---

ON a vacation trip to Niagara last fall, my companion, who was a Protestant, and myself, having feasted our eyes and ears on the sublime beauty and music of the Falls, took steamer at Lewiston, about the noon of Saturday, for Ogdensburg. During the day we remained on deck, enjoying the breeze and the scenery of land, and lake, and sky. As evening shed its shadows over all, and the sunset crimson faded into night, we watched the stars as they came out, stealthily as it were, one by one, to see their bright faces in the mirror of the transparent waters of Ontario. The chill of the night air, however, soon forced us to retire to the saloon. The following conversation was occasioned by my asking the captain this question :

“Captain, is there a Catholic Church in Ogdensburg?”

“Yes; two. But I don’t know at what hour service is held.”

“Surely,” said my traveling companion, “you don’t mean to attend worship to-morrow, and to leave me here all alone ‘in the blues’?”

“I must hear Mass if in time for it. If you like, you can come with me.”

“Thank you; I don’t care to attend service in the morning; but, if you wish, I will go in the evening. Cannot you be content for one Sunday to worship under the canopy of heaven, in a temple not ‘built by human hands’?”

“But,” I said, “I am bound by a precept of my church to attend Mass to-morrow morning, if I have no reasonable excuse for absenting myself.”

“But it is too inconvenient,” remonstrated my friend. “Moreover I do not see why you may not adore God as

well on board this vessel as under the roof of a church. May we not pray, and give thanks, and worship in every place?"

"Undoubtedly, with the inward worship of the heart, which may be offered in every place, and under all circumstances; and the oftener we do so the better. But there is another kind of worship, which we can offer only where we have an altar, a priest, and a victim, which we have not on board this steamer—I mean worship by sacrifice properly so called."

"Sacrifice properly so called!" he repeated. "What do you understand by that?"

"I understand '*the outward offering of a substance, perceptible to the senses, which undergoes some change effected by the act of a priest properly ordained, and which is thus changed (or immolated) in the name of the community, for the purpose of signifying God's supreme perfections, especially his dominion over life and death.*' Three things are therefore essential to a true and proper sacrifice: firstly, a substance perceptible to the bodily senses; secondly, the outward oblation by the sacrificial action of the priest, which produces such a change in the substance as entitles it to be called a host, or victim; thirdly, a priest appointed by authority binding on the religious community, and empowering him to act and offer in its name."

"But all persons will not agree in your explanation of sacrifice properly so called, will they?"

"Yes. Protestants as well as Catholics agree substantially in this description of it. Moreover, it is easy to determine its meaning and its constitution. Because it is a *sign*, an *arbitrary* sign: a *sign*, because it leads the mind to the knowledge or thought of the divine majesty, which it has been instituted to honor; and *arbitrary*, because, like the matter of the sacraments, it has not this signification of its own nature, but because it has been ordained and accepted in religious society with this meaning. As the coin or stamped paper represents to the civil community a certain value, not of its own nature, but because it has been so chosen and appointed by authority binding on the community, in the same way sacrifice has been set apart as the outward substantial representative of the adoration due to God. Usage,

therefore, is the test of its constituent elements as of its signification. A cursory examination of its history among the different nations from the beginning shows that the three things already mentioned were always essential to form the sacrificial sign. In any case, if the Catholic can prove that sacrifice thus explained is necessary for a perfect religious worship, or that Christ instituted it as an ordinance of his religion, it is sufficient to decide the controversy between Protestantism and Catholicity, because Protestantism has *not*, and does *not* pretend to have, any sacrifice in this sense."

"Taking this statement of the question," said my fellow traveler, "the Catholic position is clear; but you can not sustain it by proof."

"Do you admit," I went on, "that men are borne instinctively to manifest their inward feelings by words and actions *outwardly* and *adequately*, if possible?"

"I do."

"Do you not also admit that the highest, holiest, noblest, and strongest sentiments of the soul conscious of its relations to God are those of the supreme adoration due to him?"

"Yes."

"Now, then," I continued, "the only outward sign which represents these sentiments *of itself*, (that is, when presented without explanation before the public eye,) and in an *adequate* manner, is—sacrifice. Every other outward rite or ceremony, or act of religion, may of itself be used to manifest the lower reverence paid to creatures as well as the high worship which is God's inalienable right. We may bow, kneel, prostrate ourselves before creatures, as the subject in eastern countries does before the monarch's throne, or as Abraham did before his angelic visitants. We may, like the balm-tree, diffuse sweet odors, burn incense, as did the Jewish priests before the ark of the covenant and the winged cherubim, or utter 'the harmony of sweet sounds' in honor of the saints and angels. Take away sacrifice, and religious worship has no *outward, enduring, public* sign, which *by itself* expresses *adequately* and *exclusively* those high feelings toward the divine perfection which are the most obligatory on mankind individually and as members of society. In this respect Christianity as a wor-

ship would be less perfect than Judaism, or even paganism! But retain sacrifice, and then it possesses an enduring, substantial, acknowledged rite, which can be presented to God, and to God alone; which from the very threshold of Eden has been set apart and used by all peoples with this signification. Thus Cain and Abel offered sacrifice, Noah and his children, Abraham and Melchisedech, Isaac and Jacob, all the patriarchs offered sacrifice. Job, Tobias, and other holy men, who, thrown among the Gentiles, 'worshiped God as they knew him,' offered sacrifice. The Gentile nations themselves, 'seated in the valley and shade of death,' did not lose every ray of the primal revelations and usages. With the notion of a Supreme Being, they preserved universally the practice of sacrifice—a fact which goes far to show that sacrifice, if not originally the suggestion, was after the heart of man's rational nature. God himself appointed the number and the variety, the times and places, the nature and the manner, the objects and the effects of the Mosaic offerings. Here, then, we have the cravings of our rational nature, the morally universal practice of mankind, and the sanction of God in our favor. The number of those who abolished the sacrificial rite weighs only as a little dust in the scale against the countless generations who have used it as the only adequate and worthy mode of worshiping God. Behind these facts as an impregnable fortress the Catholic takes his stand; nor can he be thence dislodged, unless it be *positively* proven that Christ abolished sacrifice in the new law."

"Oh! the new law," he interposed, "has the sacrifice of the cross, and that suffices it; doesn't it?"

"Yes; as an *atonement*, but not as a *continuing* sacrifice, unless you suppose it to be perpetuated, which is done only in the Mass. The cross is the *atonement*, the *redeeming* sacrifice; and, as such, is as much the property of the patriarchal and Mosaic as of the Christian religion. The argument I have been urging proves the necessity of a *continuous* sacrifice; that is, which may be offered from time to time, which will supply successive generations with a substantial sign of the homage they owe and ought to pay God, and will be worthy of his infinite majesty, and which will last as long as the religious

worship of which it is the perfection and the crown. If sacrifice were only useful as the price of our ransom from sin, then 'the one sacrifice once offered' would suffice; and there would be no necessity for *continuing* sacrifices either in the Jewish or in the Christian system. But it is useful and required for other purposes already mentioned; and these the sacrifice of Calvary, unless perpetuated in the Mass, does not meet. View the Protestant and Catholic hypotheses side by side. The former has nothing to satisfy the cravings of the human soul, which looks for an offering worthy of its own feelings, and of the divine Being. It introduces, after five thousand years of the world's history, the startling novelty of a ministry without a priesthood, a worship without a sacrifice, a temple without an altar. It has robbed religious worship of its shining crown, religious society of its brightest and strongest link of union. It presents to view the sad picture drawn by the prophet Daniel of the Jewish temple in the hour of ruin: for once again the rail is pulled up, the sanctuary laid waste, the altar overturned, and confirmed desolation reigns in the holy place! The Protestant can not estimate the benefits and consolations of which he is deprived. But the Catholic in the Protestant temple feels as in the presence of a body from which the spirit has departed. The outward features of worship may be, in some respects, the same as those of his own church, as they were indeed before the ever-shifting atmosphere of Protestant opinion had yet time to decompose them; but they are cold and lifeless. The tabernacle, in which the Emmanuel of the new dispensation was to have dwelt with his people, is closed. The sun and centre of all life has departed; and nothing but the coldness of death remains! But look at the Catholic system. Here religious worship has its perfection, society its golden bond of union, the typical sacrifices of the old law their complete fulfillment. Here the aspirations and cravings of the human heart, and the claims of God's infinite nature, are satisfied by a victim of infinite value. Here Christianity has not to bow the head to Judaism, but presents an offering as far superior to the Jewish victims as the reality is to the type, the substance to the shadow, as heaven is to earth, or God to man. Here there is no op-

position to reason and human nature, to universal tradition, or divine authority.

"But the Protestant," interposed my friend, "can show that Christ *positively* abolished the practice of *continuous* sacrifice, as you call it. Because Holy Writ speaks only of 'one sacrifice once offered' by Christ."

"Complete the verse," I said, "and you will find the answer to your objection. 'Christ was offered once to *exhaust the sins of many*.\*' Does not the passage clearly refer to the *atoning* or *redeeming* sacrifice? Now, we Catholics insist as strongly as you that the *redeeming* sacrifice was not, is not, and can not be repeated. But Holy Writ in other places speaks of a continuing sacrifice, which would apply individually to us the fruits of the redeeming sacrifice, and would in this sense be its perpetuation."

"Where does Holy Writ so speak?"

"In many passages too numerous to mention. Have you ever examined these words of the first chapter of Malachi: '*I will no longer receive a gift at your hands,*' which God addressed to the Jewish priests foretelling the future abolition of the Mosaic offerings? The reason assigned is, because in their place would be substituted a sacrifice which could not, like the Jewish victims, be corrupted or polluted by the malice of the priest or of the people, and which would be offered up among the Gentiles in every place from the rising to the setting of the sun. 'For,' says the Lord, '*from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof great is my name among the Gentiles; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation.*'† This description is verified nowhere in Christianity save within the bosom of the Catholic Church. There only is found a true and proper sacrifice, which the Lord promised would succeed the sacrifice in the temple. There only is found a victim which can not be polluted by priest or people; and that is, the body and blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine. There only is found a sacrifice offered in '*every place* from the *rising* to the *setting of the sun.*' For the sun is ever rising on some part of Christendom, and as it rises the Catho-

\* Heb. 9 : 28

† Mal. 1 : 11.

lie priests ascend the altar of the church; and thus the 'clean oblation' is being constantly offered, encircling the earth, like the encircling sunshine, with one continuous chain of praise and adoration to the great Creator."

"The passage, as you interpret it," said my fellow-traveler, "is strong and striking."

"It can be interpreted in no other way. But it is too late now to dwell further on it. I bring it forward to show that the Mass was foretold in the Old Testament. I will point your attention to another passage in which it was foreshadowed. David in his 109th Psalm, and St. Paul in the seventh chapter of his letter to the Hebrews, call Christ 'a priest forever after the order of Melchisedech.' Now, as a priest of that order, (or as the Hebrew has it literally, 'after the *thing*, the *rite*, or *custom* of Melchisedech,') Christ must have offered the characteristic rite or sacrifice of the Melchisedechian priesthood, must he not?"

"I think that is clear from the words. Moreover, it would be strange to call him 'priest of an order or of a rite' according to which he never even once offered."

"Very well. But an offering under the appearance of bread and wine was the characteristic of Melchisedech's priesthood. Because, firstly, there is no other rite mentioned in Scripture to distinguish it from the order of Aaron. Because, secondly, it is said, in Gen. 14, that 'Melchisedech, *bringing forth bread and wine*, for he was a *priest* of the Most High, blessed Abraham,' etc. We may quibble over the reading of this sentence. But the context and common sense show that there is no connection between his being a *priest* and his '*bringing forth bread and wine*,' save only that of sacrifice. Finally, Christ offered sacrifice under the appearance of bread and wine at the Last Supper. For, 'taking bread, he blessed and brake it, and said, *This is my body*.' This sentence, to be true, requires that at its close the substance of Christ's body be present where that of bread was at its commencement. And similarly of the chalice. Here, then, you have the three essentials of a true and proper sacrifice: first, *a victim*, which is Christ himself under the appearance of bread and wine; second, *its immolation*. This is evident from the words of St. Luke as found

in the Greek: 'This chalice is the new testament in my blood, which (*chalice*) is offered for many unto the remission of sins,' showing that the blood as in the *chalice*, as under the appearance of wine, was offered *then* and *there*. Now, what he did *then* and *there* he commanded his Apostles and their successors in the priesthood to do to the end of time, 'This do in commemoration of me.' Here we have, third, the priest ordained by legitimate authority."

"There is one difficulty to my mind. Melchisedech offered the *substance* of bread and wine. You do not hold this substance to be the victim at the Last Supper or in the Mass?"

"What we insist on is that Christ offered according to the *order* or *rite* of Melchisedech. A *rite* means that which is outwardly seen, which falls under the senses: a sacrifice, as I said, is an outward *sign*. Now, in order that Christ would offer the same *rite*, or sacrificial *sign*, with Melchisedech, it is only necessary that the outward appearance of his victim would be the same as the outward appearance of Melchisedech's, even though the inward substances be different."

It was far advanced in the night. The waiters were putting out the lights. We were soon in our berths; and nothing was heard but the wind rattling the casements of the windows, and the waves murmuring about the steamer as she cut her way through them. In the morning I found my Protestant friend pacing the deck thoughtfully. After salutation his words were: "Do you know I have been thinking much of what you were saying last night, and I will go to Mass with you to-day?"

"All right," said I, "time did not permit me to say half what I might have said to you. But we will have more leisure after Mass."

There was not a more attentive worshipper in the church that morning than my Protestant friend.



January 13<sup>th</sup>

No. 25.

## THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

---

A FOURTH DIALOGUE BETWEEN MR. OLDCASTLE AND  
MR. MAYFLOWER.

---

MR. OLDCASTLE and Mr. Mayflower did not meet again for several months after their conversation in the Park. The former soon after this conversation left the country for a summer tour in Europe, and the latter went to his country-seat, where he divided his time between reading and rural amusements. A short time after both these gentlemen had settled themselves once more comfortably in their ordinary course of life, Mr. Oldcastle received a note from his friend, inviting him to drop in on his first leisure evening for a quiet family dinner, and a long, cosy chat afterward in the study. The benevolent old gentleman, surmising that this indicated a desire on the part of his friend to resume their conferences on religious topics, lost no time in complying with the invitation. The evening of the day on which he received the note saw him seated *tête-à-tête* with his old friend in the comfortable study of the latter, all ready for a conversation which was evidently to last till midnight. Mr. Mayflower only waited for his friend to get well settled in his chair, when he broached the subject of their evening's discussion in his usual direct and frank manner.

*Mr. M.*—"Oldcastle, I want to have a long talk with you, and I am going to come to the point at once, without losing any time in beating the bush. Since I saw you last, I have become fully confirmed in my belief of

the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and others which make up positive, dogmatic Christianity. More than this, I have almost made up my mind that the belief in these doctrines requires in strict logical consistency the belief of the entire Catholic system, of which they seem to me to form only a part; the most essential part, it is true, but nevertheless a part: requiring to be completed by the other integral though subordinate portions of revealed Christianity, in order to make a consistent, perfect whole. I say, *almost* made up my mind, because I have not quite made it up. If I do, of course I shall lose no time in applying to be received into the Catholic Church. But I want to be sure of every step of my ground before I advance further, so as to do nothing with premature haste. Now, then, if you can help me to come to a satisfactory conclusion, I give you a fair chance, and you may have all the glory of making a conquest of your obstinate old Unitarian friend, whom I dare say you have often inwardly consigned, though I doubt not with regret, to the company of the finally impenitent."

*Mr. O.*—"I am in the best disposition, my good old friend, to help you as far as I can, without, however, assenting to the truth of your last observation. But, man alive! am I to give you a complete theological course in three hours? Where am I to begin? Where does the shoe pinch? We must have some precise, definite point to aim at, or we shall be obliged to protract our discussions into the next century. Let me know what you are prepared to admit, and what particular point you wish to have cleared up, so that I may know where to begin."

*Mr. M.*—"I am prepared to admit, in a general way, that the historical succession and continuity of Christianity lie principally in the Catholic Church. Also, that a reunion of all Christians in the communion of the Catholic Church is desirable. Moreover, that, if Jesus Christ did establish one organized communion under a hierar-

chical constitution, in strict external unity of doctrine, worship, and government, with a precept obligatory upon all persons in all times to join that communion, that communion can be no other than the Catholic Church. The *if* in my statement will show you where my doubt lies, and it is this doubt which I wish you to assist me in clearing up."

*Mr. O.*—"Very well. Let us attack this point at once. I go back for a first principle and starting-point to the dogma we have previously established of the divinity of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is truly God: his laws are therefore divine, and irrevocable by any authority inferior to his own; his institutions are divine, and unchangeable by any human authority. He came for the express purpose of accomplishing the work of human redemption in his own person, abrogating all preceding and merely preparatory dispensations, and establishing Christianity as a final, perfect, universal system for the regeneration and salvation of the whole human race. I suppose you will admit all this, will you not?"

*Mr. M.*—"Without difficulty."

*Mr. O.*—"Do you acknowledge, also, that the personal work of Jesus Christ was finished when he ascended into heaven, and that he is not to be expected to return again to the earth in order to repair or reconstruct Christianity?"

*Mr. M.*—"Most certainly I do."

*Mr. O.*—"Now, then, I have a fair starting-point for my argument. Merely human philosophers have been able to impress their doctrines so firmly on the minds of their disciples that they have gained a lesser or greater degree of permanence and extension in proportion to the genius of the men and the force of their ideas. Human institutors and lawgivers have been able to accomplish a similar result with their institutions. Inspired men, messengers and prophets of God, like Abra-

ham, Moses, David, Isaiah, and the Macchabees, have done more; they have preserved, defended, handed down the sacred deposit of divine revelation, the precious germ of human regeneration, in a successful manner; thus accomplishing the end of the preparatory dispensation committed to them. Jesus Christ, being God as well as man, having, therefore, the plenitude of wisdom and power, must have been able to perpetuate his doctrine and institutions through all time, and to give them a sway coextensive with the world. Now, the Catholic Church, as you have admitted, is organized, historical Christianity. Its beginning cannot be traced or its inventors designated by any one who denies that Jesus Christ and his apostles are its founders. It fills the space which Jesus Christ intended to fill with the genuine Christianity of which he is the author. It has been able to perpetuate its doctrines and to extend its sway over such a large portion of the human race, that there is nothing improbable in the supposition that it may one day subdue the whole. I apply, then, the argument often used respecting the character of Jesus Christ portrayed in the four gospels. Either the true, genuine character of Jesus Christ is copied from the life by the writers of those gospels, or some person, by his creative genius, has conceived the ideal of that character in his own mind. But any person who could conceive such an ideal would be himself equal to the ideal created by his own imagination, and would in reality have accomplished by means of a myth or an imposture the very regeneration of mankind which this ideal Christ is believed to have accomplished. The supposition is absurd; and therefore the ideal Christ of the gospels is truly the real, historical Christ who lived and died in Judea. So with the historical Christianity of the Catholic Church. If it does not proceed from Jesus Christ himself as its author, it must proceed from another mind equally great.

may more, far greater, because able to supplant his work, and to accomplish that which he was unable to accomplish. Yet, nevertheless, it must be a myth or an imposture, pretending to be the genuine religion of Christ when it is not so, pretending to be the work of the Christ of history when it is but a counterfeit. This is inconsistent with a belief in the divinity of Jesus Christ. If he is the Son of God, he must have given perpetuity to his doctrine, permanence and universality to his institutions. He has not done so, unless his doctrine and institutions are to be found in the Catholic Church. Moreover, it is inconceivable that, after this long lapse of time, the genuine, original doctrine and law of Christ should be restored and universally extended, unless Christ himself were to return and to recommence his work from the beginning—a supposition which destroys the credibility of his divine mission by assuming that it failed of its proposed end in the first instance and must therefore be repeated. My conclusion is, therefore—and I defy the world to refute it—that the very fact of the existence of the Catholic Church, with the four, bright, legible marks of unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolic succession, demonstrates her claim to have Jesus Christ as her founder to be true and undeniable. What have you to say to this, Mr. Mayflower?"

*Mr. M.*—"Your conclusion appears to me to be just. I am convinced that the Catholic Church is substantially and essentially the embodiment of the genuine Christianity of Christ. But is the Catholic Church, as an external, organized hierarchy united under the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, the sole, complete embodiment of Christianity, exclusive of the Orientals, Anglicans, and other bodies of professed Christians? Is there a divine precept, binding every one in all times, which requires membership in this communion as the condition of salvation? Suppose, now, that the Catholic Church is the principal

and most perfect portion of Christendom. Other bodies may be minor and more imperfect portions, really united with her in essentials, separated in regard to external communion by misunderstandings, dissensions, and various sorts of revolutions. It is undoubtedly incumbent on all to seek for a reunion of Christendom under the headship of the principal see. Yet the Roman Church may be partly in fault for the division which has taken place, and it may be necessary for her to make some concessions. The state of Protestants may be a sort of temporary, provisional condition. I do not like it, and I wish to see the reunion of Christendom take place. Yet, why should I be bound individually to go over to the Church of Rome? I can have more liberty of thought, perhaps may do more good, by joining Dr. Flower's congregation, where there is a sort of Unitarian Catholic movement going on, or at the most, going to the Episcopal Church, a step which is not by any means such a long stride as becoming an out-and-out Roman Catholic."

*Mr. O.*—"Why do you say that the Catholic Church is more perfect than the Oriental, Anglican, or other Protestant communions?"

*Mr. M.*—"Because she alone possesses the perfect principle of unity in doctrine and organization."

*Mr. O.*—"You admit, then, that it is only through this principle that a reunion of all Christians with the Catholic Church can take place?"

*Mr. M.*—"I do."

*Mr. O.*—"Is not this principle seated in the doctrine of the supremacy of the Holy See over the universal church, in relation to all matters of faith and discipline?"

*Mr. M.*—"It is."

*Mr. O.*—"Then the Roman Church can make no concession on the points of difference between herself on one side, Orientals and Protestants on the other, without losing the principle of unity, and thus making all reunion

for ever impossible. All the concessions must be on their part. They must yield in regard to every point which involves a rejection of the supremacy of the Roman Church, whether as to discipline or doctrine. That is to say, they must recognize the justice of the claim put forth by the Roman Church, that communion with her is essential in order to constitute a particular church an orthodox and legitimate member of the church universal. This is precisely the exclusive claim to which you object. For it requires by logical necessity that all who are not within the communion of the Roman Church should be excluded from the true Catholic Church founded by Christ. The Catholic Church comprises within itself the universal body of pastors and faithful in unity with the Roman Church. This Catholic Church is infallible in doctrine, sovereign in legislation.

“Behold the entire, special, and exclusive claim of the Catholic Church, the principle of her unity and stability, the principle which alone can enable all Christians to participate in the same unity and stability, and thus escape from the state of perpetual division and change in which they now are. This is the very principle which constitutes the Catholic Church of to-day the true successor of all the preceding ages, or, in other words, the real embodiment of historical Christianity. Therefore, by the force of what you have previously admitted, you must acknowledge that this principle has been received from Jesus Christ himself, and by him implanted in the original constitution of the church.”

*Mr. M.*—“I believe I must; anyhow, I don't see how I can help myself. The sovereignty and infallibility of the Catholic Church as constituted a corporate unity by the supremacy of the Roman Church, must be acknowledged, or we must fall back on individualism, *alias* rationalism, *alias* nihilism, and return to the region of chaos and old night. Still, I would like some positive proof

that Jesus Christ did personally promulgate a decree establishing the Roman Church in the imprescriptible rights claimed by her; and a precept commanding obedience to the doctrine and law proclaimed by her."

*Mr. O.*—"Allow me to modify your verbal statement of the demand you have made, and I will satisfy it as fully as any reasonable man can desire. You speak of a decree giving rights to the *Roman Church*. There was no supremacy conferred by Jesus Christ on the Roman Church as such; that is, considered as a congregation or diocese existing in the city of Rome. The ruling and teaching functions of a particular church are lodged in the bishop. When we speak of the supremacy of the Roman Church, we mean the supremacy of the Roman bishops, who are aided by the counsel and advice of their clergy, and fulfil a great portion of their official duties through their instrumentality, but whose authentic acts of jurisdiction proceed from their own personal authority. It is not precisely in their quality as bishops of Rome that they possess a universal, episcopal jurisdiction over the Catholic Church. That jurisdiction is a right annexed to or superinduced upon the ordinary episcopal jurisdiction of the Bishop of the Roman Church, by virtue of his succession from St. Peter. It is because St. Peter made the episcopal see of Rome his own apostolic and pontifical see, leaving his own special, personal authority as Vicar of Christ, together with the ordinary power of the episcopate, to his successors in the same see, that the bishops of Rome are the supreme bishops of the Catholic Church. Our Lord Jesus Christ did constitute St. Peter and his successors his vicars on earth; St. Peter did establish an order of succession to this vicariate in the line of succession to the Roman episcopate. It is easy enough to prove these two facts; and that is equivalent to proving that the supremacy of the Roman Church is derived from a precept of Jesus Christ."



*Mr. M.*—"I have been studying this matter for the last five months, and, indeed, I had examined ecclesiastical history pretty carefully long before this. I am convinced that Christ gave the primacy to St. Peter, that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and that the bishops of Rome have always had the primacy as successors to the see of Peter."

*Mr. O.*—"Well, then, my good friend, what more do you want?"

*Mr. M.*—"Proof that there is a precept of Jesus Christ requiring all persons to submit to that teaching of the Bishop of Rome, regarding his own supremacy in matters of faith and law, to which the Bishop of Rome exacts submission, as the condition of enjoying the privileges of his communion."

*Mr. O.*—"I suppose you will admit that Jesus Christ, when he proclaims himself to be the Son of God, by that very fact exacts all the obedience from men which is due to him as supreme ruler?"

*Mr. M.*—"Yes."

*Mr. O.*—"In the same way, when he proclaims St. Peter and his successors as his vicars in the supreme pastorate of the universal church, he has already given a precept to all the members of the church to submit to their pastoral office. He gave to St. Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and declared that whatsoever he should bind or loose on earth should be bound and loosed in heaven. This is a delegation of his own supreme power to St. Peter, which constituted him, in the full force of the term, the Vicar of Christ. Now, when the successor of St. Peter requires the acceptance of certain doctrines and the obedience to certain laws as a condition of enjoying the full rights of a member of the church or a citizen of the kingdom of heaven, he exercises this power of the keys and this power of binding or obliging the conscience. Jesus Christ has given his own full, unre-

served sanction to it beforehand, and, as it were, affixed his signature and seal to the blank sheets on which his vicars write their laws. In doing this, Jesus Christ has made himself responsible that his vicars shall never exact as a term of communion in the Catholic Church the belief of any doctrine as of faith which is not contained in the divine revelation, or the rejection of any doctrine which really is of faith, or obedience to any law which is sinful, or the violation of any law which is morally binding. He can and he ought to do this, in order to conform to the truth of his divine nature as God Incarnate. He can make his church indefectible and infallible, because he has divine power. He must do it, because he has given to his church an authority which would be nugatory, or else subversive of his own authority, unless he did confer this unerring gift. By appointing St. Peter and his colleagues the teachers of the world in his own name, with his own previous and explicit sanction of their teaching, he has sanctioned the teaching of their own infallibility which they have put forth from the beginning. Still further: as there is no legitimate authority in the Catholic Church except St. Peter and his colleagues, and every member of the church is bound to obey the legitimate authority of its pastors, and every baptized person is a member of the church, every baptized person is bound to obey the Pope and those bishops who are in communion with him, as the successors of St. Peter and the apostles. This is a necessary consequence of faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Because Jesus Christ is truly God, his institutions are permanent and unchangeable, his laws divine and obligatory, his vicars and delegates clothed with authority by right divine. He being supreme lord and sovereign over all, obedience to his precepts, whether given directly by himself or immediately through his duly authorized legates and ambassadors, is of universal

obligation upon all men, in all times and places. Therefore, my dear friend, that obligation which Pope Pius IX. and the Archbishop of New York bind upon you to submit yourself as a docile child to their pastoral authority is bound in heaven; and that excommunication from the company of the faithful which they bind upon you as the penalty of knowing, wilful disobedience to their precept, is also bound in heaven. Show me a dispensation, if you can, countersigned in the celestial court with the same authentic seal and signature. For that alone could justify you in staying out of the Catholic Church, with such a clear knowledge as you possess of the grounds which prove that she is the only true church of Christ."

*Mr. M.*—"I have no such dispensation, nor do I want it. I am convinced, and I am glad of it. Mrs. Mayflower, as women usually do, has taken the shorter road of the heart and the holy instincts of the spiritual nature to the same result. The children are all ready and eager to be received into the Catholic Church. I started them off in the right direction, and they got ahead of me. I have been lagging behind to reason up the matter, after my fashion as a slow old gentleman. But I have reached the gate at last, with some puffing and blowing, and you may be sure that I shall not be slow in knocking for admittance."

*Mr. O.*—"Well said; and when done, it will be well done, and so, of course, it will be well if it be done quickly. I am sure you will make one of the staunchest Catholics going, after you are once fairly in the church."

*Mr. M.*—"You may rely on me for that. I like to be true to my own principles, and, when my premises are well established, to follow them out logically to their conclusions. There is no tenable ground between being an utter sceptic or a thorough-going Catholic, on sound philosophical principles. To be a sceptic is to be a fool; and therefore the highest wisdom, the most perfect act of

reason, the most ennobling act of manhood, is to submit to the infallible authority of the Catholic Church, which alone can give us certitude in matters of religion elevated by their very nature above reason."

The two old gentlemen, finding it was already past twelve o'clock, here ended their conversation; and after a very affectionate adieu, the one betook himself to his own home, and the other to his night-prayers before going to bed. Mr. Mayflower was as good as his word; and the very next day made his appearance, accompanied by his wife and his family of blooming children, at the parlor of a religious house, asked for one of the fathers, and requested him to take the whole group under his instruction. Last Sunday they all made their first communion together, and Mr. Oldecastle knelt at the rail beside his old friend, without any great demonstration of emotion, but with his honest, upright heart full of a calm, intense joy at the happy result of his example and conversation during so many past years.

We take leave of our respectable old friends, with our best wishes for their future happiness, and the devout hope that many others like them may be led into the bosom of the Catholic Church; where the reason is satisfied, doubt allayed, the conscience purified, the heart filled, and both life and death made blessed by the grace of the true God and our Saviour Jesus Christ, who is the only Light, and the true Life of the world.

## WHO FOUNDED THE CATHOLIC CHURCH?

WHEN Jesus Christ walked upon earth among men, the question was asked, "Who is he?" Some answered, "He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of devils he casteth out devils."\* Others took him to be a holy and inspired man: some saying, "He is John the Baptist, others Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." † On the other hand, his true disciples, with the Apostle Peter, confessed his divinity, declaring him to be "Christ, the Son of the living God." ‡

In the same way the question is asked in our day, "What is the Catholic Church?" Some men answer, She is the work of Satan, the seat of error, and the synagogue of Antichrist. This is what Luther and his followers would have the world believe. On no other ground could he or can they justify themselves for breaking off from the Catholic Church and setting up another form of religion in opposition to her. This belief of theirs was made a part of the Protestant creed. Hence they took every means in their power to destroy the church. They even called, upon the Turks to aid them in its destruction. The great body of Protestant commentators on the Holy Scriptures interpret them, when they speak of "the man of sin," and the "harlot of Babylon," to mean the Catholic Church. In their synods and in their sermons they keep up the same language, and prophesy the speedy downfall of the Catholic Church.

\* Mark. lii. 23.

† Matt. xvi. 14.

‡ Matt. xvi. 16.

Is it not strange, thoughtful reader, that the Catholic Church, which has faithfully preserved the Hcly Bible, and from whose hands all Christians have received it, and which alone has been instrumental in converting the nations to the Christian faith, should be spoken against and vilified in this manner? Do such works look like the works of "the man of sin?" Is it not strange that the Catholic Church, which counts among her children millions of martyrs, who laid down their lives for the testimony of Christ, should be the church of Antichrist? Is it not strange that missionaries like St. Austin, St. Boniface, St. Patrick, and St. Francis Xavier, and men like St. Bernard, St. Charles Borromeo, and St. Vincent of Paul, should be the ministers and apostles of Antichrist? Is it not strange that men who are acknowledged by all as eminent for their intelligence and virtue, such as the Schlegels, the Newmans, the Wilberforces, and the Mannings, should, in the light of our day, become members of the Catholic Church and she be the synagogue of Satan? Are such fruits as these the fruits of Satan? Is Satan divided against himself? "How can Satan," was the reply of our Lord to his calumniators, "cast out Satan?" Are not these accusations against the Catholic Church proofs of her being Christ's Church according to his own words: "The disciple is not above the master, nor the servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord. If they have called the good man of the house of Beelzebub, how much more them of his household? Therefore fear them not."\*

Men of another class, who have more knowledge and are less blinded by prejudice, such as Macaulay, Channing, and Bancroft, seek to account for the founding of the Catholic Church on another theory. They recognize

\* Matt x. 25.

the greatness, the permanence, and the Christian character of the Catholic Church, but attribute this to "human skill and sagacity in religion," and regard her as a monument of human genius." These men are like those Jews who looked upon Christ as Elias, or Jeremias, or one of the prophets.

What truth is there in this theory? Let us see: Here is a church that possesses unity of faith and an unchangeable code of morals, which counts two hundred millions of men as her children, which has lasted for nineteen centuries, and bids fair to last until the end of all time. Now, to tell us that this is all due to the sagacity and genius of Catholics is much too flattering to be true, and we honestly cannot so accept it. Without any claim to an unusual degree of humility, we may, on the part of Catholics, venture to express the opinion that they are not endowed with any more skill, sagacity, or genius than other folk. We disclaim all natural superiority, as Catholics, over our fellow-men. The inventors of this theory do not believe it themselves, but, like the inventors of the Satanic theory, they put it forth in order to avoid the necessity of acknowledging the true character of the Catholic Church. For there is no other way of giving a rational account of the Catholic Church, except by recognizing that she was founded by Christ, and is guided and upheld by the Holy Spirit of God.

The Catholic Church was founded by Jesus Christ. This is what the third class acknowledge. That Christ intended to found a church there can be no question. Here are his words: "And I say to thee, that thou art Peter; and upon this rock *I will build my Church.*"\* No Christian will venture to doubt that Christ fulfilled this his promise.

He promised that his Church should never fail; for,

\* Matt. xvi. 18.

after having made the above promise, he added, "And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."\* Hence the truth of the saying, "Once the Church, always the Church."

Christ gave to his Church the commission and command to preach his Gospel to the whole world. "All power is given to me in heaven and upon earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations."† A command which the Catholic Church alone has fulfilled.

He promised to remain with his Church always. "And behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." Hence the Church is always holy, for Christ always dwells in her.

Be not stultified, sincere reader; it is not Satan, it is not human sagacity or genius that has founded the holy Catholic Church, but the word of Jesus Christ, the God-man, who has said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away."‡

Be no longer misled, sincere reader; it is not ignorance or superstition which so strongly attaches Catholics to the Church. It is nothing of this sort; but it is their firm faith, grounded upon the express words and promises of Jesus Christ.

Do you, reader, believe firmly in the divinity of Christ? If so, be a consistent follower of him, and believe, also, firmly in his word, and acknowledge the Catholic Church, "which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."§

\* Matt. xvi. 18.

† Matt. xxviii. 18.

‡ Matt. xxiv. 35.

§ 1 Tim. iii. 15.



## THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

---

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN MR. MATHER, A PROTESTANT,  
AND MR. APPLETON, A CONVERT TO THE  
CATHOLIC CHURCH.

---

MR. MATHER meets Mr. Appleton returning from church one Sunday morning, and after some desultory conversation he is emboldened to ask, "Friend Appleton, why did you become a Catholic?"

*Mr. Appleton.*—"Why did I become a Catholic? To save my soul, of course. What other motive do you suppose I could have had?"

*Mr. Mather.*—"Well, I don't know precisely. The fact is, I have been a good deal puzzled by your leaving the good old paths of your forefathers and joining the Catholic Church, and I have often thought I would like to hear what you had to say in justification of such a course. You certainly do not mean to say that you could not have been saved just as well in the religion of your ancestors as in that religion which we have all been taught to look upon as superstitious, and even idolatrous and abominable?"

*Mr. A.*—"I mean just what I have said. I joined the Catholic Church to save my soul, and because I became fully convinced that I could not save my soul in the religion in which I had been brought up."

*Mr. M.*—"Ah! then I see it is true, what we have so often heard charged against the Catholics: you believe

that the Catholic Church is the only true church, and that out of that church there is no salvation."

*Mr. A.*—"Well, yes, I do believe that the Catholic Church is the only true church, and that out of it there is no salvation, for *me* at least."

*Mr. M.*—"For *you* at least? Of course, if there is no salvation for you, there is no salvation for any of us."

*Mr. A.*—"I did not say that, but if you like the logic I will not be so bold as to deny it."

*Mr. M.*—"If I like the logic! But I don't like the logic. The conclusion is too absurd and too dreadful for any sane man to admit."

*Mr. A.*—"Why is it so absurd? If the premises are good the conclusion follows as a natural consequence, whether we like it or not."

*Mr. M.*—"But I am not so sure of the premises."

*Mr. A.*—"Do you believe Almighty God established a church in the world?"

*Mr. M.*—"Of course I do; we believe in the church as much as the Catholics do."

*Mr. A.*—"What was the church established for?"

*Mr. M.*—"To save souls, of course. Our Lord chose His apostles and sent them into the world to preach the Gospel and establish His church; and His great commission was, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned.'"

*Mr. A.*—"Very good I am glad to see you are so orthodox. Now if, as you have clearly proved, our Lord made the church the ordinary means of salvation to man, what becomes of those who are out of the church?"

*Mr. M.*—"Ah! I see you are trying to corner me. But remember a great apostle has said, 'In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him.'"

*Mr. A.*—"I might ask why you twist the word 'nation' about to mean 'church' in that text, since, if you refer to the verse Acts x. 35, you will see that St. Peter said that because he had just been convinced by a vision that other people could be saved besides those who were by *nation* Jews, and that there is no question about 'church' at all. Certainly a Hottentot can be saved as well as an American, and on what condition, friend Mather?"

*Mr. M.*—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

*Mr. A.*—"And he that believeth not—"

*Mr. M.*—"Shall be damned."

*Mr. A.*—"And is not that, also, too absurd and dreadful for a sane man to believe?"

*Mr. M.*—"Then you mean to say that it is no more absurd and dreadful for you Catholics to believe that we poor heretics will be damned if we do not believe what you teach than it is to believe that the heathen and infidels will be damned if they refuse to receive the message of the Gospel?"

*Mr. A.*—"Did I call you a heretic?"

*Mr. M.*—"You might as well. You claim to be the only true church, and of course all who are out of that church must necessarily be heretics, or at least schismatics, which is not much better."

*Mr. A.*—"You have learned logic, I see, under an excellent master."

*Mr. M.*—"But this is not my argument; it is yours."

*Mr. A.*—"Well, what is your argument? Do you mean to say that heretics and schismatics will be saved?"

*Mr. M.*—"Of course not. How can I maintain that those will be saved whom our Lord and His apostles condemn? 'Mark those who cause divisions (schisms) among you, and have no fellowship with them.' And *schisms*

are included among those sins which merit the divine reprobation."

*Mr. A.*—"That is good Catholic doctrine. I assent to that most fully. Wherein do we differ?"

*Mr. M.*—"You need not try to make out that we are agreed; I'm sure we are not."

*Mr. A.*—"But why should you insist that there are differences between us when there are none? Is it not desirable that Christian people should agree as far as possible?"

*Mr. M.*—"Yes, but I don't like you to turn me over to the uncovenanted mercies of God."

*Mr. A.*—"The uncovenanted mercies of God! I never used such an expression. That is not Catholic language."

*Mr. M.*—"I don't know what Catholic language is, but I know what Catholic theory and Catholic practice are. They unhesitatingly consign all who are out of what they call the church to eternal perdition."

*Mr. A.*—"What do *you* do with all who are out of what you call the true church?"

*Mr. M.*—"We leave them in the hands of God."

*Mr. A.*—"In the hands of the 'uncovenanted mercies?'"

*Mr. M.*—"I see you are determined to poke fun at me. But I am not to be put off in that way. I still maintain there are very serious differences between the Catholic and Protestant theory."

*Mr. A.*—"Oh! I have not the slightest doubt of that, but so far as we have gone I don't see but we are pretty well agreed. You believe that Christ established a church on earth to be the ordinary means of salvation to man. So do we. You hold that those who willfully reject the truth will be damned. That is our belief also. You believe that heresy and schism are damnable sins. So do we. And those who are out of the church, as you understand it, you leave to the 'uncovenanted mercies

of God,' or, as we prefer to say, in the hands of a merciful God, which is not necessarily to consign them all to eternal perdition, since, 'in every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness,' he that honestly lives up to the light he has, and walks humbly before God, he that loves the truth and seeks for it as for hidden treasure and is ready to follow it wherever it leads, 'is accepted of Him.' That is our doctrine also with reference to those who are out of the church, as we understand it."

*Mr. M.*—"Then you do admit that some of other churches may be saved?"

*Mr. A.*—"If I do, it is not *because* they are members of those churches, but in *spite* of it."

*Mr. M.*—"Rather a *spiteful* reason, it seems to me; but explain, if you please, how they will be saved."

*Mr. A.*—"They will be saved by virtue of their baptism and belief."

*Mr. M.*—"But they do not believe in the Catholic Church nor have they been baptized into it."

*Mr. A.*—"Yes they have, if they have been *validly* baptized. True baptism unites to the body of Christ and necessarily makes one a member of the Catholic Church."

*Mr. M.*—"But how, pray tell me, can a man be a member of the Catholic Church and at the same time a member of some other church?"

*Mr. A.*—"There can be but one true church of Christ, that is the Catholic Church. If a man has been validly baptized, he thereby has become a member of the Catholic Church, and will continue so until, by some voluntary act of his own, he forfeits his title to membership, no matter what other society he may belong to, whether it be a temperance society, a moral reform society, or a religious society calling itself a church."

*Mr. M.*—"Then a man can really be a member of the

Catholic Church though he be not in *visible communion* with the church?"

*Mr. A.*—"Exactly so. And if his separation from that visible unity be not the result of his own voluntary act, (such as apostasy or refusing to join her visible communion through any motive when he is interiorly convinced of her truth,) and if he is validly baptized and perseveres to the end, he will undoubtedly be saved."

*Mr. M.*—"That, I suppose, is what you call being saved by *invincible ignorance*?"

*Mr. A.*—"No. The Catholic Church does not teach that any man will be saved by ignorance of any kind. He will be saved by virtue of his union with the body of Christ. His invincible ignorance will excuse him for any want of compliance with the visible institutions of the church."

*Mr. M.*—"After all, I must confess those views are much like our own in reference to the spiritual nature of the church. True, we profess not to attach so much importance to baptism and what we call the externals; but still we hold that baptism is the door of entrance into the church, and we admit that a man is bound to believe the truth under pain of damnation; and if he really has a disposition to accept the truth, when made known to him, if he love the truth for the truth's sake, and is ready to follow wherever it leads at any sacrifice, Almighty God will excuse him for ignorance of such truths as may not have been made known to him. Still, I must insist that the church as you understand it, and the church as I understand it, are two very different things."

*Mr. A.*—"No doubt of it. If I had not been convinced of that fact, I never should have abandoned the religion of my fathers and accepted that of the Catholic Church; and I want you to confess now, as an honest man, that the real ground of your objection to that church is not the old slander, that she consigns all out

of her pale to eternal perdition, but simply that she claims to be the true church of Christ."

*Mr. M.*—"Well, I will candidly acknowledge, if it will be any satisfaction to you, that there does not seem to be so much difference between us on that point as I had supposed. The real ground of my objection I see is, as you say, to the exclusive claim of the Catholic Church to be the true church of Christ. It seems so absurd and unreasonable for one denomination to set itself up above all others and say, 'We are *the* church.'"

*Mr. A.*—"Then you don't claim to belong to *the* church?"

*Mr. M.*—"Well, yes, I claim to belong to the true church of Christ of course, as I understand it."

*Mr. A.*—"The true church as you understand it! But the church as you understand it differs from the church as I understand it?"

*Mr. M.*—"Of course it does."

*Mr. A.*—"And they can't both be true?"

*Mr. M.*—"No. The Protestant religion and the Catholic religion cannot both be true."

*Mr. A.*—"Then, if you maintain that the church as you understand it is the true church, and the church as I understand it is not the true church, do you, or do you not, set yourself up above others and claim to be *the* church?"

*Mr. M.*—"But I am not absolutely sure that I am right. We do not claim to be infallible, as you do."

*Mr. A.*—"Now, friend Mather, that is just the point I wish to come at. You admit that there is a true church?"

*Mr. M.*—"Yes, I am certain of it."

*Mr. A.*—"And there are false ones?"

*Mr. M.*—"No doubt of it."

*Mr. A.*—"Now, tell me, do the false ones know that they are right?"

*Mr. M.*—"How can they know they are right when they are not?"

*Mr. A.*—"Does the true one know that she is right?"

*Mr. M.*—"Well, I suppose she ought to know it."

*Mr. A.*—" 'Suppose she ought.' Speak out, man, and look the truth in the face. She does know it. She must know it. Pretty kind of a true church that would be which couldn't tell herself from a heresy."

*Mr. M.*—"Well, what do you make out of that?"

*Mr. A.*—"Just this, my friend. The Catholic Church is the only one that says she knows infallibly that she is right. All others disclaim that infallible certainty for themselves, as being false they honestly ought to do, and therefore the Catholic Church, and she alone, is the true church of Christ."

*Mr. M.*—"I give it up. Your argument is unanswerable. I must examine into the claims of your church more particularly."

*Mr. A.*—"Do. The Catholic Church courts inquiry, and urges all men to study her doctrines, to weigh the reasons she gives for her faith and practice in the balance of common sense, and to examine her whole character in the light of the holy Scriptures and the teachings of history. Examine, examine, examine, my dear friend. The only thing I fear is that you will drop this matter, and not examine it thoroughly."

*Mr. M.*—"Oh! yes, I will. Don't fear. What you have said to me this morning puts me under the obligation, as a sincere and honest man, who is not afraid to confront the truth, to examine these serious claims of the Catholic Church."



## CHILDREN AND PROTESTANTISM.

ONE bright summer morning the writer of this was on board a steamer going down the Lower Bay of New-York, to Red Bank, to get a sniff of the fresh sea-breeze. A decently dressed individual came up and asked me whether I was a "professor of religion." I replied that I was a member of the Catholic Church. At this he began to inveigh against the awful superstition of this corrupt Church, as he was pleased to style her, and declared that it was by the merits of Christ alone that any one could be saved.

I replied, that I by no means felt inclined to dispute that assertion.

"But no one," he proceeded, "can be saved except by a simple personal reliance or trust in Christ."

"Well, then, my friend," said I, "you will oblige me very much by telling me in what way infants and young children are to be released from the state of sin in which they are born, and how they are to be introduced into the kingdom of heaven."

This was a question which had evidently been for the first time brought to his mind, and he was not prepared to give any answer to it.

It is a most practical one, and leads to important consequences, as I propose to show very shortly.

The doctrine of "Justification by faith only" shuts the gate of heaven to all infants and young children; it is therefore false, and the whole edifice of Protestant

religion built on this foundation is built on error, and the reformation is no reformation at all, but the substitution of a new falsehood for an old truth; and the quicker we return to the old truth the better.

The doctrine of "Justification by faith only" proceeds on the assumption that all men, young and old, are born in "original sin," by which they are totally depraved, lying in the wrath and anger of God, and under sentence of eternal misery. We are introduced into this state by birth, and must continue in it until we are delivered from it. And the only means by which this can be done is by "faith alone," or by a personal simple trust or reliance on Christ for salvation, apart from any other disposition of the soul, or any other condition whatever.

Now, an infant or young child can not make any such personal acts, for it has not the use of reason sufficiently to do any such thing, and therefore, in the failure of any means of release, it must remain in original sin and a state of condemnation until it arrives at an age in which it is supposed to make the act of "simple reliance" which shall deliver it.

Baptism can not deliver the soul of the child from original sin; for then we would not be "justified by faith alone," but by baptism. If there is only one means of justification, every other one is necessarily excluded.

Neither can children be justified by the faith of their parents or guardians, for this is no personal faith, but the faith of another, which can only operate to his own benefit.

Besides, every adult person, whether baptized or no, is exhorted to exercise this "faith alone" to secure his salvation. If he has in any way been already justified, this mode of treatment is inexplicable and impertinent.

Hence, I conclude that, according to the theory of "Justification by faith alone," children are left in a

state of condemnation and disfavor with God until they arrive at years of discretion.

This is the doctrine constantly inculcated from the pulpit. The child who listens is told that he and all else are included in both the guilt and condemnation of sin. He is never told that he is in God's favor, or that the fault of Adam in which he was born has in any way been made good; but, on the contrary, he gathers that he is the child of wrath and a sentenced criminal.

We can not say, then, that the Protestant doctrine of "Justification by faith only" is true; for this consideration that it excludes children from the pale of salvation is positive proof of its falsity. A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit. The truth of God can not lead to any false or evil conclusion. A more injurious consequence than the exclusion of children, who are fully half the human family, from all participation in the promises of Christ, we can not well conceive of.

The contempt and hatred of religion which this false doctrine produces in the minds of the young is too well known that it need be enlarged upon. "A word to the wise is sufficient," and I appeal most confidently to the experience of those who have lived under such teaching, to testify that what is here said is only the plain and literal truth.

Baptism has been established by our Saviour on purpose to wash away "original sin and its consequences." "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" and again, "Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Ghost he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

The Church of God, for all ages, and in all countries, has understood, that being "born of water and the Holy Ghost" means that when the water of baptism is applied, according to Christ's institution, the Holy Ghost sanctifies the child, rendering it really and truly the friend

and child of God, and the heir of heaven; removing all the disability it contracted through the sin of Adam. Surely the practice and teaching of the Church for all ages ought to weigh more than the private and personal interpretations which even twist words out of their natural and obvious sense.

In consequence of this perverse treatment of Christ's words, we find baptism fallen into great disuse. The Baptists reject altogether infant baptism, and many other sects think so little of it that it is safe to say the great majority of infants are not baptized. The greater part of children who die, die without the waters of regeneration.

Strange! that parents who guard their children from all possible harm in this life, and toil and sweat to procure for them the means of living well here, should be so indifferent and so careless about applying that simple means which nine tenths of Christians in all ages firmly believe to be the door of heaven, and the appointed means by which God has provided that they who, without any coöperation on their part, lost the grace of eternal life, should by his free bounty receive back again the grace they had lost.

The Catholic Church is a true mother of the soul to children as well as adults, as has been shown more fully in Tract No. 16, of this series.

Here I leave the matter to the consideration of the reader, in connection with the words of our Saviour, "A good tree can not yield bad fruit, neither can a bad tree yield good fruit. By their fruits ye shall know them."

~~No. 20.~~

February 3<sup>rd</sup> - 1932

## HOW TO KEEP LENT.

---

You are well aware, my dear reader, that the Holy Church has set apart each year a certain time called Lent, in which she enjoins on her children to practise fasting and abstinence from certain kinds of food. Now, one may ask, Why does the Church do this? I will tell you.

Many people think it useless and even superstitious to fast from food, or to deny one's self in other things which are pleasing to our natural inclinations. Their idea is, that, so long as we do not do anything positively sinful, there is no need to put any further check upon our own will and pleasure. This is a very deceitful and flattering delusion, and one calculated to eat out the very life of the Christian character. Self-love and self-indulgence are the worst enemies of the soul. As they grow stronger, the love of God grows weaker. The more they are kept under control and made powerless, the more the grace of God will exert its effect upon us.

Hence, our Saviour has said, "He that will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." And he, as we read, went out into the desert and fasted forty days and forty nights, to give us an example. He kept the first Lent, and the church has kept Lent ever since in memory of that first Lent, and to imitate the example he then gave us.

She prescribes fasting from food in order to sanction and recommend the grand principle of self-denial in re-

gard to worldly things and pleasures, so that we may raise up our minds to a greater earnestness in heavenly desires. In this she shows clearly the divine wisdom which directs her, and that she is truly Holy Mother Church, that is, a true mother of our souls.

Is it not plain that most people need such a time as Lent to renew themselves in spirit, and to correct what has become amiss? It is so with the merchant. No matter how carefully he manages his affairs, he must have his set times for posting up his books and taking account of his stock, or his business will fall into disorder. When he has done this and brought everything into good order, he feels great satisfaction, and is prepared to go on with new life and energy. And I may say that God himself seems to renew the face of nature in the spring of the year. The grass grows green, the buds swell, the leaves open, and the whole country is clothed in a new dress. In like manner ~~the~~ Lent is the spring-time of the soul, when the cold, frosty winter gives way, and the soul grows young and fresh once more in her love of God and resolution to keep his commandments.

And when this time of Lent comes round each year, God stirs up a new life in you, and makes you say to yourself, no matter how careless or how wicked you have been: "It is high time for me to attend to myself. God calls me, and I must obey his voice. It will not do to let this Lent go by without having set the accounts of my conscience in order, and made my peace with my Creator." This is the thought of the Catholic heart. And now let us see how this blessed time can be spent in the best manner possible.

In the first place, begin it with a right good will, and say: "I will endeavor to get all the good I can out of this Lent. I will now endeavor to give my best attention to the affairs of my soul, and in order to do this I

*A Season that is needed*

will withdraw it as much as possible from all vain and useless things, which would take up my mind and drive God and holy things out of it. My fast shall not be merely from the meat of the body, but from vain thoughts and idle words; and I will go into Lent with a cheerful and hopeful spirit, trusting in the goodness of God, who never refuses to help those who sincerely seek him, and ask his grace with humility."

Begin, then, on Ash-Wednesday, so as not to lose time, and be in the church on that morning to receive the ashes. The priest will mark the sign of the cross with them on your forehead, and repeat the words, "Remember, man, that thou art dust, and unto dust thou shalt return." A most impressive ceremony, and one calculated to remind you forcibly of the one great fact which sooner or later must come to every one of us. Bear in mind this great lesson, and think on death, for this will drive out all that is evil, and sanctify your soul; for, as Scripture says, "Remember thy last end, and thou shalt never sin." (Eccl. vii. 40.)

*Begin  
on the  
first day*

Make up your mind to attend all the services which are held in the church during this time; assist at Mass with all possible devotion; and whenever the word of God is preached, be there to hear it. If there is to be preaching or the Way of the Cross in the evening, do not mind the cold ~~of the~~ weather, but get your supper and be off to the church. Keep in mind the saying of a good old woman, who, when she came back from an early Mass on a cold winter morning, was asked by her grandson, who had just crept out of a warm bed to his breakfast, "Grandmother, how can you, old as you are, go out to church on such a morning as this?" and she replied, "My son, my faith keeps me warm."

Let your faith warm *your* heart, and go to the church. There God is present in the blessed sacrament, and speaks through the mouth of his minister, the priest.

How much better to be there than at a place of dissipation, where sin abounds and all sorts of evil conversation are carried on! How much better to be there than to be idling away your time at home in jokes and laughter, if not in slandering your neighbor or in more sinful talk!

Go to church, even if it costs you some self-denial, and you will come back happy and contented. Stay at home because you are careless and indifferent, and you will be self-condemned, cross, and miserable. People are often unhappy and they do not know the reason why. It is because they place their happiness in selfish indulgence, and they cannot be satisfied with it. If they would only seek it in God and his service, they would enjoy a satisfaction beyond the power of words to express.

But going to the church would be of little avail without adding prayer to it. Pray as much as you can during the Lent. Fasting would be of no great advantage without prayer. If you do not offer up the fast with the right intention to God, it will not be acceptable to him; and this right intention cannot be kept up without much prayer. One ought to say to himself: "I have a good deal of business to transact with my God at this time, and I must be about it. I must send up to heaven a great number of prayers to beg for mercy and pardon, and for a thousand graces I need so much. I will do it in the house and in the street, at my work and at my meals, at home and in the church, by night and by day, at all times and in all places." Short prayers, or ejaculations, as they are called, such as, "God be gracious to me," "O Lord! be merciful to me and pardon my sins," "The will of God be done in all things," "God preserve me from all sins, small and great," etc., repeated frequently, have a most powerful effect to draw down the grace of God in abundance upon the soul. Some who have practised them faithfully for even a few

*Double your  
Devotion in Prayer*



days have been so changed that they have abandoned a wicked life, and turned to God with their whole hearts, and continued to lead holy lives ever after until the hour of their death.

And try to <sup>arrange a little</sup> get a good time each day when you can be alone with God, and spend it in sending up sincere and earnest prayers and good wishes to draw down the grace which he has promised to give to all who persist in begging until their prayers are granted. He that hears the cry of the young birds will not despise the cry of a poor soul, for whom our Lord Jesus Christ died on the cross. If you will have a profitable and a delightful Lent, pray much. Try it, and see if my words do not come true.

But what would be the use of going to the church and praying, if you should allow yourself to go on in sin or in any sinful habits? It is of the very first and prime importance to shut the door on such things at the very beginning of Lent. Bid good-by, then, to any old habits of sin you may have, and you need not be very polite about it either. Say to them all: "Get you gone! you have deceived and cheated me long enough. You pretended to make me happy, and you have made me miserable and poor enough; for you have robbed me of my God, you have stolen all the treasure of my soul from me. Begone! and never come back. I have done with you for ever!"

Avoid the haunts of dissipation, the drinking-shops and bar-rooms, or any other bad resorts. Say to yourself: "As to such or such a place, I will never set my foot within it from this moment. If I would avoid the kingdom of Satan for all eternity, I must keep out of his dominions now."

Make this firm and good resolution. Stop all sin at the outset of Lent. Cut off all the occasions of sin which led you into sin before, and will do so again if you go into

*Conquer Your Faults*

them. Do this, and it will be the surest way of drawing down God's blessing upon you. It will most surely drive the evil one from you, and break up his power, so that he cannot get it again. God has said, and he will be true to his word: "When the wicked man turneth away from his sin, and doeth that which is right, he shall surely save his soul."

This will sometimes cost a great deal, and require a strong resolution; but think of the reward beyond all price, and it will give you courage to make the sacrifice, and to make it gladly and cheerfully.

With these dispositions, I can safely promise that the Easter-time will not go by without your having made *several* good and satisfactory confessions, and obtained the pardon of your sins. You may have been a long time away, or your conscience may be weighed down by heavy sins, and you may feel a dread of confession, but your goodwill will remove all the difficulties. These difficulties are always more imaginary than real, and, when one is in downright earnest, they disappear like the clouds before the wind. Think on your soul, and pray, and your sins will come up before you, and you will see them in their real enormity, so that it will not be difficult either to examine your conscience, or to conceive a true sorrow for your sins when you discover them. Your thoughts will naturally be directed to your confession, and with no great effort or difficulty you will be able to make it satisfactorily, and at the time of your confession the priest of God will assist you, so that there is really no obstacle in your way which need hinder you a moment.

The confession and the communion put the seal on the good work begun by prayer and self-denial, and this is the reason why the Easter communion is made an obligation on all Catholics. Would that Holy Church, and the holy angels and saints, and our Lord Jesus Christ could look with satisfaction on the spectacle of all the

faithful, clothed in white garments of innocence and renewed in the spirit of their minds, assisting each year at the celebration of the festival of Easter, when our Lord arose from death to immortal life! Then, arising from the death of sin to the life of grace, we should soon arise to eternal life, to share with him his boundless and unspeakable glory and happiness.

Of course, you will endeavor to keep the fast and abstinence prescribed by the church as well as your health and the nature of your occupation will permit. If you are unwell, or have laborious and exhausting labor to do, and in some other circumstances, you are not required to fast. In such case, try at least to keep the spirit of the fast, and deny yourself what you can without injury. Observe moderation in all things, and cut off what simply serves luxury and pleasure, and offer all your mortification to our Lord with great cheerfulness. Say: "What a privilege it is to be able to deny myself a few things now, that my soul may be stronger and more inclined to heavenly and spiritual things!" Remember the words of our Lord: "When you fast, be not, as the hypocrites, sad: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. But, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not to men to fast, but to thy Father, who is in secret: and thy Father, who seeth in secret, will repay thee."

Those who are able to read would find it a great help to spend their Lent well, if they had some good books to occupy themselves with when they find leisure time. I would recommend particularly the Holy Scriptures or the lives of the saints. Nothing is more powerful than example to encourage us to the practice of virtue. The words and life of our Lord, the lives of the saints and their happy deaths, influence our soul with an ardent desire to imitate them, and to be associated with them in

*If you cannot fast  
do something else*

their reward. Instead of trashy novels and irreligious newspapers, how much better to read moral and religious books. Books are a powerful engine nowadays either for good or evil; we should use them to promote the life and health of the soul, and not for its destruction and death.

For the rest, remember that Lent is the time for all sorts of good works. The examples of Jesus Christ and of his Blessed Mother ought to be before your eyes constantly. He went about doing good, and you, according to your opportunity, should try to do good to a poor neighbor, or at least to speak a good word to encourage him. Jesus Christ was mild and gentle in all his actions. The thought of this ought to keep down many a rising of angry passion, many a harsh word, many a rash judgment, and make you give up all enmity. Jesus Christ was humble, and looked up to his Heavenly Father as the author of all good. This should make us put away all pride and contempt of others, and make us acknowledge that there is no good in us which has not been given us by our Creator, who can take it away when he pleases. Jesus was patient, and suffered all kinds of pains and hardships. If we are sick, or poor, or afflicted, let us remember this, and we shall be able to say, as Job did, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord."

Draw near to God in this way during Lent, and he will draw near to you. Spend even one Lent in this way, and you will be quite sure to spend the next in the same way, and all that come after it. By and by there will be no need of Lent, for you will enjoy a perpetual, never-ending Easter in heaven.

## IS IT HONEST

*To say that the Catholic Church prohibits the use of the Bible—*

WHEN any body who chooses can buy as many as he likes at any Catholic bookstore, and can see on the first page of any one of them the approbation of the Bishops of the Catholic Church, with the Pope at their head, encouraging Catholics to read the Bible, in these words: "The faithful should be excited to the reading of the Holy Scriptures," and that not only for the Catholics of the United States, but also for those of the whole world besides?

## IS IT HONEST

*To say that Catholics believe that man, by his own power, can forgive sin—*

WHEN the priest is regarded by the Catholic Church only as the agent of our Lord Jesus Christ, acting by the power delegated to him, according to these words, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained?" St. John xx. 23.

## IS IT HONEST

*To repeat over and over again that Catholics pay the priest to pardon their sins—*

WHEN such a thing is unheard of anywhere in the Catholic Church—

WHEN any transaction of the kind is stigmatized as a grievous sin, and ranked along with murder, adultery, blasphemy, etc., in every catechism and work on Catholic theology?

## IS IT HONEST

*To persist in saying that Catholics believe their sins are forgiven, merely by the confession of them to the priest, without a true sorrow for them, or a true purpose to quit them—*

WHEN every child finds the contrary distinctly and clearly stated in the catechism, which he is obliged to learn before he can be admitted to the sacraments? Any honest man can verify this statement by examining any Catholic catechism.

## IS IT HONEST

*To assert that the Catholic Church grants any indulgence or permission to commit sin—*

WHEN an "indulgence," according to her universally received doctrine, was never dreamed

of by Catholics to imply, in any case whatever, any permission to commit the least sin; and when an indulgence has no application whatever to sin until after sin has been repented of and pardoned?

## IS IT HONEST

*To accuse Catholics of putting the Blessed Virgin or the Saints in the place of God or the Lord Jesus Christ—*

WHEN the Council of Trent declares that it is simply useful to ask their intercession in order to obtain favor from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Saviour and Redeemer—

WHEN “asking their prayers and influence with God,” is exactly of the same nature as when Christians ask the pious prayers of one another?

## IS IT HONEST

*To accuse Catholics of paying divine worship to images or pictures, as the heathen do—*

WHEN every Catholic indignantly repudiates any idea of the kind, and when the Council of Trent distinctly declares the doctrine of the Catholic Church in regard to them to be, ‘that

there is no divinity or virtue in them which should appear to claim the tribute of one's veneration;" but that "all the honor which is paid to them shall be referred to the originals whom they are designed to represent?" Sess. 25.

## IS IT HONEST

*To make these and many other similar charges against Catholics—*

WHEN they detest and abhor such false doctrines more than those do who make them, and make them, too, without ever having read a Catholic book, or taken any honest means of ascertaining the doctrines which the Catholic Church really teaches?

Remember the commandment of God, which says: "*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*"

Reader, would you be honest, and do no injustice? Then examine the doctrines of the Catholic Church; read the works of Catholics. See both sides. Examine, and be fair, for

AMERICANS LOVE FAIR PLAY.



## WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

---

DOES the Bible afford conclusive proof, as many believe, against the doctrines of the Catholic Church? Catholics say not; that, on the contrary, they are laid down in the Bible in plain and simple words. Which are right? Let us be impartial, and examine the principal doctrines of the Catholic Church by the light of the Holy Scriptures.

*It is denied that our Lord appointed St. Peter to be His vicegerent, and the head of His Church upon earth. Now, on the headship of St. Peter,*

## WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

“And when Jesus beheld him, he said: Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas: which is by interpretation, Peter.” (Rock or stone. See word Peter in Cruden’s (Protestant) Concordance.) (St. John 1:42.)

“And I say unto thee: Thou art Peter, (Rock,) and upon this Rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” (St. Matt. 16:18.)

“And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (V. 19.)

“Jesus said to Simon Peter : Feed my lambs. He said to him again : Feed my lambs. He said to him a third time : Feed my sheep.” (St. John 21 : 15-17.)

*It is denied that the Church of God is unerring in teaching the doctrine of Christ. Now, in regard to the Church of God,*

## WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

“Go ye, teach all nations. . . . Teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you ; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” (St. Matt. 28 : 19, 20.)

“And he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth.” (St. John 14 : 16.)

“But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind whatsoever I shall have said to you.” (V. 26.)

“Upon this rock I will build my church, AND THE GATES OF HELL SHALL NOT PREVAIL AGAINST HER.” (St. Matt. 16 : 18.)

“He that heareth you, heareth me : and he that despiseth you, despiseth me. And he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.” (St. Luke 10 : 16.)

“The church of the living God, the Pillar and Ground of the truth.” (1 Tim. 3 : 15.)

*It is said the Holy Sacrament is not the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, but only bread and wine. Now, on this point,*

## WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

“And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.” (St. John 6: 51.)

“And Jesus said to them: Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” (St. John 6: 53.)

“Take and eat: this is my Body. Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood.” (St. Matt. 26: 26.)

“For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body.” (1 Cor. 11: 29.)

*It is denied that the priest of God has power to forgive sins, though Christ Himself, with impressive ceremonies, gave a solemn commission to His ministers to do this. Now, on this point,*

## WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

“And he said to them again: Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent me, I also send you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them: and he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: WHOSE SINS YOU SHALL FORGIVE, THEY ARE FORGIVEN THEM: AND WHOSE SINS YOU SHALL RETAIN, THEY ARE RETAINED.” (St. John 20: 21-23.)

*Catholics are condemned for honoring the Blessed Virgin Mary so much. Whether Catholics, or those who condemn them, are right, is decided by asking—*

## WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

“And the angel (Gabriel) having come in, said to her: Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women.” (St. Luke 1:28.)

“And she (Elizabeth) cried out with a loud voice, and said: Blessed art thou among women.” (V. 41.)

“And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me.” (V. 42.)

“And Mary said: For behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.” (V. 48.)

“A woman of the crowd lifted up her voice and said: Blessed is the womb that bore thee, and the paps that gave thee suck.” (St. Luke 11:27.)

*It is considered superstitious and ridiculous to anoint the sick with oil, as the Catholic Church does. Now, in regard to this matter,*

## WHAT DOES THE BIBLE SAY?

“Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man: and the Lord shall raise him up: and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.” (St. James 5:14, 15.)

Reader, the “Word of God” is not to be trifled with. No man can explain it away, or evade the duty of obeying it. Read it, then, in view of this most heavy responsibility, and faithfully follow its teachings if you would save your soul.

From The Catholic World. \*

## THE ROMAN GATHERING.

BY W. G. DIX.

A MAN of many years, without vast temporal resources, despoiled of a part of his possessions, having many and vigorous enemies about him, and regarded by many even of those who profess the Christian faith as about to fall from his high place in Christendom, such a man invites his brethren of the apostolical ministry throughout the world to honor by their personal presence at Rome the anniversary of the martyrdom, eighteen hundred years ago, of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and to join with him in the exaltation of martyrs who, like them, though in far distant lands, were "faithful unto death." They respond with eager joy and haste to the call, and those who cannot go send on the wings of the wind their words of loving veneration.

To say not a word of the spiritual claims of the man who sent forth the invitation, so eagerly and widely accepted, there is in the fact just stated a glowing evidence that, even in these days of triumphant and insolent materialism, moral power has not entirely lost ascendancy. Though millions of knees are bent in honor of the Dagon of materialism, in some one or other of its myriad forms of degrading idolatry, yet millions of hearts also recognize the gift of God as present evermore in his holy church. Never before has the Catholic Church beheld so great a multitude, from so distant places, assembled at her call at the central city of the faith.

The enemies of catholicity have again and again referred to the great inventions of modern times as sure destroyers of the claims of the Catholic Church and of her hold upon her millions

\* We give place to the above article in our columns, though from a non-Catholic pen, thinking that it will be read with interest by our readers, while it indicates, at the same time, the religious tendencies which are becoming more and more prevalent among not a small class of minds in our country.—EDITOR CATHOLIC WORLD.

of members ; but lo ! these very inventions are brought into the service of the church. The printing-press, which was going to annihilate the Catholic Church, has proved one of her most effectual bulwarks ; millions of printed pages inspire the devotion of her children, and make known her claims to reading men, until many who were even her enemies and revilers, from ignorance and prejudice, acknowledge their error, and make haste to go to "their father's house." Steam, in the view of many, was about so to change the structure of society that the old and decrepit Church of Rome, the great obstacle on the railroad of materialism, was about to be run over and cast to the roadside, a weak and useless wreck ; but lo ! the power of steam enables hundreds and thousands more to go up to the sacred city, as the tribes of Israel were wont to visit Jerusalem, than could otherwise attend the festivals of the faith in St. Peter's Church. Of the manifold uses of steam, a large proportion is in the service of catholic truth. And then the telegraph ; that, surely, was to show an advanced state of civilization which could not tolerate the slow and ancient ways of catholicity ; but lo ! here, again, the event has contradicted the prophecy ; for, by means of the telegraph, the assemblage of the vast host at Rome was known throughout the world on the very day of its occurrence ; and almost literally, in all parts of Christendom, thousands of devout worshippers could turn their faces reverently toward the altar of God in Rome at the very instant when those in its immediate presence were bending before it, and could join in the same prayers and anthems, as though the world itself were one vast St. Peter's Church, and the strains of penitence and hymns of joy could reverberate across oceans and mountains, among distant nations and islands of the sea, as among the corridors and arches of one great temple sacred to the triune God.

As in these instances, so in many others, the church has extended her sway and deepened her power by the very forces which many supposed would work her ruin. The history of the church has shown in the domain of natural science, so often applied in the service of infidelity and disorder, as in the field of human passion, that God will make the wrath of man to praise him, and turn weapons designed to attack his holy church into her consecrated armor of defence. The grace of God so overrules the inventions of man and the powers of nature, that even the terrible lightning becomes the vivid messenger to convey to the ends of the earth the benediction of the Vicar of Christ.

What is the chief lesson of the recent gathering at Rome? It is this, that the church of God, so often, in the view of her enemies, destroyed, will not stay destroyed; that after every "destruction" she renews her invincible youth, and rises to pursue her career of conquest over sin, prejudice, and wrong; that, though she may bend awhile to the storm that beats upon her sacred head, she has never been wholly overcome; that, notwithstanding all that mortal enmity, defection, outrage, have done or can do, she yet lifts her forehead to the sky to be anew baptized with light from the sun of truth above; and, strong in the faith and promise of the Eternal God, she falters not in her endeavors, patient and persistent, to subdue the world to Christ.

The history of the Catholic Church abounds with instances like the Roman gathering in June, which prove that her hours of affliction are those very ones when her faithful children gather to her side, to assure her of their prayers and support, and to discern upon her saintly face those "smiles through tears" which, in times of trial, are the warmest and most touching acknowledgments of filial veneration.

The commemorative assemblage at the capital of Christendom signifies that the church of God is indestructible by any forces that earth or hell, singly or united, can bring against her. She may be at times like the bird in the snare of the fowler; but she is sure of being released at length, and then she plumes her wings afresh, and soars heavenward, filling the air with the divine, exultant music of her voice. The powerful of the earth have sometimes loaded the church with fetters; but by the strength of Christ that dwells evermore in her, she has broken the bonds asunder, or, by his transforming grace, they have become the wreaths and garlands of new victory, even as the cross of humiliation has become, by the sacrifice of our Lord, the emblem of unfading glory.

The church of Christ, bearing on her brow his holy seal, and in her hands his gifts of power, knelt in sorrow at his grave; but she hailed his resurrection with joy, and was endowed anew with treasures of immortal life. Afterward, the might of heathendom arose against her, and she descended from the wrath of man into the catacombs; but she reascended, to wear upon her brow the diadem of a spiritual empire that shall never fall until the elements shall melt with fervent heat; and even then, true to all her history in deriving new glory from every apparent defeat, she will rise again from the great grave of nature to enjoy for

ever the vision of God. Kings of the earth have denied her right to invest the pastors of her children with their due prerogatives, and have even dared her to mortal combat ; but though distressed and thwarted, she has never relinquished her inherent rights, and she never will. As many times as the head of the church on earth has been driven from Rome by armed, ungrateful violence, so many times exactly has he been welcomed back with tears of penitence and shouts of rapture.

Despoiled of treasure committed to her care by faithful stewards of God's bounty, she has labored with her own hands to feed her needy children. At one time, persecuted in the wilderness, she has found a refuge and a welcome in the courts of princes ; at another, driven from the courts of princes, because she would not deny her Lord or her divine commission, she has found a humble sanctuary in the wilderness, and knelt upon the bare earth to adore the Lord of life and light, once the child in the manger, and to invoke all the saints in glory to plead her cause in the ear of infinite justice and goodness.

She has spurned the anointed king from the temple of God, until he repented of his crime ; and on the head of the lowly monk who was spending his days in labor and prayer, she has placed the triple crown. With one hand she has bathed with "baptismal dew" the brow of the day-laborer's child, while the other she has raised in defiance of imperial might, which dared to assail her holy altar.

One of the most violent objections to the Catholic Church has been urged for the very reason that she has so faithfully held the balance between the contending forces of society. She has been accused of favoring the claims of absolutism or popular demands, as the triumph of either at the time would favor her own ends, irrespective of right. The charge is unjust, is urged by many who know better, yet it springs from an honest misapprehension in many minds. It would have been utterly impossible for an institution, designed to enlighten and guide mankind in its higher relations, not to touch human interests of every kind, and human institutions generally in many ways ; yet the challenge may safely be given to any thoughtful student of history, to acknowledge with candor, whatever may be his ecclesiastical position, that the Catholic Church, having often been chosen to be, and having an inherent right to be, the umpire between the rights of authority and the rights of individuals, has faithfully labored to sustain lawful authority when assailed by



the wild fury of misguided multitudes, and that she has interposed her powerful shield, often with the most triumphant success, to protect men whose rights as men were assailed by authority changed by ambition into arrogant and exacting tyranny. What inconsistency and insincerity have been charged against the Catholic Church for this remarkable and noble fact in her history ! In this respect the Catholic Church has followed strictly in the steps of her Divine Author, who, when on earth, invariably upheld the rights of authority, while vehemently denouncing those who unjustly exercised it ; and, while going about doing good, the friend of the friendless and the helper of the helpless, pleading with divine eloquence, and laboring with divine power for the outcast and the poor, never and nowhere sanctioned the spirit of insurrection, but enjoined obedience as one of the main duties of life. Hence, it has come about, by one of those sublime mysteries which prove the divine origin of Christianity, that the greatest revolution which has ever taken place in religious belief and in civil society in all their bearings, has been effected by the teachings, by the life and death of one who by no word or deed ever assailed authority itself or incited resistance to it.

Beauty and order being the same thing, and religious truth being the beauty of holiness, Christ, who was truth in person, must have made his church the friend and upholder of all beauty and order ; and so it has proved for eighteen hundred years. The church has been the celestial crucible in which whatever of human art or invention had within it the essential attributes of higher and spiritual goodness has been purified and adapted to the service of religion. Has poetry sought to please the imaginations of men ? the church of Christ unfolded before her the annals of Christianity, with her grand central sacrifice of infinite love, and all her demonstrations of heroic suffering and courageous faith ; and poetry drew holier inspirations from the view, and incited men by higher motives to a higher life. Have painting and sculpture sought to represent objects of refining grace and sublimity ? the church of Christ persuaded them to look into the records of the Christian past, and there they found treasures of beauty and splendor, devotion and martyrdom, whose wealth of illustration as examples, incentives, and memorials, art has not exhausted for centuries, and will never exhaust. Christian history is the inexhaustible quarry of whatever is most noble and heroic in man, purified by the grace of God. Has

architecture sought to invest stone with the attributes of spiritual and intellectual grace? the church of God has so portrayed before her the sublimities of the Christian faith, that she knelt at her feet in veneration, and thenceforth consecrated herself to build enduring structures, which, the more they show of human power and skill, the more they persuade men to the worship of God. Has eloquence sought to nerve men for the grand conflicts of life? the church of Christ has touched the lips of eloquence with living fire from her altar, until have sprung forth words that flamed with love to man and love to God. Has music sought to weave her entrancing spells around the ear and heart and soul? the church of Christ has breathed into music her own divine being, until the music of the church seems like beatific worship, and worship on earth like beatific music.

As in these respects, so in others, the church has made a holy conquest of whatever is noblest among the endowments of men. In speaking of Catholic history, even from the secular point of view, it may be justly said, that nowhere else has there been such wonderful discernment of the various capacities of the human mind, and of their various adaptations. Tenacious of the truth and of all its prerogatives, the Catholic Church has, nevertheless, allowed a wide liberty of thought. That the Catholic Church has narrowed the understandings of men, is a singular charge to make in the face of the schools of Catholic philosophy, in which men of varying mental structure, training, or habits of thought, have had full, free play of their faculties. And where else have there been so many free and varying activities as in the Catholic Church? The false charge that the church fetters the minds and movements of men, may be traced to the fact that all Catholic diversities of thought have converged, like different rays of light, in the elucidation of truth, and that varying modes of Catholic action have had one object—the advancement of truth.

Here is the intended force of all these illustrations, for they have had a logical purpose. The world will never outgrow the church. All the boasted improvements in science, in art, in civilization, so far from impeding the church of Christ, and making her existence no longer needed, will, at the same time, advance her power, and make her more needed than ever. If in the middle ages, when society was in the process of transition from the old to the new, the church was pre-eminently needed to keep what was just and right and true in the older forms of

civilization, and gradually to adapt to them what was just and right and true in the newer developments of society, most truly is the church needed now, when there exists a perfect chaos of opinions, and when a part of the civilized world is in another transition, from the aimless, rudderless vagaries of Protestantism to the solid rock of Catholicity. If ever the voice of authority was needed, like the voice of the angel of God, heard amid and above the howlings of the storm, it is needed now.

Much false reasoning has been uttered about the "unchangeable church," as though, because "unchangeable," it was not adapted to a changing and striving world, when, in truth, for the very reason that the church of Christ is unchangeably true, she is required and adapted for all the changes and emergencies of time. Who ever heard a sailor complain of the mariner's compass, because, on account of its unchangeable obstinacy, it would not conform to his private judgments and caprices about the right course? No one. It is for the very reason that the mariner's compass is unchangeably true to the eternal law of magnetic attraction, under all circumstances and in all places, that it is the unerring guide among the whirlwinds and heavings of the great deep. Catholicity is the mariner's compass upon a greater deep—even that of the wild and rolling, beating ocean of humanity, pointing, amid sunny calms, or gentle winds, or raging gales, unerringly to the cross of Jesus Christ, as the needle of the mariner's compass points to the north—guiding, age after age, the precious freights of immortal souls to the harbor of infinite and unending joy.

The force of this illustration is all the stronger that the mariner's compass is a human adaptation of an immutable law of nature to navigation, while the church of the living God is divine alike in origin and application, and has existed from the beginning, unchangeable, like God himself, yet adapting herself to the wants of every age. The church of God is like his own infinite providence, in which unchangeable truth meets in the harmony of mercy the innumerable changes of human need.

Much has been written and more said about "the church of the future," as though it were to be some millennial manifestation altogether different from the historic church; but the church of the future, which is not also the church of the past and of the present, can be no church; for a true church must reach to the ages back as well as to those before. If the continuity is broken, truth is broken, and cannot be restored. As for eighteen centuries there have been no forms of civil society, no calms or tempests in the moral, political, social, or religious world, in which the Catholic Church has not been true to the organic principles of her divine life, even the enemy of catholicity should admit—that fact being granted—that the presumption is on her side that she will be equally true to those principles during the centuries that are to come. He may deny that the

church has been true, and, consequently, that she will be true, but he will not admit one proposition and deny the other; he will admit both or deny both. In other words, he will admit, equally with the friend of catholicity, the identity of the church, past, present, and to come. Now, it would be impossible for a friend or enemy of the Catholic Church, from her beginning to this very day, to point to an hour when she was not a living church; it is, then, probable, that she will continue to be a living church. But where, since the promulgation of Christianity to this time, has existed a body of Christian believers, which, for the quality of continual existence, has so good a right to be called the church of Christ as the Catholic Church? Considering her numbers, extent, and duration, that church has been pre-eminently the church of the past; considering numbers, extent, and duration, that church is pre-eminently the church of the present; considering all analogies and probabilities, then the Catholic Church will be pre-eminently the church of the future.

In truth, the vindictive anger of the enemies of the Catholic Church, in whatever form of opposition it may be shown, proceeds from the fact, not that she is the dead church of the past, as she is sometimes called, for there would be no reason to war with the dead, but because she is, as she has been and will be, the living church. The Catholic Church is hated, not for being too dead, but for being too living. She has seen the birth and death of countless "improvements" of her principles, and she has received with gladness into her fold many an eager and conscientious inquirer for the "new church," who has at length reached an end of his wanderings and a solution of his doubts in finding, with tears of rapturous submission, that the new church, for which he was seeking, is the same church which has stood for ages, ever old, yet ever new, because representing Him who is alike the Living God and the Ancient of Days.

The Catholic Church, so frequently and unjustly denounced as ever behind the age, or even as facing the past, has been foremost in all parts of the world. She has sent her faithful soldiers of the cross where the spirit of commerce dared not go; she was the first in the East and the first in the West; it was her lamp of divine light which dispelled the gloomy terrors of the barbarous north of Europe; it was her sceptre of celestial beauty which, under the guidance of Heaven, transformed the political and social wreck of southern Europe into order. In what part of the world which man could not reach has she not planted the cross? Where on the face of the earth is the mountain whose craggy sides have not, at one time or another, sent back into the sounding air the echoes of Catholic worship?

Daniel Webster gave a vivid picture of the extent of the power of England, in what I think to be the grandest sentence which America has contributed to the common treasure of English literature. He said: "The morning drum-beat, following

the sun, and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth daily with one unbroken strain of the martial airs of England." That grand figure of speech may be applied to the extent of the Catholic Church. Yet it is not by martial airs, but by hymns of praise and penitential orisons and the continuous sacrifice that the Catholic Church daily celebrates, "from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same," the triumphant march of the Prince of Peace. How like "the sound of many waters" roll hourly heavenward the anthems of catholic worship throughout the world! Not only is every moment of every day consecrated by catholic hymns sung somewhere on earth; but how majestically roll down through eighteen hundred years the unbroken anthems of catholic devotion! Minute after minute, hour after hour, day after day, night after night, month after month, year after year, century after century, the holy strains go on unending. To the mind's ear seem blended in one almost overpowering flood of holy harmony the unnumbered voices which have sounded from the very hour when the shepherds of Bethlehem heard the angelic song to this very moment, when, somewhere, catholic voices are chanting praise to the Lord and Saviour of men.

And, in this view, how literally has been fulfilled that consoling prophecy, "Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." Wherever the Divine Son has been duly honored, there also she, who was remembered with filial love even amid his dying agonies for a world's salvation, has been remembered and called blessed; called blessed from that lowly home and from that mount of sorrow in the distant east, in millions of lowly homes, and under the shadow of mountains to the farthest west; called blessed by millions of loving and imploring voices through all the ages since; called blessed in all the languages that have been spoken since that time in all the world; called blessed in the rudest forms of human speech and in the most ecstatic music of voice and skill; called blessed by the lips of the little child that can hardly speak the name of mother, and by the lips that tremble with age and sorrow; called blessed by the sailor on the deep, by the ploughman on the land, by the scholar at his books, by the soldier drawing his sword for right upon the battle-field; called blessed by the voices of peasant-girls singing in sunny vineyards, and by the voices of those from whose brows have flashed the gems of royal diadems; called blessed in cottages and palaces, at wayside shrines, and under the golden roofs of grand cathedrals; called blessed in the hour of joy and in the hour of anguish—in the strength and beauty of life, and at the gates of death. How long, how ardently, how faithfully has all this loving honor been paid for so many generations, and will continue to be paid for all generations to come, to that sorrowing yet benignant one, who bore him who bore our woe!

The recent gathering at Rome indicates that there is no de-

mand which civilization can rightfully make of the Christian Church which she will not eagerly, fully, and faithfully meet. The largest assemblage of professed ministers of Christ which this age has known—leaving here out of view the claims of the Catholic Church to an apostolical priesthood—has been held in Rome by the church so extensively proclaimed and derided as being behind the age. If there is life, deep, full, pervading life anywhere on earth, it is in the Catholic Church and in all her movements. She will continue to draw to herself all the qualities and capacities of life which are in harmony with her spirit; and this accumulated spiritual force will constantly weaken the barriers that divide her from the sympathies of a large part of Christendom, until at length she will be acknowledged by all as the only living and true church of Christ.

“The restoration of the unity of the church” has been the subject of many thoughts, of many words, of earnest and devout prayer, of much and noble effort, and, when understood as referring to the reconciliation of those who have left the Catholic Church, or who are now out of it because their fathers left it, the phrase may pass without objection; but the phrase is greatly objectionable, even to the extent of expressing an untruth, when it is used to convey the idea that the unity of the church has ever been broken. This has not been, and could not be. The church, intended to be one, and to endure until the end of time, could not, in its organic structure, be really broken at any period of its history, without destroying its title as the one church of Christ. Individuals, communities, even nations, as such, have been broken off from it; but the essential church herself has remained one and unbroken through all vicissitudes. The theory that the Church of Rome, the Greek Church, and the Church of England are equal and co-ordinate branches of the one church of Christ has no foundation as a historical fact, and is as destructive of all true ideas of the unity of the church as the wildest vagaries of Protestantism. Is there on earth an institution which schism, heresy, and political ambition have tried to destroy and have tried in vain? There is; it is the Catholic Church. Is there an institution on earth which, leaving out of regard all its claims, has had the quality of historical continuity for eighteen centuries? There is; it is the Catholic Church.

The charge, if not of bigotry, yet of most unreasonable arrogance, has been more or less directly made against the Catholic Church, because she has not received overtures of reconciliation from enthusiastic and earnest individuals claiming to represent national churches, as cordially as was expected. But how can she accept, or even consider, any such overtures, proceeding as they do from the assumption of equal position and authority, without disowning herself, without denying even those claims and prerogatives, the existence of which alone makes union with her desirable? If there is no institution on earth which has a

valid title to be the continuous church of Christ, all efforts will be vain to supply the gap of centuries by an establishment now. A union of churches will not satisfy the design or promise of our Lord, when he founded the unity of his church. If the Christian church has really been broken into pieces, it will be in vain to gather up the fragments ; for, on that supposition, the divine principle has long since departed, and the gates of hell have prevailed. Those men of strong Catholic predilections, who, nevertheless, have clung to the theory that the church of Christ has been really broken, and must be repaired by management, will yet thank God from their inmost souls for the immovable firmness with which that theory has been denied at Rome.

The Catholic Church has never condemned a heresy more false or destructive than the proposition that she is herself but one of the divisions of the Christian church, having no authority to speak or to rule in the name of her Lord. To deny that the one church of Christ is now existing, and that she has existed for ages, is to deny not merely a fact in history, but it is to deny the word of our Lord ; and to do that, is to deny alike his holiness and his divinity. How can the Catholic Church treat with those who wish to make terms before submitting to her authority, on the basis of a positive untruth ? Catholicity is not an inheritance, to be divided among many claimants, no one of whom has any right to be or to be regarded as the sole heir of the homestead ; but it is an estate left by the divine Lord of the manor, in charge of the Prince of the Apostles and his successors, on the express injunction that it is to be kept one and undivided, in trust for the benefit of the faithful for all time. The estate has been kept one and undivided, according to the title-deed ; the injunction has never been broken ; notwithstanding all defections from the household, the homestead of the Christian world remains in the hands of the same faithful succession to which it was committed by our Lord himself. May God grant that all the younger sons who have gone astray, may return with penitential alacrity to their Father's house !

The Catholic Church will not stop in her progress, until she has converted the world to Christ ; but she has not denied, and will not deny, her sacred trust and prerogative of catholicity for the sake even of adding whole nations to her fold. Whoever enters her fold must admit by that act her claim to be the one, undivided, indivisible Church of Christ. There can be no "branches of the Catholic Church" which are not directly joined to the root and trunk of catholicity. A severed branch is no branch.

It is not the fault of the Catholic Church that multitudes "who profess and call themselves Christians" are not members of her communion. She affords the very largest liberty for individual or associated action that can be yielded without denying her faith or her commission. The highest poetry and the severest

logic may kneel in brotherly harmony at her altar. Gifts and talents the most diverse have been consecrated to her service. The Catholic Church advancing, century after century, under the banner of the cross and dove, to the spiritual conquest of the world! how far more sublime a spectacle it is than that of some parts of Christendom, which are broken into little independent bands of sectarian skirmishers, keeping up a kind of guerrilla warfare against "the world, the flesh, and the devil," and each other!

There are inspiring tokens which show the depth and breadth of the conviction, that the great schism of three centuries ago has proved a terrible mistake. Multitudes outside of the Catholic Church are inquiring with earnest solicitude about the meaning of catholic unity. The main course of intellectual inquiry is, in both hemispheres, respecting the claims of the Catholic Church. There are evident signs that the chaos of Protestantism is about to be broken up, and the wild and dreary waste to bloom and glow with Catholic beauty and order. God grant that it may be so, and that not only thousands of individuals may know how precious a prize it is to kneel devoutly and sincerely before the altar of God; but that even mighty nations may be convinced what priceless gifts they have forfeited by three centuries of separation from the source of all they have that has been or is worth keeping.

In view of the fact that the revival of catholic feeling enkindles also the enmity of those who scan it, the gathering at Rome is not only an assurance before the world that the Catholic Church will continue to be the guide of life and the umpire of civilization, but it is also a sublime challenge against all the agencies of every kind that have been or may be tried to eliminate Catholicity from the age. The Catholic Church has a work to do, and she will do it. She can no more forego it than she can die by her own will. She has never flinched yet; she never will. It is the very necessity as well as the reason of her being that she shall fulfil her charge without wavering or diminution; and this she will do. If the "gates of hell" cannot prevail against the church of God, she may safely defy all mortal might. The sun might more easily have refused to come forth at the bidding of the Creator, than the church can refuse to do his will in conquering the world for Christ. God speed the day when the divisions of Christendom shall end; when all who profess to be the disciples of Jesus Christ shall seek and find consolation in his one, true, enduring fold; and when the sceptre of God, manifest in the church, shall be extended in benignant power over an obedient and rejoicing world!



## THE RELIGION I WANT.



“ I WANT a religion that makes the people happy who possess it.”

Then I would advise you to join the Catholic Church.

‘ I want a religion which will make me feel so sure of its truth that it would be a sin to doubt it.”

Then you *must* join the Catholic Church.

“ I want a religion which teaches that God will reward a man according to his works, and not condemn him for what is not his own fault.”

Then you want the religion of the Catholic Church.

“ I want a religion which teaches that God is good and kind to all his creatures, that he has called all men to salvation, and thus leaves no man to despair.”

Then you had better join the Catholic Church.

“ I want a religion that is equally acceptable to rich and poor, to high and low, to the master and the servant, to the king and the peasant.”

Then, of course, you want the religion of the Catholic Church.

“ I want a religion that makes children members of the fold of Christ, and treats them as such.”

You will find such a religion in the Catholic Church.

“ I want a religion that does not teach one day what it will probably deny the next.”

Such a religion can only be had in the Catholic Church.

“ I want a religion that will permit me to hold communion with my dear departed relatives and friends.”

Your want will be satisfied when you join the Catholic Church.

“ I want a religion that will give me a plain and reasonable way of obtaining pardon for my sins, and show me how I can obtain a sure absolution.”

Such a plain and reasonable way is known to all those who belong to the Catholic Church.

“ I want the same religion the twelve apostles had.”

That is the religion of the Catholic Church.

“I want the same religion that the hundreds of thousands of martyrs believed in who were slain for the faith of Christ during the great persecutions of the Roman emperors.”

That is also the religion of the Catholic Church.

“I want the same religion which St. Augustine preached in England, St. Boniface in Germany, St. Martin in France, St. Patrick in Ireland, St. Francis Xavier in Japan, and to which these apostolic men converted all those peoples from paganism.”

That is also the religion of the Catholic Church.

“I want a religion that can make Sisters of Charity and such others like them, who leave all for Christ to give comfort to the wretched, the poor, and the sinful.”

The religion of all such is the religion of the Catholic Church.

“I want a religion whose priests love nobody better than they do me.”

The priests of such a religion are all priests of the Catholic Church.

“I want a religion whose priests are not afraid to come and give me its consolations if I should happen to have the small-pox, or the yellow fever, or the cholera, or any such contagious disease.”

Then you want the ministrations of the priests of the Catholic Church.

*The Religion I Want.*

“I want a religion whose priests preach the Gospel and not politics.”

Then go to the Catholic Church.

“I want a religion that is a religion for all nations, and for all time, even unto the consummation of the world.”

When your want is realized, you will call yourself a member of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

“I want a religion that both Protestants and Catholics agree to be a safe religion, in which I can save my soul.”

Then, my dear friend, you have no choice but to become a Catholic. All these wants the Catholic Church alone can satisfy. Go and examine for yourself. Any Catholic priest will gladly give you the proofs of the truth of what I say.

## HOW TO HAVE A HAPPY CHRISTMAS.

“HAPPY CHRISTMAS to you, friend Moreton!” cheerily exclaimed Mr. McWorthy, overtaking his friend, and slapping him on the shoulder with the familiarity of old acquaintance.

“Good-morning, Mac,” replied Mr. Moreton, grasping the proffered hand. “You look as if it was ‘happy Christmas’ sure enough with *you*, at any rate.”

And so he did, for his face was all lit up with a ruddy glow, which showed how blithely his blood was bounding under the influence of his active morning walk, and of the dry, cold December wind that was whistling along the snowy pavements, while every feature was radiant with a smile of exuberant contentment and good humor.

“To be sure it is happy Christmas with me,” said he, taking his friend by the arm and hurrying him into a quicker step, “and I’d like to know what else it should be with any man? Isn’t it happy Christmas with you, old friend?”

“Well, no, Mac, I can’t exactly say it is,” replied Mr. Moreton. And then, as if anxious to evade the subject: “But where are you coming from, so early in the morning?”

“Why, I’ve just been to early Mass and received my Christmas communion, and now I’m hurrying home to breakfast. And where are you going, if it is a fair question?”

“Well, I thought I’d step down to the store a minute. I had to leave rather early, yesterday evening, and I want to see whether anxiety to get to their Christmas jollifications hasn’t made my scatter-brained clerks neglect a matter of importance that I told them to attend to.”

“Going to the store on Christmas morning!” exclaimed Mr. Mac. “Who ever heard of such a thing! Now, look here, my dear Moreton, do let me use the privilege of an old friend, and ask you what you meant when you said just now that Christmas wasn’t exactly happy Christmas with you.”

"Well, no, Mac," he replied, "it isn't. To tell you the truth, Christmas day always gives me the blues. You needn't look so astonished—it is a fact; and I'll tell you why. Of course, there was a time when I looked on Christmas day as most other people seem to do. When I was a little fellow, I suppose I used to dream about it for weeks ahead, with its glorious visions of sweet things, and toys, and fire-crackers—the Fourth of July wasn't a circumstance to it. Then, when I grew up, its social gatherings and home enjoyments made it a day of real happiness to me. But, as I became older, the sugar-coating wore off; and now the whole thing seems so empty, and I can feel so little sympathy with all this bustle of enjoyment, that positively it gives me the blues to have to see it. There at home, now, I've just left my family in the height of their Christmas merriment. I didn't wish to throw a cloud over it with my gloomy face; and, to tell you the truth, that is more than half the reason why I started out for my counting-room. May be I've grown too cynical; but I can't help it. It's just as I've told you." And he struck his walking-stick heavily on the sidewalk three or four times, as if he would gladly pound to death the mirthfulness that annoyed him.

"Why, my dear Moreton!" exclaimed Mr. Mac, "you do indeed astonish me, and pain me too. This is so unlike what I should expect to hear from my dear friend on Christmas morning! There must be a screw loose somewhere. Surely this sweetest festival of the year ought to be enough to gladden any heart that has a spark of religion in it. Why, man alive! just to think that it is our blessed Saviour's birthday—and to hear the big-toned church-bells telling us so—and to listen to the organ at early Mass pealing forth the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which the angels sang on Christmas morning—and to hear the priest repeating to us their joyous salutation: 'Behold, I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all the people, for this day is born to you a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord.' I ask you, is not this enough to thaw out any heart that is not ice itself?"

"Surely, Mac, it ought to be, and I wish it could thaw mine; but it don't."

“Have you ever given it a chance?”

“Well, probably not as fair a one as I ought. To be candid with you, Mac, *there* is the whole trouble; my religion has always been more in my *head* than in my *heart*; I have always been ready to defend my faith, but remiss in practising the religious duties it enjoins; and, of course, not practising its duties, I have not been animated with its spirit, and so its festivals find my poor heart in no condition to share in their sanctifying and consoling influences. I see it all clearly enough; but how can it be otherwise with all the business worry and family cares that I have to engross my thoughts? And now, while we are on the subject, let me ask you plainly, Mac, how you, having similar cares to engage you, have still managed to keep up the good spirit so well.”

“Well now, friend Moreton,” said he, “I don’t wish to seem as though I were preaching you a sermon; but as you’ve asked a plain question, I’ll try to give you a plain answer. I didn’t begin life with the principle that my worldly duties must necessarily interfere with my religious duties, and I have never found it necessary to adopt it. I started with two good resolutions: first, that, as I am God’s creature, and not my own nor the world’s, my duties to God should always go before every other consideration; secondly, that, as an absolutely necessary means of keeping this resolution, I would always be faithful to my religion, and regular in receiving the sacraments. I’ve always tried to stick to them. Of course, I have all along found plenty of obstacles, and many a time, when the day would come for receiving the sacraments, some other attraction, or an annoyance or care of some kind, would come athwart my good resolution to throw me off the track; but I had determined that my duties to God *must* go first, and, thanks be to God, I have found that, ‘where there’s a will, there’s a way.’ So I go on quietly, and I must say I don’t find it very hard. In fact, friend Moreton, I can’t help feeling certain that any man can manage to live up to his religion if he only tries in earnest, and that, if he does, he will need no stretch of imagination or enthusiasm to taste the sweetness of religion, to enter with gusto into the spirit of its festivals, and so, when Christmas morning comes round, to feel

that it is *happy* Christmas in earnest. Eh! friend Moreton, now don't you believe so yourself?"

"Ah you rogue!" he replied laughingly. "You want to catch me, and make me condemn myself! Still, I suppose I must own up, and say yes. But let me ask you to make me understand a little better than I do now the meaning of that expression you use, 'the spirit of the festivals.' I must acknowledge my notions are more indistinct than they ought to be about such things. And then you'll tell me what the spirit of Christmas is."

"Why," said Mr. Mac, hardly able to conceal his astonishment at his friend's unusual interest in such a subject, and barely managing to overcome the embarrassment which he could not help feeling at finding himself moralizing so seriously. "Why, it means simply this: Every festival comes to teach us a particular lesson, brings with it a special grace to help us to learn and profit by that lesson, and has attached to it a special blessing from Almighty God for those who shall have tried to do so. This is what is meant by the spirit of a festival. Then, to look forward to a coming festival as being in this way a season of instruction and grace, to endeavor to attune one's soul to the lesson it comes to teach, and to pray for the grace it brings that we may benefit by its influence—this, you see, is what is meant by entering into the spirit of the festivals. So they pass by, and pass again, year after year, benefiting every soul that cares to be benefited by them, and leaving a new blessing from Almighty God with every soul that is willing to receive it."

"Come now, Mac!" interrupted Mr. Moreton, with as matter-of-fact an air as he could assume. "That is all very nice; but don't you think there is more fancy than reality in it?"

"No, I don't, you provoking fellow!" retorted Mr. Mac, "and I know you don't, either. You know just as well as I do that our blessed Lord intended his life to be our model, as he says himself, 'I have given you an example, that as I have done you also may do.' You know, without my telling you, that every mystery of his life is full of instruction for us, and must bring grace to help us to profit by it, and that it is according to the guidance of the Spirit of God



that the church brings these mysteries before us in the various festivals of the year. I'm sure you are not a deist, and if you are not, you must know that all this is true. Eh ! old fellow, what have you to say for yourself?"

"Well, well," he replied, with pretended pettishness, "I suppose I must let you have your own way about it. But go on, and let us hear about the spirit of Christmas."

"That is easily understood," said Mr. Mac, resuming the line of thought which his friend's pretended incredulity had interrupted. "The spirit of Christmas flows from the lesson taught us by our infant Saviour in his birth. To know what the lesson is, I have only to take a little peep into the poor stable of Bethlehem, and every feature of the scene speaks it loudly enough. Whew !" he exclaimed, as the wintry blast came rushing down the street they were just then crossing, "how the wind is sporting itself, this morning ! I wonder if it blew so cold and fierce around the poor stable on that first Christmas night. Ah ! yes," he continued, with real emotion, "I've no doubt it did ; for our good, kind Lord was pleased always to take the worst and bitterest for his portion. Yes, as I was saying, every circumstance of our Saviour's birth teaches me a lesson. The poor stable itself, so strange a palace for the King of kings ; the manger with its bed of straw, and its little Baby occupant, wrapped in swaddling-clothes, and weeping the tears of infantile weakness ; the poor young mother, bending over her Babe to screen him from the blast, and mingling her tears with his ; good, simple-hearted St. Joseph, and the lowly shepherds, kneeling or standing around in wondering awe—all these are like so many great voices that speak to me of humility and self-denial, and detachment of heart from the world's goods, warning me at the same time how important must be the lesson which the Son of God has taken such pains to teach us, and coaxing me to the love of the good God who has loved his poor creatures with so touchingly tender a love. Friend Moreton, when I think of all this, I could not, if I would, resist its influence. For the life of me, I couldn't help taking the lesson to myself, and trying in my own poor way to put it in practice ; and, small though the result may be, yet the mere effort makes me feel like a better and happier man. The

effort to imitate our Saviour's humility gives me more peace of mind, by helping me to be tranquil and cheerful under things that would otherwise torture my wounded pride; and, far from depressing me, makes me stronger and more resolute, by causing me to lean more on God's strength and less on my own weakness. The effort at detachment from the world's goods gives me a more confident trust in divine Providence, enables me to look with comparative calmness on reverses which would otherwise worry me to death, and gives a real stimulus to my industry, by making me esteem money not for its own sake, but for the sake of the good I can do with it; not as a means for my own selfish aggrandizement, but as a treasure which Providence puts in my hands, that I may use it for the good ends which Providence sends in my way, and as enabling me to prove the sincerity of my compassion for our infant Saviour's poverty, by relieving the poor whom he has declared to be his representatives. Then, too, when I try to animate all that with love for our loving God, I can't tell you the buoyancy and freedom of spirit it gives me. My Christmas communion, which I would not miss for the world, becomes a real feast with our infant Saviour himself; and when I leave the church, I feel as if I did indeed carry with me a blessing from his own and his Mother's hand. How in the world, then, could I feel otherwise than happy on Christmas morning? But, gracious me!" he exclaimed, remarking in his friend's pensive air and softened features the effect which the simple eloquence of his own warm feelings had produced, "see how I've been running on, preaching away at you, and 'blowing my own horn' too! Friend Moreton, forgive my thoughtlessness!"

"God bless you for it, my dear Mac!" replied Mr. Moreton with genuine feeling. "God knows it would be well for me if I heard more and thought more of the same kind. If I did, I shouldn't feel as I felt this morning. But may be it isn't too late yet."

"Too late! My dear Mr. Moreton, it is never too late for such a heart and such a will as yours. Just try it, and I'm sure, when this day next year comes round, you won't feel like growling at your old friend for wishing you a happy Christmas."

Taking his friend's hand for a parting shake—for they had reached the corner where Mr. Mac turned off to his home—and looking full in his face, he thought he saw something like tell-tale moisture glistening in his eyes. Glad to escape further risk of his own emotions, with a squeeze of the hand that spoke more than volumes, he darted round the corner, and in a few moments was in the bosom of his family, spreading around him the same happiness whose seeds he had just planted in his friend's heart.

Mr. Moreton, meanwhile, continued his walk. He looked thoughtful and abstracted. Every now and then he punched the snow-heaps with his stick, as if angry at the emotion caused in him by the conversation, and anxious to get rid of it. But he could not shake it off. He thought he would not go to the store this morning after all. Turning another way, he soon found himself amid a stream of persons all going in one direction. Almost unconsciously he followed the tide, and, in a minute more, found himself in St. Patrick's church, where second Mass was just beginning. Dropping mechanically into the nearest pew, he knelt motionless; but his brain was working hard and fast. The Mass went on, but he felt as if in a maze. He had a vague consciousness of rising to his feet with the rest of the congregation at the *Gospel*, and then of hearing the priest saying something that sounded very much like what Mac had just been saying, and the thoughts crowded faster still. The *Offertory* began, and from the transept-gallery the sweet voices of more than a hundred orphan-girls floated out in the touching strains of the *Adeste Fideles*. He could stand it no longer; he broke right down, and, after a convulsive quiver or two through his strong frame, wept the first genuine tears that his eyes had known for many a day.

The little bell in the sanctuary tinkled at the *Sanctus*, and then at the *Consecration*, and again at the *Domine, non sum dignus*, and then there was a movement among the congregation that aroused him. Lifting his face from his hands, in which it had been buried, he saw the crowds advancing to the communion-rail. He felt very lonely. But the die was cast. Then and there he resolved that he would be ready to receive holy communion on the following Sunday, and the resolution made him calmer.

Mass was over. The congregation dispersed, save those remaining for their thanksgiving after communion ; and still he was on his knees, his lips saying nothing, but his heart a great deal. At length he arose. As he passed out, he saw a poor woman kneeling near the door, an infant in her arms, and shivering with the cold that crept through her scanty clothing. He thought of the Mother and Child shivering in the stable. He slipped a dollar into her hand, "Here ; buy something for your Christmas dinner," and left her wondering at the unusually large alms. The outside air felt bracing. Passing his hand across his forehead two or three times, he set his hat firmly on his head, and started homeward.

Things wore a new face that day. Somehow or other, the noisy merriment on the streets did not annoy him as it used to ; the young 'folks at home remarked how much more pleasant than usual pa was ; Mrs. Moreton wondered what good news he could have heard upon the street ; he went with them all to High Mass and Vespers ; at the dinner-table he was the life of the party ; and when he lay down that night, with the events of the morning still fresh in his mind, he felt that he had at last learned how to have a happy Christmas.

He kept his resolution. The following Sunday he received holy communion. The two friends met frequently, feeling more friends than ever, and often reverting with grateful pleasantry to "that Christmas morning walk." Twelve months passed, and Mr. Moreton received his Christmas communion kneeling at friend Mac's side. He never let the ice grow over his heart again.

Kind reader, do you use the same means that good Mr. Mac did to make Christmas happy? If not, the lesson conveyed by his simple words is as needful for you as it was for his old friend. Learn the lesson as well as Mr. Moreton did, and you will have learned sufficiently how to have a happy Christmas.

## PROGRESS AND THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

---

*Prot.* "Well, my friend, what do you think of yourself now? Have you seen the letter of your Pope Pius IX., in which he condemns 'progress, liberalism, and modern civilization?'"

*Cath.* "No! I have seen no such letter, and I do not believe there is any such in existence. The Popes have always been in favor of progress and civilization, and Pius IX. is a better friend of them than you yourself, if you did but know it."

*Prot.* "Why, man alive, where are your eyes and your ears? The whole country is ringing with the stupid folly and inconceivable blindness of the Pope and Cardinals in publishing such sentiments in the blazing light of this nineteenth century. Why, not a newspaper, review, magazine, or periodical of any kind that I take up, but is full of the subject. They all with one voice agree that the Pope has thrown down the gauntlet, and declared himself the irreconcilable enemy of progress, liberality of sentiment, and all our modern civilization."

*Cath.* "I am not at all surprised at this agreement of the newspapers to put a false construction upon the words of the Pope; for you know as well as I, that they have about the same sentiments toward him that a pack of wolves have toward a traveller, when they smell out a chance to tear him to pieces and lick up his blood."

*Prot.* "What you say is true, but not to the point. Here is the very proposition condemned in the Encyclical: 'That the Pope ought to reconcile himself and come to

terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.' Here it is in to-day's paper ; read it for yourself."

*Cath.* "I have no need to read it. I know precisely the words, and I say there is no condemnation whatever, or disparagement of either progress, liberalism, or modern civilization."

*Prot.* "Why, how is this? Does he not deny that he has any need to be reconciled to them?"

*Cath.* "You catch yourself in your own trap there. Of course he does, because he has never been their enemy, and therefore has no reconciliation to make. This is the way the proposition reads, and this is what it means."

*Prot.* "It is true it is capable of such an interpretation, and a friendly spirit would so interpret it. But still, having been educated to think ill of the Pope, I cannot agree with you, unless you prove that you are right."

*Cath.* "I can easily do so. Each proposition which is condemned, is extracted from some one of the Pope's addresses or public letters, and a reference is made to the very one from which it was taken. By referring back to this one, we find in exactly what sense the Pope condemns the proposition, just as when we quote a text of the Bible we give the book, chapter, and verse, so that we can gather from the context what its meaning is. The proposition we are speaking of was taken from the Address or Allocution of March 18th, 1861, which begins thus: 'We have for a long time been witnesses of the agitation of civil society, particularly in our time, caused by the violent struggle of opposing principles of truth and error, of virtue and vice, of light and darkness. For certain men favor on the one hand what they call modern civilization ; others, on the contrary, defend the rights of justice and of our holy religion. The first demand that the Roman Pontiff should reconcile himself to, and come to terms with, *progress* and liberalism, (such are their expressions ;) in a word, with what they call modern civilization. But the others reclaim, and with right, that the unalterable principles of eternal justice should be preserved unimpaired.' "

*Prot.* "I see the broad distinction which the Pope makes between progress, civilization, etc., and what some choose to call by those names. In declaring against the latter, he professes to uphold that progress, liberality, and civilization which is true, or based on the eternal principles of right and justice. But all this is generality. Why does he not come to particulars, and tell us in what respects the ideas he opposes are against right and justice?"

*Cath.* "He does this very thing. He goes on to say that in the name of progress, the faith of treaties, solemnly concluded, is broken; that the most legitimate rights of property are entirely disregarded; that the church is robbed of her property; that the bishops and defenders of the church and her rights are exiled and thrown into prison; that all sorts of attacks upon religion and morality are allowed, while writing in defence of the church subjects the authors to punishment of extreme severity, etc."

*Prot.* "Well, I have no doubt the old gentleman has much to vex him, from what we read of the fines, imprisonments, confiscations, exiles, etc., in the papers every day. The church is having rather a hard time of it, I know."

*Cath.* "She is, and such kind of progress she considers rather fast. We have made considerable such progress in this country, a progress in corruption, in bribery, in vice; our divorce laws have fairly got into a gallop lately, and we seem to be in a rapid progress toward free love as well as free speech and free religion. Perhaps we may, by and by, make such a progress that the legislature will come to free plunder, and confiscate our churches, asylums, hospitals, colleges, and the funds of the Bible, and missionary societies. How do you think our Methodist, Episcopal, or Presbyterian brethren will like it when they are politely invited, in the name of modern civilization, to reconcile themselves to such proceedings?"

*Prot.* "Not at all. But, my friend, are you so ignorant as not to know that it makes all the difference in the world whether it was your bull that gored my ox, or my bull that gored yours? Eh!"

*Cath.* "I am glad you're not so blind as a good many who do not care to see when their prejudices are involved. To make the matter clearer, the Pope continues: 'Let things be called by their right names, and the Holy See will always appear consistent with itself. It has always been the initiator and the protector of true civilization; the monuments of history attest this in all ages. . . . But if under the name of civilization, we are to understand a system invented precisely to break down and destroy the church, the Holy See can never ally itself with such a civilization.' . . . 'We declare, therefore, before God and man, that we have no motive for reconciling ourselves with any one whatever.'"

*Prot.* "Pius IX. is after all not so foolish as they strive to make him out. His words are brave and full of conviction. I have not reflected much about it, but I should not wonder if he was right, after all."



## HOW'S THAT?

NO. I.  

---

*Mr. A.* "One thing I don't like about you Catholics is, that you have crosses stuck all over your churches, and on all the clothes the priest wears; and then you are for ever making the sign of the cross. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "Well, you see, this holy sign is made use of in all the sacraments to give us to understand that they all have their whole force and efficacy from the cross; that is, from the death and passion of Jesus Christ. The reason we use it so often is to show that we are not ashamed of the cross of Christ; it is to make an open profession of our believing in a crucified God; it is to help us to bear always in mind his death and passion."

*Mr. A.* "There is another thing I want to ask you about. One of my neighbors, who is a Catholic, told my wife that your Church teaches that Christ is really and truly present on your altars; but I knew him to be only an ignorant man, and concluded, of course, he was mistaken. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "No, my dear fellow, he was not mistaken; and, no matter how poor or ignorant a Catholic may be, he always knows what his Church teaches. He was right. The Catholic Church does teach the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the altar; and, if you will only listen a moment, I think I can prove it. I prove it first from the express and plain words of Christ himself—the eternal truth—delivered at the time of the first institution of this blessed sacrament, and recorded in no less than four different places in the New Testament; and in all these places Christ himself assures us that what he gives us in the blessed sacrament is his own body and blood. St. Matt. xxvi. 26: 'Take, eat. This is my

BODY; this is my BLOOD of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sin.' St. Mark xiv. 22: 'Take, eat. This is *my body*; this is *my blood* of the New Testament, which is shed for many.' St. Luke xxii. 19: 'This is *my body* which is given for you; this cup is the New Testament in *my blood* which is shed for you.' 1 Cor. xi. 24: 'This is *my body* which is broken for you; this cup is the New Testament in *my blood*.'"

*Mr. A.* "Yes; but why do you take these words of Christ at his last supper according to the letter, rather than in a figurative sense? How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "You might as well ask a traveller why he chooses the high-road rather than to go by by-paths, with evident danger of losing his way. We take the words of Christ according to their plain, obvious, and natural meaning. The words themselves plainly speak for us; for Christ did not say, This is a figure of my body, and this is a figure of my blood; but he said, 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood.'"

*Mr. A.* "But your priests are the only ones who receive the cup. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "Well, you see, the Catholic Church has always looked upon it to be a thing indifferent whether the faithful receive in one kind or both; because she has always believed that they receive Jesus Christ himself, the fountain of all grace, as much in one kind as in both; but her custom and discipline for many ages has been to administer this sacrament to the laity only in one kind—viz., under the form of bread—for fear of the danger of spilling the blood of Christ, if all were to receive the cup. Communion in one kind can also be proved from the Scriptures; for in St. John vi. 57, 58, Christ tells us, 'He that eateth me, even he shall live by me; and he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever;' besides, it stands to reason that whoever receives the body of Christ most certainly receives his blood at the same time; since the body which he receives is a living body (for Christ can die no more—Rom. vi. 9), which cannot be without the blood. There is no taking Christ by pieces. Whoever receives him, receives him whole."

*Mr. A.* "But priests always take the cup. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "No, my dear fel'ow; you're wrong. Unless a priest is saying Mass, he only gets communion under one kind; and no priest, bishop, or Pope, even on his death-bed, ever receives otherwise than in one kind, unless, as I say, he is saying Mass."

*Mr. A.* "What do you mean by Mass?"

*Mr. B.* "The Mass is the Liturgy of the Catholic Church, and consists in the consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and the offering up of the same body and blood to God, by the ministry of the priest, for a perpetual memorial of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross, and a continuation of the same to the end of the world."

*Mr. A.* "But I hear that your service is all in Latin, sermons and all. Now, you don't mean to say that all the poor folks I see going up to your church know what you are talking about? How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "As to the sermons, they are not in Latin; they may be in English, German, French—in fact, any language that the people best understand—and as the sermon is the principal thing in your service, our people, you see, get all yours do—but, as to the holy Mass, that is in Latin. It always has been and always will be. You see, the Catholic Church don't change with every whim and fashion of the age. Latin is her ancient language, used in all her sacred offices, even from the Apostles' days, throughout all the western parts of the world; and, therefore, the Church desires to celebrate her liturgy in the same manner as the saints have done for so many ages."

*Mr. A.* "Still, it must be a great prejudice to your folks that the Mass is said in Latin, which is a language that the generality of them do not understand. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "Not at all. They know how to accompany the priest with prayers and devotions adapted to every part of Mass; hence it is visible to any unprejudiced eye that there is far more devotion amongst Catholics at Mass than there is at a Protestant prayer-meeting."

*Mr. A.* "Well, I believe you Catholics—at least, most of you—think that your priests can forgive sins. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "Most of us! Yes, indeed! all of us. That is easily proved. When Christ was founding his Church he said to his ministers, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins soever ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whose sins soever ye retain, they are retained' (St. John xx. 22, 23). And again, in St. Matt. xviii. 18: 'Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'"

*Mr. A.* "But, then, I'm told that you can go and give the priest a dollar, and he will forgive you all the sins you want to commit. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "Oh! no, my dear fellow. You certainly don't believe any such trash as that. In the first place, a man's sins can't be forgiven unless he is heartily sorry for having committed them, and that is what we call contrition; and then he has to make up his mind that hereafter he will fly from all occasions of sin. And as to paying for having your sins forgiven, that's all nonsense. I've been a Catholic for fifty years, and I've never paid the priest for anything of the kind."

*Mr. A.* "Yes; but my wife gave our servant a dollar last week which she said she had to take to get her sins forgiven. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "Unfortunately, servants sometimes do get money from their mistresses with that excuse; but I can assure you they use it for a very different purpose: and I would advise you, as a friend, never to keep such a servant around your house, or you may some day find some of your silver or your wife's jewellery gone."

*Mr. A.* "Well, now, I see it is getting late, and I'll have to be going. Still, there are a few other things which I would like to ask you about. After all, I don't think you Catholics are as bad as I was led to believe. If you have no engagement to-morrow evening I will bring my wife along with me, and then we can finish up this talk about religion. You see, I don't often care to talk on this subject; but, somehow or other, I got thinking of your Church to-day as I was going down the avenue. I saw a couple of Sisters of Charity, with their calm faces and modest demeanor, on their way on an errand of mercy; and I thought to myself, Can it be possible that these folks are playing a farce, or is there something in their religion? Well, I must go. Shall we come over to-morrow night?"

*Mr. B.* "Yes, certainly; I shall be most happy to see you. I'm glad you are honest enough to examine our religion, and shall do all in my power to clear up any doubts that may present themselves to your mind concerning the Holy Church. Don't condemn a thing which you know nothing of. Read both sides; then give a fair, unbiassed opinion, remembering the old adage,

**"FAIR PLAY IS A JEWEL."**

## HOW'S THAT?

NO. II.

*Mr. A.* "Well, Neighbor B., here I am, and, as you see, I've brought my wife with me. I told her all about our conversation last night; and she is very glad of a chance to hear a Catholic explain his religion. She thought that Catholics were ashamed to talk about their Church, or, at least, when they did so, it was in the dark, in an undertone, and always with superstitious people."

*Mr. B.* "Be kind enough to sit down. I'm very glad to see you both; and I hope before you leave here Mrs. A. will find that Catholics are neither ashamed of their religion nor afraid to talk about it."

*Mrs. A.* "Well, it always seemed to me that the Romish churches were so dark, and often built in obscure places, and that, as a general thing, Popish priests were—"

*Mr. B.* "Excuse me, madam, but, before we go any further, let me suggest that in our conversation we use the English language. Last night your husband found fault because in the Catholic Church the Latin language—a language which most of the people don't understand—is made use of: now let me say that you are making use of language which I don't understand. There are no such words in the English language as 'Romish' and 'Popish.' I might with equal impropriety say 'the New Yorkish Bay,' or that Baden is a Germish city, or that Paris is the capital of a Europish empire. I beg your pardon for correcting your grammar; but this common grammatical error of Protestants generally sounds very badly."

*Mrs. A.* "I don't think that Protestants generally are aware that they are using bad grammar when they make use of those words. It never once occurred to me."

*Mr. A.* "As for me, I always like things called by their proper names. Catholics are not ashamed of their name; therefore let them be called Catholic. But I notice many of our Episcopalian friends are ashamed of their name, and are now trying to shake off the 'P. E.'—Protestant Episcopal—from their name, and make folks believe they are Catholics. I have no objections to their being Catholics, but I like to see fair dealing."

*Mr. B.* "Yes, you are right; things should be called by their right names, and that openly and above-board too. If your friends want to become Catholics and have a right to the name, let them do so in a legitimate way."

*Mr. A.* "Well, now I'm going to open my battery on you. Are you ready?"

*Mr. B.* "Yes. Fire!"

*Mr. A.* "I hear that you Catholics pray for the dead. Certainly after a man is dead that is the last of him, as far as we are concerned. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "Praying for the dead is a practice as ancient as Christianity, received by tradition from the Apostles, as appears by the most certain monuments of antiquity. This practice is grounded upon Christian charity, which teaches us to pray for all that are in necessity, and to implore God's mercy for all that are capable of mercy—which we have reason to be convinced is the case of many of our deceased brethren; and therefore we pray for them."

*Mr. A.* "Yes; but, even granting that your prayers can help the dead, where will the dead be all this time, as you know they have to go to one of two places? How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "You're wrong again. Fortunately there is a middle place called purgatory. This I prove first from the Scriptures, which teach us in many places that it is the fixed rule of God's justice 'to render to every man according to his works.' See Psalms lxii. 12, St. Matt. xvi. 27, Rom. ii. 6, Apoc. xxii. 12, etc. So that, according to the works which each man has done in the time of his mortal life, and according to the state in which he is found at the moment of his departure out of this life, he shall certainly receive reward or punishment from God. Hence it evidently follows that, as by this rule of God's justice they that die in great and deadly sins, not cancelled by repentance, will be eternally punished in hell, so, by the same rule, they that die in lesser or venial sins (which is certainly the case of a great many) will be punished somewhere for a time, till

God's justice be satisfied. Second, I prove it from the words of our blessed Lord in St. Matt. xii. 32, where he says that 'who-soever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, nor in this world, neither in the world to come.' In this text our Lord (who could not speak anything absurd or out of the way, would never have mentioned 'forgiveness in the world to come' if sins not forgiven in this world could never be forgiven in the world to come. Now, if there may be forgiveness of any sin whatsoever in the world to come, there must be a middle place or purgatory; for no sin can enter heaven to be forgiven there, and in hell there is no forgiveness."

*Mr. A.* "I notice, too, that you Catholics won't eat meat on Friday. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "We have every reason to think that fasting and abstinence are agreeable to God, since John the Baptist's abstinence is commended—St. Luke i. 15 and St. Matt. iii. 4. And Anna the prophetess is praised—St. Luke ii. 37—for serving God with fastings and prayers night and day. The Ninevites, by fasting, obtained mercy—Jonas iii. 5. Daniel joined fasting with prayer—Dan. ix. 3—and by fasting was disposed for heavenly visions—Dan. x. 3, 7, 12. And God, by the prophet Joel, calls upon his people—Joel ii. 12—'to turn to him with all their hearts in fasting, weeping, and mourning.' And then, too, our Saviour himself gave an example by fasting forty days—St. Matt. iv. 12—and prescribed lessons concerning fasting—St. Matt. vi. 16; so you see, like most other things which the Catholic Church teaches, she can go back to Jesus Christ as the originator or founder."

*Mr. A.* "Another great fault I have to find with you Catholics is that you pray to the Virgin Mary and the saints, when you ought to pray to God alone. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "We have every reason to believe that it is a pious and profitable practice to beg the prayers of the saints and angels, just as we have to desire the prayers of God's servants here upon earth, or as St. Paul had to desire so often the prayers of the faithful, to whom he wrote his epistles. See Rom. xv. 30; Eph. vi. 18, 19; 1 Thess. v. 25. For if it be pious and profitable to desire the prayers of sinners here upon earth (for all men here upon earth must acknowledge themselves sinners), how can it be otherwise than pious and profitable to desire the prayers of saints and angels in heaven? Certainly you cannot say that **the saints and angels** have no knowledge of what passes upon

earth, and therefore are not to be addressed for their prayers, since our Lord assures us 'that there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth'—St. Luke xv. 10—which could not be if the citizens of heaven knew nothing of what passes here upon earth. And as to the great respect and devotion which we have to the Blessed Virgin Mary, that is grounded upon her great dignity of Mother of God, and the close relation she has thereby to Jesus Christ, her Son; for how is it possible to love and honor Christ with our whole hearts, and not value and love his blessed Mother?"

*Mr. A.* "Well, now, I have one more question to ask you, and then I've done. I hear that you Catholics pray to pictures and images. How's that?"

*Mr. B.* "That is a mistake. We merely have them, not only for ornament and for the instruction of the ignorant, but for the honor and remembrance of Christ and his saints, and to help to raise our thoughts and hearts to heavenly things. Besides, we don't worship these things, as you Protestants are so fond of saying; for the Second Council of Nice has expressly declared that divine worship is not to be given them; to which the Council of Trent has added, that we 'are not to believe that there is any divinity or power in them for which they are to be worshipped; and that we are not to pray to them, nor put our trust or confidence in them.'"

*Mr. A.* "I declare my eyes have been opened by your remarks. I always thought that Catholic priests were a bad set of men, and that your system of religion was suited to them; but I find there is not a word of truth in all these stories gotten up against your Church."

*Mr. B.* "Well, it does me good to hear you say so. I like an honest man—one who is not afraid or ashamed to examine for himself, and, when he finds he is wrong, come out like a man and admit it. Now, my dear friend, I want you to promise me to keep on in the good work already begun. You certainly can no longer worship with those who make a living by teaching false doctrines. There were such persons in our Saviour's time; learn a lesson from their unhappy end, and do right."

*Mr. A.* "I thank you with all my heart for your kindness in explaining these knotty questions, and promise to examine further and ask God's guidance into the right path. Good night."



# POPERY AND THE APOSTLES;

OR,

## THE BITER BIT.

---

CALVIN CUTLOOSE, Esq., just home from Germany, where he has had the opportunity of conversing with some of the more "advanced thinkers" of our day, meets with his old friend, Mr. Peter Groper. Getting upon religious topics, Mr. Groper remarks:

"There is a fact about the Christian religion, Friend Cutloose, which perplexes me, and I must say troubles me too."

*Mr. C.* "What's that, Groper?"

*Mr. G.* "It is that the Christian religion, as taught by the Apostles, developed so soon as it did into Popery. The Apostles had no sooner founded the Church than Popery took complete possession of it, and held it until the Reformation."

*Mr. C.* "Doesn't she hold it yet?"

*Mr. G.* "Happily not all. But it must be confessed she still manages to keep the lion's share."

*Mr. C.* "I think it quite reasonable she should."

*Mr. G.* "You astonish me, Mr. Cutloose; not to say shock me. What! *reasonable* that Popery should claim and hold the Church of the Apostles and the great majority of Christians in subjection!"

*Mr. C.* "I don't see anything to be astonished at, Groper."

If the Church of the Apostles developed into Popery from the very start, as it undoubtedly did, I conclude that Popery is the natural result of Christianity as the Apostles preached it. A tree is known by its fruits. And if the Church of the Apostles has not budded and blossomed and borne Popish fruit for nineteen centuries, and, from all appearances, is likely to bear the same for nineteen centuries more, then history and facts are not worth the notice of a man with a grain of common sense."

*Mr. G.* "That is a disheartening reflection!"

*Mr. C.* "Possibly for you, Groper; but not for me. If you were as true a Protestant as I am, and hated Popery as much as I do, you would take quite another view of it."

*Mr. G.* "As true a Protestant as you! You astonish me still more. Am I not a child of the Reformation, even as you?"

*Mr. C.* "Yes, but only yet, I see, half reformed."

*Mr. G.* "In the name of truth, Friend Cutloose, what *do* you mean?"

*Mr. C.* "Just this, Groper. Did not the Church of the Apostles immediately develop into Popery?"

*Mr. G.* "I have said that is just what troubles and perplexes me."

*Mr. C.* "It needn't. Do not all the Papists, numbering some two hundred and fifty millions of people, believe, to-day, that such a development was both natural and true?"

*Mr. G.* "It is a lamentable fact."

*Mr. C.* "A word in your ear, now, old fellow. I hate Popery with all my heart and soul and mind and strength, and I don't nor won't believe in *anything* that *could* develop so quickly, easily, and entirely into Popery as your Church of the Apostles did, and ought to have done; for the sincere conviction of two hundred and fifty millions of all nations and tongues, not to speak of the proofs they bring that such a development was a true and logical one, is not to be despised."

*Mr. G.* "Can my old friend and fellow church-member have visited the home of Luther and all the venerated

shrines of Protestantism only to return a disbeliever in Christianity?"

*Mr. C.* "Not at all. I am a Christian yet, in my own way, but not in a way that can be developed into Popery, I can tell you; and that is more than you can say of the way of the Apostolic Church you still hold to."

*Mr. G.* "But, my friend, if you cut yourself loose in this fashion from the 'faith once delivered to the saints,' where will you end?"

*Mr. C.* "Not in Popery, thank God!"

*Mr. G.* "May I presume to ask you where you start from, if not from the Apostles?"

*Mr. C.* "From Jesus Christ, sir, Bible in hand."

*Mr. G.* "But Jesus Christ never wrote a word of the Bible. It was written by the Apostles."

*Mr. C.* "H'm, well—~~he~~ inspired them to write it, and so it amounts to the same."

*Mr. G.* "True. And then he commanded them to *teach* it, too, telling them to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; and that, I take it, amounts to something more."

*Mr. C.* "What do you make out of that?"

*Mr. G.* "I make out that the Church the Apostles founded, and the Christianity they taught, is the Church Jesus Christ commanded them to found, and the religious doctrines and practices he commissioned them to teach—the Church which you and I and all men must belong to, and whose teachings we must believe or be damned; as our Lord told the Apostles all would be who refused to hear and believe them."

*Mr. C.* "It will land you into Popery, man. It will land you into Popery; and you can't help yourself."

*Mr. G.* "I don't care to help myself, if it *does* land me there. If Popery is the legitimate fruit of Christianity as the Apostles taught it, so be it. In the name of God, I will embrace it."

*Mr. C.* "Heaven help us! is the man mad?"

*Mr. G.* "Mad, Mr. Cutloose! I think it is you that have lost your reason; to imagine yourself at liberty, Bible

in hand, to sit in judgment upon the Apostles of Jesus Christ.'

*Mr. C.* "I tell you again, Apostolic Christianity developed into Popery."

*Mr. G.* "If so, I only repeat, Popery is then the development of the truth, from which I conclude that if your new-fangled way *cannot* be developed into Popery it must be false, for all truth ought to be in harmony."

*Mr. C.* "Would you become a Papist in the light of the nineteenth century, Groper?"

*Mr. G.* "Most assuredly, if I would have become one by following the Apostles in the first. You have helped to open my eyes not a little on this subject. By the way, friend, you told me where you started from, but you have not told me yet where you will end."

*Mr. C.* "Just where I began, with myself, Bible in hand."

*Mr. G.* "That's pretty good! Here am I, Calvin Cutloose, Esq., dry-goods merchant, with the Apostles' words in my hand, ready to make a religion warranted never to develop into *the* religion which did develop from them, and which, in the judgment of the great majority of Christians in every age, and in my own opinion as well, ought to develop from them. That is: Here am I, Calvin Cutloose, Esq., dry-goods merchant, ready to guarantee that two and two, *in my hands*, will never make four."

*Mr. C.* "Bah! Down with the Pope!"

*Mr. G.* "Long live Pius the Ninth, successor of the Apostles!"

## CONVERTED BY AN INFIDEL.



AT the University of Cambridge, England, among the subjects to be taken up for the Little-Go (the first public examination) is Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*. A young Cantab, named Richard Hannan—a seriously inclined young man, and intending to follow in the clerical footsteps of his father—had recently passed his Little-Go very well, especially distinguished by his Paley paper. It happened that one evening, in a friend's rooms, he met an adherent of that school of rationalism which is spreading so rapidly in the English Church, and particularly in the Universities. There were five other guests (making the party eight), and the conversation was lively till it finally turned on the "neotogians." Hereupon Richard, having watched his opportunity, put in a very strong remark, to the effect that these men were as shallow as they were infidel; for that, regarding the claims of Christianity, it was wholly a question of evidence.

"I accept the issue," said M'Donald, the rationalist. "I have heard of your flooring the last Paley paper; but I floored one too in my year; so I'm quite prepared for you on that ground."

"Then please show me," answered Hannan, "the joint in Paley's armor."

"Why, he assumes the supernatural, to begin with."

"I beg your pardon: he does nothing of the sort. He insists on the credibility of human testimony to facts which are not of the natural order; but this is not assuming anything, except that testimony which is credible in one thing is equally credible in another."

"And that's the very point I deny. I deny that the evidence of the senses can prove the fact of a miracle. If I saw with my own eyes what was called a miracle, and what I could not account for by any law hitherto discovered, I should put it down to the unknown, perhaps, or, if you please, the unknowable; but I shouldn't call it supernatural."

"Then you'd be contradicting the universal judgment of humanity."

"Possibly—as far as it has hitherto progressed; but wait for its voice a thousand years hence."

"Then you think yourself and the favored few who happen to hold your opinions a thousand years ahead of the race?"

This caused a laugh at M'Donald's expense; and our host opportunely remarked, "Mac, old boy, you've a genius for *fouling*; you ran foul of me on the river to-day, and to-night you've run foul of common sense."

"A miracle," continued Hannan, "is proposed to the reason through the senses; if reason is incapable of pronouncing upon it as something contrary to the laws of nature, and which, therefore, must have come from a supernatural power, it is equally

incapable of pronouncing upon any, the most ordinary, phenomenon; and you'll have to say, in the end, that man is a contradiction to himself."

"And what if he is?" said a deep bass voice, as its owner filled his glass. "I'll be bound M'Donald is conscious of being a contradiction to *himself*."

M'Donald rose amid the general laugh, to take a fresh cigar and light it. Though a Scotchman, he kept provokingly cool.

"Well," said he, "we'll waive the question of possibility: for I see you either cannot or will not understand me. I'd like to know the utility of miracles—the call—the necessity for them. Let Mr. Hannan tell me that."

"You must surely remember," replied Hannan, "that Paley is careful to state that. He lays down, as a thing universally conceded, that miracles are the only proof we can have of the veracity of any one claiming divine mission. Besides, the working of miracles was doubly necessary to Christ, because the Jews, to whom he preached, had a divine religion already; a divine law was in possession; and they could not have listened justifiably to the preachers of a new doctrine until they were reasonably certified that the same authority which had given them their law had now, in turn, repealed it; and this certitude they could not have received from any other proofs than miracles."

"Oh! very good!" rejoined M'Donald, with a sudden flash of triumph on his face. "You have all heard, gentlemen, what Mr. Hannan says?"

"Yes," said the other six voices in the room.

"And you all, I presume, are members of the Church of England as by law established?"

"Of course."

"Very well, then; I have you. You've all been thinking me—illogical, to say the least. I ask you, then, which is the more illogical—the man who, rejecting the supernatural altogether, regards Christianity as a human system; or the man who, believing Christianity divine because established by miracles, adheres to a negative form of it which was not established by miracles?"

As all remained silent, quite taken by surprise, and wondering what he was driving at, he hastened to follow up his advantage.

"You adhere to the Reformation. Did the authors of that movement work miracles to prove their divine mission? Did Luther, or any of the Continental reformers? Did Cranmer or any of the British reformers? Not one of them even pretended to do so; though Luther *did* ask Zuingle for his—forgetting that the question was equally applicable to himself. Then where was the divine mission of these men to abolish the ancient faith and start a new one? And what right had the Catholics of their day to listen to them and become their followers? The Church was in possession—to use Mr. Hannan's phrase. Then, for the matter of that, she's in possession still; and you, to be consistent with your profession of Christianity, ought at once to return to her allegiance."

Such a sudden turn of the tide told with crushing effect. There was not a man in the room, except M'Donald himself, but felt a strange uneasiness; although Richard Hannan was the only one present sufficiently in earnest about religion to appreciate the situ-

atie duly. As for him, he felt carried off his legs and being swept out to sea.

"Can any gentleman help me?" he asked; "I acknowledge I'm nonplussed quite."

"Why, my dear sir," said the bass voice again, "you're not going to let yourself be floored by a Scotchman's sophistry, are you? He knows very well that the age of miracles was over long before the Reformation; and also that the reformers appealed to the Bible for their authority."

"I beg your pardon, Mr. Holt," retorted the candid Hannan. "There's no Scotch sophistry here. If the age of miracles was over, then so was the age of revelations. While as to their appealing to the Scriptures for their authority, where was their authority for appealing to the Scriptures?"

"Well, but, Mr. Hannan," said another voice, "didn't Christ and the Apostles appeal to the Scriptures?"

"In a very different way, Mr. Davis. They appealed to prophecies which their enemies themselves admitted were to be fulfilled in the Messiah; besides having wrought miracles first, as their credentials for presuming to appeal against the authority in possession. Whereas the Reformers appealed against received doctrines and interpretations, and without any such credentials for attacking the authority in possession. Moreover—for it now recurs to my mind that our Saviour warns us against FALSE workers of miracles—even if the Reformers had shown this power, that wouldn't have justified the Catholics for listening to them. You see, gentlemen, the Church was in possession (a legal term, but the best I can find); and this is everything. And now that I think of it, I keep remembering several passages of the New Testament in which the Church is promised that immunity from error which the Catholics have always claimed for her. Why, doesn't St. Paul even call her 'the pillar and ground of the truth'? To be sure he does; and it seems to me I'm waking from a sleep of some kind—a forgetfulness, or a blindness, or something. Yes, here's another text. St. Paul declares that even if an angel from heaven should come and preach a new gospel, he should be held accursed. So that even if Luther and Calvin and the rest had been angels from heaven, you see, the Catholics to whom they preached ought, according to St. Paul, to have held them accursed."

"Mr. Hannan," said M'Donald gracefully, "I beg to assure you of my profound respect; not only because of your clear-headedness, but also because of your sincerity. From the day that Gibbon enlightened me as to the substantial identity of the Catholic Church of modern times with that of the first four centuries—identity, I mean, in doctrine and discipline, for no one disputes their historical identity—I recognized the fact that the 'evidences of Christianity' are identical with those of the said Church. If, therefore, I believed in the one as divine (that is, in your sense of the word) I should also believe in the other as equally infallible and superhuman. As it is, you and I must agree to differ: not, however, that this need prevent us from being good friends. My plan is to let every man alone, provided he'll let me alone. And, believe me, should you become a Catholic, my esteem for you will only be increased."

Richard was touched and interested. "Besides thanking you most cordially, Mr. M'Donald, for your good opinion of me, I must add thanks equally sincere for the 'change that has come over the spirit of my dream' through your masterly reasoning this evening. You have quite upset my repose; quite cut away the ground from under me:—yet I thank you for this, I say, because truth before all things is what I believe in. At present the position of my mind is this: That the ancient Church which our fathers left *ought to be* right after all; that her doctrine *ought to be* pure and unchanged. I have therefore no choice before me but to examine without delay; and if I indeed find Rome in the right, to Rome I go, be the consequence what it may."

\* \* \* \* \*

About a month after the above scene, Richard Hannan was received into the Catholic Church by the worthy priest of Cambridge. He had kept his resolve manfully; had called on the priest the very next day, and opened his whole mind to him. He found the priest a very pleasant man, and one of the first order of intellect; and after some earnest conversations, and the reading of some books which made him call his hitherto darkness Egyptian, and receiving all necessary instructions, he became a very zealous convert.

He contrived to keep his conversion quiet, though; and left Cambridge at the end of the term—which happily came a week after his reception. Wallace M'Donald was the only man to whom he confided the secret; having carefully evaded the questions of the rest. But when he had left there was a general talk; and some did not hesitate to put down the "long-headed Scotchman" as a "Jesuit in disguise."

As to Richard's relatives, why, of course they made a terrible piece of work; their grief being augmented tenfold by the culprit's actually choosing to be a priest, and getting sent to Rome to study. However, in time they all forgave him, with the exception of his father and some clerical uncles—who, of course, could hardly be expected to forgive him. The dear fellow is still in Rome studying. He always writes in the best of spirits; and tells me he shall ever look back to the day of his reception into the Church as the proudest and happiest of his life.

The last I heard of M'Donald was that he too had gone in for "Orders" (Anglican); and was laboring in the cause of "progress" in the wake of Colenso & Co.

But what of those other six gentlemen who were present that memorable evening? They too had heard the argument that led to Hannan's conversion; they too had been unable to meet it. Then why were THEY not converted? Did not truth concern them as much as Richard Hannan? Yes; but *they* were not concerned with *it*. They didn't think or care enough about it. One shook off the difficulty in one way, another laughed it down in another. They "knew not the time of their visitation."

And you, gentie reader—for which side are you? For the "too much trouble" side—for the "what does it matter?" side—or for the "truth before all things is what I believe in" side?



## WHAT THINK YE OF MARY? WHOSE MOTHER IS SHE?

---

A PICTURE in a window attracted me. I turned with my friend to look at it. Said I, "I must have that; it takes my fancy more than any thing I've seen yet." So in we went, and I bought the picture. It was a "Madonna and Child," from the work of an artist not known—at least to the keeper of the shop. My friend too was much struck with it; so when we came out, he remarked,

"I acknowledge the poetry of that devotion, and of your religion generally; and can easily understand what a hold it must have on a person of your temperament."

"Yes," I replied; "but, for *me*, poetry has to be truth. Beauty is 'the splendor of truth;' and where there is no truth, there is no beauty—but a sham and a mockery instead. If, then, this devotion were not true, it would have no charm for *my* philosophy."

"But isn't that begging the question?"

"Not at all. We ask you to 'prove before you praise.' A Catholic's faith is no tissue of fancies, no system of opinions—like that of a Protestant. Most truly can we use to you the words of our Saviour to the Samaritan woman at the well, 'You worship you know not what: we *know* what *we* worship.'"

"Then come," said he, "since you are so certain that you are right, show me, if you can, how it is true, how it is scriptural, how it is not idolatrous, how it is not—I will even say—blasphemous, to call the Virgin Mary 'the Mother of God,' and to give her divine honors?"

"You mean *religious* honors, I presume?"

"Why, what's the difference?"

"I thought as much. But let me answer one charge at a time. However, as the street is not the place for such

*What think ye of Mary?*

discussion, do me the favor to come home with me; and then we will have a *tête-à-tête* at leisure."

Arrived at the house, I produced the purchased picture; and, placing it before us, began my lecture.

"Now then," said I, pointing to the Divine Infant, "who is this?"

"Well," he answered hesitatingly, "I suppose you mean me to say God?"

"Why, of course I do. Don't you believe him to be God?"

"Yes; but man too."

"Well, wait a moment about that. This child is Almighty God. Very good, then; who is that?" (Pointing to the Blessed Virgin.)

"Ah! yes," finding himself caught; "you mean me to say God's Mother."

"Exactly. Admit that child to be God, and you have to admit that woman to be God's Mother."

"Well," said he, "Christ being man as well as God, and having derived his manhood only from the Virgin, how can you say that she is any thing more than the mother of his human nature? Whereas, to call her 'Mother of God,' makes her the source of his divine nature—which was eternally begotten of the Father."

"Does it, indeed! You exhibit, my dear friend, in common with all Protestants, a total misapprehension of the Incarnation. The mystery of the Incarnation consists in this, that in Christ two natures are united in one person. Wherefore, with regard to the maternity of Mary, *the question is not of natures, but of persons*. Deny that she is the mother of a Divine Person, and you make her the mother of a human person; for *a rational nature can not exist without a person to support it*. Assert, with the Nestorian heretics, that Mary is the mother of a human person, and you vitiating the atonement instantly; for if it was not a *Divine Person* that suffered for us in *a human nature*, not only were

his merits not infinite, but the Incarnation was utterly aimless."

Here I paused, to see if my friend would answer. But his silence, and the look of bewilderment on his face, told me more plainly than words that this was the first time the Incarnation had been put before him in such a light. I therefore felt encouraged to proceed.

"You doubtless remember those words of St. Paul, 'God sent forth his Son *made of a woman*'? and those of St. John, 'The Word was made flesh'? Expressions so strong, that they must needs startle the ear of a Protestant, I think, every time he reads or hears them. Now, *how* was the Son of God 'made of a woman'? By becoming her son—was it not? And *how* was 'the Word made flesh'? By being conceived and born of a virgin. Although, then, he could not derive his divine nature from his own creature, yet he was *personally* derived from her *as Man*. But his person could not become divided—half to remain with his divinity, and half to assume his humanity. He therefore united his human nature with his divine '*hypostatically*' in his *undivided person*. 'Hypostatically,' means in one hypo-stasis or *entity*; the natures remaining perfectly distinct and yet equally supported by his single and undivided person.

"Now, Protestants are ready enough to admit that the Son of Mary was God; but shrink from saying, 'God became the Son of Mary;' for that would be the same as saying that 'Mary became the Mother of God.' But I have proved to you that God *did* become her Son; and that therefore she became God's Mother. And not alone *became*, but *is*, his Mother; stands in that most intimate of relations to him at this day and forever. As surely as Mary has a Son, so surely has God a Mother."

"You astonish me!" he exclaimed. "I really can not answer you. You certainly have proved your thesis, if it can be proved. In short, you have shown me (what I had

no idea of before) that a realization of the divine maternity of Mary is inseparable from a right belief in the Incarnation; since if the person born of Mary was not God in human nature, there was no *Incarnation* at all."

"It's my turn to be astonished," said I, "to hear you express yourself so clearly already. But I see you were in good faith; and grace has not failed to enlighten you by means of my feeble words."

"But it is an awful mystery!"

"I grant you; the greatest mystery in the faith. It is, of course, impossible to demonstrate it. We can only show that it is not contrary to reason, and none of our opponents can show that it is. But now let me answer your second charge, since you allow that I have disposed of the first. Let me speak of the *worship* we pay to the Mother of God and also of that personal devotion to her which enters into the life of every true Catholic."

"If you please. I'm all attention."

"Well, then, in the first place, the word *worship* means veneration or honor; and persons or things are honored and venerated according to their dignity and the esteem we have of them. Since, then, the dignity of being God's Mother comes next to that of being God himself—while, at the same time, the distance is infinite, the worship due to her who has that dignity must be next in degree to the worship due to God—although, at the same time, the difference is infinite. Wherefore, the Catholic Church ascribes to the Blessed Virgin the highest worship that a creature can receive; immeasurably higher than that which she pays to the other celestials, and, at the same time, infinitely inferior to that which she pays to Almighty God. Here, too, I am speaking but of one *kind* of worship—the only kind which Protestants know of; for, be it remembered, the Catholic Church offers God the worship of *sacrifice* as well—a worship that can not be paid to a creature.

"Now, Protestants show that they do not understand

even the one kind of worship they have, when they charge us with giving *divine* honors to creatures. What would they say to us if we accused them, in turn, of giving the Bible divine honors? Yet they give it *religious* honors, don't they? The principle of all religious honor is the same, and so is its end the same—namely, God—whether directly or indirectly. The homage which is paid directly to God has in him its beginning and its end; and so has the religious veneration paid to creatures—being relative, or given *with reference to God*. You honor the Bible as *God's* word, don't you? So do *we* honor the saints as *God's* saints, and the angels as *God's* angels, and the Virgin Mother as *God's* Mother. So that, you see, my dear friend, *your quarrel lies with God, and not with us*. You want to know what business God has with angels and saints and a mother! Yes, you do. For, if he has them, we are bound to honor them. And, after all, what is the honor we pay them compared with that which *he* has paid or pays them? *He* has given them miraculous graces, and crowns and thrones and sceptres. *We* can only *recognize this fact*; can only invoke these 'friends at court' to pray for us, and ask them to use for us their influence with the King, and the power *which he has bestowed upon them*. I say, then, your quarrel lies with God, and not with us; as in every thing, your protest passes the Church, on whose authority we believe and act, and rests on Him who has made her what she is."

I paused again. A melancholy motion of the head mutely requested me to continue.

"It remains, then, to speak of the personal devotion which all true Catholics have for the Blessed Virgin, and which enters, as I said, into their daily life.

"Now, this is not only because of her peerless virtues and unspeakable loveliness every way; nor only because, by her free consent and obedience to the proposed will of God, she coöperated with him to accomplish the Incarnation, and thus became to us the channel of all the graces

that event brought with it; nor, again, is it only because she is thus the true Eve, the true 'Mother of all living'—the Mother of the mystical body of Christ; nor only because she is our advocate with her Son—the mother of the sinner as well as of the Saviour; of the culprit as well as of the judge; not only, I say, for these reasons—the least of which, rightly understood, will be found to necessitate our devotion to her; but especially because our Lord himself, who is our model in all things, has set us an example he expects us to follow, of the most tender devotion to her.

"You stare. Exactly. You and I find a very different story in the Gospel respecting the conduct of our Lord to his Mother. A Protestant sees only those two or three passages in which, to his perverted gaze, our Lord appears to slight his Blessed Mother, and to act as if he wished to guard against the future worship he foresaw would be paid to her. The Catholic, on the other hand, reads in these passages quite another lesson from that. Having before his eyes the great fact of what Mary is, and in what relation her Son and she must ever stand to each other, he knows that these words of our Lord to his Mother can not set aside that fact, and are therefore meant to teach *us* that when we are "about our Father's business" we must be, as it were, dead to all earthly ties, however intimate and dear to us.

"But with what a blindness are those persons afflicted who fail to see any thing in the fact that our Lord lived in voluntary subjection to his Mother for thirty out of his thirty-three years! And is that nothing to us? Was it but a meaningless delay, a waste of time? Or does it not show the paramount importance which our Saviour attached to this devotion to his Mother, when he considered three years enough for the work of his public ministry, and thirty years scarcely enough for his hidden life with Mary? I say 'scarcely' enough, because of the reluctance he evinced to begin his public life when his mother asked him to work his

first miracle at the marriage-feast of Cana. And here, again, note this incident as it deserves. It was 'at her word,' that 'he let down the net,' and sooner than he had wished to do so. 'Mine hour is not yet come,' he said; and yet he performed the miracle, showing us thereby that he had made his Mother's will a law to him, and could refuse her nothing. And as to the words 'Woman,' and 'What have I to do with thee?' every Greek scholar knows perfectly well the meaning of those every-day eastern phrases: how, in the Greek plays, even a king addresses his mother or his queen *in public* by the title of *Gunai*—'Lady,' (which in the New Testament is rendered 'Woman;') and how *Ti esti emoi kai soi*—literally, 'What is that to me and to thee?'—meant nothing more than 'Why do you ask me?' in a context like that of our Lord's answer to his Mother.

"Again; while our Lord was walking with his disciples, during the time of his three years' ministry, the Holy Virgin *of course* did not go round with him in public. She followed him in private, and ministered to him, but *her* share in his apostolic work was *prayer*—the prayer of retirement answering then to the prayer of the cloister now. And therefore as the Gospel narrative deals almost exclusively with our Lord's public life, it would have been out of place and of keeping with the modesty of Mary's character, to bring her forward more than was necessary in the story of that life.

"And yet once more: our Lord's three years' ministry, although recorded for our sakes because of much that he did and said, is not among the principal facts which immediately concern the world's redemption. These are three; his Incarnation, his Birth, and his Death—the mysteries of Nazareth, Bethlehem, and Calvary; and when we seek him at either of these chief fountains of grace and of doctrine, we find him 'with Mary his mother.' As to the first, we owe our very knowledge of it to *her*; for St. Luke must have received the account from her—unless you gratuitously suppose it revealed to him by the Holy Ghost. Then

for the virginal birth of the Divine Infant, his Mother and S. Joseph were its only human witnesses; and when the shepherds and the Magi came to adore the Saviour, it was Mary who 'showed them the Blessed Fruit of her womb.' So too on Calvary we find the Mother partaking in the Passion of the Son. She stands by his Cross, with the sword through her soul, and this by no mere accident, no mere force of human affections, but as holding her proper place in the economy of the redemption. Accordingly our Lord points her out to us as the Mother and Lady of the Church, when he commends S. John to her, with the words, 'Behold thy son!' and her to S. John with, 'Behold thy mother!' For S. John was not standing there by accident either; but as being at once an apostle and a disciple he represented the whole church—both the church teaching and the church learning.

"Wherefore, my dear friend, not to detain you longer, I think I have proved to you—briefly yet fully, (while volumes would not exhaust the subject)—that in the simple 'Madonna and Child,' you behold an epitome of the Christian revelation—of 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' So admirably has it been said that 'as Mary inclosed Jesus, so the truth about her includes that about him.'"

"Indeed you have!" was the welcome reply. "I am silenced forever as a Protestant. And *à propos* of your concluding remark, I may say you have proved the whole Catholic religion. For although, of course, I have every thing to learn regarding its other doctrines, which I can see clearly have been shamefully misrepresented; yet obviously, your church, being right in this, is bound to be right in all—since this is at once the centre and the circumference. While, again, it is equally obvious that the very worst feature of Protestantism, as the one which strikes at the root of Christianity, is its hostility to the Mother of God."



## ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS.



WHAT is an œcumenical council? This is the question which I intend to answer in this paper, in plain, simple language, for the benefit of those who desire and need it.

A council is an assembly of bishops and prelates, for the purpose of making laws and otherwise consulting for the well-being of the churches under their government. A lawful council is one that is composed of Catholic bishops, assembled according to the laws of the Catholic Church. An œcumenical council is the highest and most authoritative of the different kinds of councils. It is so called from a Greek word signifying "the habitable globe." The name, therefore, shows that it is a council of the universal church, spread throughout the world, making laws for the whole Catholic Church. In order that a council may be truly œcumenical, it must be (1) general, that is, one to which all bishops in the communion of the church are summoned; which is actually attended by a considerable number from different parts of the world; or, at least, one which, though not called at first as a general council, is numerously attended by bishops of several provinces, and made general by the universal acceptance and ratification of the bishops of the whole church. It must be (2) ratified and sanctioned by the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. The decrees of such a council are œcumenical, that is, they extend to the universal church with a supreme and binding force over all the faithful, clergy and laity, kings, governments, and people alike.

The Pope, as Vicar of Christ and Supreme Head of the Church, has the right to convoke, prorogue, regulate, and dissolve general councils, to propose to them the subjects of their deliberation, and give the prelates permission to make propositions for decrees, and, finally, to pronounce the supreme and final judgment upon all the decrees which have been passed by the prelates. He presides in the council, either personally or by Legates who are appointed to represent him.

The council is composed chiefly of bishops, who sit in it as fellow-judges with the Pope on all matters of faith, morals, and discipline which are lawfully submitted to them, but in subordination to the supreme judge, by a divine right annexed to their office. Those Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church who are not bishops have also a seat by privilege, because they are the counsellors of the Sovereign Pontiff, and his assistants in the government of the universal church. Abbots and Generals of Religious Orders also have a seat by privilege, as the heads of communities formed by the permission and under the sanction of the Holy See, and in great measure exempt from the ordinary authority of local bishops. All these have a decisive vote. There are many other ecclesiastics admitted to councils as theologians, or representatives of absent bishops, who take part in the deliberations, and assist in the preparation of the decrees, but they have no decisive vote. Princes, ambassadors, and other laymen of high rank have also been admitted to councils in past times, in order that the temporal interests of nations, which were closely connected with questions of doctrine and discipline, might be represented, and that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities might concur in the execution of the decrees. They were, also, in the early ages, the protectors of the council from all violence and coercion, although they frequently abused their office, and became the tyrants and persecutors of the church. They have never been permitted to have a vote on ecclesiastical questions.

What is the utility of œcumenical councils? In order to answer this question, it is necessary, first of all, to make a brief explanation of the hierarchical constitution of the church established by our Lord Jesus Christ. The church is a holy kingdom, over which Jesus Christ is both King and High Priest. He has delegated the functions and offices of priesthood and government in the church militant on earth to a hierarchy composed of sacred ministers and rulers. The priestly functions relating to the sacrifice, sacraments, and sacred rites of religion are committed to the order of priests, which is divided into two classes: bishops, who possess the priesthood in its fulness with the power of communicating it by ordination, and presbyters, who have not this power. The priesthood is aided in the inferior functions of the sacred ministry by six other orders, the highest of which, the order of deacons, is of divine institution, the other five having been established by ecclesiastical authority. The power of ruling is committed to the Sovereign Pontiff and to the Bishops by divine

institution. By the power which Jesus Christ left to the church of completing its organization in regard to everything not decreed by himself, other grades and offices have been established, as those of Patriarchs, Primate, and Metropolitans among the bishops; Cardinals at the Roman Court; abbots, generals, arch-priests, deans, archdeacons, canons, vicars-general, parish priests, etc., among the regular and secular clergy. The supreme pontificate over the whole church was given to St. Peter, with full power to rule, govern, and feed the universal flock of Christ. The other twelve apostles received a special delegation from the Lord to exercise the same power with that committed to St. Peter, as it were being made perpetual legates *a latere*, under the presidency of their Prince and chief, St. Peter. This was necessary in order that they might found the church, regulate the faith and sacraments, and establish the hierarchy throughout the world with a supreme and divine authority from which there was no appeal. All danger of dissension in serious matters which might divide the church and break its unity was prevented by the confirmation of the apostles in grace, and the extraordinary sanctity to which they were raised by the indwelling power of the Holy Spirit within them. They were, moreover, inspired by the same Spirit to make the full and complete revelation by their oral and written teaching of the faith and law of Jesus Christ. All these extraordinary powers, given to the apostles for the foundation of the church, died with them, for they were given to them personally, and not for transmission to their successors. Their ordinary powers, and they only, passed to their successors. The Pope succeeded to St. Peter as Supreme Pastor and Ruler of the universal church. The bishops succeeded to the other apostles as subordinate pastors and rulers. The faith having been once for all delivered, the sacraments and divine constitution of the church having been once for all instituted, and the foundations of the kingdom of Christ having been securely laid, inspiration was no longer needed, and passed away. The special jurisdiction of the apostles throughout the universal church for the same reason passed away, leaving in full sway the jurisdiction given to St. Peter, not as one of the twelve, but as the Vicar of our Lord and Prince over the apostolic college. In this way, full provision was made for the continual preaching of the true faith, and the administration of the sacraments and discipline. Each bishop governed his church, teaching the faith and administering the sacraments according to the tradition of the apostles and apostolic men who founded the churches. Mission-

ary bishops founded new churches precisely according to the model of those from which they were sent. In every case where a superior authority was necessary, the metropolitans or patriarchs, as delegates of the supreme Roman Pontiff, exercised that authority, and, if necessary, called councils of their suffragan bishops, who decided the various cases presented and made suitable laws. The supreme appeal was always to the Roman Pontiff in these local causes, and in the greater causes, as where patriarchs were to be judged, or cases to be decided which related to the universal church or large portions of it, he judged the cause in the first instance, calling in the aid of as many bishops to sit with him in council as he considered necessary. In the course of time, questions of such vast and universal importance arose relating to the faith and other vital interests of religion, that the Popes found it expedient to summon œcumenical councils, and they have continued to call such councils at intervals down to the present time, when the nineteenth of the œcumenical councils is in session at Rome. The utility of these councils is now easily shown. The great emergencies which are the occasion of calling them argue the existence of widely spread and dangerous errors or other disorders and evils in Christendom. The Pope has the full power, no doubt, to condemn these errors, and prescribe remedies for these disorders, yet it is of great utility to him that he should be fully informed of all the facts in the case by the testimony of bishops and other learned men from all parts of the world, that he should know their sentiments and receive their counsel. As for laws and decrees of discipline, he can better judge how to make them wisely by the aid of the concurrent judgment of the men who will have to execute these laws, and who know perfectly the difficulties they must meet and overcome. In matters of faith and doctrine, also, it is plain that the means of making his supreme decision in such a manner as to strike error with the most fatal blows, and to define truth with the most lucid and exhaustive precision, are furnished in the most perfect possible manner to the Supreme Bishop by the information and judgment of a collective council of his fellow-bishops. Doctrine is no longer proposed by way of new and immediate revelations. The revelation of God's word is finished. The Catholic episcopate has only the commission to keep, proclaim, expound, apply, and defend the eternal, unchangeable principles of truth revealed through the prophets and apostles, and the positive laws enacted by the authority of **Jesus Christ**. The judgments of the supreme tribunal must there-

fore rest on evidence and knowledge respecting the tradition left in the churches by the apostles, and on solid learning in the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Fathers. The bishops coming together from all parts of the world give the most authentic testimony concerning their own faith and that of their clergy and people. All their learning and wisdom, together with that of the greatest theologians of the world, is collected together in a focus, like that of a thousand calcium lights, concentrated on the points respecting which the Pope desires to give a final and irreversible decision. Moreover, the light and assistance of the Holy Spirit must be obtained by prayer, and the prayer, accompanied by fasting, of the whole Catholic Church gathered together in council is the most efficacious that can be offered.

Besides all this, we must consider that those who make schisms and heresies in the church are disobedient and rebellious, and that very many of the faithful are badly instructed and of very imperfect virtue, so that they are easily deceived by cunning and wicked perverters of the truth. Moreover, those who are outside the church reject the authority of the See of Peter. The manifestation of unity and catholicity, the exhibition of the agreement of all churches with their "Mother and Mistress," the Roman Church, the world-resounding profession of the faith of the Catholic Church which are made by an œcumenical council, give greater moral weight to the judgment of the Apostolic See. It overwhelms the rebellious, confirms the wavering, and impresses with awe the unbeliever. Therefore, although the Sovereign Pontiff has full power to teach, feed, and govern the whole flock, bishops as well as laity, and ordinarily exercises his power without consulting the body of the bishops, yet there are times when he finds it expedient to summon a general council.

There have been eighteen of these œcumenical councils held previously to the present one now in session. (1) The First Council of Nice, held between A.D. 327 and 330, condemned the heresy of Arius, who denied that the Son is consubstantial with the Father; that of the Novatians, who denied the power of the church to remit certain sins, and decided the time of celebrating Easter. (2) The First Council of Constantinople, in 381 or 383, condemned the heresy of the Sabellians, who denied the distinction of Persons in the Trinity; of the Apollinarists, who denied the complete humanity of Jesus Christ; and of the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit, together with various other heresies connected with Arianism. (3) The Council of

Ephesus, in 431, condemned the heresy of the Nestorians who maintained that there are two distinct persons in Jesus Christ, and denied that Mary is the Mother of God. (4) The Council of Chalcedon, in 451 or 454, condemned the heresy of the Eutychians, who denied the two natures in Christ. (5) The Second Council of Constantinople, held in 549, was a supplement to that of Chalcedon. (6) The Third Council of Constantinople, held in 580, condemned the heresy of the Monothelites, who denied the distinction of two wills in Christ. (7) The Second Council of Nice, held between 781 and 789, condemned the heresy of the Iconoclasts, who denied the veneration due to sacred images. (8) The Fourth Council of Constantinople, held in 869 or 870, condemned Photius, the intruded Patriarch of Constantinople, and first author of the Greek schism. (9) The First Council of Lateran, held in 1123, was called for the purpose of repressing the usurpations of kings and princes over the church, and providing for the defence of Christendom against the Mohammedans. (10) The Second Council of Lateran, held in 1139, was called to suppress the schism of Peter Leo, an anti-pope, and the heresies of Peter de Bruys and Arnold of Brescia. (11) The Third Council of Lateran, held in 1179, condemned the heresies of the Albigenses and Waldenses. (12) The Fourth Council of Lateran, held in 1215, is called the Great Council, on account of the large number of mitred prelates present, that is, according to Bellarmine, 1283, many of whom, however, must have been abbots. This council is remarkable for its magnificent definitions, among others of transubstantiation; it condemned anew the Albigenses and many other heretics, decreed that the faithful should receive the sacraments once a year, and made many excellent disciplinary canons. It was also a grand States-General of Christendom, many princes and ambassadors being present, and arrangements were made to repress the insolence of the Mohammedans. (13) The First Council of Lyons, held in 1245, condemned the Emperor Frederic II., the oppressor of the Holy See and the church, and promoted the Crusades. (14) The Second Council of Lyons, held in 1274, defined the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, condemned the errors of the Greek schismatics, and adopted measures for the reunion of the Greeks to the church, and the conquest of the Holy Land. (15) The Council of Vienne, held in 1311, condemned the Knights Templars, and the heresies of the Beguards, Beguins, Fraticelli, and other sectaries. (16) The Council of Ferrara and Florence, held in 1438 and 1439,

reunited the Greeks and Armenians to the church, and defined the doctrines of the procession of the Holy Spirit, purgatory, the beatitude of the Saints before the resurrection, the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, etc. (17) The Fifth Council of Lateran, held in 1512 and 1517, condemned several schismatical councils. (18) The Council of Trent, held in 1545 and 1563, condemned the errors of Protestantism, defined a great number of doctrines, and enacted numerous canons of discipline. Besides these councils, those of Sardis in 351, of Sirmium in 356, the Trullan in 680, of Frankfort in 794, of Constance in 1414, and of Basle in 1431, have been partly approved and partly condemned by the Holy See.

Not only are the decrees of an œcumenical council the supreme law, binding on the conscience, its doctrinal decrees and definitions are infallible. The Catholic Church is infallible. The Holy Spirit dwells in it, and it is impossible that all the members of the Catholic Church should agree together in believing and professing any false, erroneous doctrine as a revealed truth, or in rejecting any doctrine revealed by God. The Bishops in council represent and speak for the faith of the whole company of the faithful. It is impossible that they should fail to bear witness to the truth believed always, everywhere, and by all. Besides, the Roman Church is the centre of unity, the principal seat of truth, indefectible in faith. Upon that church "the holy Apostles Peter and Paul poured out all their doctrine with their blood."\* "With that church it is necessary that all other churches in every place should agree, on account of its more powerful principality."† The agreement of the doctrine taught by the bishops with that of the Roman Pontiff manifests the truth of the doctrine. In regard to all difficult or disputed questions, where the sense of the Scripture and the genuine apostolic tradition are not plain at the first view, the learning and wisdom of the great doctors and theologians of the church cannot err where they are generally agreed. But beyond all this, there is a special promise of our Lord Jesus Christ to the bishops and their supreme chief that he will direct and assist them in their judgments by the Holy Spirit, so that they shall never err. Among many other glorious predictions of the prophets, especially of Isaias, respecting the church, there is one which says: "*I will lay thy stones in oraer, and will lay thy foundations with sapphires; and I will make thy bulwarks of jasper, and thy gates of graven stones, and all thy borders of desirable stones. All thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of*

\* Tertullian.

† St. Irenæus.

thy children. And thou shalt be founded in justice ; no weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper, and every tongue that resisteth thee in judgment thou shalt condemn." \* The promise of the Holy Spirit to the church, and all the proofs which establish the infallibility of the church, apply especially to councils, because in them the church exercises her highest offices as witness, judge, and law-giver. A council is the Teaching Church, and is therefore infallible, because the church cannot err or be led into error. Our Lord said : "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." † This text was interpreted by the Fathers to refer especially to councils ; for, if Christ is present even with a few who are gathered together in his name, how much more must this be true in a congregation of the universal church? The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem, which was a type and model of the episcopal councils held after the apostolic age had passed away, in its Encyclical Letter wrote : "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." ‡ The clearest proof, however, that Jesus Christ promised infallible assistance to œcumenical councils is found in the language he used to St. Peter : "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not ; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren." "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church : and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." " whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." § The Catholic Church receives stability and indefectibility from the See of Peter, and the sanction of St. Peter's successor gives to the decrees of its councils the seal of divine authority. The Catholic episcopate, by virtue of its union with the Apostolic See, is, therefore, the heir of the promise made by Jesus Christ, that he would be with his apostles in their teaching office to the end of the world.

Pius IX., when he publishes the decrees of the Council of the Vatican, the holy council consenting and approving, will infallibly teach the pure word of God, and enact laws which are ratified in heaven. Let every good Catholic pray for the blessing of God upon his sacred and august person, and the venerable assembly of the bishops.

\* Isa. liv. 11-17.

† Acts xv. 28.

‡ Matt. xviii. 10.

§ Matt. xvi. 18, 19.



## DEVOTION TO MARY A DUTY OF JUSTICE.

---

MANY persons think that some of the doctrines of the Catholic Church are in the beginning distasteful even to its own members, but that by habit they learn to accept them. Devotion to the Blessed Virgin is one of these. Oh! what a mistake! How little they know us! Our devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin is neither forced upon us, nor is it a mere matter of sentiment. It is simply a duty of justice; though, it is true, that it is also a duty of love. Very far from being unnatural, it is most natural and spontaneous. It lies in the depths of our hearts like a spring of pure water which must work its way into outward expression, unless we do violence to our nature and prevent it.

I say, then, that devotion to the Blessed Virgin is natural because of the beauty of her character. It is natural to love persons in whom we find graces and virtues. Even those who do not practice virtue will allow as much as this. The strength of this love, moreover, is in proportion to the beauty of the character. Let St. Gabriel tell us, then, the measure of the Holy Virgin's graces: "*Hail, FULL of grace . . . Fear not, Mary, for THOU hast found grace with God.*" (St. Luke 1: 28, 30.) She, above all women, was pleasing to her Maker. Do you ask, why this privilege to Mary? Because God had chosen her as the future mother of his Son. You know what pains are taken, and with what a lavish hand money is spent, in furnishing the mansions and palaces of the great. I well remember an instance of this kind. Some years since, Queen Victoria made her first visit to Birmingham. A nobleman's palace in the neighborhood was fitted up to receive her, at the cost of some ten or twelve thousand pounds, though she was to spend but a night or two there. Had we been there before the alterations were made, we might have been tempted to think that the furniture was already sumptuous enough. But no, it is the sovereign who is coming, and nothing short of the best is thought worthy of her. This nobleman considered it a privilege to be allowed to show his respect and loyalty in this way. We recognize at once how natural and how right it was. Well, here is a Sovereign who is coming from heaven to this earth. His

home must be prepared for his reception, as becomes his dignity as the Son of God. He is to spend there not a day or two merely, but nine long months. More than this. In that home—the body of the Virgin Mary—and from the substance of that body, he is to frame his own body, which is to redeem the world by its blood, and which will continue to be his own to all eternity. Christian soul! of whatever creed you may be, you who love your Saviour, your true Sovereign, will you not confess that nothing short of the best adorning of that earthly home is worthy of him? For his sake, at least, you must allow, too, that nothing less would become her, whose dignity must be in proportion to the newness of her relationship with him. “*Thou art all fair, my love, and there is no stain in thee.*” (Cant. 4:7.) Otherwise her body and soul were unworthy of the Royal Guest who once abode within her. It is then natural to love the Blessed Virgin, because it is natural to admire and love beauty of character whenever we meet it.

But, again, it is just to love the Blessed Virgin, because it is natural to love a benefactor. There is not a more elevated sentiment in the human heart than gratitude, as there is nothing more base than the want of it. Every body feels this. Let me give you an instance of what I mean. During the Crimean war, a young lady of wealth and rank left her home and followed the camp of the English army. She devoted herself to the care of the sick and wounded with such self-sacrifice that every newspaper and almost every tongue was sounding with the praise of Florence Nightingale. But on what principle of justice can we praise this young English woman as a public benefactress, and yet deny it to the Blessed Virgin Mary? Our Lord excepted, there has never been so great a public benefactor as she. Her blessings have not been confined to one nation only, but have extended to the entire world. To her sex she has given, as it were, a new resurrection to a new life. The condition of woman, even among civilized nations, was most degrading before the coming of the Immaculate Virgin. The poems of Homer contain no instance of the vindication of chastity. The public games of Greece and Rome were shameless exhibitions of the absence of womanly modesty. Again, among our American Indians what was woman's condition? She was the servant and the slave. Work alone fell to her share, whether in the field or in the wigwam. She planted and hoed the corn. She chopped the wood. She cooked the food. Her husband kept her so long as it was convenient, and put her away without a reason.

Now, how is it with Christian women? They are mistresses of their homes. Their place at table is the head. When they go abroad into the world, men give place to them, and rival one another in their attention to them. How, then, shall we

account for this change? Simply in this way: We follow our own memory back eighteen hundred years, to the morning of the Annunciation, where we see an archangel kneeling at a woman's feet. God had looked upon "the humility of his Handmaid," and exalted her to the dignity of his mother. Therefore it was that St. Gabriel called her "blessed among women." Therefore it was that St. Elizabeth, filled, as St. Luke says, with the Holy Ghost, exclaimed, "*Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?*" (St. Luke 1 : 43.) Therefore it was that our Lady herself in turn exclaimed, "*Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.*" (St. Luke 1 : 48.)

But what has she done for the world? She has given it its Redeemer. He was conceived in her pure body, when she gave her consent to St. Gabriel. She bestowed upon him a mother's tender care from his infancy until his mission began. For many years she was the only friend of our blessed Saviour. And at last she stood beneath his cross and freely offered him to die a cruel death. She did not refuse to remain fifteen or twenty long years on earth after he had gone to heaven. Why did she do all this? Ah! she knew full well that she was the stewardess of a great trust in *our* behalf, and joyfully and lovingly did she acquit herself of the task. Such is woman's, such is the world's great benefactress! I claim, then, for Mary the gratitude and love of all who profess themselves Christians, by every title of justice and natural good feeling.

Devotion to Mary is just, too, because God is honored in his creatures. In praising a piece of work, surely I praise the person who made it. Suppose, as I go along the street, I stop to examine one of the many curious and ingenious inventions of the day—we will say a sewing, washing, or mowing-machine. I admire the simple and beautiful arrangements of wheel, screw, and cylinder, and I unconsciously exclaim, How complete! how clever! what a saving of labor and expense! Now, if the man who invented it overhears me, does he not appropriate my praise of the machine to himself? Of course he does. The blush of conscious pride colors his cheek, his heart is filled with delight. You know this well from your own experience. Again, how common it is to gain the affection of parents by making much of their children! There is perhaps no way to gain their hearts so effectually. Every little romp or frolic we have with them secures for us an additional place in the affections of the parents.

Now, apply what I have said to the Blessed Virgin Mary. I say, how gentle, how lovely, how holy a character hers is! I call her the choice work of God's hands. I think how fortunate I shall be if I can secure her prayers. Well, God hears me give her this praise. She is his work, and I am doing honor to his work. Have I not, then, reason to hope for his approbation

and blessing? The prophet David calls upon the mountains, the clouds and dew, the wind, the sun, the ice and snow, old men and maidens, priests and people, to praise the Lord. Why, then, may we not call upon Mary? She knew well how all things were for the honor and praise of their Maker; but she knew, too, that after the sacred humanity of her divine Son, there was one thing more beautiful than all creation besides, and this was her own soul. This led her to exclaim in her hymn of thanksgiving, "*Magnificat anima mea Dominum,*" "Let my soul praise the Lord." Her pure soul was the best thank-offering she could make to God for his goodness to her.

Lastly, it is natural to love the Virgin Mary because she is the Mother of God. What would you say to a man who expressed very great devotion to you, but told you he would much rather you would keep your mother out of the room when he came to see you; that he felt as if he could not treat her with respect? Why, you would scorn his friendship, and most likely you would chastise his insolence. There is no feeling of the human heart more sensitive than a son's, when the honor of his mother is called in question. But our Lord was a Son! He is now a Son; and still there are those who think to honor him the more by depreciation of his mother! Blessed Lord! spare them, for they know not what they do. They can not mean to treat thee so.

Now, I have pleaded the Blessed Virgin's claim to your honor and love, on the ground that it is easy and natural to pay them to her, and unnatural not to do so. I have tried to show you that your heart and sympathies are all enlisted on the side of loving her. What do those persons need, then, to make them love her, who acknowledge that they do not? I will tell you: they need to know her. No one can love that of which he has no knowledge. Their ignorance, which in some cases may not be their own fault, is like a tree which has fallen across a stream, and either altogether stopped its course or turned it another way. Remove this—and this is what I have been trying in fairness and sincerity to do—and the stream will flow on in its natural channel, the heart will spontaneously give to our Blessed Lady that tribute of devotion which is her rightful due.

## THE DUTY OF OBEYING THE POPE.

---

IT is the duty of all Catholics to obey the pope when he declares to them what they are bound to do in order to fulfil the law of God, and what they are bound to avoid as a transgression of that law. This is clear from the Holy Scripture, which the church proposes to the faithful in that true sense in which she has ever held and explained it, as the inspired, infallible word of God, whose teachings and precepts we are bound to follow. St. Paul says, "*Obey your prelates, and be subject to them.*" (Heb. 13 : 17.) St. John says, "*We are of God. He that knoweth God heareth us ; he that is not of God heareth us not ; by this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error.*" (1 Ep. St. John 4 : 6.) The pope is the chief of all prelates and pastors, and therefore it is to him chiefly that obedience is due from all bishops and priests, and therefore much more from the faithful. Our Lord expressly gave this supreme power of teaching and ruling the whole church to St. Peter and his successors. "*Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.*" (St. Matt. 16 : 19.) There is no restriction or reservation in this grant of power. The laws of the pope are confirmed by a divine sanction, and are obligatory on the conscience in the same manner as the laws

of Moses were binding on the Jews. The pope is the vicar of Jesus Christ, his delegate and representative on the earth. Our Lord said even to the seventy-two disciples, who represent the body of the priesthood, "*He that heareth you heareth me ; and he that despiseth you despiseth me. And he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me.*" (St. Luke 10:16.) If those who despise and disobey the ordinary clergy of the church, who are duly commissioned in their respective places and offices, are guilty of contempt against Christ and God the Father, much more are they guilty who despise not only their priests and bishops, but the vicar of Christ himself, the supreme head of the church, and the sovereign judge and lawgiver, from whose decisions and judgments there is no appeal. It is a dogma of the Catholic faith that "the Roman pontiff is the successor of the blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole church, and the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him in blessed Peter has been delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ *full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal church.*" (Council of Florence.) Whoever denies this dogma of faith, is a heretic and cut off from the church. Whoever contumaciously resists and disobeys this power, is a schismatic and equally excommunicated. Our Holy Father, Pius IX., has recently renewed the sentence of excommunication against "schismatics and those who pertinaciously withdraw themselves or recede from the obedience of the Roman pontiff for the time being." (*Acts of the Holy See.* Baltimore : Kelly & Piet. Vol. v. No. 54, p. 289.) Those also are excommunicated, and their absolution reserved to the holy see, who are guilty of "teaching or defending, whether publicly or privately, propositions condemned by the apostolic see under the pain of excommunication *late sententiæ,*" (that is, which takes effect without the sentence of a judge.) (*Ibid.* p.

292.) The pope, in the exercise of his supreme authority as teacher and ruler of the church, requires, therefore, obedience to his doctrinal decisions and to his laws, in certain cases, under the penalty of excommunication, which is incurred as soon as the act of disobedience is committed by one who knows the law and the censure annexed to it, and the absolution of which is reserved to himself. If bishops and priests in this country have power to absolve in these cases, it is only by virtue of a special power delegated by the holy see on account of the difficulty of recurring to Rome in every particular case. The authority of the pope to teach and command the faithful in regard to all things relating to the doctrines which they are to hold or to reject, and in regard to all things relating to the religious and moral acts which they are to do or to avoid, has been given to him by Jesus Christ. This is a truth revealed in the Holy Scripture and in the unwritten word contained in the apostolic tradition ever preserved in the church, and moreover defined by the infallible authority of the Œcumenical Council of Florence in the terms above quoted. It is, therefore, in the exercise of a divine right that the popes have forbidden certain opinions to be maintained, and certain acts to be done, under the penalty of excommunication. This is the exercise of the power of the keys, the power of binding and loosing, the power of feeding, governing, and ruling the universal church, given by Jesus Christ to St. Peter and his successors. These acts of supreme authority, exercised by the vicar of Christ, our Lord expressly declares are ratified in heaven, and are therefore to be respected and obeyed as really emanating from Jesus Christ himself. It is evident, therefore, that whenever a Catholic knowingly disobeys and defies them, he is guilty of contempt of Jesus Christ, and is held as an offender against the divine Majesty. Not only is he subject to privation of the sacraments of pen-

ance and the holy communion, but he is also excluded from the grace of God and the kingdom of heaven.

It is plain from the foregoing, and well known to every Catholic who has been instructed in the first principles of his religion, that the faithful are bound to obey the pope. He is the vicar of Jesus Christ, and whenever he raises his voice to teach, to instruct, to admonish, to exhort, and to warn the faithful, all are bound, from the highest prelates to the humblest of their flocks, to listen with the most profound respect, reverence, and docility. Whenever he commands, by virtue of his supreme authority, with the manifest intention of binding the conscience, it is a duty to obey him which can not be violated without mortal sin, unless invincible ignorance excuses a person from the blame of a willful transgression of the divine law. If the penalty of excommunication is annexed to the act of disobedience, those who venture to defy this censure are cut off from the enjoyment of their privileges as members of the church, and can only be restored when they have submitted and made reparation. What, then, are we to think of those who venture to hold and express opinions which they know have been condemned and reprobated by the holy see? Of those who have no respect or reverence for the dignity and office, the instructions, commandments, and prohibitions of the vicar of Christ and of their bishops? Especially, what are we to think of those who join societies and carry on enterprises which have been condemned as contrary to divine and human law, under the penalty of excommunication? And of those who defend these acts of disobedience, publicly speak and write against the pope and the hierarchy, on account of their just exercise of authority, and seek to poison the minds of the simple faithful with their false doctrines? In proportion to the extent to which all such persons are disobedient and contumacious, they are bad Catho-



lics ; and if they have not lost their faith, they are in the way to lose it, and all their influence is directed to the lessening and overthrowing the power of faith in the minds of others.

Those who seek to cover up their anti-Catholic doctrines with a specious appearance of adherence to the Catholic faith, have an adroit way of hiding themselves under words and phrases which deceive the simple. They know well that their only chance of gaining influence over well-intentioned Catholics, who love their religion, is to keep up an appearance of being Catholic. Let them deny in plain terms the supreme authority of the pope, and the authority of the hierarchy ; let them attack the church and the Catholic faith openly, and they know that all except apostates who have renounced their religion totally will shrink from them with horror. Perhaps they themselves shrink from the thought of totally abandoning their religion, and dying under the anathema of the church. They invent, therefore, a plausible form of words with which they deceive others, and perhaps themselves also. Let us take an example, in order to make this clear. Several of the sovereign pontiffs have prohibited the faithful from joining certain societies, under the penalty of excommunication. Pius IX. has promulgated this decree anew in his recent Bull of Censures. Under the head of excommunications *latæ sententiæ*, reserved to the Roman pontiff, he decrees, "We declare that those persons lie under excommunication *latæ sententiæ*, reserved to the Roman pontiff, who give their names to the Masonic or Carbonarian sect, or to other sects of the same kind, which carry on machinations openly or clandestinely against the church or legitimate powers, and also those who give any kind of favor to those sects." (*Acts*, etc., as above, page 293.) Those who resist this act of authority pretend that they do not deny the supreme authority of the pope itself ;

but deny that in this case the popes have exercised it wisely, with full knowledge of the case, and for sufficient reasons. But who is the judge? Is a private person to judge the rulers of the church and the vicar of Christ himself? The supreme tribunal established by Jesus Christ, in which the pope is supreme judge and the bishops are assessors, is the only authority competent to judge of the reasons and motives of decrees, either of doctrine or of discipline. It is a tribunal without appeal, and especially without appeal to bad Catholics who are excluded from the sacraments.

Another sophism is, that the pope and the hierarchy interfere with matters belonging to the temporal order, to politics and human rights, when they prohibit certain acts as illegal, contrary to good order and the public peace, and to the obedience due to civil magistrates and laws. No one, who is not either in total ignorance of Catholic doctrine or in direct opposition to the church, can maintain such an opinion. The authority of the church extends over all things relating to morality, over all questions of right and wrong, duty and transgression of duty, justice and injustice, lawfulness and unlawfulness. As well might one talk of our Lord Jesus Christ *interfering* with human rights as his vicar or his church. Man is responsible to God in all his relations, as a child or parent, a subject, citizen, artisan, merchant, lawyer, legislator, or governor. The moral law, the rule of right and wrong, runs through the state, society, the family, and every relation or institution in which man is a free agent, having rights and duties. The church is supreme in deciding all moral questions, and the pope is the sovereign minister of the law of God, with power to punish by his spiritual censures all infractions of the divine law. It is, therefore, the same thing as denying the pope to be the vicar of Christ, to say that he interferes with natural rights when he denounces certain acts as contrary to natu-

ral right and justice, and to the right which laws and magistrates possess to be obeyed. One might as well say that the pope and the priesthood *interfere* with people's private affairs and social rights when they condemn bribery, swindling, drunkenness, working on Sunday, eating meat on Friday, divorce, cruelty to children, and a thousand other things, and refuse the sacraments to those who will not obey.

The duty of obeying the doctrinal teaching and moral precepts of the vicar of Christ is one which has great need of being strongly urged on all classes of Catholics, and deeply considered by all. Those who have had their opinions formed by the current, uncatholic literature of the day have great need to bring their opinions to the unerring criterion of Catholic doctrine, and correct them by the authoritative teaching of the church. The Catholics of Irish birth or descent, who form the great majority of the faithful in this country, have always been here, as they have always been in the country of their origin, most loyal and faithful to the church and the holy see. The counsel of St. Patrick recorded in the Book of Armagh has not been lost upon them: "As you are children of Christ, so be you children of Rome." There are, however, some false brethren, and some who are aliens from the faith of Ireland, who seek to malign the holy father, the hierarchy and the clergy, under a false pretense of love to Ireland and the Irish people, whose greatest enemies and betrayers they are. Let the faithful descendants of the ancient martyrs and saints give ear to their great and glorious apostle, and not to these seducers. Let them not believe that the holy father, or their own bishops and clergy, are indifferent either to their temporal or spiritual welfare. There was never a time when the glory of the faithful church and people of Ireland was so widely known or so highly appreciated throughout the whole of Christen-

dom as now. All Catholics, whether priests or laymen, even though belonging to other nations, sympathize deeply with the sufferings and oppressions under which the Irish nation has been so long and so heavily weighed down. All desire to see it regain its liberty and its rights, and to see its soil, richly watered with the blood of saints, flourish in temporal as well as spiritual bloom and prosperity. This can only take place through the blessing of God and the intercession of the saints in heaven, who watch over the land where they lived and labored and died for Christ. This blessing can only be attained by persevering in strict and loyal obedience to all the instructions and precepts of the pope and unwavering fidelity to the Catholic religion.

---

*Printed for "THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.," New York. Price  
\$6 per 1,000 copies.*

# THE SCHOOL QUESTION

IN ITS

## RELATION TO CATHOLICS.

---

### ORIGIN OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

THE school system now in vogue originated in New-England; strictly speaking, in Massachusetts. As originally established there, it was simply a system of parochial schools. The parish and town were coincident, and the annual town-meeting voted the amount of money to be spent for schools by the school committee, chosen at the same meeting. In none of the States, however, was there developed at first a system of free public schools, supported by a school fund, or by a general tax levied by the state. As the sale of public lands gave rise to the school funds, the present system, in its present form, grew from the parochial schools.

### THE SCHOOLS WERE ORIGINALLY ESTABLISHED FOR A RELIGIOUS END,

not for one purely secular. The people did not dream of divorcing sécular education from religion. The schools were intended to give both religious and secular education in their natural union, and there was no thought of the feasibility of separating what God had joined together. The Bible was read as a class-book, the catechism was taught as a school exercise, and the minister visited the schools and gave instruction about religion as often as he thought proper. That religion, as Catholics hold, was defective, and even false; but the principle on which the schools were founded was sound, and worked well in the beginning, did no injustice to any one, and violated no con-

OUR SUNDAY VISITOR LIBRARY  
HUNTINGTON, INDIANA

science. For where religious sentiment was divided, conscience was respected, because the character of the school was determined by the inhabitants of the district, and nobody was obliged to send his children to it, *and those only who did send were taxed for its support.* But in none of the States is there a unanimously accepted religion. And in all there is a variety of denominations *with equal rights before the state.* Hence it is obvious that the Massachusetts system can not now be maintained or adopted, nor can the plan of taxing only those who use the schools answer the necessities of the times, for various and obvious reasons. Here commences

#### THE DIFFICULTY,

which as yet has received no practical solution, and which the State legislatures are now called upon to meet. Hitherto the attempt has been made to hush up complaint by excluding from the public schools what the state calls "sectarianism;" that is, whatever is distinctive of, or peculiar to, any one denomination. But this solution is impracticable where the division is not one between Protestant sects only, but between Catholics and Protestants. Catholicity must be taught as a whole, in its unity and integrity, or it is not taught at all; and not to teach it is to teach Protestantism, whose essential mark is its denial of Catholicity. To exclude from the schools all that is distinctive of and peculiar to Catholicity, is to exclude Catholicity itself, and to make the schools either purely Protestant or purely secular, and in *either case* hostile to the conscience of Catholics, and such as they can not support. Yet this is the system adopted, and, while the law enables non-Catholics to use the public schools with the approval of their consciences, it excludes the children of Catholics, unless their parents are willing to violate their Catholic conscience, and neglect their duty as fathers and mothers. Evidently, then, the plan of allowing only our supposed "common Christianity" in the schools does not solve the difficulty, nor secure to the Catholic his freedom of conscience.

#### THE EXCLUSION OF THE BIBLE

would not help the matter. This would only make the schools purely secular, which were worse than making them purely Protestant. For, as regards public morality, we Catholics hold that Protestantism is far more wholesome than paganism, or no religion. The question, however, lies deeper than reading the Bible. Of course, our church disapproves of the Protestant version of the Bible, as a faulty translation of a mutilated text; but its exclusion would by no means

remove our objection to the schools. We object to them not merely because they teach more or less of the Protestant religion, but also on the ground *that we can not freely and fully teach our religion* and train up our children in them to be true and unwavering Catholics; and we deny the right of the State, the city, the town, or the school district to tax us for schools in which we are not free to do so.

We value education—universal education, which overlooks no class or child, however rich or however poor. We are willing to concur in sustaining the system of free schools for all the children of the land, and to submit to the decision of the law, that the property of the state should bear the burden of educating the children of the state—the two great and essential principles of the system which endear it to the hearts of the American people. Universal suffrage without universal education is a mischievous absurdity; and universal education is generally held not to be practicable, unless provided at state expense. But we value no education that is divorced from religion and religious culture. Religion is the supreme law, the chief thing in life, and we wish our children to be accustomed so to regard it from the dawning of reason, and to view whatever they learn or do as bearing upon their religious character or their duty to God.

Of course we do not and can not expect, in a state where Protestants have equal rights with Catholics before the state, to carry our religion into public schools designed for all. We have no right to do it. *But Protestants have no more right to carry into them their religion than we have to carry ours*; and carry theirs they do, when ours is excluded. Their rights are equal to ours; and ours are equal to theirs; and neither does nor can, in the eyes of the state, override the other.

As

#### THE QUESTION IS A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE,

there can be no compromise, no splitting of differences, or yielding up of one party to the other; here comes the precise difficulty. The state is bound equally to recognize and respect the conscience of Catholics and Protestants; and has no right to restrain the conscience of either. There must be some fair and honest arrangement made by some new solution. The following have been suggested:

1. Exclusion of the Bible. This we have seen is unsatisfactory, and does not better matters in the least degree.

2. To adopt in education the voluntary system, as we do in support of denominational churches. This would involve endless difficulty with regard to the disposition of the funds held by various States for common schools, academies, etc., and also in determining to whom should belong the school and college buildings and fixtures already in existence. Moreover, it would break up the whole free-school system, and defeat the end which it contemplates—the education of all the children of the land, and especially of the poorer classes.

3. Our solution does not destroy or injure the free-school system. We repeat, that what we want is simply its modification so far as to secure the rights of all. This modification is much less than has been supposed; and instead of weakening, would perfect the system, and

render it acceptable to Protestants and Catholics, and combine both in the efforts necessary to sustain it. Our solution is to divide the schools and school funds between Catholics and Protestants, and assign to both shares of each proportioned to the number of children which they respectively have to educate. This would leave Catholics free to teach their religion and apply their discipline in the Catholic schools, and Protestants free to teach their religion and apply their discipline in the Protestant schools. The system of free schools at public expense will thus remain unimpaired; and a religious education, so necessary to society as well as the soul, can be given to all without lesion to the freedom of conscience guaranteed by the Constitution. The Catholic will thus be restored to his rights, and the Protestant will retain his. And, finally, the state will have the same facility of seeing that the public funds are properly expended, and of regulating the standard of secular education.

One objection of a practical character has been brought against this solution by the *New-York Tribune*. It says that, if the division could be made in cities and large towns, it would still be impracticable in the sparsely-settled districts. We answer, At any rate, let the towns have the benefit of the division; and if in the country the *pro rata* be scant for any one school, let Catholic charity make up the deficiency for the Catholic, or Protestant charity for the Protestant school.

The above may be regarded as a summary of our case. We place our demand for separate schools on the ground of conscience. Our conscience forbids us to support, at public expense, schools from which our religion is excluded, and in which our children are taught either what we hold to be a false or mutilated religion, or no religion at all. Such schools are perilous to the souls of our children; and we dare avow that we place their salvation above every other consideration. This plea of conscience ought to suffice, especially in an appeal to a state bound by its own constitution to protect the rights of conscience for each and all of its citizens, whether Catholic or Protestant.

In making this statement concerning the position of Catholics in respect to the public schools, it is necessary to distinguish between that portion of it which is Catholic doctrine and that which is only an exposition of the policy which we think the majority of Catholics are disposed to adopt. That religion and secular instruction ought to be combined in education, and the supervision of the doctrine and morals taught ought to be exercised by the bishops, is Catholic doctrine; and it is this alone which claims the assent of all Catholics in the view we have presented. As to the policy, which is recommended as a way of reconciling the maintenance of the school system with the rights and duties of the Catholic conscience, we simply propose it as one which we think the majority of the Catholic hierarchy and laity are likely to approve and support.



## THE LOVE OF JESUS CHRIST.



WHAT is going to make us happy when we reach heaven? Is it not the love of Jesus Christ? In Paradise there will be beautiful scenes without, and kind friends around, but that which makes the very essence of heaven is the pure soul within, loving intensely its Creator and Redeemer. Now what follows from this truth? Loving our blessed Saviour is going to make us happy in Paradise; if, then, we would begin to love Him fervently now, we should have a Paradise upon earth. Because we love God with the same love on earth with which we shall love Him in heaven itself. A beginning of Paradise is thus even now at our disposal. Do we appreciate this truth? Is the love of Jesus so rooted in our souls that we can be happy in spite of worldly trials and sorrows? If it is not, it is because we forget the pressing motives we have for loving our Lord. This tract has been written to place some of these reasons briefly and clearly before you. Its only object is to fill your hearts and minds with this divine love. Read, then, these motives, and pray that God may make them profitable to your soul.

WE MUST LOVE JESUS BECAUSE HE HAS LOVED US.— Every creature that God has made can be won by kindness. Even dumb animals love their masters, when they are treated kindly. But man, above all other creatures, is governed by his heart. This is our weak point. God has taken advantage of it in order to gain our love. *“He first loved us that we might love Him.”* *“I have loved thee,”* he says again, *“with an everlasting love.”* Love is the only price we can return for love. If, then, God’s love

is "everlasting," how can we fail to love Him in return? Perhaps you have some friend who was faithful to you during many years and in severe trials. Do you find it difficult to love that friend? Surely, then, we ought to find no trouble in loving this Friend of ours, who is called Jesus, and who is the greatest of all our friends. Some one has said that if every one in this world, and all the saints and angels, together with the Blessed Virgin, should try to love us with all their might, their love would fall so far short of the love which Jesus bears to us, that it would be only as a drop of water in an immense ocean. This is true. Their love would only be limited and finite. The love which our Lord has for our souls is *simply unlimited and infinite*. Here is a great truth (and perhaps you never thought much about it before): *Jesus cannot love us more than He actually does*. His earthly life proves this. He cared more for us than for His own comfort, His glory, or His pleasure—more than for His life itself; for He sacrificed even that to teach us this divine truth. Remember, too, the words He spoke to a saint: "*I would be ready to renew each day this sacrifice of myself for my brethren, if it were necessary for their salvation, if it were necessary to gain their love.*"

WE MUST LOVE JESUS BECAUSE HE HAS BESTOWED SO MANY BENEFITS UPON US.—What do we owe to Jesus? St. Paul has answered that question. "*In all things you are made rich in Him.*" What does this text mean? Surely this: St. Paul wishes to tell us that every blessing comes from Jesus. We owe Him everything that we have now, and all that we expect in Paradise. You love your children; it was Jesus that gave them to you. You are strong and able to support your family; it gives you pleasure to do this; you like to see all around you happy and contented; now, remember, you owe all these blessings to Jesus. But, perhaps, some one who is poor and has to struggle hard to get along in the world will read this tract.

It may come to a sick-bed, where the weary sufferer has endured much pain for many months. Ah! can I not speak to your hearts, and tell you that the love of Jesus is the balm of every earthly sorrow. Who but He has made sorrow and humiliation His companions, that from His example we might learn the holy lesson of faith and confidence in God? It is Jesus, also, who has given the certain knowledge of that better land "*where there is no more pain, neither sorrow nor crying.*"

WE MUST LOVE JESUS BECAUSE HE HAS SURRENDERED HIMSELF TO US.—Our Lord has given Himself to us in two ways: first, by His crucifixion; second, by that perpetual memorial of His Passion which He has left in the Blessed Sacrament. He could have saved us without dying and without the least suffering. Why, then, did He submit to be crucified for you and for me! *You well know the reason. "He loved us and delivered Himself up for us."* See what St. Francis says of this text: "When we reflect that Jesus Christ, true God and true man, has loved us to such an excess as to suffer the death of the Cross for our sake, our hearts are, as it were, put in a wine-press, and suffer violence, until love be *extorted* from them. But the stronger this violence is, the more delightful it becomes." Another saint was forced to cry out, when she saw a crucifix: "My Jesus, Thou art crazy with love; I repeat it, and I will say it for ever, Thou art crazy with love." But even His Passion could not satisfy our Lord's love. He must show it in a still more wonderful way. He has placed Himself entirely at our disposal in the Holy Eucharist. He has done this that each one of us might have before our eyes an ever-present pledge of His love. Oh! my dear Catholic brethren, Jesus has, as it were, annihilated Himself that He might be united to our poor hearts! One day He said to a person who had just received communion: "*See the beautiful union between me and thee: COME, THEN,*

## *The Love of Jesus Christ.*

LOVE ME; *let us ever remain united in love, and let us never be separated again.*"

But, further, "WE MUST LOVE JESUS, BECAUSE OUR FUTURE DEPENDS UPON HIM."—What is going to become of us when we leave this world? At the hour of death, how completely dependent we shall be upon the goodness of Jesus! If, then, we are not generous enough to love Him out of gratitude, let us be wise enough to love Him from self-interest. We must live for ever; and our eternal happiness depends upon His word. One day He is going to judge us. If then we do not love this Saviour for His sake, we ought, at any rate, to love Him for our own advantage. We shall not save our souls if He does not help us, a great deal. We shall not escape hell, unless He pardons our sins. But, on the other hand, if we are faithful and do our best, no one can tell the happiness He will bestow upon us in Paradise. Here, then, is something which should rouse every one to love our Lord. The eternal happiness of our soul depends upon the decision of Jesus Christ, as completely as a little infant depends upon its mother.

BUT HOW ARE WE TO KNOW IF WE LOVE JESUS?—He himself has answered this question. "*If you love me, you will keep my commandments.*" Then each one of us can decide for himself, whether he loves our Blessed Redeemer or not. We do not love Him if we are in the habit of committing mortal sins. If we disobey the laws of the Church, we do not love Him. Those who are unkind to their families, or who slander their neighbors, cannot lay any claim to this divine love. But if we do obey God's commandments, if we try always to do right, when our Lord says to us, "*Lovest thou me?*" we can answer Him with St. Peter's words, "LORD, THOU KNOWEST THAT I LOVE THEE"

## THE POPE'S TEMPORAL POWER.

---

WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY THE POPE'S TEMPORAL POWER?

We mean the jurisdiction which has been exercised by the Roman Pontiffs over a small portion of Italy.

WHAT OUGHT A CATHOLIC TO BELIEVE CONCERNING THIS TEMPORAL POWER?

He is bound to believe that the Holy Father should enjoy that political independence which is necessary for the free exercise of his spiritual authority throughout the entire world.

HOW CAN THIS INDEPENDENCE BE SECURED?

Only in one way. The Pope must be a sovereign himself. No temporal prince—whether emperor, or king, or president, or any legislative body—can have any lawful jurisdiction over the Pope.

WHAT RIGHT HAS THE POPE TO BE INDEPENDENT OF EVERY CIVIL RULER?

He has it in virtue of his dignity as the Vicar of Christ. Christ himself is "King of kings." But the Pope governs the Church in the name of Christ, and as his representative. His divine office, therefore, makes him superior to every political, temporal, and human government.

BUT COULD NOT THE POPE EXERCISE HIS SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY, AND YET BE THE SUBJECT OF SOME TEMPORAL PRINCE, FOR INSTANCE, THE KING OF ITALY?

Most certainly not. For, as the representative of God, the Pope is compelled to denounce whatever injustice and iniquity he finds in the world, including the acts of grasping and unjust civil governments. How, then, can he be their subject? Does any one imagine that temporal rulers would tolerate such an exercise of authority? If they wished to begin an unjust war, to seize the territory of their weaker neighbors, or to establish iniquitous laws, would they allow one who is in their power to rebuke them for their evil

deeds? Such sins as these are not rare with modern rulers. And, further, is it not quite certain that they would use every means to compel the Pope to sanction their unlawful acts? Would they not imprison him, and even threaten his life, that they might accomplish their wicked designs? History has already proven this fact. It is not a mere speculation or opinion. Sovereigns have not hesitated to seize the sacred person of the Supreme Pontiff when he refused to encourage their wickedness.

WHAT, THEN, MUST A CATHOLIC BELIEVE CONCERNING THE JURISDICTION WHICH THE POPE HAS EXERCISED OVER A PORTION OF ITALY?

He must believe that the civil principedom of the Roman Pontiff has been established by a particular design of God, for the safety and protection of the Pope, and for the unimpeded exercise of his spiritual powers.

WHAT IS THE PROOF OF THIS STATEMENT?

It is proved, first, by the condemnation of other opinions. In the Allocution "*Quibus Quantisque*," the proposition that "the abrogation of the civil principedom, which the Apostolic See possesses, would greatly conduce to the liberty and happiness of the Church," is condemned. This is the 76th condemned proposition of the Syllabus. In the Allocution of September 25, 1859, "*Maximo Animi*," the Pope "*condemns all acts of rebellion against the ecclesiastical power and immunities, against his supreme power, his civil sovereignty and domination, the power and the jurisdiction of the Holy See, and declares them null and without effect.*" Besides these condemnations, the Pope and Bishops have also clearly stated the Catholic doctrine in this matter. In the Bull of Excommunication, "*Cum Catholica Ecclesia*," the Pope declares "*that it was by a particular decree of divine Providence that the Pontiffs acquired their civil jurisdiction.*" A like declaration was made by all the bishops who were assembled in Rome at the canonization of the Japanese martyrs. "*We recognize that the temporal power is a necessity, and has been established by a manifest design of divine Providence. We do not hesitate to declare that in the present state of human affairs it is absolutely required for the good of the Church and the free government of Catholics.*" The judgment of the Episcopate of the United States is shown by the language of the Council of Baltimore: "The temporal dominion of the Roman Pontiffs over the States of the Church, or Patrimony of

Peter, is most useful, and, in the present state of affairs, in a certain way necessary, that the Roman Pontiff may freely exercise the rights and offices of the Primacy for the good of the Church throughout the world."

WHY, THEN, DID THE POPE NOT ALWAYS HAVE THIS TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY ?

It is because in the providence of God the Pope was to receive temporal authority only after the conversion of the Roman Empire. God perfects his works gradually. The Church must meet the wants of the various centuries. This makes necessary the establishment of various laws and offices unknown in Apostolic times. Among these is the temporal power of the Pope.

HOW LONG HAVE THE ROMAN PONTIFFS EXERCISED THIS TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY ?

They have been kings of Rome for more than eleven hundred years. Compared with this, all the existing dynasties and governments of Europe are but of yesterday. The life of our own country can be counted by days. The temporal power has endured for centuries. A government is lawfully established when it can maintain its independence for a few years. What, then, shall we say of a kingdom which has survived for ages ?

IN WHAT WAY DID THE POPES OF ROME ACQUIRE THEIR TEMPORAL POWER ?

Most modern governments began by conquest, by fraud, and by rapine. It is not so with the temporal power. No great conqueror gave it to the Holy Father. It was not won by intrigue. It was not forced upon an unwilling people. *On the contrary, when the Roman people had no other protector, they made the Vicar of Christ their King.* The temporal power is one of the first historical instances of a people choosing their own form of government.

BUT IF THE PEOPLE OF ROME MADE THE POPE THEIR RULER, CAN THEY NOT NOW DEPOSE HIM ?

They cannot depose him, because he is their lawful sovereign. They cannot annul the contract of their ancestors. If they could do this, the people in the District of Columbia have a right to withdraw from the United States, and annex their territory to Maryland, in order that Washington might become the capital of that State. To depose the Pope is to rebel against his rightful authority. Now, rebellion is never justifiable, save when the established government is extremely unjust and oppressive in its enact-

## *The Pope's Temporal Power.*

ments. But no one accuses Pius IX. of severe measures. The Roman people have never been oppressed. On the contrary, there is not a government in Europe or America which has been marked by so many extraordinary instances of clemency to civil and political offenders. If Pius IX. has done any wrong, it is that he has been too gentle with his enemies.

**BUT CANNOT THE POPE YIELD TO CIRCUMSTANCES, AND SURRENDER HIS TEMPORAL POWER?**

He cannot and he ought not to cede his jurisdiction over the States of the Church. This is the reason: He holds this temporal power as a sacred trust, in the name of the Catholic Church. Two hundred millions of Christians demand that the Pope shall preserve inviolate the Sacred City. It is their inheritance. Rome is degraded, if it becomes merely the capital of Italy. By Divine Providence, it has been selected to be the centre of the Christian world. What a fall if Rome should no longer be the home of the Popes, but only the capital city of Victor Emmanuel's government!

**WHAT, THEN, ARE WE TO THINK OF THE PRESENT SEIZURE OF ROME?**

It is an act of great injustice and sacrilege. It is inexcusable injustice, because the Pope is a lawful sovereign, in quiet and long possession of his kingdom, just in his laws, earnestly laboring for the welfare of his people. It is sacrilege, because the injury is done to a person consecrated to God's service, whose dignity surpasses all other honors and dignities, who is no less than the Vicar of Christ. It is also a sacrilege, because the territory which has been seized belongs to God's Holy Church. Whether men believe it or not, the Creator has some rights in the world which he has made. It is no light sin to violate these rights, and take possession of that which God has set apart for his own use. Let us be careful to keep ourselves innocent of this outrage. We must detest it in our hearts. At all times, we must protest against this great injustice. Above all, we must pray for the speedy overthrow of these enemies of religion, and the speedy restoration of the Holy Father to his rightful throne.



## A SHORT READING FOR THE SICK.

*Read to the Sick slowly, distinctly, and a little at a time.*

### I. PATIENCE IN PAIN AND SUFFERING AND TEMPTATION.

—S. Angela of Foligno says—“Sufferings are most holy and precious. *They pray for us before God.*” S. Francis of Assisi was ill and in great pain. Somebody advised him to pray to God that his pains might be taken away. S. Francis rose up from the bed of sickness and knelt down. Instead of praying for his pains to be taken away, he thanked God for sending him these pains. S. Aloysius said—“The best sign of going to heaven is to continue patient and resigned in suffering.” Jesus Christ said to S. Teresa—“The souls most dear to My Father are those who suffer most.” S. Alphonsus says—“It would be a great advantage to suffer during all our lives all the torments of the martyrs in exchange for one moment of heaven. Sufferings in this world are a sign that God loves us and intends to save us.” S. Catherine of Genoa says—“*God makes a purgatory of the bodies of sick persons.*” Jesus said to the blessed Verani—“I do to you what My heavenly Father did to Me. I send you as many sufferings as you can bear.” S. Joseph, the Franciscan, was very sick. It was necessary for the doctor to do something for him which would be very painful. So the doctor said he had better be tied. S. Joseph took a cross into his hand. Then he said—“The will of Jesus shall tie me.”

II. TEMPTATIONS OF THE SICK.—Remember that a temptation is not a sin. If you consent to it, it is a sin. If you

try to put it away, you give glory to God, and ensure your reward in heaven.

**TEMPTATIONS AGAINST FAITH.**—If you feel any doubt about the holy faith, put away the doubt directly, and say in your heart—*My God, I believe all the Catholic Church teaches.* When blessed Columba was dying, devils came to her with temptations. These temptations were against faith. The devils tempted her fearfully, as might be seen from her face. Blessed Columba struggled against the temptations. She kept saying, *I believe in God.* These temptations lasted for about half an hour. She then called on the holy name of Jesus, and at the sound of that name the devils went away.

**TEMPTATIONS TO DESPAIR.**—Perhaps in sickness and death we shall feel as if God had forsaken us. If you feel a great fear that you will go to hell on account of your sins, put that fear away. Say—*My God, I hope in You ; I am sure You will save me, because Jesus died to save me.* Say also—*Sweet Jesus, You died to save me, do not then refuse to save a soul which You died to save.*

**TAKE NOTICE.**—It often happens that at death the devil strongly tempts people to commit some sin which they often committed before. They must quickly put away the temptation, and say—*Jesus and Mary, help me.*

**SICK PERSONS SOMETIMES SAY THAT THEY CANNOT PRAY.**  
—S. Vincent of Paul when sick tried to think continually of the presence of God. But he could only say some short prayer, such as, *O my God, Thy will be done,* and also, *O my God, I hope in Thee.* S. Alphonsus says—“One thanks be to God in sickness is worth more than a thousand in health. In sickness, if we cannot think on holy things, let us look sometimes at the Cross.” Let us offer our sufferings with

those of Jesus on the Cross. S. Angela of Foligno says—  
“*When we are sick and patient, our sufferings pray for us.*”

SICK PERSONS ARE DISCOURAGED BECAUSE THEY CANNOT DO GOOD WORKS.—If we cannot do good works, we must be content not to do them, because it is God’s will. Ven. John of Avila says—“Do not think of what you would do, if you were well. Only think that you will be glad to remain sick as long as it is the will of God.” God made known to His servant Alvarez that a certain nun had gained more merit in eight months’ sickness, than all the others had gained in many years. S. Alphonsus says—“Let us not desire to live longer to do penance for our sins. *The best penance we can do is to receive the sickness, because it is God’s will.*” Alvarez says—“*that although we can do nothing, we please God more by being patient for a month in sickness, than we should if we worked for Him for a whole year in health.*”

III. THE BEST THING WE CAN DO WHEN WE ARE SICK IS TO BE WILLING TO DIE FOR GOD.—We should be willing to die: 1. Because it is God’s will. S. Alphonsus says—“In time of sickness we should be ready to accept death, and the kind of death it shall please God to send.” He says also—“When we are told that our death is near, let us be willing to die to please Jesus. It was this willingness to die for God’s sake which made all the merit in the martyrs.” Let us then say, *My God, I am ready to do all You wish, and to die when You wish.* 2. We should be willing to die for our sins. S. Alphonsus says—“The best penance we can do is to be willing to die, because it is *God’s will.*” 3. We should be willing to die that we may be like Jesus. God has predestinated all the saints to be made conformable to the image of His Son (Rom. viii.). Jesus was willing to die. Therefore let us be willing to die

with Him. 4. We should be willing to die that we may go to heaven. S. Augustine said—"Let me die, for death alone can give me the happiness of seeing God face to face, and of loving Him for ever in heaven. Ven. John of Avila says—"When we find ourselves in good dispositions, although they are only moderately good, we ought to desire to die, to get away from the danger, so frequent on the earth, of sinning and losing God's grace."

#### IV. WE CAN HOPE FOR SPECIAL HELP AT THE HOUR OF DEATH.

1. JESUS, Our blessed Lord, is certain to be near us in this time of trial. He will send us graces to fit us to die well. He will inspire the Blessed Virgin, our Patron Saints, and our Guardian Angel, to pray for us.

2. S. BARBARA is particularly prayed to for a happy death. The prayer of the Church is this: "O God, before we die, may we do true penance and make a sincere confession, and receive the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, through the prayers of the Blessed Barbara, virgin and martyr." When the night becomes dark, the stars grow bright. When the darkness of death comes upon us, without doubt the light of God will shine upon us. Perhaps it will be a light brighter than any that ever came to us before. Your holy patrons will assist you. Pray for your own soul, and for him who has been the means of giving you this little tract.

The funds for publishing this little pamphlet were furnished by the St. Paul's Christian Doctrine Society. It was first published by the Catholic Truth Society of England, but some few additions and alterations have been made in it.

Printed for "THE CATHOLIC PUBLICATION SOCIETY CO.," New York. Price \$3 per 1,000 copies.

## IS IT TRUE

THAT IN THE MIDDLE AGES THE BIBLE WAS CHAINED TO PREVENT PEOPLE READING IT?

This is like saying that a man "chains" a dipper to a well to stop people from drinking the water. It's like "chaining" a door-mat to the front stoop to prevent people cleaning their muddy shoes. Of course Catholics admit the Bible was chained; BUT HOW AND WHERE? *It was "chained" in a church, open every hour of every day—"chained" at a desk near some window which would always give light sufficient to read it.* At a time when books were rare and costly, who is so stupid that he cannot see it was "chained" there to be at the service of every one? Such a proceeding is not entirely unknown even in modern times. In New England, we remember a good Connecticut family who always "chained" their almanac in the corner nearest the window. In our own enterprising city the most prominent business firms "chain" a city directory to their counter. Thus the nineteenth century bears witness to the wisdom of the Middle Ages. When a book is valuable and used by many, it is chained in a public place, precisely as the Bible used to be chained in the Catholic churches. Again,

## IS IT TRUE

THAT CATHOLICS HAVE SERVICES IN LATIN TO KEEP THE PEOPLE IN IGNORANCE?

Ignorant of what? Is there any diabolical mystery in the words of Mass and Vespers which must be concealed? If it were so, priests and bishops would have taken good care to prevent any translation of these services. Precisely the opposite is the real truth. *These translations have been encouraged by the clergy, and may be found in every Catholic prayer-book. By reading them, you will learn that Mass and Vespers are principally composed of passages of Holy Scripture: whatever else they contain is the writing of some learned and devout Christian.* These translations are used every day by Catholics. Protestants frequently remark this fact. One great advantage of having the services of the Church in a

fixed language is well seen in this country. Go to one of our city churches, and you will find that English, French, German, Irish, Spaniard, Belgian, Italian, and American kneel before the same altar. *Although the priest reads Mass in Latin, every worshipper can follow the service in his own language.* However distant their native land, they are at home in the Catholic Church! But

## IS IT TRUE

THAT THE CATHOLIC RELIGION IS ALL CEREMONY, AND HAS NO GENUINE PIETY?

We invite you to attend some Catholic church, and judge for yourself. Here is the testimony of some Protestants who have already done this:

FIRST WITNESS. *Universalist.* Rev. Mr. Knowlton, in the *Universalist Quarterly* for October, 1870, writes: "*The order of public worship in a Catholic church is not a 'senseless mummery.' Its ritual is artistic and impressive, its faith strong, its ministrations consoling. At the name of Jesus every knee is bent and every head is bowed—a manifestation of reverence not apparent in our stiff-necked Sunday gatherings.*"

SECOND WITNESS. *Scotch Presbyterian.* Mr. Laing, a celebrated traveller and a shrewd observer, says, "*The fervor of devotion among these Catholics strikes every traveller who enters a Roman Catholic church.*"

THIRD WITNESS. *Rationalist.* The well-known writer, James Parton, tells us that "*during the intense stillness at Mass, a low, eager whisper of prayer can be heard, and THE WHOLE ASSEMBLY IS LOST IN DEVOTION.*"

## IS IT TRUE

THAT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH CANNOT BE THE CHURCH OF GOD BECAUSE THERE HAVE BEEN WICKED PRIESTS AND POPES?

No one denies that there have been bad priests, bishops, and popes. But what does that prove? *It proves nothing but their own wickedness.* It does not affect the Catholic Church. They disobeyed her teaching when they committed sin. The bad have been extremely few in number. None of us are so perfect that we can boast of ourselves, but where shall we find men to equal the Catholic priesthood

in devotion to duty, in self-sacrifice, in their desire to benefit their fellow-men? They labor unknown, they endure poverty and reproach, they have abandoned every worldly ambition for the sake of their brethren. What about the Popes? *Of 250 Popes, every one admits that 240 have been above reproach: only ten have at any time been unworthy men.* That is to say, there has been an unworthy man elected Pope once in 185 years. There has been one unworthy Pope to 24 good ones. None ever denied the faith. *This is a better record than the apostles themselves can present.* Out of the chosen twelve, one betrayed our Saviour. Yet no one rejects the testimony of the faithful disciples, because Judas was a villain. *What right, then, have we to reject the Catholic Church, because there have been a few whose lives were bad among her clergy? No Protestant can answer satisfactorily that simple question.* But, further, of the ten unworthy Popes, *not one can be shown to have committed any great crime, during the time he was Pope.* Wicked men destroy their own souls, they cannot injure the Church of Christ, any more than a bad Protestant minister can corrupt the members of his congregation.

## IS IT TRUE

### THAT THE CATHOLIC CONFSSIONAL TENDS TO INCREASE SIN?

According to Protestant ideas, when a man is sorry for his sins, he steps into his closet and prays. According to Catholics, you must go to a priest, confess your sins with true sorrow for them, restore any money or property unjustly acquired, retract publicly every grave slander and calumny, and declare your intention never to commit a mortal sin again. *Which is the easier of the two? A Catholic does not simply confess his sins; he declares his repentance and promises amendment. Without these promises, no Catholic priest would dare to give him absolution.* If the confessional increases sin, it ought to be stopped by law. Intelligent men understand its effect. The brother of Henry Ward Beecher, Rev. T. K. Beecher, says that "the sacrament of confession is of peculiar excellence and profit to those who piously use the same. *That confession is profitable is self-evident.* No man ever yet confessed his sins truly, and took counsel of a Christian father and adviser, but he was at once a better and a happier man for it." We know

a prominent Protestant business firm in New York who require their Catholic clerks to go to confession. Let us ask one more question :

## IS IT TRUE

TO SAY THAT "ONLY IGNORANT CATHOLICS ARE SINCERE: I WONDER HOW TWO PRIESTS CAN LOOK ONE ANOTHER IN THE FACE WITHOUT LAUGHING?"

If Catholic doctrines are so hard to believe that only the ignorant are sincere, how is it that many educated and refined Protestants become members of the Catholic Church? Come, we want to make you answer our question squarely. *Does your conscience justify you in saying that such men as Brownson, Wilberforce, Faber, Newman, and Manning are insincere?* Were Archbishop Hughes, and Lacordaire, and the learned Cardinal Wiseman, all men of falsehood and insincerity? What is the greatest test of sincerity? Is it not sacrifice? But what denomination endure so much for their religious convictions as Roman Catholics? We are scarcely allowed to eat our Friday's fish in peace. Many Protestants disown, disinherit, and persecute their relatives who become Catholics. These converts, in cases innumerable, have remained steadfast in spite of the most trying difficulties. By their courage, they have proved that, whether Catholicity be true or false, they are sincere in professing their faith in it. *If a Catholic is not sincere, he is the biggest fool in the world.* In this life, he meets with contempt and ridicule; and, if untrue to the convictions of his conscience, he must expect in the future world that God will punish him for his unfaithfulness and insincerity.

You see, then, that these popular objections to the Catholic Church are readily answered. This is true of all objections to the Catholic religion. None of them can stand. *It is no empty boast, it is the sober truth, there is a ready, a reasonable, and a convincing answer to every argument brought against the Catholic Church.* You need only common sense, sincerity, an honest investigation, a prayer to God to direct you aright, and YOU TOO WILL BECOME A ROMAN CATHOLIC.



# THE MISSION OF THE PRESS.

---

## *THE PRESS IS A CATHOLIC INSTITUTION.*

A Catholic invented it. Catholics first printed books both in Europe and America. Catholics printed the first daily paper. A Catholic city was the birthplace of the art. The Catholic Church fostered its infancy. Pope Nicholas's letter, dated 1455, is the first publication having a date. 17 years before Luther's rebellion, over 200 cities in Europe had printing-presses. At the Council of Lateran, Pope Leo X. declared printing "*invented for the glory of God, for the propagation of our Holy Faith, and for the advancement of knowledge.*" But the enemies of Catholicity have seized this powerful weapon. At present

## *ALL ENGLISH LITERATURE*

is tainted with anti-Catholic prejudice. This is so universal that falsehoods are often told unintentionally. History, poetry, fiction, and even school-books, serve to injure the Church. *Scarcely a book or paper is printed without some unjust sneer at the Catholic religion.* These are often believed without a question. Protestant preaching does little injury to the Church. *The press is our dangerous foe.* It keeps alive Protestant calumnies. It prevents conversions to the Church. Above all,

## *THE DAILY AND WEEKLY NEWSPAPERS*

spread the poison. No party is exempt from this charge. Day after day, both Republican and Democratic journals publish the most glaring falsehoods about the Catholic Church. *She has not one friend among the daily papers. They do not care for the truth about our religion.* One instance among a thousand is the Pope's Infallibility. Catholics have clearly and frequently explained this dogma. It has occupied the attention of the civilized world for more than a year. Yet these papers still print the grossest falsehoods about the doctrine. What an injury to religion! These absurd statements go to every part of our country. All classes read and believe them. Their importance is readily seen when we

*LOOK AT THE FIGURES*

which tell their circulation: *New York Daily Tribune*, 50,000; *Herald*, 80,000; *Sun*, over 100,000; *Leslie's Illustrated Papers*, 180,000; *Weekly Tribune*, 200,000; *New York Weekly*, 300,000; *Ledger*, 375,000. A paper is usually read by several persons. *One issue, therefore, reaches 500,000 readers. This immense power is daily used against our religion.* Who can tell its influence? *Half a million different persons read every falsehood they print about the Catholic Church.* But let us take up our open enemies, the

*SECTARIAN PUBLICATIONS,*

and see what they are about. The Baptist Publication Society prints yearly 1,000 volumes and 200,000,000 pages. The Methodist Book Concern, 2,000 volumes, 1,000 *different* tracts, and *over five hundred million pages* for its Sunday-schools. The Presbyterian periodicals circulate 2,000,000 copies yearly. 300,000 books and tracts are issued by Unitarians. The Boston Tract Society sends out annually 1,350,000 pages; its New York rival, 800,000 volumes. What a deluge of heresy! The Church must be divine that can triumph over this wholesale system of misrepresentation. They act on Voltaire's maxim: "Keep on lying; some of it is sure to stick." And what are we doing to antidote their poison? Let us see what part

*OUR CATHOLIC LITERATURE*

takes in this great activity of the press. Truth ought not to be silent when falsehood is bold and defiant. But unfortunately the extent of our work is soon told. We have one magazine, 4 or 5 smaller monthlies, and, perhaps, 12 weekly papers. Only one or two of these have a circulation of 40,000. What a contrast to the *Sun's* daily circulation of over 100,000 copies, and the *Ledger's* weekly circulation of 375,000 copies! *To our sorrow, we must admit that between six and seven millions of Catholics support scarcely twenty weekly and monthly publications, and are without a single daily paper!* Nor do we read Catholic books. Except prayer-books, very few works do more than pay the cost of printing, while some are actually a loss to their publishers. This experience has taught them to refuse to publish many books which, if they could find readers,

would be most profitable to our people. Our fault is twofold: we read the current novels and journals of the day; we seldom read Catholic publications. Now,

### *DON'T TOUCH PITCH!*

It's a duty of conscience to refuse to purchase or read anything that may injure our souls, such as those weekly papers which have articles or illustrations casting ridicule upon the Catholic Church. Popular novels are equally dangerous. They inspire no good thoughts. They say nothing profitable. Let us, then, throw them aside for ever. If it be a sacrifice, make it for the love of God. And let us

### *BUY CATHOLIC BOOKS,*

which sow good thoughts in our hearts. They will increase piety. They strengthen our faith. *Good books often save souls.* If you cannot buy expensive books, at least you can purchase a library of

### *CHEAP PUBLICATIONS*

for a very moderate sum. Catholic books of fiction, amusement, travel, and devotion, cost only from 25 cents to \$1. Will books ever be cheaper than this? Is 25 cents too much for an entertaining work? Many dollars are spent on frivolous objects. *Can we not, then, give a dollar for a book which will last our lifetime, and be a pleasure to our entire family, and even to our friends also?* If we do not want cheap books ourselves, we might give them to our poorer neighbors, both Catholic and Protestant. It's a missionary work. But even

### *HANDSOME BOOKS*

are no longer very costly. Catholic publishers now issue books equal to the finest editions of the secular press, and elegant enough for any drawing-room table or library. Well-made books are always the cheapest. In buying books the clergy are liberal, but many

### *WEALTHY LAYMEN*

have expensive libraries, yet only a few Catholic works, and some scarcely a Catholic work upon their shelves. Ought this to be so? They are generous in other respects. They spend money freely for secular purposes

Why not, then, give something to sustain the Parochial and Sunday-school Library? Why not devote something yearly to advance American Catholic Literature? Our Catholicity should induce us to buy our own books. Our patriotism should induce us to become

### *A READING PEOPLE,*

like all other American citizens. *This is the greatest nation of readers the world has ever seen.* Yet our countrymen know but little about the Catholic Church. They will question us about it, but imperfect explanations will not satisfy them. They are too keen for that. If we do not read Catholic books, we shall be unable to answer their questions or solve their doubts. How often this happens! Many who read this tract will recall instances in their own lives. But if we do our duty, how bright

### *THE FUTURE OF CATHOLIC LITERATURE*

will be! This bright future is the time when the truth of the Church will be placed plainly before our people. With God's blessing, we shall see that day. *Support Catholic literature, and you will hasten its coming.* New books can then be published to meet the wants of our time and country. Nearly thirty millions of souls depend upon us for the blessing of Catholicity. Those who have gone before us have planted the faith, and done their duty nobly. Let us prove equal to our grand vocation. Let us do something for our great cities; for the farm, the prairie, and the plantation; for the souls in the factories, the stores, the mines, and the workshops of the Great Republic. *If you purchase and circulate Catholic books, you do a truly apostolic work.* You give human souls the Divine truth of God. The press is the needle-gun of truth. In God's name, let us use it. Every good book is a missionary. Listen to the exhortation of Pius IX: "PROVIDENCE SEEMS TO HAVE GIVEN, IN OUR DAYS, A GREAT MISSION TO THE CATHOLIC PRESS. . . . LEAVE NOTHING UNTRIED BY WHICH OUR MOST HOLY RELIGION AND ITS SALUTARY TEACHING MAY INCREASE STILL MORE IN THE UNITED STATES, AND UNHAPPY WANDERERS MAY RETURN TO THE SAFE PATH."

## HOW TO UTILIZE THE PRESS.

---

IN the tract on the "Mission of the Press," it was shown that the press rightfully belongs to the Catholic Church, and that it is one of the most powerful instruments for spreading the truths of the Catholic religion among our people. But there is a still more important and practical question: *How shall we use the press to the greatest advantage? How can Catholic books and tracts be thoroughly circulated? How can the press become a really efficient instrument for the improvement of our people?* This is the great question of the day. It is of the utmost practical importance. We propose to give an answer which appears to be the true one. We must organize a

### CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE SOCIETY.

Great works can only be accomplished by united and organized effort. All who feel an interest in the work must be united in one society. *In union there is strength.* By union we encourage each other. We undertake works never attempted by private persons. Sometimes a wealthy Catholic contributes a considerable sum to start a library, or circulate some work in which he feels a special interest. But this is rare. *Evidently we cannot rely upon acts of private benevolence when we have a work which demands all the means and the energy that can possibly be obtained.* No; our first great duty is to gather all our forces into one body. The question, then, is

### HOW TO ORGANIZE

such a society. Nothing is easier. Call a meeting of your parishioners at some favorable time. Explain to them the object of the society. Circulate copies of this tract among your people. Experience tells us that you will obtain a good number of members. By zealous management, this number will continually increase. During the past year, one such society enrolled over 700 members. Yet that society is not in a very large parish, and was conducted by a priest who had many other duties. The same result can be obtained in nearly every parish in the country. The

### CONDITIONS OF MEMBERSHIP

are not onerous. You must have a monthly meeting, at which the members are expected to attend. They will

pay fifty cents each year as a condition of membership. At monthly meetings they usually make some offering to support the work of the society. They have no stated prayers or penances to perform. They are only expected to lead a Christian life. At these

## MONTHLY MEETINGS

the real work of the society is accomplished. Tracts or cheap publications are distributed among the members, who, in turn, distribute them among their friends. Generally a short instruction is given upon some point of Christian doctrine. Sometimes, however, a conference upon the work of the society is given, and never fails to instruct and edify the members. A manual of the order of exercises can be obtained of The Catholic Publication Society. This contains appropriate prayers, and a hymn to St. Paul as patron of the society. The

## YEARLY REVENUE

of the society is collected from these sources: 1st. The subscription of fifty cents. 2d. Collection at monthly meetings. 3d. Donations of wealthy patrons. These three sources will give the society a yearly income of about two dollars for each member. This might readily be increased by lectures or large donations of the wealthy. But we wish to put it at the lowest figure. In the poorest parish, a society of 500 members will readily yield an income of a thousand dollars without drawing heavily upon the purse of any one. Further, the

## GREAT PRIVILEGES

of the society ensure its success wherever it is established. These privileges are: 1st. Monthly Mass for living and deceased members. 2d. Gratuitous distribution of tracts or books at monthly meetings. 3d. Monthly instruction. But, above all, the

## SPECIAL INDULGENCES FROM ROME.

These indulgences are:

First. Any time within a month after reception into the society, any one who shall have confessed with true penitence

tence, and received the most Holy Eucharist, may obtain a Plenary Indulgence.

Secondly. He may obtain Plenary Indulgence if, in the article of death, he shall invoke with true contrition the Most Holy Name of Jesus in his heart, if he cannot with his lips.

Thirdly. All the associates may gain *three hundred days' indulgence* as often as, by good works, counsel, or any other means in their power, they shall promote the interests of their institution.

Fourthly. These indulgences can be applied to souls detained in purgatory.

The indulgences were granted by our Holy Father, Pius IX., at Rome, on April 7, 1870. *They show the interest the Holy Father takes in these societies.* They will certainly attract a large number of members. Perhaps no society has greater indulgences. In order to obtain them, it is only necessary to affiliate your society to the society of St. Paul's Church. This can be done by directing a letter to St. Paul's Christian Doctrine Society, West Fifty-ninth Street, New York. In addition to this, the

## OBJECT OF THE SOCIETY

will interest the energetic and leading members of your congregation. This object may vary. Your Christian Doctrine Society will give you means to begin or to increase your Sunday-school or parochial library, or it will distribute copies of some child's paper among the children. If these are already provided for, you can devote your revenue to the purchase of books and tracts for some hospital, prison, or asylum in your vicinity. These institutions are generally poor and need such assistance. In this matter, we are not dreaming. The

## WORK OF A YEAR

of St. Paul's Christian Doctrine Society proves how much good can be done in this way. Last year its receipts were \$1,200. With this money it purchased 1,541 books, 15,287 miscellaneous publications, 62,175 tracts; total number of publications gratuitously given away, over 79,000. Among them is a subscription of 1,000 copies of the *Young Catholic*. These have been sent to the various Orphan Asylums in the country, giving pleasure and useful reading to thousands of these little ones. More than 90 public institutions have been assisted in various ways. Books have

been given to prisons and hospitals, which will last a lifetime. They will call down the blessing of God upon the members of that society long after they have left this world. Every State and Territory in the Union, Mexico and Canada, and even England, Ireland, and Africa, have received Catholic publications gratuitously from the society. But of course this society needs company. It cannot do the work alone. It hopes that other societies will spring up to rival and even to exceed its labors. One great

## ADVANTAGE OVER PROTESTANTS

that we have, is that we can always find persons to circulate the publications we send them. They must pay their colporteurs a stated salary. We find members of the various religious communities already devoted to the care of orphans, the poor, the sick, and the prisons, and very grateful for the books and tracts we place in their hands to give away. No one can estimate the good that can be done by means of these Societies of Christian Doctrine. The pen is mightier than the sword. No other society is doing this work. It does not interfere with societies already established. Indeed, this is not simply our opinion. The

## COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE

speaks most plainly in reference to this matter. In Sections 499, 500, and 501, it uses the following strong language: "WE MOST EARNESTLY DESIRE THAT SUCH PIOUS SOCIETIES SHALL EVERYWHERE EXIST, WHOSE OBJECT SHALL BE THE PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF GOOD CATHOLIC BOOKS AND TRACTS. THESE SOCIETIES OUGHT TO BE PROTECTED, ASSISTED, AND PROPAGATED WITH ALL THE MORE ALACRITY AND ZEAL IN PROPORTION TO DAILY INCREASING EFFORTS AND ALMOST INCREDIBLE DILIGENCE OF WICKED MEN AND SECTARIES WHO SPREAD EVERYWHERE COUNTLESS PUBLICATIONS AGAINST GOD, HIS CHURCH, AND SOUND MORALITY. . . . WE ARE NOT DESERVING OF HIGH PRAISE IF FOR THE BEST OF CAUSES WE DO ONLY THAT WHICH THE IMPIOUS DO FOR A WICKED CAUSE, AND TAKE FOR THE SALVATION OF SOULS THE SAME PAINS WHICH THEY TAKE FOR THEIR DAMNATION, BUT NOT IN ANY WAY TO RIVAL THEM WERE MOST DISGRACEFUL SLOTH."



# WHO SHALL HAVE THE CHILD?

The State claims it. The State claims the right to determine how, and in what, the child shall be educated. To this end, it has established public schools, and supports them by taxation. Whence did the State derive this pretended right?

## WAS IT FROM NATURE?

No! The natural right to the child belongs to its parents. Theirs is the duty to nurture, train, and instruct their children. Parents cannot delegate this right and its duties to others if they would. This is the voice of the instincts of our nature.

## WAS IT FROM GOD?

Where is the revelation to that effect? Who has the documents? We read in Holy Writ: "Honor thy father and thy mother." We read again: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is just. . . . And you, fathers, provoke not your children to anger; but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." (Eph. vi. 1-4.) Nowhere is it revealed that the State has the right to take the place of parents, and assume the duty of training and instructing children.

*This assumed right of the State to educate children, to the exclusion of parents, has no foundation either in nature or in God's revealed Word. It is an encroachment by the State on parental rights.*

THE STATE, IT IS SAID, REQUIRES FOR ITS SECURITY AND PROSPERITY INTELLIGENT CITIZENS.

Granted! The State no less requires for its security and prosperity God-fearing and law-abid-

ing citizens. Let the State, therefore, teach religion and morality as well. The State also requires for its defence able-bodied men. Let the State, therefore, see that its citizens are provided with wholesome food, are well clothed, and properly housed. The right in the one case is no greater and no less than in the other. Where are we drifting? Are we going back to the black-broth system of Sparta? or forward into the abyss of Communism? Political governments ought to be confined to those general duties, and to those only, which the people are not individually capable of fulfilling. This is the spirit of our institutions. "The world is governed too much," is one of our American political maxims.

### WHO ARE THESE STATE OFFICIALS, THAT THEY SHOULD TAKE THE DUTY OF PARENTS INTO THEIR HANDS?

They are called politicians. Are politicians, as a class, eminent for probity, purity, morality, religion? If not, why should they be allowed to assume this sacred trust, and prescribe what our children should be taught, and how far they must be educated?

### WHAT IS EDUCATION?

If education means anything, its aim is, by training and instruction, to facilitate the attainment of our true happiness. It is this or nothing. Good! Will our State officials, the members of the Board of the Public Schools, favor us with their definition of man's true happiness? Does their notion take in the idea of a hereafter? If so, what is that hereafter? How are we to reach it? By what means? What must we learn in order to prepare for it? Who are right in this matter—the Jews or the Turks? the Methodists or the Mormons? the Episcopalians or the Quakers? the Presbyterians or the Muggletonians? the Shakers or the Free-Lovers?

## PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION, THEY SAY, HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS?

Hasn't it? One instance among many. You teach history—modern history? Of course you do. Who, we ask, civilized and christianized our forefathers when they were barbarians? Who established the family? Who founded the nations of Europe? Who gave birth to modern civilization? No intelligent student of history will hesitate to answer, "The Catholic Church!" What is modern history with the Catholic Church left out? The play of "Hamlet" with Hamlet left out. This is the modern history taught in our public schools; or else, if forced to cross the path of the Catholic Church, it then imputes to her falsehood or caricatures her. (See Willson's *History*, used in the common schools.)

## BUT CHILDREN CAN BE TAUGHT RELIGION AT HOME OUT OF SCHOOL HOURS!

That is, when the child has been wearied out in the public school at his tasks of secular education, when the time has come which he requires for relaxation and recreation, then you turn him over to his religious instructors, to manage matters as best they can! In this way you render religion tiresome and disgusting. This you call fair play and religious liberty! If things had their right names, this would be called "shuffling and hypocrisy." You know it, too.

## WHAT WILL BE THE RESULT OF PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION?

In spite of the good intentions of many of its advocates, we shall soon have as its fruit a generation of men and women destitute of all religious and moral instruction. Society will drift back into paganism, with all its attendant vices and corruptions. Public morals will have no religious sanction, and ruin will be brought upon our beloved

Republic. "Can you not discern the signs of the times?"

## WHAT ARE THE VOTARIES OF THIS SYSTEM AIMING AT?

Those who have now the controlling political power not only uphold this oppressive, irreligious, and dangerous system of education, but are determined to fasten it upon the General Government of the United States, and are striving to make it compulsory on all the free citizens of our great Republic.

## HOW OUGHT AMERICANS AND CHRISTIANS TO REGARD THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION?

As an usurpation of parental rights, as an insidious attack on all religion and morality, and as hostile to the genius of our American civilization.

## BUT ARE YOU OPPOSED TO EDUCATION?

No; not at all. On the contrary, we are the truest friends of education, and would have every citizen of the Republic well educated.

## HOW CAN THAT BE ACCOMPLISHED?

Let those who prefer the public schools maintain them. Let those parents who provide schools for their children maintain those schools. But if the State taxes the people for education, let it be impartial, and give to these parents a fair share of the taxes. Even "despotic" Prussia does this for Catholics; and "despotic" Austria, for Protestants.

In this way, the benefits of education would be extended, liberty of conscience maintained, and the rights of parents protected. Americans love

## FAIR PLAY AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

## BE SURE YOU ARE RIGHT—AND THEN GO AHEAD!



THIS is an excellent maxim; it is an American maxim; and one that Americans generally follow; especially the "go ahead" part. But we sometimes fail a little on the other; we take things a little too much for granted. Leaping is a healthy exercise; but looking beforehand makes it a great deal healthier.

By thus neglecting a part of this excellent and American maxim, one is apt to run foul of two others which everybody endorses, or ought to; the first is an old-fashioned command, reading as follows: "*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor;*" and the other is a rule of common prudence, to this effect: "*When a man doesn't know what he's talking about, it's safer to stop talking till he does.*"

Now, there is one thing in particular that this may well be applied to.

### WHAT AMERICANS KNOW ABOUT THE CATHOLIC FAITH

from good authority, if they are not Catholics themselves, can generally be written on a very small piece of paper, perhaps on their thumb-nail; under the circumstances, then, would it not be well to find out something about it, so as to have a good foundation, before beginning to build? For, if one begins his house at the top, the structure will, to say the least, not be very solid. It may even come down.

Did you ever ask yourself seriously—What do I know

for certain about the Catholic faith on those very points about which I am accustomed to hear charges made, and to make them myself? Those who make them have heard them from others, or found them in Protestant books. But where did those other persons, or the authors of those books, get them? Did they examine the documents?

THE CATHOLIC FAITH IS NO SECRET passing from mouth to mouth, to be learned by inference, or by listening at a keyhole. It is all down in black and white. It does not cost much to learn it; only the price of a child's catechism, and the time it takes to read it. It is so easy to find out the truth in this matter, that a lie, *though not intended, cannot be excused. Do not bear false witness against your neighbor.*

BUT YOU SAY YOU HAVE NO TIME to examine into everybody's creed. Very good. Employ your leisure some other way, but not in calumniating us. Stop *that!* In this case, *to go ahead is to go wrong.* Stop being a Protestant, till you know what you are protesting against. But if you want to go ahead, don't "go it blind," but open your eyes and see what you are about. *As you don't know what you are talking about, stop talking till you do.*

And as you will find it very hard to stop, we decidedly recommend you to go ahead. *But be sure you are right.* Buy a catechism. Price, three cents. *You will find more news in it than in any paper you have ever read.*

COME, NOW, WHAT IS AN INDULGENCE?

I will wager that you don't know. But no, I can't bet on a certainty. For if you did know, *being honest,* you couldn't talk as you do. I do know, though; it's pardon for sin. By no means! Then it's a permission to com-

mit sin. Worse yet! Well, then, I don't know. *I told you so.* Now, don't repeat that nonsense again, but look in your book, and find out the truth. Be sure you are right, and *then* go ahead!

HERE IS ANOTHER QUESTION.

If we do not get pardon for sin by an indulgence, how do we get it? Well, I suppose that, at any rate, all you have to do is to confess to the priest. Then you suppose wrong, which you have no business to do. But at all events, if he gives you absolution, you think yourself sure of heaven. Not at all! *Go study your catechism.* Then you can go ahead, *if you find that you are right.*

ONE MORE CHANCE.

What do we have images and pictures in our churches and houses for? Why, to pray to, of course. That is ridiculous; you have no right to think we are fools. But at least you honor the saints more than you do God. You know you call the Virgin Mary His Mother. Does not that make her out greater than He is? You had better look at your catechism, and clear up your ideas. *If you find that you are right, go ahead,* repeat your charges; if you find that you are wrong, *at least*

HOLD YOUR TONGUE.

Some things you will not find in the catechism, because they are matters of fact. You think that we pay for absolution. Find somebody who has done so. You think that the Catholic people are as ignorant of what goes on in church as you are. Ask them, and see if you are right. Perhaps you even think we

PREACH IN LATIN.

*Come to our churches and find out.*

Yes, *that* is the way. Come to our churches. The

## *Be Sure You are Right.*

Pagans in old times had some pretext for slandering us, for they were shut out from our assemblies; but you can come and welcome. And when you do come, *keep your eyes open*. Do not say that we pretend or believe that a bell is rung by miracle, because we bow our heads, when a little boy is ringing it before your face. *Ask somebody*, and find out what we *are* bowing our heads for.

In short, if you want to talk about us, *find out something* about us. And, at any rate,

### IS IT NOT WORTH WHILE?

Is it of no consequence what <sup>three</sup> two hundred millions of Christians believe? Americans take pride in being up with the times, and in knowing everything of importance which is thought, said, and done throughout the civilized world. And they take all available means to have accurate information. But, in this case, you believe implicitly what somebody tells you who knows no more about the matter than yourself, and whose information is of such venerable antiquity, and has passed through so many hands, that it strongly suggests the well-known story of the

### THREE BLACK CROWS.

If you will examine for yourself, *you will be sure, not that you are right, but that you have been wrong*. You will be surprised that such calumnies and falsehoods could have been so widely circulated and believed; and you will find that there still is a people to whom the words of the Founder of our religion apply: "*Blessed are you, when men shall revile you and persecute you,*

**AND SAY ALL MANNER OF EVIL AGAINST YOU FALSELY, FOR MY SAKE."**



# PASTORAL ADDRESS

OF THE

CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF IRELAND  
TO THE CLERGY, SECULAR AND REGULAR,  
AND THE LAITY OF THEIR FLOCKS.

---

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN :

As pastors of your souls, for which, "when the Prince of Pastors shall appear," we must render a strict account, we deem it our duty to address you at present on a subject in which your eternal interests and those of your children and your children's children are most deeply involved. We have done so on many occasions, but never in circumstances more critical than the present. Assured of the love with which you cherish the ancient faith of Ireland, and of your desire to hand it down to your sons, pure and unsullied, and knowing the union of minds and hearts which has always subsisted between you and your bishops, we confidently address to you words of instruction and advice on the important subject of the education of your children. Whilst everywhere throughout Christendom the greatest efforts are being made to banish religion from the school, and thus to estrange youth from God and his church, it is incumbent on us to use renewed vigilance, and on you, dearly beloved brethren, to listen with even greater attention than usual to the admonitions which it is our duty to give you.

## *Urgency of Question—Admission of Mr. Gladstone.*

The urgency of this question is manifest. The distinguished statesman who now holds the reins of government has frequently admitted that the state of one branch of education in Ireland is unsatisfactory, and has expressed his desire to redress admitted grievances; while our avowed opponents, determined to resist every concession to our just demands, and clamoring for a settlement of the Irish Education question, are endeavoring to force upon us godless systems, which as Catholics and Irishmen we must condemn. Some settlement or attempt at a settlement cannot therefore be long delayed.

## *Pastoral Address.*

### *Duty of Catholics as Parents and Citizens.*

And you, the Catholics of Ireland, expect from us, your bishops whom God has placed as sentinels on the watch-towers of Sion, clear teaching as to your duty respecting the education of your children. To you especially, Irish fathers and mothers, are our words addressed, for to God, "from whom all paternity is named," must you answer for the souls of your children, whose welfare hereafter, as well as here on earth, chiefly depends on your securing for them the benefits of a Catholic education. Knowing your duty to your children, it will be for you, as citizens of this empire, to assert your constitutional right to the fullest liberty and to complete equality with your fellow-subjects, in the fulfilment of those duties which your conscience, guided by religion, imposes on you. It is the boast of the government under which we live, that all citizens are equal before the law, and that it interferes with the conscientious religious opinions of no man. It will be for you, who are members of the Holy Catholic Church, the "pillar and the ground of truth," and who thus enjoy the inestimable blessing of infallibly knowing the truth of God, to claim for the truth the legal rights and privileges so freely granted to every form of error. Therefore, declaring to you the maxims of our holy religion, we apply to the present circumstances of our country the principles which our faith teaches us, that you may know what is the will of God well pleasing and perfect.

You must, then, fathers and mothers, have always before your eyes, in the education of your children, that fundamental truth, which Incarnate Wisdom himself taught us, when he said: "What doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his own soul?" (Matt. xvi. 26.) What will it profit you or your children to gain all knowledge, and to attain the greatest success in this world, if, through your fault and through your exposing them to the danger of evil education, they suffer the loss of that faith without which "it is impossible to please God"? (Heb. xi.)

### *Teaching of the Syllabus.*

Guided by this principle, our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., has declared that Catholics cannot "approve of a system of educating youth unconnected with the Catholic Faith and the power of the Church, and which regards the knowledge of merely natural things, and only, or at least primarily, the ends of earthly social

life."\* Catholic parents cannot approve of an education which fits their children only for this life, and ignores that life in which the soul is to live for ever. As faith is the foundation of all our hopes for eternity, and as faith without good works is dead, you cannot choose for your children education which would endanger their faith and morals, and consequently imperil their eternal welfare."

*Teaching of Pope Pius VII.*

This is no novel doctrine, as some assert. In the beginning of the century, the illustrious Pius VII., in an Encyclical Letter, addressed to the Bishops of the Catholic world, July 10, 1800, thus writes :

'It is your duty to take care of the whole flock over which the Holy Ghost has placed you as bishops, but in particular to watch over children and young men. They ought to be the special object of your paternal love, of your vigilant solicitude, of your zeal, of all your care. They who have tried to subvert society and families, to destroy authority divine and human, have spared no pains to infect and corrupt youth, hoping thus the more easily to execute their infamous projects. They know that the mind and heart of young persons, like soft wax, to which one may give what form he pleases, are very susceptible of every sort of impression ; that they keep tenaciously, when age has now hardened them, those which they had early received, and reject others. Thence the well-known proverb taken from the Scripture, 'A young man according to his way, even when he is old he will not depart from it.' Suffer not, then, venerable brethren, the children of this world to be more prudent in this respect than the children of light. Examine, therefore, with the greatest attention, to what manner of persons is confided the education of children, and of young men in the colleges and seminaries ; of what sort are the instructions given them ; what sort of schools exist among you ; of what sort are the teachers in the lyceums. Examine into all this with the greatest care, sound everything, let nothing escape your vigilant eye ; keep off, repulse the ravening wolves that seek to devour these innocent lambs ; drive out of the sheepfold those which have gotten in ; remove them as soon as can be, for such is the power which has been given to you by the Lord for the edification of your sheep."

*Rescripts of his present Holiness condemning the Queen's Colleges.*

Our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX., consulting for the special wants of the Catholics of Ireland, has not ceased, almost from the very beginning of his glorious pontificate, to repeat similar instructions in his apostolic letters to your bishops. Hence, by his

\* *Syllabus*, Prop. xlviii.

rescripts of October, 1847, and October, 1848, he condemned, from their first institution, the Queen's Colleges, on account of their "grievous and intrinsic dangers to faith and morals;" and since then he has frequently repeated his sacred admonitions, warning us and you, our faithful people, to beware of evil systems of public instruction, and to secure by every means in our power the blessings of Catholic education for the rising generation.

*Resolutions of Irish Bishops in 1824 and 1826.*

Nor have your prelates been unmindful of their duty in this respect. In 1824, that is to say, five years before Catholic emancipation, and in the midst of the struggle for that recognition of the existence of our people as citizens, they presented to Parliament a petition, from which we make the following extract, which clearly shows their conviction of the necessity of religious education :

"That in the Roman Catholic Church the literary and religious instruction of youth are universally combined, and that no system of education which separates them can be acceptable to the members of her communion ; that the religious instruction of youth in Catholic schools is always conveyed by means of catechetical instruction, daily prayer, and the reading of religious books wherein the Gospel morality is explained and inculcated ; that Roman Catholics have ever considered the reading of the Sacred Scriptures by children as an inadequate means of imparting to them religious instruction, as a usage whereby the Word of God is made liable to irreverence, youth exposed to misunderstand its meaning, and thereby not unfrequently to receive in early life impressions which may afterwards prove injurious to their own best interests, as well as to those of the society which they are destined to form. That schools whereof the master professes a religion different from that of his pupils, or from which such religious instruction as the Catholic Church prescribes for youth is excluded, or in which books and tracts not sanctioned by it are read or commented on, cannot be resorted to by the children of Roman Catholics ; and that threats and rewards have been found equally unavailing as a means of inducing Catholic parents to procure education for their children from such persons or in such schools ; that any system of education incompatible with the discipline of the Catholic Church, or superintended exclusively by persons professing a religion different from that of the vast majority of the poor of Ireland, cannot possibly be acceptable to the latter, and must in its progress be slow and embarrassed, generating often distrust and discord, as well as a want of that mutual good faith and perfect confidence which should prevail between those who receive benefits and those who dispense them."

Your bishops again expressed the like sentiments in 1826. We give the resolutions.

Resolutions of the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, on Education, unanimously adopted 26th January, 1826 :

“1. Having considered attentively a plan<sup>o</sup> of national education which has been submitted to us—Resolved, that the admission of Protestants and Roman Catholics into the same schools, for the purpose of literary instruction, may, under existing circumstances, be allowed, provided sufficient care be taken to protect the religion of the Roman Catholic children, and to furnish them with adequate means of religious instruction.

“2. That, in order to secure sufficient protection to the religion of Roman Catholic children under such a system of education, we deem it necessary that the master of each school in which the majority of the pupils profess the Roman Catholic faith be a Roman Catholic; and that, in schools in which the Roman Catholic children form only a minority, a permanent Roman Catholic assistant be employed; and that such master and assistant be appointed upon the recommendation, or with the express approval, of the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese in which they are to be employed; and further, that they, or either of them, be removed upon the representation of such bishop. The same rule to be observed for the appointment or dismissal of mistresses and assistants in female schools.

“3. That we consider it improper that masters and mistresses intended for the religious instruction of Roman Catholic youth should be trained or educated by or under the control of persons professing a different faith; and that we conceive it most desirable that a male and female model school shall be established in each province in Ireland, to be supported at the public expense, for the purpose of qualifying such masters and mistresses for the important duties which they shall be appointed to discharge.

“4. That, in conformity with the principle of protecting the religion of Roman Catholic children, the books intended for their particular instruction in religion shall be selected or approved by the Roman Catholic prelates; and that no book or tract for common instruction in literature shall be introduced into any school in which Roman Catholic children are educated, which book or tract may be objected to, on religious grounds, by the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese in which such school is established.

“5. That a transfer of the property in several schools which now exist, or may hereafter exist, in Ireland, may be utterly impracticable, from the nature of the tenure by which they are or shall hereafter be held, and from the number of persons having a legal interest in them, as well as from a variety of other causes; and that, in our opinion, any regulation which should require such transfer to be made, as a necessary condition for receiving parliamentary support, would operate to the exclusion of many useful schools from all participation in the public bounty.

“6. That, appointed as we have been by Divine Providence to watch over and preserve the deposit of Catholic faith in Ireland; and responsible as we are to God for the souls of our flocks, we will, in our respective dioceses, withhold our concurrence and support from any system of education which will not fully accord with the principles expressed in the foregoing resolutions.”

#### *Establishment of National Education and Queen's Colleges.*

In the year 1829, Catholic emancipation was granted, and the necessity of dealing with the question of education in Ireland

forced itself more and more upon the legislature. Accordingly, the National system was instituted, and a few years later the Queen's Colleges were founded; but, unfortunately, in these attempts at settling a question which concerns you and your children above all others, your wishes and the demands of your bishops, speaking as the guardians of your faith, were not listened to as they deserved.

*Address of the National Synod of Thurles.*

A National Synod met in Thurles, in August, 1850; and again the prelates spoke words of instruction, of which recent sad events in France have furnished a new and most melancholy confirmation:

“As rulers of the Church of Christ, chief pastors of his flock, religiously responsible to the Prince of Pastors for every soul committed to our charge, it forms, as is obvious, our first and paramount duty to attend to the pastures in which they feed—the doctrines with which they are nourished. And surely, if ever there was a period which called for the unsleeping vigilance, the prudent foresight, the intrepid and self-sacrificing zeal of our august ministry, that period is the present. The alarming spectacle which the Christian world exhibits at the present day, the novel but formidable forms in which error presents itself, and the manifold evils and perils by which the Church is encompassed, must be evident to the most superficial observer. It is no longer a single heresy, or an eccentric fanaticism, the denial of some revealed truth, or the excesses of some extravagant error; but a comprehensive, all-pervading, well-digested system of unbelief, suited to every capacity and reaching every intellect, that corrupts and desolates the moral world. Is not such the calamitous spectacle which the continent of Europe offers to us at this moment? Education, the source of all intellectual life, by which the mind of man is nurtured and disciplined, his principles determined, his feelings regulated, his judgments fixed, his character formed, has been forcibly dissevered from every connection with religion, and made the vehicle of that cold scepticism and heartless indifference which have seduced and corrupted youth, and, by a necessary consequence, shaken to its centre the whole fabric of social life. Separated from her heavenly monitor, learning is no longer the organ of that wisdom which cometh from above, which, according to St. James, is ‘chaste, peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, consenting to the good, full of mercy and good fruits, without judging, without dissimulation,’ but rather of that wisdom which he describes as ‘earthly, sensual, and devilish’ (James iii. 15-17).

“It is, we feel assured, unnecessary to observe to you, that, of all modes of propagating error, education is the most subtle and dangerous, furnishing as it does the aliment by which the social body is sustained, which circulates through every vein, and reaches every member; and that, if this aliment should prove to be corrupt or deleterious, it will not fail to carry moral disease and death to the entire system. Hence, the awful obligations we are

under, at the peril of our souls, of watching over the education of the people whom God has entrusted to our charge.

"Listen to the emphatic words in which the present illustrious Pontiff sets forth the dangers to which youth is exposed at the present time, and the duties which are placed upon the pastors of the people in this regard. 'It is incumbent upon you,' he says, 'and upon ourselves, to labor with all diligence and energy, and with great firmness of purpose, and to be vigilant in everything that regards schools, and the instruction and education of children and youths of both sexes. For you well know that the modern enemies of religion and human society, with a most diabolical spirit, direct all their artifices to pervert the minds and hearts of youth from their earliest years. Wherefore, they leave nothing untried; they shrink from no attempt to withdraw schools, and every institution destined for the education of youth, from the authority of the Church and the vigilance of her holy pastors.'—*Encycl. Letter of Pius IX., 8th December, 1849.* Such are the words of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, which show the responsibility under which we are placed, and point out our duty to protect from the insidious snares laid for their destruction the lambs of the fold—that most helpless but precious portion of the flock of Jesus Christ, which the prophet represents as carried in his bosom."

*Mixed System again Condemned.*

Again, in 1859, 1862, 1863, 1867, and 1869, we renewed our condemnation of the mixed system, and demanded for you and your children the advantage of truly Catholic education.

We give as an Appendix the resolutions adopted by your Bishops on those several occasions.

*Unanimity of Catholic Bishops throughout the world on this point.*

The most wonderful unanimity on this important subject of Education is to be found among all the Bishops of the Catholic Church—a unanimity which can proceed only from that Spirit of Truth which abides with the Church, and teaches and will teach her "all truth even to the consummation of the world."

Several of the most distinguished Bishops of France have, over and over again, condemned the mixed system, and declared the necessity of a thorough union between religion and secular teaching in the school. For all, we shall give you the words of one among them addressed to the Catholic Congress of Mechlin, in 1864:

"At this moment while I am addressing you, a few writers for the press tell us that religion must be driven out of the school, and other things of the same kind. And at the same instant, what are 10,000,000 of human beings doing in Europe? They are laboring; and after their work they are going back to their poor

cabins or miserable rooms to begin again the same wretched round to-morrow; and in this monotonous life, with minds so little cultivated, what are the few rays of comfort which fall upon them from the cradle to the grave? In childhood, they would fain spend their time at play: whose voice was it that repeated to their ears, 'No, my child; you must work'? In youth, they would fain amuse themselves, and waste what is most precious in the youthful soul—its love. Whose was the voice that said, 'No, my child; be pure'? At 40, they thought of riches, of revolutions, of sensual indulgence. What voice then said, 'Be just, be calm, be temperate'? At 60, they were becoming the victims of despair, of rancor, or of every brutalizing passion. Who said to them in that hour of trial, 'Have hope'? Gentlemen, here below there is only one voice which can say all this—and with power—to the laboring and suffering millions: it is the voice of Religion. Hers is the only voice which reminds all who are poor, or who suffer, of God, of duty, of eternity, of Jesus Christ, who labored and suffered as they do, and of the crucifix, which will be their comfort and hope at the last hour."\*

The sentiments so eloquently expressed are shared by the Bishops of Prussia, of Austria, of Belgium, of Holland, of Australia, of Canada, and of the United States, who, in their pastorals, their synodical addresses, and in their other publications, condemn with one accord the mixed system, and declare that education based upon our holy religion is alone suitable for Catholic children. Not to multiply quotations, it will suffice to cite the following extract from the address of the Plenary Synod of the Church of the United States, held at Baltimore, in the year 1866. That council was one of the most numerous assemblies held after the Council of Trent, until the meeting of the General Council of the Vatican. Its decrees were signed by seven Archbishops, thirty-seven Bishops, two procurators of absent Bishops, and two Abbots.

*Address of the Plenary Synod of Baltimore, United States.*

"The experience of every day shows more and more plainly what serious evils and great dangers are entailed upon Catholic youth by their frequentation of public schools in this country. Such is the nature of the system of teaching therein employed, that it is not possible to prevent young Catholics from incurring through its influence danger to their faith and morals; nor can we ascribe to any other cause that destructive spirit of indifferentism which has made, and is now making, such rapid strides in this country, and that corruption of morals which we have to deplore even in those of tender years. Familiar intercourse with those of false religions, or of no religion; the daily use of authors who assail with calumny and sarcasm our holy religion, its practices, and even its saints—these gradually impair in the minds of

\* *Address of Mgr. Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans.*



Catholic children the vigor and influence of the true religion. Besides, the morals and examples of their fellow-scholars are generally so corrupt, and so great their license in word and deed, that, through continual contact with them, the modesty and piety of our children, even of those who have been best trained at home, disappear like wax before the fire. These evils and dangers did not escape the knowledge of our predecessors, as we learn from the following decrees:

“(a) Whereas, many Catholic children, especially those born of poor parents, have been and are still exposed in several places of this province to great danger of losing their faith and morals, owing to the want of good masters to whom their education may safely be entrusted, we consider it absolutely necessary that schools should be established in which the young may be imbued with the principles of faith and morality, and at the same receive instruction in letters.”—*Council of Baltimore*, No. 33.

“(b) Whereas, the books generally used in schools contain much that is opposed to the principles of our faith, inaccurate statements of our doctrine, and even historical falsehoods, whereby the minds of the young are filled with error, to the grave peril of their souls, the interests of religion and education, and the credit of the United States, imperatively demand some remedy for so great an evil.”—*Ib.*, 34.

“(c) Whereas, the character of the public education given in these provinces is generally such as to promote heresy by insensibly instilling into the minds of the young the false principles of the sects, we warn all pastors to use their best diligence to secure a Christian and Catholic education for children, and to take care that the children do not read the Protestant Bible, nor recite the hymns or prayers used by other religions. They should be vigilant, therefore, lest books or practices of this kind be introduced into the public schools to the peril of faith and piety. All such efforts on the part of the sects should be resisted with firmness and moderation, care being taken to ask the co-operation of those in authority.”—*Ib.*, 54.

“Now, the best, and, indeed, the sole remedy for these most serious evils and inconveniences, in our judgment, is this: that schools be erected in every diocese, near each church, in which Catholic youth may be imbued with literature and a liberal education, as well as with religion and morality, as was already prescribed by the Fathers of a former Plenary Council.

“We exhort the Bishops, and, considering the dreadful evils that spring from a bad system of education, we implore them by the bowels of the mercy of God, to take care that schools should be attached to every church in their dioceses, and if necessary, and where circumstances allow, let them provide suitable masters at the expense of the church to which the school is attached.”—*Ib.*, 54.

### *Teaching of the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX.*

In fine, to show the union of the bishops throughout the world with the Apostolic See in their teaching respecting education, we add the words of the Supreme Pontiff, Pope Pius IX., in which, replying to the Archbishop of Freiburg, in Germany, his Holiness

clearly expounds, as the Infallible Teacher of the faithful, the truth we are now developing for your instruction :

“It is not wonderful that these unhappy efforts [to spread irreligious and revolutionary principles] should be directed chiefly to corrupt the training and education of youth, and there is no doubt that the greatest injury is inflicted on society, when the directing authority and salutary power of the Church are withdrawn from public and private education, on which the happiness of the Church and of the commonwealth depends so much. For thus society is, little by little, deprived of that truly Christian spirit which alone can permanently secure the foundation of peace and public order, and promote and direct the true and useful progress of civilization, and give man those helps which are necessary for him in order to attain after this life his last end hereafter—eternal happiness. And, in truth, a system of teaching, which not only is limited to the knowledge of natural things, and does not pass beyond the bounds of our life on earth, but also departs from the truth revealed by God, must necessarily be guided by the spirit of error and lies; and education which, without the aid of the Christian doctrine and of its salutary moral precepts, instructs the minds and moulds the tender heart of youth, which is so prone to evil, must infallibly produce a generation which will have no guide but its own wicked passions and wild conceits, and which will be a source of the greatest misfortunes to the commonwealth and their own families.

“But if this detestable system of education, so far removed from Catholic faith and ecclesiastical authority, becomes a source of evils, both to individuals and to society, when it is employed in the higher teaching, and in schools frequented by the better class, who does not see that the same system will give rise to still greater evils, if it be introduced into primary schools? For it is in these schools, above all, that the children of the people ought to be carefully taught from their tender years the mysteries and precepts of our holy religion, and to be trained with diligence to piety, good morals, religion, and civilization. In such schools, religious teaching ought to have so leading a place in all that concerns education and instruction, that whatever else the children may learn should appear subsidiary to it. The young, therefore, are exposed to the greatest perils whenever, in the schools, education is not closely united with religious teaching. Wherefore, since primary schools are established chiefly to give the people a religious education, and to lead them to piety and Christian morality, they have justly attracted to themselves, in a greater degree than other educational institutions, all the care, solicitude, and vigilance of the Church. The design of withdrawing primary schools from the control of the Church, and the exertions made to carry this design into effect, are therefore inspired by a spirit of hostility towards her, and by the desire of extinguishing among the people the divine light of our holy faith. The Church, which has founded these schools, has ever regarded them with the greatest care and interest, and looked upon them as the chief object of her ecclesiastical authority and government, and whatsoever removed them from her, inflicted serious injury both on her and on the schools. Those who pretend that the Church ought to abdicate or suspend her control and her salutary action upon the primary

schools, in reality ask her to disobey the commands of her divine Author, and to be false to the charge she has received from God of guiding all men to salvation; and in whatever country this pernicious design of removing the schools from the ecclesiastical authority should be entertained and carried into execution, and the young thereby exposed to the danger of losing their faith, there the Church would be in duty bound not only to use her best efforts, and to employ every means to secure for them the necessary Christian education and instruction, but, moreover, would feel herself obliged to warn all the faithful, and to declare that no one can in conscience frequent such schools, as being adverse to the Catholic Church."

We conclude, then, dearly beloved brethren, exclaiming with the great St. Augustine: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*" The bishops of the universal world, united to the Vicar of Christ, speak with authority; their judgment cannot be gainsaid. Peter has spoken through Pius; the question is settled; would that the error too were at an end!

*Testimonies of Enemies of the Catholic Church.*

However, it is not from the bishops alone that we learn the dangers of bad education. Your opponents, too, the enemies of our holy religion, deem no other means more efficacious for alienating you and your children from your mother, the Catholic Church.

One of the greatest enemies of the Catholic faith in the first half of the last century, Primate Boulter, who took a chief part in founding the notorious "Charter Schools," writing to the Bishop of London on the 15th May, 1730, said:

"I can assure you the Papists here are so numerous that it highly concerns us in point of interest, as well as out of concern for the salvation of these poor creatures who are our fellow-subjects, to try all possible means to bring them and theirs to the true religion, and one of the most likely methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation; for, instead of converting these that are adults, we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go off to Popery."

And with respect to mixed education in particular, we have the opinion of another Anglican prelate who, in despite of his professions of liberality, may be fittingly classed with Primate Boulter in his contempt for our people, and desire to subvert our holy religion by means of education—the late Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whately. We are informed by his daughter that on one occasion he said: "The education supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church." (*Life of Dr. Whately*, p. 244, first edition.)

Again: "I believe, as I said the other day, that *mixed education* is gradually enlightening the mass of the people, and that, if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I cannot venture openly to profess this opinion—I cannot openly support the Educational Board as an instrument of conversion. I have to fight its battles with one hand, and that my best, tied behind me" (p. 246). We shall not dwell on the duplicity of one who, while entertaining and expressing in private such sentiments as these, could publicly put forward the National system as one perfectly safe for Catholics. We shall only remind you of the lessons taught by these avowals, and in particular of the dangers of mixed education which they reveal, and of the duty incumbent on you to guard your children against those dangers by not sending them to mixed schools, and by using every constitutional effort to obtain for Catholics a system of education, Catholic in all its branches, primary, intermediate, and university.

*Opinion of Rev. Dr. Haughton, F.T.C.D.*

We shall next quote for you the words of the Rev. Dr. Haughton, a gentleman who has been a clerical Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, for nearly a quarter of a century, and who, in a pamphlet on University Education, published by him in 1868, says:

"The Roman Catholic clergy warn their flocks against Trinity College as a Protestant institution, necessarily dangerous to the principles of Catholic students, and in thus warning them, they are practically wise, for it is simply impossible for 70 Catholics to associate with 1,100 Protestants, as equals and fellow-students, without renouncing, more or less, the narrow views respecting Protestants that prevail among the higher circles of their hierarchy. Trinity College, however, although considered dangerous, has never been placed by the Roman Catholic clergy in the same category as the Queen's Colleges, which are essentially secularized institutions, without a recognized religion, and *godless*; as such they are absolutely condemned by the hierarchy, and faithful Catholics are prohibited from entering their walls. The practical effect of secularizing Trinity College would be to convert it into a fourth Queen's College, and it would thus become one of a class of educational institutions which the Church of Rome has always and consistently forbidden her children to enter. It is hard to see how such a plan as this can be rationally advocated, on the ground that it would satisfy the just demands of the Catholics of Ireland. So far, therefore, as Irish Roman Catholics are concerned, the secularization of Trinity College would be to them a loss, and not a gain."

The opinion, therefore, of the learned Fellow of Trinity College, speaking with the experience of twenty-five years, and view-

ing the matter from the Protestant standpoint, is, that mixed education is far more objectionable to Catholics than Protestant education itself. What wonder, then, that the fathers of the National Synod of Thurles should have united both systems together in one common condemnation?

*Declaration of the Synod of Thurles.*

“That a system of education, the dangers of which have been publicly and solemnly pointed out by the Church, which is the Pillar and the Ground of Truth—a system against the dangers of which the history of modern Europe bears witness, will meet with your marked reprobation; that you will not yield it encouragement or patronage of any kind, but that you will save your children from its influence—is an assurance supplied to us by your uniform and devoted obedience to the voice of that Church, and attested by every page of your history and by every act of your lives.

“The solemn warning which we address to you against the dangers of those collegiate institutions, extends, of course, to every similar establishment known to be replete with danger to the faith and morals of your children—to every school in which the doctrines and practices of your Church are impugned, and the legitimate authority of your pastors set at naught. Alas! our country abounds with too many public institutions of this kind, which have been the occasion of ruin to thousands of those souls that were redeemed by the precious blood of Jesus Christ; but still they bear the perils with which they are replete inscribed upon their front, and they are known by all to be most dangerous and anti-Catholic. It is not necessary, nor was it ever necessary, to raise our voice against establishments so avowedly hostile. It is when the wolf assumes the clothing of the sheep, that the pastor has most reason to tremble for his flock, and to exert all his courage and energy for its defence.”

*Feeling throughout Ireland.*

These instructions of your prelates have been listened to and obeyed by you, beloved brethren, with edifying docility. The general feeling throughout Ireland is in favor of denominational education. Within the last two years, nearly one thousand of the leading Catholics of Ireland, including several noblemen, members of Parliament, magistrates, and others, have publicly declared to the Prime Minister their dissatisfaction with the existing arrangements for higher education in Ireland. The wealthier classes of Irish Catholics send their children at considerable expense to Catholic schools and colleges, and generally to those which are directed by ecclesiastics or by religious ladies. There are over 5,000 Catholic boys in our higher schools, and an equal number of young ladies receiving education in convent schools. On the other hand, a recent parliamentary return shows, that with the exception of those who frequented the Queen's Colleges in order to obtain professional qualifications (and many of this class of students get their education elsewhere), there were in the year 1868-69 only 37 Catholic students receiving their education in arts in those mixed establishments, namely, 18 in Cork, 16 in Galway, and 3 in Belfast.

As for you, dearly beloved poor of Jesus Christ, feeling as you

to in a special manner the signal blessing you enjoy in possessing the true faith, and knowing that it is a priceless treasure with which, far more precious than worldly substance, you can enrich your children, your love for Catholic education is proved to evidence by the multitudes of your sons and daughters who throng every Catholic school, and especially every school in which the presence of Christian Brothers or of Nuns gives a guarantee that religion shall have the first place, and shall impregnate the whole atmosphere which your little ones are to breathe for so many hours of the day. You have proved also your dislike and fear of mixed education, by turning your faces away from schools in which no expense had been spared, on which thousands of pounds of the public money had been squandered, but against which we deemed it our duty to warn you. Hence in several Model Schools erected in populous cities and towns, where the great majority of the inhabitants are Catholic, sometimes not ten, sometimes not two, of your children are found within the unhallowed precincts of those mixed institutions.

In fine, the opinion of all of you on this subject of education, dearly beloved brethren, is so well known, that nearly all the Liberal candidates who sought your votes at the last elections for the House of Commons, declared in their electioneering addresses their adhesion to the principle of denominational education, and their determination to uphold it and push it forward in Parliament.

And with good reason are you steadfast in those principles. For you know the necessary connection between good education and the maintenance of religion in our country. And you are determined to struggle for the establishment in Ireland of a sound Catholic system of public education, and never to relax your efforts till you obtain the recognition of this, your own and your children's right, even as you wrung Catholic emancipation from a hostile parliament.

Be not therefore deceived, dearly beloved, by those who, pretending to promote your welfare, would fain persuade you that mixed education will not endanger the faith and morals of your children. Those who advocate that system sometimes say that the youth growing up under it will form in Ireland "a liberal Catholic party, such as that which in Belgium and Italy opposes the aggressions of the priests." This is the end which the enemies of social order and religion throughout the world are seeking by every means, even the most diabolical, to compass, especially in these latter days: namely, to separate the people from the clergy, the flock from the shepherds whom God has appointed to guard them, that thus the fold of Christ, when unprotected, may be made desolate.

#### *Secret Societies seek to spread Irreligious Education.*

We have often deemed it our duty to warn you against secret societies, which would hurry you on to temporal and eternal ruin. These societies, especially on the continent of Europe, profess the most irreligious and anti-social doctrines. Among the chief means employed by them for pushing forward their diabolical principles is *education without religion*. The *International*, one of the most powerful of these organizations, has lately put forward a programme, in which the following points are laid down as

most necessary to be insisted upon in the agitation conducted by the socialist democratic party in Switzerland :

. . . "3. *Compulsory and gratuitous education* up to the completion of the fourteenth year of each child's age. . . . 4. Separation of the Church from the State, and also of the schools from the Church."

About three short years ago, a pamphlet was published in which we find detailed the efforts made in France to spread irreligion by means of bad education. The letters of eighty of the prelates of France are appended to the pamphlet. Alas! the sad forebodings of that noble episcopate have been too soon and too terribly fulfilled!

### *Efforts to spread Irreligious Education in France—Disastrous Results in France.*

"I see," says the most reverend author, "that for some time past the most extraordinary efforts are made in France to spread impiety, immorality, the most anti-social theories, under the pretext of spreading education. No longer, as formerly, it is in newspapers and books that religion, morality, and the eternal principles of good order are attacked with the most deceitful and formidable weapon of a corrupt system of education. Under cover of an excellent object—and here is the great danger, for we are deluded by this pretext—under the pretext of spreading education and waging war against ignorance, infidelity is spread, war is waged against religion; and thus, whether we will or not, we rush on to the ruin of all order, moral and social. And we the Bishops, who are as desirous as others, and perhaps more desirous than others, to see spread far and wide the blessings of education, the education of children, female education, the education of our whole people—for this is by excellence a Christian work—we are accused of being enemies of education, because we oppose anti-Christian and anti-social education."\*

The first fact mentioned by the learned writer is the existence of schools, which are called "*professional schools for females*," into which young girls are received at twelve years of age and upward, for the purpose of continuing their education and learning a profession. These schools have been founded by women, free-thinkers, who formally and expressly declare it to be their object to train the youth of their own sex in rationalism and infidelity. The following incident shows the impious end for which these schools have been founded: One of the principal teachers died, and over her grave her husband pronounced these words: "I will tell you, for it is my duty to tell you, that if this funeral is that of a free-thinker" [unaccompanied by any religious ceremony], "it is so not only by my wish, but also and chiefly because such was the desire of my dear wife." He adds that she had devoted herself to "the great work of spreading education and *morality without religion*, because she had no faith except in *learning and in justice*: she was of the number of those who, having once seen and comprehended these truths, can have no other beacon to guide them *in life or at the hour of death*." Round that grave, whose occupant had rejected religion and its ministrations in life and in death, stood 300 girls, pupils of those "*professional schools*," hold-

\* *Les Alarmes de l'Épiscopat, par Mgr. l'Évêque d'Orléans, p. 7.*

ing bouquets in their hands, and throwing flowers on the coffin of their mistress. The schools are of a piece with the teachers. Ten hours a day are spent in them, but all religious instruction is strictly forbidden, under the pretext that they are free schools, "*open to children of all persuasions, without religious distinction.*" The founders of these schools propose to give to the girls entrusted to them *a moral education without ever speaking to them of religion!* And this is the system of education which people are anxious to spread throughout France, and even in this country also. But though we hope they will not succeed, can we feel fully confident that we shall escape the contagion, when we remember that this system is no other than "*the mixed system,*" and when we bear in mind the untiring efforts which are made to develop and consolidate that system in Ireland in every branch of education, from the university, through the model-school, down to the humblest village-school? Read the description of the schools in France, of which we are speaking, and say, Does it not apply to every school, even in Ireland, where the mixed principle is thoroughly carried out?

"The printed prospectus of these schools [continues the most reverend writer] clearly explains the advantages of professional education, while it hides the religious danger under vague expressions of an apparent liberality, such as the following: '*The school is open to children of all persuasions, without religious distinction.*' The meaning of which words is no other than that in these schools, where children are kept from the twelfth to the eighteenth year of their age, and for ten hours every day (from eight A.M. to six P.M.), God and the Gospel shall be treated as if they never existed; not only religion shall never be mentioned, but these girls shall be taught morality independent of any dogmatic faith, of any religion. . . ."

The second engine used by the enemies of religion in France for the maintenance and spread of infidelity, is the Educational League. This League has been introduced from Belgium into France by the Freemasons and the "*Solidaires*"—the members of an impious association, the avowed object of which is to prevent persons from receiving the sacraments or any of the sacred rites of the Church in life or in death. The Educational League, with a wonderful spirit of propagandism, has established throughout France libraries and courses of instruction for men and for women, and even for girls and young children. On their banner is inscribed "*Spread of education*"; but under this device is hidden the scheme of propagating irreligion. The founder of the "*League*" in France † was a Freemason, and both his declarations and those of the organs of Freemasonry leave no doubt of the Masonic origin of the scheme and of the spirit which animates it. Now, the third article of the statutes of the "*League*" declares, when speaking of the education to be given by their association, that "*neither politics nor religion shall have any part in it.*" And lest there should be any mistake as to the meaning of this article, one of the leading Masonic journals declares that religion is "*useless as an instrument for forming the minds of children, and that from a certain point of view it is capable of leading them to abandon all moral principles.* It is incumbent on us, therefore," concludes this journal, "*to exclude all religion. We will teach youth its rights and duties in the name of liberty, of*

\* *Les Alarmes de l'Épiscopat*, p. 17.

† M. Jean Macé.



conscience, of reason, and, in fine, in the name of our society." \* And again: "Freemasons must give in their adhesion *en masse* to the excellent Educational League, and the lodges must in the peace of their temples seek out the best means of making it effectual. Their influence in this way will be most useful. *The principles we profess are precisely in accord with those which inspired that project.*" † In April of the same year the same organ of Freemasonry contained the following paragraph: "We are happy to announce that the Educational League and the statue of *our brother Voltaire* meet with the greatest support in all the lodges. There could not be two subscription-lists more in harmony with each other: Voltaire the representative of the destruction of prejudices and superstition; the Educational League, the engine for building up a new society based *solely upon learning and instruction*. Our brethren understand it so." In fine, that there may not remain upon our minds the least doubt as to the identity of the principles of this League with those of Voltaire, we find its founder in France proposing at a great Masonic dinner a toast to the memory of that arch-infidel; while the newspaper, from which we have quoted so largely, informs its readers, that at one of the "professional schools" described above, the prize for good conduct (*le prix de morale*) was awarded to "*the daughters of a free-thinker, who have never attended any place of religious worship.*"

We cannot better conclude our remarks on the efforts made in France to destroy religion in the masses by means of education, than in the following words of warning, not less applicable to good and sincere Catholics in Ireland nowadays, than to those to whom they were specially addressed:

"Good and sincere Catholics [continues the author of the pamphlet already quoted], who, deceived by the motto of the association, have given their names to this *Educational League*, take part without knowing it in a Masonic institution, and in building up this new state of society, from which religion is to be banished. Well may the Bishop of Metz say: 'These persons forget that, like Proteus in the fable, Freemasonry knows how to multiply *ad infinitum* its transformations and its names. Yesterday it called itself "*les solidaires*," or "morality independent of religion," or "freedom of thought;" to-day it takes the title of an "*Educational League*;" to-morrow it will find some other name by which to deceive the simple.'"

The efforts to corrupt the youth of unhappy France by means of bad education in its higher branches, have been not less energetic and widespread. The lectures of the School of Medicine of Paris were inaugurated in 1865, amid shouts of "*Materialism for ever!*" ‡ and on the 30th of December, a candidate for degrees was permitted by the Medical Faculty to advance the following revolutionary doctrine, grounded on the materialistic principles he had been taught: "Who still speaks to us of free will? As the stone which falls to the ground obeys the laws of weight, man obeys the laws which are proper to him. . . . Responsibility is the same for all, that is to say, *none*." And again: "Physicians must not be accomplices of the magistrates and judges, who punish men for acts for which they are not responsible" (pp. 32, 33). Here we have a sample of the teaching of the School of Medicine

\* "La Solidarité," *Le Monde Maçonnique*, Octobre, 5866 [1866] p. 472.

† *Ibid.*, February, 5867 [1867].

‡ "Vive le Matérialisme."

of Paris, not only the first medical school of France, but among the first schools of Europe. And this sample is, unfortunately, not a solitary one. The Medical Faculty and the University of Paris gave medals in 1866 for two dissertations, in one of which we find a denial of the act of creation and of God the Creator, and a rejection of every metaphysical idea, *as useless and dangerous*; while human thought is set down as produced *by heat!* In the other we read the following propositions: "Matter is eternal." "The notion of a *First Cause* is useless and irrational—it is *chimerical!* Again: "It is absolutely impossible to explain the existence of a creative power;" and, "An immaterial being is not necessary for the production of life." And, "To attribute the phenomena of life to an immaterial soul, is to substitute a chimerical being for the hypotheses of machinists." Materialists have done good service to physiology by eliminating metaphysical entities from this study. The idea of the soul, as an immaterial power, is a mere abstraction; in fact, nothing of the kind exists."

Unhappily, these principles, subversive of all morality, are not advanced by the aspirants only to academical distinctions; most certainly, the students would not advance these theories had they not learned them from their masters. Hence we find one of the professors of the University of France in Bordeaux asserting that, "even among civilized nations, moral ideas are so relative, contradictory, and dependent on exterior and individual relations, that it is impossible, and will always be impossible, to find an absolute definition of goodness" (p. 38, note). And the *Medical Review* published the discourse pronounced by one of the physicians of the Faculty of Paris, M. Verneuil, over the grave of a member of their learned body, Dr. Foucher, in which we find the following:

"We are reproached with believing with the sages of old that Fate is blind, and as such presides over our lot. And why should we not believe it? . . . Humbling and sad as is this admission, still we must make it: imperceptible elements of the great social organization, appearing upon this earth, as living beings, fragments of matter, agitated by a spirit, we are born, we live, and we die, unconscious of our destiny, playing our part without any precise notion of the end, and, in the midst of the darkness which covers our origin and our end, having only one consolation—the love of our fellow-man.

"This simple philosophy alone," M. Verneuil continues, "as- suages our grief and ends by drying our tears. By the side of the half-open tomb we ask, whether he, whom it contains, served the good cause without deceit. . . . If, by his intelligence or his kindness of heart, he labored in the great work, we say, he has paid his part of the common debt, and 'whether he returns to his original nothing or not,' whether he is destroyed or merely changes his form, whether he hears our words or not, we thank him in the name of the past and of the future."

Another distinguished professor published in 1866 *Lectures on the Physiology of the Nervous System*, in which we find the following passage:

"We admit," he says, "without any restriction, that intellectual phenomena in animals are of the same order as in man. . . . 'As for *free-will*, we comprehend a certain kind of free-will in the more intelligent animals; and, on the other hand, we may add *tha*' perhaps man is not so free as he would fain persuade him-

self he is.' And, 'as to feeling the distinction between good and evil, it is a grave question, which we must first study in man himself'"!

Let it not be supposed that these principles are merely announced as abstractions; conclusions are drawn from them which must fill every thinking mind with horror. Eighty students of the Normal School, the great training institution of teachers for the north of France, applauded such conclusions in a public letter. Several of the infidel professors of the Faculty of Medicine received ovations from crowded class-rooms; millions of immoral and irreligious books were scattered throughout the country. Thus Freemasonry, under the pretext of combating ignorance, wages a deceitful and implacable war against religion. "We too," says the organ of the Freemasons,\* "we too expect our Messiah, the true Messiah, of the mind and reason—universal education."

It is scarcely necessary for us to remind you, dearly beloved brethren, that the seeds of irreligion and anarchy thus sown broadcast over the fair face of France, have already produced a too abundant harvest of evils, perhaps the most disastrous recorded on the page of history. All Europe has been horrified by the atrocities perpetrated within the last few months in the name of liberty in that city, which was looked on as the centre of the civilization of the world. National monuments have been destroyed, peaceable citizens robbed and murdered, the venerable Archbishop, many of the clergy, and leading members of the civil and military authorities, massacred in cold blood. In other cities of France, too, we have seen anarchy and irreligion proclaimed—miscreants in arms against the property, and liberty, and lives of their fellow-citizens, often of the helpless and unprotected; and all this at a moment when the country was invaded, and a great part of it occupied, by its enemies. The storm had been sown, and in very truth unfortunate France has reaped the whirlwind.

*Spread of Infidelity through bad Education not confined to France.*

And unhappily, dearly beloved brethren, the spread of infidel principles by means of bad education is not confined to France. A few years ago a congress of students was held in Liège, in Belgium, where infidel and anti-social principles in their worst form were proclaimed amid the plaudits of the assembly. In England irreligion and socialism are publicly taught. Even in our own country it is a matter of notoriety, that a Chair in one of the Queen's Colleges has been occupied since their foundation by a gentleman who, in a published work, extolled the first French revolution; and, in another place of the same book, compared our Saviour—whose name be praised for ever!—to Luther and Mohammed! Again: In Trinity College one of the fellows denies the fundamental truth of Christianity respecting the eternity of the punishment of sin; and others call in question the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, or of portions of them, and impugn many truths which constitute the foundation of all revealed religion. In the same University, too, the doctrines of Positivism, a late form of infidel philosophy, have a large number of followers. The nature of that philosophy may be gathered from the following

\* *Le Monde Maçonnique*, June, 1866.

passages in the "Catechism of Positivism, or Summary Exposition of the Universal Religion," translated from the French of Auguste Comte.\* The preface begins thus:

"In the name of the past and of the future, the servants of humanity—both its philosophical and practical servants—come forward to claim, as their due, the general direction of this world. Their object is, to constitute at length a real Providence in all the departments—moral, intellectual, and material. Consequently they exclude, once for all, from political supremacy, all the different servants of God—Catholic, Protestant, or Deist—as being at once behindhand and a cause of disturbance."

The work consists of "Thirteen systematic conversations between a woman and a priest of Humanity," and the doctrines contained in it are epitomized in the following blasphemous lines:

"*In a word, Humanity definitively occupies the place of God, but she does not forget the services which the idea of God provisionally rendered.*"

*Testimony of Rev. Professor Liddon.*

Again, during the last two sessions of Parliament a Select Committee of the House of Lords sat to inquire into the condition of the English Universities. The Marquess of Salisbury was the chairman. The evidence taken before that committee reveals the appalling fact, that infidelity, or doubt as to the first principles of the Christian religion, nay, of belief in God, is widespread in the Universities of England, and especially among the most intellectual of the students; and that this sad result is due in a great measure to the teaching and examinations. In the first report for the session 1871, pp. 67, 69, and 70, in the evidence of the Rev. Professor Liddon, D.D., Canon of St. Paul's, London, and Professor of Exegesis in the University of Oxford, we find the following passages:

"*Quest. 695, Chairman.*—Very strong evidence has been given to us upon the influence of the Final School" (the examination for degrees with honors) "upon Oxford thought, as tending to produce at least momentary disbelief?"

"*Witness.*—I have no doubt whatever it is one of the main causes of our present embarrassments.

"696.—That, I suppose, is a comparatively new phenomenon?"

"Yes; it dates from the last great modification in the system pursued in the Honors Schools of *litera humaniores*. It is mainly the one-sided study, as I should venture to call it, of modern philosophical writers.

"697.—Is there any special defect in the management which produces this state of things, or is it essential to the nature of the school?"

"I fear it is to a great extent essential to the nature of the school as its subjects are at present distributed."

Again, in answer to Question 706, the same witness says:

"I ought to have stated to the noble chairman just now, that cases have come within my own experience of men who have come up from school as Christians, and have been earnest Christians up to the time of beginning to read philosophy for the Final School, but who, during the year and a half or two years employed

in this study, have surrendered first their Christianity, and next their belief in God, and have left the University not believing in a Supreme Being."

*Results which would follow in Ireland from the general spread of such principles.*

Surely it is time for the Catholics of Ireland to cry out to our rulers: "*And now, O ye Kings, understand; receive instruction, you that judge the earth*" (Ps. ii. 10). Do not force upon our Catholic nation an educational system which produces such results; do not train our children without religion, to infidelity, and consequently to revolution; do not teach the youth of Ireland to reject God and his Church; they will not be long faithful to you, if you make them unfaithful to the faith of their fathers—which may God in his infinite mercy forbid!

Such is the abyss which yawns beneath the feet of our country, and into which the advocates of *education without religion*, perhaps some of them unconsciously, seek to precipitate us by forcing upon this Catholic nation un-Catholic systems. We say, *by forcing upon our Catholic people*, for it must not be forgotten that influential and rich Associations or Education Leagues, backed up by a handful of Presbyterians and other Dissenters, who, in three of our four provinces, do not number even *one per cent.* of the population, are banded together at this moment for the purpose of hindering you, Catholic fathers and mothers, from educating your children in accordance with your conscientious convictions and the principles of your holy religion.

*Irish Catholics will not have Protestant, Mixed, or State Education.*

In the presence of these dangers, we are constrained to urge you, dearly beloved brethren, to join your Bishops and clergy in demanding from our rulers, with all the power given us by the Constitution under which we live, a system of truly Catholic education. We will have no Protestant education for Catholic children. The failure of the attempts to draw the Catholic youth of Ireland into Protestant schools during the last 300 years is a pledge and a proof that we will not allow the children of the Faith to be taught in Protestant schools. We will have no mixed education: the failure of the Model Schools and of the Queen's Colleges, where the mixed system is practically carried out, to attract Catholics in any considerable numbers, ought ere now to have convinced our rulers of this our firm resolve. Nor can we surrender to the state the education of our children; the warning of our great fellow-countryman, Burke, has not been thrown away upon us:

"If you consent to put your clerical education, or any other part of your education, under their direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. There will be an end not only of the Catholic religion, but of all religion, all morality, all law, all order in that unhappy kingdom." (Burke to Rev. Dr. Hussey, 17th March, 1795.)

Again, Mr. Stuart Mill says:

"It is not endurable that a government should either in law or in fact have a complete control over the education of the

people. To possess such a control, and actually to retain it, is to be despotic. A government which can mould the opinions and sentiments of the people from their youth upwards, can do with them whatever it pleases."

But we will have Catholic education in all its branches, primary, intermediate, and university; that is to say: We demand for you, and you, as Catholic parents, demand for yourselves, the legal right and, as far as it is afforded to others, aid from the state, to discharge your duty of educating your children in accordance with the dictates of your conscience, and the teaching of the Catholic Church, of which you are members.

### *Demands of Irish Catholics.*

As to primary education, therefore, we demand:

1st. For all schools which are exclusively Catholic, the removal of all restrictions upon religious instruction, so that the fulness of distinctive religious teaching may enter into the course of daily secular education, with full liberty for the use of Catholic books and religious emblems, and for the performance of religious exercises, and that the right be recognized of the lawful pastors of the children in such schools to have access to them, to regulate the whole business of religious instruction in them, and to remove objectionable books, if any. In such schools the teachers, the books, and the inspectors should all be Catholic.

2dly. That the public money should never be used in the work of proselytism.

3dly. That in Mixed Schools, where the children of any religion would be so few as not to be entitled to a grant for a separate school, stringent conscience clauses should be enforced, so as to guard as far as possible against even the suspicion of proselytism.

4thly. That the existing Model Schools should be abolished.

5thly. That Catholic Training Schools, male and female, should be established, in which teachers would be educated, morally and religiously, as well as intellectually, and in accordance with Irish traditions and feelings, for the holy office of teaching the Catholic children of Ireland. The reasonableness of this demand is manifest from the fact, that of the entire number of teachers in Ireland—about 9,000—there are in schools connected with the National Board about 5,700 untrained.

As to Intermediate Education, we demand, that the large public endowments now monopolized by schools in which you and we have no confidence, and many of which are directly hostile to the Catholic religion, should be taken up by a Commission in which the Catholics of Ireland would have full confidence: that the Commission thus appointed should be merely for financial purposes, and should hold the endowments in question for the benefit of the whole nation, of all the Intermediate Schools in Ireland without religious distinction, and for the general advancement of middle-class Education: that the national fund thus held should be devoted to the encouragement of Intermediate Education by means of Exhibitions open to the competition of all youths under a certain age, and to payment by results to every Institution established for middle-class education, the examinations being conducted in such a manner as

to preclude the possibility of partiality or of interference with the religious principles of any competitor or of any school.

“As regards higher education” [we repeat the words of the resolutions adopted by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland in August, 1869], “since the Protestants of this country have had a Protestant University with rich endowments for 300 years, and have it still, the Catholic people of Ireland clearly have a right to a Catholic University.

“But should her Majesty’s Government be unwilling to increase the number of Universities in this country, religious equality cannot be realized unless the Degrees, Endowments, and other privileges enjoyed by our fellow-subjects of a different religion, be placed within the reach of Catholics in terms of perfect equality. The injustice of denying to us a participation in those advantages, except at the cost of principle and conscience, is aggravated by the consideration, that, whilst we contribute our share to the public funds for the support of Educational Institutions from which conscience warns us away, we have, moreover, to tax ourselves for the education of our children in our own Colleges and University.

“Should it please her Majesty’s Government, therefore, to remove the many grievances to which Catholics are subjected by existing University arrangements, and to establish one National University in this kingdom for examining candidates and conferring Degrees, the Catholic people of Ireland are entitled in justice to demand that in such university, or annexed to it,

“(a) They shall have one or more Colleges, conducted upon purely Catholic principles, and at the same time fully participating in the privileges enjoyed by other Colleges of whatsoever denomination or character—

“(b) That the University honors and emoluments be accessible to Catholics equally with their Protestant fellow-subjects—

“(c) That the Examinations and all other details of University arrangement be free from every influence hostile to the religious sentiments of Catholics, and that with this view the Catholic element be adequately represented upon the Senate, or other supreme University body, by persons enjoying the confidence of the Catholic Bishops, priests, and people of Ireland.”

All this can, we believe, be attained by modifying the constitution of the University of Dublin, so as to admit the establishment of a second college within it, in every respect equal to Trinity College, and conducted on purely Catholic principles, in which your Bishops shall have full control in all things regarding faith and morals, securing thereby the spiritual interests of your children, placing at the same time Catholics on a footing of perfect equality with Protestants, as to degrees, emoluments, and all other advantages.

In conclusion, we direct the clergy of our respective dioceses to read this address, or a portion of it, to their flocks on two successive Sundays in the month of November next. We further request, dearly beloved brethren, that on one of those two Sundays you will hold, when practicable, a parochial meeting in each parish; or, at least, that you will sign a declaration embodying your views on this momentous subject; and that you will, on or before the 1st of December next, forward to the Prime Minister the declaration with your signatures, and the resolutions of your public meeting.

We further direct that on each of the two Sundays above mentioned, after the principal Mass in every church and chapel of our respective dioceses, the Litany of the Blessed Virgin shall be recited, and the Pater, Ave, and Gloria Patri repeated three times, in order to beg of Almighty God through the intercession of His Immaculate Mother, of St. Joseph, the Protector of the Church, and of our Holy Apostle St. Patrick, that His Divine Majesty would preserve our Holy Faith in Ireland from every danger, and would grant our rulers wisdom, so that they may establish in this country a truly Catholic system of Education.

The Grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.

- ✦ PAUL CARDINAL CULLEN, Archbishop of Dublin.
- ✦ DANIEL McGETTIGAN, Archbishop of Armagh.
- ✦ JOHN, Archbishop of Tuam.
- ✦ PATRICK LEAHY, Archbishop of Cashel and Emlly.
- ✦ THOMAS FEENY, Bishop of Killala.
- ✦ EDWARD WALSH, Bishop of Ossory.
- ✦ WILLIAM KEANE, Bishop of Cloyne.
- ✦ FRANCIS KELLY, Bishop of Derry.
- ✦ DAVID MORIARTY, Bishop of Kerry.
- ✦ PATRICK DURCAN, Bishop of Achonry.
- ✦ DOMINIC O'BRIEN, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore.
- ✦ J. P. LEAHY, Bishop of Dromore.
- ✦ LAURENCE GILLOOLY, Bishop of Elphin.
- ✦ JAMES WALSHE, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.
- ✦ JOHN MACEVILLY, Bishop of Galway, etc.
- ✦ THOMAS FURLONG, Bishop of Ferns.
- ✦ PATRICK DORRIAN, Bishop of Down and Connor.
- ✦ MICHAEL O'HEA, Bishop of Ross.
- ✦ NICHOLAS CONATY, Bishop of Kilmore.
- ✦ GEORGE BUTLER, Bishop of Limerick.
- ✦ THOMAS NULTY, Bishop of Meath.
- ✦ JAMES DONNELLY, Bishop of Clogher.
- ✦ JAMES LYNCH, Coadjutor Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.
- ✦ GEORGE CONROY, Bishop of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise
- ✦ JAMES McDEVITT, Bishop of Raphoe.

Dublin, 20th October, 1871.



## PROGRESS IN RELIGION.

---

THE present age is one of progress in many ways. Especially is it so in matters of natural science. Every year something is found out which we did not know before. Many questions are being discussed which were never touched till lately; and they are not only being discussed, but, what is better, they are being *decided*. Science is making progress; and the present age requires that religion shall make progress too.

There is quite enough *discussion* in the matter of religion. The religious mind of the present age is active enough, but its activity does not seem to lead to any result. It is like the activity of a locomotive on a frosty morning. A great deal of steam is let off, and the wheels turn round furiously; but they slip on the track, and the train does not get ahead. There is plenty of discussion about religion, but no *decision*; there is plenty of exertion, but no progress is made. So, at least, it would seem.

The state of things reminds one of the fate of an unfortunate gentleman who is mentioned in the ancient mythology. He is said to have been condemned in the lower regions to roll a huge stone to the top of a hill; this by great exertion he could indeed manage to do; but when with great difficulty he had got it to the top, it always escaped from his grasp, and rolled to the bottom again. Then his work began anew.

So people are always beginning anew in this matter, which is the most important of all to finish. One view comes up and then another; one "*ism*" is popular yesterday, another to-day; one here, and another there. They all come up, but no one *stays* up, and most of them have been up at least once before. The "new" ideas which people are continually ventilating, have been discussed, had their day, and been dropped, perhaps fifteen hundred years ago.

It must be confessed that the prospect is not very encouraging. There seems to be no more chance of coming to any conclusion in the future than there has been in the past. Discussion is of little use for its own sake; and the question naturally occurs, whether further discussion of this

sort is in any way worth while. Some people are of the opinion that it is not. Would it not be better to talk about subjects where talking leads to some result; to employ our time and labor where they will not be thrown away?

But how is it that in other things there is so much more success? In matters of science, discussion leads to decision. In that department, it does not take long to find whether a new view agrees with the facts. If it does not, it is abandoned, and we hear no more of it. There are no "*isms*" in science. Scientific discussion removes doubt; religious discussion seems only to increase it.

There may be several reasons for this, but one at least is tolerably plain. Science and religion both are concerned with facts; but in one case the facts can be examined with the senses, and in the other they cannot. The man of science brings out his telescope and microscope, or perhaps his pickaxe and shovel, and goes to work on his materials. But there is no telescope or pickaxe which we can bring to bear on things which merely concern the soul.

Some facts of religion *can* be got at, it is true, by our natural powers alone, if these powers are not blinded by prejudice or sin. By the light of nature we may be convinced that there is a God. But many questions in which we are all interested cannot be answered in this way. We cannot find out by reasoning what becomes of the soul when the body dies. If these questions are ever to be answered, it must be by some one who has other means of information than those which are accessible to all. It is of no more use to speculate about them than about what is on the other side of the moon.

Unless these questions have been answered by such a person, who has, as we may say, *been there*, and whose word is to be believed, the only thing is to wait till such a person appears. But that he has already appeared, Christians generally admit. So, according to this opinion, still quite common in the civilized world, the progress which religion needs to make is not precisely like that of science. It is not to consist in finding out what has never been found out before, but in determining just what it is that has once been certainly revealed. But this, *in point of fact*, seems to be just as much beyond the unaided powers of man as the discovery of new truth would be. We have to consider the case *as it is*, not *as it might have been*.

It is quite true that a complete record of the Christian revelation might have been left in writing, so far as we can

**judge** Some people say that such a record has been left in the Bible of King James; though precisely what reason there is for selecting the particular books contained within its covers, no more and no less, it certainly is not easy to see. But even if the Christian faith is in this book, it is plain, at least from experience, that it *cannot be got out* by human talents. If it could have been, there would not be such disagreement as to what the Bible really does teach, and this too among men of real learning and ability. To talk about its teaching being clear, is to undervalue the intellect of the Protestant world.

If, then, we are really to make progress in the matter of religion, and come to any decision as to what has been revealed, we are as much in need of an interpreter of the revelation as ever. We must, at least, have some one to interpret the Bible; and Protestants have really been obliged, in spite of their professions, to take this office on themselves. But if one is empowered to interpret the Bible, why not also to interpret the faith directly? No one can explain the Bible when its sense is doubtful, except by knowing what the faith really is.

If there is any one now in the world thus authorized to explain the Bible and the faith, we can make just the progress that we want. In what will this progress consist? First, as has been implied, in bringing out in a clear light those points of faith which are doubted or denied; but, secondly (and this is hardly less gratifying, though not so important), in drawing the conclusions which naturally follow from them; that is, in constructing a perfect, scientific, and complete theological system.

*Has this sort of progress ever been realized?* Certainly there is something here among us which looks very much like it. There is an actual religion which makes progress in just this way. It began at the beginning of Christianity; and it has always claimed the power to reproduce the original revelation whenever doubts or disputes should make it necessary so to do. It does not claim this power for every individual Christian, but only for certain ones to whom the divine commission has been given; and such a limitation seems to be reasonable, for this power must needs be one above nature, and we cannot expect that miracles should be multiplied more than the occasion demands. This religion claims that its visible head is infallible in matters of faith; and this seems to be as modest a claim as, under the circumstances, can be made. For *some one*

*must be so*, since the Bible is not sufficient to help us through; and it is not so improbable that one man should be infallible as that a million should. But this infallibility has not been used without necessity nor without first resorting to argument; supernatural assistance has not been expected to be given except by human and natural means.

Discussion among Catholics does lead to decision, whatever the cause may be. It dispels doubt, instead of increasing it, as it does among Protestants. By means of discussion, the creed of the Catholic Church has been placed, point by point, beyond the reach of attack; the assaults made upon it have only increased its strength.

Religion among Catholics has also made progress *by way of drawing conclusions*. Catholic theologians, having definite and fixed first principles, have been able to pass to what is beyond. Theology, among Catholics, has had time to grow into a science; among Protestants it cannot rise to any height before its foundations are withdrawn.

On which side the truth is, we need not dispute just now. But this much is certain, that the Catholic religion is a success, and the Protestant a failure. The one is practical and progressive; the other just the reverse. The faith of Catholics continually becomes more and more distinct; that of Protestants less so. This does not absolutely prove that one is right and the other wrong; but still, is not the failure of Protestantism some sign that the religion against which it rebelled is true? People can agree in the truth; but never for a long time in error.

Suppose you have a sum to add up, and you take the notion that even a single figure of the true answer is wrong, will you ever agree with others, or even satisfy yourself with the results you get? You will never be satisfied with anything but the truth. You will keep rubbing out your work and going over it again, and wondering what under the sun can be the matter.

Protestants certainly have a prejudice that some of the figures in the Catholic answer are wrong. And is not this also one reason that they do not make any progress? Perhaps you entertain this prejudice yourself. If so, try to get rid of it, and perhaps you will find that the old faith is right after all.

## HOW TO GET MARRIED.

---

THIS is a very interesting question, and one which most people think about a good deal. But it is not one question only. There are several things to be considered about it. Let us take them one by one.

In a certain old-fashioned receipt-book, you will find the question treated "How to Cook a Hare," and the instructions naturally begin with the warning, "First, catch your hare." That is the first thing to be done in this case, also; but you must be a little particular as to the kind of hare you catch. Make sure that it is a good one. But why be so very careful? For the following excellent reason—

### THIS IS AN EXTREMELY IMPORTANT MATTER,

and a serious one, though you may be accustomed to treat it lightly. It is one which concerns your happiness for perhaps the whole of your life; *for it is not as if you could get a divorce*, as the world vainly imagines; your marriage, once validly contracted, can only be broken by death. And not only does it concern your happiness in this life, but also in that which is to come. Moreover, marriage among Christians is a *sacrament*, and therefore a sacred as well as an honorable thing.

### THE FIRST CONSIDERATION OF ALL

is, of course, about religion; *do not, then, marry any one not of your own faith*. The Church abhors such marriages, and gives dispensations for them very unwillingly. The danger to your own soul is great, especially as things are with us now. That Protestants here are, generally speaking, richer and in a better social position, while it is an inducement to you, will also be a temptation against your

faith. Do not, then, marry a Protestant, unless there is a good chance of converting him or her; and, even if there is such a chance, remember the peril to yourself, and that your own soul is what you have to take care of before that of any one else.

## BUT IF YOU WILL INSIST ON MARRYING

without the blessing of the Church, bear in mind what the Church absolutely requires in such a case. First, that it be done before the priest; *if you are married by a Protestant minister, you commit a most grievous sin, and are excommunicated by the very act.* Also, that you obtain from the other party a most distinct and solemn promise that the children, *boys and girls*, shall *all* be brought up Catholics; and that your own practice of your religion, as well as theirs, shall meet with *no hindrance whatever.* If these two points are not secured, the marriage cannot be allowed. And do not wait to settle them till you come to see the priest; be sure they are right in the first place. But instead of taking all this trouble, and running into all this danger, it is ever so much better to

## MAKE UP YOUR MIND TO MARRY A CATHOLIC,

and *a good Catholic at that.* Take no one merely on account of good looks, or for the sake of money merely. Be sure that he or she has qualities that will make you happy as long as you live. Look out for one who is honest and industrious; who is not extravagant, and a burden instead of a help; who goes regularly to Mass and to the Sacraments; who is free from bad habits, and especially from the disgraceful vice of drunkenness. Above all, take care about this last point; do not make a hell for yourself upon earth.

## SO MUCH FOR WHO IT SHALL BE ;

common-sense ought to tell you this, and more. Now, let us see how to cook your hare after it has been caught.

Your intended is a good practical Catholic, then, that is understood. So you will just go to the priest in the parish of one of you, and give in your names without any fuss, to be called out in the church. Without a reason, and a good one too, you have no right to be dispensed from this. *It is not a matter merely of choice ;* nor is it in the power of the priest ; it is a law of the Church, which cannot be put aside at pleasure. Do not, then, make the ridiculous objection that "you had rather not," as if that made any difference ; you might as well say that you had rather not abstain from meat on Fridays. And do not urge that "people will talk" ; such a foolish excuse is not sufficient. If there is no real reason against it,

## THE BANNIS MUST BE CALLED,

and you ought not to be ashamed if they are, but rather if they are not. And as for talking, there is really a great deal more reason for people to talk if they are not called than if they are. The banns are appointed by the Church that people may know of your marriage, and that, if there is any real objection, it may come out before it can make any trouble. If you try to avoid their publication, it looks as if there were some such objection. There is no disgrace in being married, and it is very silly to act as if there were.

## YOU SHOULD ALSO GO TO CONFES- SION

shortly before you are married ; the very day before, if you can. *It is a sacrament which you are going to receive,* and if you receive it in mortal sin, you are guilty of a horrible sacrilege. And even this is not all ; you also will not get the

*special grace or assistance* in your new state of life which this sacrament is meant to give, an assistance which makes its burdens light and its duties easy. Perhaps you will never get this grace in its fulness; certainly not till you repent. Go to confession, then, even if you have confessed not long ago; in such a matter, it is well to be on the safe side.

Then, lastly, if possible,

### TRY TO HAVE A NUPTIAL MASS.

This is the spirit and intention of the Catholic Church, with which every one should try to comply. And, besides complying with this spirit of the Church, you will really satisfy yourselves much better by so doing; you will never be sorry that you did as much as that for the honor of the sacrament, for your own credit, and to set a good example to others.

Well, then, in short,

### HOW ARE YOU GOING TO GET MARRIED?

First, I am not going to marry a Protestant, or a person of no religion at all, but a Catholic. Second, I mean to be sure that I marry a *good* Catholic, one who practises all the duties of religion and morality, who sets a good example to others, and who is fit to make me happy for life. Third, I am going to have the banns published the full number of *three times*. Fourth, I am going to confession. Lastly, I will have a Mass if I can. Do this, and you will please God, gain His grace, and do a great deal to secure your happiness in this world and in the next.



## HOW TO DIE.

---

ANYBODY can die. That is true; and more than that, everybody *must* die; and that is just the reason why everybody ought to know *how* to die. Besides, one can die only once; so that in this matter one cannot learn by experience.

The first thing in order to *die* well is to *live* well. Not to live well as the world understands it: to have plenty of money, plenty to eat and drink, plenty to wear, a fine house, fine clothes: no, by no means; these things may not prevent a good death, but they will not do anything to secure it. To live well is to live in the grace of God: to avoid sin and to keep the commandments. Heretics pretend that this is not possible, but we know that it is. By the help of God, one may easily live without grievous sin.

One who really tries to live well will be likely to die well. But after all, one must not be too sure. So do not let death find you unprepared. If, in the providence of God, you are to die suddenly, your only real preparation will be the life you have led. Still, if this life be good—that is, if you are really trying to avoid sin—you can, without a mockery, prepare yourself for death every morning and every night, remembering that each time may be the last. And how will you prepare yourself? By examining your conscience; by making the very best acts of faith, hope, and charity that you can, from the bottom of your heart; by making also a fervent act of contrition with a real earnest purpose of amendment; and finally, by resigning yourself to the holy will of God, and asking the prayers of His Blessed Mother and the saints. “Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and *at the hour of*”

*death.* Amen." Do this especially when about to be exposed to any danger (as in travelling) of dying suddenly.

But most likely you will die by sickness. Remember, men, whenever you are taken ill, that this illness may be your last. Do not reckon with certainty on getting well. Send for a good physician, one who is also a good Catholic, if such can be had; for he will feel it his duty to let you know what your real condition is. If, then, there is any danger at all, now is the time, *before you get worse*, to do two things. The first is, to arrange your worldly affairs, and make your will, if you have one to make. This might perhaps have been done better before, but at any rate it should be done now, while your mind is still clear.

The second and most important thing is, to examine your conscience. Do this well and carefully, but do not waste time over it; do not delay your confession on the false pretence that you want more time to prepare.

You will, then, send for the priest before your illness has gone too far for you to make a *real good confession*, such as you would like to make in the church. And let your contrition and purpose of amendment be as strong and perfect as possible; for this may perhaps be the last time.

One greater than the priest is now coming to visit you. You are going to receive communion. But how will you ever prepare to receive Almighty God? He is coming to your house; He will enter your chamber; more than that, He will enter into your heart, to unite Himself to you. You have received Him in this way before, often perhaps, at the altar; but there one part of the preparation at least was made in some sort of a suitable way. There was a lighted altar, a beautiful sanctuary, and everything else of this kind, provided by the church. But the priest cannot bring the church with him.

See, then, that your friends put your house or room in order, before our Lord comes into it. Have a table near your bed, with a clean cloth, a candle in a candlestick or something else which will serve to hold it, some holy water,

and a tumbler of common water with a spoon ; also it will be very well to have a crucifix, that your table may look something like an altar. Of course, the rest of the room or rooms should be in as good condition as possible. Think of how you would feel if our Holy Father the Pope should condescend to visit you ; how ashamed you would be to have things in confusion. But the Pope, great as is his dignity, is nothing compared with the Visitor who is coming now. You need not, probably you cannot, kneel to receive Him ; but all the rest who are present *should kneel* when the priest comes in, if they know he has the Blessed Sacrament, and not get up till you have received it, unless to help to get things ready. They should also not be talking to the priest or to each other at this time without need.

Now, even if you have strong hopes of recovery, make this communion as if it were your last ; with a perfect submission to whatever may be the will of God. And after it, spend as much time as you can in thanksgiving, and in asking for the graces of which you are now specially in need.

You still hope to recover ; and do you know what is the best thing to help you to do so ? There is a Sacrament which is ready for you, and intended for this very purpose. When your illness becomes serious, *you should be anointed*. Do not wait till it would be a real miracle for you to get well. What does St. James say, speaking of Extreme Unction ? “ *The prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up.* ” All priests, and many other people also, know how often these words come true. Of course anointing will not always save your life ; you must die at some time ; but do not foolishly fancy, as some do, that your being anointed is a sign that you are going to die. At any rate, whether you die or not, there is something else it will do for you. What more does St. James say ? “ *If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.* ” Not those sins which you ought to confess, but the remains of your sins, which make you sometimes uneasy, and feel as if you had not made

a good confession, though in point of fact you have. It will also give you strength to resist temptations, and to overcome the enemies of your soul, who may attack you in your last moments, should it be the will of God to take you out of the world.

When you receive this sacrament, you want to prepare yourself as for the others. Have the table, the cloth, the candle, and the holy water as for communion. No matter about the tumbler and spoon, or about any one kneeling down, until the priest directs it. And beside these preparations, you will prepare your soul to receive the grace of God as fully as possible. Make acts of contrition especially for the sins committed by your five senses which will be anointed, and pray that the sacrament may have its full effect.

Is Extreme Unction the last grace you will receive? No, you may get absolution and communion again, perhaps several times; and when it seems probable that the time for your death has come, you can receive the last blessing and plenary indulgence. This may free you from a great deal of purgatory, perhaps from the whole of it; but to obtain this indulgence, you must have *contrition, the love of God, and a willingness to die*, accepting death as a just penalty for the sins you have committed.

I cannot tell you much about what comes after this. But if you have the same dispositions in your soul that you should have had all along, and the holy names of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in your heart, if not on your lips, you may have a firm and confident hope that God will be merciful to you, and will Himself help you in your last moments, and show you *how to die*.

## SALLY BRANCH.

---

SOMEWHERE about the year 1858 I passed a few weeks at the house of a clerical friend in the western part of Georgia. During my stay, my attention was attracted to two servants who lived in a cabin close adjoining my friend's house, an old mulatto and his wife. They had once been favorite household servants in the family of a planter named Branch, and their early life, they told me, had been happy enough. "But ah! how fortunes vary," both among rich and poor. Their master died, leaving his affairs so embarrassed that the estate was sold to pay the debts. Land, house, furniture, slaves, and all passed away under the auctioneer's hammer into strange hands. The children of Tom and Sally Branch, as these mulattoes called themselves, were all sold, and scattered in various directions, and they themselves in their old age bought up for a small sum by a negro-trader. It was a sort of forlorn speculation on his part, and they were left with my friend until called for, with permission to have their services free for the sole keeping. Tom was healthy enough for an old man, and could do any kind of simple work that did not call for much strength. Sally was a prime cook, as our daily fare demonstrated, and she officiated also most satisfactorily as housekeeper, waiter, and chambermaid.

As I talked very kindly and familiarly to this couple, they soon lost all shyness before me; and one day Sally led me into the following conversation:

"Massa Fader Robert, may I tell you my 'sperience?"

"Yes, Sally, I should like very much to hear it."

"Yer it is den, widout any circumbolution. Wen I was a gal—you know wat gals ar—well dat was jus' me. I was mighty peart an' proud an' dressy, an' I tought der wasn't much mo' in de world 'cept me, an' wat I had on my back. Dat wasn't de worst. Oh! I was a case. But de Lord was merciful, an' I had my spells of religion sometimes. Once a voice 'peared to follow me close behind, an' said: 'Give it up, Sally, give it all up.' But I couldn't do dat de fust call nohow; no, nor fo' a long time. But I allus went an' cwied instead. Because, you see, der was mo' devil in me dan in most gals, on account of my education. Fo' you see I was bwrought up in one of de fust families. Dey wasn't anyting in de country could go afo' us Branches, I tell you. Well, wat I was gwine to say is dis: It came on me onct all of a sudden, as if someting had been shook out of me, an' I said: 'I give it up, Lord;

I give it up.' And den all at onct I saw a gweat light. 'Peared as ef everyting shone all around me—'peared as ef noting was under me—'peared as if dey was no heft in me, as ef I was floatin' in someting, as ef I was de same as asleep, only I knowed wha' I was, an' didn't want noting to disturb me."

"Now, Fader Robert, you tink all dat nonsense?" said Sally suddenly, and looking at me with very searching eyes.

"No, indeed, Sally," I replied; "it seems to me very reasonable—I don't well see how it could be otherwise. When you made up your mind resolutely to give up all your foolish and wicked ways, and to begin in earnest to love God, and try to please him, it would be very strange if that should not make you feel happy, and make everything look brighter around you. It couldn't be otherwise."

"God A'mighty bless you, Fader Robert, for sayin' dat. I's been afeard to tell you. I kind a' tought you'd say it was Metodis' nonsense."

"Not I, Sally. I know better than that. Any Catholic would feel the same as you did under the same circumstances, only we don't express ourselves in the same way. But I understand what you mean very well."

"So you do, Massa Robert; I'm bound you do. An' I understand you too like a book. Ef I'd a nussed you my own self I couldn't know you no better."

This established a great confidence between us, and led to further developments.

One evening, after Sally had removed the tea things, old Tom came shyng into the room with the air of having an important message to deliver, without knowing precisely where to put his hand on it. He turned his hat over and over, as if he thought it might possibly have got in there. His embarrassment was soon turned into vexation when he saw his wife come in and take her stand by his side.

"'Spose you couldn't fin' someting better to do dan to come in yer," said he.

Sally was 'not to be routed in this way. "Wat's dat you said Fader Robert preached yesterday about de Catholic Church?"

"Wy, dis is wat it was," said Tom, driven to his trumps. "He said de Catholic Church was de fust one, an' would be de last one." On this the two raised their large, round eyes, and fixed them on me with an expression of wonder, both immense and intense.

"Is dat so?" inquired Sally.

"Yes, that is so," I replied. "The Catholic Church is the first one for the simple reason that it is the same church which Jesus Christ established, and the only one. All the others were started

long afterwards. When somebody became dissatisfied with the old church, he tried his hand at making a new one."

"Guy! Is dat so?"

"Yes, that is so. We have the history of all these churches. We know when they started, and how they started, and who first started them, But nobody can say when the Catholic Church was started, unless he goes away back to the beginning, and nobody can name the man that started it unless he names the name of Jesus Christ, who was the founder. That is the way to find out which is the old church."

"An' how ole, den, is de Catolic Church?"

"One thousand eight hundred and fifty-eight years old."

"Guy! An' how ole is de Presbyterian Church?"

"Only a little above three hundred years old."

"Guy! An' how ole is de Baptis' Church?"

"About the same."

"An' how ole is de Piskypalian Church?"

"About the same. Of all these different Protestant churches, the oldest is but a little more than three hundred years old."

"Guy! I wonda now. Tell me zackly, please, how ole is de Metodis' Church? Dat's mine."

"One hundred and twenty-nine years old. It started about the time your grandfather was a baby."

"Oh, guy! Dat keels me over. I's done for now."

"But, Tom, the Methodists perhaps will tell you that their church is all the better for being made late. In this way they get all the modern improvements."

"Dey ought to be ashamed of demselves den," said Sally. "As ef de Lord didn't know noffin wen he made de fus' one. Ole Tom," continued she mournfully, "you an' I's about played out. We's been barkin' up de wrong tree dis yere long wile."

"Not altogether, Sally," I said. "You meant right. God understands that very well. The honest prayers that you have sent up to him all these years have not been thrown away. And besides, you can join the old church now."

"Oh! Massa Fader Robert, wat chance is dey fo' us? Next ting you know we'll be sole away to some out o' de worl' plantation, an' no sign of a Catolic Church to go to; an' wha ar' we den?"

"You must do what is right, Sally, and leave the rest to God. He knows his own wherever they are, and can take care of them too."

"Sure enough. Bless de Lord. I spec' so too. Well, I guess you better book me an' dis yere man fo' de ole church, anyhow. Tom, speak up!"

"All right, Sally. Put me down fo' de same."

"I know'd you would. Dis ting is all settled now, Fader Robert ; an' I promise you dey'll be no backin' out."

They were both promptly instructed and received into the church. When at the profession of their faith they received each a lighted candle to hold, and it was explained to them to represent the light of the Catholic faith, which they were henceforth to profess openly, and to keep burning brightly in their hearts, old Sally raised hers high above her head like a beacon, and sobbed for joy.

Several years passed away before the duties of my profession led me down South again. One day, halting at a small inn near the northern boundary of Alabama, the landlord discovered, after some indirect and ingenious questioning, that I was a Catholic priest, a great wonder in that vicinity. "I think," said he, "there is one of your people in this neighborhood that would be glad to see you. She is near dying too. If you like, I will show you the way."

He conducted me to a wretched hut, where, stretched on a rude bed of straw, lay a poor mulatto woman, evidently near to her end. Her eyes were closed, but she was not sleeping. Her lips were moving now and then as if speaking, although we could not distinguish any intelligible sounds. In her right hand she held a candle, which she grasped firmly. "She will not let any one take it from her," said the landlord. "I don't know what it means; perhaps you do." "I think I do," I replied, "and, unless I am very much mistaken, I know the woman too." It was my old friend Sally Branch. Borrowing a match, I lighted the candle, and raised it straight in her hand. She opened her eyes slowly and reluctantly, like one called rudely away from better things. They brightened up as they caught the flame of the candle, and then, raising them to my face as I bent earnestly over her, she gazed at me with a look of enquiring wonder. Slowly, as the memories of the past came back and gathered into shape, her features relaxed until her whole visage became illuminated with joy, and she raised the candle high again.

"Fader Robert! Fader Robert! Yer it is. I's all right. I's stood by de ole faith. I's kep' de light burnin' all dis time. Ole Tom all right too. I see him off fust. Bless de Lord!"

I had barely time to administer the last rites of our holy religion when that simple, faithful soul departed to meet the Bridegroom with her lamp trimmed and burning.



## SOMETHING ABOUT INDULGENCES.



Something about indulgences. *Not everything.* I do not propose to show in this tract that indulgences are not a Popish corruption of Christian doctrine, a permission to commit sin, etc., etc. And why not? Why, for a very good reason; because it would be of little or no use to do this, for Catholics know better; and honest Protestants who desire to learn the truth on these points can find it elsewhere; and as for those Protestants who are not honest, their slanders may indeed be silenced for a while, but as soon as your back is turned they will be repeated, louder than before, to make up for lost time. The truth is not an object with these people, and nothing whatever is gained by explaining it to them. *They will lie just as long as they can do so with impunity.*

But there is one mistake which Protestants might easily be excused for making, even knowing what indulgences are. This mistake they actually do make. They think that we are extremely anxious to get all the indulgences which are to be had. Now, this idea of theirs, I am sorry to say, is not correct, though it ought to be. We really do neglect this precious treasure which the Church offers to us so freely. Let us try to remedy this; and to this end let us consider, first, *what indulgences do for us*; secondly, *how much we need them*; and, lastly, *how easily they are to be had.*

What, then, does an indulgence do for us? It remits, as the catechism tells us, "*the temporal punishment due to sin.*" This temporal punishment is that which remains after the sin is forgiven; and it usually has to be undergone for the most part *in the next life.* We can, it is true, expiate our sins, perhaps even entirely, by penitential works, or by the patient endurance of the sufferings which it may please Almighty God to send us. But it is not likely that we shall do enough penance or have enough to suffer; and an indulgence is the means provided to take, to some extent, the place of penance and suffering. Or, what comes to the same thing, it takes the place of *purgatory*, to which our want of penance would otherwise condemn us; and this is no small benefit. For the pains of purgatory are *more grievous than any pains of this life*; they are more severe than the torments which the martyrs endured. They are also *much longer*; they are not for a few hours only, but

often for years and years ; and, what is worse, each hour of them seems as long as many days of this life.

In the next place, then, as to our need of indulgences. Perhaps you who read this, think you will not go to purgatory ; or, if you are not so bold as that, you think you will not remain there a long time. You think that your friends will pray for you, that Masses will be said, and alms will be given, and that after a day or two your soul will go to heaven and be happy for ever. It is just possible that it may be so ; but still, if you neglect to gain indulgences, it is *extremely unlikely*. Christians in former times never acted on any such principle ; they knew that if they sinned they had to suffer for it, even if the sin were forgiven ; repentance, and that the most fervent repentance, was not enough for them, but they had also to perform penances, compared with which those now given are simply nothing at all.

For example, in former times, any one who should strike his father or mother had to fast seven years on bread and water, and even for speaking in church during Mass the same fast was prescribed for ten days. Other offences were also punished in a similar way. And these penalties were not more severe than those which Almighty God Himself has assigned for forgiven sin. His chosen servant, Moses, for a slight fault, the only one which we know him to have committed, was not allowed to enter the Promised Land. Let us count up *our* sins, then, and see how much penance *they have deserved*, and how much penance *we have done*.

Now, indulgences are meant by the Church to take the place of these great penances of early times. It would be better to perform a great penance if we could prudently do it, but it is no use talking about that ; if you are a saint, and performing heroic works of mortification, you will only be more anxious than before to get indulgences. No, *we shall all need indulgences*, and we cannot have too many. Practically, we shall find that we *cannot do without them*. Do penance, too, if you can, but supply its deficiency by indulgences at any rate.

It is plain enough, then, that we need indulgences ; and now it remains to consider how easily they are obtained.

And the principal reason, perhaps, why you do not try to obtain indulgences, is because you think it is so hard to do so. You do not know how liberal the Church has been in dispensing them. It is not necessary to wait for a Jubilee, or for the Forty Hours, to gain a plenary indulgence. *Twenty or thirty can easily be gained every month*, by any one who complies with the very simple conditions. This we shall see further on.

But first about partial indulgences. These are yet more easy to

get. *Hundreds of them can easily be obtained every day.* There are very many prayers to which partial indulgences are attached, which can easily be committed to memory, and repeated over and over again. Now, notice one point. There are many people who say such short prayers habitually, and yet do not gain any indulgence, because they do not say the *precise* words to which it has been attached. For one has to be a little particular in this matter; but this is no great burden. It does not take long to learn a prayer of five or six words, and there are many such to which indulgences are attached.

Then as to those which are plenary. These are generally gained by repeating the prayers which have partial indulgences, *at least once a day for a month*; then by means of confession and communion, and a visit to some church, with prayer for the intentions of the Pope, the plenary one is obtained; these are the usual conditions; sometimes there is something more or less. But let us understand a little better what is meant by the two last. By visiting a church is meant simply going into the church and praying for some time; five minutes, or even much less, is quite enough if one prays with recollection and devotion. Five Paters and Aves are, it is true, often recommended; but this is only by way of suggesting how much prayer to make, in order to be safe. *And one good fervent Pater and Ave would be better than five poor ones.*

These prayers should be, as we said, for the intentions of the Pope. That is, for the prosperity and triumph of the Church, for peace among Christian nations, and for the downfall and destruction of heresy, schism, and sin. Also for any other special needs of the Holy Father at the time; such as for example, at present, the restoration of his dominions, which have been unjustly taken from him, as well as for those wants of the Church which you may happen not to know of. Do not forget, then, to make these intentions of the Pope the principal, if not the only, object for your prayers, in a visit made to gain a plenary indulgence.

But where shall we find all the indulgenced prayers which I say are so plenty? There are a good many in most prayer-books, but they are not always marked as such. The *Catholic's Vade Mecum* is very good in this respect. But best of all is one called the *Raccolta*, which can be had at any Catholic bookstore, and which has almost all the indulgenced prayers which there are, and also full particulars with regard to each.

Now, surely no one can complain that indulgences are hard to get, or urge any reason for not getting them. But stop a moment; yes, there is one thing which makes a little difficulty. One must, of course, to gain an indulgence, *be in the state of grace*. We may

say prayers from morning to night with mortal sin on our souls, and though these prayers may avail for our conversion, they will not have any special power in satisfying for this sin or any other. This is one reason why confession and communion are required for a plenary indulgence, besides the excellence of going to them, as a good work.

But is this such a great difficulty that we must be in the state of grace? Ought we not to be ashamed to make such a miserable objection as this? As if it was such an extraordinary and almost impossible thing to live in the grace of God. Why, any one can do it, at least by frequenting the sacraments; *by going to confession and communion once a month.*

Yes, and that reminds me of quite a practical point. Plenary indulgences are usually gained, as we said before, by repeating a prayer which has a partial indulgence every day for a month. Well, now, if you say several such prayers every day, *you can gain several plenary indulgences on the one communion.* Only you must make *just so many distinct visits* to the church. One visit will not do, no matter how many prayers you might say while making it. And more yet; if you go to confession once a week, you can gain *all the plenary indulgences during the week* for which communion is required, without any other confession; it being supposed, of course, that you have leave to receive several times in the week without confessing. In this way, as was said before, one may get *twenty or thirty plenary indulgences every month.*

But what will I do with so many? Well, perhaps you will not gain them perfectly, for of course it requires the most perfect dispositions to gain a plenary indulgence fully. But, at all events, cannot you give some of what you do get to somebody else? Almost all of them, plenary and partial, can be *applied to the souls in purgatory*; and how grateful these souls will be to you! Nothing, except the Mass, does them so much good as holy indulgences. Remember, too, that you have *plenty of deceased friends*, who are probably in need of them, and who have a special claim upon your charity. And even if you lose something yourself by this, it will be amply repaid; they will help you from heaven, in this world, and in purgatory if you go there, by their most efficacious prayers.

Get a *Raccolta*, then, or some other selection of indulgenced prayers, and go to work. And go to the sacraments often, *once a week if possible*, not only for their own sake, but also that you may *get all the indulgences you can.*

# HOW TO FIND THE TRUE RELIGION.



No one who mixes in the world can fail to notice a very remarkable fact—remarkable, at least, in a country which calls itself Christian. It is this: two-thirds of the men one meets have no fixed religious belief, and belong to no church. Approach them on the subject, and they at once exclaim :

“ Yes, of course it is

## THE DUTY OF MAN TO WORSHIP GOD ;

but in our day there are so many contradictory opinions concerning religious faith that one is bewildered and does not know what to believe. We have neither the knowledge nor the time to make a thorough study of the Bible, which, after all, would be to no purpose, for they who study it most agree least as to its meaning.

## WE THEREFORE CANNOT HAVE ANY RELIGION,

or belong to any church, nor can we recommend any to others.”

Now, let us ask these men to pause a moment, and inquire whether there is not a simple and certain way of discovering

## THE TRUE RELIGION.

The true religion is not, and cannot be, a thing of recent invention. The world can never have been without it. In the beginning, God gave to Adam a knowledge of His holy will, and taught him how he should worship his Creator. The religion of Adam came directly from God ; it was, then, beyond all doubt, the true religion. At this time

## THERE WAS NO BIBLE,

no written code of religious doctrine and law. How then, was religious faith preserved and perpetuated in its purity? *In a very simple way.* The father of the family was also clothed with religious authority, and the children learned the truths of faith by hearkening to the voice of *this living teacher.*

This was the method employed down to the time of the deluge. How were false religions introduced during this period? *By disobedience to the living authority* established by God.

After the deluge, Noah became the second father of the human race.

## HE HAD NO BIBLE,

no book of religion, but taught his children the faith handed down from Adam. His children in turn taught theirs the same truth. Again the children disobeyed the teachings of their fathers, and made religions of their own; so that idolatry became almost universal. Then God called Abraham, who still held to the religion of Adam and of Noah.

## ABRAHAM HAD NO BIBLE.

He taught Isaac, Isaac taught Jacob, and thus religion was preserved down to the time of Moses. On Mount Sinai, God gave to Moses the ten commandments written on tables of stone. *Was this written law the rule of faith?* No; God instituted the Sanhedrim, *a religious tribunal*, to which He gave power to decide all disputed questions of religion. We read in the seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy, and in the Protestant version (which we have used throughout this tract):

“ If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates: then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the Lord thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come to the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire; and *they*

*shall show thee the sentence of judgment* : and thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the Lord shall choose shall show thee."

Remember that this decision was one of religion, for the law was the law of God.

Again, our Lord himself says : " The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat ; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do."—St. Matt. xxiii. 2.

In the Mosaic religion, there was

## NO PRIVATE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE,

but a divinely constituted *tribunal* determined religious truth.

From Adam down to the birth of Christ, therefore, we find but one method of coming to the knowledge of the true religion ; and this method was to *listen to the voice* of those whom God had appointed to teach it.

In all the ages preceding Christ, *there was no private interpretation*. Now, how did Christ establish His religion, and how did He determine that it should be propagated amongst men ?

## HE HIMSELF WROTE NOTHING.

He taught, and he did not ask men to examine into his doctrines, but to believe in them. He chose apostles to be His representatives on earth, and to remain, in their successors, until the end of time. What command did he give to them ? Did he bid them

## WRITE A BOOK,

to be placed in the hands of all, that by reading it they might come to know the truths which he had taught ? No. He said to them : " All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth ; go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; teaching them

to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." And again he said to them : " He that heareth you heareth me ; and he that despiseth you despiseth me." He thus formed them into a living and indefectible church, of which he said : " If any man neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." This church he built upon a rock, with the promise that the gates of hell should never prevail against it, and that the Holy Ghost should

## TEACH IT ALL TRUTH.

Christ, then, *did not change the method* of religious instruction employed by God in the days of Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses ; but, giving to the world a fuller revelation of divine truth, he simply established a more perfect and unerring living authority to watch over and preserve it in all its integrity and purity. Therefore

## NOT THE DEAD LETTER OF THE BIBLE,

but the living voice of the divinely established church is the infallible guide to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.

Now, is not this a fair argument ? Do not accuse us of sophistry and perversion of truth. We have nothing to gain by persuading you to believe as we believe ; but you have everything to gain, if you weigh well our argument, and, if you refuse to consider what we say, perhaps everything to lose. For you cannot say the whole matter is doubtful, as long as you refuse to consider a simple statement like this ; if you are thus wilfully careless,

## YOUR BLOOD WILL BE ON YOUR OWN HEAD.



# AN APPEAL

FOR

## CHRISTIAN EDUCATION.

---

### WHERE ARE WE DRIFTING?

WE are told, on good authority, that a vast majority of the American people attend no religious service, belong to no church, and make no profession of any religion.

### HOW IS THIS?

Are the American people irreligious or sceptical? By no means. Perhaps none are more disposed to be in earnest in religion, or more susceptible of religious impressions.

### WHAT, THEN, HAS BROUGHT ABOUT THIS STATE OF INDIFFERENCE IN RELIGIOUS MATTERS?

Holy Writ declares that if you "train up a child in the way he should go, when he is old he will not depart from it." Our fault has been here. We have not trained up our children in the knowledge of Christian truth and under the influence of the Christian spirit.

### HOW HAVE OUR CHILDREN BEEN TRAINED?

For the greater part, in our Public Schools, the foundation principle of which is the exclusion of all positive religious instruction. The sole aim is to give a secular education.

Is it, then, to be wondered at that our children, growing up under a system of secular education, become smart business men, absorbed in gaining worldly wealth and high posi-

tion, alive to all the concerns of this life, and dead to their future welfare? "As you sow, so shall you reap."

### BUT ARE NOT OUR CHILDREN INSTRUCTED IN RELIGION AT THEIR HOMES?

The greater part of our children are not. The reason is plain. They belong to the hard-working and poorer classes of society.

### WHO CAN TEACH THESE CHILDREN AT THEIR HOMES?

Not their fathers, after they return home weary from toil at the close of the day. They need and seek repose. Not their mothers, who are busy the whole day with household duties and trying to make the two ends meet. Moreover, many parents who may have the time and inclination to give religious instruction to their children are not themselves instructed. A wise man opens his eyes and looks at things as they are.

### BUT THERE ARE THE SUNDAY-SCHOOLS?

The Sunday-schools, so far as they go, are doing a good work. The difficulty is that a majority of the children of our general population, who are in the greatest need of religious instruction, do not go to these schools. Suppose they were all sent to Sunday-schools,

### WHAT THEN?

Why, at best these could not supply the instruction needed. Look at it a moment! You give the child in public schools from twenty to thirty hours a week instruction in secular knowledge, and once a week on a Sunday you give at most one or two hours' instruction in religion. Is it a wonder that Christianity, placed at such a disadvantage, is rapidly going to the wall?

### IS THIS JUSTICE TO OUR CHILDREN?

It does not take a wiseacre to see that the amount of

religious instruction which children receive at Sunday-school, compared with the secular instruction they receive in public schools, is but a drop in the bucket. "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light."

### IS THERE NO REMEDY FOR THIS?

First of all, we must look the evil squarely in the face. Our common-school system is well calculated to make secularists, sceptics, and infidels, but to expect our children to grow up to be Christians under such a training is as absurd as to pretend to gather figs from thistles, or grapes from thorns.

### WHAT IS THE REMEDY?

Believers in Christianity must not, under any plea whatever, let mistaken notions of education rob their children and future generations of what is dearer and more precious to them than the gaining of the whole world—the knowledge of Christian truth, and the conviction of its divine origin and character. Let them look to it that their own convictions of the truth of Christianity are transmitted to the minds and hearts of their children. If we expect to have Christian men and women, we must train up our children in the way of Christianity.

### HOW CAN THIS BE DONE?

Simply by maintaining the right of parents of teaching their children according to the dictates of their own religious convictions.

### BUT DOES NOT EVERYBODY ENJOY THIS RIGHT NOW?

Theoretically he does, practically he does not. *When Christians are taxed to support a system of education which from its very nature excludes all knowledge of distinctive Christianity, they are made to play into the hands of the*

*enemies of Christianity, whether they recognize it or not.* Our system of education, under the pretence of being unsectarian, is flooding our land with a sect of infidels.

**BUT HOW CAN RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE BE IMPARTED WITHOUT IMPLICATING THE STATE IN TEACHING IT?**

Simply enough. Let every school receive *pro rata* according to its numbers for teaching the secular knowledge which the State has a right to exact in order to form intelligent citizens. It is no concern of the State, provided the knowledge it requires be given, what religion may or may not be taught in the school.

**WOULD NOT SUCH A SYSTEM ACT UNFAVORABLY TO THE GENERAL EDUCATION OF OUR CHILDREN?**

On the contrary, it would promote education in a much greater degree and make it universal. In the first place, it would enlist religious zeal, the most powerful of motives, in the cause of education. In the second place, as no one would be taxed for an education which violated his conscience, education could then fairly be made compulsory; thus hundreds and thousands of illiterate children who now run in our streets would be found in our schools under instruction.

**THE RESULT.**

Such a system would receive the approval of all men of sincere religious convictions, whatever might be their creed; of the true friends of the education of all the children of the Republic; and of all who advocate religious equality and the liberty of each man to follow the dictates of his own conscience.

# PRACTICAL PIETY.



SOMETHING was said about indulgences in a recent tract. I shall try in the present one to give this matter a practical bearing. Some indulgenced prayers are so long that we cannot well remember them, and perhaps cannot easily find time to say them. But there are many which we cannot find any such excuse for neglecting. And as we often say short prayers nearly to the same effect, what a pity it is not to gain the indulgence, as well as the favor which we specially desire! I say *not* to gain the indulgence; for to gain an indulgence we must use *exactly* the form which the Church prescribes.

The following are taken from the *Raccolta*, the authorized Roman collection of indulgences. The *Raccolta* may be had at most Catholic bookstores. One may use them for one's self, or apply them to the souls in purgatory. And all of them have a plenary indulgence (unless otherwise stated) once a month, if they are said daily, on the usual conditions; that is, confession and communion, and a visit to some church, with prayers for the Pope's intentions. And if one goes to confession once a week, communions made during the week suffice to gain the plenary indulgences, without any additional confession.

1. "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Hosts, earth is full of thy glory. Glory be to the Father, glory be to the Son, glory be to the Holy Ghost." Indulgence of 100 days—once a day, and three times on Sunday.

2. Three times "Glory be to the Father," etc., at morning, the same at noon, and at night, in thanksgiving to the Most Holy Trinity for the graces and special privileges granted to most holy Mary in her glorious Assumption into heaven (100 days).

3. "Jesus, Joseph, Mary, I offer you my heart and my soul Jesus, Joseph, Mary, assist me in my last agony. Jesus, Joseph

Mary, may I breathe forth my soul with you in peace." 100 days for each. No plenary indulgence. (The name of St. Joseph is put before that of our Blessed Lady for the sake of versification, in the original Italian.)

4. "My sweetest Jesus, be not to me a Judge, but a Saviour." (50 days' indulgence. Plenary once a year, if said every day, on the feast of St. Jerome Emiliani, July 20, or during the octave.)

5. "Eternal Father! I offer thee the Precious Blood of Jesus, in satisfaction for my sins, and for the wants of Holy Church." (100 days. No plenary indulgence.)

6. The invocations of St. Ignatius of Loyola, which are called the "Anima Christi" from their opening words in Latin:

"Soul of Christ, sanctify me. Body of Christ, save me. Blood of Christ, inebriate me. Water out of the side of Christ, wash me. Passion of Christ, strengthen me. O good Jesus, hear me; hide me within thy wounds; suffer me not to be separated from thee; defend me from the malignant enemy; call me at the hour of my death, and bid me come unto thee, that with thy Saints I may praise thee for all eternity. Amen." (300 days.)

7. "Blessed and praised every moment be the most Holy and Divine Sacrament!" (100 days, once a day.)

8. One Our Father, Hail Mary, and Creed, with the ejaculation, "Sweet Heart of my Jesus, make me love thee ever more and more!" (Two plenary indulgences each month, if said every day, **one** on the first Friday or Sunday, the other on any other day. **No** partial indulgence except on the four Sundays immediately preceding the feast of the Sacred Heart.)

9. "My loving Jesus, in order to show the grateful love I bear thee, to make reparation for my unfaithfulness to grace, I (*here mention your name*) give thee my heart, and I consecrate myself wholly to thee; and with thy help I purpose never to sin again." (To be said before a picture or other representation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. 100 days, once a day.)

10. The Angelus, or Regina Cœli. Find out how to say it, and say it at the sound of the church-bell, if the bell is rung for that purpose. (100 days.)

11. The "Hail, Holy Queen," etc., every morning, adding the following versicles and responses: "Make me worthy to praise thee, O Holy Virgin. Give me strength against thine enemies.

Blessed be God in his saints. Amen." And the prayer: "We fly to thy patronage, O Holy Mother of God; despise not our petitions in our necessities, but deliver us always from all dangers, O ever glorious and blessed Virgin," at night, with the same versicles and responses. (100 days. Plenary, *twice* a month, and at the hour of death. They should be said specially in reparation for the injuries cast by heretics upon the honor due to the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and their images.)

12. "Sweet Heart of Mary, be my salvation." (300 days.)

13. The "Memorare" of St. Bernard. "Remember, O most gracious Virgin Mary, that never was it known that any one who fled to thy protection, implored thy help, and sought thy intercession, was left unaided. Inspired with this confidence, I fly unto thee, O Virgin of virgins, my Mother; to thee I come; before thee I stand, sinful and sorrowful. O Mother of the Word Incarnate, despise not my petitions; but in thy clemency hear and answer me. Amen." (300 days.)

14. One Hail Mary, then "My Queen! my Mother! I give thee all myself; and to show my devotion to thee, I consecrate to thee this day my eyes, ears, mouth, heart, myself wholly, and without reserve. Wherefore, O loving Mother, as I am thine own, keep me, defend me, as thy property, and thy own possession."

To be said morning and evening, to implore our Lady's aid against temptations, especially those regarding holy purity. 100 days. Also 40 days, but no plenary indulgence, for the following ejaculation in temptation:

"My Queen! my Mother! remember I am thine own. Keep me, defend me; as thy property, thy own possession."

15. Seven Hail Marys, with the verse after each, "Holy Mother, pierce me through, in my heart each wound renew, of my Saviour crucified." (300 days, once a day.)

16. Blessed be the Holy and Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. (100 days. No plenary indulgence.)

17. "Angel of God, my guardian dear, to whom his love commits me here. ever this day be at my side to light and guard, to rule and guide. Amen." (100 days.)

18. "O most merciful Jesus, Lover of souls: I pray thee by the agony of thy most Sacred Heart, and by the sorrows of thy

Immaculate Mother, cleanse in thine own Blood the sinners of the whole world who are now in their agony and are to die this day. Amen. Heart of Jesus, once in agony, pity the dying." (100 days. Should be said three different times a day, to gain the plenary indulgence.)

19. The acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity. No special form of words is required, if the motives of these virtues are sufficient y expressed. No partial indulgence, except as often as they are made at the hour of death. Plenary indulgence also at that time.

20. "My Jesus, mercy!" (100 days. No plenary indulgence.)

21. For two persons saluting each other with the following words: "Praised be Jesus Christ"; Answer, "Praised for evermore." (100 days. No plenary indulgence, except at the hour of death.)

22. A plenary indulgence to those who visit the Repository on Holy Thursday and Good Friday, and pray for the Pope's intentions; if they go to communion on Holy Thursday or in Easter week. Also 10 years and 10 quarantines to those who visit it with a firm resolution of confession.

It would not be right to conclude without giving the remarkable prayer to which a plenary indulgence is attached, every time it is said before any representation of Jesus crucified, after communion. Prayers must also be said, as usual, for the Pope's intentions.

23. "O good and sweetest Jesus, before thy face I humbly kneel, and with the greatest fervor of spirit I pray and beseech thee to vouchsafe to fix deep in my heart lively sentiments of faith, hope, and charity, true contrition for my sins, and a most firm purpose of amendment; whilst I contemplate with great sorrow and affection Thy five wounds, and ponder them over in my mind, having before my eyes the words which, long ago, David the prophet spoke in his own person concerning thee, my Jesus: 'They digged my hands and my feet; they numbered all my bones.'"

These are a few treasures from the storehouse of the Church. Is it not a pity they should be so little known, and so much neglected? Let us try and have a more *practical piety*.



## THE LAST OF THE POPE.

---

'THE Papacy has fallen. Victor Emanuel has entered Rome. The morning of civilization has dawned upon Italy. We have seen the last of the Pope.' "That sounds well," said our Presbyterian minister, as he finished the last page of his sermon, and rested his pen on the last full stop: 12 P.M. on Saturday night. "That sounds well," he kept repeating. "I'll bring that out to-morrow with a jerk that will make my congregation start from their seats!"

"What are you saying, Mr. Jones?" asked a sharp voice. Our minister looked up, and, to his utter astonishment, saw a black little head protruding from his inkstand, in the act of addressing him.

"Who are you?" asked Mr. Jones.

"Never mind who I am," answered the queer little face. "My business is to live in ink, to be pierced by sharp steel pens, and be spread out and dried on paper. I am very cross, Mr. Jones. Every fool that can write is poking away at me. I am becoming particular about the manner in which I am used; it seems to me that you have written a very stupid sentence."

"It seems to me," said Mr. Jones, "that you must be the devil himself."

"I am no such thing, Mr. Jones. The best proof of it is that I love the truth. How dare you say that you have seen the last of the Pope?"

MR. JONES—"Because Victor Emanuel has taken his city, and he will have to obey the Italian Government, or leave Rome for ever."

"For ever, Mr. Jones?"

MR. JONES—"Yes, for ever."

"This is just what stupid men like you have been always saying. Don't you know, Mr. Jones, that the Pope has been coming to an end, as you call it, for the last 1800 years. Listen, now, and I will tell you what a Catholic is writing at the present moment:

“ ‘If you can show me a single example in all history,’ Louis Philippe is reported to have said to a French statesman, who advised him to break with the Holy See, ‘of a prince who made war against the Pope, and had no reason to regret it, I will take your advice.’ ‘What is your opinion of the Roman Question?’ asked the Empress Eugénie, some years ago, of the prosperous old gentleman who is to-day the tolerated President of an impossible Republic, which to-morrow will have ceased to exist. ‘I confess,’ replied M. Thiers, ‘that I am not a good Catholic; but I am a Papist, because I have read history, and have learned there that all who have eaten of the Pope HAVE DIED OF IT.’ If Napoleon III. had made the same reflection on the downfall of his uncle, he would have derived more profit from that formidable lesson, and might still be sitting on a throne. But for such men the most solemn warnings have no meaning.

“ ‘The Popes suffer,’ says a living preacher, ‘and the Catholic faith prevails. The greater number of the Popes of the first three centuries were either martyrs or confessors. And though, after eighteen hundred years, the successor of St. Peter remained still on his apostolic throne, yet from the beginning until now he has been so frequently driven forth that such a fortune may be said to have become one of the characteristics of the Papacy.’ Here are a few examples out of many: ‘Cornelius was relegated to Cività Vecchia, Liberius to Thrace; John I. was imprisoned in Ravenna; Martin was first sent to prison by the emperor, and then banished to the Chersonese. And since the time that the Pope has become a temporal sovereign, Leo III. had to leave Rome; John VIII. was obliged to seek an asylum in France; John XII. was expelled by the first Otho; Benedict V. died in exile at Hamburg; Benedict VIII. was driven from Rome, and went to Germany. The Roman factions expelled from their city John XXI.; Benedict IX. was twice driven out, so likewise was Gregory VI.; Gregory VII. died in exile; Paschal II. was a prisoner in Sabinum; Gelasius II. an exile in Gaeta; Innocent II. had to flee from Rome as soon as he was elected; Alexander III. had to leave Rome four times. Gregory IX., Innocent IV., Urban IV., Boniface IX., Innocent VIII., were all obliged, through persecution, to leave Rome; John XXIII. was

## *The Last of the Pope.*

forced to quit by a hostile army; Eugenius IV. by the people; Clement IV. by a foreign power.' Yet the succession has never failed! Human lords disappear, and the world knows them no more; but the Pope abides for ever. When will the world understand that it will be so to the end?' "

"Now, let us hear what you have to say to prove that what has been before will not happen again?" As the little face repeated sentence after sentence, it seemed to swell, and at the last word exploded—bang!

Mr. Jones awoke to find the ink spilt all over the page, except the last sentence, which he must have written while asleep: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven" (St. Matt. xvi. 18, 19). Perhaps, dear reader, you think that Mr. Jones has become a Catholic. Not at all. Since then he has written a number of sermons about St. Peter. The following are his arguments:

1. If Abraham and St. Peter were both called by God, and each received a new name, this meant a great deal for Abraham, but nothing at all for St. Peter.

2. If Abraham was called the "father of the faithful," and St. Peter was called the "rock," it was because Abraham was really to be what he was called, while St. Peter might just as well have been called by any other title (St. Matt. xvi. 18).

3. If our Lord said, "Upon this rock I will build my church," this was no allusion whatever to the name which he had given St. Peter.

4. If he gave to St. Peter "the keys of the kingdom of heaven," this was *only an awkward way of saying something which, after all, does not mean anything.*

5. If "our Lord told St. Peter to pay the tax" for "ME and for THEE" (St. Matt. xvii. 26), he did not mean in any way to associate St. Peter with himself.

6. If St. Peter is always named before the other apostles, *in the inspired Word of God*, "first Simon, who is called Peter" (St. Matt. x. 2), this is only the result of *accident.*

7. If St. Paul "went up to Jerusalem to see Peter." (Gal. i 18), while he adds, "Other of the apostles I saw none," we must not suppose that there was any special reason why he should see St. Peter.

8. If the same apostle says of the risen Saviour that "He was seen *first* by *Cephas*, and after that by the eleven" (1 Cor. xv. 5), this was only because St. Peter happened to be on hand.

9. If the angel said to those who found him sitting in the Sepulchre, "Go tell his disciples *and Peter*" (St. Mark xvi. 7), this was another absurd way of distinguishing St. Peter from the rest.

10. If St. John relates that although he "outran Peter, and came first to the Sepulchre, yet he went not in" (St. John xx. 5, 6), but waited until St. Peter had gone in first, this was not because he held St. Peter in any special reverence.

11. If to Peter *alone* our Lord committed his flock, saying, with the most solemn ceremonies, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep," this simply proves that the flock of Christ is perfectly able to feed itself without St. Peter.

12. If St. Peter was the only one of whom our Lord said, "I have prayed for thee, Simon, that thy faith fail not, and thou, having been once converted, confirm thy brethren" (St. Luke xxii. 31, 32), this was only because the other apostles were much more faithful than St. Peter.

13. Finally, if the successor of St. Peter at Rome has maintained his place as head of the majority of Christians for 1800 years; if every sect that has separated from the Roman Church has split up and gone to nothing, this is not because it was said by our Lord that "the gates of hell" should not prevail against the church founded on St. Peter, but because the bishops of Rome have been very cunning and wicked men.

These were the sermons of Mr. Jones. Was he deceiving himself, or was he trying to deceive others? Were the people to whom he preached led astray by some unreasonable prejudice, or did they believe at all in the inspired Word of God? Judge for yourself, dear reader.

# BAPTISM.

---

## ITS NECESSITY.

BAPTISM is not only the first, but also the most necessary, of all the sacraments. No unbaptized person can enter heaven, unless by an extraordinary grace. Unless a man be born again of water, and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God (John iii. 5). Moreover, without the previous reception of baptism, one cannot receive any of the other sacraments; for this reason, baptism is sometimes called the gate of all the sacraments. None can be saved without receiving baptism, as we learn from Mark xvi. 16: He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be condemned.

## THE EFFECTS OF BAPTISM

are to wash the soul and to cleanse it from all sins; thus baptism not only takes away the stain of ori-

ginal sin, but also removes from the soul the effects of actual sin, and delivers it from all the punishment due to these sins. Baptism, moreover, imprints a spiritual character upon the soul, and gives to the recipient many precious graces to help him to attain the end of his creation.

#### THE MINISTER OF BAPTISM.

Bishops and priests are the ordinary ministers of baptism, and deacons also can administer solemn baptism, if they are authorized to do so by the bishop. In case of necessity, when an infant is in danger of death, or when any one is in danger of dying without baptism, any man or woman, even an infidel or a heretic, can confer baptism.

#### WHAT IS NECESSARY FOR BAPTISM.

With regard to a person who has attained the use of reason, he should have the intention of receiving baptism, faith, and sorrow for his sins.

For baptism are also required the proper matter and form, and the intention of the minister. The form consists in the words used by the minister during the pouring of the water upon the head of the person to be baptized. The words of the form are as follows: "I baptize thee in the name of the

Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Sponsors—that is, a godfather and godmother—are required in baptism. These sponsors contract a spiritual relationship with the person baptized and with the parents of such person, and cannot be married to any of these without dispensation.

#### BAPTISM SHOULD BE ADMINISTERED

in the church. To administer it in private houses, without an urgent necessity, is strictly forbidden. In case, however, that a child is baptized at home, it must be brought to church. should it survive, in order that the ceremonies of anointing with oil, etc., may be supplied.

#### THE CEREMONIES OF BAPTISM

are various ; for instance, blessed salt is placed upon the person's tongue, to remind them of the Christian wisdom by which they must guide themselves ; they are anointed with holy oil because they are buried with Christ, whose sacred body was anointed before burial ; a white veil is given to them, to symbolize the purity of soul which they acquire from the sacrament ; and, lastly, a lighted candle is given to them, to show that they must guide their footsteps by the light of faith.

You know now, dear reader, the necessity, the effects, and the manner of administering baptism. If you have not already been baptized, can you hesitate to receive this saving sacrament, which will incorporate you into the mystical body of Christ, the Holy Catholic Church, and which will entitle **you** to look forward to everlasting bliss?

#### THE OBLIGATION OF BAPTIZING DYING INFANTS.

The laity ought to know that they are bound, under pain of mortal sin, to baptize children under the age of reason, when they are in danger of death, if there is no minister of the church at hand to perform this office. It is understood, of course, that the parents do not prevent them from baptizing the child. They are bound, also, to baptize any person who has the use of reason, in the same case, if he desires it, and professes to believe in the Catholic faith and to repent of his sins. Every one ought to know how to baptize, and to be careful to do it rightly when the occasion presents itself. The way to baptize is to pour water over the forehead, saying at the same time, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."



# HOW TO MAKE A GOOD CONFESSION.

---

THIS is the most important of all things to be known. Your salvation may depend on knowing it. And it will not do to think you know it. Your confession must be *really* a good one, in order to save your soul.

Every one, therefore, who is in mortal sin, had better be very careful about this matter. There are such things as confessions which are not sinful; that is, which are meant to be good ones, but which leave the soul in just the same state as it was before. There is no need of making such confessions; only we must

## TAKE CARE.

Well, then, in order to make a good confession, you have three things to do: 1st, *to find out your sins*; 2d, *to be sorry for them*; and 3d, *to make up your mind to avoid them, and all other sins, for the time to come.*

Now, certainly you ought to try to find out your sins before you come to confess them. If you do not, the priest will have to find them out for you. And is it not rather hard upon the priest, after he has already heard perhaps a hundred confessions or more, and is nearly tired out, to make him find out your sins for you, and ask a great many questions to no purpose? One would think you were doing a good turn for the priest in letting him hear your confession, instead of his doing one for you. And is it not rather hard on the people who are waiting for you to come out, to detain them so long, and perhaps prevent them from being heard at all? If, then, you are not

## TOO STUPID

to find out your own sins, try and do so before you come.

And do not simply find out what sins you have committed, but also *how many times* you have committed them. Or, what is just as good, tell *how often* you have fallen into this sin, or that. How often, for instance, in the week, or in the month.

Besides that, do not accuse yourself of a sin when you know it was *no fault* on your part. Do not say, for instance, that you

missed Mass on Sunday, when you were lying sick in bed, or that you ate meat on Friday, when you really thought it was Thursday. But you ought to say when you have acted against your conscience, even though what you did was really no sin in itself. For instance, you ought to tell if you ate meat on Thursday, thinking it was Friday.

If, however, you are really unable to understand and to do all this, or even if you do not feel like taking the trouble,

## DO NOT FAIL TO COME TO CONFESSION

on that account. The priest will be very glad to hear you and help you, tired though he may be. He would rather hear you, if you are really in mortal sin, than any number of people who do not need absolution. And He whom the priest represents will be more pleased to hear you too. "*There shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just, who need not penance.*" The priest, then, will find out your sins, if you cannot or will not find them out for yourself. But the other things needed for a good confession depend principally on your own good will. It is your part, and not the priest's, to

## BE SORRY FOR YOUR SINS.

To do this, however, is not so hard, with the help of God. You have not got to shed tears, or to feel as one would whose dearest friend was just dead. But you have to remember that you have indeed lost for a time the dearest Friend you can possibly have, and that you have been in danger of losing Him for ever; and that you have, besides, exposed yourself to all the pains of hell. You have lost God for a time, but now He is coming back to you. Go to Him, tell Him you are sorry for the wrong you have done, and beg His pardon, as you would that of some one whom you had frequently injured and insulted, and who had been waiting to forgive you as soon as you would ask it, and who had been doing you good for evil all the time. Think what pain your sins cost Him in His Passion and Death; think that every one of them helped to nail Him to the Cross. If you do shed tears, so much the better; but one can shed tears without being in earnest, and one can be in earnest without shedding tears.

But now, remember, all this sorrow goes for nothing without

## A FIRM PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT.

And this purpose of amendment is *the most important thing of all*. It is just the point where people are so apt to have the least scruple, and where they ought to have the most. It is for the want of it that so many confessions which are meant to be good ones are not really of any use. These confessions, what do they amount to? Just this: telling a number of sins, and wishing they had not been committed.

Sometimes, one ventures to "hope, with the help of God," that they will not do such or such a thing any more. That sounds very fine. It sounds like an humble acknowledgment that one cannot depend on one's own strength. But, too often,

## WHAT DOES IT MEAN?

It means, in plain terms, that if God wants us to keep His commandments, He must give more grace and help than He has given hitherto. It means to shuffle the responsibility of amending our lives off from ourselves, and put it on Him. "*With the help of God,*" indeed! As if you had not had already a great deal more help from God than you had any need of; as if He had not been trying all along to convert you, and given you grace enough to have made you a saint long ago, had you not resisted it with your own obstinate free will.

God's grace is always sufficient; there is no trouble about that. You yourself are the one to blame. When there is anything that you really *intend* to do, you do not say anything about the help of God. If you are going to take your breakfast, you do not wait for God to come and put you in your chair at the table; you go there yourself. But you do *not* really intend to amend your life. If, however, any one would treat you as children are sometimes treated, and offer you a little reward, say

## A DOLLAR A DAY,

for every day that you would be good, we should soon see what a change there would be. The difficulty is only this, that you are not a quarter part *in earnest*. You imagine that you are; but just notice the next time, and see if you really try any harder to please God the day after confession than you did the day before. You imagine that you are, and do not mean to make a bad con-

fession ; so your confession does you no harm ; but perhaps it does not do you any good. This is the chief reason why I said in the beginning that there are such things as confessions which are meant to be good ones, but which leave the soul

## JUST AS IT WAS BEFORE.

Of course, I do not mean that, after a good confession, you will never sin any more. But I do mean that if a person goes on just the same afterward as before, *in a matter of mortal sin*, it looks very much as if there was a screw loose somewhere. And the screw that is loose is most likely this, and no other : the *purpose of amendment* was not what it ought to have been.

And yet you worry yourselves to death, perhaps, over your past confessions, and think the trouble is that you did not tell all your sins. Suppose you did not,

## WHAT OF IT ?

Unless you are sure that you were *grossly negligent*, that will not harm you. Sins forgotten in confession are forgiven, along with the rest. Sins are forgiven all together, not one at a time.

As for sins which are certainly venial, there is no real need to confess them at all. Better take those that you really mean to amend, and confess *them*. It will not be long before there is a change the right way, if you do this.

St. Francis of Sales says :

## IT IS NOT THE LONG CONFESSIONS THAT ARE THE GOOD ONES.

Try and remember this. Do not be so dreadfully anxious to have an exact list of every little fault, but conceive a true sorrow for all mortal sins, and a firm purpose to avoid them ; and if there are no mortal sins, tell the venial ones as simply as possible, unless you need some special advice. It is not so much matter about the circumstances of these smaller affairs. Do not worry the priest with long stories about nothing. Take the advice of this tract, and your confessions will do you more good than heretofore.

## DEVOTION

TO THE

## SACRED HEART OF JESUS.



DEVOTION to the Sacred Heart of Jesus may be said to be both an old and a new devotion. In one sense, it is as old as the worship of the Sacred Body of the Lord, that is, as old as the Holy Eucharist and as the Incarnation itself, and as necessary and universal as that worship. For the Sacred Heart is a part, and one of the principal parts of the Lord's Body, which has been adored ever since its conception in the sacred body of Mary, and must be adored by every Christian. In another sense, also, it is as old as Christianity, that is, considered as a devotion specially directed toward the Sacred Heart, and not merely included in the worship of the entire Body of Christ. It was a devotion of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of St. John the Apostle, of St. Gertrude, St. Bernard, St. Aloysius, St. Francis de Sales, St. Jane Frances de Chantal, and other saints. But, in this special sense, it was a private and not a public devotion, a particular and not a universal devotion. As a special public and universal devotion it is comparatively new and recent.

The reason of this is, that the Holy Spirit did not inspire saints, devout persons, prelates of the Church, and the Holy See to make it a public and universal devotion, until these modern times. The Lord reserved it as a special means of grace for these latter days, the wicked and dangerous period in which we live.

It has been made known and introduced by revelations and miracles, propagated by the efforts of enlightened, faithful, and zealous servants of our Lord, approved by the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and made obligatory in so far as the appointment of a special feast in honor of the Sacred Heart is concerned—a feast which we hope may one day be made one of the great feasts of obligation. Through the piety of many devout adorers of the Sacred Heart, religious congregations and confraternities have been founded in its honor, and the devotion has spread among the faithful in a wonderful way. Immense portions of the Catholic Church have been consecrated by the prelates ruling over them to the Sacred Heart, and numberless churches, altars, and shrines have been built and dedicated under its august invocation. The spiritual benefit which the Church and a multitude of her members have derived from this new fountain of grace is incredibly great. There is, therefore, every reason and motive why Catholics should cherish and seek to extend this devotion as much as possible.

This devotion is directed to the Heart of Jesus, as the bodily seat and instrument of the human

affections of His Soul, and more especially of His love to men. This human love of the Soul of Jesus is the love of a Soul united to the Divine Nature in the Person of the Word. It is therefore the love of God. The Sacred Heart of Jesus, the bodily organ of this love, with and through His Soul, is also united to the Divine Nature, and is, therefore, the Heart of God. The Soul and Body of Jesus are deified by this union, and are worshipped with supreme adoration, or worship of *latria*, in themselves, on account of their belonging to a Divine Person. For this reason, divine worship is due to the Heart of Jesus, and is given to it by the Catholic Church.

God has a real human heart, and loves us with a tender, human affection, conjoined with His divine love. God is Trinity in Unity; Three Persons—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. God the Father so loves the world that He sends His Only-Begotten Son to redeem all men. God the Holy Ghost so loves the world that He dwells in the hearts of all men who are fit to receive Him, and sanctifies those who are not fit by reason of sin, that they may be made fit. God the Son so loves the world, that He has become man, died on the cross, given Himself in the Holy Eucharist, and made men His brethren, co-heirs with Him of the kingdom of heaven. The love of the Blessed Trinity comes to us through the Sacred Humanity of Jesus. His Sacred Heart is the seat and the visible symbol of that love, the living Temple of

the Trinity. In that Sacred Heart, God and man meet and are united in love. The Heart of Jesus draws the hearts of all men who are not in mortal sin into unity and conformity with itself, and draws the hearts of all sinners, if they yield to its attraction, out of the state of sin into the state of grace. Devotion to this Sacred Heart is the most certain means of sanctification for the just and conversion for sinners which can be employed, when it is joined, as it must always be, with devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. It is the shield and sword of the Church in the warfare which is waging with the powers of darkness. The banner of the Sacred Heart is the banner under which we must march and fight, in order to conquer our spiritual enemies. The pastors of the Church and the great champions of the faith have given you the example which you ought to follow, by their signal acts of devotion to the Sacred Heart of our Lord. Follow this example, especially during this month of June, the month specially consecrated to the Sacred Heart, by adoring the Heart of Jesus, and offering your hearts to Him in grateful love, as a return for that love which is ever burning for you and for all men in that sanctuary of grace and perpetual adoration, the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be praise and glory, for ever, with the Father and the Holy Ghost. Amen.



## NO SECT IN HEAVEN.



WE are told that there will be no sect in heaven. This is a most consoling and comfortable doctrine. It is calculated to reassure good Christians of all denominations who may feel doubtful as to their religious position. And why? Because, of course, if there be no sect in heaven, it will make no difference at all what sect a man belonged to upon earth. He need have no fear that he will be asked, before admission to that happy abode, whether, on earth, he was

### A PRESBYTERIAN OR A METHODIST.

Certainly not. If there is to be no sect in heaven, why should not all sects be welcome? All true Christians will there meet on friendly terms—Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, and even Catholics. It is understood, however, that they must have been *true* Christians, and have experienced a change of heart.

A change of heart is the one thing which is required—that is, which is required on earth. But it really seems as if, at least on entering heaven, or perhaps before it, some persons would have to experience also

### A CHANGE OF HEAD.

The saints in heaven can no longer agree to differ, as they did here below. Either the Baptist will have to confess that it is right to baptize infants, or his opponent will have to acknowledge that it is wrong. It cannot be right and at the same time wrong. But will they both, perhaps, still remain in doubt about the point? Certainly, there will be some points upon which

### DOUBT WILL NO LONGER BE POSSIBLE.

The Protestant, for instance, if he goes to purgatory himself, or meets friends who have been

there, can no longer hold that purgatory is a superstition, invented by the priests for making money. And the Catholic, if he goes straight to heaven after a most imperfect life and death, will have to admit that the doctrine of his church on this point is open to correction.

### BUT IS IT NOT ABSURD

to suppose that the blessed in heaven will remain in ignorance as to which was right in belief on earth? Shall we not, if we reach heaven, know there the truth about all those matters on which we now hold such opposite opinions? Was St. Paul indeed mistaken when he said that in heaven he should know even as he was known? Was St. John in error when he said that in heaven we shall see God as He is? Are these great saints, and the others who are with them,

### PUZZLED TO DECIDE

the important questions which arise between the various denominations which profess and call themselves Christian? No, it cannot be that anybody there will still continue to think that perhaps every one of them is right. Everybody will know who was right and who was wrong. There will, indeed, be no sect in heaven. It is to be hoped, certainly, that some who have outwardly adhered to different sects on earth will be found in that great assembly of the just, and that some who have not been professedly even Christians will be there. But if this be so, all who have not held the true faith will have had to give up the sect to which they belonged. Either the Presbyterian or the Methodist will have to renounce his favorite creed; perhaps both of them will have to do so. The Catholic must turn Protestant, or the Protestant must turn Catholic. And if so many people will have to give up their sects in heaven why not

### GIVE THEM UP NOW?

There are only two answers to this. One is to say that it is of no importance who is right.

That may satisfy some people, but the trouble is that it proves a little too much. If religious belief is of no importance, the Turk, the pagan, and the atheist are as well off as the Christian. Let the missionaries to the heathen all come home. It costs millions of money to support them which had better be turned to some more practical use. But even in this money-loving age Christians have not come to that conclusion. They will continue to labor under the impression that the Christian faith is the only thing that will save the world.

The other answer is that

### IT IS IMPOSSIBLE

to find out exactly what the whole truth is about these matters on which we differ, and that God does not command what is impossible. But how do you know that it is impossible? Perhaps you have not tried. There is no telling what a man can do when he really tries. A few years ago people said it was impossible to travel thirty miles an hour. But as soon as they really made up their minds that it had to be done, they found the way to do it. Perhaps, if you would determine in good earnest to find the truth, it would even come to meet you. Some One has said, "Every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." Perhaps in religion, as in other matters, the maxim may be good,

WHERE THERE'S A WILL THERE'S A WAY.

Strike that word "impossible" out of the dictionary. For this matter may be one of more importance than you suppose. Just think a moment, and see if there is any real solid ground for your impression that all these matters about which Christians differ are matters of little importance; or whether you have any good, sound reason for saying that such and such doctrines are essential,

and such and such others are not, so that men can differ about them as they please. If God has revealed *any* truth, He wishes and expects you to believe it; and if he expects you to believe it, is it safe to disappoint Him? Is it not possible that you may find, when the secrets of all hearts are made known, that it has been

### YOUR OWN FAULT

that you did not care to know what He meant that you should?

There is one other point: you have sinned against Him and broken His laws. We have all done that. If you have not been to blame for being mistaken or ignorant, you have for many other things. How do you know that you have been forgiven? How do you know that you have done all that was required on your part to make your peace with God? Is it not specially important to be sure that you are right about this? This is a practical point, an eminently practical one; and perhaps, when you have passed out of this world, it may be too late to make use of the knowledge about it which you may then acquire.

Try and acquire it now, and to settle your mind on all these points. Put away prejudice. Be in earnest, and ask God to help you. If you do this, and if He has established a true church on earth, where the true doctrine is taught, He will bring you into it. And must He not have established one? If there is to be no sect in heaven, there ought to be

### NO SECT ON EARTH,

but only one true, universal church, where everybody has the same belief that they have in heaven above. Try at once to find out if there is not indeed such a church, and make up your mind to enter it without delay, if there is.

# THE SACRAMENT OF CONFIRMATION.

---

You will find some grown people, and even some who are quite old, who have never been confirmed. Either they did not have the opportunity for it when they were children, or they neglected the opportunity which they had. Is that any reason why they should not be confirmed now? Certainly it is not. It is true that all Christians ought to receive this sacrament as soon as they are able to understand what it is; the sooner, the better. But it is also true, and for the same reasons, that if it is best in youth, it is far

## BETTER LATE THAN NEVER.

All Christians, that is, all who have been baptized, ought, I say, to receive this sacrament as soon as they are able to understand what it is. They could, indeed, receive it before they could understand it; and it has been sometimes allowed to have infants confirmed immediately after their baptism. If an infant were so confirmed, it could never be confirmed again. But at present it is required, out of reverence for this great sacrament, that every one should know, when he receives it, what it is that he is receiving; and any one would commit a sin if he should neglect the instructions which are given, and the study which he needs, to enable him to do so. No one need be afraid of being too well prepared.

Let us then consider, in this short tract, some points which all, whether they have yet been confirmed or not, should know. And in the first place, let us ask ourselves the question which I have just said we all ought to know how to answer—

## WHAT IS IT THAT WE ARE GOING TO RECEIVE,

or have already received, in this Sacrament?

*Who* is it, we should more properly say, for the answer to the question is this: *In Confirmation we receive Almighty God Himself.*

In Holy Communion, you know, we also receive God; for it is Our Lord Jesus Christ, God the Son, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, who comes to us in that, under the form of bread, to give life to our souls. But Confirmation is different from this, for in it

## WE RECEIVE GOD THE HOLY GHOST,

the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, not the Second. And He does not come to us under the form of bread, or

any other form that our eyes can see; but He really comes to us for all that, and enters into our souls.

There is another difference between this Sacrament and that of Holy Communion. When we receive Communion God indeed comes to us, and gives us as many graces and gifts as we are able and willing to receive. But He does not remain with us very long. But when He comes to us in Confirmation,

### HE COMES TO STAY WITH US ALL OUR LIVES.

The graces of Confirmation are not only for a short time, but to last as long as we live. We may lose them for a time, by sin, it is true. The Holy Ghost will not remain in a heart which is stained by mortal sin; but when the sin is driven out by a true sorrow and a good confession, He will come back to be with us in the same way as before.

The Sacrament of Confirmation, then, lasts all our lives. But in one sense it lasts even longer; that is, for all eternity. For when we are confirmed,

### A CHARACTER OR MARK IS IMPRINTED ON OUR SOULS.

We cannot see it, for we cannot see our souls themselves; but it is there. And if we are saved, and go to heaven, it will be a glory and an honor to us that those who have not been confirmed will not have.

This ought to be enough to show how foolish as well as how wrong it is to neglect to be confirmed. In Confirmation, God the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, equal to the Father or to the Son, comes to honor us with His presence and His graces for all our lives, and to put a glorious mark or sign upon our souls, which will make us happier even in heaven; and if we neglect to be confirmed, we as much as say to Him that we do not care for His presence or His grace, or at least can get along well enough without them. Does not this seem very much like an insult to Him? Certainly it is hard to see how

### ONE WHO NEGLECTS CONFIRMATION,

when he has a chance to receive it, can be excused from *mortal sin*. So, you see, there was very good reason for saying that all Christians ought to be confirmed, that is, that *they are obliged* to be so, though they may certainly be saved without it, if it has not been through their own fault, or if they are heartily sorry for this sin, as for all other sins, when they come to die.

But let us ask ourselves another question, and we shall

see even more plainly why we ought to be confirmed, and what is gained by receiving this sacrament. And this question is,

### WHAT DOES GOD COME TO US FOR

when we receive him in it?

The name of the sacrament is intended to answer this question. He comes to *confirm* us. And what does that mean? It means to make us *firm*. You know what is meant by being firm. When a man stands firm on his feet, it is not easy to knock him down. Now that is what the devil is always trying to do. He is always trying to throw us down: out of the state of grace and into that of sin. And how does he do this? He does it by temptation. And if we have not a special gift of standing firm against his temptations, he will be almost sure to succeed in making us fall, and making us fall very often too. So the Holy Ghost comes to us in the sacrament of Confirmation to give us this special gift of firmness against temptation, and He wants us to receive Him in this way as soon as temptations begin: that is, when we are still young; and not to wait till we have fallen over and over again.

### THE CATECHISM TELLS US

that "in Confirmation we are made strong and perfect Christians and soldiers of JESUS CHRIST." *Soldiers*; yes, for we have a battle before us, and a hard one too, against the world, the flesh, and the devil. In Confirmation we get our armor and our strength for this battle; so it is as foolish for us to go without it when we can get it as it would be for a soldier to go to fight the enemy without armor when there was plenty at hand for him to use. That would not be common sense.

There is one temptation against which the grace of Confirmation is specially needed, and to meet which it is more particularly intended. And that is the temptation to which we are more or less exposed,

### TO DENY, BE ASHAMED OF, OR ABANDON THE FAITH.

So this is a reason why, in countries like this, which are not Catholic, it is peculiarly important to be confirmed.

Beside this strength to resist temptation, there are seven special gifts of the Holy Ghost, which are received in Confirmation. They are called wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge, piety, and the fear of the Lord. There would not be room in a short tract like this to explain them all; so we must pass on

to two more questions, namely, *how is Confirmation given?* and, *how shall we prepare to receive it?*

## HOW, THEN, IS CONFIRMATION GIVEN?

It is only Bishops who have ordinarily the power to give this sacrament. The Pope can appoint a priest to confirm, but this is seldom done. And the way in which the Bishop confirms is by making the sign of the Cross with chrism on the forehead of the person, and saying the words: "I sign thee with the sign of the Cross, and confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Chrism is a mixture of oil and balsam; and it must be blessed by a Bishop before it is used in Confirmation.

There are other rites and ceremonies connected with this sacrament, but these are all that are essential. It is only the work of a moment, but in that moment a *work is done that will last for ever.*

Now, lastly, let us ask ourselves,

## HOW SHALL WE PREPARE TO RECEIVE THIS SACRAMENT,

if we have not yet received it?

First, we must try and understand as much about it as we can. But this is the least important part of the preparation. We shall receive its graces, if we do not understand all about it, if it is really not our fault that we do not. But we shall not receive them *unless we are in the state of grace*, for this sacrament is a sacrament of the living and not of the dead. And, furthermore, any one who receives Confirmation, knowing himself to be in mortal sin, *commits a horrible sacrilege.* The Holy Ghost will indeed come into his heart when he repents of his sins, but such a great sin as this would be a great obstacle to repentance.

In order, then that we may be sure to be in the state of grace,

## WE MUST MAKE A GOOD CONFESSION

shortly before coming to be confirmed, and also receive Communion, if possible. And we must pray earnestly for the grace to approach this great Sacrament of Confirmation, which can be given to us *only once*, with the best possible dispositions, and make the firm resolution that when God shall come to us in this wonderful way, that we will never drive Him from our hearts by sinning again.



## DEVOTION TO THE ANGELS.

---

OCTOBER is the month of the angels—the month, that is, which Catholic piety calls theirs. But I wish to excite in you a devotion to the angels more business-like than paying them some passing attentions this one month of the year. And, first, because of the claim they have on your veneration and love; secondly, because of the good that will follow both to you and to the Church at large.

I. There is nothing more remarkable in Holy Scripture, whether we consider the Old Testament or the New, than the prominence given to the angels as God's messengers and ministers to men. And while the Old Testament, as the "law of fear," more especially teaches us to *revere* the angels, the New no less strikingly teaches us to *love* them. Who can hear the story of the Annunciation and not feel moved to love the angel that said the first "Hail Mary"? And does not Our Blessed Lord himself speak of the angels ("the *holy* angels," as he calls them again and again) in a way that commends them to our love? For instance, he tells us that little children have guardian angels—implying thereby that we all have (St. Matt. xviii. 10); and that "there is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner doing penance" (St. Luke xv. 10). Then, for his apostles, it is enough to hear St. Paul (Heb. i. 14): "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation?" I need not multiply texts to show that the New Testament teaches us to love the angels; while, of course, this love is in perfect harmony with the awe inspired by the Old Testament history.

What says Tradition, again, living for us in the perpetual voice of the Church? That our mother, the Church, venerates the angels and invokes their protection and in-

tercession is abundantly clear not only from the festivals she has instituted in their honor, but still more from her constant practice and example. At the *Asperges*, before Mass, she prays God to send his angel to guard and keep the congregation. And whenever her priests visit the sick to administer Viaticum or Extreme Unction, she makes them invoke the presence of the angels and place the house under their protection. Then, too, all approved manuals for private use contain prayer to St. Michael, at least, and to the angel guardian. And you will find in the *Raccolta*, the authorized collection of indulgenced prayers, not only devotions to the three archangels whose names are revealed in Scripture, but also a beautiful "angelic chaplet" or beads in honor of the "Nine Choirs."

It is plain, therefore, from the authority of both Scripture and Tradition, that the angels have a claim on our veneration and love.

II. Now for the good that will follow from a right devotion to the angels.

The lost angels—the fallen "principalities and powers," the "spiritual wickedness in high places," with which we have to "wrestle" (as St. Paul says)—are playing a double game now in the world: apparently, but not really, one hand against the other. With one hand (so to speak) they play the game of *materialism*—persuading their dupes to reject the supernatural and believe in nothing but matter. With the other hand they play the game of *spiritualism*—pretending to be departed human souls, and to reveal secrets of the life to come as well as occult things on earth. I say there is an appearance here of one hand defeating the other. But, although many persons have assured us of their having ceased to be materialists from witnessing the phenomena of spiritualism, they remain, essentially, as much *naturalists* as before; the fact being that both materialism and spiritualism have the same logical ending—pantheism; and that, in turn, is only atheism in disguise.

Now, devotion to the angels will keep us far removed

from tendencies which lead to materialism, and which infect the moral atmosphere we are all compelled to breathe in non-Catholic countries, and especially in our own. For this devotion, rightly understood, cultivates (I may say) the society of the angels. We come to realize that these blessed spirits—our future companions in heaven—are around us here on earth, not separated from us as the saints (once our fellow-mortals) are; and this realization can only make us more supernaturally-minded. Accustom yourself to think daily, and often through the day, that an angel is at your side, and that everybody else has one at their side; and it is needless to say what a salutary restraint will be put upon your own words and actions, or how much the charity and respect due to your neighbor will be facilitated and increased.

So, again, with regard to other prevalent tendencies in the direction of *diabolism*—a term very properly used to include as well superstition of all kinds as false mysticism or “spiritualism.” An intelligent devotion to the angels will prove a great safeguard here also.

People have recourse to superstitious practices, and consult fortune-tellers, or “mediums,” from a natural craving for preternatural help. Now, Catholics know that whenever they do get any superhuman aid by such means, it must come from the evil spirits, and not from God. Then, if these fallen and malignant spirits are able to assist their clients, must not the good angels have fully as much power, or rather, a vast deal more? If you reflect a few moments, you will doubtless recall the fact of having suddenly remembered important things of which there was nothing (that you knew of) to remind you; or, again, that some wise course of action was suggested to you, you knew not how. So, too, you must have been frequently surprised at escaping an awkward fall or other accident, or at finding something you had no hope of obtaining, or, if lost, of recovering. Well, for all these things you are indebted, under God, to your angel guardian, or possibly to some other angel.

Then why not have recourse to the holy angels in all troubles and difficulties for which the superstitious resort to forbidden means? Is it not because you are not in the habit of praying and asking favors with submission to God's will? And if this be so, then are you not consciously partaking with "the children of disobedience"?

I have not space to enlarge on my subject further, except to remind you that I spoke at starting of the good which the devotion I am advocating would bring to the Church at large as well as to individuals. This is obvious, of course, from the fact that the Church is made up of individuals. But what I particularly mean is that our prayers to the angels, and the efforts we make to live worthy of their society, will enable them to do more than they can at present toward helping the Church in her war with the powers of darkness. Help is granted to *merit*. The saints, even Our Blessed Lady herself, can only aid us—ordinarily, that is—when we *deserve* that they should by, *at least*, doing them the honor to ask it; and however much the Divine mercy may stretch itself in favor of *their* merits, they are constantly hindered from doing all they want for us by *our* miserable *demerits*. So it is, then, with the angels. By devotion to them we shall enable them to accomplish what they are waiting for now. It is a pious belief, and founded on the most reasonable grounds, that the final combat which the Church has to wage, and which has even now begun, is to be given into the hands of the holy angels under Mary, their Immaculate Queen. In endeavoring, therefore, to honor the angels of God by invoking their protection and intercession, and by (what I have called) cultivating their society, we shall be co-operating with them in hastening that glorious end which is the object of all devotions—the triumph of our Lord and his Church.

Queen of Angels, pray for us!

## “TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE.”

---

I AM convinced that there is a large class of Protestants—earnest, humble-minded Christians—who cannot believe our religion because it appears to them “*too good to be true.*”

They hear us claim an “infallible” Church, with an “infallible” Head. At first they are shocked at such doctrines, and enquire of the Catholics they know whether we really do hold what we are said to hold. “Why, yes,” is the reply; “but please hear the explanation. We believe the Church ‘infallible’ because the Holy Ghost has been given to her to make her so. He *dwells in her* perpetually, and ‘guides her into all truth’ (St. John xvi. 13). It is he preserves her wonderful unity, and, in spite of all the machinations of the devil, all the wickedness or frailty of man, keeps her, century after century, the unfailing source of holy doctrine and the means of holy living. So, again, her Visible Head, the Pope, is ‘infallible’ in laying down the law on questions of faith and morals, because the same Divine Spirit takes care to *overrule* his teachings and decisions. You see, then, there is no superstition in our belief; for we attribute this infallibility to God, and not to men.” Here the candid enquirer is ready to acknowledge that our faith is intelligent, and even enviable, but feels himself

forced to add that "he never could believe such things; they are not to be had in an erring world like this—they are simply 'too good to be true.'"

Take, again, our doctrine of the Eucharist, the "Blessed Sacrament." When they hear us talk of having Jesus Christ really present on our altars day and night, and of receiving him in Holy Communion in such a way as to become one body and blood and soul with him, they are amazed beyond measure at the *daringness* of our belief. As before, they gladly acknowledge that our doctrine has been misrepresented to them, and that, when it is properly explained, there is nothing absurd or repulsive about it. "On the contrary," they say, "it is a beautiful *idea*, but—ever so much 'too good to be true'!"

The same result is produced in their minds when our "Sacrament of Penance" is set before them in its right light. To be told that the love and compassion of the Saviour has provided such easy means of obtaining pardon cannot fail to attract tender consciences. They learn that we go to Confession because we believe that our priests at ordination receive the Holy Ghost for the express purpose of forgiving sins by the authority of Jesus Christ; and that, when our dispositions are right, and we receive absolution, our sins "*are remitted*" (St. John xx. 23) there and then, and will never again be "mentioned" (Ezech. xviii. 22) to us. "How is it possible," they say, "for anything so good to be true?"

And, once more, when their misconceptions of our devotion to the Blessed Virgin are removed, they find that, instead of putting her in the place of her Son (the "one Mediator" of salvation), we rely upon her *intercession with him*, and acknowledge the favors and graces she

obtains for us to come to us *through his merits*. They also see that we look up to her with the love and confidence of children because we believe her *our* Mother as well as his, and that he has given her to us as a pledge of his unfailing mercy—himself being our Judge as well as our Advocate. So that, instead of her making him less to us, she makes him a very great deal more, and is the dearest possible bond between ourselves and him. Now, of course, when they find all this out, they are honest enough to withdraw at once the charges they have made against our doctrine, yet here, too, fall back upon the same old notion that what is so beautiful *must be imaginary*—or, in other words, is "too good to be true."

Dear reader, why does it not occur to you that, when God sets about a thing, he does it in the way most worthy of himself? Now, you believe, as we do, that he came into the world to institute a religion for "all nations" and all times. Then, pray, do you think it more like him, more worthy of him, to have left this religion to the "private interpretation" of those for whom it was intended, and to have made himself responsible for endless confusion and discord, or to have organized and endowed a visible society to teach and preserve it to the end of the world? And, supposing he did thus form and qualify a visible, teaching Church, would it be worthy of him, think you, to let this Church fall from the truth and propagate damnable errors, or become "divided against itself," like the "kingdom" with which he ridiculed the Pharisees? (St. Matt. xii. 25). More ver, we may well ask, What form or constitution for a teaching Church could *you* devise at once so durable and so *simple* as the form which we claim *he* devised?

*Simplicity*, indeed, is a note of God's handiwork. What

more *simple* than baptism? You believe in baptism; then why do you not recognize the same Master-hand in our equally simple Sacrament of Penance? And the Eucharist—for all the mystery of the Real Presence—might commend itself to you by its simplicity. As a sacrifice, it perpetuates that of the cross, under the very simple forms of bread and wine—*perpetuates* the Sacrifice of Calvary without *repeating* it, and applies its fruits to our souls. As a sacrament, it unites us with our Lord in the closest possible manner—our substance becoming one with his, as the food we eat becomes one with ours. Tell me, could Infinite Love have invented anything more *simple* than this? and is not such an invention *just like* what we know of that Love?

Now, ponder what I have said, and pray over it. Lay aside all prejudices, all foregone conclusions. Perhaps you have hitherto regarded our religion as the creation of logicians or of visionary enthusiasts. *Pray that you may find it true, if it is true.* And, believe me, the hour will soon come when, instead of calling it "too good to be true," you will joyfully testify, with us, that it is "*too good NOT to be true.*"



# PURGATORY.

---

By Purgatory is meant a place where souls which have departed this life with the guilt of venial sin, or without having fully satisfied the justice of God as regards the temporal punishment due for mortal sin, even when its guilt has been remitted, are purified before being admitted into heaven. Hence it is also called a place of souls suffering for a time on account of their sins.

The Waldenses, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Protestants generally, with some few exceptions, deny the existence of Purgatory. However, Protestants of very great reputation in England and Germany have admitted this place of temporary punishment in the next life, and the use of prayers and suffrages for the benefit of souls therein detained. Thus, among the English—Montagu, Gunning, Scheldon, Barrow, Blancsford, and others; and among the Germans, such men as Molanus and Leibnitz.

It is a matter of Catholic faith that Purgatory exists, and its existence is moreover proved by Scripture, tradition, and reason.

“If any one shall say that after the penitent sinner has received the grace of justification his sin is so remitted, and the guilt of eternal punishment so washed away, that no guilt of temporal punishment remains to be paid, either in this world or in the world to come—in Purgatory—before he can be admitted to the kingdom of heaven, let him be anathema” (Con. Trid., sess. vi. c. 30).

Judas Machabeus, when some of his followers were slain in a battle fought against Gorgias, made a collection among the survivors, and sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem to have sacrifices offered for those who had fallen in the battle, “thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection” (2 Mach. xii.) In the forty-sixth verse of this same chapter are these words: “It is, therefore, a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins.” Those who deny the existence of Purgatory say, indeed, that the books of the Machabees are not canonical; but against these we have such authorities as Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine; the Third Council of Carthage, can. 47; the Council of Rome, under Pope Gelasius, A.D. 494; St. Innocent I., in his epistle to Exuperius, and others, to show that both in the early Latin and Greek Church these books were looked upon as canonical. Even if it be granted for the sake of argument that these books are not really canonical, this much cannot be denied: that they are of great antiquity, and that all the various copies, Latin, Greek, and Syriac, have all this same text, which proves at least that the Jewish and Catholic teaching concerning Purgatory are identical.

“And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come” (Matt. xii. 32). Now the words, “neither in this world nor in the world to come,” would have no meaning

unless some sins are forgiven in the world to come, or after the soul has departed this life, and surely our Divine Lord was not the one to use unmeaning language.

Another proof from sacred Scripture may be found in 1 Cor. iii. 15, where St. Paul shows that on the last day some shall immediately receive their reward on their works being found fire-proof, while those whose works fail to stand the required test shall suffer loss, yet so that they themselves may be saved by fire.

Tertullian, *Monogamia*, cap. 10; St. Epiphanius, *Hæresi*; 75, n. 7, 8; St. Augustine, *Serm.* 172, cap. 12, and numerous other Fathers of the Church, are of one voice in proclaiming the existence of Purgatory and the universal tradition of the Church in offering sacrifice, prayers, and good works for the benefit and relief of souls detained there. St. Augustine wrote a book to show the care that should be had for the dead, and he himself prayed for his mother after her death, and begs the prayers and good works of his readers for her soul's repose (*Con.*, l. 9, cap. 13).

In the Council of Florence the Latins and Greeks were in accord on this dogma, and in the Greek liturgy, as in the Roman, there are appointed prayers for the dead; and this holds for the liturgies of the various churches of the East, even the most ancient which touch upon the days of the Apostles.

Modern Jews also admit this dogma of Purgatory, to which their forefathers so strongly adhered, as Serarius and Genebrardus prove from the Rabbinical books. The Islamites also pray for the dead, and travellers tell us that the Indians offer suffrages for the dead. The ancient Greeks and Romans more or less explicitly admitted the doctrine of Purgatory. It was held by the Stoics (Clem. Alex., *De Stoicis*), and Eusebius quotes Zoroaster to prove that the Persians held this same doctrine. Holy Scripture and reason both convince us that the pardon of sin by no means necessarily includes the pardon of the temporal punishment due to sin, and which seems to follow it as an effect upon its cause. If, therefore, a person depart this life without having discharged the temporal punishment he has brought upon himself by the commission of mortal sin, and which the grace of justification does not remove, he must have some place to go to in order to be purified, since nothing defiled can enter into heaven or bear the vision of God's infinite purity. Again, it is repugnant to every dictate of reason and every well-ordered conception of God's goodness, to suppose for a moment that the soul stained only with some slight venial faults must be condemned to the same everlasting punishment as the soul steeped in the blackest and most heinous crimes. But the soul spotted with the smallest imperfections cannot bear the beatific vision of God, and it must therefore find some middle place where it can purify itself perfectly, and this middle state the Catholic Church calls Purgatory.

One great objection which the opponents of this doctrine make is taken from the fact that the word Purgatory is not found in the Holy Scripture, which speaks of but two divisions of mankind in the next life—namely, the damned and the saved. Still this is no great objection after all, because it matters little whether or not we find the word Purgatory in Scripture when we find the

doctrine clearly expressed there, and all that the Catholic Church wishes to express by the word Purgatory. Neither the term Trinity nor Consubstantial is found in Scripture, yet Protestants make use of both these terms and profess to believe the doctrine expressed by them. When Scripture speaks of the two states or conditions of men in the next life, it speaks of them as they shall be after the final judgment, and not of any present or temporal condition. "Then shall the king say to them that shall be on his right hand: Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." "Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. xxv. 34, 41). They say, too, that the Latin Church and the Greek disagree on the doctrine of Purgatory; but this is not so. They disagree, if you will, about the nature of the punishment which the souls in Purgatory have to endure, but about the existence of Purgatory and the utility of praying for the dead there is no dispute between them. Even the dispute about the character of the punishment cannot be said to exist between the Latin and Greek Churches, but between the individual members of each. For with regard to the doctrine of Purgatory there are only two points of Catholic faith—namely, that there is a state of temporal suffering after this life which is called Purgatory, and that souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, and especially by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. All else regarding this doctrine is left to the discussion of theologians. All admit that the sufferings of Purgatory have a twofold character, arising on the one hand from the withholding of the beatific vision, and on the other from the pain of sense. This pain of sense, according to Greek theologians, is caused by labors and bitter sorrows, while, according to the Latin theologians, it is similar in its nature to the suffering of the damned in hell.

St. Thomas, *Suppl.*, q. 72, art. 1, says that the suffering undergone in Purgatory is greater than any that can be endured in this life, though not to be compared with the suffering of hell, because the souls in Purgatory are resigned to their sufferings, and they have the friendship of God to sustain them with the sure hope of one day possessing eternal glory. The suffering of Purgatory is not the same for all, either in intensity or duration, but is proportioned to the debt due from each individual to the requirements of divine justice.

Hence St. Bonaventura and Bellarmine teach that the greatest suffering of Purgatory is greater than the greatest suffering of this life, but that the least suffering of Purgatory is not greater than the greatest suffering that may be met with in this life. It is the general opinion among Catholic theologians that Purgatory is a certain place, or that it has a certain location, though, according to St. Thomas, *Suppl.*, q. 69, art. 8, concl., God may allow souls to undergo their purgatory outside of this place, and permit them to wander over the earth either for the instruction of the living or for the succoring of the dead.

No one can say how long souls are detained in Purgatory. Alexander VII., March 18, 1665, condemned a proposition which

seemed to limit the time to ten years. St. Augustine offered prayers for his mother, and recommended her to the prayers and suffrages of others, thirty years after her death, and the Church still prays for her children who died hundreds of years ago. How those who shall be alive when the last day comes and who may still have temporal debts to pay to divine justice shall be purified we know not; God knows.

Souls in Purgatory cannot merit, but neither can they sin. But though they cannot merit, nor make satisfaction for their sins, still there is no reason to prevent them exercising acts of virtue, such as acts of faith, hope, charity, and resignation. They may also by their prayers obtain favors from God, either for themselves, as the remission of some part of their punishment, or for the living, especially those who pray for them, and thus by reason of the communion of saints are especially united to them. According to this opinion, which is sufficiently general and well grounded to be acted upon, we may commend ourselves to the prayers of the souls in Purgatory, as we commend ourselves to the prayers of the just on earth—that is, in our private devotions.

According to the Council of Florence, the souls in Purgatory are helped by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, by the suffrages of the faithful on earth, by alms-deeds, by prayers, and other works of piety. The Mass and the office celebrated in the name of the Church benefit the souls in Purgatory even when offered by an unworthy priest, because these works do not depend for their efficacy on the personal dispositions of the one who offers them. Prayers, fasting, and good works must be done in the state of grace to be of profit to the dead—that is, they must be living works and pleasing in the sight of God.

No one can say how much the good works and prayers of the living may benefit the dead, even when they are most excellent in themselves and performed with the best dispositions, because the value of their application depends upon many circumstances—namely, the nature of the sins on account of which they are suffering in Purgatory, upon the will they had of doing penance before their death, upon the solicitude they had for the souls in Purgatory, and the care they took to make intercession for them while they themselves were on earth. We cannot say how much the suffering of Purgatory is diminished even by the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, though we know that sacrifice is infinite in value. Hence we should all try to make our stay in Purgatory as short as possible by doing all the good we can now, and by trying to pay the debts we owe for our sins while time is yet given us, for one hour of patient suffering on earth is, as we are told, worth more than years of tardy punishment in the prison-house of Purgatory. Let us remember, too, that the interest we now manifest in aiding the souls in Purgatory is the measure of the interest that shall be shown towards ourselves when we are gone hence. With the measure you now ~~measure~~ measure unto others it shall be measured unto you in return.

## A PASTOR'S PLAIN TALK.

---

YOU are a Roman Catholic, and as such you intend to live and die, hoping for your eternal salvation in the next world. Now let me, as your Parish Priest, put you a few questions, that you may examine your conscience carefully and find out what you are doing to show yourself a Catholic, such as you would like to be found on the day of judgment.

Did you make your Easter duty last year? Are you going to make it this year? You are bound to do this; otherwise you are not a good Catholic, for you set yourself up in defiance to the Church, which has made the law requiring you to receive Holy Communion at Easter-time. *"If any man will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."* Do you come to Holy Mass on Sundays and Holydays of Obligation? Have you got a pew or a seat in the church? Did you pay your last pew-rent? Do you do all in your power to help your pastors in the work that they are doing for you and your children? Do you think you are doing enough for the support of your religion if you come to an early Mass and give your five or ten cents a Sunday or a Holyday? Do you grumble because you have to give even that little sum? The priests want to build a new church or school, or pay off the debts on them. How much have you given towards the defraying of the expenses? Do you find yourself so devout at the time of the collection that you never see the plate or basket being passed around? Did you *have* a pew or a seat? Why did you give it up? Suppose everybody was to make the same excuse and act as you have acted, what would become of your Catholic religion? You admire the priest for his self-sacrifice; you expect him to wait for you to come to Confession; he must be on hand

for you ; if not, you would be the first to complain. When sickness and death come to your house, oh ! then " Send for the priest." But what have you done to support him that will warrant you in calling him at any hour of the day or night, in the cold or heat, in the rain or snow, to give you his services ?

This is a law of the Church, the keeping of which makes you a good Catholic, and the violating or neglecting of which makes you a bad Catholic. The law says : "*Contribute to the support of your lawful pastors.*" What does St. Paul say to the Catholics under his charge. "*Know you not, that they who work in the holy place, eat the things that are of the holy place.: and they who serve the altar, partake with the altar ? So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel.*" Now, this doctrine is plain. St. Paul means to confirm just what I want you to think about, something that you must make a point of conscience and speak of in Confession. Ask yourself how you discharge this duty of supporting your pastors. Oh ! yes, the children must be baptized, the Mass must be said, the Catechism must be taught, the poor must be fed, the sick and dying must be attended, sermons must be preached, confessions must be heard, advice must be given to everybody in every imaginable difficulty, and counsel and comfort and aid to the miserable, the despairing, and the criminal ; the orphan and the widow, the houseless and friendless, the foundling and the outcast must be cared for ; churches, schools, asylums, hospitals, must be built and supported—this is the duty of the poor priest ; but what have you done to help the priest do all these things ? How much of your money is faithfully and conscientiously set apart for the priest ? St. Paul says to his people : "*If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things ?*"

Those gentlemen and ladies of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, who give their time and energy in sacrifice for God and his poor, labor by their talent and money to hold up the hands of the priest, and they relieve you of doing in person what you are bound to do, namely, to relieve the poor and suffering. But what do you do to help them ? If a lecture

is given for the poor, do you buy the tickets sent to you? If you are blessed with means, do you act selfishly and take just the number you want and no more? Do you come to the lecture, or do you find yourself suddenly so indisposed that you can neither go out or even buy one ticket? Ah, slothful servant! "*As long as you did it not to one of these least ones, neither did you do it to Me.*"

"Oh!" you say, "the priests are for ever talking about money. You hardly ever hear that in Protestant churches." If the Catholics who thus complain would do their share, the call for money would be cheerfully dropped from the Catholic pulpits for ever. How do the Protestants act? Why, they club together, buy land, build a church, fit it up, and give a preacher a call at a salary of five, ten, fifteen, or twenty-five thousand dollars a year. If the church needs coal, the members of the church buy it; if the poor (the few they have) need help, the members of the church give liberally; if the minister or his wife needs anything to make them comfortable, the members of the church club together again and help them in their necessities. See what is done to keep up error and heresy—see how a false religion is supported! You can and ought to think of this. Priests are poorer fed, worse clad, and harder worked than any men in any profession. They are willing to be such, for they are in an apostolic work and they are laboring for Christ's poor. But they can't live on the wind. The wind won't feed, clothe, or support them; the wind won't build the church. You must realize your position, your dignity, your responsibilities. Your position is the greatest position you can have, for you are blessed with the light and truth of the Catholic faith. Your dignity is that of a Catholic layman, and you are by this fact a child of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. Your responsibilities are to labor by your faith and good works to become a possessor of heaven.

Now, my Catholic brother and child, you must see that these things are true when you reflect on them. You know I am not moved by any other spirit than that which is just in the sight of God and men. It is not fair to make the few willing ones bear the whole burden. You see that you must do your share.

If there is anything that ought to make you proud, it is

the thought that you are a Catholic, a practical, praying Catholic, and that you are justified in God's sight by faith and *good works*. Your faith may be such as to move mountains, but you must show it by your works; for St. James says: "*Show me thy faith without works; and I will show thee my faith by works. . . . For as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead.*" Do you want to have a living faith? Then do what I say. Think over this little plain talk. Ask yourself again and again the questions I have rehearsed for you. Now begin; it is never too late to mend. Don't be a coward. You know how mean it was during the war to see some men in uniform hide behind a haystack or run away as the battle was about to commence. If the debt on the church is great, do not run away to another parish or give up your seat or pew; face the difficulty and stand up like a man with your smile, your voice, and your money until every dollar is paid off. Rent a pew or a seat in the church at once. Save up something every week to help the good work. Come to the High Mass on Sunday; it is your duty to give good example, and hear the sermon that is preached at the High Mass. The sermon is the word of God, and, next to the Sacraments, helps you to save your soul. Come to Vespers and Benediction and receive the Blessing of your Lord in the Holy Sacrament. If there is a charity lecture, buy tickets, come to it, bring others; help the good work of clothing and feeding the poor. For "*He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord.*" If the church is not built or paid for, whose fault is it? Say to yourself, "It will not be mine, for I intend from this time forth to do all that I possibly can to help you." Be united with your pastor. Work for the glory of God and the honor of His Immaculate Mother. Let your children and your children's children see your faith in the monuments that you leave behind you.

"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven."

God bless you!

YOUR DEVOTED PASTOR.



# Books for the Million.

## The Religious Mission

OF THE

# IRISH PEOPLE

AND

## Catholic Colonization.

By J. L. SPALDING, D.D., Bishop of Peoria.

### Contents :

I. The Church and the Spirit of the Age. II. The Religious Mission of the Irish People. III. The Country. IV. The City. V. The Irish in the United States. VI. The Work of the Church in the United States. VII. Catholic Colonization. VIII. The Irish Catholic Colonization Society. IX. Conclusion: Amid Irish Scenes. English Rule in Ireland.

Single Copies, paper, - - - - -	\$0 30
Twenty-five copies, - - - - -	4 50
Fifty copies, - - - - -	8 50
One hundred copies, - - - - -	16 00
Fine edition, cloth, - - - - -	1 50

## Stumbling Blocks

MADE


## Stepping Stones

ON THE

## ROAD TO THE CATHOLIC FAITH.

By Rev. James J. Moriarty, A.M.

One vol. 16mo, paper cover, - - - - -	\$0 30
Twenty-five copies, - - - - -	4 50
Fifty copies, - - - - -	8 50
One hundred copies, - - - - -	16 00

 The fine edition of this valuable work having gone through three editions in a very short time—a fourth being now in press—we have concluded, with the permission of the author, to issue a **PEOPLE'S EDITION** at the very low prices given above. This will enable those who wish to circulate this work among their non-Catholic friends to do so at a very small outlay. Fine edition of this work, cloth extra, net, \$1 25.

# THE CATHOLIC WORLD

## REDUCED IN PRICE.

TO OUR READERS.

THE April (1880) number of THE CATHOLIC WORLD began a new volume, and it was sent forth with fresh hope inspired by the following letter of approval and encouragement received from His Eminence Cardinal McCloskey, and at the same time we express the earnest and sincere desire that THE CATHOLIC WORLD may be always so conducted as to merit such hearty sympathy from ecclesiastical authority.

I. T. HECKER.

### LETTER FROM CARDINAL McCLOSKEY.

NEW YORK. Feb. 20, 1880.

DEAR FATHER HECKER :

I learn with much pleasure that you propose to make several improvements, beginning with the new volume of THE CATHOLIC WORLD. In view of this praiseworthy resolve, and of the renewed efforts you are about to make to enhance the value and increase the popularity of a work so justly held in the highest esteem for the eminent services it has rendered to the cause of religion and morality, I cannot but reassure you of my cordial approval and earnest sympathy, to which I must add the expression of my very sincere hope that the Catholic public will esteem it a pleasure and a duty to show their appreciation of your labors in their behalf by a more generous and active support.

Praying that God may bless your zealous efforts and crown them with success, I remain, very sincerely,

Your servant in Christ,

*John Card McCloskey*  
*Archbishop of New York*

1,728 pages a year. Only \$4; single copies 35 cents.

**The Catholic Publication Society Co.,**

LAWRENCE KEHOE, Manager,

9 BARCLAY STREET, NEW YORK.