THE JESUITS.

PROF. SCRIMGER ATTACKS AND FATHER JONES DEFENDS THEM. Rev. Mr. Scrimger to Father Jones.

To the Editor of the Montreal Star: Sin—At the risk of wearying the public I must crave the privilege of a further reply to Father Jones.

I regret that he still persists in confining the discussion to what is after all a com-

paratively minor point and refuses to dis-cuse the wider and more serious question as to the prevailing tone and character of Jesuit teaching in which I and the public are mainly interested. His reasons for this refusal are characteristic.

One is, that such a discussion would be in danger of shocking the apparativeness of

thought of this resson as coming from one who claims the right to introduce these topics at will, into his private professional interviews with any of his pend. e topics at will, into his private pro-ional interviews with any of his peniteats, whether men or women? I am ac-customed to think that publicity is a better safeguard against abuse in dealing with such matters than the mere judgment or purity of the individual con-

The other reason for refusal is that the teaching of the Jesuite is practically iden-tical with that of the Roman Catholic Church in general, and therefore I suppose needs no defence This, if true, will no doubt weigh with the members of that Church. (I need scarcely say it weighs nothing with me ) But is it true? The nothing with me) But is it true? The point is one on which an outsider must speak with caution, but I very much mistake the condition of things within that Church if all the ethical and especially the political principles of the Jesuits are accepted universally by its adherents. The Jesuits may have triumphed over all opposition, but, if so, it has been only after a hard struggle with the nobler and more patriotic Gallican party; and the end is not yet. Father Junes seems surprised that I should care so little about priced that I should care so little about this point, and hints that I am scarcely in touch with my fellow religionists. It may help him to understand my position if I explain that in making that remark I referred mainly to ethical points, whereas the present just alarm has arisen chiefly from the practical assertion of those ex travagant and dangerous political princi ples of which the Jesuits are the chief if

For these and perhaps other reasons also which he does not care to mention Father Jones will not discuss the general issue. He, however, suggests another mode of dealing with it which seem more to his mind—the persecution of those who presume to criticize too severely by means of vexatious liberauits. I think we have heard of this style of argument before, and the covert threat to resort to it in this instance does little credit to the goodness of his heart or the strength of cause. I certainly am not anxious for alibel suit, but I suspect Father Jones and those who may back him will find that truth is not to be so trampled down on the American continent in this nineteenth century. It may not, however, be one of the least of the supposed advantages entincorporation that they are now able to institute such actions in their the article on the Jesuits in the last edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica and I find his rentering almost identical with have to thank Father Jones for his hint my own. that this is to be their policy. Forewarned is forearmed. But as he refuses to discuss the general question, I may be allowed to make a few remarks on the point which he does discuss, viz, the cor-rect rendering of the passage in the con-stitutions of the Jesuit Order. He not unnaturally makes the most of my admis sion in the previous letter that, in view of the usage of Thomas Aquinas three hundred years before, the words "Obligatio ad peccatum" may mean an obligation under pain of sin, and that I was prepared to accept his word for it that this was the meaning put upon it by the order at the present time. He ought to have been content with that admission; for I fear I shall now have to take it back or at least to qualify it, as the result of his additional o quanty 15, as the result of his additional ingument. He proves altogether too nuch for his own view of the case.

He endeavors to make out that the inserpretation of the Society's Constitutions

terpretation of the Society's Constitutions was as much in keeping with sound moral ity in the past as it is to-day. In support of this he appeals to the commentary of Suarez on the constitutions published about three hundred years ago as an ex ponent of the meaning put upon this passage at that time. This is perfectly fair. But when we look at that interpretation what do we find? I must assume the accuracy and fulness of Father Jones extracts from Suarez, as this work is not accessible to me at the moment. But unless I misunderstand Suarez his interpre tation of the passage, while certainly un objectionable, is entirely different from that of Father Jones. The view pre sented by the latter is so strange that I find some of my friends, reading less carefully, have missed it altogether and I take the liberty of re-stating it, as I understand it, in slightly different terms. He makes the passage to mean that no rule of the constitutions, apart from the great vows, can involve an obligation under pain of sin, in virtue of the rule itself. To make an infraction of such a rule sinful, it must be especially commanded by the Superior in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of holy obedience. Suarez seems to take no account of the exception at the end, "nisi superior ea etc.," "unless the superior commands these, etc.," but contents himself with asserting that accord ing to this paragraph obedience is to be yielded to the superior's voice in all things in which there is no manifest sin (in quibus nullum est manifestum peccatum). This is unexceptional, indeed, as far as it goes, but it is entirely different from Father Jones' interpretation. In fact he does not claim that it is the same, but only that it is "equally unexceptionable."
The truth seems to by that whenever the Jesuits seek to explain this passage for

last century. Then the exception "nist Superior es juberet" came out and something new had to be devised. Father Jones gives us one device, but for aught I know now there may be half a dezen others doing duty in various parts of the world. The same thing may be said of the interpretation given in the summary of the Constitutions. I may say to Father Jones that I had not overlooked the passage in the 31st number, which has Father Jones that I had not overlooked the passage in the 31st number, which he kindly quotes for my benefit, where they are exhorted to conform their will and judgment wholly to the Superior's will and judgment in all things where there appears no sin (uff peccatum non cerner etur). But neither do I forget that this also was printed long before the Constitutions appeared, at Jeast a century and a half, perhaps more. (The adition from Jesuit teaching in which I and the public are mainly interested. His reasons for this refusal are characteristic.

One is, that such a discussion would be in danger of shocking the sensitiveness of chaste ears. I certainly feel that there is some force in this, as no Jesuit casulat that I have read seems to be able to discussion y subject very long without introducing matters which should "not so much as be named" But what is to be thought of this reason as coming from

Father Jones finds fault with me for overlooking the marginal references in the Gonstitutions, on which he seems to lay much stress. But I did cite the heading of the chapter, and now we are coolly told that the expression "obligatio peccati" which occurs there "has no weigh in the matter" as giving the general subject of the chapter. Mere marginal references could hardly carry greater weight, even if it were true that they pointed in a different in the county of the chapter. Mere marginal references could hardly carry greater weight, even if it were true that they pointed in a different in the county of the chapter. The pointed in a different in the county of the chapter was to restrain the rules from leading to the commission of size. But they naturally take in o account of the exception, wherein lies the whole sting of the charge

He also complains that I do not discuss his explanation of "ad" as equivalent to obligation under pain of sin (Star, Feb.)

He also complains that I do not discuss his explanation of "ad" as equivalent to "urque ad," and somewhat ostentationally refers me to Livy and Cicero and Leverett's dictionary. Now Leverett happens to be the dictionary I use, and I never doubted or questioned that meaning of it But that seuse is quite as consistent with my rendering as with his—in fact, a little more so. What I did say was that the natural meaning of peccatum was sin not penalty of sin, in which sense it is not tound in any classical author that I can penalty of sin, in which sense it is not found in any classical author that I can discover.

Now, I do not mean to crowd Father Jones too much. I can easily understand how with the best intentions men may be led to persuade themselves that awkward and inconvenient passages in their recognized formularies do not mean what they plainly say, but something else that is unobjectionable. And I had far rather see him do that than defend such a monstrous doctrine as this which appears in the Constitutions. He is heartily welcome to his interpretation as it must be a great relief to his science. But I still maintain that my rendering, is the natural rendering of the passage. Not one of my arguments has been overthrown. He ad mits that I am sustained by the usage of Gury. All his own authorities bear out the sustained by the susage of the susage o my view as to the general purport of the chapter. That granted, the exception at the end can have no sense other than what I have given it, And I am not alone in this opinion. A friend has furnished me with the translation of this passage by Dr. Littledale, the writer of the article on the Jesuits in the last edition of the Eucyclopedia Britannica and I find his remaining almost identical with

command as to which he had scruples of conscience. I answer that I can hardly conceive of any worse crime before G d against my son than that of requiring him by force or fear to soil his conscience through obedience to any command of mine, unless it should be to train him up in such fashion that he would cherish no thoughts but mine; know no will but mine, have no conscience but mine I would then be able to obtain unquestioning obedience, but I should have slain his

JOHN SCRIMGER.
Montreal, February, 28th, 1890.

Father Jones to Rev. Mr. Scrimger. To the Editor of the Montreal Star:

SIR-Saturday is a good day to balance one's accounts. I invite you to inspect with me the results of this week's business. For convenience sake, I shall distribute it under several headings. I cordially in vite our mutual friend, Professor Scrim ger, to join the party. You probably will congratulate us on the fact that no bones were broken, no very hard names given, and that good humor and mutual selfrespect have characterized our little "difference."

WHAT THE PROFESSOR HAS NOT GRASPED. 1 That to vindicate the Constitutions I do not take "peccatum" for the penalty of sin, but for sin. That we are not discussing the import of "obligatio peccati" but of "obligate ad peccatum," and that consequently "obligatio peccati" has nothing to do with the matter.

2 That Suarge loss etter to be less than the consequence of the co

2 That Suarez, loco citato, is laying down, as given in the Constitutions, the limits of the Superior's right to command, and insists upon the very exception scouted at by the Professor.

3 That there are much earlier author-ized editions of the Constitutions than the one he gives of 1757. So that he will have to make room for a few more books

in his library.

4 That "nothing new had to be de-4 That hotting new had to be devised," as the famous "ubi peccatum non cerneretus" may be found on pages 16 17 of an authorized edition of the Summary of the C netitutions, printed in 1582, and which, Mr. Eittor, I take the liberty of ending you for inspection.

WHAT THE PROFESSOR HAS NEGLECTED TO DISPROVE OR HAS CONVENIENTLY OVERLOOKED

1. That the Ministerial Association, etc.,

is attacking the Ustholic Caurch over the shoulders of the Jesuits.

2 That the Catholic Church has found the public eye they feel its awkwardness naught to condemn in Liguori's teaching, and cast about for some method of explain or in that of his humble follower, Gury. and cast about for some method of explaining it away. The earlier method was the more satisfactory until the Constitutions themselves had to be published as the result of the famous law suit over Lavallette's hankruptoy in the middle of the lette's hankruptoy in the middle of the

pain of sin," and not of "obliging to com-

mit sin."

4. That in corroboration of that inter-

4. That in corroboration of that interpretation of the "obligare ad" of the 5th, ch of the 6th Part of the Institute, we have the parallel passages:

(a) Summary of the Constitutions, No.

31. The will and judgment of the inferior is to be conformable to the will and judgment of the superior in all things where there appears no sin

there is no manifest sin.

(d) Letter on Obedience, No. 18, substantially the same.

5 That Science (1549 1617), after quot-

ing the above passages in explaining the sc ps of obedience in the Society (Star, 27 Feb.), declares that the Superior's right to mention the exception, which was then unknown to the public.

Father Jones finds fault with me for of the licit (intra latitudinem materiae)

of the usage of St. Thomas Aquinas three hundred years before, the expression "obligatio ad peccatum" may mean an obligation under pain of sin (Star, Feb.

2. That he never doubted or questioned that meaning of "ad," whereby it is rendered as "usque ad," "unto" (Star, Feb. 28)

WHAT THE PROFESSOR DENIES.

That "usque ad" is a natural meaning of "ad" (Star, Feb 28).

I deferentially submit that the natural meaning of an expression is any one of those significations in which it is used by standard authors. Both Livy and Cicero have used it in this acceptation, therefore it is the natural meaning of the word. If the Professor means that it is not the usual acceptance, then, at least let here the Professor means that it is not the usual acception, then, at least, let him refrain from saying that it "has not even the merit of being good Latin" (Ster, Feb 26). What should a conscientious man 26). What should a conscientious man do when a word with a two fold meaning occurs, and the reputation of his neighbour depends upon the interpretation he is to put on it? Is he to take it, in spite of the protestations of his neighbour, in the sense that would go to make him a villain? Or should be consult the context, and parallel passages of the document to determine the meaning. Jesuit morality, as well as the law of charity, would prescribe the latter course. But what are we to think of him, if the scoepation sanctioned her water in the stabelly form to think of him, if the sceeptation sanctioned by usage in the schools from the days of St. Thomas precludes all doubt as to the rendering he should adopt?

THE PROFESSOR HAS INDULGED IN A LITTLE public.

I thought J. suits were the only ones to be accused of fineseing in an argument.

I refer to the point where the inferior
has a doubt about the propriety of obeying his superior, or when the boy calls in question the right of his father to clear my own.

Oue more word and I have done. He asks me to look to my own household and see how I would brook any hesitancy on the part of one of my sons to obey a command as to which he had scruples of command as to which he had scruples of atlent of that connectence? By whom ation of that conscience? By whom ation of that conscience; by wn m should be be taught those lessons of mor ality necessary to prevent that conscience from being warped? And we must not lose sight of the fact that in the hypothe sis, his conscience is not made up as to the unrighteousness of an act, for then he must disobey, as when the father would have him lie, or steal or otherwise sin. But be doubts whether the thing be right Sinday school. He is commanded and Sinday school. He is commanded to keep holy the Sabbath, the seventh day in the week. Hitherto, like other Christiens, he has kept Sunday, the first day of the week, but one Saturday he is told by his father to saw a cord of wood. He finds no warranty in Scripture for the change. Proof fessor Scrimger no doubt would proceed to form his boy's conscience. He, on the second to form his boy's conscience. He, on the second to form his boy's conscience the second to form his boy's the second to form his boy's conscience the second to form his boy's conscience the second to form his boy's conscience the second to form his boy's a conscience the second to form his boy's a conscience the second to form his boy's a conscience the s words "This is My bidy," "Do this in commemoration of Me," and forthwith asks his father if it would not be well for him to attend Catholic service, while that doctrine is put into practice. Would the conscientious Professor be more inclined and not one of them to that of the sinful in conclusion let measure of respect for the individual conscience, but every father will understand my meaning who is not a bad doctrine is put into practice. Would the conscientious Professor be more inclined. conscientious Professor be more inclined to flay his body than to slay his soul? For the inferior, in the Jesuit O.der, there For the inferior, in the Jeautt O.der, there is no necessity, in such cases of "nuquestioning obedience" St. Ignatius himself in his letter on that subject, which forms part of the Constitutions, gives the following directions to the interior: in No. 19 (No. 18 ends with the famous limitation in another form "quae cum peccato manifesto conjuncte non sunt"): "Neither are you hindered by this if any thing occurs to you different from the thing occurs to you different from th superior's opinion, and it seems (after you have commended the same humbly to God) that it ought to be declared, but that you may propose it unto him, etc

WHAT THE PROFESSOR RASHLY OPINES That it would be preferable for the con-fessor and the penitent to invite the public to audit the settling of all matters of conscience; while, very likely, he would not tolerate in publical consultations between the physician and his patient, nor enthusi satically encourage indiscriminate clinical operations in the forum. Once again our no ions of morality are at variance.

The Professor seems unduly alarmed at the prospect of the forum in another form. To altay his fears, I can assure him that we have not the slightest intention of drag-ging him before relentless judges. Though it might inspire with a salutary fear, certain publishers, to be told that it is not at all necessary to be armed with a bill of incorporation to proceed against

To the Elitor of the Mentreal Star : SIR-Though I have already trespassed upon your kindness and space, I may be allowed, in accordance with Father Jones'

under pain of. Leverett, his own authority, gives us the meaning, even to, as far as, up to, to the amount of, etc., but nowhere, under pain of, or anything equivalent to it. Unto is not equivolent to under pain of, as Father Jones asserts, except by an ellipsis which he would supply in one way, while I think it ought to be supplied in another. The natural phrase to express his meaning is not ad peccatum, but sub peccat or more fully sub poeca paeccati.

2. On a second point a little additional.

Jones correctly enough says there are earlier authorized editions. I have before me a reprint of the original Latin edition printed in Rome, at the House of the Society (Rome, in aedibus Societatis Jeu) 1558. But these earlier etitions were for the use of the members of the Society only (apparently not even for all large well without it at long he will be Jones correctly enough says there are earlier authorized editions. I have before me a reprint of the original Latin edition of them), and were carefully prevented from going into general circulation. The text of this chapter was therefore not known to the public until the middle of ever to entrap those who wonder much in the last century except surreptitiously, and as it was thus of doubtful authentic it was easily denied. I dere say this fact was already known to Father Jones and that he communicated it to you privately, when he sent down for your inspection his precious 1582 copy of the Summary (an altogether different work, which does not contain the passage under discussion)

judge between us. For the banefit of those whose Latin is a little rusty he might have sent along also Leverett's Lexcon, if he could spare it for a few days. As there appears to be some ambiguity in the statement of the Constitutions, and as he seems to think the matter very serious,

ness or otherwise of an infraction of the minor rules in the Constitutions. In the paper which has called it forth. I shall proof see the admirable condensation of them in Saturday's letter. This shows notice of any corrections, ciercal or other that even Father Jones feels this to be the

6 When I test these interpretative and parallel passages one after another, by adding the obnoxious exception of this passages. To the Editor of the Montreal Star; sage under discussion : unless the Superior sage under discussion: unless the superior command these in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc. I find that they all make good sense, which would hardly be the case if it were already embraced in with what comes under the heading of his the case if it were already embraced in them, and that this sense is exactly the one I have given to the chapter. I take the shortest as a sample, adopting Father Jones' words: "The Superior is to be the shortest as a sample, adopting Father Jones' words: "The Superior is to be the same sample, adopting the same sample, adopting Father Jones' words: "The Superior is to be the same sample, adopting Father Jones' words: "The Superior is to be the same sample, adopting Father Jones' words: "The Superior is to be the same sample, and that this sense is exactly the one paragraph 4. He will be hard to please the sample sample sample, and that this sense is exactly the one paragraph 4. He will be hard to please the will be hard to please the sample obeyed in all things wherein sin appears will not have even the excuse of pleading not," unless the Superior command these before his Maker that he acted up to the not," unless the Superior command these in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of holy obedience. I ask your readers to try it with any of the others in the same way. These solemn formulas of command "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" or "in virtue of holy obedience, I see your account of command "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" or "in virtue of holy obedience," are very rarely to be used (see Gury, Compend. Vol. II, § 171), but when they are used the subordinate's only course is obedience. I am sorry if this sense goes to make some of my neighbors out as villains' or rather to show the religious of the Suciety of Jesus bound.

before his Maker that he acted up to the dictates of his conscience in obeying a formal command by a legit.

the sill what he acted up to the set me right with his friends, and beg him to believe that so far from its being any—thing strange or anomalous in religious or ders, it is the exception when their constitutions bind the members under pain of sin, in virtue of the rule itself. I "And he (St. Ignatius) declares that off-nee to His Divine Majesty.

A—Suarez (1649-1617). Opera omnia, sense igoes to make some of my neighbors out as villains' or rather to show the religious of the Suciety of Jesus bound. is not at all necessary to be some dwith a bill of incorporation to proceed against them.) Any citizen, be he a member of the Law and Order Society or not, might amuse himself at their expense.

bors out as villating or rather to show that their system may lead directly to the by their yow in every matter whatever if lick?" In § 6, under the above heading, after a prefatory remark on the status attack and when I consider that the society in its brief history.

allowed, in accordance with Father Jones' invitation, to check his balance sheet of Saturday last and supplement some of its omissions from my point of view. Though he has been kind enough to assure me that I am to be exempted from the operation of the libel suit policy, I notice that this does not apply to the publisher, so I shall be as moderate as I can. Perhaps I shall the better succeed in this that a quiet Sunday has intervened.

1 On one point we seem to have mis understood each other all through, as even the most fair minded and good natured the most fair minded and good natured. can. Perhaps I shall the better succeed in this that a quiet Sunday has intervened.

1 On one point we seem to have mis understood each other all through, as even the most fair minded and good natured controversialists will sometimes do. It now appears that in the phrase "obligation ad peccatum," which has sigured so largely in the discussion, Father Jones takes peccatum, as I do, in the sense of sin, but makes ad mean under pain of, on the ground that it is equivalent to usque ad I mild, and altogether besieve that he will an away properly be used as equivalent to usque ad in classical Listin ever has the meaning under pain of. Liverett, his own authority, gives us the meaning, even to, as far ity, gives us the meaning, even to, as far ity, gives us the meaning, even to, as far I leave this to the judgment of the public, asking only one question: Even

becastum, but sub peccati or more fully ub poena paeccati.

2. On a second point a little additional matters of morals, but I see no need for the Society of Jesus were first authoritatively published in 1757. Father octety only (apparently not even for all very well without it, as I hope he will be ever to entrap those who wonder much in its mazes even though their intentions are of the best.

9 Father Jones accuses me of fines ing

in my reply to his question as to the right of a father to compet obedience from his son when the latter has scruples of conscience. I am sorry he should have allowed him self to use the expression, as it is wholly unwarranted, and is the only thing which an altogether contain the passage under that he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to mention it to the But he has forgotten to the related to the right of a father to clear up his son's doubts. These two things: compelling obedience in the face of soruples and clearing up doubts, may mean the same to Father Jones; they mean the same to Father Jones; they are far from being identical with mention of the works of Aquinas in graph the same to Father Jones; they are far from being identical with mention of the works of Aquinas in graph the same to Father Jones; they are far from being identical with mention of the case related to my horse or my dog, they might be so, but not with my propose of the city for the edification of the leading business.

Agary be unwarranted, and is not the courting all that he has said as to the courtesy dis-played in the discussion thus far. I shall I would seek to clear up my son's doubts and remove his scruples. In both of the ingenious cases which he supposes I would seek to "form his conscience" That is what I am trying to do every day with all the midden and disconnent look with all the wisdom and discernment God bas granted me by giving him instruction and laying down sound principles of sction, even by guarding him from

In conclusion let me say that I am urged be glad to receive from Father Jones subject of the chapter, notwithstanding his own assertion that it is about something done him.

wise, which he might desire to have made in his part of it, so that full justice may be done him.

JOHN SCRIMGER. done him. John Scrimger, Montreal, March 3rd, 1890.

the religious of the Society of Jeaus bound

My thanks, in closing this letter, are due to the Professor, and I take you to witness, Mr. Elifor that he has been considerate enough almost to promise not to crowd me too much. But if I feel myself seriously incommoded, and find that there is not room for us both, why, I shall as gracefully as possible bow myself out, and perhaps it is time to do so already.

St. Mary's College, 1st March, 1890.

Rev Mr. Scrimger to Father Jones.

Of three and a half centuries has been expelled in turn from almost every country under Heaven, Oatholic and Processing is that obedience in the Society; in other words, does it extend to any object whatever, and to any actions? And here there is no question of any arrest of judgment.

7. I am sorry to introduce any new matter at this stage of the discussion, but as Father Jones has done so in his com munication of Saturday by referring to a promise of a vow, as they are displeasing rest of judgment.

7. I am sorry to introduce any new matter at this stage of the discussion, but as Father Jones has done so in his communication of Saturday by referring to a couple of passages Nos 18 and 19 in the famous Letter on Obedience, I trust he will pardon me if I ask why be has not also cited for us a little more of Chap. If § 1 of the Sixth Part of the Constitutions. It has a very intimate bearing on Superior, that is, God." This sets at rest hold good against the command of the Superior, that is, God." This sets at rest the accusation that the Jesuits believe that a Superior may command sin, and

this evidence is "previous to 1757."

I reharmed part of § 7, of this same chapter XII, in my letter of Thursday last, and I now pass over the remainder of that section and the other sections which that section and the other sections which precede and follow it, as far as § 13. The passages omitted would throw still more light on the subject, but are too lengthy to find room in your columns. Those interested may consult them in the original. If Professor Scrimger be willing to accept my invitation he will be welfarmed to partial Sparge at his lessure. come to peruse Suarez at his leisure. For his former visit has left none but pleasant I now come to § 13, entitled "Con-

firmatio proxime dictorum —B Ignatius et exactam in suo ordine observantiam et obligationem ad culpam extra vota nullam Laducit." Anglice: "Confirmation of what has just been said .- In his order, St. Ignatus imposes neither a strict observ-ance nor an obligation under pain of sin, outside the matter of the vows." Suarcz, we here see, makes use of "ad" after the manner of St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Ignatius. He takes "obligatio ad culpam" as an equivalent for "ob igatio ad pecca-tum." To take it as it here stands, in this chapter 12, with its immediate surroundings, in any other seuse than that of "an obligation unto sin," or, in plain English, "an obligation under pain of sin," would suppose a recklessness of conse-quences of which I deem Professor Scrimquences of which I deem Professor Scrim-ger to be too shrewd a person to be guilty. To forfett a reputation for exegetical capacity, would be simply ruinous for any man in the Professor's position. It would be drawing too heavily on the treasures of a fair name amassed by long carried programmitting taken. It would in years of unremitting labor. It would, in fine, be putting too violent a strain on the good will and implicit reliance on his word, which bind to him a not insignifi-

cant train of admirers.

It was indeed with unfelgned regret that I watched the Professor venturing already so far out in treacherous waters, though he was warned in time that his though ne was warned in time that his foot hold on the shelving bottom was less steady. It is undoubtedly not yet too late to save his reputation as a incere man, and an unfaltering seeker after truth; but as for his reputation as an exegete, a few, ugly rents require immediate mending before it can again stand the scrutinizing gaze of an over exacting pub

But we are losing eight of Suarez, who, in treating ex professo, in this his Chapter XII, the Chapter VI of the Constitutions goes on to say :

B -"And this (what he had just developed in preceding sections) is borne out, since a more extended power (t. e., of commanding things not according to the ordinary mode of life within the Society) under this vow (of obedience) is neither necessary nor useful to the Society in view of its end; nay more; it would prove hurtful on account of the peril and prove hirtin on account of the peril and perturbation which might arise from the exercise of it. It is, therefore, beyond belief that any such power was given to Superiors either in the intention of those vowing or of those who framed and who approved the Institute. And this may be correctly asserted in view of the 5th chapter of the sixth part of the same Constitutions, in which our blessed Father Ignatius wisely provides egainst bave him ite, or store.

But be doubts whether the thing be right or wrong Let us take a case in point of wrong Let us take a case in point. His son is an assiduous attendant at Sinday school. He is commanded by God to keep holy the Sabbath, the seventh day in the week Hitherto, like other Christians, he has kept Sunday, the first day of the week, but one Satisfirst day of the week day in the desires at the like. And I mean to keep on that the classifications and order of life to be satisfactions, and under pain of sin, mortal or venial, to the end, that snares and perils might be avoided; he adds, however, one exception: "Unless the Superior command in the name of our Lird Jesus Christ, or in virtue of chedience (nisi Superior in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, v.lin

nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vilin virtute obedientiae juberet ")

Let me here interrupt the quotation to remind Professor Scrimger that Susrez does take account of the exception, "Nist Superior ta, etc.;" and that the same exception did not come out for the first time on the occasion of Lavalette's bank-ruptcy, in the middle of the last century, ruptcy, in the middle of the last century, but when the Society's Constitutions were first approved by the Holy See. In the days of Suarez they had already become public property, though it be not the custom of religious orders to place their constitutions in the market. Consequently, Professor Scrimger's unhistorical insinuation, in the Star of February 28, is but another myth in the minds of anti-Jesuits. I must add, for the Professor's esuits. I must add, for the Professor's Jesuits. I must add, for the Professor's sati-faction, that he, in the same paragraph, renders quite correctly the meaning of the passege as it is universally understood by every Jesuit from the great Suarez down to my own humble self. I thank him, therefore, for having set me right with his friends, and beg him to believe that so far from its being any.

"And he (St. Ignatius) declares that not even this should be done without urgent cause, when he says: 'Which may be done in the case of such matters and persons, in which it shall be judged, that it will greatly conduce to each one's individual welfare or to the welfare of all? If the extent he properly taken all? If the extent be properly taken into account this power (of commanding) bears on the observance of the constitu-tions, declarations and order of life strictly

(Vid. pr point to pain of s you will Though scholastic have it justified technical thoughts seal upo only they pecularit are apt to Ignatius touching their La want of point to intended men, an I have against th Oatholic

world, I

intellect,

angels,"

virtue th

often at

being ur

that the

Church, sanction

ligious si makes t

nesses, will be t

round b

parative the bitte is better

death. Church o

in keep cerning tion an

proper e

not in f

power, o proceed As the

ical answ

longer a

of the cl

historica wanton

by the in

his "Sup For a ser stamp, it they hav M seter, low, and

as ble G she may not as se the Profe I vent

that the

complair exhibition

in any C

over gaves rei

rence, an

acity, my many of crowded dence to

And to our discu note, the

most agr doubt as mand, that as far ba and has main rea in favor I since ger (par. very har the Engl the equals inconcing I cousoul, he sing lack from me of a Jesu plain of expression it has co Let him that ther interpre' peccatum he manfu meaning tends at Catholic board ou as a sacra let him f for othe When he to the So

wares propublic, for ing. The terfuges,

the part

Jeeus eni See, and and more

can cause

unerring Christ.